

## BOOK REVIEWS

*The Vinland Sagas: The Norse Discovery of America. Graenlendinga Saga and Eirik's Saga.* Translated by MAGNUS MAGNUSSON and HERMANN PALSSON. (New York: New York University Press, 1966. 124 p. Maps. \$4.50.)

The sudden resurgence of interest in the pre-Columbian Norse voyages to the mainland of North America has made this book a publication of more than ordinary interest and importance. Considering the ridiculous "controversy" concerning the priority of discovery of America stimulated by the publication of Yale's Vinland Map, it is vital that the public be offered what are truly the "grass roots" of the matter.

First published in 1965, the book has now been reissued with a note referring to the newly discovered cartographic evidence of the Norse landfalls. In addition to the excellent translations of the GRAENLENDINGA and EIRIK Sagas—the basic stories of the Vinland voyages—the book contains a first rate analytical introduction and an explanatory note on the translations themselves. Both of these are of inestimable value to an uninformed reader making contact with the Sagas for the first time.

The authors are to be complimented on their balanced appraisal of the background of the voyages and the genesis of the Sagas. They also touch on the fascinating and frustrating "question mark" as to whether or not Christopher Columbus knew of the Norse voyagers before his own "Enterprise of the Indies."

Speculation as to the exact location of Vinland will go on and on until concrete and unassailable archaeological evidence proves conclusively where the site might be. Possibly the recent excavations of Dr. Helge Ingstad and his archaeologist wife in Newfoundland will prove to be Vinland, but this must await the publication of the scientific report on this fascinating discovery. The authors remain sceptical that the Ingstad dig is specifically *Vinland* as it "is inconsistent with the sagas at one crucial point—the grapes that gave Vinland its name; for wild grapes, it is believed, have never grown farther north than Passamaquoddy Bay, between Maine and New Brunswick. This automatically disqualifies Newfoundland as the location of Vinland and no amount of philological juggling with the name . . . can wish this away." This statement is based, as the authors say, on "the Sagas themselves where the name of the country is explicitly associated with its wine."

Readers of this book will be particularly impressed by the Sagas themselves and the exciting, bloody, and dramatic adventures of the participants

and the comparison of identical events related in both accounts. It is indeed a matter for congratulation that these basic documents are now readily available to an already fascinated audience!

*Yale University*

ALEXANDER O. VIETOR

*The Elizabethans' America: A Collection of Early Reports by Englishmen on the New World.* Edited by LOUIS B. WRIGHT. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965. xii, 295 p. \$6.50.)

This book is the second volume of a new enterprise, sponsored by the Harvard University Press and known as The Stratford-upon-Avon Library, which is planned to publish important parts, from original texts, of the staple literature of the Tudor and early Stuart periods. In consequence, the present volume is composed of the salient texts, from contemporary sources, of the earliest days of English colonization in America, especially in the Roanoke venture, in the founding of Virginia, and in Bermuda. Newfoundland and New England also come in for honorable mention.

After an excellent introduction by Dr. Louis Wright of the Folger Library, the texts begin very appropriately with Hakluyt's *Purposes and Policies to be observed in Colonization*. Then the contemporary accounts follow, starting with a description of Florida by John Hawkins, who coasted it on his second voyage (1566), and ending with Francis Higginson's eulogy of the New England climate (1630). Throughout the book, the selections are excellent, and all of them from important sources. Among the longer narratives are Sir Humphrey Gilbert's attempted Newfoundland colony; Harriot's story of the Roanoke colony, Weymouth's description of the coast of Maine; Gosnold's expedition to Cape Cod and Buzzard's Bay; George Percy's account of the founding of Jamestown; John Smith's explorations of Chesapeake Bay and his captivity among the Indians; two brilliantly vivid accounts of the shipwreck on Bermuda and the founding of the colony there, from sources which inspired Shakespeare's *Tempest*; Ralph Hamor's tale of Pocahontas and her marriage to John Rolfe; the beginnings of representative government at Jamestown; and finally the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers, from Bradford's *Plymouth Plantation*.

In reprinting this assembly of sources, this book makes an excellent companion to another splendid anthology: *America Begins*, edited by Richard Dorson, which was published in 1950, a book similar in design, which however begins about where Wright's volume leaves off and carries the story through the seventeenth century. Between them, these two books cover the first century and a half of the English in North America. Most of the texts may be found in the original editions in the collections of the Library Company of Philadelphia and in the Elkins collection at the Free Library of Philadelphia.

Considering the relatively high price of the volume, *The Elizabethans' America* would have been greatly improved with some carefully chosen

illustrations from contemporary sources, such as John White's map of the Carolina sounds, and Smith's map of Virginia. As it stands, however, there are no embellishments. An index of proper names would likewise have been a useful addition. But as far as the text goes, for a single volume of source material dealing with the initial settlement of what is now the United States, it is difficult to see how this volume could be improved.

*Devon, Pa.*

BOIES PENROSE

*William Penn the Politician, His Relations with the English Government.*

By JOSEPH E. ILLICK. (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1965. xi, 267 p. Bibliography, index. \$5.75.)

This study of William Penn and his relationship to the English government is a useful addition to the voluminous literature about the great Quaker and founder of Pennsylvania. It is the first volume published by a scholar who had access to the papers of Albert Cook Myers, which are now deposited in the Chester County Historical Society.

No previous author has been as assiduous in his effort to study and comprehend the relationship between Penn and the various governments of England in the years from 1670 until his death in 1718. The fact that Professor Illick has been unable to provide satisfactory and convincing answers to all questions is only proof that Penn still defies his biographers; it does not reflect upon the ability of the author.

By definition, Illick has largely ignored Penn the Quaker and has concentrated upon Penn the courtier. Where Penn is both a Quaker and a courtier, in his relationship to Pennsylvania, the author has been less successful than when he focuses firmly on the relationship between Penn and the various branches of the English government. This weakness does not diminish the importance of his major emphasis.

The first chapter, which traces Penn's career from his birth until he sailed for Pennsylvania in August, 1682, summarizes his background and early years and his share in the development of West New Jersey. It stresses the two years beginning with his application for a charter from Charles II in June, 1680. Aside from the very careful consideration of the granting of the charter to Penn in March, 1681, part of which he had previously published in this journal—LXXXVI (1962), 375-396, cited erroneously in the footnote—there is little that is new in this chapter. He, of course, means Charles I at the top of page 12, not Charles II.

The summary of the first two years of government in Pennsylvania and Delaware, the period of Penn's first visit to the New World, found in Chapter II, is followed by a very careful study of Penn's relationship with James II. In the debate which has existed over this question, Illick comes down on the side of those who believe Penn was wrong in supporting James. He believes that Penn supported the King in his efforts toward toleration and ignored the other aspects of his policy which he opposed. He suggests

that Penn compromised his principles in order to aid his beloved Pennsylvania. While one wonders whether the author really understands the relationship between the King and the Quaker any better than other scholars, it must be said that he makes a convincing case for his conclusions.

The author's discussion of the five years following the Glorious Revolution is most illuminating. He has viewed Penn from the vantage point of an objective observer who sees the English government more completely than previous biographers. He points out that while the government of William III put into effect the religious toleration and Whiggish ideas Penn had worked for in the previous reign, Penn's personal allegiance to James II made him suspect. It seems to this reviewer that Illick exaggerated the animosity of William III for Penn and ignored evidence which might have indicated that the new king was not entirely antagonistic.

The chapter describing the interplay between Penn and the newly created Board of Trade is a very useful contribution to the understanding of Penn during the last years of the century. It is interesting to see that Penn was able once again to cultivate and use influential persons in the government for the protection of his colony. Illick's description of Penn's second visit to Pennsylvania, 1699-1701, is less satisfactory. He ignored the fact that the colony appropriated large sums to him during that period. He appeared to say that the laws enacted in 1700 were a new effort "which transformed Quaker custom into Pennsylvania law" (p. 179), when this was merely a rewriting of laws which had been in effect for two decades. Apparently he did not know that the colonists returned the Charter of 1683 to Penn, and that they had no constitution at all until the Charter of Privileges of 1701 was ratified. On the other hand, he has written an interesting description of the effort made in England to seize the Pennsylvania government from the Quaker proprietor during this period. The final chapter summarizes the years 1702-1718, the years in which Penn's importance diminished sharply as compared with the earlier period.

This is a very useful book which sheds much light on Penn, especially on his relationship to the various parts of the English government. We can only hope that other aspects of the character and personality of this complicated man will be illuminated as well in future books.

*Haverford College*

EDWIN B. BRONNER

*The Prose Works of William Byrd of Westover: Narratives of a Colonial Virginian.* Edited by LOUIS B. WRIGHT. (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press, 1966. viii, 438 p. Illustrations, appendix, index. \$9.75.)

Slowly, but at an accelerating pace, the writings of our colonial ancestors are getting into print in scholarly and eminently readable editions. Not the least of the recently discovered or recovered works have been some of those

of William Byrd II, urbane Virginian who was equally pleased to be at home in a London drawing room, a Williamsburg inn, or his library at Westover on the James. A quarter of a century ago Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling discovered, deciphered, and edited one of Byrd's diaries, and since then they and Maude Woodfin have presented the two other known diaries to the public. A translation of Byrd's German-language come-hither assemblage, *A Natural History of Virginia*, has also appeared. Meanwhile Dr. Wright and Mrs. Tinling have been gathering the letters of the three William Byrds here and abroad and preparing them for publication, and Dr. Wright has long been engaged on a Byrd biography.

The interest aroused among students of history and literature by the publication of the diaries has emphasized for most of us a real need—a carefully edited and complete edition of Byrd's four major prose works in one volume. Three of these were not printed at all until a century after his death, and the fourth much later still, though they had all circulated earlier in handwritten copies. *The Westover Manuscripts*, one version of *The History of the Dividing Line*, *A Journey to the Land of Eden*, and *A Progress to the Mines*, had been printed by Edmund Ruffin in 1841. An edition by Thomas H. Wynne in 1866 was more carefully done, though it contained errors perpetuated in later editions, especially in the handsome *Writings of Colonel William Byrd of Westover in Virginia*, Esquire in 1901. In 1929 William K. Boyd brought out a parallel text of *The History of the Dividing Line* from the earlier editions and the rediscovered *Secret History of the Line* from among the manuscripts of the American Philosophical Society. Boyd seems not to have seen the second manuscript version of the *History*, also in the American Philosophical Society, and his edition left the gaps existing in that text of the *Secret History*.

Dr. Wright has uncovered missing leaves in various libraries, has collated the two now known texts of the *History* and the fragments of it and the *Secret History*, and has employed a newly revealed commonplace book of Byrd's to enrich his introduction and notes. All this would not have been possible had not the Virginia Historical Society recently acquired the Westover Manuscript and commonplace book (1722–1732) and made them available.

Therefore, what we now have is a carefully collated and completed edition of the four major works printed in the probable order (at least for the latter two) in which they were written: *The Secret History of the Line*, *The History of the Dividing Line*, *A Progress to the Mines*, and *A Journey to the Land of Eden*. The former two, which Boyd printed parallel on facing pages, are here to be read only in sequence. This has distinct advantages for both general reader and scholar, who are not now distracted by jumping across the pages. Wright has employed, and acknowledged, Boyd's useful notes on these two pieces and has added scores of equally useful ones of his own.

Both the thirty-eight page introduction and the notes have been enriched by the editor's long-time gathering and studying of Byrd letters, the diaries,

the commonplace book, and lesser scattered items. The introduction is written in Dr. Wright's usual easy, urbane, and yet incisive style. It is the best and fullest analysis of his subject as man and writer that has yet appeared. The notes are unobtrusive and the type clear and handsome. This version of Byrd's works will compel most readers to agree with the editor that "Few other contemporary documents are so 'civilized,' so entertaining, and so modern in tone and point of view."

For here is characterization, satire, scientific observation, flowing narrative, all sustained by the combination of an air of detached observation and trenchant wit in the writer. Social types and classes, manners and traditions of aborigines, mode of life from great mansion to rude hut or beds among the boughs, all together present the eighteenth-century upper South as a twentieth-century man might look at it.

A final feature must be noted. Mrs. Kathleen L. Leonard in an Appendix, "Notes on the Text and Provenance of the Byrd Manuscripts," has answered the questions historians and bibliographers may have in mind as they read Dr. Wright and William Byrd. Mrs. Leonard traces the known history of the various manuscripts, describes and quotes from Jefferson's and others' correspondence concerning them, and outlines the matter and the manner of creating this "authentic" text. She illustrates with samples of parallel passages from the two contemporary manuscripts of the *History*. Altogether, we now have an entirely satisfactory text of Byrd's major literary creation. We only hope the letters, the miscellanea, and the biography will soon come along from the hand of Louis Wright.

*The University of Tennessee*

RICHARD BEALE DAVIS

*Guns at the Forks.* By WALTER O'MEARA. [American Forts Series, edited by STEWART H. HOLBROOK.] (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965. xii, 276 p. Maps, illustrations, bibliography, index. \$6.95.)

The struggle between the French and the British for the control of the Ohio valley finally came to a focus on one spot, the Forks of the Ohio, where the French in 1754 headed off a Virginia attempt to build a fortified post and built their own Fort Duquesne. The recapture of the Forks became a major British objective in the war which followed. They failed in the Braddock expedition of 1755, but in 1758 the more thorough preparations of General John Forbes brought a superior force so close to Fort Duquesne that the French were compelled to abandon and destroy it. They fled up the Allegheny River to Fort Machault at present Franklin, where they remained a threat to the British at the Forks until July, 1759, when Sir William Johnson's capture of Fort Niagara forced the French to abandon their remaining posts in northwestern Pennsylvania. Although French power was rapidly fading, the British built a new fort at the Forks, the

impressive and substantial Fort Pitt, which was to meet only one serious threat when the Indians cut its communications during the Pontiac War in 1763. This threat was removed by Colonel Henry Bouquet's defeat of the Indians at Bushy Run in August of that year. Thereafter, as the settlement of the surrounding country began, Fort Pitt declined in importance; trade and industry at Pittsburgh, the settlement which grew around the fort, replaced guns as the center of attention at the Forks.

The story of this struggle for the Ohio valley can well be told in terms of the locality of the Forks, as in the present work by Walter O'Meara, whose historical novels and other writings about early Minnesota and the Canadian West may have given him background to convey a vivid impression of the upper Ohio valley in the days when it was the West. His writing is engaging and lively, and his analyses of causes and motives and his presentation of military movements are usually sound and convincing. Although his research seems to have been limited to printed materials, he has made good use of recent publications in the field. For example, he has drawn on Charles M. Stotz's work in *Drums in the Forest* and on William A. Hunter's *Forts on the Pennsylvania Frontier, 1753-1758* to good effect; and the recently published volumes of Contrecoeur papers and Bouquet papers obviously supplied material too. It is a measure of the success of such works that their new materials and new findings should thus find a place in a book intended for the general reader.

Although *Guns at the Forks* is not annotated, its bibliography is usable, if not in standard format; and the story occasionally provides clues as to the sources of statements. The serious student will, however, find statements over which to raise an eyebrow. Thus, a footnote on page 12 calls Logstown or Chiningue "an old Indian trading village," although Logstown in 1753 was hardly more than ten years old. The stockaded fort built by the Virginians at the Forks in 1754 never bore the name of Fort Prince George; Governor Dinwiddie of Virginia may have intended so to name the fort which was being planned, but the French forestalled its construction. When news of the British siege of Fort Niagara halted the French preparations at Fort Machault to retake the Forks in July, 1759, it seems most unlikely that they would have burned their bateaux and buried their swivel guns; and, in fact, according to a report of Indian spies to the British, the French commander "ordered all the Battoes to set up the River [French Creek], and to turn those that were coming down back." (George Croghan to General Stanwix, July 15, 1759.) Boats, guns, and supplies were needed for the emergency expedition to save Fort Niagara; garrisons were left in the northwestern Pennsylvania forts; and there was no reason for any demolition until the British capture of Niagara compelled the French to leave the region.

Sources are sometimes shifted out of context. It was in February, 1754, that Joncaire reported that "the brandy supply was so low at Venango"

that the Indians were boiling the casks at least to enjoy the odor—not in December, 1753, when he entertained Washington on his way to Fort Le Boeuf. Martha May's pathetic plea for release from Carlisle jail so that she could continue "to carry water to soldiers in the heat of battle" belongs in the story of the Forbes expedition, not the Braddock expedition; the "Colonel" whom she had upbraided was Bouquet. Moreover, in the quotation from her letter of June 4, 1758, on page 122, the capitalization and spelling have not only been changed but the actual wording has not been followed accurately. A random sampling shows the latter fault elsewhere, possibly attributable in some cases to typographical errors.

This volume then is basically a good general survey of the history of Fort Duquesne and Fort Pitt and of their role in the struggle for the Ohio, despite flaws in various matters of detail. Its entertaining presentation and lively style should arouse in many readers a desire to learn more about this period; and in this, of course, it could be said to have achieved its purpose.

*Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission* DONALD H. KENT

*The Enterprising Colonials: Society on the Eve Of The Revolution.* By WILLIAM S. SACHS and ARI HOOGENBOOM. (Chicago: Argonaut, Inc., Publishers, 1965. xi, 236 p. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, appendixes, index. \$8.50.)

The scope and content of this concise, sprightly account of colonial society, business, and politics on the eve of the American Revolution is indicated by the chapter headings which I have slightly amplified.

Two introductory chapters entitled Genesis and Maturity, are followed by Seeds of Discord; The Power Elite; The Good Society [English]; The Good Society, American Version; Setting Trade in its Proper Channel; From Village to Town to Nation; Social Betterment; The Acts of Trade; Economy and Reform [of British measures regulating colonial trade]; and The Course of Human Events, i.e. the colonial opposition to the attempted "reform." The chapter on the Good Society struck me as particularly original and enlightening.

I found the volume interesting throughout, but tantalizing because no supporting evidence is given for many of its most interesting and arresting statements. Take, for example, the statement "Many of them [Massachusetts towns] . . . eagerly gave over voting proxies to eastern representatives" (57). Voting by proxy was practiced in the British House of Lords (though not in the House of Commons) but I have not seen evidence of this in the Massachusetts House of Representatives and the authors give none.

Another example: "Politics in the tobacco kingdom had a sectional flavor



only in Virginia, where proud planters of the Piedmont challenged the prouder Tidewater aristocracy. . . . They wanted more seats in the House of Burgesses, more appointments for their office-seekers, more state funds for their districts, more acres for their budding land companies. . . . Their rise to parity occurred when their brilliant young politicians, Patrick Henry and Richard Henry Lee, exploited a disclosure that John Robinson, Speaker of the House and Treasurer of Virginia, had mishandled government funds" (60).

The exposure of the embezzlement by Robinson, a member of the Tidewater aristocracy, was indeed, as is well known, exploited to oust him from both his offices and to put a stop to the practice of having one man hold both offices. But was this exposure a challenge by planters of the Piedmont and was it followed by the important changes in their favor stated by the authors? The facts that Lee, one of the two principal challengers named, was a Tidewater aristocrat, not a Piedmonter, and that both Robinson's speakership and treasurership went to Tidewater residents (Peyton Randolph and Robert Carter Nicholas) tend to indicate that the challenge was not a sectional movement. It may have been so, and, even if not sectional, may have been followed by the important changes mentioned. But here again the authors fail to present evidence to support their statements.

A third, "The factor [selling goods on consignment in the colonies] usually advanced a portion of the value on anticipated sales . . ." (117). The widespread sale of merchandise on consignment is an interesting aspect of colonial business on the eve of the Revolution, and, if the statement that the factor usually advanced a portion of the value on anticipated sales is true, this is an original and important contribution to our knowledge of colonial business practice. But here again no evidence is given to support the statement.

The same is true of other interesting statements such as "Councillors [members of the provincial Councils] . . . lamented the absence of a true American peerage" (62). "Boston's Caucus Club, founded by James Otis and Samuel Adams, made its reputation through dirty politics and corrupt practices" (62). In "strictly internal matters . . . political leaders [throughout the colonies] preferred local control and systematically weakened their state legislatures" (89). "One tried and true method of discrediting an opponent [a political opponent in the colonies] was to accuse him of consorting with common folk" (89). "France was not a maritime nation. Its first line of defense as well as offense rested with organized masses of landlubbers standing stiffly at attention" (114).

This might have been an important as well as readable book but falls short because of the failure to give evidence in support of many of its arresting statements.

*Chester, Conn.*

BERNHARD KNOLLENBERG

*The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution.* By H. TREVOR COLBOURN. (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1965. viii, 247 p. Appendixes, index. \$7.50.)

It is an old and hallowed truism that the cultural inheritance of men exerts a profound influence upon their behavior; yet the precise content of that inheritance as well as the nature, extent, and relative importance of its influence are areas that have not been adequately explored for most periods and events in modern history. For the era of the American Revolution this statement is less true now than it was twenty years ago. Since World War II a number of scholars—Douglass Adair, Frederick B. Tolles, Caroline Robbins, Cecelia M. Kenyon, A. O. Lovejoy, and Bernard Bailyn, among others—have produced articles and books sketching in the details and assessing the significance of various strands of the cultural inheritance of the men of the American Revolution. The present volume, the first published work to deal comprehensively with American conceptions and uses of history in the constitutional debate with Britain preceding the American Revolution, is an important contribution to this growing body of literature.

Most of the volume is devoted to delineating and explaining what the colonists' ideas of the past were. In two general chapters the author describes the accounts of ancient, medieval, and modern English history contained in the books most frequently found in colonial libraries, and in five other chapters—including general regional analyses of New England and the southern colonies and detailed examinations of John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, John Dickinson, James Wilson, and Thomas Jefferson—he shows that Americans read those books and accepted with minor qualifications and regional and individual variations the versions of history they presented. As the author's subtitle suggests, it was the whig conception of history as set forth in the legal, political, and historical works of such writers as Sir Edward Coke, William Petty, William Atwood, Algernon Sidney, Sir Robert Molesworth, Thomas Gordon, John Trenchard, Walter Moyle, Gilbert Burnet, Paul Rapin-Thoyras, James Tyrrell, William Molyneux, William Robertson, Catherine Macaulay, and James Burgh that colonials read and to which they were devoted.

That conception saw the past as a continual struggle between liberty and virtue on one hand and arbitrary power and corruption on the other. Rome fell only after its citizens had sacrificed their temperance and virtue to luxury and vice, only after they had substituted a standing army for their ancient free militia system and sold their freedom to corrupt military despots like Julius Caesar. Against the invading Goths, a people of unblemished virtue, degenerate Rome was clearly foredoomed to defeat. It was the Goths or, more specifically, the Saxons who first brought virtue and

its corollaries—a free constitution of government and an alodial system of landholding—to Britain. The Norman invaders subsequently sought to replace the Saxon system with despotism and feudalism, but they never completely succeeded in extinguishing the ancient Saxon virtues. Recurring attempts to regain pre-Norman liberties in the medieval period resulted in important gains, the most notable of which came with Magna Charta in 1215, but the slow process of restitution did not come to fruition until after the despotic Stuarts, taking advantage of the declining virtue of their subjects in the years after 1660, sought to reverse the process altogether and thereby provoked the Glorious Revolution of 1688. Unfortunately, that revolution and the reinstitution of a free constitution that it produced were not accompanied by a reformation in English character, and the early eighteenth century presented a dreary scene of continuing moral degeneration and political irresponsibility—the harbingers, English whig writers warned, of the total collapse of constitutional government, the predominance of arbitrary power, and the eventual fall of Britain. The gross distortions in this reading of the past, as the author properly insists, mattered much less than the fact that American leaders of the revolutionary generation accepted it as essentially accurate.

Still other and vastly more important questions raised by the author are how American leaders used the whig conception of the past in meeting the successive challenges with which they were confronted, and how important that conception was both in determining their responses to those challenges and eventually pushing them into a revolutionary posture. It did not, the author carefully emphasizes, “supply their motivation for political action.” As an integral part of the intellectual experience of almost every literate member of the revolutionary leadership, it did, however, “inform powerfully on their political thought and final action.” Translated to suit their own particular needs, whig history provided Americans with a powerful arsenal of arguments against British “encroachments” upon their rights and liberties. Most important, their notions of history inevitably colored their explanations of imperial actions and thereby became a significant causative force. Their interpretation of the history of Rome and of Britain itself since the Restoration led American leaders irresistibly to the conclusion that the behavior of the British government toward the colonies after 1763 was a clear indication of its degeneration, and that resistance was the only way to preserve not just their liberty and property but their virtue as well and helped to turn a political and constitutional debate into a moral conflict. One does not have to accept the author’s conclusion, in a rare lapse from a customary caution, that “Independence was in large measure the product of the historical concepts of the men who made it,” to agree that those concepts were enormously important in the coming of the American Revolution. Just how important they were in relation to other factors is a question for a more general book, a book that can perhaps be written only after other

scholars have explored other neglected aspects of the cultural heritage of the men of the American Revolution with the same thoroughness and perception that the author has devoted to their ideas and uses of the past.

*University of Michigan*

JACK P. GREENE

*British Politics and the American Revolution: The Path to War, 1773-75.* By BERNARD DONOUGHUE. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964. x, 324 p. Appendixes, bibliography, index. \$8.50.)

The relevance of the English political scene to the emergence, conduct, and conclusion of the American Revolution is now generally acknowledged. But it was not always so. Developments in England in the 1770's and 1780's were once accorded the same sort of neglect known by the American Tory—and perhaps for the same reasons: they were both villains in the American mind, and they both lost. But the contributions of Namier, Herbert Butterfield, Dora Mae Clark, Knollenberg, Ritcheson, and Sosin (to name only a few) have transformed our knowledge and understanding of Anglo-American politics in the era of the Revolution. And this new, narrowly focused study by Bernard Donoughue adds depth and dimension to the historical picture hitherto presented.

Donoughue begins with the reminder that Toryism in England, discredited in 1745, was “dying out of the political vocabulary” when George III ascended the throne. He proceeds to review the main categories of House of Commons membership after 1760, and examines the political context in which the King and Lord North operated. There was, he notes, a significant difference between the 1760's and the 1770's: by 1767 the opposition was weakening, with several notable figures entering the North cabinet by 1771; by 1772 the opposition was mustering only twenty-eight votes in the Commons. He sees Lord North as an able, nonfactional figure with whom the King could and did work most effectively: the Ministry could now deal with American problems without undue worry over its internal stability. Its majority large, its popularity evident, the Government could afford to renew its address of the issue of Parliamentary supremacy over the American Colonies.

At this point—page nineteen—Donoughue announces the purpose of his book: to study the Ministry's attitude toward and management of the colonial crisis extending from December, 1773, to April, 1775. The author notes, correctly, that historians have traditionally treated this period with scant concern, being well aware of the impending Revolution and anxious to grapple with it. Indeed, one of Donoughue's achievements is in conveying the impression that the Revolution was not inevitable, that political events made it seem so. But for eighteen months, “a separate period of crisis,” there was at least a theoretical chance of a peaceful settlement.

Donoughue's treatment of this vital period is often illuminating. He is at his best describing the seeming political schizophrenia of Lord Dartmouth, in examining the Cabinet's respect for law—and its determination to demonstrate its authority. He shows how the Ministry sought to punish Boston (for the Tea Party) through limited executive action, until the Law Officers denied them this solution; only then did North move towards legislative action, broadening both the issues and the punishment. Donoughue helpfully reminds us not only of the division between the Chatham and Rockingham groups, but the reluctance of the latter to take a stand that would seem to question the Declaratory Act they had enacted in 1766. Ironically, it was the resultant feebleness of the opposition that helped convince North of the rectitude of his Coercive Acts.

Rose Fuller, in denouncing these measures, exclaimed "It is not an error of the Ministry, it is an error of the nation." Politically, Fuller was correct. The surprise elections of 1774 confirmed the profound disinterest of the British electorate in either American problems or the opposition's quibbling approach to the colonial crisis. Burke once commented that "all opposition is absolutely crippled, if we can obtain no kind of support without doors," and the fact was the City merchants, disenchanted with the American trade, were now turning to Europe for an increasingly lucrative commerce. With political cripples for an opposition, the City largely disinterested and colonial agents divided, Lord North was unhealthily strong.

Of course coercion by legislation proved insufficient. By January, 1775, the Ministry made the tacit admission that force would be necessary to secure colonial submission, although North nourished some hopes of dividing the Americans with limited concessions. By March the Cabinet was in a box of its own creation: Burke might cry out that the issue was one of interest, not right, but the Ministry felt obliged to remain in what he called their "great Serbonian bog," and Lexington and Concord were allowed to decide the future.

If Donoughue's contribution is substantial, it is also somewhat parochial, a reminder that too few British scholars enjoy the facilities to master American scholarship. While Donoughue's main concern is properly the British political scene, his attention to colonial developments is unnecessarily limited and often based upon indifferent (and sometimes obsolete) secondary sources. Such deficiencies are very obvious in his treatment of colonial problems prior to 1773 and his rather tired treatment of the familiar Quebec Act in 1774. He has consulted Alvord, but not Sosin; Gipson, but not Dora Mae Clark. (Gipson's famous article, "The American Revolution as an Aftermath of the Great War for the Empire" is cited as if it were a book.) Donoughue's is a very good and useful book, but had the manuscript been afforded a more careful reading and editorial attention this would have been a truly excellent monograph.

Perhaps the concluding chapter represents what might have been, for here we have good writing combined with thought and substance. Here

Donoughue succinctly sums up the odyssey of the North administration up to 1775: the Ministry, he concludes, "could not conceive of any constitutional compromise which could be offered to the colonial radicals while still maintaining the imperial relationship." But Donoughue cannot resist wondering whether compromise and conciliation might have worked. He contends that it is unlikely that Burke's pragmatic program—sidestepping the issue of authority—would have succeeded. Speculative though such a question must be, it tempts argument. A timely concession from the British might have infuriated Sam Adams, but it would have relieved many Pennsylvanians. This reviewer has long contended that a factor in the arrival of Revolution was its unexpectedness. The colonists had known British retreat in 1766 and again in 1770. Why not in 1774 or 1775? Expecting concession, colonists could afford to wax more furious, behave more angrily, hoping and believing that resistance would again bring an acceptable settlement. Perhaps a more meaningful question would be, why were Americans not better informed of the new British temper, the new Ministerial power, that Donoughue argues here so persuasively?

*Indiana University*

H. TREVOR COLBURN

*Toward Lexington: The Role of the British Army in the Coming of the American Revolution.* By JOHN SHY. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965. x, 463 p. Index. \$8.50.)

*Toward Lexington* is one of the best books on the Revolutionary era to appear in the past several years. It is not so much just a study of the British army in America, as an examination, broadly conceived, of the coming of the Revolution, using the military theme to throw into relief basic constitutional and institutional problems and to examine the intentions and motives of British policy makers. By tracing a single theme through the pre-war era—indeed by analyzing colonial defense from the early seventeenth century—Shy has deepened our understanding of several fundamental issues of imperial organization and administration.

When British officials turned to their expanded American empire in 1763, they faced a bankrupt colonial defense policy and a host of new imperial problems. Just what was to be the role of the army in America in peacetime? To prevent the outbreak of expensive Indian wars by regulating the fur trade and enforcing the Proclamation Line? To police the older settled areas? To put teeth into the Grenville program? Shy's treatment of these questions is the best now available; and his answer, that ultimately no one really knew, forecasts the breakup of an unwieldy, growing empire.

The absence of any tradition of effective administration to build upon, and overly ambitious plans to rationalize the empire, conceived in the halcyon days of the Enlightenment but outrunning contemporary com-

munications, financing, linguistic knowledge and administrative skills, doomed post-1763 military plans. The location of the troops kept in America was determined more by chance than by plan, and confusion over the army's role stimulated misunderstanding that soon prompted Americans to question Britain's intentions. Furthermore, an increasingly centralized military organization in North America, which ambiguously undermined the power and prestige of the governors, raised fundamental constitutional issues. And though Thomas Pownall warned of dangers imbedded in the new practices, which were likely to arouse citizens who had inherited a distrust of standing armies, government persistently failed to distinguish between the legality and capability of using force.

By 1768 the costs of maintaining garrisons in the West and the army's inability to control either the fur trade or settlement of Indian lands led to the withdrawal of troops from all but major posts. Coming as it did in the summer of 1768, however, the decision only made easier the shipment of troops to Boston in the autumn, adding a whole new dimension to imperial policy. Although officials recognized that garrisoning Boston was to be temporary and would of itself solve no fundamental existing problems, Parliament's failure to pass recommended quartering legislation undermined Hillsborough's "strong" policy. And thereafter the opportunity to reap permanent advantages from the decision passed quietly, as Irish problems, re-emergence of the Wilkes issue, and the Carib insurrection subsequently drew attention and resources from the older colonies. Even the eventual conciliatory gesture of removal that followed the massacre was accompanied by no significant improvement in relations, for Britain's bombastic behavior prevented her from collecting the benefits of moderation.

Shy is at his best when suggesting some of the more subtle effects of the presence of the British army in America. The "Americanization" of the army, the Anglicizing influence of the officers on the colonial elite, and the economic impact of the garrisons are deftly treated. Equally useful are implications drawn from the recognition that the presence of the army in any colony introduced a center of authority that lay outside the political structure of the colony and ultimately altered the governors' role. Now that they *shared* responsibility, the presence of troops encouraged them to rely on this available reservoir of emergency power. Thus, Shy circumspectly suggests, an unhealthy illusion made the governors "both more aggressive and more complacent than they ought to have been—aggressive toward American resistance and complacent about the possible consequences of aggressiveness."

Finally, the inescapable fact was that the British government did not know what the army should be doing in America, and the estrangement produced by this realization was decisive. Colonists willing to believe the worst about the imperial government easily found evidence to suggest British duplicity—that the army was sent to control not to defend the colonists—and were angered accordingly. If in the end they did not come to

hate the British government, "they did cease to believe that the government had any necessary, organic part in their own existence."

*University of Nevada*

PAUL H. SMITH

*The Battle of Trenton.* By SAMUEL STELLE SMITH. (Monmouth Beach, N. J.: Philip Freneau Press, 1965. 36 p. Maps, illustrations, appendixes, bibliography. \$4.95.)

The better jewels of scholarship are not always the largest. Mr. Smith's *The Battle of Trenton* is a little gem that will sparkle in any Revolutionary library. Except for the lack of an index (which perhaps is not necessary in a book of this brevity) the flaws are few, and discernible only to the most meticulous critic. The author occasionally indulges in a slightly irritating habit of guessing—"rains . . . *seemed* [reviewer's italics] to have a delaying effect," "General Lee . . . *seemed* to hesitate," etc.—but otherwise the reporting is factual. Incidentally, the author lets General Charles Lee off rather easily by failing to explain the selfish motives that caused Lee to delay supporting Washington. Nor is any mention made of the note of warning supposedly delivered to Colonel Rall (purportedly by the renegade Tory Moses Doane) the night before the battle, which note the Hessian commander failed to read. This story is so popular that if Mr. Smith discovered contrary evidence perhaps he should have made a note of this discovery. Complete silence on the matter makes the critic wonder if Mr. Smith is cognizant of the tale.

Despite the small size of the book an immense amount of research has gone into its production. The Hessian Archives in Marburg, Germany, have been culled extensively in order to present the Hessian side of the battle. The story of the famous crossing of the Delaware, the American march to Trenton, and the battle is meticulously told, and, since so definitive, must be read carefully in conjunction with the excellent maps if the narrative is to be fully savored. The maps, which are to be commended, indeed complement the narrative in fine fashion. The points of historical interest both in the narrative and on the maps are located in modern as well as Revolutionary terminology, so that if the reader is so inclined he could readily use the book as a guide when touring the battlefield.

The only real regret the reader may discover is that although the subject has been covered so nearly completely, the subject itself is a short one, thereby necessitating a short work. The text is of such interest that the reader could wish that there was more to read. Some compensation for this necessary "defect," however, can be found in the ever-recurring delight of rereading Mr. Smith's informative little opus.

*Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge*

JOHN F. REED



*The Peacemakers: The Great Powers and American Independence.* By RICHARD B. MORRIS. (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965. xviii, 572 p. Illustrations, index. \$10.00.)

Richard B. Morris' *The Peacemakers* is the masterwork of a mature and dedicated historian. The story of the making of the peace treaty of 1783 ending the war between Great Britain and her thirteen wayward daughters has been told before, but never in such detail and never with such mellow scholarship. Those who want a description of all the diplomacy of the American Revolution from the mid-1770's on will probably still want to consult Samuel F. Bemis' classic on the subject, but that book and all others dealing in part or whole with the peace negotiations themselves are now superseded by *The Peacemakers*. Professor Morris has produced as nearly definitive a work on the negotiations as any sane historian (there are other types) would judge worthy of even such a complex subject. He has left the rest of us working on the subject with the unsolvable problem of diminishing returns.

The subject is complex, limitlessly complex, and Professor Morris did not shirk the responsibility of dealing with its complexities. He is one of the few American historians to face up fully to the challenge of writing diplomatic history. He has defied barriers of language, geography, and expense to consult manuscripts strewn across the western world from such comfortable and accessible nooks as the University of Michigan and the South Carolina Historical Society to caches on the dim frontiers of American historiography in the archives of Seville, the Hague, and Vienna. Luckily, the Tsars saw to it that their diplomatic correspondence was published before they left us, so Professor Morris did not have to fight the cold war to find out exactly what Catherine the Great thought of the American Revolution.

More than any other book *The Peacemakers* brings to the reader a full sense of the Byzantine complexity of relations between the belligerents of the world war of which our Revolution was the chief feature. Sometimes the complexity of the matter at hand leads Professor Morris down paths difficult to follow—for instance, "Early in February Kaunitz [of Austria] passed on to Comte Mercy in Paris a proposal then being mooted by which the King of Prussia would transmit through the Danish court a plan of pacification enlarging on the propositions of the Empress of Russia already in the hands of the belligerents."—but it must be said that Professor Morris is always as clear as the events that he describes will permit.

No other book has ever pointed out in such detail how helpless the United States was to control its own destiny during the Revolution. This fledgling claimant to sovereignty was annihilated, revived, granted continents, reduced to a seaboard shoestring of a nation bereft of several of its chief ports, and so on and so on in discussions between men whose names our diplomats sometimes barely knew in palaces to which no American could gain entrance. Kings, emperors, empresses, ministers, mistresses, a

playwright, a priest, a man who alternately called himself Goëzmann, Lerchenberg, Klebsattel, and John Williams—all these and others played at international intrigue and the game of deciding the future of the thirteen colonies in revolt. The full story is apt at least to alter any sense of gratitude an American might feel to our eighteenth-century allies, and to encourage a deep reverence for the memory of George III, whose pigheadedness led him to refuse any settlement which would grant the thirteen colonies even partial independence, until events forced him to accept the final settlement, which granted them complete independence.

The heroes of this book are few and do not emerge from the telling of their stories as shining knights—Professor Morris has done his research too thoroughly for that—but they are there. Shelburne, called “the Jesuit of Berkeley Square” by his rivals, all of them good Protestants in their hates, comes through as the man who committed political suicide by sacrificing thirteen of Britain’s North American colonies in order to preserve the rest of the Empire and the possibility of revived greatness. And had he been able to implement his views on free trade, commercial reciprocity between the mother country and her thirteen daughters might have gone a long way toward bringing about some sort of mutual recognition of the family relationship, and Great Britain might have entered the age of the French Revolution and Napoleon with the assurance of sympathy and economic support from the United States.

The real heroes of this book are, of course, the American negotiators, chief among them being John Jay, Benjamin Franklin, and John Adams. The immensity of their responsibility, the ease with which they could have failed with individual honor, and the courage of their rejection of the Congressional instructions to subordinate themselves to Vergennes and French policy have never before received fuller description and acknowledgment. They won for their nation independence and a continental future. For themselves they won the highest praise their British counterparts could have paid them: as one of the Britons said, “. . . these Americans are the greatest quiblers [*sic*] I ever knew.”

*San Fernando Valley State College*

ALFRED W. CROSBY, JR.

*The King's Friends: The Composition and Motives of the American Loyalist Claimants.* By WALLACE BROWN. (Providence: Brown University Press, 1966. xiv, 411 p. Maps, appendix, bibliography, index. \$7.00.)

The Loyalists of the American Revolution have suffered the usual fate of the vanquished in civil war—cast into perdition by their contemporaries and into obscurity by historians. Though Van Tyne, Flick, Harrell, and others published earlier works on American Toryism, it may be the present decade that will bring the Loyalists into their own. Recent investigations by

William H. Nelson and Paul H. Smith are now complemented by Wallace Brown's study of those Loyalists who submitted claims to the British government for losses suffered during the war.

Professor Brown's book is in the increasingly common genre of quantitative history, with most of the strengths and weaknesses of this kind of historical study. Thus, the study presents an analysis of the composition of American Loyalist claimants with unparalleled statistical precision. However, conclusions about Loyalism in general that are based upon a study of those Loyalists who were claimants are somewhat open to question. Social scientists are frequently able to select their samples; the historian's sample more often is fortuitously chosen for him. Brown studies 2,908 Loyalists—a sizeable sample, but still an accidentally formulated group consisting only of those who submitted claims.

Despite such limitations, *The King's Friends* is a very fine study. In thirteen chapters, Professor Brown analyzes the strength and nature of Loyalism in each colony. The text and statistical tables indicate in which economic classes, geographical areas, native or immigrant groups, and occupations Loyalism was strongest. Some colonies reveal unique characteristics, but broadly similar patterns are found in many. In Brown's study Loyalism appears as: a seaboard phenomenon, with notable rural exceptions; strong in large cities including Boston but not Philadelphia; stronger among immigrants than among native-born. Farming alone contributed 49.2% of all claimants, but these 1,368 Loyalists were a very small fraction of the farm population in America. Thus, the Loyalist proportion of other occupational groups was higher, the precise percentages varying from colony to colony. Professor Brown notes that the claimants included men of all degrees of wealth, but one might question his emphasis upon the large number who were of modest means. He seems to feel that anything below £1000, or even £2000, is modest wealth, and anyone with less than £500 is poor. Such criteria provide only a rough discrimination of economic classes. Less comprehensive suggestions are made as to the role of education and religion, particularly Anglicanism, in American Loyalism.

Brown is less successful in analyzing Loyalist motives than in describing the composition of the group. A bit more skepticism is in order in evaluating their own explanations of their actions. And Professor Brown too often believes that some characteristic—wealth or mercantile association, for example—makes a man's Loyalism self-explanatory. In pointing to families and business partnerships which split along Patriot-Loyalist lines, he recognizes that a statistical analysis of wealth, occupation, and geography does not provide an entirely satisfactory explanation of motives. One of his statements is worth echoing: "In the last analysis Loyalism was often a state of mind, an emotional commitment."

As to Pennsylvania, Professor Brown suggests that there was much less Loyalism here than earlier writers believed. Loyalism in the Quaker colony was equivocal and neutral, and it is notable that many outstanding Tories

opposed British policy until independence became the issue. Brown believes that the Quakers were "genuine neutralists" who were unfairly branded Tories because of their pacifism, as was true of some other sects. More than 68% of the claimants lived in the three original eastern counties, but even in Philadelphia only 0.26% of the town's population were Loyalist claimants. A majority of Pennsylvania claimants were immigrants, almost all from Britain; a large number of them claimed less than £500; and 42% of them were in commercial occupations, while 33.5% were farmers. Through such statistical analysis, coupled with a thorough study of specialized works on the subject, Professor Brown provides an unusually enlightening book on Loyalism in Pennsylvania and its sister colonies.

*Lehigh University*

JOHN CARY

*Benjamin Franklin and Eighteenth-Century American Libraries.* By MARGARET BARTON KORTY. [*Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series*, Vol. 55, Part 9.] (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1965. 83 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. Paper, \$2.00.)

Benjamin Franklin printed, sold, wrote, bought, and was given books. He also founded the first subscription library in America. To that library, the Library Company of Philadelphia, and, as time went on, to many other libraries, he gave books and encouragement. To say that he was at heart a bookman from adolescence to old age is to understate his commitment to the highest desideratum—as stated by Frederick B. Adams, Jr.—of getting the right book into the right hands at the right time.

To establish libraries and to help them was one way of doing just that. Sometimes intensively, sometimes almost offhandedly, Franklin helped American libraries. Mrs. Korty has scoured the secondary sources on Franklin to collect anything that might throw light on his connection with libraries. The information she has culled ranges from fourteen pages on the Franklin-founded Library Company and ten on the Franklin-founded American Philosophical Society to a comparatively brief note on Louis XVI's gift to the College of William and Mary which "was a by-product of the love and esteem that the French people had for Benjamin Franklin, although he had no direct connection with it." Almost anyone wishing to learn what Franklin had to do with an American library will find it included in Mrs. Korty's monograph. It is a painstaking compendium, "a shortened and revised version of a dissertation submitted to the Catholic University of America, in partial fulfillment of the degree, Master of Science in Library Science."

More sophisticated scholars, seeking more than basic knowledge, will wish that Mrs. Korty had sought out some primary sources in addition to

the 114 books and monographs cited in her bibliography. To cite *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin* is to be on safe ground. To copy a document from Austin K. Gray's charming, but not punctilious, history of the Library Company is to skate on occasionally thin ice. It was not "Sieur Du Port Royal moral essays" which was ordered in the library's first shipment, but, as the Minutes read, "Sieurs Du Port Royal." Mrs. Korty would then not have made the error of referring to the work as the *Moral Essays* of Du Port Royal, thereby attributing the authorship to a nonexistent person rather than members of a Jansenist college. It is also misleading to quote the account of Peter Collinson's first gift to the Library Company as including "Sr Isaac Newton's Philosophy," without noting that this was not a copy of the *Principia*, but Henry Pemberton's *View of Sir Isaac Newton's Philosophy*.

I could give a number of similar examples of naïveté in the accounts of the Library Company and the Loganian Library, with which I am most familiar, but it would serve little purpose. Mrs. Korty should not have relied uncritically and exclusively on secondary sources. Her very considerable effort would have been improved had she handled the books and seen at least some of the manuscripts referred to in the pages she so carefully read. She has still brought together in one place from sometimes obscure printed sources more information than is available elsewhere on Franklin's contributions to the early libraries of this country.

*The Library Company of Philadelphia*

EDWIN WOLF 2ND

*Fisher Ames: Federalist and Statesman, 1758-1808.* By WINFRED E. A. BERNHARD. (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1965. xiii, 372 p. Illustrations, notes on sources, index, \$8.75.)

Of all the memorable figures who occupied the national scene in the decade after 1789, there was scarcely one whose star rose so rapidly, burned so brightly, or set so precipitously as that of Fisher Ames. In 1787, at twenty-nine, he astonished his colleagues at the Massachusetts Ratifying Convention with his oratorical abilities. Two years later, he was overawing fellow legislators—some of them twice his age—in the House of Representatives. For the next seven years he acted as the principal spokesman in the House for Hamiltonian policies. But at thirty-nine, Ames's career was finished, and he had retired to his farm in Massachusetts, his health broken, to raise pigs, scribble political polemics, and commiserate with likeminded visitors at the onrush of Jeffersonian Republicanism.

It is not surprising that Ames has been so long in attracting a biographer. For although he was perhaps the most eloquent partisan of the cause of high Federalism, his morbid pessimism has made him too funereal a subject for

most historians. Students of the early national period will thus be grateful to Winfred Bernhard, who has now given us the first full-length study of Ames. Though much of Ames's correspondence is lost, Bernhard has uncovered an impressive amount of material relating to Ames's private and public affairs. What emerges is a carefully detailed, meticulously researched portrait of the man who so effectively promoted Federalist programs in the House of Representatives from 1789 to 1796. One learns also that Ames was not simply a choleric conservative who shrank from "the people" and put his faith in a narrow elite. There was a human side to him also. He doted on his children, developed close friendships, easily played the role of country farmer, and cracked jokes in Congressional committee rooms.

To develop this side of him does not, however, alter the fact that Ames is historically important because he epitomized in the 1790's what Samuel Eliot Morison called "the catastrophic theory of democracy." Ames viewed all opposition to the Federalist policies as seditious, believed that Jeffersonians adhered to "silly principles," was convinced that a Republican majority in Congress meant anarchy, and held that democracy, as Bernhard writes, "automatically denoted a violent form of government" which could not exist free of mob domination. After the election of 1800, Ames saw Jefferson systematically plotting the destruction of banks and commerce; he regularly predicted the country's doom, and expected that Bonaparte, after conquering England and America, would conscript "our own dear children" for duty in St. Domingo.

It is unfortunate that Bernhard, though he describes this political melancholy in full detail, is largely unable to account for it. Perhaps Ames was a typical high Federalist, but little attention is given to that group or even to the voters in eastern Massachusetts who supported Ames. The movement apart, one wonders if Ames's gnawing doubts about the people and his recurrent visions of impending doom do not relate to insecurities in his own life. A nervous and precocious child, Ames entered Harvard at the age of twelve. Even then he exhibited a penchant for melodrama. Thereafter he developed pronounced tendencies for polarizing issues, for taking categorical positions. His reaction to Shays' Rebellion in 1786 was "volatile, almost violent," Bernhard notes. Nothing, it seems, gave the intense young man any sense of security or fulfillment. He resented his older brother, Nathaniel, who was a doctor of local prominence in Dedham. He studied law almost compulsively, yet abhorred legal work. His mood fluctuated wildly. As he himself wrote: "I am habitually a zealot in politics . . . I burn and freeze, am lethargic, raving, sanguine, and despondent, as often as the wind shifts."

Whatever Ames's problem, it apparently ruined his physical health. At thirty-seven he was chronically ill, though doctors could not diagnose the problem. Exertion of any kind, especially prolonged argument, left him faint, and often sick for days. Nonetheless, he remained active, accumulated a sizeable fortune through shrewd investments, and was known as one of the

cleverest political propagandists of his era. Like the ultra-conservative social and political philosophy he espoused, his career was brilliant but short, cerebral but unfeeling, and doomed because it looked backward rather than forward.

*Princeton University*

GARY B. NASH

*Essays on Education in the Early Republic.* Edited by FREDERICK RUDOLPH. (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1965. xxv, 389 p. \$6.95.)

With the Declaration of Independence and the successful termination of the American Revolution, the new independent nation was confronted with many social and economic problems. Not the least of these was the question of the system of education that would be appropriate in the new republic. It would be too much to expect that a new system would emerge immediately, for the colonial concepts and practices were stubborn enough to cast a long shadow for several decades; indeed, Merle Curti contends that "American schools still bore the characteristic impress of the colonial era" until nearly a hundred years ago.

What form of education is compatible with a republican form of government? Can education be for all? Should schools be used consciously to inculcate republican and democratic principles? Just what should be taught? These were the questions which faced thinking men in this era. To these challenges there were numerous responses; some responses were merely general statements by the founding fathers, exalting education as a national interest and concern, but there were several comprehensive essays proposing a system of universal education to be crowned by a national university.

Until now, the best single source of information regarding the educational proposals of these essayists has been Allen O. Hansen's *Liberalism and American Education in the Nineteenth Century* (Macmillan, 1926). Now Frederick Rudolph, professor of history at Williams College and author of *The American College and University*, has studied eight essays by seven of the essayists and reproduced their writings with a brief introduction and short biographical sketches of the writers. Somewhat arbitrarily, he has chosen two essays by Benjamin Rush of Philadelphia, the best-known physician of his time; Noah Webster of textbook and dictionary fame; Robert Coram, veteran of the *Bonhomme Richard* and editor of the *Delaware Gazette*; Simeon Doggett, principal of an academy; Samuel Harrison Smith, editor of the *National Intelligencer*; Amable-Louis-Rose de Lafitte duCourteil, a master at the academy in Bordentown, N. J.; and Samuel Knox, Presbyterian minister and principal of the academy at Frederick, Maryland. The editor's rather arbitrary rules result in the exclusion of equally important writings by Thomas Jefferson, Pierre Samuel DuPont de Nemours,

James Sullivan, Nathaniel Chipman, and others. The essays reproduced are a representative sample of the best, but a teacher of American educational history must regret the guide-lines which result in the omission of equally significant writers.

Among the ideas one finds in these essays are many harbingers of the pathway eventually to be taken by the American educational system: a system of universal, free schools under public control; education for citizenship; enlargement of the scope of science in the schools; replacement of the classical languages by more functional and utilitarian subjects; secular rather than sectarian instruction; emphasis upon thinking and discovery rather than on rote memorization; setting the stage for continued human progress; the education of "females."

Now, when education is again of as much concern to the general public as it was in the early days of the nation, a reading of these thoughtful essays is a pleasant exercise. One wonders if contemporary essays by Conant, Bestor, Woodring, Gardner *et al.* will be as interesting nearly 200 years hence.

*Muhlenberg College*

WILLIAM MARSHALL FRENCH

*George Rapp's Harmony Society, 1785-1847.* By KARL J. R. ARNDT. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965. 682 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$12.00.)

This work tells the story of one of America's more interesting experiments in communal piety. With narrative skill and perceptive eye for detail, Professor Arndt takes us through the history of the religious society which George Rapp founded in Württemberg from its establishment in Germany, to Harmony on the Connoquenessing, to New Harmony on the Wabash, and to Harmony on the Ohio. Here we have the facts, unadorned and without theological interpretation, telling the story of this highly interesting and significant American experiment.

The religious drive which stimulated George Rapp lay in his discontent with the coldness and sterility of formal religions. This is an old story, the story of radical pietism which has been heard before in Colonial Pennsylvania. Here is authentic religious experience moving men and women to abandon the society which requires that one gather its goods and reflect its materialism; here is freshness and vigor of spirit. Professor Arndt might have dealt more fully with the theological ideas which precipitated this movement, but his purpose seems to have been to give us a narrative history rather than an exposition of the ideas involved.

And give us a good sound narrative he certainly does! Here is a detailed and rich account of the Harmony Society in America from its arrival in 1803 and its establishment of a model town on the frontier, to the creation of a



cultural oasis in Indiana. The relations of George Rapp and socialist Robert Owen are treated, as also the conflicts which arose between Harmonists and the American economic and social systems, the great schism and subsequent healing. Here is a book of factual narrative which tells us, perhaps with somewhat too much wordiness, the story of a remarkable American experiment.

While the work includes an impressive bibliography and while its factual character cannot be challenged, this reviewer would have appreciated fuller documentation. Quotations are not supported by footnotes and it is not always clear where the author's facts come from. Apart from a paucity of scholarly techniques, the book remains the most authoritative and factual account of this interesting and important phase of American cultural history.

*Kutztown State College*

JOHN JOSEPH STOUTD

*The War of 1812.* By HARRY L. COLES. [The Chicago History of American Civilization.] (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1965. xvi, 298 p. Maps, illustrations, important dates, suggested reading, index. \$5.95.)

For several generations after the War of 1812 Americans were rather generally agreed that the war had come as a result of British maritime practices and that it was declared in a spirit of patriotism to preserve the national honor, even though a minority of "Blue Light Federalists" in New England insisted that it was "Mr. Madison's War," waged at the behest and for the benefit of Napoleon. Later scholarship emphasized the leadership of western and southern congressmen in bringing on the war and explained this phenomenon variously in terms of expansionism, the Indian menace in the Northwest, or low agricultural prices in the Mississippi Valley and the South. The thesis of western (and southern) provenance of the war dominated historical accounts until the past few years, when a renewed interest in the subject led to further research and to the publication of a series of articles and books which have revived, in a more sophisticated form, the stress upon the maritime and patriotic themes. Professor Coles's volume was not a product of this new movement, but its appearance at this time enabled it to incorporate the best of the old and new scholarship and to put the nonspecialist abreast of the most up-to-date literature on the war and its antecedents. The author in his list of suggested readings provides a useful annotated survey of this material.

An introductory chapter gives an excellent summary of the events leading up to the war and then appraises the various interpretations of its causation. Coles's conclusions support the views of Norman Risjord and Roger Brown with their emphasis upon national honor and the desire to preserve the

reputation and influence of republican government. The five chapters on the military and naval phases of the war form the core of the book. They are well organized, well written, and unusually clear in following the various campaigns. Particularly noteworthy are the helpful short characterizations of the leaders, the insights into the British and Canadian side of the war, and the balanced judgments of the author in assessing responsibility for the almost incredible blunders and inefficiency which characterized so much of American conduct of the war. Coles takes issue with the big-navy views of Mahan and Roosevelt and argues that government commerce destroyers were most likely to have advanced American interests. The shortcomings in the conduct of the war he attributes to "poor preparation, poor civilian and military leadership, lack of unity, and bad strategy," but he also notes that the great distances involved and the inadequacies of transportation and communication made really effective large-scale operations virtually impossible under any circumstances. The two final chapters discuss war finances, the Hartford Convention, the negotiations at Ghent, and the long-term significance of the war to both the United States and Canada.

Despite the limitations of space imposed by the format of the Chicago History of American Civilization series of which it is a part, this is a highly readable book of surprising breadth and clarity. There are a few editorial slips such as the use of "levy" in place of "levee," and of twenty-three thousand for twenty-three million acres (p. 202). More disturbing are the surprising errors in the quotation of figures on exports and revenue on page 89. It is annoying to detail such minor points in a review, but it is still more regrettable that a book otherwise so worthy of praise should through careless errors in research and editing become the source of later inaccuracies on the part of those making use of it.

*Rice University*

S. W. HIGGINBOTHAM

*Hinton Rowan Helper: Abolitionist-Racist.* By HUGH C. BAILEY. [Southern Historical Publications No. 7.] (University, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1965. xi, 256 p. Illustrations, bibliography, appendix, index. \$6.95.)

Professor Bailey carefully acknowledges in his preface that this volume is not a complete biography of Hinton Rowan Helper. He was unable to locate Helper's papers, and has found it necessary to rely almost exclusively on printed materials. The result is a book that provides few details of Helper's youth, education, family life, and personal finances. Unfortunately, the book also adds little that is not already known about this remarkable abolitionist and racist.

Helper was a native North Carolinian, of the same class of small farmers and artisans that produced Andrew Johnson. Both men detested slavery and large slaveholders, and both were decidedly racist in their views on national affairs and the Negro question. Professor Bailey never makes this

comparison. Instead, he likens Helper's prejudices to those of Lincoln. He properly notes that both favored emigration of the freedmen as a solution to the race question. However, although Helper favored emigration because of his detestation of the black man, Lincoln urged emigration as a solution to a vexing problem, the seeming inability of whites and blacks to get along together. The motivations of the two men were hardly analogous. Lincoln was never a racist.

Helper, however, was both racist and abolitionist. His most famous work, *The Impending Crisis*, was an economic comparison of northern and southern society as well as a violent abolitionist attack on slavery. By use of an impressive array of statistics Helper demonstrated that the South was sadly lagging behind the North in material prosperity. The single cause, to Helper, was slavery which impoverished small farmers and southern white laborers, and in general retarded the economic progress of his section. He hoped that *The Impending Crisis* would become a literary weapon that southern poor whites would use in voting Republican in 1860 and thereby destroy the political power of the hated slaveowners. The book circulated in the North and proved to be a useful Republican campaign document in the election of 1860. In the South, however, it was never widely read nor circulated.

After the war Helper's writings on national issues turned against the Radicals because of their efforts to aid southern Negroes. He went along with President Johnson in denouncing Republican attempts to build a political party in the South based on Negro votes. In Helper's eyes Reconstruction was wrong because the Negro was "a very inferior and almost worthless sort of man." He should be freed, colonized, and then left to himself. Not unnaturally, Helper's post-war writings became valuable Democratic documents in the presidential election of 1868.

The author includes several interesting chapters on Helper's search for riches in California during the gold rush, and his activities in Latin America during and after the Civil War. However, Helper's most significant work was connected with slavery and the Negro problem. Professor Bailey's study, unfortunately and necessarily incomplete, whets our appetite for more information.

Villanova University

JOSEPH GEORGE, JR.

*The Politics of Reconstruction: 1863-1867.* By DAVID DONALD. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965. xvii, 105 p. Tables, appendixes. \$4.00.)

Professor Donald is persuaded that in spite of "something of a revival" of scholarly interest in the history of the years following the Civil War, "the rewriting of Reconstruction history appears to have become curiously stalled." He attributes this unhappy circumstance to a virtual exhaustion of the sources conventionally used by historians—public documents, news-

papers, and manuscripts; to the predominance of a biographical orientation on the part of historians of the period (with a resulting emphasis on individual, rather than group motivation); to the heavy emotional burden which the issues of the period still carry; and to boredom with the conventional questions students have been asking about Reconstruction.

It is Donald's hope that in these three brief essays, the Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History for 1965, he has suggested an approach which may bypass the "roadblocks" which have stalled the rewriting of Reconstruction history. His suggestion, when reduced to its essentials, is to apply "the simple arithmetic of politics" to the problem of Republican Party factionalism. Specifically, he examines the nature of the problem facing the Republican Party as the war drew to a close, the congressional elections of 1862, 1864, 1866, and 1868 in selected northern states, and the legislative history of the First Reconstruction Act of March, 1867.

Working from the premise that politicians "either wish to be re-elected to their present offices or aspire to higher ones," Donald attempts to correlate the voting records of Republican congressmen with the relative security of their seats. The results convince him that the basis of the Republican factions was political necessity rather than ideology. They also convince him that the Reconstruction Act of 1867 "was not the work of any man or of any faction," nor can that Act be understood, he believes, "as the product of a particular ideology." Rather, he concludes, the votes of individual congressmen "were determined . . . by the degree of strength and security each felt in his home district."

One can sympathize with, and share, Professor Donald's frustration over the failure of historians to identify the motives of the various Republican factions. Yet, his proposal to substitute the "simple arithmetic of politics" is not entirely satisfactory. That arithmetic, almost inevitably, discounts the wide variety of motives, some political and some highly personal, affecting a congressman's vote on a single issue, or on his decision to seek reelection. Some of the men surveyed by Donald were young and eager for office, just as he assumes. Others, however, were old, disillusioned, or sick and therefore ready to leave. Some were leaving office to seek greater power and wealth in other offices or in other lines of endeavour. To ascribe to all a common desire for office, at the hands of the same electorate, is to run a serious risk of oversimplification. But Professor Donald has, as he always does, provided us with a thoughtful and provocative book and we would be ungracious to ask for more.

*University of Maryland*

DAVID S. SPARKS

*The Rise of Bucknell University.* By J. ORIN OLIPHANT. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965. xii, 448 p. Illustrations, index. \$7.95.)

As one would expect from Dr. Oliphant's pen, this excellent work is well-planned, well-documented, meticulous in its foreground detail, yet

never losing sight of the horizon. A work of devoted scholarship, it is nevertheless subject to the inevitable restrictions of a college history and makes no pretense of being written primarily for professional historians. It is written, as the Dedication makes clear, for the alumni, the children of alumni, and the alumni-to-be:

TO  
BUCKNELLIAN OF ALL TIMES  
Those of Long Ago: *in memoriam*  
Those of My Time: *ave atque vale*  
Those in Years to Come: *ad astra per aspera*

The author, by limiting his objectives, avoids the frailties most common to college histories. He does not try to do everything, to catch a total impression of Bucknell (a complex of student, faculty, and administrative *mores*). His aim—as the title of the book suggests and the Foreword explicitly announces—is to show the phenomenon of Bucknell's *rise*: its rise from a small frontier institution to the status of a full, modern university.

It follows that, while not devoid of humor and warm humanity, the book has little room for campus *trivia*—though there are some pleasant touches of it, as in the quoted remark of a Senior, “You have to work like hell for three years to stay in, then work like hell the fourth year to get out.” For the most part it keeps to the administrative level, concerning itself with presidents, boards of trustees, faculty, and financial campaign managers: in a word, with those immediately responsible for the institution's material and curricular growth.

The University of Lewisburg, as Bucknell University was originally named, was projected by the Northumberland Baptist Association as a denominational institution of learning to be located in the small and at that time isolated community of Lewisburg on the West Branch of the Susquehanna. Professor Stephen William Taylor, who was engaged to bring the institution into being, began his duties at Lewisburg in December, 1845. Thanks to his experience and great energy, a charter was quickly drafted and submitted to the Legislature. Passed by that body, it was signed by the Governor on February 5, 1846. In October of the same year, Professor Taylor opened a preparatory school for boys and girls in the basement of the meetinghouse of the Baptist Church in Lewisburg. But the University was not founded in a day. By a wise and far-sighted provision inserted by Professor Taylor, the Charter prescribed that it could not become valid until \$100,000 had been subscribed for the young institution's support. It took several years to meet this requirement. The first president of Lewisburg University was not appointed until 1851, when the Rev. Dr. Howard Malcolm was installed.

From that time on the advance was more rapid and steady than that of most “fresh-water” institutions of learning in that day. Not that its upbringing was without troubles, curricular and financial. In 1880 a severe

crisis (\$50,000 or we close our doors) was resolved when that sum was pledged by President David Jayne Hill's friend, William Bucknell, who continued to make contributions that came in the end to many times that amount. A grateful institution changed its name in his honor.

For Bucknellians, this book will always be a prime work of reference. Besides that, its literary quality is high. The work is well rounded, showing as it does not only material development but the evolution of the University's vision, its objectives. Dr. Oliphant opens Part One, "This Great Enterprise," with an account of the intellectual forces that brought Bucknell into being. A wave of idealism drew the Baptists into that movement of Protestant evangelism intermixed with "American cultural nationalism" which sparked America's nineteenth-century sense of its world mission. Colleges were founded to prepare young people for a leading part in the conversion of the world to this country's way of life, religious and political. The author closes Part Five, "The Challenge of a Changing World," with a sketch of the more modest but no less significant objective of first *understanding* the world around us: among other ways, by "sending each year," as President Merle Odgers reported in 1960, "ten or twelve young men or women abroad for the junior year."

*Lebanon Valley College*

PAUL A. W. WALLACE

*The Garrett Snuff Fortune.* By C. A. WESLAGER. (Wilmington, Del.: The Knebels Press, 1965. xv, 175 p. Illustrations. \$6.00.)

The title alone of this volume attracts one's interest, for it seems curious that a large contemporary fortune could be built on the processing and sale of snuff. Mr. Weslager very ably shows how the Garrett family did create such a fortune and how a part of it was the subject of twenty years of litigation in the Orphans' Court of Philadelphia County.

After a short discourse on the origin and development of snuffing, the author deals specifically with the activities of the Garrett family, which was in the snuff business for 100 years with its mills in New Castle County, Delaware, and its offices and residences generally in Philadelphia. From the account presented the Garretts were of simple tastes, and their great wealth was not evident until the drama appeared in court.

In effect, the first act of this drama began with the marriage in 1872 of Walter Garrett, aged forty, and Henrietta E. Schaefer, the daughter of poor German immigrants, who was eighteen years his junior. They took up residence at 404 South 9th Street, Philadelphia, where they lived quite simply until his death in 1895 and hers in 1930. She never had any children and she outlived all her immediate family.

When Walter died he gave the residue of his estate with a value of about \$6,000,000 to his widow. When she died the estate was worth \$17,000,000.

By the time that the court-appointed master filed his report in 1950 its value was more than \$21,000,000 despite principal disbursements during that period for taxes and expenses of administration of about \$5,000,000.

Although her husband before his death and in his own will had requested Henrietta to make a will, and although there was some evidence that she had done so, no will that disposed of the residue of her estate was ever found in spite of most painstaking searches, including the examination of the contents of her coffin, disinterred seven years after her death. Because of the intestacy the estate would either pass to Henrietta's heirs at law, if there were any, or by escheat to the Commonwealth.

Thus the stage was set, and, as the author says, 26,000 frenzied claimants demanded their day in court. By far the majority of these had no proof whatsoever of any relationship to the decedent. False testimony was presented both in oral and documentary form. Among the most vocal claimants were those who without a shred of relevant testimony believed that a vast conspiracy existed to deprive them of their rights.

Even the federal government and the Commonwealth got into the act. The latter tried to prove that there were no heirs so that the estate would escheat, and it also tried the dubious expedient of amending the Inheritance Tax Act (not the Intestate Act, as the author states) retroactively so as to provide that if an estate has not been distributed at the expiration of seven years from the death of an intestate the tax shall be at the rate of 80% of the value of the property passing to a first cousin or one more remote in degree, instead of the 10% rate theretofore in effect.

The Intestate Act provided that in the absence of closer relatives first cousins take to the exclusion of all persons more remotely related. Out of all the welter of testimony, which was printed in 323 volumes with 67 volumes of exhibits, it became apparent that three first cousins had survived the decedent. This was a fact that had been known to the attorney for the administrators nearly 20 years before. Not one of the three was still living by the time that the master's report was filed.

When distribution was finally made the assignees of the heirs received comparatively little because in order to prevent further litigation millions of dollars were paid in settlement of claims, including that of the Commonwealth, which based its case upon the amendment to the Inheritance Tax Act, which was of dubious constitutionality. The share of one of the cousins, a resident of Germany and therefore an enemy alien, was transferred to the U. S. Treasury. Mr. Weslager is to be commended for having winnowed out of the mass of details facts which he presents ably and succinctly to tell a story of human cupidity reminiscent of the feverous activity that follows upon a gold strike.

If any fault may be found in this book I think it has to do only with certain minor inaccuracies in regard to the Philadelphia Orphans' Court. For example, the author states that that court besides handling matters of minors has jurisdiction over certain inheritance cases even though the

deceased was childless. In fact that court has jurisdiction over all cases involving wills and intestacies as well as a broad jurisdiction in other areas. Nor is the president judge appointed, as the author states, but he succeeds to his position by seniority.

This book gives no clue as to what happened to the fortunes of Walter Garrett's brother and two sisters, all of whom were apparently as wealthy as he and all of whom died without ever having married. Presumably the reason for this omission is that any information in regard to those parts of the family riches would be anticlimactic after the story of the administration of the estate of Henrietta Schaefer Garrett.

Villanova, Pa.

T. F. DIXON WAINWRIGHT

*The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays.* By RICHARD HOFSTADTER. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965. xiv, 315 p., and xii. Index. \$5.95.)

A two-time Pulitzer Prize winner, Richard Hofstadter has become firmly established as one of the most original and provocative writers on American history with such works as *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, *The Age of Reform*, and *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. His unique gifts as an essayist can be attested by numberless history students (and their grateful instructors) whose perspectives on our major political figures have been greatly enlarged by *The American Political Tradition*. The present collection of essays—written and printed during the last fourteen years but considerably revised for this publication—is further testimony to Professor Hofstadter's outstanding analytical and writing abilities.

The book is divided into two parts. The first contains the title essay and three others on the recent American Right, including probably the best short appraisal of the Goldwater movement in print. The second part consists of a new version of the often-cited essay on Manifest Destiny and the Philippines; a study of a subject virtually ignored by American historians, the anti-trust movement after 1938; and the most extended account of William H. ("Coin") Harvey and Free Silver that has been written. Anticipating doubts about the meaning of a collection of essays on such varied subjects, Hofstadter admits that its unity, besides being a "personal and informal one," rests not upon "a single consistent argument but a set of related concerns and methods." Central to all the essays is the Columbia professor's well-known concern that rationalistic economic or interest group interpretations are not sufficient to explain much of American political behavior. Important also, he believes, is an understanding of the emotional and symbolic aspects of politics—" . . . it has become increasingly clear that people not only seek their interests but also express and even in a measure define themselves in politics; that political life acts as a sounding board for identities, values, fears, and aspirations."



Recurring nonrational styles of thought and behavior, he demonstrates, can be detected in public responses to critical situations or enduring dilemmas throughout American history. One such style is that of the politic paranoid (who differs from the clinical paranoid in that he sees a hostile and conspiratorial world directed against his nation and way of life rather than against himself as an individual). It has been evident in public reactions from the panic over Illuminism at the end of the eighteenth century to "Coin" Harvey and the Populist Movement in the 1890's to its present manifestation in the extreme right wing. ("We are all sufferers from history," Hofstadter observes, "but the paranoid is a double sufferer, since he is afflicted not only by the real world, with the rest of us, but by his fantasies as well.") Another emotional style can be seen in the approach of certain reformers as well as conservatives to political and economic issues as though they were "matters of faith and morals rather than matters of fact." The attitude of the trust-busters at the beginning of the twentieth century who inveighed against "evil" industrial giants was not unlike that of today's pseudo-conservatives (Hofstadter's term for right-wing radicals) who denounce the trend of the modern economy as being destructive of the moral fiber of the nation. Further, Hofstadter shows how emotional responses have influenced attitudes towards American foreign policy. Widespread anxieties and discontents of the 1890's helped generate the feelings of outraged humanity and aggressive desires which led to the Spanish-American War and the acquisition of the Philippines. Today, pseudo-conservatives, frustrated by America's inability to control international events and deluded by the easy triumphs of the past, demand a reassertion of American omnipotence and final solutions to our world problems.

*The Paranoid Style* will probably be widely read because of its incisive treatment of contemporary pseudo-conservatism and the Goldwater campaign. Certainly, it is important for providing us with the perspective to view and evaluate political movements of our own time. It also serves a useful purpose in making readily accessible a number of essays which are in the process of becoming classics in American historical writing. Perhaps even more important for the historian and political scientist, however, is the further evidence offered on the value of an increasingly employed method for enlarging our knowledge of American political behavior.

*Beaver College*

LLOYD M. ABERNETHY

*Keepers of the Past.* Edited by CLIFFORD L. LORD. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965. 241 p. \$6.00.)

The eighteen essays in this book sketch the lives of men and women who have won distinction for their work with historical societies, history museums, public archives, and for the preservation and development of historic sites. Almost all the authors are historians directly or indirectly associated

with an historical organization. Some of the essays are spritely while others are more pedestrian, a common characteristic of community projects. The editor's introduction outlining the history of the historical preservation movement is a good summary. There is little excuse for omitting an index.

Historians have recorded the deeds of the four giants of historical society development—Jeremy Belknap, John Pintard, Lyman Copeland Draper, and Reuben Gold Thwaites. The summaries here are adequate. The best essay of the group is John Krout's incisive, forceful, and illuminating story of Dixon Ryan Fox's work with the New York Historical Association.

Not as many men and women featured in the four remaining sections—public archives, historical museums, special collections, and historic sites—are as widely known. An exception is John Franklin Jameson, whose effort to establish the National Archives has long been recognized. David Van Tassil's succinct summary of his career is informative. But we do not often hear about men like Thomas McAdory Owen and Robert D. Conner, who were instrumental in establishing state archival programs in their own states of Alabama and North Carolina. Lack of dynamic leadership has partially eclipsed the Alabama program, but the North Carolina Department of Archives and History is a model of its kind, and one that has been much admired and imitated. Conner's work at the state level had national significance, culminating in his appointment in 1934 as first Archivist of the United States. Bringing to a wider audience the achievements of persons like Conner is a useful result of this volume.

For museum preservation the selections include essays on George Brown Goode, of the Smithsonian Institution; Edgar Lee Hewett, who founded the Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe; and George Francis Dow, of the Essex Institute, who pioneered the period room concept. One might have expected an essay on Charles Willson Peale, of Philadelphia. Although Peale's museum stressed the curio and the curiosity, it had widespread influence and is one possible explanation for the plethora of "cabinets of curiosities" that passed for museums between 1850 and 1950. Some still exist!

In spite of James Heslin's delightful story about Bella C. Landauer, the weakest link that ties these essays together is the section on special collections. Neither the Huntington nor Landauer story shows any "evolution" in the historic preservation field as defined by the editor.

The last section on historic sites includes essays on Ann Pamela Cunningham, who saved Mount Vernon and whose work has served as a model for so many other preservation societies; Adina DeZavala, the little-known champion of the Alamo preservation group; William Sumner Appleton, the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities; Stephen Pell, Fort Ticonderoga; and John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Colonial Williamsburg.

I wish the editor had given some attention to the area of historic sites and zoning legislation at the municipal, state, and national level. It may not have been the work of any single individual, but this development is one of

the most important in the historic preservation movement in the twentieth century.

*Chicago Historical Society*

CLEMENT M. SILVESTRO

*The Polite Americans: A Wide-Angle View of Our More or Less Good Manners Over 300 Years.* By GERALD CARSON. (New York: William Morrow & Company, 1966. xvi, 346 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$6.50.)

This entrancing jumble of a book is presented, by the publishers at least, as a survey of "American manners," in which case epitaphs, beards, pianos, duels, and almost everything else you've ever heard of can be considered "manners." The book is really a sort of magpie collection of any aspect of American life that Mr. Carson has found funny. Since he has a keen eye for the historical bauble and lots of wit himself, hardly a page goes by without something quotable on it. When the reader is not laughing to himself, he will be reading aloud to others.

The book is really a collection of articles on various odd subjects, some of which have appeared already as such in magazines. The book could be read equally well, chapter by chapter, beginning from the back; but a certain vague chronological sequence is observable, from Plymouth Rock to Rock and Roll, and beyond. One gets the impression that Mr. Carson began to write a book on American books of etiquette, and then led himself astray. The chapters on beards, pianos, duels, and what-have-you usually refer to these manuals on manners somewhere, and the most authoritative chapter is one dealing exclusively with works of this sort from the nineteenth century. The fun begins however when Mr. Carson digresses, which he does permanently. The epitaph on page 55:

"Here lies as silent clay  
Miss Arabella Young  
Who on the 21st of May  
1771  
Began to hold her tongue,"

may not be "manners," but it's certainly fun.

The Carson approach could be described as beneficent Mencken—a rather debunking preference for hearty vulgarisms as opposed to the genteel, for the eighteenth century as opposed to the nineteenth, for the forthright as opposed to the mincing. One can hardly quarrel. But at the risk of being a blue-nosed literary Puritan, one might be tempted to ask, "Just what is the book supposed to be *about*?" It is possible that a more seriously organized point of view, or a real concentration on books of etiquette as such might have produced a more important and even interest-

ing book. Hardly, however, a more entertaining one, and seriousness might merely have spoiled it. As it is, the book is at its worst when it attempts to sociologize and generalize.

I do find myself sometimes just a bit put off by the hilarity. The general subject, God knows, is stuffed with laughs; but I feel that from Dixon Wecter on too much has been made of the riotous vulgarities attendant upon the Rising Glory of America, and that some more sober corrective might be in order. Sociological ponderousness is not the answer certainly, but a book on Republican Manners that is something besides a lark might be refreshing.

Meanwhile, let us enjoy what Carson hath wrought, without worrying about what he didn't write. Anyone who fails to chuckle while reading really should have his head examined.

*Princeton, N. J.*

NATHANIEL BURT

*The Fulham Papers in the Lambeth Palace Library: American Colonial Section, Calendar and Indexes.* Compiled by WILLIAM WILSON MANROSS. (Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1965. xxii, 524 p. Index. \$20.20.)

This impressive calendar and index to the American section of the Fulham Papers will serve as a guide to the history of the colonial church as well as to other important aspects of colonial history. Microfilms of the original papers are now at the Library of Congress.

In brief, the volume records the correspondence of the Bishop of London with the American colonies, including Canada and the British West Indies, and will open the door to the material contained in the collection. Its indexes will be of much value to students seeking information.