

BOOK REVIEWS

Colonial Grandeur in Philadelphia. The House and Furniture of General John Cadwalader. By NICHOLAS B. WAINWRIGHT. Foreword by HENRY FRANCIS DUPONT. (Philadelphia: The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1964. xiv, 169 p. Illustrations, appendix, index. \$10.00.)

This welcome book gives us for the first time, step by step, a documented account of how the interior architecture and furnishing of a great eighteenth-century Philadelphia mansion was accomplished. The first half of the book is divided into three sections: the building of the John Cadwalader house, its furnishings, and its history. Like Samuel Powel, John Dickinson and several other prominent Philadelphians of this period, Cadwalader did not build his house but bought it already built and then embarked on complete renovation.

John Cadwalader commissioned Thomas Nevell, prominent member of the Carpenters' Company, as master carpenter in charge of the operation. Nevell's plan was to strip the house of all the plain Quaker woodwork originally installed by its prolific builder, Samuel Rhoads, and to replace it with elaborately paneled, carved and fretted mouldings suitable to the tastes of the new owner. Nevell's designs were doubtless inspired from Abraham Swan's *The British Architect*, as he was a subscription agent for the Philadelphia edition of this work. They were probably not slavish copies for, with the exception of a few details, there are no illustrations in Swan that match exactly the description of John Cadwalader's house. A new service wing was to be added, as well as a stable and carriage house, but the basic plan of the main house was to stay unchanged.

To accomplish this, even as today, Nevell subcontracted much of the work. David Evans, another member of the Carpenters' Company and subscriber to Swan, built most of the less exacting wings and outbuildings. For John Cadwalader's great rooms, Benjamin Randolph, cabinetmaker of "sample chair" fame, designed the carved decorations and executed many of them. This is perhaps the first time that a cabinetmaker of Randolph's stature is shown to have been employed in the embellishment of paneling. His detailed bill dated November 24, 1770, is reproduced as irrefutable evidence.

Hercules Courtenay, carver and gilder from London, and the firm of Bernard and Jugiez also had a hand in the extensive and intricate carving which must have been as elaborate as any heretofore seen in Philadelphia. It embraced leaf consoles, grass carved mouldings, and several pediments surmounted with a lion and dragons. Courtenay's carved rendition of "The

Judgment of Hercules" set off by festoons occupied the central fireplace frieze, with several echoing carved friezes for the overdoors. Much of this carving was gilded with 27 books of goldleaf acquired from the pharmacist, John Day. The ceilings of two parlors were decorated with stucco flowers, doubtless supported on curling rococo stems. This was done by James Clow, who had arrived from England in 1763. A quantity of gilt paper and gilt borders were also acquired by Cadwalader, though it is not known exactly how they were used; possibly the walls were papered and the gilt moulding used to frame the edges. At any rate, as Mr. Wainwright points out, there were other houses with carved woodwork and stucco ceilings, but John Cadwalader's was more elaborate, his carving was gilded, and his flower bestrewn ceilings were more expensive than others so far on record.

Anthony de Normandie glazed the windows, prepared the woodwork, and painted the house with 134 yards of green paint, 216 of blue paint, 124 of yellow paint, 88 of mahogany, and 64½ of lead colored paint. The house, when finished, must have presented a glittering medley of color and form. In his diary, Silas Deane, Connecticut member of the Continental Congress, observed that it was the finest house and furniture he had seen in Philadelphia or elsewhere in this country.

Thomas Affleck, Penn family cabinetmaker, oiled and polished five large mahogany doors, and in the winter of 1770-1771 supplied much fine furniture which was carved, not by him, but by James Reynolds and the aforementioned firm of Bernard and Jugiez. Specialization was quite a regular practice among handcraftsmen of the eighteenth century.

William Savery, in the same winter, was making a large quantity of walnut furniture, mostly for Cadwalader bedrooms and secondary rooms. Though many of Benjamin Randolph's bills are incomplete or missing, it is believed that he was responsible for the elaborate hairy-paw foot furniture, among which is the card table shown in the well-known Charles Willson Peale portrait of John Cadwalader and his family. It is used as the frontispiece and on the dust cover of this book.

The maker of a gold and white Cadwalader looking glass, hanging in the Stamper-Blackwell Parlor at the Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum, has long been the object of speculation. It is here shown as one of five mirrors purchased by Cadwalader from James Reynolds, carver, "one painted white." Other fine glasses were purchased from the today better known John Elliott.

Mr. Wainwright tells us that John Cadwalader signed the non-importation agreement of 1765, which was still in effect in 1770. The slant of his sympathies is shown by his patronage of local craftsmen. All but one piece of furniture was made nearby and, though Plunket Fleeson, famed Philadelphia upholsterer, supplied Wilton carpets to go under the slab tables in the hall, they may have been old stock as Cadwalader held off from purchasing even small imported accessories until the importation agreement was eased. Several years later, we find items such as English steel knives in a

case, English silver, and much Irish and English glass. An astonishing item was twelve Dresden cups and saucers, heretofore thought not to have been used in the Colonies.

An unparalleled flood of bills dating from 1769 tells us the names of those Philadelphia craftsmen and shopkeepers who supplied the dozens of details used in the interior of this mansion and the prices paid for each. Many of the bills are reproduced in facsimile, some with printed transcripts opposite, making them a pleasure to read. Some of the items follow: hardware, moulding (carved and uncarved), marbles, leaf gold, gold paper hanging and gilded papier-mâché mouldings, portraits, landscapes, stucco work, floor cloths, carpets, even the fearsome Webster Liquor (for exterminating unwelcome inhabitants in upholstery). An amusing bill from Shaw and Chisholm of Annapolis is for a "True Madame Table," the description of which identifies it as a billiard table.

The latter half of the book starts with the heading "Possessions and Possessors." It names and illustrates other "Old Philadelphia Houses for Purposes of Comparison with the Cadwalader House." Voluble information concerning craftsmen is supplied by bills to Cadwalader's cousin, John Dickinson, who was renovating a nearby old house at almost the same time. It also illustrates and compares rooms from Mayor Samuel Powel's House, which was already built when purchased from Charles Stedman in August, 1769. It, too, was refurbished by Powel shortly thereafter which makes the comparison especially interesting. The Mount Pleasant mansion and the Corbit-Sharp House of Odessa are also described and compared. The latter has been ably documented and delineated under the title *Grandeur on the Appoquinemink* by John Sweeney, curator of the Winterthur Museum. A further comparison is made with the most elaborate Philadelphia carved and paneled woodwork extant, the Stamper-Blackwell Parlor at the Winterthur Museum.

Another section illustrates and describes "Belongings once owned by General Cadwalader." Among these are handsome portraits with frames carved by Hercules Courtenay, a so-called Randolph sample chair which appears in a Peale portrait of Lambert Cadwalader, and another card table which appears to have been made by Thomas Affleck in 1771. It is now at Winterthur. A lovely slab table in the French taste, long owned by the Metropolitan Museum of Art and acquired soon after the Cadwalader sale of 1904, shows strong documentary evidence as having emanated from Benjamin Randolph's shop.

Randolph, Affleck, Reynolds, and Courtenay are names often attached to great Philadelphia pieces, sometimes solely by mere virtuosity of carving. Many are the attributions of the past. Now, with the correlation of these newly discovered Cadwalader papers by Mr. Wainwright, the names of these craftsmen can be definitely assigned to individual pieces.

It is particularly significant to observe that the names of these same great craftsmen that we have known so long, are the ones which consistently

recur in the Cadwalader papers in relation to completing the contract for what was probably the most elaborate mansion in Philadelphia.

In a third section photographs are illustrated of people whose lives relate to the Cadwalader house, its history and its furnishings. Warm glimpses of Cadwalader biography, also interlarding these latter pages, are not the least of the pleasures gained by the antiquarian willing to spend a few highly rewarding hours.

Of the greatest assistance in studying the pages of Mr. Wainwright's book has been the excellent appendix and the meticulously compiled index of references and cross references. The book is a scholarly and unique contribution to our knowledge of the American decorative arts, as well as to American history. It can inform and delight the student and amateur alike.

Wilmington, Del.

DAVID STOCKWELL

Ebenezer Kinnersley: Franklin's Friend. By J. A. LEO LEMAY. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964. 143 p. Illustrations, appendix, bibliography, index. \$4.00.)

J. A. Leo Lemay's brief biography of Ebenezer Kinnersley is an interesting and scholarly study of one of the minor personalities in colonial Pennsylvania. Although born in Gloucester, England, in 1711, he was brought as a child to Pennsylvania, where he remained until his death in 1778. During his lifetime he engaged in three careers: that of a Baptist minister, a scientist and public lecturer on electricity, and a Professor of English and Oratory at the College and Academy of Pennsylvania.

Little is known of Kinnersley's early life, but in 1739 he married Sarah Duffield, a niece of Colonel Jacob Duché, prominent Philadelphia merchant. He apparently moved to Philadelphia to enter Duché's business as an employee. At this time he was also an assistant minister to the Reverend Jenkin Jones. The Great Awakening soon brought serious differences of opinion within the Philadelphia churches, and in the summer of 1740 Kinnersley used the pulpit of the Philadelphia Baptist Church to attack the emotional preaching of the Reverend George Whitefield and his local followers. When Kinnersley refused to recant, he was tried in a church court where he again refused to make a "frank Confession" of his errors. He had Benjamin Franklin print a summary of his position in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*. By fall, the immediate controversy which had raged in the pulpit and in the press was over. In 1746, however, he engaged in another dispute with the Reverend Jones. As a result of his differences with Jones and the Philadelphia Baptist Church, he never was able to secure a church of his own although he continued to be active in church affairs.

Meanwhile Franklin had begun his electrical experiments, and one of his friends with whom he experimented was Kinnersley. Since Kinnersley was

unemployed at the time, Franklin suggested that he "undertake shewing the experiments for money, and drew up for him two lectures." Kinnersley usually published a broadside or inserted an advertisement in the local newspaper prior to giving his lecture. He became the "greatest lecturer of colonial America." Not only did his lectures on electricity remain popular for twenty-five years, but most of the other lecturers copied his experiments and manner of advertising. In 1749 he began a successful four-year tour in Annapolis which eventually took him through most of the colonial cities and ended in the West Indies in 1753.

It was while Kinnersley was in the West Indies that Franklin as a trustee of the Philadelphia College and Academy offered him the position of Professor of English and Oratory in the English School. Kinnersley accepted the position although it was never completely satisfactory to him because the classical curriculum drew the best students. He did remain, however, until October 17, 1772. Meanwhile, he continued his experiments and his electrical lectures.

Professor Lemay devotes considerable attention to two topics, one of which has little direct relationship to the biography. He describes in detail the introduction of electricity into the colonies in order to "clear up the question of the date and source of Franklin's introduction to electricity." More appropriately he refutes the charge that Franklin "stole the Franklinian system of electricity from Kinnersley." It was a bitter political opponent, the Reverend William Smith, Provost of the College and Academy, who first accused Franklin in print. Smith's accusation was printed in the October, 1758, issue of the *American Magazine*. Kinnersley replied to his immediate superior in the College in Franklin's *Gazette* on November 30, explaining his and Franklin's part in their joint experiments.

In the opinion of this reviewer, Professor Lemay has done a commendable piece of work with a paucity of available information. The biography is not so inclusive as one might wish, but the author is to be complimented for bringing together the available information in this excellent study.

Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia

JOHN J. ZIMMERMAN

The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin. Edited by LEONARD W. LABAREE, RALPH L. KETCHAM, HELEN C. BOATFIELD, and HELENE H. FINEMAN. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964. [viii], 351 p. Illustrations, selected bibliography, index. \$12.50.)

There are some kinds of statement that the prudent man will never make. Even if he is a historian, he will not make sweeping, categorical statements about the past; he doesn't know enough about it. Neither will he make such statements about the future; he doesn't know anything about that. Nevertheless, even in the presence, as it were, of that apostle of prudence,

Benjamin Franklin, I shall start this review by making precisely such a statement, involving both past and future. There have been scores, hundreds of editions of Franklin's *Autobiography*, but never has there been and never will there be one better than this one, prepared by the Editors of the *Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, now being produced at Yale University.

You know that it is a beautiful volume when you draw it out of its box. It is a substantial book of almost quarto size with a delicate design of rose-pink, gold, and gray on its front and back covers. It is well bound: lay it on your desk, open it, and it will lie open at whatever page you choose. It is printed in large and readable English Monotype Fournier type on fine, heavy, opaque paper. The two-page illustrations showing the houses where Franklin lived while writing the *Autobiography* are superbly mounted in such a way that one sees the whole picture without that annoying crease down the middle whereby the center of the picture is usually lost in the binding. It is a handsome book, in which Franklin as a bookseller and printer would have taken deep pleasure.

Apparently, the editors still plan to print the *Autobiography* in the many-volumed *Papers of Benjamin Franklin* in four distinct segments, thus recognizing the four periods in which Franklin worked on it. I complained mildly about the inconvenience of this arrangement when I reviewed the first volume of the *Papers* in this *Magazine* in April 1960, but with this splendid edition of the whole book in my hands, I now swallow that complaint. The editors' work here is, as one would expect, almost faultless. They have based the text on the original manuscript, now at the Huntington Library in California, making only a very few trivial but legitimate changes in the interests of readability. The annotation is excellent: the footnotes are not conspicuous or excessive; they are always brief, pointed, and useful. Instead of identifying individuals in footnotes where Franklin mentions them, they have appended a series of alphabetically arranged biographical notes at the end of the book. They have also included Franklin's outline of the *Autobiography*, a document which only makes one wish that somehow Franklin had contrived to get the book all written.

The editors' Introduction seems to me admirable. They attempt no new assessment or interpretation. They deal briefly and appreciatively with the book's qualities in content and style. They refer to some of the writers who have spoken of the book with great appreciation and to some of the others who have detested it. They tell the story of Franklin's writing it and the complicated history of its successive publications, not omitting to point out that its first appearance in print was in a French translation and that its first appearance in English was in the form of not one but two translations of it back into the language but not the words in which Franklin had written it! They tell us something of the varying texts in which Victorian gentility had tried to "improve" Franklin by changing "great Guzzlers of Beer" to "great drinkers of beer" and "he had got a naughty Girl with Child" to "he had had an intrigue with a girl of bad character." They have provided

a fine index, a useful chronology of Franklin's life, and a selective bibliography. What more could any editor do?

So far I have spoken chiefly of the work of the printers, the binders, and the editors. But Franklin, after all, wrote the book. I have only one thing to say about it. If you have never read it, read it. If you read it as a child, read it again. If you have read it a dozen times, then I say once more: read it again.

Swarthmore College

FREDERICK B. TOLLES

The Age of the Democratic Revolution. A Political History of Europe and America, 1760-1800. Vol. II, The Struggle. By R. R. PALMER. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964. x, 584 p. Maps, index. \$7.50.)

This completes what is perhaps the most important contribution by an American scholar of this generation to Western history in a very important period. The first volume, *The Challenge*, described revolutionary movements from about 1760 to 1792 against the old order of society. These were doubtfully successful save in America. *The Struggle* discusses the course of revolution and reaction in many countries from 1792 until 1800, when France settled down for the time being under Napoleon Bonaparte, and the United States, after a decade of party contentions, under Thomas Jefferson.

In a brilliant combination of narrative and analysis, Professor Palmer sketches "issues and adversaries" in what was often called the "second revolution" of the summer of 1792. The French monarchy collapsed. Extremists were in the saddle. War on the frontiers spread as the new French Republic offered "aid and fraternity to all peoples wishing to recover their liberty" (p. 59). Kaleidoscopic changes in European governments and boundaries took place. In eastern Europe Poland was all but obliterated. Republics sprang up in the Netherlands, and in different parts of Italy. An "ambiguous revolution" can be detected in Germany. What is called "The High Tide of Revolutionary Democracy" (XI) was reached in 1798. Palmer pauses to give a useful comparative survey of the new constitutions. Britain presented the most determined resistance to French ideological and military aspirations throughout the period, but even there a not inconsiderable number of Jacobin sympathizers may be found. In Ireland the United Irishmen unsuccessfully attempted, with inadequate French help, to gain freedom for their country.

Throughout the book, Professor Palmer continually pauses to notice American affairs. Section XVI, "America: Democracy native and imported," includes comments on Latin America and on Canada. In the United States, he points out, "there was a curious reversal or transposition.

In Europe, on the whole, those who favored the French Revolution were middle-class people living in towns, including . . . those interested in the newer forms of economic enterprise and development" (p. 523). In the countryside it was landowners and farmers most involved in market economy who were revolutionaries. In America, the business and mercantile community were federalist and anti-French. The European counterrevolution was agrarian. In Virginia the gentry were Jeffersonian. Hamilton, Palmer notices, was more revolutionary than Jefferson in temperament and in "the politics he espoused" (p. 522). He, like the European republicans, wanted to abolish the states and strengthen the national government, where Jefferson, who defended the French, was for a different kind of liberty and equality. Hamilton admired the new industrialism of Britain, while Jefferson feared it. But the chapter must be read to appreciate fully its flavor and to follow Palmer's illumination of the birth of the two party system, long recognized as produced by reactions to contemporary European happenings.

A final chapter, "Climax and Denouement," (1798-1800), vividly portrays Napoleon's course to power. A scant half dozen paragraphs suffice for the moral Palmer draws from his extensive examination of this period of revolution. In human history there is an almost irresistible urge towards equality. During the last forty years of the eighteenth century, this, as never before, became clear. Thereafter, defenders of inequality were obliged to modify or abandon their arguments. Perhaps no revolution was inevitable if the warning signs of the times induced the ruling class to rectify abuses. Social disintegration seems bound to develop wherever a sense of injustice and oppression persist without the hope of redress.

The book is admirably printed. Maps illuminate the less familiar areas discussed. Footnotes, conveniently placed at the bottom of the page, amply document the author's investigations. The Index at first glance seems less satisfactory, but, used with the *Contents* (vii-ix) and with the cross references in the notes, provides most that a reasonably industrious reader needs. Those especially concerned with American history should turn to Section XVI, page 523, note 13, where references elsewhere to comparisons, "explicit and allusive" are conveniently listed and well worth looking up.

As the scope and nature of the scholarship involved in the production of these volumes is soberly considered, the author's statement (vi) that the work occupied much of fourteen years is surprising only in the realization that one man with occasional, (and amply acknowledged), assistance from expert colleagues, could persist in the arduous task. A work like this is seldom attempted and rarely with the measure of success achieved. All historians must be grateful to Professor Palmer for an imaginative conception and a scrupulous and scholarly accomplishment.

Loyalists and Redcoats. A Study in British Revolutionary Policy. By PAUL H. SMITH. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1964. xii, 199 p. Appendix, bibliography, index. \$5.00.)

In this worthwhile book, Mr. Smith analyzes the relationships between British military policy and the Loyalists of the American Revolution. He concerns himself primarily with answering the questions of how and why efforts to use the Loyalists as an effective military force failed. His suggested answers are several: British policy was belatedly formulated; when finally adopted, that policy was based upon mistaken views of the nature of the struggle in the New World; and British commanders made numerous mistakes in carrying out programs somewhat haphazardly designed in London. The result was an increasing dependence upon the Loyalists that weakened the whole British war effort.

Essentially, British ministers began with no understanding of the vastness of the problems to be faced in the American War. Believing in the continued allegiance of most colonists, military planners thought that a show of force in a single campaign might end colonial resistance. Thus, at first, the policymakers saw no real need to rally or to arm the Loyalists. When events indicated that the rebellion could not easily be crushed, the British government did take a few steps designed to encourage Loyalists to take up arms. Somewhat ironically, as British mistakes and reverses made more difficult the recruitment of Americans, the plans of the North ministry came to rely more and more upon strong Loyalist support. From March, 1778, British strategy "rested squarely upon participation of Loyalists in the re-establishment of royal authority. . . ." (p. 172). In London, the ministers made several assumptions: there were large numbers of Americans who would be willing to give armed support to royal government; these men were angry enough at "Congressional tyranny" that relatively few inducements would be necessary to lead them to enlist in militia units or provincial detachments; and such loyal men could defend reconquered colonies once the army had cleared them of major Continental forces. This British policy was to receive its one real test in the campaign that led to temporary successes and ultimate defeat in Georgia and South Carolina. Yet thereafter the British government remained committed to this same set of beliefs. Facing other enemies, lacking enough troops for the American War, fending off peace demands at home, the ministers clung to the contention that there were large numbers of Americans who could not be deserted to the mercy of the rebels and who were willing to fight to restore royal authority. Thus, the ministry fumbled along just as Cornwallis, who was, unlike his superiors, already thoroughly disillusioned about the Loyalists, stumbled on through the Carolinas and Virginia.

In general, Mr. Smith has provided a fine analysis of the development of a British policy which, as he repeatedly stresses, was so intimately connected with the loss of so much of the old Empire. As he notes, his subject is not

an easy one with which to deal: it "is varied and somewhat diffuse. . . ." (p. ix). Of necessity, the narrative jumps from London to New York to the Carolinas and so on. Consequently, there is a certain lack of narrative continuity in the early chapters. Mr. Smith has a somewhat unfortunate habit of summarizing and restating his arguments with great frequency. But these two complaints about style should be taken as minor ones. The research has been thorough. Mr. Smith has obviously spent many hours examining the bulky communications exchanged among the makers of British policy. In several instances—such as the significance of the expedition to the Southern colonies in 1776—he clarifies matters frequently subjected to misinterpretation in the past. His views of figures like Germain and Clinton provide a valuable contrast to those offered by Piers Mackesy in his *The War for America*. Mr. Smith's work obviously has many strong points and provides new insights on the Loyalist problem and the weaknesses of British policy during the American War.

University of California, Davis

DAVID L. JACOBSON

Decision at the Chesapeake. By HAROLD A. LARRABEE. (New York: Clarkson N. Potter, Inc., 1964. xviii, 317 p. Maps, appendix, bibliography, index. \$5.00.)

With a keen sense of the dramatic, a strict adherence to fact, and a facile pen, the author has created an outstanding contribution to the naval history of the American Revolution, and has presented another graphic illustration of the importance of sea power in warfare. Whether or not the comparatively minor engagement, in which DeGrasse thwarted Graves' effort to relieve the beleaguered Cornwallis at Yorktown, "determined the outcome of the American Revolution," it was unquestionably one of the most decisive naval battles of the war. One wonders, however, if Howe's failure to trap Washington and his entire army on Long Island in 1776, or Germain's neglect to send the dispatch which would have ordered the British in New York northward to meet Burgoyne, were not just as strong determining factors in the final outcome. Regardless of the validity of the claim, Dr. Larrabee has written one of the most penetrating accounts of the events leading up to the battle and a vivid word picture of the battle itself. His device of creating a stage, whereon the various "Architects of Defeat" exhibit either their incompetence or their blunders, is a piece of graphic historical writing. There are profiles of George III, and the Lords North, Germain and Sandwich, which clearly expose their fatuous belief that the American Colonies could be conquered with ease; of the Admirals Graves, Hood and Rodney, and the Generals Clinton and Cornwallis, which place them in no favorable light as strategists or tacticians.

As to the actual engagement, it is interesting to note that the British participants had considerable more to say about it than the French, largely,

perhaps, because the former had a lot of explaining, or alibiing to do about their failure. Dr. Larrabee states in his Foreword: "The aim in writing this book has not been to find out a great deal that is new about the battle of the Chesapeake, but to bring together from many sources, some of them obscure, most of what we know about it, and to explore its historical background." In that aim he has been remarkably successful. The jacket design by William Metzger adds materially to a well-printed book.

Brevard, N. C.

WILLIAM BELL CLARK

America and Europe in the Political Thought of John Adams. By EDWARD HANDLER. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964. xiv, 248 p. Index. \$5.25.)

This gracefully written, immensely learned, penetrating, and provocative book is a distinct addition to the growing literature on John Adams. In his finely honed and closely reasoned analysis of Adams' political thought, Professor Edward Handler finds a central paradox (if not insoluble contradiction) in the man's encounter with Europe. Out of a growing sense of American nationality, Adams represented America and Europe "as antithetical poles of political reality": the one was virtuous, liberal, and unique; the other was corrupt, servile, and bleak. The two were clearly distinctive worlds in his mind, yet he submerged the disparities between them and "imposed European categories of experience upon America and American categories upon Europe." It is this tension in Adams' thought—particularly his reactions to the ideas of European liberalism and his considerations on the problem of revolution in Europe—that Handler explores with insight and erudition.

Of all the figures of the American Enlightenment, John Adams remains the most elusive, yet, strangely in many ways, the most appealing. Jefferson was more versatile, Washington more stalwart, Franklin more obvious, Madison more perceptive, and Hamilton more cunning, but none were as human and few as important to the events that shaped the American revolutionary mind and spirit. In the history of American political thought, however, he has become (particularly since his manuscripts were opened to scholars a decade ago) a singularly puzzling figure. Earlier it was easy to dismiss him simply as a Burkean conservative, slavishly imitating Burke's ardor for traditionalism and romanticism, privileged orders and hereditary principles, kingship and aristocracy. But Handler, with greater understanding and fuller documentation, persuasively argues that Adams stood squarely within the Whig tradition of liberalism—a tradition that "represented both defense against radical democracy and challenge to traditionalism and the ramparts of privilege." He was obsessed with a concept

of the political machine fashioned in the Newtonian image, "in which each active force was met by a counteractive force." The purpose was to produce "rest" or organize deadlock in the machinery of government sufficient to check the insatiability of human passions and the horrors exhibited in the history of unmixed governments.

Adams was incurably doctrinaire in advocating "the excesses of an abstract universalism," imposing on all men and societies a single set of values. His universalism obscured the crucial differences in the situation and character of nations. And in Handler's judgment, Adams "in transposing an American solution to an alien government . . . doomed himself to irrelevance."

The universalist and relativist strains in Adams' definition of American social reality and his response to Europe's revolutions were frequently contradictory. Even though he thought of the two worlds as having a common destiny, he was endlessly alert to the differences between America and Europe. What was peculiar to America was its commitment to liberty within an unusually favorable situation for its realization. And he asserted that the sexual immorality of France and the absence of general literacy in that nation made the attainment of republican institutions impossible. This stubborn independence of his mind, this faculty for trenchant social observation, this obsessive commitment to a mechanistic system of balances led him into confusion and seeming paradox between the particular and universal all through his social analysis. The mixture of his blindness and insight is epitomized in his insistence that the system of balanced powers must provide the constitutional basis for renovation of the political order. The error of Adams' universalism was in believing that the same unvarying constitutional formula could be applied without reference to differences in situation to create that necessary balance.

In spite of his censorious tone, Handler discusses with subtle sympathy and unremitting brilliance Adams' insights and postulates on Europe and on the ills and problems of wretched mankind in general. This reviewer's only serious disagreement with the author is over his incomprehensible indiscretion in firing a parting shot in the last paragraph of the book at the diplomacy of John Adams, pointing up the diplomat Franklin—that "quintessential Yankee who could accept Europe on its own terms"—as an example of "American openness" needed in today's world. This gratuitous accolade to Franklin's integrity and ability as a Revolutionary diplomat is made without any supporting evidence; the weight of available documentation runs counter to this judgment. This being said, we are left with an admirable book. Its balanced pages reveal, rightly, that Adams' hard shell contained an amiable heart as well as a brilliant mind. Handler wears his scholarship lightly: he has the talent to make the abstruse brilliant, and the complex clear.

The Diary and Selected Papers of Chief Justice William Smith, 1784-1793, Vol. I: The Diary, January 24, 1784 to October 5, 1785. Edited by L. F. S. UPTON. [*The Publications of the Champlain Society, XLI.*] (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1963. lvi, 298 p. Frontispiece.)

William Smith, New York's enigmatic politician and Quebec's farsighted Chief Justice, was seemingly destined to tilt against sturdy indefensibles. His career cannot be assessed with ease: in New York he supported the radical Livingston clique and fought the conservative Delancey faction up to the moment of independence, and then did an abrupt about face that left many of his friends puzzled; in Canada his career was to be equally perplexing. Perhaps he was simply a visionary who could not fully share his dream with anyone else.

In the first of two projected volumes, Mr. Upton has edited the portion of Smith's diary covering his two-year sojourn in Britain after the war of the American Revolution. The editor has included a lengthy introduction in which he discusses Smith's career, the problem of imperial organization, and Canada's position in the empire. The reader is thereby provided with some understanding of the man, the situation in which he found himself, and the problem which dominated his thoughts during this period.

As a diary, this volume is particularly rich in material on London society and politics, especially as viewed through the eyes of an American. Its very richness raises a question about the consequences of the editorial techniques used by Mr. Upton. It is evident that Smith did not intend this to appear in print, but kept the diary as a personal record of people, events, and places. It sometimes contains bare notes and other times extended analyses. In editing this material, Mr. Upton has rigorously limited himself to a few citations of supporting documents and some more detailed identifications of persons mentioned by Smith. This editorial apparatus is perfectly satisfactory if the intention is simply to make a significant document more readily available to specialists, but not so if there is any reason to make it more meaningful to those generally interested in the problem of Anglo-American history in the late eighteenth century. As the personal record of a man whose intellect was sharp, whose insights were shrewd, and whose knowledge was extensive, this diary deserves a wider audience than it will now receive.

Mr. Upton's decision to limit his editorial intrusions is paralleled by that of William H. W. Sabine who earlier edited a two-volume selection from the Smith diaries covering the years 1763-1778. In both instances the decision was unfortunate, and the handsome format provided by the Champlain Society makes it doubly so in this instance. Smith's diary, properly excised of trivia and expanded where necessary by the addition of relevant materials, could stand as a fitting monument to a man of great ability. Perhaps William Smith will finally receive his due tribute in the *Life* which Mr. Upton is preparing.

Fort Ticonderoga, Key to a Continent. By EDWARD P. HAMILTON. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1964. 241 p. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. \$5.95.)

To call Fort Ticonderoga "Key to a Continent" is to invite argument, and that perhaps is what Mr. Hamilton had in mind. Some historians would nominate Fort Pitt as a claimant for the title, and a case might be made for Niagara as another. Indeed, the author himself in one passage prefers to call Ticonderoga "the key to the vital Champlain Valley" and elsewhere refers to "Fort Niagara, the key to the heartland."

The history of any fort may be expected to be episodic. It is important only in wartime, and even then the battles, though they determine the fate of the stronghold, may be fought elsewhere. Built by the French in 1755 as Fort Carillon, Fort Ticonderoga was renamed by the British in 1759. Americans seized it by surprise in 1775 but in 1777 abandoned it to the British, who then destroyed it.

Of Mr. Hamilton's 230-page account, 67 cover the years 1755-1759 and 123 deal with the events of 1775-1777. The emphasis obviously is on the Revolutionary period; and the account of the colonial period is in fact partly reprinted from the author's earlier book, *The French and Indian Wars*. The first part of the book reads well in spite of some lapses in grammar and style (a boat is described as "the simplest and quickest one suitable for shallow water that can be nailed together"); the more detailed second part suffers somewhat from digressions and flashbacks.

The story is warmed by the author's enthusiasm and evident enjoyment of the subject. Director of the Fort Ticonderoga museum, he has an engaging fondness for surviving relics of the events he relates: the two cannon removed by Americans in 1775 but now back at Ticonderoga; the silver bullet and concealed message swallowed and regurgitated by an English spy; the gondola *Philadelphia*, sunk in 1777 but now in the Smithsonian Institution; the tinderbox that led Stephen Pell to his project of restoring the fort. Mr. Hamilton is interested in boat construction and in armament; he has made and sampled the spruce beer he writes about; he comments on the character and the alteration of terrain; he devotes a half-page to "the legend of Inverawe, immortalized in a poem by Robert Louis Stevenson" (but Stevenson did not immortalize the version repeated here). He has frankly stated opinions: Braddock "deserves better of history than he has received"; Lotbiniere's "intentions, unlike those of Bigot, were not evil"; "Gilliland is to be believed rather than [Benedict] Arnold"; "I cannot help but feel that Wayne could have accomplished more"; "nature had never intended [Schuyler] to lead an army"; the Americans should not have tried to hold Ticonderoga in 1775; he appraises Burgoyne, "whom the more I study, the more I like." Less obtrusively than the Homeric gods, he interjects his own reactions to the events taking place: "I doubt this . . . I cannot but feel . . . I also cannot help but wonder . . . to my mind at least. . . ."

The military importance of Ticonderoga is of course debatable. It withstood one major attack, Abercromby's unfortunate campaign of 1758. It was the springboard for no successful invasion: The French stopped here in 1755; the British advance to Canada in 1759 was overshadowed by the earlier fall of Quebec; the American advance to Montreal in 1775 ended in failure; and in 1777 the British moved south only to surrender at Saratoga. The Hudson-Champlain corridor was an important route between the British colonies and Canada, used by Indians, smugglers, peaceful travelers, and armies. Ticonderoga became a door in that corridor, closed from time to time but seldom very effectually locked. Debates aside, it is remembered for its resounding name, for a Highland Scottish legend and the disastrous attack it commemorates, for the colorful tale of Ethan Allen's exploit, long dear to American patriots, and because of its restoration as a historic landmark, a project for which the late Stephen Pell was so largely responsible.

The publisher apparently thought of the present book as popular rather than scholarly. There are no footnotes; the bibliography is a bare, unannotated list; sources of the plates are not identified; the endpaper map and three in the text are not listed, and the one on page 185 is not even identified. The five-page index may be described as helpful. Regrettably, in a book about a fort, there is in the text no formal description of the fortification and no consistent record of its commandants and garrison.

*Pennsylvania Historical and
Museum Commission*

WILLIAM A. HUNTER

John James Audubon. By ALICE FORD. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964. xiv, 488 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$7.95.)

This is the latest of numerous books devoted to Audubon, the famous pioneer naturalist and artist. Miss Ford's research has been considerable as is evident from the acknowledgments that appear in the preface of her biography. She has unearthed many new facts about the Audubon family, particularly concerning the artist's mother Jeanne Rabine, "the daughter of a plowman of Les Mazures," France. Mlle. Rabine was one of several mistresses enjoyed by the father Jean Audubon during his frequent sojourns as a marine captain at "Les Cayes" (now Aux Cayes) on the southern coast of Haiti. Some of the illegitimate children, including John James, were later taken to France where they were well looked after by the childless Madame Audubon. The young artist, who early showed an interest in painting and natural history, emigrated to the United States while still in his teens.

Following Audubon's marriage to Lucy Bakewell, there are accounts of his lengthy and arduous expeditions, and later of his trips to England and France in an effort to find subscribers to his classic *Birds of America*.

While in Europe he was entertained by many men of importance and of noble rank. In spite of his poverty it seems strange that Lucy did not accompany him on these trips, for England was her native land and she would doubtless have enjoyed the rounds of social activity. It is difficult to believe that she was deterred, as her husband implied, by the discomforts of an ocean voyage.

Throughout the book we note an abnormal amount of bickering and jealousy between Audubon and other naturalists of his period. This was perhaps Audubon's fault, for he appears to have been both arrogant and thoughtless of others, qualities that one does not associate with men in his profession. But he was essentially an artist rather than a naturalist. His paintings are still held in great esteem, but his writings are seldom read. As an ornithologist he was inferior to Alexander Wilson. To regard him as "the greatest American delineator of birds" is untrue, although few have equaled him in artistry.

Miss Ford is clearly more impressed with the distinguished acquaintances of Audubon than with the humble men who aided him on his expeditions. We note, for example, that Thomas Lincoln, in honor of whom Audubon named a sparrow, is mentioned only once.

Although the author is evidently adept and thorough as a biographer, her knowledge of wild life is deplorable. The idea of Audubon as a four-year-old boy running along a beach "from one nest of the tody to another" to show the eggs to his father is sheer fantasy, as is her statement that a duel may have been averted due to the "fact that the painter of birds could drop a covey of partridges at a single shot." Other errors pertain to migrations of wild turkeys and grouse, the black-headed grosbeak referred to as the "black-haired grosbeak"; and the attractive illustration of a nighthawk is captioned "Whippoorwill." Her statement that a "hawk that he named 'Black Warrior harlani' for Harlan was actually the well-known red-tail" is also erroneous. Harlan's hawk is recognized today as one of the few valid species described for the first time by John James Audubon, although this and most of the others were discovered and collected by other men.

*The Academy of Natural
Sciences of Philadelphia*

JAMES BOND

Lincoln's Gadfly, Adam Gurowski. By LEROY H. FISCHER. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964. xviii, 302 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$6.95.)

This volume received the \$5,000 Literary Award presented by the War Library and Museum of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States and the Pennsylvania Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States. The judges made a wise selection.

Prior to the publication of Fischer's book the only useful studies of Gurowski were a brief sketch in the *Dictionary of American Biography* and an article on Gurowski and Lincoln in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, both written by Fischer. Now this full length study will be of value to anybody interested in the Civil War.

Count Adam Gurowski was a member of the Polish nobility who early in life became involved in revolutionary efforts to secure his partitioned country's independence. When the attempt failed, the Czarist government confiscated his estates and condemned him to death. He became an exile in western Europe where his unpleasant disposition soon caused him to break with most of his exiled compatriots. He soon abandoned the cause of Polish nationalism for that of Pan-Slavism, convinced now that Russia must lead the movement to unite Slavdom. This remarkable shift in sympathy cost him what little support he had among Polish nationalists but won him an amnesty from the Czar. He went to Russia and worked in the Imperial Ministry of Public Information and Education. However, Gurowski was too much of a revolutionary to remain content in St. Petersburg. In 1849, he crossed the Atlantic as a refugee, as Fischer notes, the most interesting of the small group of Poles who emigrated to America following the revolutions in Europe. In America, Gurowski became friendly with Longfellow and Edward Everett in Boston and later worked briefly for Horace Greeley's *Tribune*, but when South Carolina seceded, he went to Washington. With the aid of Senator Sumner, Gurowski received a temporary clerkship in the State Department. His famous diaries, however, caused him to lose this position and any other chance of employment in the Lincoln government. He used his diaries as a vehicle to denounce both the President and the Secretary of State.

Gurowski's importance as a Civil War personality is based on his diaries, published in three volumes, in 1862, 1864, and 1866. They were written with the intention of warning Americans of the inadequacies of high government officials who were not performing their wartime duties as vigorously as the public good demanded. Few leaders were spared the bitter invective Gurowski poured into his writings. Lincoln, Seward, Postmaster General Blair, Sumner, McClellan, Halleck, all were subjected to harsh criticism in Gurowski's diaries. Only Stanton was consistently spared the abuse received by other leaders. The diaries do not contain significant source material dealing with the Lincoln administration or with the wartime history of the nation's capital. Their chief value is their reflection of the views of a strong anti-slavery enthusiast dissatisfied with the President's cautious policy toward emancipation and the frustrating inability of the nation's generals to bring the war to a swift conclusion. Gurowski, as a young man, had liberated the serfs on his Polish estates and in America was consistently a firm supporter of the Negro. Unfortunately, his reforming zeal made him intolerant of anyone who did not agree with him or who sought the same ends by different means. These men were violently condemned in his diary

and they in turn detested and avoided him. George Templeton Strong quite properly criticized the diaries and concluded that Gurowski's "style and temper are those of an enraged Tartar Khan, full of raw horse and bad liquor."

Gurowski's pugnacity was not only limited to his writings. He threatened at least one man to a duel and had near scrapes with several others. According to Ward Hill Lamon, Lincoln, once described by the Court as a beast, considered Gurowski the one person in Washington who might attempt to assassinate him. Lincoln is quoted as saying, "it would be just like him to do such a thing." All in all, he was not a pleasant person.

Professor Fischer has performed a useful service in making available this study of a man who was, indeed, not only Lincoln's, but wartime Washington's gadfly.

Villanova University

JOSEPH GEORGE, JR.

The Triumph of Militant Republicanism. A Study of Pennsylvania and Presidential Politics, 1860-1872. By ERWIN STANLEY BRADLEY. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964. 467 p. Illustrations, appendix, bibliography, index. \$8.50.)

In 1870, William S. ("Warrington") Robinson, the Radical Republican essayist from Massachusetts, denounced "the tendency toward personal government, instead of a government of politics." In Warrington's home state Benjamin F. Butler personified this trend, but in every state, it seemed, some counterpart appeared. The apparent degeneration of his party with all its erstwhile creative energy and reforming zeal into a motley collection of rings, cabals, and personal machines mystified Warrington, as it has fascinated historians ever since.

Simon Cameron was the ringmaster of Pennsylvania's Republicans, and the intrigues of Cameron, his friends, and his foes provide the subject of Erwin S. Bradley's study. From this point of view the work is valuable. Professor Bradley has examined the papers of prominent political figures and presented his findings with sufficient care to provide the reader with a useful chronicle of partisan maneuvers during the 1860's. By locating the roots of Cameron's persistent feud with Andrew G. Curtin in their futile competition over Know Nothing endorsement for the U.S. Senate in 1855, and by delineating the power Cameron wielded among state Republicans even before 1860, he shows that personalism existed in politics before Grant and Tweed. The narrative makes it quite clear, furthermore, that Cameron made his way to undisputed control of the state's Republican machinery not solely by masterful manipulation of patronage, but also by his ability to ride the major national currents. His aggressive methods were enlisted by

Lincoln in 1864, then briefly proffered to Andrew Johnson before they were committed to support the Radical program in Congress. When Governor John White Geary attempted to pursue a Radical program inside Pennsylvania, Cameron, his railroad allies, and the reforming Liberals all rained blows on the maverick.

All this, I say, can be learned from *The Triumph of Militant Republicanism*; it is not the thesis of the book. In fact, not only does the book leave Warrington's problem unanswered (and unasked), it does not even attempt to define "militant Republicanism." Professor Bradley recounts well the machinations of ruthless politicians. But such a tale could, for all practical purposes, take place anywhere, anytime. What was peculiar to Pennsylvania at this time? What social and ideological links connected the occupants of the "smoke filled rooms" with the voters who ratified or rejected their handiwork? One cannot write meaningful political history in terms of feudal cabals to which an inert, shadowy mass called the electorate responds passively, even haphazardly.

Although Professor Bradley displays keen perception when he analyzes Johnson's use of the patronage or the birth of the Matthew Quay-J. Donald Cameron alliance, he sees no definitive political issues except the tariff and the civil rights of Copperheads and ex-Confederates. Ignoring the debates over currency and banking, he dusts off Henry C. Carey, foremost economist of the state, as an inconsistent fool. Even the titanic battle over Reconstruction is presented so that the reader is well aware that the author prefers Johnson over the "sinister figure" Thaddeus Stevens, but has no idea what is at stake. Black Codes, the Freedman's Bureau, the Civil Rights Act, the Fourteenth Amendment—the pivotal issues of Pennsylvania's politics in 1866—pass unmentioned. To ascribe to that year's Republican platform a call for "the reorganization by Congress of the late insurrectionary states" (p. 263) is erroneous and premature. To treat Andrew Johnson as the oracle of the Constitution is to scorn the Supreme Court, which differed sharply with his interpretation of the organic law in *Texas v. White*. To declare (p. 275) that Stevens' policy of "'Thorough' had triumphed" in 1866 (or ever) is absurd.

Minor errors are few: Leonard Myers was a Republican, not a Democrat (p. 358), and the Missouri Liberal Republican platform called not "for equal suffrage (for Southern whites)" as Democrats had (p. 376), but for equal suffrage for all adult males. Factually the book is reliable. Its great failing lies in the fact that, for all the care Professor Bradley put into its preparation, he neglected the literature of the last half dozen years which has completely recast the Reconstruction period. No author today can be content to add new factual data to the emotionalism of George F. Milton and Claude Bowers.

University of Pittsburgh

DAVID MONTGOMERY

The Struggle for Equality: Abolitionists and the Negro in the Civil War and Reconstruction. By JAMES M. MCPHERSON. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964. xii, 474 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$10.00.)

Most histories of abolitionism, including the recent excellent volumes by Louis Filler and Dwight L. Dumond, stop with the coming of the Civil War. Actually the antislavery societies continued active throughout the war and the early part of Reconstruction. It was not until the year 1870, after the achievement of Negro suffrage by constitutional amendment, that the American Anti-Slavery Society dissolved. Dr. McPherson's book, the outgrowth of a dissertation done at the Johns Hopkins University under the direction of Professor C. Vann Woodward, thoroughly and ably narrates the history of this last decade of abolitionism.

The first part of the work treats the relation of abolitionists to the election of 1860, secession, the opening of hostilities, and the emancipation issue during the war years. In this section as in the rest of the book disagreements among the abolitionists are analyzed and illustrated with considerable detail. Some went along with Lincoln and some did not. The main focus of the study is on the eastern, Garrisonian wing of the movement.

Most abolitionists were not satisfied with the Emancipation Proclamation and the Thirteenth Amendment. They felt there was much more to be done. A second general concern they had which receives much attention in this book was the question of equal rights in the North. There is a chapter on the anthropological debate over racial inferiority, and at various points in the book questions involving discrimination against the Negro in the North are discussed. Pennsylvanians will be particularly interested in the author's account of the efforts to achieve equal treatment for Negroes on Philadelphia streetcars, a goal which was achieved only through passage of a state law on the subject in 1867. School segregation and the suffrage, of course, were also issues with which abolitionists were concerned. Questions involving the use of Negroes in the armed services supply material for a chapter.

A third theme of the book, recurring at various points, is the freedmen's aid movement. Abolitionists were active in the formation, support, and operation of the numerous societies formed to supply relief and education for the ex-slaves. Particularly notable in this connection is the author's account of the early work for freedmen at Port Royal, South Carolina, which relies to a considerable extent on another Hopkins dissertation recently published as a book, *Rehearsal for Reconstruction: The Port Royal Experiment*, by Willie Lee Rose. Abolitionist contributions to the development of the Freedmen's Bureau are also dealt with.

The fourth and last topic discussed is the relationship of abolitionism to Reconstruction politics: the Civil Rights Bill, the Freedmen's Bureau Bill, military reconstruction, the impeachment of Johnson, and the Fourteenth

and Fifteenth Amendments. The author suggests that the greatest failure of Reconstruction was in not providing land for the freedmen, a problem which was of continuing concern to abolitionists. Dr. McPherson concludes that the civil rights movement of today is building on foundations laid by Garrison, Phillips, and their cohorts a century ago.

The book is based on exhaustive research in primary sources and is completely documented with footnotes conveniently placed at the bottom of the page. Among the individuals frequently quoted is the important but neglected Philadelphia abolitionist J. Miller McKim, whose surviving manuscripts at the New York Public Library and at Cornell University have been used to good advantage. The author has also made extensive use of the voluminous antislavery collections of the Boston Public Library and various other repositories, as well as newspapers like the *Liberator* and the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*.

The writing is competent, though possibly there are a few too many quotations. There is an excellent bibliographical essay, and the index is thorough. The publishers have done a handsome job of book-making. Some illustrations from *Harper's Weekly* are included. The only serious reservation this reviewer has concerns the book's organization, which is basically chronological and tends to be somewhat loose. A topical approach might have produced a more concise and clearcut study.

Pennsylvania State University

IRA V. BROWN

The Molly Maguires. By WAYNE G. BROEHL, JR. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964. x, 409 p. Illustrations, index. \$8.75.)

Lament for the Molly Maguires. By ARTHUR H. LEWIS. (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964. xii, 308 p. \$5.75.)

The drama, legend, mystery and controversy surrounding the "Molly Maguires" have long intrigued and puzzled labor and social historians, but past "Molly" books, charged with deep partisan and prejudiced feelings, have been scandalously inadequate. Those written before 1929 followed the tone set by Allan Pinkerton in his incredible *The Molly Maguires and the Detectives* (1877) and contained so much anti-labor and anti-Irish bias as to make them almost entirely useless; and two books written in the 1930s, one from a Catholic point of view (Coleman) and the other by a Communist (Bimba), cast the "Mollies" in a more favorable light but drew upon limited evidence and, especially in Bimba's case, contained numerous factual errors and ahistorical judgments. The violence, the economic and ethnic conflict, the role of private detectives, powerful coal companies and immigrant fraternal societies, and the judicial irregularities in the anthracite coal fields in the 1870's have long awaited a definitive study placing these and other

events in a coherent and meaningful historical context. Two recent books on the "Molly Maguires" by Arthur H. Lewis and Wayne G. Broehl, Jr., fail to do so and for entirely different reasons. There still is need for a comprehensive work on the "Molly Maguires."

Lewis' *Lament for the Molly Maguires* can be dismissed out of hand. It adds little of importance to our knowledge of this controversial subject and could have been written eighty years ago because it makes the same assumptions and establishes the same faulty conceptual framework that blinded contemporaries to the "legal" excesses in the coal region and made them cheer the execution of men called "Molly Maguires" as the triumph of justice and civilization. Sacrificing accuracy for adventure, truth for legend, and insight for melodrama, Lewis combines a prosecutor's brief against the "Mollies" with an oversimplified "morality" saga. From the very first sentence ("On a warm and pleasant morning . . .") to the start of the final paragraph ("And now, gentle readers . . ."), events and motives are made simple and "virtue" wins out (of course!) in a thriller set in eastern Pennsylvania rather than the Wild West. The leading characters are depicted as stock figures in a late Victorian horse opera: "Molly" Alex Campbell "a bold, unscrupulous man"; "Molly" Jack Kehoe "a virile, ruthless, clever leader"; detective James McPharlan a man of "obvious sincerity" on the witness stand; "Molly" nemesis and railroad executive Franklin B. Gowen a "tenacious and shrewd antagonist"; and master detective Allan Pinkerton "able, honest, [and] discreet."

Lewis' use of evidence should make professional historians shudder. Although the book lacks footnotes, bibliography, and even index, it is clear that the author fully accepts older one-sided works as authoritative and factually accurate. Worse still, detective McPharlan's "reminiscences" are recorded throughout the book ("The detective recalled . . .") but with no hint as to when he made these statements and how and if the author validated them. Whole verbatim conversations recur and should jar even the most naive reader. Local "authorities" on the "Mollies" are cited again and again without reference to contemporary evidence. Other "living witnesses," including a 13-year-old observer to the 1875 Gomer James murder as told to a reporter 70 years later, a woman recounting how her mother, aged 11, watched a "Molly robbery," and another woman telling of her grandfather's alleged but improbable encounter with McPharlan and James Kerrigan, offer "factual" accounts of important events long since passed. Although much of this material is legend at best, the author assures us he has checked "reported conversations . . . wherever possible" and promises them to be "as accurate as individual memory and the passage of time allow."

Egregious errors of commission and omission also abound, and only one example of each type need be cited. *First*, the unproven generalization: Lewis insists that Catholic priests who "spoke ill of the secret society" were "not immune to physical attacks" but offers no single instance of such

violence. *Second*, the compounded factual error: more than once, the author writes that John Siney led the "Mine Workers [*sic*] Benevolent Association," an anthracite labor union, but Siney presided over an entirely different union, the Miners' National Association, and the anthracite miners' union, called the Workingmen's Benevolent Association, was headed by John Welsh. *Third*: contradictions: on page 41 Gowen "refused to allow a single 'pluck me' store in any of his company's patches . . .," but on page 119 "Gowen and the other operators gave . . . a complete stoppage of credit at the 'pluck me's'." *Fourth*: generalizations contradicted by facts: on page 121 we read that the 1875 "long" strike "gradually disintegrated" after March 31, 1875, but the same page cites the *Shenandoah Herald* of May 29, 1875: "This is now the end of the fifth month of the lockout . . ." A few of many, these examples suggest the severe shortcomings of this book and indicate the author's woeful confusion about coal region history.

Although heavily written and confusingly organized and although its uses of evidence as well as its conclusions often raise serious methodological questions and limit its overall value, Broehl's *The Molly Maguires* is far more useful than Lewis' *Lament*. Broehl supersedes other "Molly" scholars in two main respects: he is the first to explore deeply (although unsuccessfully) the relationship between anthracite region violence and the "heritage of secret-society beliefs and tactics" allegedly brought over from Ireland, and he also is the first to use the Allan Pinkerton letterbooks (only Pinkerton's outgoing correspondence) and many (but not all) of the manuscript detective reports prepared by McPharlan and other Pinkerton agents who infiltrated the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the anthracite mine unions. The volume therefore contains much rich and hitherto unavailable data on economic and ethnic conflict in the Schuylkill region after the Civil War, on the character and attitudes of Pinkerton, on the operations of the Pinkerton National Detective Agency, and on the relationship between Pinkerton, his operatives, and F. B. Gowen. Broehl also convincingly summarizes Gowen's rise to power and the relationship between his anti-union crusade and his efforts to "monopolize" the southern coal fields. And he adds new and unusually interesting dimensions to the complex role played by the local Catholic clergy.

But the volume has serious shortcomings and a brief review can hint at only three of them. Broehl argues that the "seemingly random attitudes and devices in the Pennsylvania story actually had deep roots in Irish history." Drawing upon research he did in Ireland, he details patterns of Irish peasant violence and sees the "secret society" as one of several extra-legal responses to rural decay and suffering, landlordism, and alien British rule. Parallel problems in the Schuylkill region rekindled these traditions among Irish miners, saloon keepers and others, and an "inner" group of members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians (uncovered by detective McPharlan) committed personal and social crimes, including murders. Unlike Gowen and earlier historians, Broehl does not connect these crimes

with trade unionism and labor violence, per se. Instead, he emphasizes the Irish tie and writes: "So many of the Molly Maguire tactics in the coal fields stemmed directly from closely similar tactics in Ireland. The rationale behind the tactics was quite alike in both places." But if this explanation of the causes of anthracite disorder is valid, similar violent patterns should be found in other parts of the United States where Irish rural peasants, conditioned by similar traditions and confronted with difficulties similar to those encountered by the Schuylkill Irish, lived and worked. Broehl's argument is weakest precisely at this point. Even in the northern anthracite region where the Irish may have faced more drastic disabilities than in the Schuylkill area and in all other industrial areas with large Irish population, there occurred no parallel to the "Molly terror." The so-called "Molly Maguire" phenomena was unique to the lower anthracite fields; nothing like it occurred elsewhere. If this is the case, how can anthracite region violence be attributed mainly to the "heritage of secret-society beliefs and tactics"? Other factors, *unique to the Schuylkill region*, may have been more significant in explaining the disorders and conflict, but Broehl gives inadequate attention to these other factors. And, in any event, this explanation hardly explains the "violence" practiced against the Irish.

Broehl's use of certain evidence raises so many additional questions as to make this reviewer doubt the accuracy of substantial portions of his narrative as well as certain normative judgments about controversial events. He recognizes the possible "fallibility" of the detective reports prepared by McPharlan and lesser Pinkerton agents and admits "it is more than a possibility that, either for reasons of personal prestige or by instruction of Pinkerton or Franklin, certain things were overemphasized or omitted." He also points out that all but one set of the detective reports accessible to him are "handwritten summaries" (not the originals) prepared in Philadelphia from the originals by Pinkerton superintendent Benjamin Franklin and forwarded to Gowen. Broehl, furthermore, only had access to "reports" or "summaries" of detective findings for about half the period of time McPharlan sleuthed in the anthracite region. Detective reports on many critical events either were unavailable to him or have disappeared. Even though he warns of the inherent danger of such evidence, there is insufficient indication that he has tested these documents against other contemporary sources. To the contrary, *entire events*—including significant meetings and acts of violence and murder—are reconstructed from these Pinkerton sources and nothing else. On other occasions, lacking such "summaries" and "reports," Broehl often bases his narrative on dubious materials such as Pinkerton's *Molly Maguires and the Detectives*, reminiscences and trial testimony written or given well after a particular event, and one-sided newspaper accounts, particularly from the *Pottsville Miners' Journal*, a newspaper sympathetic to the operators and violently anti-union and anti-Irish. Broehl refers to almost no contemporary sources critical of the coal operators and their policies or suspicious of the "Molly Maguire 'legend,'" and

labor sources (basic to such a book) are conspicuous by their complete absence. In one sense, therefore, the author is the prisoner of his sources, and since the sources used have been narrowly selected and often culled from uncritically, the entire narrative is unbalanced. It is almost as if one wrote of anti-British agitation in Boston between 1763 and 1776 and relied mainly on reports from British spies, loyalist memoirs, courts of admiralty, and the loyalist press.

Equally distressing is Broehl's treatment of the "Molly" trials. The author gives inadequate attention to many questions of importance: jury selection, the admissibility of evidence, the attitudes of the judges, the reliability of testimony by McPharlan and other "informers," the arguments of the prosecution allowed by judges, the acceptance of "guilt by association," the rejected complaints of various defense counsel, and so forth. While this reviewer does not doubt that some of those executed for "Molly" crimes were probably guilty, still others went to prison for many years and even to the gallows innocent of major crimes and on the basis of shoddy evidence. Broehl, however, side-steps the major question: did those tried for "Molly crimes" have fair and impartial trials even by contemporary standards and if not why not? For this reason, among others, Coleman's (1936) treatment of the trials, with all of its weaknesses, is far superior to that of Broehl. Readers also should compare Broehl on the trials with Henry David on the Chicago 1886 trial in his *History of the Haymarket Affair*, a model for the kind of study still to be written about the "Molly" trials.

Much else needs to be written about the anthracite coal region between 1860 and 1880 before the "Molly Maguires," James McPharlan, Allan Pinkerton, and Franklin B. Gowen can rest in peace. Broehl has gathered much useful new material and raised important questions. But he has not used the material well nor answered the questions adequately. We need a careful study of the "Molly Maguire" stereotype and of violence and disorder in other coal and industrial regions. Most important, we need a careful study of the social, economic, and political structure of the anthracite region in these years so that *all* of the disorder and violence, not merely the crimes detailed by Broehl and Lewis, can be fitted into a meaningful historical context. Until that is done, the "Molly Maguires" will remain little more than legend and controversy about them will flourish.

State University of New York at Buffalo

HERBERT G. GUTMAN

With Walt Whitman in Camden. Vol. V: *April 8-September 14, 1889*. By HORACE TRAUBEL. Edited by GERTRUDE TRAUBEL. (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1964. xiii, 524 p. Illustrations, index. \$12.50.)

The first thing to note about the fifth volume of *With Walt Whitman in Camden* is that it is in a similar binding to that of the first three volumes, a

beautiful green with the name of the book and author in large gilt letters on the spine. The volume was edited by Gertrude Traubel, the daughter of Horace Traubel. This must have been a difficult task, for to most people his handwriting was undecipherable, the letters not being formed and one looking like the other. She has supplied a brief preface in which she says that she had corrected obvious slips and checked references. She states that the conversations were taken down within an hour. This attests to their fidelity. We almost hear the voice of Whitman. Traubel was veritably a tape recorder. Miss Traubel pays the proper tribute in her acknowledgments to her mother, Anne Montgomerie Traubel, and to that indefatigable Whitman collector, Charles E. Feinberg of Detroit, who, as Miss Traubel says, made the publication possible with encouragement and assistance.

It was in 1888 that a young man 29 years old began recording everything Whitman said up till the time of his death in 1892. Traubel had keen foresight. In 1888 Whitman was not recognized as a poet except by a few disciples in America and England. It was predicted that within a short time "Whitmania," as the one-time admirer, Swinburne, called the critical approval of the poet, would die out. Probably Traubel himself did not envision a time when the academic world would join with the old admirers and hail Whitman as the greatest American poet.

This volume is important for students of Whitman. In fact it might be said that no complete portrait of him can be presented without this fifth volume and the few that we hope will follow. One need not expatiate on how very helpful Traubel was to the "old man" as he used to refer to him in mentioning him to me. He was responsible, as the poet testified in an inscription in a volume of his works, for the bringing out of books by the poet in the latter period of his life.

Traubel's first entry of his talks was March 28, 1888. The first volume carrying the conversations down to June 14, 1888, was published in 1906. Traubel issued two more volumes and prepared the fourth volume, which was published under the editorship of Professor Sculley Bradley. The present volume covers the period between April 8 and September 14, 1889. Thus we find that about a year and a half is the period dealt with in five volumes. Traubel was more detailed than Boswell who covered a period of twenty-three years in two volumes in his life of Johnson. The index shows that most references were made to Richard Maurice Bucke and John Burroughs, the two men who first wrote books about Whitman; to William Douglas O'Connor who had defended him in a pamphlet and who had recently died; to William Sloane Kennedy; to his publisher David McKay, and to Philadelphia friends like Thomas Harned, Harrison S. Morris and Francis Howard Williams.

The volume is most interesting, shedding side light on the man and poet. A life-like portrait appears before the reader. Traubel went to the poet's house at Mickle Street, Camden, daily for some time in the morning, and then in the evening. It is a familiar opening that at 7.50 P.M., he found the poet at the window in the parlor.

Whitman every once in a while would call attention to the fact that there was a cabal composed of writers like William Winter and Richard Henry Stoddart to keep down his growing reputation. He included the Emerson family who could not reconcile themselves to Ralph Waldo's encomium. A book on the essayist appeared by Emerson's son, which had a disparaging note calling Whitman a mechanic, and saying that his father was disappointed in his later work and regarded his early work as a sort of catalogue. Whitman knew that this did not represent Ralph Waldo Emerson's opinion. Matters were worse when James Elliot Cabot published his *Memoir of Emerson* and extracts from his journal. There was no mention of Whitman. Whitman noted this to Traubel who said that when the entire journal would some day be published it would be found that Emerson mentioned him favorably. Traubel lived to see his prediction verified, for when volume IV of the journal appeared in 1913 there was this comment for the year 1863—"One must thank Walt Whitman for service to American Literature in the Appalachian enlargement of his outline and treatment."

Whitman was a man of intellect and critical insight. Many of his judgments and verdicts have later proved correct. In literature, he highly esteemed Emerson, Cooper, Bryant, Ticknor for his history of Spanish literature, and William Swinton, radical, war correspondent, and author of school readers. He admired Diderot and Zola. He disliked Amiel's pessimistic journal. He time and again made very disparaging remarks about President Benjamin Harrison. He pulled from his pedestal Salmon P. Chase, because he had opposed Lincoln's candidacy for a second term. His eulogies on Lincoln are numerous. Even Stonewall Jackson who once made a Union prisoner walk ninety miles while others were transported in wagons, because he would not divulge some information, came under his lashing tongue. All the prayers in Heaven could not wipe out this spot from Jackson, he said. Whitman was a good hater and his most savage remarks were justifiably directed at Sadikichi Hartmann who published a faked interview in which he had Whitman say something hostile about Edmund Clarence Stedman, his friendly critic.

There is an interesting account of the celebration in Camden of the poet's seventieth birthday with distinguished guests in attendance. It was a great day for Traubel for he was thus justified in his high estimate of the poet. He proudly wrote: "A poet honored . . . a man into whose friendliness I had unaccountably been admitted and for which I had labored and pledged my sacrifice. . . . How my heart leaped into every action of others that went to the finer significance of the occasion."

There are so many good things in this book that one does not know what to cite. We must conclude that Traubel was a good reporter because he knew how by questions and remarks to bring Whitman out.

Philadelphia

ALBERT MORDELL

Theory and Practice in American Politics. Edited by WILLIAM H. NELSON. (Chicago: published for William Marsh Rice University by the University of Chicago Press, 1964. xvi, 149 p. \$5.50.)

During the course of its semicentennial anniversary celebration Rice University arranged a series of symposia. One of these on theory and practice in American politics has been assembled between the covers of this book by the then chairman of the History department. Nine scholars have contributed their thoughts on pertinent phases of the theme. Five historians and four political scientists examine the relationships between the theory and practice of politics. The essays consider the background of American political behavior and various of its phases, the relations of the executive and the legislative, the functions of the Supreme Court, sectionalism, foreign policy, civil and military relations, concluding with a summary which defines our political legacy.

The editor presents as his frame of reference his contention that as our Constitution has been in long and continuous operation, much longer than the life of other governments so constructed, the American people must be conservative, yet paradoxically "the political tradition they conserve is itself liberal."

Felix Gilbert relates the political behavior of many in the United States to a rather widespread belief that our institutions, the products of the Eighteenth Century Enlightenment, represent the height of wisdom. But unfortunately there is a common failure to realize the force of change in history, that our experience is certainly not the end but undoubtedly must be altered by further adventures made necessary by the inadequacy of our achievement.

Dumas Malone points out that the Jeffersonian and Hamiltonian interpretations of the Constitution, each have sufficient practicality to make them inevitable. Each must be suffered and accommodated, neither is sufficient for the purpose of insuring the survival and success of the Constitution.

Carl N. Degler dwells upon the necessary changes in attitudes which have been enforced by the change of the Republic from an agricultural to an industrial economy. Here we are struck by the instability of the meaning of party names and our well-accepted concepts. The United States must perforce abandon eighteenth-century concepts as it entered the twentieth.

In dealing with the Congress, Presidency and the Supreme Court, Lawrence H. Chamberlain and Alpheus T. Mason likewise consider this variance between theory and practice. Originally, the executive was designed as a restraint upon legislation, only eventually did the executive come to prescribe and facilitate it. The functions of the Supreme Court originally conceived of probably as minimal have burgeoned and have become a great moral and administrative force.

In the matter of Southern sectionalism, public opinion as a controlling factor in shaping foreign policy and civil-military relations, Benjamin F. Wright, Ernest R. May and Louis Morton suggest further recognition of the need for reconciling theory with practice. The South need not lose itself nostalgically in the Lost Cause but might better concentrate on the South of Washington, Jefferson and Marshall. In considering the forces shaping foreign policy, historians and political scientists should better understand how much the directors of foreign policy heed the voice of the people. The question of civil-military relations is not best considered in terms of the dominance of either over the other but by realizing that society is best served by a military arm that realizes that its functions are not political and by a civil government which seeks to grasp the realities of military science and strategy.

Hans J. Morgenthau's conclusion is that because of the complexity and change which characterize the twentieth-century situation of the United States the President has become the key factor, the people usually vote according to tradition or emotional preference and if the President does not educate public opinion to support his policies, the American political system will be in disorder. The facts of life "require the reformulation of the basic principles of the American political tradition in the light of the new conditions of the contemporary world."

This is a stimulating book written by thoughtful scholars which deserves careful reading in order that we may reappraise what we do politically and why we do it. The times require it.

University of Pennsylvania

ROY F. NICHOLS

Wilson: Confusions and Crises, 1915-1916. By ARTHUR S. LINK. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964. xiv, 386 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$8.50.)

The fourth volume of Professor Link's massive life and times of Woodrow Wilson covers the period from the early autumn of 1915 to the late spring of 1916, and deals largely with foreign affairs. The completion of Wilson's original legislative program with the enactment of the Clayton anti-trust law and the creation of the Federal Trade Commission produced a political lull at home. There was no lull on the high seas, however, where German submarine attacks on merchant shipping continued to evoke strong protests from Washington; nor in Mexico, where the de facto recognition of Carranza inspired Villa to undertake a ruthless campaign of revenge against American lives and property, which caused Wilson to send a punitive expedition under Pershing to capture him. For brief moments both the Columbus raid and the troop clash at Carrizal threatened war with Mexico, but they quickly paled to insignificance beside the armed ships controversy and the *Sussex*

crisis. Yet each of these episodes caused severe repercussions in domestic politics, where the growing debate over preparedness and the revolt in Congress over allowing Americans to travel on armed passenger vessels were accompanied by constant demands for intervention in Mexico.

On at least two critical occasions Wilson expressed his determination to avoid war with either Germany or Mexico, regardless of the effect on his chances of re-election. But his sending House to Europe to open the way for mediating peace was interpreted by Allies and Germans alike as merely a gesture to aid him in the coming presidential campaign. Link's account of this hopeless venture reveals House in a decidedly unfavorable light. In urging Wilson that the Allies would prefer to shorten the war through his mediation rather than win a prolonged struggle with American military assistance, he was naively indulging in a pipe-dream; while in telling the French that henceforth the United States would be willing to accept any commercial restrictions imposed by Allied military necessity, he was misrepresenting the President, who had instructed him to press for the relief of legitimate American trade with Germany under accepted rules of international law. Furthermore, not content with misrepresenting Wilson's position, House then neglected to inform him of assurances he had given the Allies in his name. Even though the only fruit of his mission was the abortive House-Grey Memorandum, the episode casts grave doubts on the trustworthiness of House as an emissary.

Much as House may have left to be desired as an emissary, however, he was definitely superior to Wilson's other vital diplomatic appointments. The President admittedly could not rely on Page, who had succumbed to British charm and flattery until he no longer attempted to stand up for the American position. As for Gerard, he proved so inept that he did not even apprise Washington of the bitter struggle for ascendancy between Germany's military and civilian leaders, knowledge of which was indispensable in formulating an intelligent American policy towards submarine warfare. And badly as his diplomats served him in Europe, the less said about Wilson's special agents in Mexico the better.

Despite the questionable competence of Wilson's key advisers, however, serious doubt arises as to whether he could have succeeded in avoiding war because of the very tenets on which his policy was based. Could the United States preserve neutrality by threatening to sever diplomatic relations with a belligerent, merely because it proved unwilling to accord Americans every right allotted neutral citizens under ambiguous rules of international law accepted before the invention of its chief naval weapon? Moreover, was it worth risking the lives of American youth simply to assert the privilege of a few persons to travel or work on the armed merchant vessels of a belligerent headed for the scene of conflict? And furthermore, must such privileges be vindicated by threatening war simply because "the honor and self-respect of the nation is involved?" Yet unless those questions are answered in the affirmative, the wisdom of Wilson's basic policy towards Germany

becomes suspect; especially in view of his express purpose to keep out of war, mediate between the combatants, and preside over their peace conference. Moreover, by insisting upon the *Sussex* pledge, which Germany gave only conditionally and for purely military reasons, Wilson placed the decision for war or peace with the United States in the hands of the Kaiser, unless he preferred to back down in case Germany should change her mind.

Professor Link is entitled to full praise for the manner in which he has organized the results of assiduous labor in the archives of several nations. Nevertheless, one lays down his latest volume with a query that would seem pertinent. He has devoted nearly five years to an extended treatment of a relatively unimportant nine-month period of American neutrality: how much time and space does he intend to apply to the far more significant events of participation in the war itself, in the Peace Conference at Paris, and in the Senate fight over ratification of the Versailles Treaty? Since Link's work, though obviously definitive, is too detailed for the general reader, students of the man and his times can only hope that the author sees fit to hurry on to those matters that established the fame of Woodrow Wilson.

Princeton, N. J.

C. PARDEE FOULKE

THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA

President, Boies Penrose

Vice-Presidents

Richmond P. Miller

Ernest C. Savage

Roy F. Nichols

Harold D. Saylor

Secretary, Penrose R. Hoopes

Treasurer, George E. Nehrbas

Councilors

Thomas C. Cochran

J. Kearsley Mitchell

Frederick B. Tolles

William Logan Fox

Henry R. Pemberton

David Van Pelt

J. Welles Henderson

Grant M. Simon

H. Justice Williams

Sydney E. Martin

Martin P. Snyder

Thomas E. Wynne

Counsel, R. Sturgis Ingersoll



Director, R. N. Williams, 2nd



Founded in 1824, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has long been a center of research in Pennsylvania and American history. It has accumulated an important historical collection, chiefly through contributions of family, political, and business manuscripts, as well as letters, diaries, newspapers, magazines, maps, prints, paintings, photographs, and rare books. Additional contributions of such a nature are urgently solicited for preservation in the Society's fireproof building where they may be consulted by scholars.

Membership. There are various classes of membership: general, \$10.00; associate, \$25.00; patron, \$100.00; life, \$250.00; benefactor, \$1,000. Members receive certain privileges in the use of books, are invited to the Society's historical addresses and receptions, and receive *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*. Those interested in joining the Society are invited to submit their names.

Hours. The Society is open to the public Monday, 1 P.M. to 9 P.M.; Tuesday through Friday, 9 A.M. to 5 P.M. The Society is usually closed during August.

