
John Smith is rightfully considered to be the most celebrated of the numerous family of Smiths, and has now at last received his due biographically, for of the fifteen or more lives of the picturesque Captain written in the present century this is far and away the best. This may sound like faint praise, since the other biographies are at best of the "popular" variety, or at worst, mere potboilers. But Mr. Barbour's book, either by comparison or on its own merits, should be absolutely definitive.

To paraphrase the blurb on the jacket, Smith's three worlds were first as a soldier, slave, and fugitive over eastern Europe, the Levant, and North Africa; second, as a wise, patient, and energetic founder of a New World; third, as a writer and promoter of the twin colonial projects of Virginia and New England. Mr. Barbour does full justice to all three phases of the life of this remarkable Elizabethan adventurer, preserving throughout an excellent balance of narrative with background material. However, of the three sections in the book, perhaps the most useful is the final one, with its description and evaluation of Smith's writings, in which ample emphasis is given not only to his Virginia books but also to his lesser known, but equally important, appeals for the colonization of New England. As a writer of promotional literature, the Captain is given full marks.

Mr. Barbour, in truth, makes John Smith come to life, and makes him emerge as a vivid and vital figure. His courage, his persistence, and his gifts as a leader of men are amply brought out, while his understanding of the Virginia Indians and his ability in dealing with them are duly emphasized. Likewise is his later interest in New England, his dogged determination and his constant bad luck in the New England ventures, and his faith in his vision that the northern region had boundless possibilities for colonization.

The book is superbly organized and the supplemental apparatus is complete and impeccable. There are seventeen well-chosen illustrations (a lot for this day and age) with explanatory notes; there are nearly a hundred pages of notes in the back of the volume (we are mercifully spared footnotes); there are six well-drawn maps, which aid the reader enormously; and there is a very fine bibliography of more than thirty pages (omitting inexplicably, however, Matthew Page Andrews' The Soul of a Nation). Furthermore, the entire book is written in very readable English, so that
the frequently involved narrative always continues to hold the reader's attention and interest.

All in all, this is a must for every Americanist.

Devon, Pa. Boies Penrose

_Carolina Cradle: Settlement of the Northwest Carolina Frontier, 1747–1762._

While historians long have agreed that the North Carolina Piedmont area was settled by the southwestward trek of Scotch-Irish and Germans from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, they have dealt in generalities. It has remained for this author to "prove the point." He has done so in a study, which amazes this reviewer who has done a bit of research himself. Not a recorder of deeds, register of wills, or even sheriff's office in the counties from which the migration began has been overlooked. He undoubtedly stirred up more dust in county offices, pulled out more vertical files, pored over more cumbersome dockets and tenderly uncreased more crumbling documents than the officeholders themselves ever have. Out of his efforts have come names, names, names, reminiscent almost of the Bible's book of Numbers. Taking but a brief period in colonial history and confining himself to Rowan County, North Carolina (Salisbury), the then frontier, he has populated the area with the early settlers by names, numbers, and antecedents. Then, having marshalled them into their various settlements—farmers, innkeepers, officeholders, blacksmiths, tanners, carpenters, painters, ne'er-do-wells, &c.—he has described how they lived, what they did, and some of the things they should not have done: "Adam Hall of Rowan County . . . did . . . retail and sell 2 half Pints of Whisky and one Quart of Beer contrary to an Act of Assembly of this Province." Adams seems to have been North Carolina's founding bootlegger. Genealogically minded folks in the states from whence these pioneers may find in the pages of _Carolina Cradle_ the names of some distant relatives they had never heard of, descendants of a collateral ancestor. But the volume is not easy reading. There are too many names to bemuse and confuse, and the text is in many places episodic. Then, when the Quakers and Irish followed the Scotch-Irish and Germans into the valley of the Yadkin and its tributaries, the going gets even more rugged for the reader. It is reassuring, however, to observe that, even in the brief period of fifteen years, there is such a wealth of material available for the local historian, if he, like Mr. Ramsey, is willing to go hunt for it. An end map, pointing up the northwest Carolina frontier, as of that period, is valuable, as are carefully prepared detail maps of the various grants and settlements. Most interesting
is the author's own conclusion: "Perhaps the truest understanding of the history of western North Carolina, the South, and the nation is to be found in careful study of the process by which they were settled. Who were the initial inhabitants? Why did they settle and under what circumstances? That there is need for detailed investigation of these questions is perhaps the most important conclusion to be derived from this study." Just how there could be more detail than is embraced within the covers of this little volume, this reviewer fails to see. But if there should be, Mr. Ramsey seems the man to do it. As usual, the University of North Carolina Press has produced an attractive format.

Brevard, N. C.

William Bell Clark


Based upon a thorough reworking of primary materials, this volume re-examines the nature and concerns of Pennsylvania politics in the third quarter of the eighteenth century with special attention to the role of Benjamin Franklin. It does not radically alter the traditional picture, but it does suggest some important modifications that deserve the attention of all serious students of early American politics.

According to the author, the keys to Pennsylvania politics before the Stamp Act were upper-class control, fear, and power. Control rested in the hands of a "Philadelphia-centered oligarchy," a "narrow, privileged minority" who governed mainly through the Assembly, a "wholly controlled subsidiary" of the Society of Friends. Drawn mostly from the "upper and upper-middle social levels," the members of the Assembly were not representative of the heterogeneous society they were supposed to serve and were constantly haunted by the fear that the several unrepresented elements would combine to bring about some sweeping "internal political upheaval." By playing these elements off against one another, keeping a "firm hold on the election process," and employing "skillful propaganda," the Quakers were, however, able to maintain their position down to the early 1760's without any serious challenge from the broad body of their constituents, and such political conflict as there was resulted from the efforts of the proprietor and his followers to challenge Assembly power. Carried on between two well-defined political parties, this conflict was bitter and intense and culminated in the Assembly's attempt to secure royal government for the colony, but, the author insists, it was no more than a mere "jousting at the top among both gentlemen rulers and their factions" over power. No basic social issues were at stake, most Pennsylvanians were unaffected by it, and even among the Quakers "principles and theories" were secondary. Led by
Israel Pemberton, a minority of Quakers did indeed insist upon a rigid adherence to pacifist principles during the early years of the French and Indian War and actually withdrew from the Assembly during the Exclusion Crisis of 1756, but the "paramount interest of most Quakers," the author argues, was in preserving their political power, and a majority of Quaker members retained their seats. Although Quaker power was weakened somewhat as a result of the Exclusion Crisis and although proprietary forces were able to make some significant, if temporary, gains in 1764 by exploiting discontent with the Assembly's response to the Paxton riots, the contest ended in a draw in 1765.

Franklin's role in these developments was crucial. Throughout his early career he remained largely on the fringes of political life, but after his entry into the Assembly in 1751 he quickly became a leading political figure. At first he refused to take sides in the hassles between the Assembly and the proprietor, hoping that by remaining independent he would be able to mediate between them. But a quarrel with Proprietor Thomas Penn in 1755 drove him into an alliance with the Quakers, and the Quaker split caused by the Exclusion Crisis enabled him to assume the leadership of the Old Party. Never did Franklin show any interest in changing the political order in Pennsylvania. No proponent of democracy or social levelling, he accepted the ideal of government by the wealthy and the virtuous, had little respect for the political capacity of the lower classes, and was even sharply antagonistic to western and non-English elements. Animated by his dislike for Penn and a deep belief in the beneficence of the mother country, he did lead the fight for royal government, but in doing so he envisaged no more than a palace revolution. As agent for the Assembly in London, Franklin failed in his fight against Penn, succeeding only in raising doubts about his own integrity that, the author suggests, impaired his effectiveness as an advocate for the colonies in the Revolutionary controversy after 1765.

Franklin's residence in London after the Stamp Act removed one "direct irritant" from the Pennsylvania scene and was in part responsible for a rapprochement between the Old and Proprietary Parties during the last decade of the colonial period, but much more important in driving the old antagonists together was the frightening excess of popular response during the agitation over the Stamp Act. Far removed from the local scene, Franklin, despite growing evidence of imperial intentions to assert tighter controls over the colonies, continued to press for royal government. "Faced with mounting restlessness among the people," however, politicians on the spot had no interest in promoting any quarrel that might overturn the traditional political order, and by joining forces they managed to prevent internal disputes from getting out of hand. Only after 1774, when the old leaders were no longer able to maintain a solid front in a rapidly changing situation, did internal revolution come to Pennsylvania. When it did come, it was the work not of Franklin or anyone else who had been prominently associated with the old regime but of new men who had been "kept outside
Better than any previous account this volume defines Franklin’s relationship to local politics in Pennsylvania, describes the composition and nature of the dominant political factions, shows the importance of political pressure from Whitehall in forcing Penn into an aggressive posture in the 1750’s, and makes clear the total absence of interest among any of the old-line political leaders in pushing for any basic changes in the political order. As an analysis of the nature of Pennsylvania politics, however, it is open to question on two points. The first involves the author’s emphatic denial of the importance of principle. Without question, the immediate prize in the struggle between the Old Party and the Proprietary Party was a “power advantage,” but, to push the inquiry further, what was it that power represented to the competing factions? Was power per se the only end of politics, or, as the author’s own evidence seems to indicate, was it to a very great extent simply the means to secure the supremacy of one or the other of two rival sets of ideas—or principles—about how the colony ought to be governed? Just as many of Franklin’s actions were strongly shaped by his vision of a powerful British Empire presided over by a just and benevolent parent state and Penn’s program for reform was influenced by his belief in the virtues of a balanced polity, so the Quakers may have been contending to preserve a way of life that they had come to understand in terms of a well-defined set of principles and beliefs. It is also possible that during the Exclusion Crisis most Quaker leaders saw that only by sacrificing one of those principles—pacifism—could they hope to preserve the rest. These suggestions can be tested only by a closer examination of the ways the participants conceived of their actions, but if they should turn out to be valid they would seem to argue for the importance, rather than the unimportance, of ideas and principles in Quaker political behavior and in Pennsylvania politics generally.

A second point involves the conception of the relationship between the governors and the governed. Although the author is careful to point out that except during the Paxton riots and the following election there was little overt evidence of substantial discontent among the governed, he places heavy emphasis upon the unrepresentative character of the Assembly and the fear among the politically dominant groups of upheaval from below. The climax of the book and, to the author, the natural conclusion of earlier developments is, in fact, the replacement of those groups by representatives of nonprivileged groups between 1774 and 1776. Thus, although the traditional conflict between aristocracy and democracy was not manifestly important on the surface of Pennsylvania politics, it was a powerful subterranean current that determined political attitudes and ultimately the direction of events. There are a number of difficulties with this emphasis. For one thing, it rests upon an extremely narrow conception of representation which assumes that only Quakers can represent Quakers, only western-
ers westerners, etc.—a conception which does not seem to have been widely diffused in the colonies prior to the Revolutionary controversy. Secondly, it posits a degree of political interest and aspiration among apparently politically inactive groups that, if it existed, should be more apparent in surviving evidence. Finally, to have stifled any serious amount of political discontent would have required the kind of efficient and sophisticated political controls that one normally associates only with twentieth-century totalitarian states and can scarcely be presumed to have existed in so politically immature a society as eighteenth-century Pennsylvania. These difficulties all suggest that in Pennsylvania, as in most other colonies, the traditions of order and stewardship and the habit of deference to political superiors were widely acquiesced in, if not also openly accepted, that to the extent that they thought about or were concerned with politics most residents were reasonably content with things as they were except when they were suffering from immediate and pressing grievances, and that the Quakers may not, therefore, have had to exclude and discourage other elements in society quite to the extent that the author indicates.

The Johns Hopkins University

JACK P. GREENE


“Franklin was a genius to whose sagacity we owe all sorts of creations from bifocal spectacles to the American Philosophical Society and perhaps the very existence of the republic. . . . This great name symbolizes the substitution in the eighteenth century of benevolent deism for a Christian God and of empirical experience for theology.” These recent words by a reliable American critic (Howard M. Jones, O Strange New World, 206, 208) express an established consensus. Since Franklin embodied most aspects of his multiplex life in writings which have survived time and neglect, it seems strange that his literary reputation long lagged behind his acceptance as one of a half-dozen dominant American writers of the century of the Revolution. Among the numerous full-scale biographies, only those by Parton (1864) and Van Doren (1938) recognize, on grounds convincing today, Franklin’s eminence regarded solely as a man of letters. The only previous study restricted to this subject, Benjamin Franklin as a Man of Letters (1887) by John Bach McMaster, presented the facts of a literary biography with a dry accuracy consistent with the author’s position as a pioneer of the new documentary history. But it is still useful for its identification of the genuinely literary power with which Franklin expressed the principal ideas—scientific, philosophical and social—of the Age of Reason in the American colonies.

Professor Granger’s book is welcome because its subject has been so long neglected, and also because there were available to him the first seven vol-
umes of The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, now in process. It should be said at once that Benjamin Franklin, An American Man of Letters makes a contribution, and is a work wholly concerned with Franklin's writings. Its author is modestly aware that a more comprehensive study can be made when all Franklin papers are available.

With respect to the method of this book the first chapter, "Literary Background," is revealing, primarily because it emphasizes those influences that are most useful for the analytical study of rhetorical form and style. Like Van Doren, Granger gives Franklin the principal credit for the evolution of a new American sentence syntactically based on the seventeenth-century plain style, modified by the practices of Bunyan, Defoe, Addison, and Swift. Franklin's "theory of expression" reflected a psychology of knowing based on the empiricism of John Locke. These literary preferences were engrafted upon the plain, coarse vulgate which as a boy Franklin inherited. The result was a literary language akin to the common speech of his countrymen, who needed no philosopher to convince them that words exist primarily as "signs for the ideas in the mind." Professor Granger's excellent analysis of the European style books include Arnault and Nicole's Port-Royal Logic, and John Hughes's Of Style, manuals which foreshadowed Locke and were still current in Franklin's youth. In setting reason above authority they coincided with Franklin's concept of the responsibility of the writer for the perfect transmission of the idea.

The liveliness of the critical element in the first three chapters is sustained by the necessary biographical commentary. After that, however, "the organization by chapter is loosely generic and chronological," each chapter dealing solely with one type of writing—"Letter to the Press," "Personal Letter," "Familiar Letter" (intended for ultimate publication), Bagatelle, and "Autobiography." The "Letter to the Press" is the author's category for epistolary articles, generally satiric or topical, such as "An Edict of the King of Prussia."

In each chapter, following the treatment of biographical or critical generalizations, or sometimes intrinsic to them, the type is illustrated by such formal or rhetorical analysis. Recurrent categories of rhetorical structure are analogy, ironic exclamation, tropes, parallel and balanced construction, proverbs as verification, disguise—as in the author's pseudonym or his role of persona incognito, as when his alter ego is "Richard Saunders." In the "Personal Letter" the rhetorical devices include effects of wit or the comic; also the obscene, bawdy, or vulgar reference. Verbal figures in the letters are more homely, such as proverbs and puns; the tropes are generally homely or simple similes or metaphors, although "occasionally he refines a metaphor in such a way that it becomes a conceit." This close analysis is not conducive to the treatment in depth of the literary values of 149 topical articles and vastly more letters than were ever before available.

Professor Granger's treatment of the Autobiography is useful and interesting. He attributes the utilitarian spirit of the work not especially to
Franklin's bent, as is so often done, but finds that its didacticism follows the eighteenth-century tradition of the autobiography, which was influenced by the vogue of the "conduct book" and the letters or journals intended for moral instruction to one's children. With respect to the problems of the text, which are well known, he notes that Franklin never completed, hence never fully revised the Ms, and that the Mss of the two "fair copies" made for Franklin have disappeared, although the Ms of the French translation by LeVeillard of his fair copy survives, together with Franklin's original draft showing his own revisions. William Temple Franklin, who in 1818 published the first official English text, used the LeVeillard Ms fair copy of Parts I–III and Franklin's draft of Part IV. From internal evidence Mr. Granger rejects the theory that either Franklin's grandson and scribe, Benjamin Bache, or William Temple Franklin made unauthorized changes in the fair copies. But since both fair copies in English are missing the last Ms cannot be conclusively reconstructed. In Granger's opinion, the text must continue to rest on a comparison of the Franklin original Ms with the printed text of 1818.

Acting on this principle Professor Granger makes sample parallel text comparisons of the Franklin Ms and the text of William Temple Franklin, assuming that changes in the 1818 text had Franklin's authorization. From this he derives some useful instruction from Franklin's revisions in his old age. If both texts can be accepted as representing Franklin's taste, the second written twenty-eight years later than the earliest section of the primitive Ms, these conclusions have genuine value and at any rate are very interesting. Accepting the evidence, one sees that Franklin in old age was still seeking a disciplined straightforward syntactical clarity, logical coherence, le mot juste, and "plain English" above all.

University of Pennsylvania

Sculley Bradley


It is a pleasure to welcome the initial volumes of a new series of the Adams Papers. In a review of the Diary and Autobiography of John Adams in the October, 1963, issue of this magazine the present writer sketched the history of the papers of the Adams family and the plans of the Massachusetts Historical Society for their publication under the editorship of L. H. Butterfield et alii. Series I is to comprise the family diaries, and it should occasion no surprise to the readers of the first-published volumes that the John Adams
diary already has been given the accolade of paperback publication. Series II will comprise in a single chronology the Adams family correspondence from the courtship of John Adams and Abigail Smith in 1761, through three generations and part of a fourth, to the death in 1889 of Abigail Brown Brooks Adams, wife of the first Charles Francis Adams. It is estimated that this series will run to some twenty volumes. The present volumes begin with the letters exchanged between John and Abigail before their marriage in 1764 and extend to Adams' departure on his diplomatic mission to France in 1778.

Between 1840 and 1876, Charles Francis Adams published various editions of what appeared in the latter year as *Familiar Letters of John Adams and His Wife*. Stereotyped, and reprinted again and again, the book achieved the status of a historical source and a minor literary classic. This dialogue on the events of the Revolution between strategically placed, articulate, and observant characters, writing with affection, confidence, and perfect understanding has been eagerly read and enjoyed over the years in spite of its dreary typographical dress. What readers and users of the book never knew was that the editor omitted all letters and parts of letters that made intimate revelations, that showed any un-Victorian emotion, or that dealt with disease, pregnancies (even a mare), or finances. The chitchat of a fond mother reporting the escapades of her children was all suppressed. And Adams corrected the spelling, grammar, and punctuation of his grandparents, supplanting the country idioms and archaisms with the decorous diction of nineteenth-century Beacon Street.

In the present volumes, the editors print 469 letters which passed between John and Abigail, just twice as many as C. F. Adams vouchsafed, and they are printed fully and exactly, usually from the recipient's copy. More than two hundred letters to and from other members of the family, and friends such as Mercy Otis Warren, are included. The editorial work on these books is superb; the manuscripts are located, and if there are important differences between drafts, letter-book copies, and letters sent, these are set down. The annotation is full, identifying people, places, and events, but it is not excessive, it is always interesting, and it is adequately documented. Each pair of volumes in this series is to carry an index, and the present one, which appears in a day of deplorably inadequate, cynical, and slapdash indexing, can only be called magnificent. The books are illustrated with some two dozen portraits or contemporary documents, handsomely reproduced in gravure, and accompanied by excellent descriptive notes.

No one is likely to dispute Mr. Butterfield's statement that the correspondence of the Adams family is unsurpassed by any other accumulation of its kind. We should be grateful that its custodianship, its editorship, and its publication have so fortunately fallen to the right hands.

*Princeton University*  

M. Halsey Thomas

(New York: Argosy Antiquarian Ltd., 1964. xi, 290 p. Map, illustrations, bibliography, index. $6.95.)

Brink of Revolution is a popularized version of the Revolutionary movement in New York from the year 1765 through 1776. Following the pattern laid down by Carl Becker more than fifty years ago in his History of Political Parties in the Province of New York, 1765-1776, Mr. Decker, who is a former newspaper man, concentrates on the theme of the rise of the common man in New York and his success in challenging the leadership of the old aristocracy. The result was an internal revolution in New York, something which Becker considered more significant than independence itself.

During the Stamp Act crisis, the first dynamic phase of the Revolutionary movement, all classes in New York, as elsewhere, united in opposing the measure. But the excesses of the mob, led by extremists, so alarmed the conservative element that henceforth it constituted a brake upon all radical measures in the province. Although conservatives and moderates might have been able to control events in New York during succeeding controversies with the mother country, forces outside the province played into the hands of the radical faction, thus keeping New York abreast of the Revolutionary movement.

Mr. Decker appropriately features the activities of the Sons of Liberty, the instigators of most of the mass protest and mob violence which accompanied the Revolutionary movement in New York. Confronted today with like spectacles all over the world, Mr. Decker has given us something to think about in our Revolutionary past. It is indeed through this phase of the Revolution that we come to understand the emotional upheaval and excitement that eventually drove Americans to open rebellion in 1775.

Careful reading will discover quite a number of errors. For instance: a daughter of Robert Watts did not marry Lord Stirling; General Gage was not in command at Boston in the winter of 1775-1776 (he had left for England); the Stamp Act Congress did not declare the Navigation Acts unconstitutional. In many cases, too, there should have been more discrimination in the choice of adjectives. “Poor old” Philip Schuyler, for example, was neither poor nor old in 1775. Unfortunately, there are no footnotes. The bibliography is inadequate, having few books listed of recent publication. Little or no use was made of manuscript material.

Rutgers University

Theodore Thayer


Alexander Hamilton’s reputation has soared in recent years. He is celebrated as a prophet in the areas of constitutional law, finance, manufactures, and race relations. In addition, the works of such men as Hans Morgenthau,
George Kennan, Felix Gilbert, and Paul Varg have made him a symbol of the diplomat’s proper concern with power and self-interest in international relations. His flaws are not forgotten but are readily forgiven. Diplomatic historians well know that he maintained secret contacts with the British, and used them to explain away any stand taken by his own government which might antagonize Great Britain. Yet he is not considered dishonorable, but an honest public servant whose zealous advocacy of a realistic foreign policy sometimes carried him beyond the bounds of discretion.

Julian Boyd has brilliantly challenged this view. He presents strong evidence that Hamilton went “far indeed beyond the limits of honorable conduct in public office.” Considering the specific charges Boyd brings against Hamilton, this conclusion is an almost ludicrous understatement.

The key to Boyd’s case is a discrepancy in the reports rendered by Hamilton and British secret agent George Beckwith to their respective governments concerning one of their conversations. In 1790, when Spain and England were on the verge of war, Beckwith showed Hamilton instructions from Governor Dorchester of Canada which expressed Dorchester’s hope “that neither the appearance of a War with Spain, nor its actually taking place, will make any alteration in the good disposition of the United States to establish a firm friendship and Alliance with Great Britain to the Mutual advantage of both Countries; I am persuaded it can make none on the part of Great Britain, whose liberal treatment of the United States in point of Commerce sufficiently evinces her friendly disposition. . . . I think the interests of the United States, in case of a war, may be more effectually served by a junction with Great Britain, than otherwise.”

Hamilton reported to Washington the following: Dorchester “had reason to believe that the Cabinet of Great Britain entertained a disposition not only towards a friendly intercourse but towards an alliance with the United States,” and “That it was therefore presumed, should war take place, that the United States would find it to be their interest to take part with Great Britain rather than with Spain.”

Until now, historians have accepted Hamilton’s account as an accurate representation of the instructions Dorchester had given Beckwith. Boyd has pointed out for the first time that Dorchester’s instructions, if read carefully, do not say that the British seek an alliance, but that they wish the United States to continue to seek one. Since Hamilton passionately opposed the plans of Jefferson and Madison to retaliate commercially against Britain’s hostile policy, Boyd concludes that he purposely distorted Beckwith’s communication to make retaliation seem unnecessary. Dispatches from Gouverneur Morris in London, however, contradicted Hamilton’s report of British friendliness. As a result, Boyd charges, Hamilton fabricated rumors that the British treatment of Morris was the result of Morris’ own misconduct during the negotiations.

Boyd makes a strong case, but he does not prove his charges beyond a reasonable doubt. Hamilton was often underhanded, but he was never so
subtle in his duplicity as Boyd's suppositions would necessitate. Boyd dismisses the possibility that the discrepancies were a product of misinterpretation or gullibility. Being an editor of precision and purpose, he allows little room for carelessness and contingency. He claims a greater degree of accuracy than the nature of his evidence will admit. If generations of historians could misinterpret Dorchester's instructions, is it not possible that an impetuous man like Hamilton, who wanted so desperately to believe that the British were friendly, could misinterpret them also? The instructions were ambiguous, perhaps intentionally so, for Dorchester and Beckwith feared an American attack on the disputed frontier posts and thus had reason to hold out to Hamilton the hope of a change in British policy. Boyd believes he has "made disclosures" about Hamilton; it would be more accurate to say he has raised strong suspicions.

San Francisco State College

JERALD A. COMBS


These two works add to the growing list of travel literature written by Europeans about early America. The former is an extremely significant work already well known, important for its picture of post-Revolutionary Pennsylvania. The second work, somewhat less significant from a historical point of view, presents an amalgamation and telescoping of older materials combined into a coherent account depicting America during the last four decades of the eighteenth century.

Brisson de Warville's work, made up of forty-six letters, looks at early America through the eyes of a French revolutionary and reveals the author's deep and ardent love for all things American. Here we discover that love for democratic America which helped to make the French Revolution, and the comparison between the decadence of feudal Europe and the moral vitality of early America is evident on every page. For Pennsylvanians, this work has special interest in that the author is fulsome in his admiration of the Quakers whom he visited for some length of time. All the famous Pennsylvanians appear here: Warner Mifflin, James Pemberton, Benjamin Rush, Benjamin Franklin, Anthony Benezet, Benjamin Lay, John Woolman. There is detailed material on the state of the antislavery movement in
Philadelphia during this period, enough to convince the reader that Philadelphia was during this time the center of the agitation for abolition. Moreover, there is a fine letter on the Quakers and military matters, showing the difficulties which the peace testimony of the Society of Friends projected them into. The description of a Pennsylvania farm is somewhat limited, as Brissot de Warville did not observe an up-country establishment but one on the fringe of the farming area. However, his classification of the settlers into frontiersmen, piedmont farmers, and tidewater merchants is of importance. This is an important and significant work, a prime source, for the history of post-Revolutionary Philadelphia.

The three volumes by Crèvecoeur, here gathered into one large work of more than six hundred pages, are justifiably not as celebrated as the Letters From an American Farmer. These volumes are really not straightforward travel literature, but they are filled with imaginary conversations, tales, Indian idylls, adventures and sagas gathered from many sources. This is rather an amalgamation and telescoping of materials some of which are obviously secondhand. Crèvecoeur claimed that he translated a “ship wrecked manuscript” which was on the Morning Star bound from Philadelphia to Copenhagen. He passes himself off as the translator when he was in fact the author. He created an imaginary traveling companion, a “Mr. Hermann,” who serves as a foil for his dialogue and it is written in a style which even the editor calls “schizophrenic.” Obviously it is a reworking of existing accounts and cannot be classed as authentic reporting of firsthand observations. However, in spite of the lack of an index, which makes specific facts difficult to find, the work may prove useful for the historian.

Of these two works the one by Brissot de Warville is far and away the more important. In spite of a bias in favor of all things American, this work provides one of the finest pictures of Pennsylvania during this period when Quakers still were quaking and when this republic, with its democratic values, was in the process of being born. It is valuable, however, to have both volumes available in contemporary editions: the former because of its accuracy, and the latter because of its subjective judgments on American affairs.

_Haverford College_  

**JOHN JOSEPH STOUDT**

_Elroy McColley. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964. 227 p. Bibliography, index. $5.00.)_  

This challenging monograph is a fresh and valuable contribution to the history of slavery and the antislavery movement in the United States. The author effectively questions two common generalizations about these issues in the early national period.

In the first place, Dr. McColley argues that the plantation economy was not a dying institution rescued by Eli Whitney and the cotton gin in the
Successful planters who made money from slave labor were numerous enough in the late eighteenth century not only to preserve but to spread the system. Few Virginians abandoned slavery, and the total number of slaveowners was always increasing. Virginians carried slavery into all the states south of the Ohio River and made efforts to get it legalized in the Old Northwest. The chief ambition of members of the yeoman class was to become plantation aristocrats, and many succeeded in rising to this level either in Virginia or in the newer states to the south and west. Slavery was a means not only of obtaining wealth but of fulfilling social and cultural pretensions.

In the second place, the author suggests that the liberalism of Jefferson and other Virginia leaders of his day on the matter of slavery has been greatly exaggerated. While occasionally admitting that the institution was an evil one, they practically never advanced systematic proposals for eliminating it. The Virginia assembly passed a law permitting voluntary manumission in 1782, but relatively small numbers of slaveholders took advantage of it. Emancipation plans were generally coupled with the idea of removing freed Negroes from the state. Negroes were generally thought to be innately inferior to whites, and a dim future was foreseen for them in competition with free citizens in American society. In connection with revision of the Virginia law code during the Revolution, Jefferson and several others worked out a plan for gradual emancipation and removal of Negroes from Virginia, but they finally decided not to submit it to the legislature. While Jefferson wrote into the provisional Ordinance of 1784 a clause which would have forbidden slavery in both northern and southern territories, as President he guaranteed French and Spanish slavery in the Louisiana Purchase and helped open that territory to American slavery as well. In his old age he opposed that part of the Missouri Compromise which closed extensive dominions to slavery.

The “true emancipators,” McCollcy contends, were the Virginia Methodists and Quakers, most notably Warner Mifflin and Robert Pleasants, both members of the Society of Friends. Early Methodist enthusiasm for the antislavery cause soon waned, but the Quakers were consistent and continuous supporters of emancipation. Small in numbers, they were not able to accomplish much.

McColley also awards little merit to the Virginia aristocrats for the state law of 1778 forbidding further importation of slaves and for their support of national prohibition of the foreign slave trade. They were not opposed to the domestic slave trade and, indeed, were more than willing to sell their excess slaves in other states. Thus they could prevent an undue increase in their slave population and maintain a safe racial balance.

While the main focus of the book is on these lines of argument, there are chapters dealing with the life of the slave, with the loss of slaves in the Revolution, and with the problems of runaway slaves and slave revolts. The general lot of both slaves and free Negroes is pictured as an unhappy one.
The American Colonization Society is mentioned only incidentally, and no attention is given to the Virginia debates on slavery in 1831–1832. The study is based on substantial research in manuscript collections as well as printed sources, but the author did not use statistical methods to demonstrate his thesis regarding the profitability of slavery. An interesting essay on sources is appended to the text. The book originated as a doctoral dissertation at the University of California, and the author is currently an assistant professor at the University of Illinois.

The Pennsylvania State University

Ira V. Brown


Students of social history will welcome this first objective, full-length biography of that fascinating figure of the early national period, Jemima Wilkinson (1752–1819). Jemima, born in Cumberland, Rhode Island, in a Quaker household, was one of twelve children of Jeremiah and Amy Whipple Wilkinson. In addition to the Quaker influence of her family, she was also attracted by George Whitefield and later joined a New Light congregation. In 1776, after a severe illness which she believed to be fatal, Jemima Wilkinson abandoned her former name, called herself the Publick Universal Friend, and seemed to suggest that she was a new incarnation of Christ, come to minister to that generation.

Her teachings did not vary appreciably from the basic Christian principles of the day. She emphasized the sinfulness of humanity and called upon her listeners to repent. Her religious services were very much like those of the Society of Friends. There was no music and no formal order of service. The worshippers waited in silence until she felt called upon to speak. She accepted the Quaker position on sacraments, and embraced the testimonies of Friends on peace, race relations, and plainness. However, she differed from Quakers in observing the Sabbath on Saturday, and in her emphasis on prophecy and the interpretation of dreams. She encouraged her close followers to practice celibacy, but did not demand it of all her adherents. She established a number of congregations in Rhode Island, and spread over into Connecticut. In 1782, she ventured to carry her message to Philadelphia, and gathered a number of faithful supporters in that region, especially around the town of Worcester, in Montgomery County, on the Skippack Pike north of Norristown.

Christopher Marshall, the Free Quaker and diarist, became an ardent admirer and he was joined by many others. The Universal Friend held public meetings in the Methodist Meetinghouse, and on later visits she used the
Free Quaker Meetinghouse. She also aroused a good bit of opposition and criticism, and this, coupled with difficulties in New England, led her to make plans to lead her adherents into virgin territory on the New York frontier. The community, which she started in 1788 on Crooked (now Keuka) Lake, she named Jerusalem. Since some of her followers lived with their families, and others lived as celibates, a situation similar to that at Ephrata, some students believe that Jemima Wilkinson was influenced by that Pennsylvania Utopian community. Wisbey points out that Christopher Marshall was very familiar with Ephrata and could have described it to the Universal Friend.

Jemima Wilkinson was a striking person during her prime. Her features were handsome, in a strong masculine way, and she wore her hair in what was regarded as a masculine fashion. She often dressed in black with a white stock around her neck, and frequently wore trousers. She spoke with great vigor and eloquence, and it was her mode of presentation, rather than the content of her sermons, which won her a following. When sickness weakened her and the ravages of illness took their toll on her physical appearance, she no longer made new converts, and began to lose some who had been faithful. In addition, she became involved in a series of lawsuits over property, and her final years were an anticlimax.

Wisbey has been careful not to accept any tales and rumors about Jemima Wilkinson unless they could be verified. She caused gossip and stories during her lifetime and she is firmly fixed in the folklore of the regions where she lived. Wisbey has exploded many stories, such as the familiar one that her followers expected her to rise from the dead in 1819, as she believed she had done before in 1776.

The author compares Jemima Wilkinson with John Murray, who began the Universalist movement during the same period, and with Anna Lee, the founder of the Shakers. The other two were born in England and came to America to undertake their work, but Jemima is the first native-born American woman to begin a religious movement. Wisbey readily agrees that she did not have the same influence upon her fellow Americans as the other two.

The reader misses any critical evaluation of Jemima Wilkinson in an otherwise admirable volume. One does not need to know much psychology to realize that some pointed questions could be raised about this woman. The author seems to accept her entirely at her face value, and does not attempt to look behind the scenes. He had his reasons for making this decision, I am sure, but this does not change the fact that the reader regrets that decision.

This reviewer found a number of valuable comments about Jemima Wilkinson in the manuscript journal of William Savery (1750–1804), who visited her several times during the negotiations of the Pickering Treaty at Canandaigua in 1794, and commented upon his earlier observations of her when she had been in Philadelphia. Wisbey, who used the published journal,
apparently did not realize that Quaker editors often omitted printing interesting items in manuscript diaries which did not seem to contribute to the purposes of Friends.

Haverford College

EDWIN B. BRONNER


With this book Bradford Perkins completes his trilogy on United States foreign relations from 1795 to 1823. The emphasis, as in the other volumes, is where it so obviously should be in any general American diplomatic history of this period—on relations with Great Britain, the power which controlled the land mass on the northern frontier and the ocean on the eastern frontier of the United States. In this final volume, Professor Perkins completes his tracing of the arc of American diplomacy from the days of dependency and the Jay Treaty to 1823 and Canning's offer of a limited alliance. _Castlereagh and Adams_ examines the last segment of that arc: from the fumbling attempts of the Madison administration to seek out peace immediately after it had launched into the War of 1812, to America's cocky substitution of the Monroe Doctrine for an acceptance of Canning's 1823 offer. The Monroe Doctrine was the logical culmination of America's fifty years of endeavor after "the rattle of musketry at Lexington... to become an independent people capable of following their own destiny without European assistance."

Bradford Perkins' unique contributions have been to reveal the role of human irrationalism and uninformed public opinion in the making of foreign policy, and, by means of unprecedentedly close examination of British sources, to reappraise the survey course clichés that "explain" so much of United States history so simply. Professor Perkins' mild and scholarly iconoclasm is, for this reviewer, the chief value of his work. In _The First Rapprochement_, he introduced us to the fact that the British thought their signing of the Jay Treaty a generous act. In _Prologue to War_, the adolescent hesitancy of America's demand for recognition and equitable treatment was shown to play as great a role in bringing on the War of 1812 as British arrogance. In _Castlereagh and Adams_, it is the former and not the latter who stars. Professor Perkins is the first American historian to give proper credit to this first British statesman to acknowledge the reality of the growth of United States power and, despite the culture lag in British public opinion, to deal with the United States as a sovereign nation, rather than as a peculiarly discourteous ingrate of a colony.

One cannot fault Bradford Perkins on depth of research or sophistication of interpretation. However, it is not possible to pay him the high honor of
recommending his work to the layman, as well as to the professional historian. To condemn him for not writing as well as Henry Adams, his great precursor, would be as worthless a criticism as telling a contemporary composer that he is inferior to Beethoven, but that does not alter the fact that there are some long dry stretches in Castlereagh and Adams. "Warfare of the Mind," his chapter on the battle of books and opinions between the United States and Great Britain, is more of a catalogue of dead men's statements than an evocation of the discordancy of brassy American chauvinism grating up against ironbound British conceit.

Professor Perkins is guilty of sentences that leave a residue of confusion after the meaning has been extracted: (p. 175) "Napoleon's downfall removed both a competing magnet for dislike and an excuse for English misdeeds. . . ." A magnet competing to attract dislike is a metaphor that tends to trip the reader, rather than to ease him forward to swifter comprehension. One might also argue with Professor Perkins' choice of quotes and on how he handles them. Why inflict upon us verbatim John Quincy Adams' awkward statement that such-and-such a declaration was (p. 330) "bearding us to our faces upon the monarchical principles of the Holy Alliance"? Coleridge did promise to devote an ode on General Ross's death to (p. 179) "lamentation on the [im]moral war between the child and the parent country . . .," but it would be better to paraphrase than to arouse the reader's suspicion by reversing the apparent meaning of the quotation by inserting a single syllable in brackets.

But the reviewer protesteth too much and has obviously forgotten that he claimed he would not fuss if a Perkins did not turn out to be an Adams. Castlereagh and Adams is now the best work on United States diplomatic history in the crucial decade following the opening of the War of 1812, and it is likely to be so for many years.

Ohio State University

Alfred W. Crosby, Jr.


The publication of Mr. Dangerfield's volume in the New American Nation Series has been awaited with pleasurable anticipation by those who have had the good fortune to read his Pulitzer Prize book, The Era of Good Feelings. His newest book is distinguished by the same urbane style, the incisive vignettes of personalities made vivid by superb contrasting phrases, and the fine interpretative insights of the earlier work. Not surprisingly, the material presented is also very much the same, although it has been modified to reflect the contributions of more recent scholarship.
As the title suggests, nationalism is the dominating theme of the book. It showed itself in the closing years of Madison's administration in attempts to write into law the lessons learned in the War of 1812, and it continued to occupy a prominent place during the terms of Monroe and Adams. Dangerfield asserts that the "Era of Good Feelings" was terminated by the Panic of 1819 and was succeeded domestically by an "Era of Introspection," in which "American democracy worked westward for its national path to the future, but inward for the terms upon which that future was to be realized [p. 289]." The Panic of 1819 likewise gave birth to the "democratic nationalism exemplified by the partisans of Jackson," which contested the "economic nationalism" of Henry Clay and John Quincy Adams. The conflict between these two is constantly recalled to the reader, and it appears, at times, to be imposed upon the material rather than to arise from it.

Almost equal stress is given to the confrontation of American economic nationalism with the Liberal Toryism of Great Britain under the Earl of Liverpool. Dangerfield presents forcefully the story of the quarrel over the West Indian carrying trade, the growing protectionism of the United States, and the unsuccessful attempts by Adams to take advantage of circumstances to force the British to accept American views both on trade and neutral rights. Even the Monroe Doctrine, regarded by the author as a phase of this Anglo-American conflict, is presented as "a far more severe challenge to industrial England, whose fleet sustained it, than to the Holy Alliance and legitimist France, against whom it was ostensibly directed [p. xii]."

Dangerfield recognizes the influence of political considerations in his discussion of the Missouri Compromises, but he is persuaded that they were more significant in bringing about compromise than in provoking the original dispute, as some have suggested. He makes clear his opinion that the compromise was an error which probably made the Civil War inevitable, and he suggests that the South would have been brought "to heel" if the northerners had been firm in insisting upon restrictions as a condition for the admission of Missouri.

In discussing the "Tariff of Abominations," Dangerfield notes the traditional story that the measure was not intended to pass but was simply a trick of Jackson supporters to advance his election, and he likewise presents Robert Remini's view that Van Buren intended it to pass and backed it as a means of garnering support for Jackson in the Middle Atlantic and western states, although he allowed southern members of Congress to think otherwise. More important to Dangerfield is the view that the tariff reflected perfectly the democratic nationalism opposed to Adams' economic nationalism, revealing "a passion for the haphazard, the piecemeal, and the ad hoc," and showing "that the central government was expected to give assistance, but never to plan the assistance that it gave [p. 283]."

This is an interesting and rewarding book, but it is too much marked by the author's predilections for economic interpretations and for viewing the
history of the United States so much in terms of Anglo-American relations. Recalling that this is the period elsewhere labeled the "Rise of the New West" and marked by the first significant stages of the "Transportation Revolution," it becomes clear that Dangerfield has written too largely in terms of foreign relations and the actions of the federal government and that the book lacks a desirable balance. The editors of the series note some of these gaps in their introduction and promise that they will be filled by other volumes of the series.

It is highly regrettable that this book should be characterized by frequent editorial lapses. Denmark Vesey becomes Vesey Denmark, John McLean is consistently referred to as John McClean, and there are literally dozens of errors in names of authors and titles in the notes and bibliographical essay. Such carelessness, or ineptness, seems inexcusable in a book of this merit. To close on a more pleasant note, the author and publishers are to be commended upon the excellent illustrations which form a welcome and useful supplement to the text.

Rice University
S. W. Higginbotham


William Jennings Bryan is a political oddity. At thirty-six, with only two terms in the House of Representatives behind him, he was nominated for the Presidency. For most of the next twelve years he was the leader of his party even though he held no office and was further handicapped by an unimaginative and inflexible mind and a surprising lack of political finesse.

What there was about Bryan that appealed to more than six million Americans is hard to define. Was it only the magnificent voice parroting the yearnings of many of his generation, or was there something more? Professor Coletta does little to solve the mystery. This may be due to the fact that he succumbed to a danger inherent in biography: he allowed Bryan to pre-empt the stage and slighted all the other characters and scenery which might have helped to explain this enigmatic figure.

Even if we disregard this major failing, Dr. Coletta's book is weak. For not only has he concentrated on Bryan and disregarded other important historical information, but he has ignored his own evidence. How else could he say, as he did in his preface, that Bryan came from "humble surroundings" and then proceed, in Chapter I, to describe the family house as a "mansion that served for years as a showplace of Marion County," and Bryan's father as being as close to "an aristocrat as rural conditions permitted"?

Such lapses are, unfortunately, common to the entire volume. Dr. Coletta's handling of election statistics is typically haphazard. He calls the
election of 1896 "fairly close," when it was, of course, the worst defeat suffered by the Democrats in more than twenty years. He says that half a million fewer votes were cast in 1908 than in 1896. In fact, nearly a million more people went to the polls in Bryan's last campaign than in his first. Carelessness and lack of objectivity of this sort seriously detract from Professor Coletta's usually careful research.

The account of the election of 1896 is, perhaps, the most disappointing part of the book. Surely this—Bryan's most important campaign—deserves something more than a rehash of all the familiar explanations for Bryan's defeat. Bryan would have triumphed, we are told, if the election had been held earlier, if there had been honest returns, if the Republicans had not had so much money. The author even repeats the old numbers game: if a few more votes had been counted for Bryan in certain states, he would have won in the electoral college. This is true, but McKinley still would have had a majority of the popular vote.

Mr. Coletta really should have spent less time repeating these old, and probably not very important, stories, and more on an attempt to delineate the significant causes for Bryan's defeat. Clearly, Bryan was a poor politician. His campaign "peaked" too soon. He concentrated on silver to the neglect of other important issues. When the price of farm products rose, undercutting his main program, he lost key farm states he had counted on winning. He failed to carry a single industrial state and could not even hold the South.

Professor Coletta notes all these facts, and many more, but he does not seem to have weighed or analyzed them. Nor is there any evidence that he sought any new solutions to the question of why Bryan lost. Even worse, he does not seem to be aware of the significance of the election. Far from being a moral victory for Bryan, the election of 1896 marked the end of the long period of balance between the parties and the beginning of Republican hegemony.

Despite these many shortcomings, which prevail throughout the book, it is the best biography of Bryan yet to appear. Professor Coletta's years of research have produced many facts and though he has failed to handle them as carefully or as imaginatively as we might have wished, he has given us enough information to allow us to form far more intelligent opinions about Bryan than we ever could before.

Yale University

Brooks M. Kelley


Thirty-four years have passed since the late Charles Shimer Boyer published his informative and detailed study of the early iron industry in New
Jersey. His account of the furnaces and forges dealt primarily with the second half of the eighteenth century. At its best, the book was a cold compilation of factual data about individual furnaces scattered over the Jersey landscape. For a quarter of a century the history of the Jersey iron industry remained imprisoned in these dull pages.

It was Arthur D. Pierce who unlocked the prison and breathed life into the story of this significant enterprise. He accomplished this in 1957 with his excellent book, Iron in the Pines. One, therefore, opened his latest work, Family Empire in Jersey Iron, with great anticipation and high expectations. There is some immediate disappointment. The book lacks clarity and organization, too often becoming a recitation of unrelated events presented in a patchwork history of the region and of the remarkable Richards family.

The introduction and the chapters dealing with the more prominent members of the Richards family have the flavor of genealogy rather than the flavor of biography. William Richards, who is much admired by Mr. Pierce, came to the Batsto Iron Works in the South Jersey pines in 1773. He had learned the iron business as a boy in Eastern Pennsylvania. A number of years later, about 1790, William Richards acquired full control of the furnace and forge which became the keystone in the arch of his family fortune. As the founder of the Richards clan, he fathered nineteen children and was the proud grandfather of forty more. The Richards family not only invested in Jersey bog iron plantations at Batsto, Weymouth, Martha, Taunton, Hampton, and Atsion, but dabbled in South Jersey glass factories, cotton and paper mills, brick kilns and shipping. They also built the Camden and Atlantic Railroad, speculated in real estate, and are regarded as the founders and developers of Atlantic City. Some members of the family served in the New Jersey and Pennsylvania legislatures and one, Benjamin, old William’s twelfth child, became Mayor of Philadelphia.

With so much available material from enterprise, careers, and generations, it seems strange that Mr. Pierce spends a totally irrelevant chapter, albeit an interesting one, on Benjamin Randolph, the famous Philadelphia cabinetmaker and joiner. Randolph’s only connection with the Richards family was that in later years he became an ironmaster at Speedwell near Burlington, New Jersey. The Speedwell furnace property, however, did not pass into the hands of Samuel Richards until 1833, forty years after Randolph’s death.

Probably the best sections of the book deal with descriptions of Weymouth furnace, forge, and paper mill located a few miles from the present town of Mays Landing. Excerpts from the “Weymouth Diary” from 1813 to 1827 are reprinted in the text of the narrative. The terse entries cast their spell and one can almost hear the crash of the great hammer and the shouts of sweating men. These are records of work and play, of birth and death, and drunkenness and despair and hope—vital raw materials of history. For those who have known Weymouth, the diary recalls the smell of pines, the sound of wind over the flat land, and the light-gray sands of the forest floor.
cut by the narrow, black waters of the Great Egg Harbor River. Along its banks huckleberries still grow in profusion in July and clouds of mosquitoes rise at dusk.

*Family Empire in Jersey Iron* is not good history as history is supposed to be written by the professional, but it is a fascinating record of the Richards family and their enterprises in iron, land, and railroads in Southern New Jersey. Arthur Pierce appears to be a combination of journalist, antiquarian, and genealogist. He is also an incurable romantic whose affection for the history of South Jersey and the pine barrens is evident on every page. For that alone we are in his debt. The pine woods still hold much of the past within themselves. Some of it has been disclosed by Mr. Pierce's meticulous researches and inquiring mind. His flashes of engaging style make his book worthwhile to even the most critical reviewer. But for those of us who love this region and “have sand in our shoes,” this book becomes a pleasant dialogue between author and reader, stirring old memories and reweaving old dreams.

*Hartwick College*  

**Frederick M. Binder**

(Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1963. xvi, & x, 817 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. $10.00.)

These two volumes, obviously the product of painstaking scholarship, present an important facet of the history of American society. No reader will cavil at the wealth of material presented, and none will begrudge my praise of this work as an invaluable source of reference.

It is shown in the first few chapters that the origins of higher education in Pennsylvania must be sought in the colonial demand for a trained clergy, and, with few exceptions, the constellation of early colleges sprang up in response to this demand. These colleges survived, however, only where they proved adaptive to the growing industrial economy and to the rapid mutations of Pennsylvanian society. To be sure, apart from secular foundations such as the University of Pennsylvania, earlier education depended for its continuity upon the financial resources of different religious bodies. Nevertheless, the transformations which occurred in those institutions of higher learning were not so much of patronage as of purpose and curricula, and especially the latter, which, during the first decades of the nineteenth century, gave an ever increasing recognition to the educational importance of science, technology and commerce. One of the conclusions which the author draws from his Pennsylvanian study is that the survival of any system of education finally depends upon its relevance to the needs of society.

I do not challenge this conclusion, though, perhaps, I feel some disappointment that the author, who has amassed and digested such a large bibliography, has not explored in greater detail some of the things we should like to
know. To what extent, for instance, was the industrial economy dependent upon any specific educational program beyond what was needed to confer upon the growing armies of factory workers the bare rudiments of literacy and numeracy? Did American early nineteenth-century industry, whose verve was the practical inventiveness, the piecemeal innovations and the commercial flair of largely self-made men, really need the kind of expertise which Dr. Sack obviously believes the changes in the curriculum were designed to impart? Or, again, did he attempt to confirm his thesis by examining the course of, say, English higher education vis-à-vis massive industrialization during the same period? One of the interesting differences between the American and English response through higher education to nineteenth-century industrial development was that in the latter the criterion of what constituted a real education was not affected.

Be this as it may, the author has collected abundant evidence of what these changes were in the nineteenth-century American concept of higher education, and he demonstrates that where collegiate institutions were not resilient to change, they were superseded by new foundations. He explains that the changed attitude towards women's education during the last decades of the nineteenth century was part of the same transforming process. Even theological, medical and law curricula, he maintains, can be seen to have been molded by the social and economic pressures.

One of the more remarkable features of American higher education is that, whereas it developed in a new, immigrant society, it was always essentially a class education. Until the end of the last century, in spite of the earlier hopes for a system of publicly maintained higher education, collegiate education was a commodity for those who could pay fees. To a non-American reader, relying on the wealth of material assembled by this author, Pennsylvanian higher education would seem in historical perspective to be subject to a tension between the constantly reiterated belief in the egalitarian right to higher education and a financial independence that fiercely required one to pay his own way. Consequently, apart from such acts as the temporary closure of the embryonic University of Pennsylvania in the eighteenth century, the historic part played by the State in determining the form of higher education would seem by European standards to be negligible. The axiom has been that the right of interference in matters of higher education rests with those who, operating under charters granted by State agencies, control the purse. Dr. Sack demonstrates how this principle of quasi-independent trustees has led, at different times in the past, not only to the impoverishment of the curriculum but to the peace of mind of the faculty.

Although there is an excellent chapter on the education of teachers, perhaps it is a pity that the author, with all the material at his disposal, has not given a section entirely to the nineteenth-century faculty. For instance, to what extent was the pattern of American higher education in the last century affected by the sort of college teachers who were available? A fact not
generally appreciated is that a pattern of curriculum in colleges can be self-perpetuating through the cadre of teachers. Once certain studies have come to be looked upon as rarely chosen electives, it is hardly likely that students of these subjects will come forward as inspired teachers for the next generation of college student. Or, if one may fairly ask these questions, to what extent did the expansion of Pennsylvanian higher education of the nineteenth century outstrip its resources of professorial talent?

Oxford Edward Best


This brilliant analysis of American culture in its formative period is noteworthy for the use which the author makes of a wealth of material on America. The men who discovered, explored, and settled the New World were men of the Renaissance, intrepid, vainglorious, perhaps religious, and certainly greedy. They failed to establish Utopias in the sparsely populated expanses of America because, with rare exceptions, they succumbed to the weaknesses of mankind. Faced with the real or imagined terrors of the West and with its riches, they became as savage and treacherous as the natives whom they sometimes depicted as nature's innocents but more often as Satan's offsprings to be exterminated like the rattlesnake.

Latin America inherited the Renaissance spirit of southern Europe and a governmental machinery that was "the product of a dying feudal order." British America took root when the Renaissance was waning and bearing "the Reformation in its bosom." The later movement was the predominant influence in New England. Here the colonists established schools, collected libraries, wrote voluminously on nearly every serious subject, but they cut themselves off from the mellowing influence of the theatre and paid little attention to other forms of art.

The bloody struggles of Englishmen of the Tudor period to subdue the "wild Irish" made them hesitant to confront another set of wild people in the distant forests of the New World. Although the promoters of colonization eventually won their point, the Irish experience influenced the colonists' attitude toward the Indians. To be sure, the Spaniards, French, Dutch, and Portuguese showed themselves cruel and violent, "but the doctrine that the only good Indian is a dead Indian first took shape . . . in the doctrine that the only good wild Irishman is a dead wild Irishman."

To the aggravating problem of how to serve both God and Mammon, Protestant America found a satisfactory solution in the doctrine of steward-
ship. Its exponents saw no glory in monkish asceticism and poverty which rendered man incapable of doing good to himself or his fellowman. Their dedication to this idea is seen in countless sermons, patriotic outbursts, schoolbooks, and the pages of Cotton Mather, Benjamin Franklin, and Andrew Carnegie.

Steeped as they were in the classics and the works of the *philosophes*, the architects of the American Republic liked to regard themselves as the heirs of the noble tradition of republican Rome. They named their slaves after Roman heroes and deities, their towns and estates after Roman cities and country seats; they gave a Roman stamp to American coins, mottoes, political and academic nomenclature, architecture, and oratory; they hailed Washington as Cincinnatus. Though they might stay away from a performance of Addison's *Cato*, they sought to emulate the *virtus*, *gravitas*, and *pietas* of the great consul.

But, like Rome, the republic of virtue was also a radical republic. Witness the number of localized rebellions fiercely fought and severely suppressed in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century America. Although American mob action preceding and during the Revolution was mild in comparison with that of the French a few years later, nevertheless the "stigma of radicalism was fixed upon the Americans." And the use of extralegal means in the current civil rights struggle has done nothing to dispel abroad the legend that the United States is a violent nation.

After cutting their political ties with the Old World and driving from the new Republic the loyalist elite, the Americans hoped to strike out in new cultural directions. But though they repudiated church establishment, and organized new sects, they could not discard the language, legal system, and literary and artistic forms which they had inherited. Even the concept that it was the responsibility of the schools to teach young persons the principles of morality and democracy and the skills essential for material success was not new. The reassertion and reinvigoration of this idea by each succeeding generation, however, gave increasing depth and breadth to American education.

It was inevitable, of course, that the American scene should influence American literature and art. The landscape, so full of wonders and abundance, so vast, incongruous, and melancholy, inspired not only explorers, scientists, historians, painters, and writers of fiction, but also the anonymous millions who followed the star of empire to the west. The second discovery of America, notes the author at the close, came "with the discovery that the voice of God spoke in the thunder of Niagara, on the heights of American mountain ranges, in the elemental power of American rivers, the endless sweep of prairie, desert, and Great Plains."

Happily there will be a sequel to this excellent work.

*West Virginia University*  
ELIZABETH COMETTI

An instructive guide to the waypoints of our history is welcome. A long-established precept of the preservation movement is that written history is reinforced through experiencing actual places and objects. The American public is increasingly on the road and increasingly receptive.

Less than a decade ago, a fundamental need was recognized for a systematic evaluation of historic sites, monuments, and buildings from which all preservation agencies would derive priorities for action against encroachment. Thus, the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings was launched by the National Park Service in conjunction with the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The instrument classified and evaluated sites according to historical period, theme, and subtheme. In this way it was determined which sites should be considered for addition to the National Park System and which were eligible for designation as Registered National Historic Landmarks.

The series drawn from the National Survey is the first attempt to make the critical evaluations widely available in a comprehensive, if selected, form. Hopefully, preservation groups will respond with the appropriate safeguards for noteworthy sites as yet undeveloped. A major contribution has already been made by the Survey, for it has pinpointed the need for smaller-scale, critical surveys within the framework of state and local government. Privately sponsored surveys after this model have also been conducted on a regional basis.

The sixth volume in the series was produced from the researches of National Park Service historians Frank B. Sarles, Jr., and Charles E. Shedd. The telescoping of events in the historical background portion of the format is skillfully done. Salient motives and consequences are not lost in the brisk shift in action and topic. In the second part, cultural trends and personal careers—even references to the decorative arts—are threaded through a catalog of districts, sites, buildings, and commemorative monuments in absorbing fashion.

Black and white photographs of buildings and battlefields are of generally good didactic or evocative quality. However, a few of the fragmentary, romantic views fail to give a clear idea of topography or to say much about the events which make the sites important. One wonders, too, at the necessity of including less meaningful photographs of stone markers. The park-site archeological and laboratory shots revealing the processes of investigation, on the other hand, are inspired. Maps locate sites and trace the evolution of
national territory to a point, by 1783, when newly sovereign states advanced claims to western lands extending beyond the Appalachians to the Mississippi. Notes contain choice references. A suggested reading list is provided, as is a list of criteria for evaluation.

Colonials and Patriots is a basic reference to major historical sites and buildings. It is ideally suited for several disciplines. Architects, for example, who contribute expertise to local preservation groups may want such a concise, integrated view of colonial history and a way of approaching buildings as symptoms of cultural development. The book’s twofold purpose as guide and guideline is eminently fulfilled.

Colonials and Patriots

Portland, Oregon

Elisabeth B. Walton


Mr. Lorant does not indicate the standards by which he expects his book to be evaluated. He merely informs us that the late Edgar Kaufmann, who initiated the project ten years ago, wanted a “de luxe book” which would demonstrate to the “whole world” what a “wonderful” place Pittsburgh was. The result is a lavish, profusely illustrated, 500-page volume, consisting of ten chapters, a bibliography and a 200-year chronology of events. Two of the chapters were written by Lorant, the others by Henry Steele Commager, Oscar Handlin, J. Cutler Andrews, Sylvester K. Stevens, Henry David, John M. Blum, Gerald W. Johnson, and David L. Lawrence (with the assistance of Lorant and John P. Robin). They extend in time from the original settlement of the eighteenth century through the so-called “Renaissance” following World War II.

One is not dealing with an essay in graphic history comparable to John A. Kouwenhoven’s masterful Columbia Historical Portrait of New York. The extensive text precludes judgment on this basis alone. Is it, perhaps, a popular history of the City of Pittsburgh designed to produce purrs of delight from the boosters and dowagers? Partly, but not entirely, considering the number of eminent historians who contributed. Is it a scholarly history of Pittsburgh? It is, to some degree, yet it lacks documentation, new data, or systematic interpretation. It is, apparently, a “de luxe” hybrid—serious and popular, textual and graphic, promotional and historical—aimed to please persons of all ages and tastes.

The text varies in quality from acceptable to poor, with a bland mediocrity as the prevailing norm. It is a tribute to some of the authors that they managed to sneak through an interpretation of events now and then, in con-
contrast to the soporific chronicle style of the two Lorant chapters (which served, apparently, as the editorial standard to which the historians were expected to conform). Lorant also had a hand in the last chapter, presumably written by David L. Lawrence, Mayor of Pittsburgh, 1946–1959, and Governor of Pennsylvania, 1959–1963; this account of the period since 1945 is hopelessly superficial. The difficult, meaningful questions are avoided. It is populated by the heroes of the Renaissance, notably Richard King Mellon and his worthy lieutenants. Good works and good will, a selfless determination to civilize Pittsburgh, inspire us on every page. What, one might ask, were the redeemers doing before the enlightenment, in more prosperous days? What a curious coincidence that redemption coincided in time with an economic and population decline that threatened the investments of banks, property owners, downtown merchants, and other business interests in the Pittsburgh region. It might be asked, finally, why the redemption of a great metropolitan community was so singularly dependent upon the initiative of a single individual, and whether the kind of decision-making process this implies provides the basis for sound, long-term community improvement. Needless to say, what is good for the Mellon National Bank may be good for the City of Pittsburgh, but at least the editor should have spared the business leaders of the Renaissance the burden of living up to a reputation of detached benevolence and civic responsibility.

The text suffers from additional faults. It is excruciatingly repetitious in subject matter and theme. How many times does one have to be introduced to Andrew Carnegie? It is eclectic to an extreme, having no perceptible criteria for choice, omission, or treatment of issues. If Lorant must accept ultimate responsibility for the elephantine quality of the text, by the same token he deserves full credit for the graphic achievement. The pictures, covering most phases of Pittsburgh life since the eighteenth century, constitute the real justification for the book. The usefulness of the collection, a bargain at the price, is enhanced by Lorant’s informative captions based on meticulous research. One only wishes that he had been content with the chronology at the end of the book, and substituted additional pictures for much of the text. One lapse of editorial judgment unfortunately detracts from the value of the graphic section. It is regrettable, in this reviewer’s estimation, that Lorant wasted so many pages depicting scenes from Pittsburgh’s past drawn on commission by living artists and illustrators. The editor should have known, or someone connected with the publication should have informed him, that authentic graphic history cannot be reconciled with such a practice. On the whole, if Lorant had used Kouwenhoven’s New York volume, also published by Doubleday, as a model, he would have produced a much better book: one in which the past spoke exclusively for itself, and one whose rich visual imagery was not compromised by an ill-conceived text.

Inadvertently, a coherent theme does emerge from this uneven book, particularly through the pictures, though one wonders if Kaufmann would have
been so eager to sponsor it if he had anticipated the end impression. The reader might shed a tear or two for the people of Pittsburgh (and America) as the indescribable, brute ugliness of the pre-Renaissance period springs to life. The pictures provide devastating documentation for the sentences quoted from H. L. Mencken's *Prejudices*: "Here was the very heart of industrial America, the center of its most lucrative and characteristic activity, the boast and pride of the richest and grandest nation ever seen on earth—and here was a scene so dreadfully hideous, so intolerably bleak and forlorn that it reduced the whole aspiration of man to a macabre and depressing joke. . . . I am not speaking of mere filth. One expects steel towns to be dirty. What I allude to is the unbroken and agonizing ugliness, the sheer revolting monstrousness, of every house in sight." *Pittsburgh: The Story of an American City* is the story of economic achievement and ingenuity combined with shoddy civic institutions and the desecration of a superb natural landscape. There has been vast and gratifying improvement since World War II, but the pictures better document the soot-laden drabness of the past than Lorant's assertion in the Foreword that Pittsburgh has become "one of the most beautiful cities in America."
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