BOOK REVIEWS

The European Discovery of America: The Northern Voyages, A.D. 500-1600.
By Samuel Eliot Morison. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971. xviii, 712 p. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. $15.00.)

Exactly fifty years ago the present reviewer sat at the feet of Assistant Professor Morison (as he then was), & heard him lecture on the French Revolution (of all improbable subjects) in the freshman history course at Harvard. A year or so thereafter I was elected to the undergraduate club to which the assistant professor belonged (the Phoenix), where the flags & pennants of the famous Harvard Columbus expedition of 1939-1940 are now preserved. Many years later the Admiral (as he had then become) took a kindly and tolerant, though critical, notice of my succès d' estime, Travel & Discovery in the Renaissance. More recently still we have foregathered within the hospitable walls of the Connaught Bar in London, and have migrated to Oxford together to partake of A. L. Rowse's Lucullian lunches at All Souls. So our paths have crossed, on the whole very pleasantly, many times during the last half-century.

Should I sound fulsome in this review, however, it is not because of our long-standing acquaintance, but because of my admiration of an elder statesman of eighty-four who could turn out such a masterpiece as the book under consideration. I had thought that Admiral of the Ocean Sea would be his greatest work, but now I feel that The European Discovery of America is quite on a par, besides being a perfect supplement to the earlier book. And two further volumes are promised!!!

In content, The European Discovery of America concerns the voyages, real and apocryphal, from Greenland to Cape Hatteras, from the mythical voyage of St. Brendan in early Christian times to the futile Roanoke colony of Queen Elizabeth's day. The Norsemen in Greenland and Vinland, the Cabots and their colleagues, Verrazzano and Jacques Cartier, Gilbert and Hakluyt, Frobisher and Davis, Raleigh and his attempted Virginia colony—they are all here, described in a brilliantly written narrative, interspersed with delicious, if sometimes sardonic, touches of humor.

It is only fair to admit that Admiral Morison is not without some very well-reasoned convictions (or shall we call them prejudices?). To be sure, he is more tolerant of the Norsemen than appeared in Admiral of the Ocean Sea, admitting that they did reach Newfoundland in the eleventh century, and that they continually visited Labrador during the Middle Ages to cut timber in the neighborhood of Hamilton Inlet. But for the Admiral it is an unarguable article of faith that no European, of any nationality whatsoever, set foot on American soil between the time of the Greenlanders and
Christopher Columbus. In this dogmatic attitude he runs up against the forces of militant patriotism: Danes, Norwegians, Portuguese, Irish, Welsh, and even the Westcountrymen of Bristol—they have all staked their claims to pre-Columbian discovery and colonization. But Admiral Morison is no respecter of persons and he pricks one bubble after another, with a fine disregard for nationalistic xenophobia. Similarly, he challenges such a sacred cow as the Vinland Map, which he frankly regards as spurious; not to speak of the relation of the Zeno brothers, the very questionable exploits of Pining & Pothorst, the graffiti on the Dighton Rock and the Kensington Stone, and similar flights of fancy and figments of the imagination. No such idle speculations are countenanced.

Furthermore, as in the case of Admiral of the Ocean Sea, Admiral Morison has visited and studied the places about which he writes, so that he speaks very much ex cathedra. One might add that he has sovereign contempt for armchair travelers (he mentions a few by name) whose knowledge of the terrain involved is entirely secondhand; a similar disdain holds for those who have never sailed before the mast. All this gives his narrative an irreproachable authenticity.

It remains to praise the perfectly organized manner in which the book is put together. Although there is no appendix, there are many pages of notes, bibliographical and otherwise, at the end of each chapter—all of the greatest interest and importance, while at the same time being an essential adjunct to the text. Also, of very particular significance, are the many aeroplane photographs of islands, bays, and coastal profiles, from Greenland’s icy mountains to the North Carolina Banks, taken by the author during a series of aerial surveys. These give a wonderfully vivid picture of what the explorers saw. (There is no photo, however, of New York Harbor; perhaps the Lower Bay has changed too much for Verrazzano to recognize it!) The maps likewise are plentiful and excellent, as are the reproductions of early portolan charts and the plates of contemporary paintings. Altogether this is a volume impeccably written, impeccably edited, and impeccably produced.

So, a full half-century after hearing an assistant professor discourse on the follies of Marie Antoinette and the wickednesses of Robespierre, in Frisky Merriman’s History One, I once again sit at the feet of the master.
are willing to concede its validity. It is precisely this idea that John Calam neglects in his analysis of the efforts of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts to bring the barbaric colonial American closer to God, to the Anglican Church, and to the British Empire. In fact, he appears to be convinced that there is a high correspondence between instruction and moral regeneration when he insists that “If simplicity of instructions alone had been the key to Society accomplishments abroad before cessation of French hostilities, schoolmasters might have performed flawlessly. Goals were clearly stated. The objective was the instructing and disposing of children to behave and live as Christians.” He is curiously oblivious to the lessons of history: formal schooling can perform no such miracle.

Intent upon escaping the opprobrium leveled at his fraternity, Calam substitutes personal history for institutional history. He hopes thereby to avoid the heinous errors of his predecessors. But an endless recounting of the irritations and vicissitudes suffered by a succession of unhappy parson pedagogues is no more captivating than an endless description of classroom happenings. Trivia are scarcely illuminating whether they be biographical or institutional.

Yet the work is not without merit. Calam convincingly documents the self-defeating effects of myopia induced by arrogance. The failure or refusal of S. P. G. parsons and pedagogues to appreciate the peculiar genius of the contemptible colonial rendered their efforts nugatory. Convinced that England and the Anglican Church represented the best of all possible worlds, Society workers conceived their mission as inducing sentiments of loyalty to the old world rather than adaptation to the new. With ill-concealed distaste they polemized against the myriad dissenting religious views that characterized the unregenerate American. They allied themselves with the supporters of empire and failed to achieve even that modest degree of political flexibility that would have permitted a modicum of effective functioning. They openly resented the educational efforts of competing religious groups as rude and unwarranted intrusions on their exclusive domain. Small wonder, then, that the close of hostilities witnessed the end of Society activities in America.

If the S. P. G. did manage, through the devoted ministrations of its parsons and pedagogues, to rescue an occasional unlettered colonial from the pit of illiteracy, it did not succeed in fulfilling the expectations of William III, who, in granting its charter in 1701, declared:

“Whereas Wee are credibly informed that in many of our Plantacons, Colonies, and Factories beyond the Seas, belonging to Our Kingdom of England, the Provision for Ministers is very mean. And many others of Our said Plantacons, Colonies and Factories are wholly destitute, and unprovided of a Mainteynance for Ministers, and the Publick Worshipp of God; and for Lack of Support and Mainteynance for such, many of our Loveing Subjects doe want the Administration of God’s Word and Sacraments, and seem to be abandoned to Atheism and Infidelity.
"And whereas Wee think it Our Duty as much as in Us lyes, to promote the Glory of God, by the Instruccon of Our People in the Christian Religion And that it will be highly conducive for accomplishing those Ends . . . sufficient Mainteynance be provided for an Orthodox Clergy to live amongst them and that such other Provision be made, as may be necessary for the Propagation of the Gospell in those Parts . . . ."

Americans, history tells us, resisted virtue British style.

*University of Pennsylvania*

Saul Sack

*The Scottish Enlightenment and the American College Ideal.* By Douglas Sloan. (New York: Teachers College Press, 1971. xii, 298 p. Appendix, bibliography, index. $10.00.)

Douglas Sloan has written a book of very special significance to those interested in the history of education in eighteenth-century New Jersey and Pennsylvania. He has investigated the influence of Scotland upon American academies and colleges, and considers it as, or more, important than that of England. To illustrate this, after summarizing contemporary Scottish university life, and that of Presbyterian academies in America, 1743–1795, he has described the roles played by Francis Alison, John Witherspoon, Samuel Stanhope Smith, and Benjamin Rush in the transmission of Scottish educational philosophy. A concluding chapter touches upon the teaching of science, the appearance of professional academic scientists, and connects the new curriculum with the young society. Lists in text and notes both of persons coming from Scotland to the educational institutions of the middle Atlantic states, and of those many Americans who studied in Scotland, document the argument. There was a vigorous two-way traffic across the ocean during the age of the Scottish Enlightenment, all the more noteworthy since the cultural flowering of North Britain took place, not as in renaissance Italy or England, in informal circles around gifted individuals, but in her universities.

Scotsmen were drastically revising curriculum and methods of teaching in accord with current social, scientific, and philosophical developments. The English language replaced Latin on podium and in classroom. Classical scholarship remained important, but to it were added studies in literature and belle lettres, mathematics, and chemistry, medical and social sciences. Famous professors like Francis Hutcheson, John Stevenson, Adam Smith, Thomas Reid, William Cullen, and William Duncan, to name no more, led Americans taught by them, or by their pupils and disciples, into fresh fields of learning inspired by new ideals. Courses of study and subjects selected in the Colleges of Philadelphia and New Jersey were inspired by the Aberdeen-trained Provost William Smith, whose influence ultimately, Professor Sloan thinks, extended all along the eastern seaboard. Instruction in medicine in the University of Edinburgh trained men like Rush, John Morgan, William Shippen and others, some of whom were to promote the
establishment of medical schools in America along Scottish lines. Scotland inspired much of the change to more modern pedagogy in the eighteenth century.

The chapters on Rush and science, though lively, deal with more familiar material than those on Alison, Witherspoon, and Samuel Smith. These provide better sketches of the three men than can be found elsewhere and are based on research into half-forgotten works, lecture notes, and manuscripts. Alison represented the old or moderate side in the Presbyterian Church, and claimed to have rescued America from the anti-intellectualism of institutions like the Log College. Witherspoon, brought over by new side or evangelical influence to maintain faith in revelation, while scorning the philosophers of the school of Shaftesbury, was himself a dedicated educator determined to produce a learned ministry, and to reconcile enlightenment and religion. The tensions between old and new sides, Professor Sloan feels, can be exaggerated. Bitter comments about each other should not be allowed to conceal the fact that they worked toward the same goal if with differing emphasis on reason and revelation.

In no matter was this common objective more noticeable than in their attitude toward relevancy. Hutcheson, Alison's mentor, had wished to discourage students from "resting in speculation" or regarding the study of philosophy as anything but "the most sacred law of life and conduct." Like him, Alison declared that "the kingdom of Christ, or the cause of liberty . . . virtue or learning" to be one and the same task. Later on, Smith of New Jersey defined his purpose to be the training of "wise and enlightened statesmen for the republic." He wanted Princeton to be the Edinburgh of North America. Yet he had troubles with trustees demanding more discipline, and with students desiring greater liberty. There were, too, critics of his extraordinarily liberal attitude toward polygamy among non-Christian peoples. The students trained by these professors and presidents form a distinguished group in their age and reveal the virtues of many of the Scottish innovations adopted in their schools.

This book deals with a somewhat neglected subject. It may rather overestimate the rationalism of those pious freethinkers of the moderate or old side persuasion, and may occasionally trace an influence where there may have been only coincidence. But it opens up new vistas in the history of American education, and provides a very good starting point for further exploration.

Rosemont, Pa.

CAROLINE ROBBINS

The editors of this volume remind the reviewer of Dr. Fothergill himself: well-intentioned, conscientious people who sacrificed many an hour’s sleep at the bedside of this book, yet who lacked the knowledge and expertise to cope with many of its problems. The editors are both historians of medicine and they acquit themselves handsomely whenever Fothergill’s letters dwell on disease or pharmacopoeia. But the bulk of the Doctor’s letters which they publish deal with politics, with either the stormy relations between the Proprietor of Pennsylvania and its Quaker Party-controlled Assembly or between the King and his American colonies as a whole. In treating political pathology the editors are sometimes little better than Dr. Samuel Leeds, whose failings, when exposed by Dr. Fothergill, caused his expulsion from the London medical fraternity and resulted in Fothergill’s famous “trial” before the London Quaker meeting.

The editors do not identify items which they should. On pages 109–110 they fail to identify Fothergill’s important public letter on the rebellion of 1745; the reviewer located it in Gentleman’s Magazine, XV, December, 1745, 631–632, entitled “The Mischief of Groundless Fears,” signed by “a friend to his country.” On pages 184, 186, they fail to identify a “letter of advice given by some Friends in Pennsylvania,” declaring their refusal to pay war taxes levied in 1755. This important letter, which was printed in England with a malicious introduction by the Rev. William Smith and which, according to Fothergill, created intense public indignation against the Quakers was the so-called “Epistle of Caution,” December 16, 1755, drafted by John Woolman and signed by twenty other “weighty” Friends. It is printed by Amelia Gummere in The Journal and Essays of John Woolman (New York, 1922), 208–210.

The editors frequently make factual errors. Benjamin Franklin was not “the recognized leader of the Pennsylvania Assembly” in November, 1754, as they claim on page 153. William Moore, a co-defendant in the celebrated 1758 case of libel against the Pennsylvania Assembly, was a justice of the peace, not a judge, as they claim on page 199. The “most general confederacy that was ever formed by savage nations,” mentioned by Fothergill in a letter of August 19, 1763, was the famous league or Conspiracy of Pontiac (as Parkman called it), not the Iroquois Confederation, as the editors claim on page 232. The “free ports,” which Fothergill mentions in a letter of September 30, 1766, as being proposed to be granted to America, were opened to her, on the islands of Jamaica and Dominica, by the statute, 6 George III, c. 49; the proposal was not defeated, as the editors state on page 270. Thomas Wharton, whom Fothergill says he had seen in a letter of May 8, 1769, was actually Samuel Wharton who had come to London to secure royal approval for a land grant in the Ohio Valley. The editors, pages 307, 309, fail to correct Fothergill’s mistake; rather, they write an irrelevant note about Thomas Wharton’s partnership in the Pennsylvania Chronicle. A “league,” which Fothergill mentions in a letter of October 25, 1780, as being a prospective mechanism for procuring universal peace was
the Armed Neutrality, not a scheme of the Doctor's own devising, as the editors claim on page 500.

Tedious and painful though it is to dwell on these editorial shortcomings, they obtrude on the reader's consciousness because of the political character of many of the letters printed. The editors' principle of selectivity is clear enough—they wanted to show Fothergill as a promoter of Anglo-American goodwill. While there is no reason to suppose that the printing of all 400 odd Fothergill holographs would have diminished his stature as an apostle of trans-Atlantic reconciliation, they would have inevitably added greater dimensions to the man and would have diverted our attention somewhat from politics. The editors' reluctance to print, calendar, or at least list all the Fothergill letters which their years of searching turned up is the more to be regretted, because future students of the Doctor's life may have to retrace their research routes. One fervently hopes that somewhere photocopies or a catalog of all the Fothergill materials in the editors' possession has been or will be deposited and made accessible to scholars.

In summary, will be useful to historians of medicine, science, and natural history. Political historians must be wary of it and use it with great care.

Institute of Early American History and Culture

JAMES H. HUTSON

The Man Who Dared The Lightning: A New Look At Benjamin Franklin.

Thomas Fleming's "new look" at Benjamin Franklin is a highly readable and interesting study of Franklin's career as a diplomat in England and France during the Revolutionary Era. Although the volume is divided into seven books of 492 pages, two of the books account for over half of the pages, indicating the author's major interest. Franklin's second mission in England from late 1764 to early 1775 is given almost one-third of the book, and his residence in Paris from late 1776 to the summer of 1785 is almost as long. The other five books vary in length from the first book of 63 pages which covers the first 51 years of Franklin's life until he leaves for England on his first mission in 1757, to only 13 pages devoted to the final book which describes his final years in Philadelphia from the fall of 1785 until his death in April of 1790.

When Franklin arrived in London in December, 1764, he alone of all Americans possessed the reputation, the social and political contacts, and the ability to be heard on behalf of the colonies. Fleming has interwoven sound scholarship with literary skill in interpreting the major episodes of the decade of his agency. From Franklin's testimony on the Stamp Act
before Parliament to the scurrilous attack by Wedderburn in the Cockpit, the author has poignantly described Franklin's transformation from that of a proud Englishman to a dedicated patriot, committed to independence. Following the Declaration of Independence, Franklin was asked to undertake the vital diplomatic post in France. Thanks to the earlier publication of some of his writings by French friends, his reputation preceded him, and he did nothing to prevent those Frenchmen who willingly undertook to sell him to the French people. Although his problems were many and his fellow diplomats did not always make his mission one of easy cooperation, he never lost sight of his goals. He diligently worked to secure military and financial aid, an alliance, and eventually a treaty acknowledging American independence.

Probably the most significant contribution in Fleming's biography is his interpretation of the relationship between Benjamin and William Franklin. During the first mission in London, William was able to share many of his father's social and political experiences as well as his frequent travels. Although the agency business was completed in 1760, Benjamin remained until William was offered the governorship of New Jersey in 1762.

With the beginning of the controversy between the colonies and Great Britain, Fleming stresses the dilemmas that confronted the two Franklins as Royal officeholders. He vividly explains Benjamin's increasingly radical ideas and growing commitment to the colonial cause, while William's dedication to the Crown and the Royal establishment becomes apparent. When at length in 1775 Benjamin realized that war was imminent, not only was he aware of the divisions between the British government and himself, but he was also concerned about the relationship with his son since he knew that a very wide gulf of political philosophy separated them.

As he had done during Franklin's English mission, Fleming shows that while in France he was again involved with his son's activities. However, William's defection to the British side and his leadership on behalf of the Loyalists brought only bitterness and resentment to his father. After William had become president of the Associated Loyalists, he had been at least indirectly responsible for the reprisal murder of a New Jersey officer, Captain Joshua Huddy, who had been taken prisoner. Later William represented the Loyalists in London, where he petitioned Parliament for compensation. Franklin's animosity toward his son became obvious. He adamantly refused to support any Loyalist claim, and practically omitted William from any share in his estate by granting him only a claim to lands in Nova Scotia.

This well-researched and well-written biography deserves to be widely read. Errors are minimal, and not significant except for the one concerning Franklin's probable arrest on page 204. The quotation used by Fleming has been corrected by a note in this issue of the magazine.

Before 1763 the idea of American union was gaining importance, but tangible evidence of union was still meager. The colonies seemed on the threshold of doing something dramatic to handle intercolonial problems, and men like James Otis and Richard Bland were reminding Britain that Americans were seeking identity. Then the Revolution accelerated and changed the movement. In measuring the growth of the idea of union, the author primarily studied tangibles—military cooperation, plans for union, and joint British-American defensive efforts against the Indians—and devoted only one chapter to the study of the “pride and joy on being an American.” Within the narrow limits he has set Professor Ward has done a competent job of gathering evidence and evaluating it. The chapters represent summaries of his findings and are useful for lectures and reference. Though they focus on the idea of union, they add very little to current knowledge of the period and overemphasize the governmental and military aspects of American development.

Undoubtedly, the growth of population and commerce contributed to the rising sentiment for union. With a population base that was expanding each decade Americans moved deeply into the continent and challenged directly the claims of the French and Indians to the land. This pressure lead to the periodic wars that had their campaigns and heroes and involved more than one colony, but Americans were unable to fight well because they were divided by jealousies and local issues. Even in the Seven Years’ War they did not accomplish much toward union because Britain provided the leadership, most of the fighting men, and the money. While the general purposes of the war were understood and appreciated by most colonials, they also smuggled supplies to the enemy, deserted from the army, or otherwise avoided full support of it. Some progress toward union was made, nonetheless, and that story of emerging union in such aspects as military logistics, finance, and manpower is well sketched.

In general, the author argues that these many wars against French Canada and the Indians expanded contacts among colonials. They encouraged groups of merchants from several or more colonies to join in providing supplies, currency, and shipping, and merchants in turn handled personal matters like apprenticing their associates’ sons, arranging marriage alliances, and providing market information, which often included private buying of luxuries. This kind of large-scale activity of an intercolonial nature the author appreciates, but his treatment of the material is incomplete or sketchy.

As one reflects on colonial union, the role of Britain becomes increasingly important. In spite of British fears of colonial independence, Britain schooled the colonies in eighteenth-century philosophy and let them
imitate her social and political institutions. British whig ideals certainly formed the basis of political thought and behavior in all the colonies. The regard for the legislature and other representative institutions, respect for property and a bill of rights, and a feeling for law and legal documents are derived in large measure from Britain's successful revolutions of the seventeenth century. The refining of these political and social values was carried on by the correspondence of church, merchant, and educational groups. They created a literature besides a set of values; they cultivated and popularized social mores; and they developed an imperial system that brought the colonies into various patterns of cooperation. These kinds of ties probably laid the foundation for the later revolutionary associations. The author omits consideration of these aspects of emerging union and misses, therefore, the important research of F. J. Klingberg, Carl Bridenbaugh (Mitre and Sceptre), and Caroline Robbins.

Probably the most valuable contribution of the book is its forty-five-page bibliography, that will take researchers to most current literature, and its unusually heavy documentation for the chapters.

University of Southern California

JOHN A. SCHUTZ


Although the title of Donald Robinson's book aptly signals its contents—an examination of the effect of chattel slavery upon the issues and alignments of early American politics—one somehow hopes for more than one finds: perhaps, in the manner of Gordon Wood's _Creation of the American Republic_ (Chapel Hill, 1969), a greater sense of the ideological predispositions and passions which divided men, or perhaps, after Winthrop Jordan's _White Over Black_ (Chapel Hill, 1968), a greater boldness in exploring new terrain, such in this case as the effect of slavery upon the rise, structure, and operations of parties. As it is, Robinson shares with both these authors a failure to provide thematic highlights and to be done with a matter and on to the next. Moreover, one finds much here—say, on the sectional tensions under Jefferson and Madison and on the Missouri Compromise—which has often been set down elsewhere. But, just the same, Robinson has a good instinct for the important problems and has taken up and treated them thoroughly and in unusually graceful and fluent prose.

This is basically a descriptive study of the public debates over slavery from the American Revolution through the resolution of the Missouri affair. Although Robinson has used all the appropriate published sources, he relies chiefly on the published records of the Continental and Confed-
eration Congresses, the Constitutional Convention of 1787, and the national Congress, supplemented by related correspondence. The result is as exhaustive an analysis of public debates and recorded votes over slavery as one can find. The way Robinson deals with them, it is as if one has encountered all the problems before but never in such detail nor with greater clarity and precision. His findings and judgments, if not surprising, are unfailingly judicious.

Robinson joins a number of scholars who have begun to analyze slavery and antislavery sentiment before the outbreak of the great abolitionist and pro-slavery crusades of antebellum America. What he is able to demonstrate more cogently than anyone before him is that the slavery issue was intimately bound up with every major national issue and event of the early republic and, more significantly, that the public figures of the time, rather than skirting the issue as many have argued, instead faced it squarely. What they found was an institution which defied eradication except at the loss of benefits—such as union, international comity, and social tranquility—which they were not surprisingly unwilling to forego. Their decisions regarding slavery, often taken bitterly, were at least taken with a reasonably full consciousness of their implications and with the sense that slavery was neither going to disappear on its own nor be banished or governed without resort to civil war.

How these decisions were taken is the burden of the book and its major contribution to historical understanding. Robinson’s should now be the standard study on such matters as the effect of the “peculiar institution” in fashioning the Constitution’s clauses on representation and federal power and in affecting attempts to amend the Articles of Confederation, to provide territorial government for the Northwest, and to forge a durable union of the states. His greatest contribution comes in two case studies, examinations of the role of slavery considerations in the negotiations and ratification of the Jay Treaty and in defining policy toward the black revolution in Santa Domingo. Indeed, with this study there can be no more ignoring the effect of slavery on foreign as well as domestic policy during the first decades of the nation. Robinson’s study should now force us to an overdue re-examination of the domestic sources of our early foreign relations.

Princeton University

James M. Banner, Jr.


Eudora Welty began her recent review of Arthur Mizner’s The Saddest Story: A Biography of Ford Madox Ford by observing that “What a reader
hopes to see in a biography is the work of the intelligent scholar who also feels an affinity for his subject' (New York Times Book Review of May 2, 1971). Father Hanley’s study of Charles Carroll’s career from his birth in 1737 to the eve of the Revolution in 1773, whatever its other shortcomings, certainly meets Miss Welty’s prime requirement. The author, who is the Editor of the John Carroll Papers project which is sponsored by the American Catholic Historical Association, clearly was highly qualified to undertake this task, and he has accomplished it with intelligence, imagination, and vigor. Aside from a few typographical errors such as Michael G. Kamerer for Kamen (p. 262), a tendency to employ “must have”, “may have,” and “should have” when speculating about the undocumented aspects of Carroll’s life, and occasional lapses into an enthusiastic but rather archaic style, Father Hanley has produced an interesting and generally well-written book.

The major thrust of this study is to explain how this highly educated Maryland Catholic aristocrat emerged as a popular Revolutionary leader by 1774. Hanley believes that Carroll’s unusual exposure to humanistic Christian thought of the European Enlightenment, his study and practice of Anglo-American law, and the natural position and responsibilities of his class produced in the future Signer an intellectual and moral dedication to revolutionary-reformist politics on one hand and to a gentil life-style with its particular balance and social responsibility on the other. This dualism of his early life was one of continual interaction, and it led him from contemplation to action when the great crisis commenced. All this is fascinating, especially so when read together with Professor Bernard Bailyn’s essay, “Religion and Revolution: Three Bibliographical Studies,” Perspectives in American History, 4 (1970), pp. 85-169. Bailyn studies the intellectual foundations of three New England Protestant ministers: Andrew Eliot, Jonathan Mayhew, and heretofore unknown Stephen Johnson, and he shows how their theoretical political radicalism, often clothed in theological garb, was or was not transformed into revolutionary action. These two works when taken together appear to this reviewer to substantiate Bailyn’s claim that “religion was no singular entity in eighteenth-century American culture and it had no singular influence on the Revolutionary movement,” and that “The effective determinants of the revolution were political . . .” (p. 85). The modes of discourse may well have been “religious” and derived from Protestant Christianity in early American culture, but the political radicalism of Carroll, Eliot, Mayhew and Johnson was secular in nature, a mixture of colonial experience and Anglo-Continental theory.

Father Hanley develops some highly interesting lines of analysis. Of particular merit is his concept of Maryland Catholic counter-revolutionary society. He means by this term a society that aimed at reversing the loss of liberties Catholics suffered as a result of the Glorious Revolution of 1688. Hanley implies that Carroll felt that the British Crown and Parliament had been parties then to this destruction of charter and colonial legislative
liberties, and that they must be halted from doing the same thing on a larger scale in 1774. Thus Carroll, a religious “Conservative,” could be a political “Radical.” This reviewer wishes that the author had carried this concept of a counter-revolutionary society on to more soundly documented ground. It has a great deal of merit, but Father Hanley merely states it as an historical truth and then put it to work supporting his general argument. The author happily points out the reverse side of the coin in demonstrating that Maryland’s Catholic aristocrats were nevertheless an important part of the general aristocracy, and cannot be labeled alienated “backwoods gentry” who withdrew from public life. Father Hanley also touches on the fact that Maryland Catholic students at St. Omer and other European academies and universities always felt themselves to be a part of their provincial ruling class. This attitude and sense of security appears to have set them apart from their English and Scottish classmates. A comparative study of the social and political attitudes of these groups in the eighteenth century might well tell us a great deal about the texture of the Anglo-American world of the time.

Despite the fact that both editions are overpriced, this is a useful book, and Father Hanley is to be praised for his labor.

The Catholic University of America

Edward C. Carter II


In this recent addition to Stein and Day’s Great Battles of the Modern World series, Mr. Furneaux undertook to write a readable, up-to-date account of the “Turning Point of the Revolution” that incorporates the results of recent scholarship. To this end, he has used valuable collections of official and private papers and a number of published diaries and journals, and his narrative includes extensive quotations from the sources. While this technique presents much useful information, the author sometimes uses it in a manner that makes the quotations unnecessarily intrusive, producing a disjointed story. At the same time, he was not sufficiently critical of his sources. Some that purported to be contemporary, like Anburey’s Travels Through Interior Parts of America and Digby’s The British Invasion of North America, were written some time after the campaign and include accretions that compromise their integrity as contemporary documents. The value of some of the published materials has suffered from the quality of the editing, differing in some instances in important details from their originals. No use was made of unpublished diaries, including the important Forbes Collection of New England Diaries in the Massachusetts Historical Society; the German Manuscripts at Harvard, Morristown National Historical Park, and in the Bancroft Collection, New York
Public Library; and the numerous manuscripts in the Library of Congress. These would have been especially helpful in developing a picture of the daily events of the campaign.

The most valuable part of the book is the portion dealing with the complicated story of the development of the British plans for 1777, in which the author corrected some popular misconceptions about the roles of Lord George Germain, Secretary of State for the American Colonies, and General Sir William Howe, commanding general in the colonies. The documentary basis for the plans were Howe's letters to Germain defining his objectives, especially those of November 30 and December 20, 1776, and April 2, 1777, and Burgoyne's "Thoughts for Conducting the War from the Side of Canada." Stated in their simplest form, the plans provided for Howe's capturing Philadelphia and Burgoyne's taking an army to Albany and to "cooperate" with Howe. The best answer to the question of what form that cooperation would take is found in Burgoyne's proposal that after taking Ticonderoga he would adapt his course to "the general plan of the campaign concerted at home" and that he would "effect a Junction with General Howe, or after cooperating so far as to get possession of Albany and open up the communication with New York, to remain upon Hudson's River and thereby enable that General to act with his whole force to the Southward."

Germain approved Howe's Philadelphia campaign with the hope that "it will be executed in time for you to cooperate with the army ordered to proceed from Canada and put itself under your command." The plans suffered from the lack of a unifying concept. They were developed independently by men out of contact with one another who focused almost exclusively on their own undertakings, and the government in London failed to impose the necessary unity, to define the terms "cooperation" and "communication," to assign priorities, and to integrate the energies of the two armies.

Given the confusion that prevailed in 1777, the reduction of the complexities of the planning to an understandable narrative is not an easy task. Mr. Furneaux relied upon selected portions of the correspondence to carry his story, but he did not succeed in assimilating the details into a satisfactory interpretation.

In the narrative of the campaign, the author tries to be fair in dealing with the complex personalities of Philip Schuyler, Horatio Gates, and Benedict Arnold; and in its broad outlines, his account is adequate. However, it is marred by a number of errors. One of these is the use of the term "Sir John Burgoyne." The general was never knighted. A second is the assertion on page 13 that Burgoyne provided an answer to the "quandary" in which Germain had been placed by Howe's change in plans. The minister was not in any quandary because he saw no inconsistency in the plans that would place him in one. A third deals with Ethan Allen's part in the invasion of Canada in 1776; and there are errors in the brief account of that invasion,
which was not led, as is recorded on page 20, by Allen and Arnold, but by Montgomery and Arnold.

A serious misinterpretation appears on page 15, where the author contrasts American and European tactics. Both armies employed linear, close-order formations and volley firing, which were the only tactics that permitted effective use of the smooth-bore musket as a military weapon. Individual sharpshooting was usually limited to riflemen, a small minority in both armies. This error influenced his interpretation of the details of the battles of September 19 and October 7 and was compounded on pages 189–190, where he wrote: "On September 19, 1977, medieval and modern methods of warfare had clashed for the first time."

Closely associated with the misinterpretation of the marksmanship is the author's persistent failure to distinguish between the services of the Continentals and the militia in the American army. While a majority of Gates' men were militia, most of the fighting was done by veteran Continentals, many of them with two or three years of hard service to their credit.

Other errors include the account of the rotation of command of the Northern Department between Schuyler and Gates on pages 55–56; the fatal wounding of Brigadier General Simon Fraser; Arnold's movements on October 7; and at the close of the book where he perpetuates the discredited Conway Cabal story.

National Park Service

John F. Luzader


Hugh F. Rankin, professor of history at Tulane University, has long had an avid interest in the American Revolution—an interest which manifested itself in two earlier books on the subject, The American Revolution and (with George F. Sheer) Rebels and Redcoats. And now comes a third book in this field—The North Carolina Continentals. In the opinion of this reviewer, the title itself is a misnomer, because the book treats, in meticulous detail, the performance of the much maligned North Carolina militia as well as that of the Continentals. At times, moreover, the reader is left confused as to whether he is describing the one or the other. But then there was a great deal of confusion when Continental officers were placed in charge of raw militia and when raw militia (notably the Guilford Run-aways) were drafted into the Continental Line.

Overall, here is a thoroughly researched, well-documented, and well-written study of North Carolina's troops in the Revolution. Thorough treatment is given to the events leading up to the war in the colony and to all the battles and skirmishes in which North Carolina Continentals engaged outside the state—notably Brandywine, Germantown, Charleston,
Savannah, Camden, Ninety-Six, and Eutaw Springs—along with a graphic and moving description of “that” winter at Valley Forge, 1777–1778. Most interesting of all to this native Tar Heel were his accounts of the Battle of Moore’s Creek Bridge (erroneously dated April 12, instead of February 27, 1776, on the dust jacket) and the Battle of Guilford Court House (once referred to in the text as Courthouse).

The chief criticism this reader has is that the author does not give the decisive Battle of Guilford Court House its proper recognition. His appraisal simply reads: “So ended the battle of Guilford Court House, an engagement that had lasted but an hour and a half, but whose results were to be felt at Yorktown” (p. 308). Instead, he concluded that the importance of Greene’s campaign in the Carolinas lay not in its great battles but in the results of its many skirmishes and small engagements (p. 318).

Despite this, this book will long be the standard study of the troop movements, terrain, logistics, and the strategy and tactics employed by the commanding officers of the North Carolina troops. Pen portraits of almost all of the significant personalities in the Continental Army flesh out the meticulously detailed story. Finally, the author reaches a well-taken conclusion: “When reviewed in the light of the conditions existing in North Carolina at the time of the American Revolution . . . its people did their best under the circumstances and experienced, in the words of one James Campbell, when he later applied for a pension, ‘a series of toils and dangers.’”

It is to be hoped that this scholarly treatment of the North Carolina Continentals (and militia) will inspire such treatments in other states. It is unfortunate, though, that there were no maps to aid the reader in following some of the more detailed tactics of battle and that certain errors were not caught: “lead” for led, “hung” for hanged, “none were” and a rather disturbing number of comma errors.

University of North Carolina, Greensboro

Blackwell P. Robinson


Henry Benbridge, born at Philadelphia, was a portrait painter of the second half of the eighteenth century. He practiced his art at Philadelphia from 1758 to 1764; studied in Italy 1765–1768; was commissioned by James Boswell to paint a full-length likeness of Boswell’s early hero, Pascal Paoli, which he exhibited in London at the Free Society of Artists in 1769; returned to Philadelphia in 1770 and was elected a member of the American Philosophical Society. He married a miniature painter, Esther (Hetty)
Sage; and, leaving Philadelphia, became the chief portrait painter of Charleston, South Carolina, from 1772 until about 1790, when his health seems to have failed and he stopped painting.

Anna Wells Rutledge published an admirable study of this artist, in 1948, in a short-lived periodical, *The American Collector*. Otherwise Benbridge has been strangely neglected. The National Portrait Gallery has now devoted an exhibition to him and issued a handsome catalogue. The text is a compendium of the information known about the artist's life; the illustrations reproduce all known works of art attributed to Benbridge, whether or not included in the exhibition. Mr. Stewart has also made an attempt to separate the large number of miniatures in the Benbridge ambience into two groups on grounds of style. One group he attributes to Mrs. Benbridge; the other larger number to her husband. Benbridge was a miniature painter of remarkable power and variety, worthy of careful study, and these groups seem at least plausible.

On the other hand, the catalogue must be used with extreme caution. Mr. Stewart has accepted without comment (except in one or two instances) all the attributions to Benbridge that have accumulated in half a century of guessing. The result is not to clarify Benbridge's work but to demonstrate how much sifting needs to be done and how many problems must still be solved, before we can feel reasonably sure of what Benbridge's achievement was. I offer the following comments upon pictures exhibited (not touching on those only illustrated in the catalogue) to point out some of the problems involved.

No. 5 A miniature dated 1777, shown as a *Self-portrait*, is entirely undocumented. It does not suggest either a self-portrait or the work of Benbridge.

No. 6 *Self-portrait*. This picture, which has remained in possession of the artist's descendants, is here dated circa 1793 on the evidence of the style of hairdressing. In my opinion, this is 25 years too late. The picture shows an obvious attempt to master Reynolds' monumental manner and would seem to be the *Self-portrait* painted in London, mentioned in a letter of January 23, 1770, as intended by the artist as a gift to his mother.

Nos. 11, 39, 72. I consider the work of an entirely different artist, as yet unidentified, but active in Jamaica and Savannah, Georgia, in the late 1760's.

Nos. 15, 16 The subjects of these portraits, Mr. and Mrs. John Deas, were traveling in Scotland, England, and France from 1769 to 1771. I believe these portraits are French, painted by a painter in the manner of Ducreux, during the Deas' visit to France.

No. 21 Perhaps an old copy after a lost Benbridge but hardly by the artist himself.

No. 46 Very probably not an American picture.

No. 56 This canvas, from the Thomas B. Clarke collection, has beautifully clear signature and date, *H. Benbridge 1771*, and was once called a
portrait of Oliver DeLancey of New York. No other signature of the kind exists in Benbridge's work and the picture itself seems to belong in the neighborhood of Allan Ramsay.

No. 60 By an unknown artist.
No. 67 By an unknown artist, perhaps Italian.
Nos. 74, 75 Perhaps by Philip Wickstead, a pupil of Zoffany, who was active in England and Jamaica.
Nos. 79, 92, 94, 147 do not appear to relate to the miniature style of either Benbridge, nor indeed to American miniature painting. I should judge them to be British.

These are some of the unsolved problems the exhibition presents. American portrait painting is a difficult field, full of confusion and misinformation, and greatly in need of clarification. It is to be hoped that the National Portrait Gallery will in future bring to it a more rigorous standard of documentation and connoisseurship.

Philadelphia

E. P. Richardson


Federalist and Republican politics during the 1790's have been a popular subject in the world of academic scholarship for the past decade or more. Peter P. Hill's study, presumably a revised and expanded Ph.D. thesis, draws upon the many recent publications and explores in considerable detail the career of "one of America's lesser known statemen," "a national figure of the second rank," whose name, according to the author, is "a familiar footnote to scholars of the Federalist era." William Vans Murray (1760-1803) was a native of Cambridge on the Maryland Eastern Shore. His middle name, "Vans," was a Scots family name and not the Dutch particle "Van," as he himself had occasion to point out when he was minister in the Netherlands. Shortly after the American Revolution, following a pre-war southern tradition, Murray went to London to study law at the Temple. While there he made the acquaintance of John Adams, to whom he dedicated a volume of *Political Sketches* (London, 1787), and of the American minister's son, John Quincy Adams. The younger Adams remained a lifelong friend; Murray's letters to him, published by Worthington C. Ford in the American Historical Association Report of 1912, are one of the essential sources for the present study. Murray was a Maryland representative in the United States Congress from 1791 to 1797, and thus a participant in the great foreign policy debates touched off by the events of the French Revolution. He was a strong supporter of Jay's treaty and
campaigned for Adams in the 1796 elections. Although his appointment as United States minister to the Netherlands was made by Washington, the outgoing president, Murray's diplomatic career coincided with the administration of John Adams. He was in all senses of the term an "Adams man." Talleyrand astutely said of him that he was "neither French nor English; he is ingenuously an American."

Murray reached The Hague in June, 1797, replacing John Quincy Adams who moved along to Berlin as minister to Prussia. At this time the "Batavian Republic" was little more than a French satellite—a fact which reinforced Murray's mistrust of France's policy toward the United States. From his listening post in The Hague he observed the arrival and departure of the American commissioners sent to Paris (C.C. Pinckney, Marshall, and Gerry), although he did not learn until later all the details of the "X. Y. Z. Affair." Following this unsuccessful attempt to patch up Franco-American relations, Murray became the channel for further French overtures, via Pichon, the French representative at The Hague. Clinging obstinately and patiently to the statement made by President Adams when publishing the X.Y.Z. correspondence—that he would send no emissary to France unless assured that he would be "received as the representative of a great, free, powerful, and independent nation"—Murray eventually obtained such assurances and was himself in turn appointed (with Oliver Ellsworth and William R. Davie) a member of the new mission to France. After long drawn out discussions with their French opposite numbers (Joseph Bonaparte, Fleurieu, and Roederer), the Americans signed the Franco-American Convention on September 30, 1800, thus bringing the period of the quasi-war to an end. Because of delays in the Senate's ratification, Murray alone carried on another round of negotiations in the summer of 1801.

The outlines of this intricate diplomatic fencing match are well known. Hill re-examines it, play-by-play, day-by-day, and thus amply confirms Murray's share in "the shaping of peace with France." The viewpoint is inevitably Murray's (and Adams'); the Jeffersonian dissenters get short shrift and little sympathy. Hill is more successful in relating the negotiations to domestic politics in America than he is in assessing events and personalities in France. The Convention of 1800 was achieved largely by postponing the two most troublesome issues, the renewal of the old treaties and the question of indemnities for French "spoliation" of American commerce. Nevertheless, it did produce a détente in relations between the two countries and create a more favorable climate for future negotiations. Unfortunately, Hill (or his publisher) has not included the text of the Convention in the book—an omission that makes it difficult for the reader to follow the references to the various "articles" under discussion. The signature of the Convention was celebrated by an elaborate fête at Mortefontaine, Joseph Bonaparte's country estate north of Paris, a characteristic bit of Napoleonic pageantry recorded in an attractive engraving by
J. Barbieri and Francesco Piranesi. Hill seems to have missed this engraving, as well as the medal struck to commemorate the Convention. These pictorial documents (which are not without their significance for diplomatic history) might have added interest to an otherwise rather colorless treatise. It may also be noted that the portrait of Murray used as a frontispiece and on the jacket is only a redrawing from an unidentified source. In his “notes on sources” Hill states that he has selected the letters and diaries that seemed best to illustrate Murray’s “place in history,” but admits not having done justice to “the rich, profuse and incisive strokes with which Murray painted the persons and events of his era.” If, as Hill tells us, Murray “had a keen eye for nuance” and wrote “reflectively and usually with candor,” it seems too bad that more such material was not included. Murray’s “place in history” would not thereby have been diminished, and the book would have had a wider general appeal. As it stands, it remains a solid monograph which will be read chiefly by other specialized historians of the Federalist era.

Brattleboro, Vt.

Howard C. Rice, Jr.


Dr. Ellis’ _The Jeffersonian Crisis_ is a disturbing work. Never has this reviewer so much wanted to praise and never has he been so constrained to damn. From Preface to Index _The Jeffersonian Crisis_ is replete with sterling qualities. It is a sometimes searching narrative of an exciting time in our history. It is filled with historical incident and information. It is enthusiastically engaged in one of the more lively and pertinent historical controversies of our day. Its research is careful and resourceful. Its footnotes are honest and helpful. Its style is straightforward. And its revelatory list of credits, “obligations,” as the author says, is candid, beguiling, altogether endearing. What, then, is the matter? Perhaps the study suffers from its assertions. It is positive where it should be tentative; it should hypothesize where it concludes. To this reviewer at least, Dr. Ellis’ generalizing appears to be excessive, intrusive, and, for the most part, wrong. Dr. Ellis’ burden of declarations would weigh heavily upon almost any work. It shatters his unconfined and crowded volume. From Jefferson and Marshall and the Supreme Court, to judicial reform in Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, to the “meaning of law and society in Jeffersonian America,” and, finally, gratuitously, to Jacksonian ideology, Dr. Ellis makes the mightiest determinations from the merest evidence.

The three distinct essays that comprise _The Jeffersonian Crisis_ are interesting, detailed, even salient accounts. But this is all. And this is not
enough. Dr. Ellis' major thesis and his host of claims have no visible support either in exhaustive investigation, relentless examination, particular and exhaustive knowledge, and seasoned reflection, or in shrewd observations and illuminating perceptions succinctly put. Moreover, the volume's tripartite division, "Politics and the Judiciary under Jefferson," "The Struggle over Judicial Reform in the States," and "Toward a Redefinition of Jeffersonian Democracy," seems fixed. The essentially separate, disparate parts simply do not assemble to argue cohesively with Dr. Ellis that his book, a "revisionist study," mediates, if it does not altogether lay to rest, the differences between our "Progressive" and "concensus" historians; that the Jeffersonian crisis was primarily a Contest between "moderates and extremists" in both the Federalist and Republican parties, with the "moderates," fortunately, triumphant; and that his foray into the world of eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century courts, lawyers, and judges does in fact qualify him to lead the way in redefining Jeffersonian and Jacksonian democracy.

Dr. Ellis' lengthy and intricate treatment of politics and the judiciary under Jefferson tends to attenuate our understanding of the complexities with which he deals. This regrettable consequence follows upon Dr. Ellis' failure to grapple with fundamentals. From first to last, it seems to this reviewer, Dr. Ellis addresses himself to inconsequential rather than to, as is his boast, "complicated and subtle political considerations." To a mass of assumptions, largely untroubled by demonstration, Dr. Ellis attaches an uncritical profusion of quotes. He lets a multitude of eminent and obscure High and Low Federalists, Old and New Republicans, and urban and agrarian "radicals" tell his story. Out of their mouths, however, he does not create a solid sense of the significance of the times, the men, and the issues. Neither does he establish a basis for his interpretation of the period. Ultimately, Dr. Ellis' interpretation gives way over the problem of definition. He employs one startlingly simple measure only: In the crucial domestic combat of Jefferson's administrations whatever prevailed was "moderate," whatever was lost was "radical." And what a pity it is that Dr. Ellis vitiates his orderly, useful, and original exposition of the embattled development of the state courts of Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts by his effort to fit this history into his strained interpretation of the meaning of the Jeffersonian ascendancy. What a pity, too, that he assays so ambitious a summary in the third and final section of his book. He endeavors nothing less than a synthesis, infused with his own contribution, of the vast and diversified recent scholarship in our early national period. Not surprisingly, Dr. Ellis falls short of the vaulting aim. He does not, however, relinquish his legitimacy to the aspiration. Very possibly its achievement awaits him in the future.

Oregon State University

Thomas R. Meehan

David Donald and others have proposed that abolitionism was the result of psychological problems created by loss of status or some other event and that enlistment in the abolition cause was often merely a way of expressing aggressive tendencies. This new study, The New York Abolitionists, is an attempt to discredit that idea. Because of its rather narrow focus on one aspect of the question, the book is more specialized than its title implies.

In an opening chapter Professor Sorin identifies his task and discusses the methods he used to reach his conclusions. In the succeeding chapters he provides short biographical sketches of top and high-ranking New York abolitionist leaders, confining his data to the period from 1838 to 1845. The sketches are too brief to be of much use and they tend to emphasize the point the author is trying to make about his subjects. Virtually all the abolitionist leaders included were exceptionally moral and religious persons. They reacted passionately to injustice, and as they in turn met hostility in response they became more deeply involved in the cause. While all of this may well be true, much of the evidence for it consists of statements made by the participants themselves or their followers. The material presented does indeed provide a picture of highly-motivated “normal” individuals whose involvement in the abolition crusade is understandable as a response to obvious injustice. The deeper, psychological forces at work cannot be dealt with one way or the other in such short sketches based on highly fragmentary evidence.

It may be that the emphasis on maladjusted, disturbed individuals whose work in the reform movement was basically an attempt to work out their own frustrations needs the kind of corrective this study provides. However, even if it could be proved that many of the abolitionists were indeed disturbed individuals, it would in no way lessen the importance of their work. It is the kind of argument impossible to settle, for by definition the abolitionists were out of step with their time. On the other hand, by today's standards the majority of Americans who were not in the abolition movement were out of step with a morality in any way compatible with a democratic society.

In the process of clearing the abolitionists of the charge of being disturbed individuals, Professor Sorin arrived at still other conclusions. He found that most of the New York leaders were from urban areas and that they were, for their time, highly educated and deeply and actively religious. He also concluded that most of them were concerned about civil rights for black people as well as for emancipating the slaves. The evidence for this is not as impressive as for his other conclusions.

For his study Professor Sorin drew material from numerous manuscript collections, newspapers and printed works. He also studied theories of social
and political psychology. A concluding chapter on moral suasion and political abolitionism presents some very provocative views. It is, as the author indicates, "An Impressionistic Afterword." Had the whole book dealt with such questions as are raised in this chapter, the final result might have been a more useful contribution to the literature of the abolition movement.

_Wilmington College_  
Larry Gara


The political impact of the slavery issue in the 1840's has recently been investigated by Charles Sellers, Joel H. Silbey, Thomas Alexander, Kinley J. Brauer, Chaplain Morrison, Jr., and Eric Foner, among others. Joseph G. Rayback now joins this list with his new book, the most detailed study of the election of 1848 yet published.

Rayback considers the introduction of the slave-extension issue with the Wilmot Proviso the central event in the campaign. It transformed a traditional and issueless scramble for nominations into a public race where the potential nominee's position on free soil was all important. Free soil provided a rallying cry for dissident elements in the North, like New York's Barnburners and their allies and Massachusetts' Conscience Whigs, and thus exacerbated party factionalism. At the same time it gave Liberty Party men like Salmon Chase a long-awaited opportunity to dissolve that party and build a broader antislavery coalition. Northern support of the Proviso provoked Calhoun's attempt to persuade southerners to abandon both major parties and unite in an independent Southern Rights Party. Faced with possible defections in both sections, traditional party leaders sought to hold voters with compromise formulas or other tactics. Among Democrats, Lewis Cass's popular sovereignty idea increased his strength in both the northwest and southwest and contributed to his winning the Democratic nomination. Southern Whigs, Rayback points out, took the lead in their party. Fearing northern attacks and recognizing that southern anger over the willingness of northern Whigs to support the Proviso could destroy their political base at home, Whigs like Alexander Stephens and John M. Berrien introduced the "no territory" resolution by which Congress would prohibit any territorial acquisition from Mexico. More important, to protect their local position, southern Whigs began to boom Zachary Taylor for the Whig nomination. Military fame and the possession of slaves made Taylor irresistible in the South and prevented Whig losses to the Calhoun movement. Solid southern support, Rayback makes clear, was the major factor in Taylor's winning the Whig nomination.

The major parties' nominations and their refusal to endorse the Proviso sparked antislavery revolt and the formation of the Free Soil Party.
Rayback finds that diverse coalition of Barnburners, Conscience Whigs, Liberty men, embittered Clay Whigs, advocates of rivers and harbors improvements, and Land Reformers united by a common moral concern for "the advancement of the democratic ideal. Full recognition of human rights and dignities and the betterment of the welfare of the common man were their goals" (p. 223).

While Rayback asserts that free soil was the central issue of the campaign, forcing both major parties to run two-faced races, he admits that party loyalty was the major determinant of voting behavior. Van Buren captured only 10 per cent of the popular vote, 14 per cent in the free states. Except for Ohio, where Whigs contributed two-thirds of the Free Soil vote, the Free Soilers recruited most of their support from the Democrats, and even Liberty men formed a larger proportion of their strength than Whigs. Despite this evidence of party loyalty, Rayback insists that the election was significant precisely because it showed both parties dividing over the slavery issue. Both lost antislavery voters in the North whom they could not appease in the future without alienating their southern wings, which had also suffered defections.

Rayback has amassed and cogently presented a wealth of information on politics after 1844, including valuable new material on the formation of the Free Soil Party. His analysis of party vote totals, moreover, is suggestive. In several respects, however, the study is disappointing. Rayback’s approach is narrative, his methodology traditional. Some of his conclusions are debatable in the light of recent scholarship. It is uncertain whether he is unpersuaded by or unaware of the work of Berwanger, Morrison, and Foner (he does not cite them in his bibliography), but nowhere does he make clear the racism of many free soilers. One wonders as well if moral concern for human rights motivated those Barnburners who hurried back to the Democratic Party after 1848 and later tacitly endorsed the Fugitive Slave Act. Most distressing, Rayback makes no attempt to identify Free Soil voting support, other than in terms of former affiliation and geographic location. One wants to know what kinds of men joined the new party and what distinguished them from those who did not. For example, Free Soilers explicitly appealed to white workingmen, but the reader never finds out how they voted. In sum, much intensive quantitative work remains to be done before we fully understand the election of 1848.

Yale University  
Michael F. Holt


This study, completed in 1955 as a doctoral dissertation, attempts to document and assess the role of the Greenback-Labor Party in the Common-
wealth's history. In an introductory chapter the author briefly summarizes currency problems from the colonial period through the Civil War. He then sets his stage by characterizing Pennsylvania politics, labor, and agriculture during the Reconstruction era, but in the opinion of this reviewer, he tends to exaggerate the extent of corruption and the neglect by political leaders of basic economic issues, including the money question, during this period. Studies published during the past two decades would significantly alter the characterization presented herein. The author then sketches the emergence of the Greenback movement from Pendleton's Ohio Idea and Edward Kellogg's interconvertibility scheme through the creation and role of the National Independent Party in the 1876 elections. He briefly notes the role of the Panic of 1873 and the depression that followed in creating labor and farmer interest in and demand for currency inflation, but he is forced to conclude that "Pennsylvania played only a small role in the Greenback movement of 1876" (p. 29).

The continuing depression, coupled with rejection by the Democratic Party of a Greenback plank in its 1877 platform, helped to revitalize the movement, and in the 1877 elections a coalition of Greenback supporters and labor reformers produced nearly 53,000 votes in the state. Pennsylvania, with about 28 per cent of the total national Greenback vote in the country, had emerged as the leading vote-gathering state for the Greenback Party. The author then devotes separate chapters to the 1878 conventions, campaign, and elections, and, ignoring the fact that in the major contest, the gubernatorial election, the Greenback-Labor candidate polled but 11.6 per cent of the total vote, he interprets the results as a "most threatening challenge" to the leadership of the older parties in the state. To claim for the Greenback-Labor Party any credit for the re-election to Congress of Sam Randall, Hendrick B. Wright, and "Pig-Iron" Kelley, and for the defeat of Andrew G. Curtin, is to misrepresent grossly the political situation in the Commonwealth.

Professor Ricker then traces the decline of Greenbackism in Pennsylvania beginning in 1879, a decline which he attributes to the combination of increased business prosperity, conflicts between labor leaders over political action, and the loss of interest by other leaders (most of them actually either Democrats or Republicans pursuing their own personal goals). The 1880 elections revealed that the party had become largely a western agricultural movement, and although the name continued to be used in the state, the party lost those primarily interested in currency and political reform and retained the support of only a small group of politically-oriented labor reformers. The anti-Cameron revolt that produced an Independent Republican Party in 1882 and helped in the election of a Democratic governor further contributed to the decline of the party, and by 1887, when its remnants were absorbed by the Union Labor Movement and the Union Labor Party, the Greenback-Labor Party had lost its identity in Pennsylvania. In a final chapter entitled "Conclusion," Professor Ricker
summarizes his findings and asserts that “whatever the verdict of history concerning the place of the Greenback-Labor Party in American political and economic development, Pennsylvania must bear a good share of the responsibility for the character of this phenomenon of American politics” (p. 127).

It is difficult to quarrel with the assertion in the Foreword by Dr. S. K. Stevens, Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, that although dissertations such as this one are available on microfilm, it has never been his experience that they receive very wide attention and use in this form. This dissertation has therefore been published, in its original form, with the assistance of a grant-in-aid from the Commission. One wishes that the author had used the opportunity for publication to revise thoroughly and update the study, using both personal papers and other published studies that have become available since its original submission. Even an additional chapter evaluating sources and studies since 1955 and their impact on his findings would have been highly useful. As a minimum, the publication should have been provided with an index.

Its being reviewed five years after its publication date is accounted for by the fact that review copies have only recently been distributed.

National Archives

Frank B. Evans


The American South is a good, well-balanced survey of southern history from colonial origins to the present day. Especially well suited for college courses, its chapters are divided into short sections, with appropriate captions, and it is supplied with colored maps, well-chosen bibliographies at the conclusion of each chapter, no footnotes, and a list of available paperbacks. Professor Billington rejects the idea of a central theme, noting how Phillips’ famous “central theme” is outdated today. If there be a central theme, one can infer it is that southern society in the past, as today, has been concerned with making money. Subordinate themes, one can also infer, were in the colonial period the rise of a home-grown aristocracy, based on slavery and the exploitation of land, in the middle period 1815–1860, the growth of sectionalism, and since the Civil War the urbanization and secularization of southern life. The author takes his stand that little “southernism” existed before 1815, but that it developed as a result of the slavery controversy and of a feeling of being exploited by northern economic interests. The chapters on the colonial period are very sketchy and the chapter on the military history of the Civil War is the least satisfactory in the book.
The American South focuses on the very modern period. It follows, with moderation, the revisionist interpretation of Reconstruction and the Woodward interpretation of the Bourbons, both of which, it seems to me, need revision today. It embodies the modern conception of history by devoting more attention to social, economic, and cultural subjects than it does to political history. One admirable quality of the book is that it asks direct and pertinent questions that older historians neglected and tries to answer them in the light of recent studies. The chapter on "Demagogues and Progressives" contains the modern, rather favorable interpretation of the southern demagogues. Especially to be commended are the discussions of the rise of the recent civil rights movement and of the South's awakened sense of the threat of industry to its ecology. This book causes one to reflect on the long, unhappy history of the South since the Civil War, caused largely by its obsession with race, thus contributing to the rise of the Solid South, the diminution of local democracy, and the preservation of a very conservative religion. The struggle of liberals to rid the South of illiteracy, the crime of lynching, the exploitation of the labor of children and women, freight rate discrimination, and economic colonialism, makes a melancholy story. At the base of much of this story lies the poverty of the masses, black and white, in comparison with the industrialized North. But all of these evils seem to be receding into the past and the future for the South looks bright.

University of Kentucky

Clement Eaton


Historians, it has often been said, should not set up hypotheses, and then set out to prove them. Yet in fact, to one degree or another, most historians probably do just that, whether they admit it or not. In Grand Old Party, Political Structure in the Gilded Age, 1880–1896, Robert D. Marcus admits what he was looking for, and confesses his failure to find it. Because American life in the post-Civil War era was so increasingly dominated by "organizations national in scope" as well as "bureaucratic arrangement," Marcus thought that he would find in the Republican Party "the rise of the national committee to a position of power over the state organizations, at least in presidential campaigns." It will come as no surprise to those familiar with the period that instead of finding this transformation he "found decentralization, an amazing lack of continuity between campaigns, weak national administrations, and even weaker national committees."

Despite the failure of his original working hypothesis, Marcus has produced an interesting and entertaining account of this decentralization,
discontinuity, and weakness. It is a detailed and very specialized picture of the way certain Republican leaders tried to win, or influence, their party's presidential nomination, and then how they organized the campaign for the presidency. Here there are no heroes or burning issues; here the candidate scarcely appears; here there are only ambitious men scheming, planning, and manipulating for power, place, or pride. For those who already know a good deal about the elections themselves, and wish to know more about the behind-the-scenes wheeling and dealing that was so important in these campaigns, this is a very interesting book.

Marcus was dealing with one of the most difficult of all events to recreate correctly: what actually happened in the management of a Gilded Age political campaign. No doubt there are many errors of detail here. For example, Marcus says that Don Cameron "had no reputation for political success" when he succeeded his father as Senator. Yet Don had been his father's chief assistant for years and was well known to the party workers, if not to the public at large. But such minor errors are forgivable and the overall picture which emerges is in the main accurate.

Marcus has some particularly astute comments about the men who were powers in the Republican Party, and particularly about the great state leaders like the Camerons, Platt, Quay, and their ilk. He makes it very clear that in order to be a powerful state leader it was necessary to sacrifice national power. "Men like Platt," Marcus points out, "had to keep commitments back home, maintain unity in their delegations, and prepare their organizations for the upcoming campaign." He might also have added that it was important to back a winner, and then to receive the rewards of patronage—the loaves and fishes—without which the state organization would starve. In any case, because of the state leader's concern for his local position, it was those Marcus calls "the adventurers," Elkins, Hanna, and the like, who could afford to gamble on promoting a particular individual for president.

It is in observations such as these that this study has its value. Had Marcus concluded by summing up these findings instead of with "some speculations on the role of presidential elections in the American political system and on the implications of the result of 1896 for twentieth century politics," his book would have been even more worthwhile. Despite that shortcoming, this volume makes a distinct contribution to our knowledge of politics in the Gilded Age.

Yale University
Brooks M. Kelley

Welch's study comes close to transforming Hoar the man into Hoar the exhibit. Somehow it is too much the academic exercise in which the conscientious author explains a hundred times over how it was that an old antebellum former Freesoiler oozed morality at every pore each time he allowed his name and prestige to be used for the glory of the Republican Party, whether or not that Party was in the right. And yet Hoar could be a constructive force, as we do learn of his brighter moments in the Congress: first in the House, when he helped design the electoral commission plan to settle the disputed Hayes-Tilden contest of 1876; and then in the Senate, when he authored the sensible presidential succession act of 1886; when he was the first prominent Republican to denounce the bigoted A. P. A. in the 1890's; and, most especially, when he (unsuccessfully) fought for the so-called Force Bill of 1891, and when he was one of two Republican senators to vote against the Treaty of Paris because the McKinley administration had opted for the annexation of the Philippines.

But even his brighter moments were usually flawed. He supported President Grant despite administration scandals and shortcomings, and he spurned the Liberal-Republican movement led by his own friends. He never understood the sharp politics behind the Compromise of 1877 (and he unwittingly allowed his admiration for fellow Half-Breed Hayes to atrophy his efforts in support of Blacks). The party leaders called him old Granny Hoar and outmaneuvered him time and again; he never seemed to understand politics at all. At no time did he even consider bolting the Grand Old Party, so naturally enough he left the impression that dying in the Congress was really more important to him than principle.

Then there were all the paradoxes that cropped up throughout his career: an opponent of veterans' pensions voting to override President Cleveland's veto of the dependent pension bill; a sympathizer for many causes—women's rights, Negroes, workingmen, immigrants, etc.—in the end justifying his failure to follow through to victory for hardly any cause at all by naively advocating the spread of free, public education, the ultimate panacea for all the déclassé he kept letting down; a scrupulously honest man allowing his conservative ideology to cover up the cupidity of rascals; an opponent of island grabbing supporting the imperialist Lodge for reelection to the Senate in 1899. Welch neatly summarizes the dilemma: "The ambivalent position of George Frisbie Hoar: the conscience-ridden partisan who sought to honor the moral pledge of the past while acknowledging the material demands of the present."

So repetitive is the subject matter that to read this book in one sitting is a chore. And yet certain chapters standing by themselves delineate well what Welch is trying to do with Hoar and the Half-Breeds. It is a scholarly production and Welch writes well with occasional welcome wit. He challenges theses or corrects in some particulars the interpretations of Matthew Josephson, Fred Harrington, David Rathman, Christopher Lasch, and Thomas A. Bailey. In some cases he is too modest and drops to footnotes.
his strictures. He should have been more vigorous in asserting his own interpretations—after all, he can certainly expect slashing counterattacks. Welch concludes that despite a lifetime of failures Hoar’s running battle for public morality produced a measure of the same with lasting impact beyond the life span of the old Cicero from Worcester. It cannot be proved. This reviewer feels that Welch should have stressed the failure of Hoar to be a genuine leader; all too often his antique poses were not really helping the victims or our overly-rapid industrialization. Welch tries to do this but does not furnish enough analysis of the needs of the times for the reader to appreciate better the consequences of Hoar’s unrealistic career.

For a man of Hoar’s experience and ability to be embarrassed whenever Democrats were supporting his position and to be infuriated whenever seemingly respectable Mugwump Republicans bolted the party over the same issues that perturbed him is sad to contemplate. His partisan behavior was petty indeed. Welch feels that Henry Adams, a sharp critic of the old Massachusetts senator, possessed too convoluted a personality to understand the simple Hoar. Possibly so, but the simple Hoar was what was and is still wrong with America. We are, however, indebted to Professor Welch for spelling out so clearly the Half-Breed response to the challenges Americans faced during the Gilded Age and part way into the Progressive Era, for we can see only too well how out of step an inflexibly conservative bias is when rapid change is taking place.

One further note: Welch might also have filled out Hoar as a personality. After all, Hoar in his autobiography makes himself out to be a rather interesting personality. But withal, this is a book of substance, and the chapters on Hoar’s struggle with the imperialists of the McKinley-Roosevelt era are especially worth reading in the light of our own equally frustrating struggle with the hawks of today.

Eastern Michigan University

DONALD W. DISBROW


Mr. Birmingham is trying to prove that Barnum was wrong. After his huge success with Our Crowd, a not-too-factual story of the German-Jewish banking families of New York, he wants to show that you can fool all the people all the time. The Grandees is so inaccurate and unhistorical, to say nothing of being cutely snobbish, that it hardly warrants a review in a serious periodical. The author has taken the fact that the first Jews to arrive in the American colonies were Sephardim, that is to say, of ancient or recent Iberian origin, and ballooned it into an exaggerated rehash of long-dead prejudices.
It needs to be explained, as Mr. Birmingham does not, that within a century and a half there were two major scatterings of Jews. The first took place in 1492 when the Jews were expelled from Spain and went into exile in Brazil, Holland, Italy and throughout the Mediterranean basin, where in many places they flourished. The second took place in 1648 when civil war in Poland broke up the long-established Jewish community there and sent its members flying westward into Germany, Holland, and, after Cromwell opened the doors, England. The older, settled Sephardic communities of Spanish origin looked down upon the new refugees, the Ashkenazim from central Europe, in exactly the same fashion that the Pennsylvania Quakers and Anglicans looked down upon the flood of Scotch-Irish in the middle of the eighteenth century, or as the Irish Catholics looked down upon the Italian and Polish Catholics who came to America at the end of the nineteenth century.

In his attempt to establish "America’s Sephardic Elite," Mr. Birmingham has subverted fact and made it fancy. He apparently does not know the difference between a Jew of Iberian extraction and one whose roots were in central Europe. Any Jew who was in British America or the United States before 1840 has been metamorphosed into the descendant of a Spanish nobleman, even Hyam Salomon, the Levys, Frankses, Ettings, Gratzes and others whose birthplaces, Yiddish language and names mark them unmistakably as Ashkenazim. To write that the Yiddish-speaking Gratzes name may have been Gracia or Garcia, when it derived from the town of Gratz in Silesia whence they came, is only one example of the arrant nonsense which fills the work. To state that Sephardic parents tell their children that Hyam Salomon, born in Lezno, Poland, was "one of us," is characteristic of the author’s just plain silliness. By the first quarter of the eighteenth century the Ashkenazim had outnumbered the Sephardim in colonial America; by the end of the century the Sephardim were a small minority in the Jewish community. The adoption of the Portuguese ritual by central European Jews and intermarriage all but wiped out any social or religious differences which had existed a century or more earlier.

Philadelphians will be surprised to learn that "By the mid-eighteenth century, no good Philadelphia club was without its Gratz, Etting, Franks, Levy, or Hays," the clubs thereafter listed including the Philadelphia, Rittenhouse, Union League, Racquet, Rabbit and City Troop. They may be equally surprised to learn that one of Salomon’s descendants lives in Ardmore, "Oklahoma." Of such stuff is The Grandees made.

The work is, however, dishonest as well. Using Dr. Bertram Korn’s history of the Jews of New Orleans—some sentences are merely recast—Mr. Birmingham writes of the marriage of an Ashkenazic Jew, Samuel Jacobs, to "one of the Sephardim," which, as he put it was almost sure to cause trouble. The wife, Rosette, "a Spanish-tempered lady who spoke sneeringly of her husband’s ‘peasant’ ancestry," was not so described by Dr. Korn. In fact, he states that she was Christian. From the same work
Mr. Birmingham takes an account of a business feud which he describes as caused by Iberian-German rivalry, but there is no evidence that the Levy, "one of several Sephardic Levy families," was that, or that most of the other Levys mentioned were other than Ashkenazim. To an account of a duel in New Orleans between Matthias Gomez and one Bosqui—he does not give Bosqui's name—he adds details not extant in the only document concerning it and most improbably makes Bosqui "a young man of Ashkenazic extraction."

Once upon a time it was fashionable for a man of wealth, frequently recent wealth, to hire a genealogist to trace his descent back to William the Conqueror. This was satisfactorily done; a genealogy was printed. To play such games in 1971 is anachronistic. Irrelevancy, combined with distortion of facts, bad writing and a basic ignorance of Jewish history, adds up to a brazen attempt to take advantage of the public. Mr. Birmingham and Harper & Row should be ashamed of their venality.

The Library Company of Philadelphia

EDWIN WOLF 2nd

Announcement

The Eleutherian Mills Historical Library, Greenville, Delaware, will sponsor its fourth annual fall conference October 29, 1971, entitled "Patterns of Urban Interaction: the Philadelphia Area in the Nineteenth Century." Speakers will be Dr. Carol E. Hoffecker of the University of Delaware and Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation, Dr. John Modell of the University of Minnesota, and Mr. Robert Douglass of the University of Pennsylvania. For further information or to be placed on the conference mailing list write Regional Conference, Eleutherian Mills Historical Library, Greenville, Delaware 19807.