A Religious History of the American People. By SYDNEY E. AHLSTROM.
(New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972. xvi, 1158 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. $19.50.)

Many a person, when he first confronts this massive, four-and-a-half pound volume, will jump to the conclusion that it is an encyclopedia of American religion, to be used only for reference. A cursory examination of the book might confirm his impression, for its range is, indeed, encyclopedic. In some 1,100 pages of text, Professor Ahlstrom examines the development of American religion from Eric the Red to the Vietnam War, including in the course of his narrative virtually every movement, leader, and idea, European or American, that in any way bears upon the subject. But the book is also much more than an encyclopedia. The author devotes his vast knowledge of American religion to the grander purpose of analyzing "the moral and spiritual development of the American people," a subject he believes is "one of the most intensely relevant . . . on the face of the earth" (p. xiii). So masterfully does he handle this elusive topic and so convincingly does he convey its importance, that his book, despite its unwieldy size, deserves to be read from cover to cover.

The book is organized around the traditional subject of religious history, the evolution of denominations. These denominational histories are treated chronologically, according to their relation to the dominant themes of the periods of American history in which they first appear—settlement, the Great Awakening and Revolution, expansion and democratic reform, the sectional crisis, etc. As the book progresses, and as the spiritual lives of Americans become more secularized, Professor Ahlstrom's discussion of "religious history" takes on its larger dimension. Increasingly he brings into the narrative attitudes and beliefs which Americans have derived from essentially nonreligious movements, such as the Enlightenment, Romanticism, and American Nationalism. By the last third of the book, the most interesting in this reviewer's opinion, denominational history becomes a mere backdrop for the author's lucid portrayal of the bewildering variety of theologies, philosophies, beliefs, attitudes and superstitions that comprise the incredible richness of modern America's spiritual life.

Despite the author's masterly organization, however, the vastness of his subject and his need to limit his discussion of certain topics is frequently a source of frustration to the reader. Themes which Professor Ahlstrom will elucidate brilliantly in one section of the book will sometimes disappear for several hundred pages. This reviewer, for example, wishes the author had worked out more fully, in the chapters on the
colonial period, his wise observations on the Protestant Ethic (pp. 115-119). Some of the discussions of "unchurched religion," such as the "Republican Religion" of Thomas Jefferson (pp. 367-368), are insightful but so brief that the reader is left begging for more. And the narratives of denominational development, especially in the first half of the volume, often seem to lose sight of the book's larger purpose, though the author usually recovers some of his perspective in his concluding remarks.

Students who do not choose to read the book through will find Professor Ahlstrom's discussions of denominations and religious movements extremely useful. There are occasional inaccuracies, as in the description of early Presbyterianism in the Middle Colonies on pages 269-270. (William Tennent emigrated in 1718, not 1716; he married a "Presbyterian minister's daughter" well before emigrating, not after; and the alliance of the Tennents with Jonathan Dickinson's New England party occurred in the 1740's rather than in the 1720's.) But such errors are exceptional. More often these discussions are small masterpieces, set in finely balanced historical perspective and synthesizing quantities of controversial secondary studies. Chapter 8, for example, is perhaps the best brief summary of Puritanism available.

Whether this book is read as a whole or in parts, therefore, students will find it a most significant contribution to the study of American civilization.

State University College, New Paltz

MARTIN E. LODGE


Biography is perhaps one of the most difficult modes of historical writing. Combining biography and intellectual history is an even more difficult task. Yet, when done well—as, for example, in Edmund Morgan's The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop—such an effort endows its subject matter with a kind of universal meaning: the biography of a particular individual provides a key to understanding human nature and discussion of the beliefs and ideas associated with the man offers insight into the dynamics of intellectual history.

Bruce Steiner's Samuel Seabury, 1729-1796: A Study in the High Church Tradition is not one of these rare efforts. Yet it has significance and merit. It provides a detailed account of the life of one of the early leaders of the Episcopal Church in New England, a man who was, among other things, a prominent Loyalist pamphleteer and proselytizer for an American episcopate, and who, as Bishop of Connecticut, worked to form a united Episcopal Church. In addition, Seabury was of prime importance in shaping the tradition of High Churchmanship.
The most successful part of the book is Steiner's discussion of Seabury's role in shaping the High Church tradition. The author argues convincingly that the early religious history of New England had as much influence in the formation of the High Church tradition as did Seabury. Even before the Bishop's rise to prominence, there had developed in the New England churches, particularly in Connecticut, a "Churchmanship with native roots" which contrasted sharply with the established religion of the southern colonies. It was a Churchmanship which owed much to Congregational antecedents. Steiner defines it as "High in its theology, evangelical in its preaching, shaped by a convert clergy and laity of Puritan background. . . ." Seabury "enlarged and deepened" its theological content by introducing doctrines developed by Nonjuring divines of England and Scotland. The result of his influence on the Eucharist, church organization, and liturgy was to create within the newly formed Protestant Episcopal Church a climate favoring further development and growth of the High Church tradition.

The major part of this book focuses on the events of Seabury's life. Nevertheless, Seabury does not emerge as an authentic personality, whether as a consequence of his apparently nondescript character or Steiner's failure to flesh out his subject (despite a wealth of detail). Moreover, Steiner does not show how Seabury's religious and political views were grounded in his character or in the peculiar circumstances of his life. Nor does he probe the connection between Seabury's Loyalism and his religious beliefs. In describing Seabury's rise to a position of leadership in the Episcopal Church, Steiner implies that the Loyalist pamphlets of 1774 were of considerable significance, yet he fails to demonstrate his point by indicating the reaction of Episcopal leaders to the pamphlets or by explaining why a group of political writings should open the door to a religious career.

Samuel Seabury, 1729-1796 will prove most valuable to the historian of American religion, particularly through its delineation of a native New England tradition of High Churchmanship. Certainly the book contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of the early religious history of New England. It is to be hoped that Steiner will continue research and writing on the origins and development of the High Church tradition, not only in the eighteenth but in succeeding centuries as well.

Louisiana State University

Anne C. Loveland


Of the some forty volumes in the New American Nation series, this book is one of two dedicated to colonial systems other than English (the second being concerned with the Spanish colonial empire). Professor
Eccles is a specialist in the history of French Canada; he writes with authority, clarity, and occasional flashes of wit. His book is an admirable effort to survey the French colonial system in North America. The task is not an easy one, since Canada, Louisiana, and the French West Indies were totally different colonial entities, very difficult to treat simultaneously. The most thorough coverage is understandably given to Canada, and is highly enlightening. Most Americans, and many historians who ought to know better, tend to regard the Anglo-Saxon dominance in North America as historical inevitability, or at very least the result of a quasi-Darwinian principle of selection. The unfettered dynamism of the English colonies has long been compared to a far more fragile society in French Canada, whose habitants, priest-ridden and broken to the despot's yoke, could not by themselves cope with the challenges of the New World. For those who hold such notions, the reading of Professor Eccles' book will be a sobering experience.

The colonial society of French Canada was far from being a theocracy. While the Crown was far more in evidence than in the English colonies, this was not necessarily a disadvantage. The colonial administration emerges as efficient and well organized, in Professor Eccles' words "a model for the other powers." In marked contrast to the Anglo-Saxon experience, private enterprise did not provide many solutions to the colony's economic problems, while the policies of the royal government were generally successful in this field. The society of French Canada had a dynamism of its own, doubling in size each generation. It was, Professor Eccles claims, actually more self-sufficient militarily than its southern neighbors. Such assertions, buttressed with solid arguments, leave the reader with the impression of a viable, often admirable community, deserving of a better fate. The text is enhanced by fascinating asides on such matters as the techniques for salting fish, the importance of birchbark, and figures on per capita bread consumption and crime.

The portion of the book dealing with Louisiana and the West Indies, which are lumped together as "the slave colonies," is competently done but more succinct. Some thirty maps and illustrations accompany the text. A useful critical bibliography of thirty pages is appended. This is a good book on the French in America; it is a superb book on French Canada.

University of Georgia

Lee Kennett


"There is nothing new here in the philosophical Way," Franklin wrote John Winthrop from London on March 11, 1769. Neither did 1769 bring much new in the political way or in any of the other spheres of Franklin's
life in London. There was a trip to Paris in the summer of the year, but it seems to have been less exhilarating than the first trip in 1767. There was buttonholing of British politicians when Parliament was in session and anxious meetings of American agents, but no dramas unfolded like the examination before the House of Commons on the repeal of the Stamp Act in 1766. There were the newspaper columns, open as always to Franklin's wit and learning, but his pen was uncharacteristically inactive. In short, few years in Franklin's mature life were as slow-paced as 1769. But fewer still were as poignant.

It is the plight of Franklin's wife, Deborah, which gives this year its special sadness. Franklin had been in England from 1757 through 1762 and returned in 1764. During this period he built an imposing house in Philadelphia, which the lonely Debby occupied in pathetic splendor. "Very few Comes to see us," she wrote her husband on December 13, 1769. In the winter of 1769 Debby suffered a mental collapse, accompanied by amnesia and insomnia. It seems clear that the attack was triggered, to a considerable degree, by depression over Benjamin's prolonged absence—she wrote of her "one [own] dis satisfied distresed att your staying so much longer I loste all my resey lushon."

Admirers of Franklin have usually preferred to avert their eyes from his chronic absences from Debby, for they look uncomfortably like desertion of the barely literate woman for the greener pastures of London. Yet Franklin's views on the political crisis in the British Empire, as they crystallized in 1769, put a somewhat better aspect on his treatment of his wife. By skillfully publishing marginalia which Franklin jotted into British political pamphlets, the editors give us a clearer picture than we have ever had on his attitude on imperial relations in 1769. At this relatively early date he believed, it is now clear, that Parliament had no authority whatsoever over America. But he was also reminded daily that Parliament's belief was precisely the reverse of his: it was convinced that it lacked no authority whatsoever over America. These irreconcilable views persuaded Franklin, and he freely predicted to his friends, that a conflagration could be avoided only by the exercise of extraordinarily able political leadership. And he seems to have persuaded himself that he was more capable than most of supplying it. Thus, by staying in London at the expense of his wife's feelings, he may have thought that he could prevent greater evils. Or, perhaps, he merely rationalized his conduct in this manner.

Whatever the case, the anguish of Deborah Franklin and the anguish of the British Empire, which her husband so clearly saw approaching, give this volume a heavy measure of melancholy.

The editors are now at home with Franklin. Their step is sure, their prose sharp, their learning prodigious. We can await with anticipation for them to guide us into the tumult of the 1770's.

This finely organized presentation has been as meticulously written as outlined. In the first instance, Graham Hood through his analyses of the fragmentary information, research, and the indisputable results of archaeology has made the first colonial American porcelain factory a reality. But more than to confirm the date of the Bonnin and Morris partnership and locate the factory site, Mr. Hood has established that after the production of a porcelain had been achieved there were, as well as the usual trials and tribulations which beset a newly organized manufacture, the added and unusual circumstances arising over the repeal of duties which made the competition with imported wares impossible. There was a designed effort to thwart the new porcelain venture which resulted in its closing after only two years of operation.

It is exciting to see little-known and only snatchily reported American ceramic efforts being explored as has been done by Mr. Hood. This work itself should be a challenge to our own native-born scholars to pick up the gossamer threads of the American story and be inspired to weave a more than illusory pattern with the names of Andrew Duché, John Barlem, William Ellis and others. This monograph is a tool for ceramic scholars.


This cannot be considered as a full-blown biography of Washington as the author directs his attention to a study of Washington as a military man and admittedly seeks the approval of that ubiquitous character, the general reader. After briefly treating Washington's early years, Callahan gets into his primary emphasis with the appointment as commander-in-chief and carries his subject in some detail through the victory at Yorktown. There is a brief review of the presidential years and an equally brief concluding chapter assesses the man's life—in other words, Washington's life here resembles a sandwich, with a thick military career thrown between two slim slices of life.

Something of a general military history of the Revolution provides the backdrop against which the General's career is displayed. At times it
would seem that too much space is devoted to actions away from Washington's command which diverts some attention from the central character. The author does provide interesting insights by frequently giving contemporary opinions of the General. On the other hand, he seems so wrapped up in his subject that one wonders if there is not too great a tendency to have Washington emerge as too gracious a figure.

Professor Callahan writes with a facile pen and his easy style befits a book of this nature. He makes no pretense that he is bursting forth with a new interpretation of the career of George Washington, although he does picture him as the catalyst responsible for holding the army together until the achievement of final victory. His approach is that of bringing together past writings and interpretations of the General into a compact and interesting package; this he has done well. Callahan has a facility for giving concise battle descriptions without wandering off into a plethora of detail. And the brief character sketches of subordinate officers is done cleverly and lends feeling to the overall effect.

There are some areas of disagreement in that it might be suggested that John André was to “attain infamy as a spy” (p. 36). This, I think, is a bit too strong in that André’s execution led to both distress and sympathy on both sides of the Atlantic. And the “Kaskia” mentioned on page 172 is spelled Kaskaskia. But this is nit-picking, and if the book is judged in the light of the author’s intentions, it can only be stated that he has fulfilled his aims quite well.

Tulane University

Hugh F. Rankin


This volume, covering George Washington's second presidential term and the years to his death in 1799, is the conclusion of the four-volume biography that Mr. Flexner began more than a decade ago. Mr. Flexner's volumes are well-written, not unduly hagiographic, and generally reliable as far as they go. They are, however, based largely on the printed collections of the writings of Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson and others. Little use is made of manuscript sources, and in this volume, as in previous ones, a number of modern studies are ignored—the works, for example, of Joseph Charles, Jacob Cooke, and the recent state studies of politics such as that of Paul Goodman on Massachusetts.

Thus, the professional historian will find little in the four volumes that is new, and much that is dated. For general readers, it does provide a biography falling between the brief one-volume studies and the massive
work by Douglas Freeman. At his best, Mr. Flexner writes as few historians can, but any reader who is committed enough to read these four, long volumes is probably perceptive enough to discern the historiographical limitations of this biography.

The most serious limitation is Flexner's presentation of the origins of American political parties. His page-by-page narration traces political conflict almost exclusively in terms of the foreign policy questions that arose out of American relations with England and France. Yet, in a quite discrete generalization, he concludes that the division between Hamiltonians and Jeffersonians was a conflict of two economic systems. Since so much of Washington's second term did revolve around foreign affairs, it is not surprising that economic and social issues are not prominent in this volume. However, the Whiskey Rebellion is treated as mere law-breaking, and no clear picture emerges of the role of the Democratic Societies or of the varied state problems in party development. Mr. Flexner sees Washington as above politics, and one gets no sense of party growth either in the states or in Congress. Politics appear as little more than the maneuvering of a handful of cabinet-level officials for Washington's favor. Jefferson and Hamilton were especially concerned, for they were fighting for nothing less than "Washington's sanction as a substitute father."

Much of the drama and interest of this volume derive from the foreign crises of the period, rather than from Washington himself. His accomplishments were as substantial as any major figure in American history, and contemporaries were nearly unanimous in noting the forcefulness of his character. Yet Washington's life lacks much of the drama that impels popular biography, and his emotional reserve and placid domestic life make it difficult to humanize him. Flexner achieves some success in this by touching upon Washington's concern with signs of aging and diminishing powers as well as his anguish over the fate of his slaves. To a large extent, however, he creates an artificial, and distorting, drama by exaggerating the attacks made upon Washington and the dangers of anarchy and social war during his second term.

Mr. Flexner's most interesting and successful chapters are on the non-public aspects of Washington's life. He presents charming vignettes of Washington as farmer, slaveowner, art collector and model for Gilbert Stuart. What emerges is a representative figure, not much different from other planters and slaveowners, rather than a unique character. Anyone interested in Philadelphia during the early years of the republic will enjoy the description of presidential society, the yellow fever epidemic, and Washington's relations with Eliza Powel. If Mr. Flexner's treatment of national affairs were equally successful, this would be a distinguished biography.

**Cleveland State University**

**John Cary**
(University, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1972. vi, 248 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. $8.50.)

In his own way Samuel Smith—merchant, soldier, politician and citizen of Baltimore—was a fascinating character. Decorated soldier of the Revolution, savior of Baltimore from the British in 1814, counselor of presidents, and a founder of the Jeffersonian Republican Party, Smith has an undeniable attraction as the subject of a biography.

Born in 1752, he was raised and trained as a merchant by his father, who was among Baltimore's most successful businessmen. During the Revolution, Smith embraced the American cause, and as an officer in the Continental Army he served with such distinction that Congress awarded him a sword. Resigning from the army in 1779, Smith rapidly built his fortune and reputation in Baltimore. By 1792 his popularity was such that he easily won election to the national House of Representatives, the beginning of forty continuous years of service in Congress under seven presidents. Originally a supporter of Alexander Hamilton, Smith soon became a Jeffersonian and played a major role in building the Republican Party in Baltimore and Maryland. During the Virginian's first term, Smith was one of his closest advisors. Regarded as an expert on banking, commercial, and military matters, he helped shape most of the important legislation in those areas during his years in the national legislature. After his retirement from Congress in 1833, Smith, by then in his eighties, was instrumental in putting down a major riot in Baltimore for which he was elected mayor of the city. His importance was underlined when, after his death, Baltimore gave him the biggest funeral in its history. President Van Buren, the Cabinet, and both houses of Congress journeyed to Baltimore in order to participate in the ceremonies.

In this, the second biography of Smith to appear in less than a year, Professor Pancake narrates the long and colorful career of the Marylander. Originally a dissertation completed nearly a quarter century ago, Samuel Smith and the Politics of Business has been revised to take into account some, but not all, of the secondary works that have appeared over the last two decades. Readers will find the title of this volume misleading. This is not a study of the relation between politics and business in the early national period. Neither does it throw much light on the relationship of Smith's business interests on his political activities since few of Smith's business records have survived. The problem of the title is illustrative of a larger difficulty with this book. While Pancake is strong in his ability to narrate, he has not gone beyond narration to analysis and thematic development. Smith's importance as a politician, his accomplishments as a soldier, and his success as a merchant are never seen together nor are they put in perspective. A study of Samuel Smith's life provides an excellent
opportunity to expand our understanding of politics in the early republic. Professor Pancake has told us much about the man and what he did but little concerning his significance.

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

FRANK A. CASSELL


The author reveals that when Eleuthère Irenée du Pont, the founder of the family in Delaware, emigrated to America in 1800 with his father and brother, he signed his passport as "Botaniste." The three du Ponts came from France with the idea of setting up a company for land development in the new country. As Irenée, while working in Paris, had taken a course in botany at the Jardins des Plantes, he hoped to undertake some landscape architecture for the company. When the original plan fell through, only Irenée was left to settle in Delaware, where he set up a powder mill (he had worked for a time as a young man in a government powder factory in Paris). Wilkinson points out how the du Pont family had already in France established a pattern of urban industrial activity with private estates in the country for family life and ornamental gardening. As a result of his success in business, Irenée was able to realize his dream of an extensive garden of his own in America.

The first six chapters chronicle the horticultural background of E. I. du Pont as a young man in France during the last quarter of the eighteenth century and the growth and flowering of his country garden in America through the first half of the nineteenth century. Wilkinson has mined the collection of du Pont family papers to show in some detail the strong link between American and French horticulture in the early years of both republics. Thus, he records the du Ponts' efforts (unsuccessful) to keep alive the botanical gardens established by André Michaux, in South Carolina and New Jersey, as French government nurseries for horticultural interchange between America and France. He recounts the life-long industry of Irenée du Pont himself in collecting and exchanging specimens of American plants for French ones, to enrich gardens on both sides of the Atlantic.

The seventh chapter traces the burgeoning gardening interests of Irenée's seven children. It implicitly conveys a great American success story: a large family becoming willing and able to carry on a tradition of private floriculture on a lavish scale.

The last three chapters are devoted to a history and description of the three great du Pont gardens: Winterthur, Longwood, and Eleutherian
(Hagley) Mills. All three are major achievements in American horticulture, but they remain essentially private, domestic, ornamental plantings, expressive of their owners' style of life. The chapters on them are short, nontechnical and illustrated in color. Indeed, now that these gardens have all been opened to the public, this book, with its background of du Pont family gardening, culminating in the descriptions of individual gardens, may well find its popular appeal as a memento of a visit to one of them.

By virtue of the original material presented in its early chapters, this book fills a significant niche in the history of American horticulture.

Philadelphia Botanical Club

RALPH M. SARGENT


Twice in the nineteenth century the moral issue of money and banking so dominated American politics that Andrew Jackson and William Jennings Bryan became two of the nation's most compelling political heroes. In the last few years historians such as Gatell, Remini, Wilburn, Sharp, and now McFaul, have taken on the task of exploring the politics of banking in the Age of Jackson. While the first three concentrate on the war against the Bank of the United States up to 1833, and Sharp deals with state politics after 1837, McFaul fills the gap by examining Jacksonian efforts to deal with banking between the removal of the deposits in 1833 and the first debate over the Independent Treasury bill in 1837-1838.

In interpreting Jacksonian Democracy, McFaul rejects the entrepreneurial-consensus view and modifies the class conflict thesis of Arthur Schlesinger. Unlike Bray Hammond, McFaul does not portray Jacksonians as rival bankers out to make money, nor does he believe that they followed the doctrine of laissez-faire. Though leaning toward Schlesinger, McFaul does not agree that the Jacksonians pursued a consistent ideological goal. The followers of Jackson, he points out, were not simply antibanking radicals, but also included pro-banking conservatives, and, most important, supporters of federal regulation. After destroying the BUS, Democrats sought to regulate the pet banks so that the new banking system would "satisfy society's needs." For a half decade an "uneasy alliance" of radical Democrats hostile to banking and moderate Democrats who wanted Treasury regulation tried to unite government and banking. When bankers suspended specie payments in 1837, the radicals deserted the alliance, forcing the party to give up regulation in favor of the Independent Treasury.

To demonstrate that Jacksonians favored regulation, McFaul focuses
on the hitherto unpublicized Secretary of the Treasury Levi Woodbury. Since the secretary was an important Jacksonian, who also served as Senator, Secretary of the Navy, and Justice of the Supreme Court, his story offers a new approach to Jacksonian Democracy. To control banks and prevent excessive credit expansion, Woodbury ordered pet bankers not to accept bank notes under $5 in receipt for money owed the government; he resisted demands to expand the number of deposit banks; and he forced the banks to increase their specie holdings.

The administration also tried to exercise control through legislation. In the House of Representatives James K. Polk introduced a bill to prevent pet banks from receiving notes of any bank that issued notes under $5, and said that the administration hoped to raise the limit to $20. Although his bill passed the House, it failed in the Senate. Ironically, the Deposit-Distribution Act of 1836, which contributed to credit expansion by distributing the federal surplus to the states, also provided regulation by prohibiting banks that issued notes less than $5 from receiving government deposits. Even after the Jacksonians abandoned the pet banks, their first Independent Treasury bill in 1837 called for a measure of government regulation. When this plan failed in 1838, their efforts at regulation had ended.

One of McFaul's arguments against Hammond is that the latter drew his evidence almost entirely from the period 1829-1833. Conversely, McFaul's thesis would be more convincing had he been able to examine the entire period 1829-1840. He refers only briefly, for example, to Jacksonian interest in government regulation or a government bank during Jackson's first term. By basing his case on only a few years, McFaul at times appears to overgeneralize from limited evidence. But McFaul's strong, well-documented book is an important addition to the literature of Jacksonian Democracy.

Phillips Exeter Academy

DONALD B. COLE


Between 1836 and 1844 there was published in Philadelphia in three elephant folio volumes a History of the Indian Tribes of North America, with Biographical Sketches and Anecdotes of the Principal Chiefs. Embellished with One Hundred and Twenty Portraits from the Indian Gallery in the Department of War at Washington. The authors were Thomas L. McKenney, Superintendent of the Indian Trade Bureau, 1816-1822, and Superintendent of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1824-1830, and James Hall, author of several books about the western frontier.
In his official capacities, McKenney had been responsible for assembling the Indian Gallery. Some of the portraits stemmed from water colors made by James Otto Lewis on visits to the Indian country, but most were painted in Washington by Charles Bird King, his subjects being famous Indians who had come to visit the capitol.

The task of producing the volumes was performed by Philadelphia printers and lithographic artists. Henry Inman, then with a Philadelphia firm, was sent to Washington to make copies of the portraits, and from these the lithographers made their drawings on stone. After the prints had been pulled, they were colored by hand.

Mr. Horan's reproductions of the colored plates give a good concept of the originals while lacking their quality. He omits the data printed on the original plates which names the lithographers, printers, and date of printing, and he provides his own biographical sketches of the subjects rather than reprinting the biographies composed by Hall with McKenney's help.

Mr. Horan has written a rather extensive introduction on McKenney's life from his birth in 1785 until his death in obscurity in 1859. One learns here quite a lot about the activities of the Indian bureaus and McKenney's difficulties in completing his *History*. His volumes preserve the likenesses he collected for the originals were destroyed by fire in 1860. Duplicates by King of many of these paintings have survived, however, notably the Redwood Library collection, now dispersed. Mr. Horan writes in a breezy style, throwing in many conversations for which there are no footnotes but which probably reflect what may have been said.

Most of the Indians portrayed were from the far West, but McKenney learned of the gift to the Historical Society of Pennsylvania in 1834 of Gustavus Hesselius' 1735 portraits of the Delaware chiefs Lapowinsa and Tishcohan and obtained permission to have them copied for inclusion in his great work.

*Historical Society of Pennsylvania*  
*Nicholas B. Wainwright*

*The Last Campaign: Grant Saves the Union.* By *Earl Schenck Miers.*  

When General U. S. Grant assumed command of the Army of the Potomac in March 1864, he came with a positive record of achievement in command of increasingly large bodies of troops in combat. First at Belmont, then at Forts Henry and Donelson, then at Shiloh and later Iuka, then at Vicksburg and finally at Chattanooga, he had achieved a record of success, albeit against opponents of mediocre ability. In the process, however, he had learned by his own mistakes and those of his opponents. As
one successful campaign followed another, he learned the value of a trained and experienced staff, the proper use of a reserve force and the need for solving each new problem without delay. As the commander-in-chief of all the fighting forces of the Union he learned to act in that capacity rather than as the immediate commander of a single army. He told Sherman what he wanted done and then left him alone; he sent Sheridan to the Shenandoah and then left him alone; he instructed Thomas in Tennessee as to his functions and objectives, though he nearly destroyed Thomas' effectiveness because he thought he was too slow to act. In spite of these proper delegations of authority, Grant was slow to discard the attitude of mentor and guide to Meade in Virginia, both because he himself was present with the Army of the Potomac and because he had, unconsciously perhaps, placed Meade in a position to expect direct interference and tactical orders. Consequently, after the bloody battles in the Wilderness and at Spotsylvania, when Grant began to confine himself more and more to his own proper sphere of directives, Meade was slow to re-assume full control of the army, continuing to interpret Grant's directives as positive orders. As a result of this unclear relationship, the bloody and unjustifiable slaughter at Cold Harbor resulted.

In Virginia, Grant was faced by Lee with a proved reputation of successful leadership, but, since Jackson's death in the previous year, unfortunately deprived of a subordinate who could carry out a general directive, either strategic or tactical, without further supervision, as was the relationship of Grant and Sherman. Grant could no longer take twenty-four hours or more to issue his next directive to Meade. He must act promptly and decisively. This he did after Cold Harbor by outwitting Lee in the unexpected crossing of the James. Only the failure of a subordinate commander prevented Grant from achieving the full fruits of his audacious move by taking Petersburg. However, in spite of his success in getting across the James, it required nearly a year for Grant with his vastly superior force of men, munitions, and supplies to force Lee out of Petersburg and Richmond and to surrender at Appomattox Court House.

This is a popular, noncritical account of Grant's "Last Campaign" from the Wilderness to the surrender at Appomattox. It is based on an imposing array of printed sources, with occasional quotations from manuscript sources in the Rutgers University library. The subtitle "Grant Saves the Union" is redundant. Sherman and Thomas contributed greatly to saving the Union, not to mention Lincoln's contribution and leadership. It was a collective rather than an individual contribution.

There are a few errors—Longstreet had no middle initial "A" (p. 20); the quotation ascribed to "Maine" should be to "New Jersey" (p. 42); General Averell's initials are "W. W." not "W. S." (p. 124); General Hardee was not in command of the Department of South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida until late in September, 1864 (p. 130); Greeley was editor of
the New York Tribune, not the New York Herald (pp. 130, 160); it was
General John B. Gordon, not James B. Gordon (p. 140).

Locust Valley, N. Y.

THOMAS ROBSON MAY

The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes. By Kenneth E. Davison. (West-
port, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1972. xvii, 266 p. Illustrations,
note on sources, index. $12.00.)

In The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes, the “first work to concentrate
primarily on the presidency of Hayes,” Kenneth E. Davison has provided
a fitting commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statesman’s
birth and has made a notable contribution to our understanding of a most
interesting President and his times. Hayes entered the White House under
the cloud of the “stolen election” of 1876 and at a time when the prestige
of the presidency was at its lowest point in American history after the
tragic Andrew Johnson and sorry U. S. Grant administrations. The new
President brought to his task the invaluable assets of character, integrity,
and old-fashioned political courage. These, combined with an excellent
educational background and solid political experience on the local, state,
and national levels, and a rugged patriotism best expressed in his phrase
“He serves his party best who serves his country best,” enabled him to
strengthen the presidential office and leave it as an honored statesman.

Davison’s brief account of Hayes’s life and career before 1876 reveals a
lucky politician who won a succession of close elections. The respected
Governor of Ohio was in an ideal position, as the second choice of many
delegates, to pluck the presidential nomination from a deadlocked 1876
Republican National Convention. The author’s treatment of the process
by which Hayes won it is full and valuable, but his brief account of the
election, and the stormy post-election period, is somewhat disappointing.
Davison prefers to concentrate on the nomination and the presidency
itself rather than “reopen the academic controversy over who actually
won the 1876 election,” but the book’s comprehensiveness would have
been enhanced by a fuller discussion of what Hayes was up to during the
period from his nomination until shortly before his inauguration.

Davison covers every conceivable aspect of the Hayes presidency, from
the organization of his White House office staff to his role in bringing
about resumption of work on the unfinished Washington Monument. The
great issues of the period—patronage, the southern question, the railroad
strike of 1877, monetary policy, Indian policy and foreign affairs—are
fully treated. Hayes successfully defied Senate oligarchs such as Roscoe
Conkling of New York, Simon Cameron of Pennsylvania, and Hannibal
Hamlin of Maine as he asserted untrammeled presidential control over the
appointment of his Cabinet. His fight for civil service reform helped pave
the way for the Pendleton Act in the next decade. Hayes's southern policy was less successful. Substituting conciliation for coercion in dealing with the former Confederate States, he saw the smashing of his dream of a two-party South, as southern Democrats triumphed in the 1878 and 1880 elections. The freedmen, left to the tender mercies of the "Bourbon redeemers," watched their political and civil rights steadily erode. Hayes sympathized deeply with the plight of the blacks, but even had he wished to reinstitute Radical reconstruction, he had neither the troops nor the congressional support to do so.

President Hayes had a clear conception of the vast potential extent of presidential power. His use of that power during the railroad strikes of 1877, while it did set the unfortunate precedent of "strikebreaking in the effort to restore normal railway service," was characterized by "considerable restraint under great pressure." Hayes deeply regretted that the strikes settled none of the serious labor-management problems which lay at their heart. Ultimately he would come to favor the placing of railroads under "a wise, watchful, and powerful supervision of the Government."

Davison provides considerable insights into less well-known aspects of the Hayes Administration. Hayes could rightly boast of "an Indian policy [of] justice and fidelity to engagements, and placing the Indians on the footing of citizens." In foreign affairs he vigorously asserted American rights in dealing with the Porfirio Diaz regime in Mexico and just as vigorously enunciated the policy that the United States should control any canal built in the Isthmian region. And through his extensive travels, including a trip to the Pacific coast in 1880, President Hayes "strengthened the power and reach of the presidential office" and made the presidency a more visible and more popular institution.

Professor Davison's coverage of the social and family side of the Hayes presidency is delightful. Mrs. Hayes, traditionally portrayed as stodgy and strait-laced "Lemonade Lucy," is revealed as a warm, charming, and highly successful First Lady. Life in the White House is vividly portrayed and here, as elsewhere in the book, the author brings Rutherford B. Hayes alive.

The author is as well grounded in recent literature on the Hayes era as he is in primary and older secondary sources. His notes are excellent, and students of Gilded Age politics will find his bibliography most helpful. The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes is likely to remain the standard work on the subject.

University of Maine at Portland—Gorham

H. Draper Hunt

It is no secret that Franklin D. Roosevelt's taste in ambassadors was not uniformly sound. His first envoy to Berlin, the historian William E. Dodd, so detested the National Socialist regime that he could hardly be persuaded to meet any of its leaders, a circumstance that did not help the quality of American reporting from the German capital. Joseph E. Kennedy, whom he sent to the Court of St. James in 1938, fell so completely out of favor with his hosts because of his insistence that their resistance to Hitler was misguided and doomed to failure that, by May, 1940, both Lord Halifax and his Permanent Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Sir Alexander Cadogan, were pressing for his recall.

The President was more fortunate in his choice of an ambassador for Moscow in 1933. If, in due course, William C. Bullitt came to dislike the Soviet leaders as much as Dodd did the Nazis, he did not allow his private feelings to interfere with the proper discharge of his assigned functions; nor did he, either in Moscow or in Paris, where he served in the difficult years from 1936 to 1940, ever succumb to the fatalism that overcame Kennedy. A well-educated and sophisticated man, Bullitt approached the problems of these posts with enthusiasm and self-confidence, and with a clear understanding that his function was to represent and maintain the interests of his country. If he had weaknesses, they were, as George F. Kennan, who served with him in Moscow, writes in the introduction to this volume, "a nature both impatient and impulsive, a contempt for the normal bureaucracy of foreign affairs, and a highly personalized concept of his role in government and his relationship to official Washington."

Both the positive and the negative characteristics are clearly illustrated in this fascinating volume, which, after a brief chapter dealing with Bullitt's first venture in foreign affairs, his famous mission to Moscow in 1919, is devoted to his personal correspondence with the President from 1933 to 1943. It is clear from these letters that from the beginning Bullitt arrogated to himself a special relationship with the chief executive which, in his eyes, freed him from any obligation to follow instructions from the State Department, unless he agreed with them. With his criticism of that organization and of its chief officials, as well as of his fellow ambassadors, he was very free, and his frankness—although it was tolerated and even encouraged by the President in the early years—finally avenged itself on him, when his criticisms of Sumner Welles and his demand that he be dismissed annoyed the President and ended their intimacy.

It is likely that other things led to the erosion of their friendship. In May and June, 1940, Bullitt seems to have lost his perspective and his dispatches were filled with emotional demands that American planes be shipped to France, planes that were neither available for shipment nor, as emerged from post-war revelations, needed by the French, who did not use the planes they had. Later, Bullitt's fretful criticism of the way he was replaced as ambassador by Admiral Leahy, his refusal to accept missions proposed by the President when he could see no point in them,
and, especially, his habit of lecturing Mr. Roosevelt about the iniquities of the Russians seem to have impaired the President's confidence in him. It is hard to judge Mr. Roosevelt's feelings from those letters of his that are included here, for most of them are marked by a deplorable flippancy, but it is clear that he did not like to be told that his own easy belief in continued friendship with the Soviet Union might be mistaken.

On the other hand, Bullitt's strength as an ambassador is repeatedly demonstrated in these pages, in dispatches that reveal his mastery in analyzing a situation and drawing conclusions from it. It is difficult not to be impressed by the quality of his papers on the Soviet Union and its intentions, not only the memoranda of January, 1943, which annoyed the President by warning him against wishful thinking, but the incisive dispatch written at the end of his Moscow mission in 1936, in which he gave his view about how to deal with the Soviets in words that have not lost their force. "We should neither expect too much", he wrote:

nor despair of getting anything at all. We should be as steady in our attitude as the Soviet Union is fickle. . . . We should remain unimpressed in the face of expansive professions of friendliness and unperturbed in the face of slights and underhand opposition. We should make the weight of our influence felt steadily over a long period of time in the directions which best suit our interests. We should never threaten. We should act and allow the Bolsheviks to draw their own conclusions as to the causes of our acts.

Above all, we should guard the reputation of Americans for businesslike efficiency, sincerity, and straightforwardness. . . . There is no weapon at once so disarming and effective in relations with the communists as sheer honesty. They know very little about it.

As for his dispatches from France in the years 1939-1940, and particularly his remarkable telegram of July 1, 1940, in which, writing immediately after the French surrender, he described his conversations with Lebrun, Petain, Darlan and Chaumtemps, they comprise a graphic and moving picture of the disintegration of the Third Republic and the moral bankruptcy of the men who established the Vichy regime.

Stanford University

GORDON A. CRAIG


The Red Arrow is an examination of two suburban traction systems, located in the Philadelphia suburbs, which originally pursued separate
paths but which were ultimately consolidated under a single management. One of them, the Philadelphia and West Chester Traction Company, was a classic example of a side-of-the-road country trolley system. The other, the Philadelphia and Western Railroad, was a unique high-speed, third-rail operation. Both companies were unique in that they were able to survive automobile competition, depression, and changing tastes in public transport to the present day.

The author has had the advantage of access to the files of both companies from their earliest years in the preparation of his history. He has evidently examined these materials in detail, and has extracted the essentials of the Red Arrow’s origins in turnpike and horsecar days and has traced it through to its present status as a division of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority. Mr. DeGraw’s background is in journalism and his early connections with public transport were those of a railfan. Both of these tendencies reflect themselves in the volume and provide the book with both its greatest strengths and its almost fatal weaknesses.

The most conspicuous strength of the work is in its graphics. *The Red Arrow* is primarily a picture book chronicling the story of a suburban transportation system over a period of better than a century. Of the 398 numbered pages in the book proper, only 78 are occupied by text. The author has ranged far and wide to make his photographic record of the Red Arrow Lines as complete and definitive as possible. There seems to be little that he could have done in this direction to improve on the finished product. Considerable attention has been given to the presentation of these pictures, the most conspicuous result of the loving care given to this aspect of the story being an awesome four-page foldout picture of the 69th Street Terminal about 1916.

Unfortunately similar care has not been taken with the text. As a historical reference work, the book is almost useless unless one becomes intimately familiar with every page. There is no table of contents, index, footnotes or bibliography. The ten chapters into which the text is divided have no titles. There is a tendency to overlook captions. The map on pages 112 and 113 is neither explained or dated, and several of the more spectacular pictures lack appropriate identification.

The text tends to be choppy in places. This is made worse by an unfortunate tendency toward one-sentence paragraphs. The chapters wander from one subject to another without warning. Chapter 5, which appears in the beginning to be a chapter on bus operations, has a brief reference to trolley improvements inserted in page 154 and subsequent references to new cars, a new terminal, declining revenues and a brief biography of Merritt H. Taylor, who became president of the Philadelphia and West Chester in 1937.

In some places, factual errors seem to have crept into the text as a result
of a lack of familiarity with other area transportation properties. On page 102, a reference to the Darby, Lansdowne and Philadelphia Street Railway confuses it with the Philadelphia Rapid Transit Company's Lansdowne line. This line was built by an entirely different dummy corporation and operated at least four years before the D L & P was incorporated.

The text is strongly chronological and furnishes only tantalizing hints of the relationships between the railway lines and the community. The relation between the railways and the suburban development of this century is not fully examined. The author has also failed to compare the operations of the Red Arrow properties with other suburban properties or to place it in the general pattern outlined by Hilton and Due in their book The Electric Interurban Railways in America.

In summary, The Red Arrow is a well-done railfan publication suitable for trolley and local history buffs. Unfortunately, we must still wait for someone to produce a good, solid, interpretive history of a major traction company.

Wilkes College  

Harold E. Cox


This bibliography is a major work, in part because d'Alte Welch had been steeped from boyhood in the books he listed. There is nothing of apology in his remark that his list was compiled from a collector's point of view, nor should there be. His own collection included more than 800 of the books in the bibliography, and so was larger by at least a third than any collection except that of the American Antiquarian Society, to which it passed by bequest and gift after his death. His search of twenty-five years for items to be included in the bibliography took him to the most important of the 185 public and eighteen private collections whose holdings he recorded. He has given his work unity and significance by limiting its scope. It is "primarily concerned with narrative books written in English, designed for children under fifteen years of age," but includes chapbooks and pleasurable nonnarrative books: poetry, jokes, riddles, natural history, books describing trades, objects, street cries, peoples of all nations, games and sports. Broadside, sermons, books of advice, catechisms, primers and school books are excluded. A few selected books in German are included, but books in French or other languages are omitted unless they have an accompanying text in English.

Welch's introductory survey is a fascinating guide to the most important books for children printed in this country from James Janeway's Token for Children, published at Boston in 1700, to William Charles' Philadelphia
imprints of 1820. The 1,478 entries in the list, arranged by author or title, must include between 3,500 and 4,000 separate printings, when subentries are counted. The basic entries represent an expansion from the 1,298 in the first publication of the bibliography in the Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society from April, 1963, through October, 1967. (The addition of new items has occasioned a renumbering of entries and subentries.) Those who used the earlier printing will welcome the clearer separation of collations, locations of copies, and references in this printing, and rejoice over the addition of running heads and an admirable "Index of Printers, Publishers, and Imprints." The references under each name in the index are arranged in chronological order, a useful feature. The omission of references from the titles of some anonymous works to the authors under whom they are entered is to be repaired by the issuance of an index of all titles that, for one reason or another, appear out of alphabetical order, and that index will be sent to purchasers of the bibliography. The omission in this printing of references to all but the earliest-known English edition of the books entered, to copies privately owned unless they are unique, and to most reference works other than Evans, Shaw, and Shoemaker is a small price to pay for keeping it within the limits of a single convenient volume.

As Clifford K. Shipton disarmingly explains it—his remark is quoted in Marcus A. McCorison's admirable appreciation of d'Altré Welch in the foreword—"because of the many years over which this bibliography has been preparing, and because of many revisions and changes in style, it will inevitably show more errors and inconsistencies than are to be expected in a work which could follow some more orthodox plan." The errors most often occur in capitalization, punctuation, or spelling in the transcriptions of titles. They suggest that supposed variants turned up by comparison of a copy in hand with a Welch entry must be checked against the copy on which his entry was based. The revision of the bibliography on which Welch was engaged at the time of his tragic death would have eliminated many of these errors, but, again, in Shipton's phrase, to have withheld the bibliography longer for further polishing would have been "to do a wrong to the world of bookmen." Perhaps no higher praise can be given to d'Altré Welch as a scholar than to record that he welcomed all corrections and additions, acknowledged them with generous thanks, and modestly considered a joint venture the great work his own boundless energy and wide knowledge made possible.

The Free Library of Philadelphia

Howell J. Heaney

Major Writers of Early American Literature. Edited by Everett Emerson. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972. 301 p. Index. $12.50.)

Buy both of them. It has always seemed to me that a reviewer should make a recommendation. I do.

In the United States we have arrived at a point of chronological maturity which has resulted in “Papers” of the great, printed in extenso; a reappraisal of the canonically received elect; and the discovery—sometimes the rediscovery—of some lesser lights. All to the good! But let us not forget that, with a few major exceptions, Americans well into the nineteenth century were still provincial in outlook, competence, and acceptance. The syndrome is a familiar one: “My son Hezekiah writes poetry and he thinks so deep.”

The major American writers do not deserve depreciation. Mr. Emerson’s accumulation of essays would have been happier had the title omitted the descriptive adjective. William Bradford was a good primitive historian; Anne Bradstreet was a fair poet; Edward Taylor, as a Trahernesque religious poet, was aesthetically on a comparatively high level; Cotton Mather, I doubt, ever looked on himself as a litterateur, but he wrote a colorfully prejudiced history, rather advanced science, and average Puritan theology; William Byrd, famous for his paradoxically dull, sexy diaries, compiled a delightful account of his travels in the then wilderness (why have not his touted letters been published?); Jonathan Edwards was a revivalist spellbinder and, if he was as successful as history tells us, he must have had what we would describe as a groovy TV presence; Benjamin Franklin wrote as well as or better than most of his contemporaries chiefly because he had both clarity and humor, both of which are obvious in his correspondence; Philip Freneau, if only the scholars who wrote about him would see him as a humorist as well as a commentator on the times, might be a more human being; and when we come to Charles Brockden Brown, all that can be said is that he did not write “the Great American Novel.” But then, who has? With a few exceptions—at about the level of their subject’s genius—the authors did justice to the “Major Writers.”

The literary detective Lemay dug out some known (who does not know “Sotweed Factor” Cook?) and some heretofore lesser-known Maryland poets, printers—never before so culturally elevated—and wits. Remember, they were far from London, that center of English civilization, and should be judged accordingly. There is a degree of understanding of this on the part of Mr. Lemay, but one wonders if these provincial versifiers were as knowledgeable about Latin and English source material as he is. Richard Lewis—par inter pares, as it were—is one who deserves more attention.

I can only repeat that, forgiving a weak essay or two in the Major Writers, these are books that no serious library concerned with eighteenth-century American culture should be without.
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