

BOOK REVIEWS

France and the Chesapeake: A History of the French Tobacco Monopoly, 1674-1791, and of Its Relationship to the British and American Tobacco Trades. By JACOB M. PRICE. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1973. Vol. I, xxii, 677 p.; Vol. II, 681-1239 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$35.00.)

The author's investigation of the British-Chesapeake tobacco trade, begun twenty or more years ago, eventually led him to a study of the French tobacco monopoly. France was the first or second most important market for the Virginia and Maryland tobacco received by English and Scottish importers. Between the 1720's and 1770's about ninety per cent of the French purchases, handled after 1730 exclusively by the Farmers General, were made in Britain through a few large sellers. The "French price" was a determining factor in the tobacco market and the "French contract" became a plum for which rival firms contended. Thus the Chesapeake economy was significantly influenced by the French market and can be fully understood only in this international context. Although the American Revolution brought commercial independence to the tobacco-growing British colonies, the basic pattern lingered until 1791, when the French National Assembly abolished the Farm General and, with it, the state tobacco monopoly. (The monopoly was re-established under Napoleon in 1810 and the essential features of the venerable Colbertian system persist to this day.)

Mr. Price describes his work as three interrelated monographs: (1) a history of the French tobacco monopoly itself, with emphasis on its political, financial and commercial aspects, and its economic implications; (2) a study of the French tobacco agents in Britain and the effects of their purchases on the British-American tobacco trade; and (3) an investigation of the fate of the monopoly and its commercial policies during the American Revolution, the post-war period (when attempts were being made to encourage direct Franco-American trade), and the opening years of the French Revolution (when fiscal reform and free trade were the order of the day). The author justifies the scale of his work by his concern with *process*, i.e., "the process by which state, administrative and market decisions are made, and the process by which the implications of decisions are felt through the multitudinous layers of the administration and the market in the lives of people insignificant, colonies unfamiliar and indeed foreign places unknown to the decision makers." Tracing these "infinitely complex and interlinked chains of happening" results in what at first

glance seems a rather formidable and forbidding book. Nevertheless, the patient reader, even the nonspecialist, will find much of interest in following the "process," for Price writes lucidly and has cast his net widely. His scrupulously documented details as well as his incidental asides (touching on everything from snuffboxes to the terminology of tobacco culture and manufacture or smuggling in Dunkirk) are always presented in the context of general history.

Price is curious about the people involved, especially the merchants and bankers of the great trading dynasties and such vast international "cousinships" as the Swiss, the French Huguenots in England, or the Irish Jacobites in France. The ramifications of their personal and family relationships are consistently stressed. We learn, for example, how the triumph of Madame du Barry at the French court determined who got the French commission to buy tobacco in Glasgow, or that Benjamin Franklin's grandnephew, Jonathan Williams, Jr., married a daughter of William Alexander of a mercantile family of Edinburgh deeply involved in the triangular American-British-French tobacco trade. Various picturesque adventurers appear: among them the Scot, Daniel MacKercher (see Smollett's *Peregrine Pickle*) and the Genevese dropout, Abbé J.-J. Huber (acquainted with Lord Baltimore), who came to America in 1737-38 with a scheme for tobacco buying—to the dismay of Governor Gooch of Virginia (who suspected espionage), although Philadelphia newspapers, Franklin's *Pennsylvania Gazette* and Bradford's *American Weekly Mercury*, opened their pages to discussions of the Huber-MacKercher proposals.

The last section of the book will be of special interest to American historians. The efforts of the Continental Congress and its agents in France to use tobacco, the chief American export, as a means to purchase war supplies, are treated in detail. Thomas Jefferson's endeavors (with the close cooperation of Lafayette) to obtain advantages for American trade and his opposition to the Farmers General monopoly are elaborated and critically assessed. It is at this point that Price's narrative comes closest to "Pennsylvania history." Robert Morris, of the firm of Morris & Willing of Philadelphia, obtained the Farmers General tobacco contract for the years 1785-87—"very likely the greatest 'private contract' of the *ancien régime*," according to Price. The main grievance of the proponents of Franco-American trade was that Morris paid for purchases in the Chesapeake by bills of exchange drawn on England (following the pre-war pattern) and thus failed to encourage the export of French goods to America. Morris' contract was not renewed. The decision came from the controller-general, Calonne, after lengthy deliberations of an advisory Committee of Commerce representing various branches of the royal administration and French mercantile interests. Here again, Price tirelessly traces the deliberations, identifying the persons involved and characterizing their respective roles, interests, and ideologies (Pierre-Samuel Dupont,

then a *commissaire de commerce* and later known as Dupont de Nemours, was a member of the Committee).

The debates in the National Assembly (1790-91) leading to the abolition of the tobacco monopoly, the committee discussions, the backstairs negotiations, the press and pamphlet skirmishes (into which William Short, the U.S. chargé d'affaires, was often drawn), are likewise carefully analyzed. The disappearance of bulk purchases by the French monopoly had repercussions in Tidewater Virginia, where another *ancien régime* was coming to an end.

Price, incidentally, has made use of materials in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania collections (letters of Robert Morris, letters to and from William Short, correspondence of Mrs. Jonathan Williams in the Alexander Biddle Collection, etc.). Indeed, he seems to have missed little of relevance in the archives and libraries, public and private, of France, Britain, or the United States. In this, as in other respects, Price's encyclopedic book deserves the term "impressive." It is a noteworthy example of scholarly diligence, persistence, and integrity.

Brattleboro, Vt.

HOWARD C. RICE, JR.

Black Bondage in the North. By EDGAR J. McMANUS. (Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1973. xiii, 236 p. Illustrations, appendix, bibliographical essay, index. \$9.95.)

Seven years ago Professor McManus of Queens College published a scholarly study of Negro slavery in New York. Now he has expanded his work to include all the colonies north of the Mason-Dixon line. While relying to some extent on his own previous book, on Lorenzo J. Greene's *The Negro in Colonial New England*, on Edward R. Turner's *The Negro in Pennsylvania*, and on other similar secondary works, McManus appears to have done a good deal of fresh research in primary sources. In any case, it is good to have an overall view of the subject.

McManus holds that northern slavery grew out of "an acute shortage of labor" and emphasizes the point that slaves were in demand not only for agriculture and domestic service but also in a variety of manufacturing enterprises, shipbuilding for example. Many worked as skilled craftsmen—bakers, tailors, weavers, carpenters, masons, etc. Throughout most of the colonial period, no stigma attached to buying and selling slaves, and even Quakers participated in the trade. Most slaves came into the northern colonies via the West Indies. While the importation of slaves was subject to tariff duties in many of the colonies, such legislation seems to have been generally designed for revenue rather than prohibition of the slave trade. The average northern slaveowner held only a few slaves, one or two men to supplement his own labor, plus a woman for domestic service. Where the

owner held more than two, he often hired them out to someone else. There were a few agricultural regions where fairly sizeable crews were maintained.

While in the beginning the status of slaves was not much different from that of indentured servants, both slaves and free Negroes were soon subjected to a humiliating network of discriminatory legislation. Professor McManus has a law degree as well as the Ph.D. and seems especially interested in the legal aspects of slavery, possibly placing too much emphasis on law rather than practice. Colonial black codes provided for curfews, forbade slaves to travel without a pass, prohibited assembly of slaves in groups, made special provisions for handling black crime and punishment, and prohibited sex relations between the races. Nevertheless, the author maintains that colonial slavery was less harsh in the North than in the South. The ambivalence with which people viewed efforts to Christianize the blacks is also dealt with at some length. A chapter is devoted to fugitives from slavery, another to black rebellions, of which the most notable one took place in New York City in 1712. Fears aroused by this episode led Pennsylvania to place a prohibitory duty on the importation of slaves.

Two chapters deal with the emancipation process in the North. Voluntary manumission, the Quaker testimony against slavery, and the influence of the American Revolution are treated. Thousands of slaves won their freedom through service in the British and American armies. McManus places less emphasis than Arthur Zilversmit did in his book on *The First Emancipation* on the ideological factors underlying the emancipation laws and court decisions following in the wake of the Revolution, holding that by this time "slaves no longer played an important role in the economy." However, he does not explain what brought about this change. The persistence of racial discrimination after emancipation provides the theme for another chapter. In his conclusion McManus goes somewhat out of his way to take up the controversy over whether slavery was milder in Latin America than in the English colonies, holding with David B. Davis that there was no substantial difference.

The book is relatively short, but it is packed with factual information concisely presented. The writing is competent, and the footnotes and the bibliographical essay unusually impressive. There is also a statistical appendix. This is a valuable contribution to the literature of Afro-American history.

The Pennsylvania State University

IRA V. BROWN

The Journal of Samuel Curwen, Loyalist. Edited by ANDREW OLIVER. (Cambridge: Published by the Harvard University Press for the Essex Institute, 1972. Vol. I, xxxiv, 516 p.; Vol. II, xi, 517-1083 p. Illustrations, index. \$30.00.)

A few years ago when this reviewer was writing a book on the Tories of the American Revolution, he was presented with a copy of the *Journal and Letters of the Late Samuel Curwen* which had been published in 1845 but was in good condition. It was helpful though not always reliable, partly because it was edited by a great-grand nephew of Curwen, George Atkinson Ward. Now under the editorship of the noted historian and attorney, Andrew Oliver, Harvard University Press has brought out a handsome and excellent edition of the *Journal* in two expensive but very useful volumes.

In commenting on the subject of the earlier book, Charles Dickens said about Samuel Curwen: "He was a man of fair learning and more than average accomplishment; not at all intolerant of opinions at issue with his own; in religion a Dissenter of the class still prevalent in New England; in his tastes scholarly and refined, not ill read in general literature, prone to social enjoyments, a reasonably good critic of what he saw—altogether an excellent example of the class of men of whom the fathers and founders of the great republic sprang."

The late eighteenth century was a time of journals and diaries. This particular one, documented and well illustrated, gives the reader a savory flavor of social life in England from 1775 to 1784. For it was during this period that Curwen, a merchant of Salem, Massachusetts, after fleeing from the harassment brought on by his Tory activities, sailed for England and there kept his journal. Needless to say, he wrote well. And there is an especially vivid quality to his quaint description which brings him close to the peruser of his prose.

A poignant part of the account deals with Curwen's separation from his wife, whom he tried to persuade to flee to England with him. Apparently she feared the ocean voyage of that day more than she did any persecution of American patriots, for she refused to go and her husband never forgave her. He even indicated that he did not wish to be buried near her when he died, so as to avoid seeing her first on the resurrection morning.

Curwen blamed both Britain and America for the Revolution which he considered "a just punishment to them for their folly." Nonetheless he got along well with the British people during his nine lonely years abroad, as he states in his journal. As if this were not bad enough, when he returned he found that his financial affairs had been ruined by his wife and her nephew. To his friend, William Pynchon, he wrote in 1786, "A wife is seen with the greatest of pleasure by an husband in two circumstances only: in the wedding and in the winding sheet."

There is comparatively little in the journal about the larger political scene in England at the time. Curwen found such men as Judge Samuel Sewall and Thomas Hutchinson from America, with whom he commiserated. Mostly his entries seem to be concerned with his walks about the cities and countryside, his chats with average people and his drinking at

frequent times a prodigious amount of tea. He sees Mr. Garrick in plays, observes the king and queen from a distance, and occasionally laments the "effusion of blood, destruction of property and waste of treasure" caused by the war.

In the increasing study of authentic source materials which is stimulated by the forthcoming Bicentennial of the American Revolution, this colorful and interesting account will prove highly valuable.

New York University

NORTH CALLAHAN

Hugh Gaine: A Colonial Printer-Editor's Odyssey to Loyalism. By ALFRED LAWRENCE LORENZ. (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972. xii, 192 p. Bibliography, index. \$6.95.)

Alfred Lawrence Lorenz is a professor of journalism, and he has written this biography of Hugh Gaine with the intention of rescuing Gaine, a Loyalist, from the unmerited oblivion to which most historians of journalism have consigned him. Lorenz is therefore perhaps less concerned with the context of Revolutionary America than historians with a broader purpose would be, and he focuses on Gaine's career to the exclusion of just about everything else.

Hugh Gaine, who had served a printing apprenticeship in his native Ireland, emigrated to New York City in 1744. After eight years' work as a journeyman printer, Gaine set up shop for himself at the sign of the Bible and Crown. Like other colonial printers, Gaine sold books, paper, writing materials, and similar items in addition to printing his own almanacs and publishing a weekly paper, *The New-York Mercury*. Gaine's chosen profession almost automatically catapulted him into the midst of the major political battles of the day, although, as Lorenz shows, he did his best to avoid becoming enmeshed in such matters. Lorenz has examined the entire run of the *Mercury*, and he demonstrates how Gaine vacillated in the pre-Revolutionary years from a radical position in 1765 to a mild conservatism in 1768-1769, back to radicalism in 1774-1775, and finally to Loyalism in 1776. Lorenz states at the outset that his purpose is "to arrive at an understanding of the reasons why he [Gaine] defected to the British," but unfortunately Lorenz' lack of knowledge of the context in which Gaine functioned partially thwarts this intention.

In the first place, Lorenz seems to regard Gaine's "odyssey" as abnormal, as something that has to be explained away by arguing that Gaine was "devoted primarily to economic survival." In fact, most Americans went through exactly the same process of definition and redefinition of political ideology in response to the startling events of the pre-Revolutionary period. Just as there were few Americans who consistently adhered

to a "radical" line, so too there were few colonials who espoused an unremitting conservatism. Almost all Americans, like Gaine, opposed the Stamp Act and then the Townshend Acts, and Gaine was far from alone in his expressions of distaste at the violence of some Revolutionary mobs. (John Adams, to take a prominent example, expressed similar sentiments.) Yet Lorenz takes Gaine's growing dislike for extralegal activities in 1768-1769 as proof positive of his nascent Loyalism, when it was nothing of the sort. Gaine, after all, joyously welcomed the Declaration of Independence six years later, which was hardly the act of a committed Loyalist. In short, Lorenz' major conceptual problem is that he constantly measures Gaine against a mythical radical monolith labeled "the Sons of Liberty," whereas, as Pauline Maier has recently shown, the Sons of Liberty was, if anything, a relatively conservative organization dedicated (as was Gaine) to avoiding unnecessary violence.

In the end, Lorenz does supply two plausible explanations for Gaine's subsequent defection to the British in November, 1776: first, Gaine was probably demoralized by American defeats in the early fall of that year, and, second, it is also likely that he was suffering serious financial distress as a result of his flight to Newark to escape the invading British army. By returning to the occupied city—like many others in the same circumstances—he could salvage his economic fortunes. And Gaine succeeded in doing just that: he published the *Mercury* under the direction of the British army throughout the war and then, after its conclusion, ceased publishing the paper, prudently removed the Crown from his sign, and continued to prosper in Manhattan as a printer and bookseller until his death in 1807.

Gaine's life can perhaps be described as an odyssey, but it was a typical one, and it demonstrates above all else the uncertainty and disruption of the Revolutionary years.

Cornell University

MARY BETH NORTON

British Maps of the American Revolution. By PETER J. GUTHORN. (Monmouth Beach, N. J.: Philip Freneau Press, 1973. 79 p. Illustrations. \$13.95.)

Dr. Guthorn is an amateur in the best sense of the word. In the intervals of a busy professional life, he gives his time and attention to the study of maps because he likes and understands them. Some years ago he perceived the need for a survey of the maps of the Revolutionary War, and in 1966 he brought out *American Maps and Mapmakers of the Revolution*. The present compilation deals with the much more numerous British maps, and it is to his credit that he has brought it out in published form although, wisely, he calls the book a preliminary study. The arrangement is suited to the material, the manuscript maps being listed by their makers with

an index to deal with specific geographic localities and regions, except for the rather numerous anonymous manuscripts, which are necessarily arranged by the areas they are concerned with. Although the chief emphasis of the book is on the manuscripts, printed maps are not neglected. Lists of the maps illustrating English magazines and books from 1774 to 1783 give an indication of the knowledge available to the ordinary Englishman of the day, that is, the general reader who may have been unfamiliar with the excellent atlases of Faden and others.

The listing and location of the manuscript maps, however, constitutes the chief contribution of Dr. Guthorn's book. Over a thousand items are briefly described, ranging from small, rough sketches to magnificent large-scale professional productions. They are located in more than twenty collections in this country and in England. Some maps are included which are privately owned, and there are a few from sale catalogues, although no attempt was made to survey these comprehensively. Of special interest are the titles from a remarkable group of maps discovered in recent years in the collection of the Duke of Northumberland, descendant of Earl Percy, who commanded a detachment of British regulars at Concord on April 19, 1775.

By far the largest collection of British manuscript maps of United States areas in the period of the Revolution was found by Dr. Guthorn, as might be expected, in the Headquarters Papers in the William L. Clements Library at the University of Michigan. Only for that collection were there modern published guides to help the compiler. He has made extensive references to Christian Brun's 1959 *Guide to the Manuscript Maps in the William L. Clements Library*, which for this period supplements Randolph G. Adams' list of the maps and sketches in the papers of Sir Henry Clinton, published in 1928. For the other collections it was necessary for the most part to rely on personal visits, requiring considerable traveling, and correspondence. Less extensive numerically than the Clements collections, the Library of Congress holdings are the other major source in the United States and apparently include more manuscripts for this area and period than the combined total in the official collections of England.

The arrangement of the list by cartographer brings out interesting distinctions between the professionally trained military engineers and the self-taught amateurs. Some of the mapmakers were Loyalists. Included also are a few men who served with the Americans, but whose maps, made prior to the conflict, are known to have been used by the British. Dr. Guthorn has provided informal biographies of the mapmakers, a type of information that is usually hard to come by because many of them were obscure individuals. The sources are omitted, however, so that it is not always possible to judge the completeness of the information, and there is little guidance for those who may want to follow up certain cartographers more intensely.

Additions and corrections to the list of manuscripts will undoubtedly be made, but the general picture it provides of the extent of surviving primary cartographic materials, as well as their types, subjects, and locations, should be of real use to historians now at work on the American Revolution.

The John Carter Brown Library

JEANNETTE D. BLACK

The Development of a Revolutionary Mentality. Papers Presented at the First Library of Congress Symposia on the American Revolution. (Washington: Library of Congress, 1972. vii, 157 p. \$3.50.)

Historians of recent years have at last found an ideological paradigm for interpretation of the Revolutionary era. If Europeans can have their Age of Reason, their Enlightenment, their Romanticism, now Americans can have their Age of Republicanism. Republicanism as the intellectual motivating force of the Revolution in America affords a convenient explanation, and, while valid and yielding a clearer understanding than heretofore of the Revolutionary generation, there are dangers of selectivity and distortion. Yet putting the American Revolutionary mind into a Republican genre has been a most significant advance in the interpretation of the Revolution.

The problem, of course, is two-fold: what was the Republicanism that Americans wrestled with and how did notions of Republicanism come about? This little volume, the product of the 1972 Library of Congress Symposia on the American Revolution, suggests answers to these questions.

Henry Steele Commager sees the institutionalization in America of Enlightenment political and constitutional ideas. The broader aspects of Enlightenment thought, however, such as the idea of progress and philosophy of history, evoked little interest among Americans. Both Commager and Caroline Robbins, who is concerned with the founding fathers' search for building a Republican faith from historical examples, stress the European intellectual development and not too convincingly show the relevancy to the American mind. While Commager emphasizes the purification of certain Enlightenment ideas in America, Robbins finds that Americans were consciously seeking to return to first principles of valor and virtue. J. H. Plumb extends Robbins' views to the fascination of Republican virtue among several European historians.

Richard L. Bushman probes the reason Americans embraced Republicanism on the practical level. Simply, it was the desire to prevent political institutions from becoming corrupt, as they believed was the condition in Europe. To Bushman corruption was more illusory than real: an obsession with official avarice, not as it existed in the colonies, but the belief that

the colonial executives as strangers on the make could not resist the temptation of corruption. The colonial governing elites distrusted outsiders. The legislative-executive power struggle—and Bushman dwells mainly on eighteenth-century Massachusetts—abetted the charge. The constitutional rivalry in itself, however, had little effect on the formation of Republican theory. Edmund S. Morgan, although in agreement, goes beyond Bushman's thesis to include the fear of governors becoming too independent once they had attained wealth and social acceptance. After the Revolution, Morgan notes, the Americans only had to look at evidences of corruption among themselves, and hence the disillusionment with Republican theory.

Pauline Maier, like Bushman, tries to determine exactly when American Republican doctrine materialized. This she discovers in both the repudiation of monarchy and in the "associations formed to regularize colonial resistance to British legislation." The associations were nonviolent and served to contain popular anarchy. Jack P. Greene finds that Maier's view is too restrictive and that Americans became Republicans because of being caught in a Revolutionary movement from which there was no return.

Mary Beth Norton examines the thought of the American Loyalists and argues that they were good Whigs. Esmond Wright concurs, adding that the Loyalists were dedicated to the idea of a unitary state and they thought that to destroy part of it would destroy it all.

This is a provocative group of essays, and the sponsors of the Symposia are to be commended for integrating the papers into a single theme. The Republican interpretation is given new dimensions by the rather high-flying search for European precedents of the first essays and the particular theses of the later ones.

University of Richmond

HARRY M. WARD

Political Parties Before the Constitution. By JACKSON TURNER MAIN. (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg by the University of North Carolina Press, 1973. xx, 481 p. Tables and maps, bibliography, index. \$15.95.)

In a succession of pioneering works Professor Main has explored the social structure of Revolutionary America, and its relationship to political behavior. In many respects the present study is a fitting capstone to Main's previous investigations; it embellishes and provides statistical evidence for his earlier conclusions concerning the political alignment over the Constitution, sheds additional light on the "democratization" of the state legislatures, and confirms his suspicions that enduring and cohesive

voting blocs existed in each state during the post-war years. But Main does more than expand and polish his earlier findings here. He has produced a valuable comparative overview of political developments in the Confederation Period, one which seriously challenges many of the assumptions currently held by historians regarding political motivation and expression in that era.

The Revolution legitimized opposition. Main seeks to measure the shape, sources, and intensity of the new political arrangements by closely analyzing voting patterns in the lower houses of seven states (the remaining six receive more cursory treatment) in light of the biographical data he has gathered on the more than 1,500 legislators involved. At some point in every state two distinct blocs emerged, everywhere possessing common characteristics, and everywhere dividing men who differed fundamentally on a range of issues. Main labels these blocs "Cosmopolitans" and "Localists," but concedes that the terms are not wholly descriptive in every state. Those familiar with Main's *The Antifederalists* (1961) will find the current alignment reminiscent of his "commercial" and "noncommercial" categories, but sketched in finer detail. Ideology is not ignored but it is de-emphasized. Main's assemblymen are moved essentially by sectional conflicts, contests that pit farmer against nonfarmer, agrarian interests against mercantile, large property holders against small, Cosmopolitan (men, both urban and urbane, who hold a broad "world-view") against Localist. Each bloc sought a government styled after its needs, aspirations, and experiences.

A remarkable continuity is demonstrated by Main. The split over the Constitution was an intensification of a division already measurable in every legislature, he tells us, and this division closely anticipated the alignment formalized by the first national parties. The implications of Main's conclusions are wide-ranging. Unfortunately he does not see fit to explore the relationship of his work to parallel studies, such as H. James Henderson's treatment of voting alignments in the Continental Congress. It is unfortunate also that there is no consistent use of the term "party" among scholars working in this field. Main's title will doubtless mislead many. He has not located the origins of modern political parties before the Constitution nor does he claim to have done so. Readers may wonder, too, at Main's labeling of political conditions in Massachusetts as "Political Parties before the Constitution" when Van Beck Hall, after examining the same legislature in roughly the same time period, finds "Politics without Parties." They agree on more than their titles intimate.

Those persuaded that quantitative history essentially identifies and measures that which can be conveniently quantified will not be entirely satisfied with this book. Surely readers will share Main's uneasiness over the subjective categorization of the biographical data, and shudder at the amount of material one is expected to accept on faith. But this is an im-

portant work which seeks to discover and weigh the factors determining political divisions in the Confederation Period, and to explain the nature of those divisions. It will elicit much interest—and much debate.

University of Northern Colorado

G. S. ROWE

Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian.

By BERNARD W. SHEEHAN. (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg by the University of North Carolina Press, 1973. xii, 319 p. Bibliography, index. \$11.95.)

This scholarly account of the way Americans perceived Indians in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, tells a lot about white society but relatively little about Indians. The central theme of the book is that by doing good to the Indians we did them in. Hence, it deals more with philosophy and practice than with "philanthropy," because there was much hate mixed in with the love. The author, Associate Professor of History at Indiana University, quotes a "perceptive" source: "The very nature of even our most friendly mode of dealing with them was pernicious to their moral welfare."

This reviewer thinks a more perceptive view to be that of A. F. C. Wallace in "Revitalization Movements . . .," *American Anthropologist*, LVIII, and in "Exporting the American Idea," *Saturday Review*, April 6, 1963, which showed mutual benefits *when there was mutual respect*. The typical action agencies of the period under review, the army, the churches, business and land interests, even when friendly, considered Indians to be inferior.

The title of Sheehan's book implies that Indians are, or are becoming, extinct. One could also say that Jeffersonian America has become extinct. Indians and all Americans have been changing.

The author draws on many source documents, books and periodicals, and arranges a wealth of material into neat categories. Analysis, characteristic of Jeffersonian times, is by hypothesis and speculation, with little scientific reasoning based on data, tests, and experiments. Conclusions are drawn from negligible information. For instance, Jefferson thought that American Indians were the stock from which the people of Asia sprang, because he thought there were more diverse languages here. Jefferson made quite a study of Indian words, but made the common mistake of thinking that Indians used few words. They probably used as many words as did illiterate "civilized" Europeans.

Jeffersonian metaphysics considered mankind to be innately moral,

Indians to be inferior, but capable of advancement, and European civilization to be the acme of human attainment. Europeans dominated their environment, and were therefore "superior" to Indians, who adjusted their way of life to nature. This was one of the justifications for the rights of whites to displace Indians. The white man was determined to improve the land to his own liking, and the Indians in his own likeness.

Since Jeffersonians thought that Christianity encompassed civilization ("true civilization is found only in Christian countries"), missions and schools were supported by the government as well as by the churches. Patriarchal families, farms, and the work ethic were the roots of success. When the Cherokees became a "civilized tribe" they were an economic and cultural threat to their neighbors. Uncivilized Indians had to be isolated to prevent evil frontiersmen from perverting them. Therefore, the very concept of civilization prevented the incorporation of Indians into the web of American life; they had to be removed and isolated.

The mixture of superiority, morality, cupidity and fear on the part of the whites required that Indians be manipulated and controlled. Indians were shown the economic and military power of the United States to intimidate them in Jefferson's time, just as Indians are threatened today at Wounded Knee by the White House response to Indians' grievances—don't try that again, or else.

Indian violence in Jefferson's time is well documented, and is the basis of much of the movie and TV stereotype of the savage Indian. The Indian side of the story is not given and no attempt is made to estimate Indian behavior before the arrival of the Europeans. The colonists came with a long heritage and practice in the fine art of torture, dismembering, and burning at the stake. Did they learn scalping from the Indians? Whites scalped and gave bounties for scalps. Indians did not pay for scalps, and they considered counting coup (the insolent touching or striking) to be a greater achievement than the killing of an enemy.

The conclusion to be drawn from *Seeds of Extinction* is that Jeffersonian "philanthropy" hated Indianness. The frontiersmen certainly hated Indians, because Indians fought to retain their land. The domination by whites throughout all our history has not succeeded in eliminating Indians completely, or in making them into white men.

If an Indian scholar had written on the subject of this book he might have dealt with the reasons for the white man's aggressiveness, his arrogance, the basis of his religion, his views on property and the social order. Now, nearly two centuries after Jefferson's days, there may be a renaissance of Indian values as "civilization" becomes more cooperative, more respectful of differences, and more harmonious with nature. That might even decrease the probability of our own extinction.

Haverford, Pa.

THEODORE BRINTON HETZEL

The China Trade: Export Paintings, Furniture, Silver, & Other Objects. By CARL L. CROSSMAN, with a Foreword by ERNEST S. DODGE. (Princeton: The Pyne Press, 1972. xii, 275 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$25.00.)

This is not only a very beautiful book; it is a highly important book as well. As the title implies, the text concerns the cultural impact of East upon West, but the central theme of the book is far more restricted; for instead of developing the story of Chinoiserie from the early days of the Portuguese in Macao until the Opium Wars of John Company's time, the China Trade is limited to the tale of Chinese exports of utilitarian and artistic value to New England during the Federalist period; in other words, from the voyage of the *Empress of China* to Canton in 1784 until the craft and workmanship of Chinese commodities underwent a complete degeneration in the mid-nineteenth century. In this period the great seaport of Salem played the lion's share, and it is therefore appropriate that this book should be the work of a distinguished member of the staff of the Peabody Museum of Salem, from which much material is taken.

The divisions of the book are topical. Paintings, water colors, glass paintings, furniture, lacquer, carvings, silver, fans, and silks, down to wallpaper with paintings of all kinds taking up more than half the text. The whole is lavishly illustrated, apparently with a magnificent disregard to expense (other, and more stingy, publishers please take note), with the happy result that the book is quite the most delightful that this reviewer has been privileged to handle for many a long day.

There are several features that give this book rather special importance. There is the discovery (?) of a distinguished Chinese portraitist, working just after 1800, who went by the westernized name of Spoilum; there is a valuable key of identifying Chinese seaports, and one for dating the views of Canton, with the foreign honges. The illustrations, too, are a wonderful supplement to the text; in fact, the accounts of such items as furniture and silver would be quite lost without them. What alone is lacking is a really good map of the whole Canton area. Altogether it is a book "to keep children from play, and old men from the chimney fire."

A second book by Carl Crossman, on export porcelain, is promised. One may be assured that it will be a worthy sequel, and that the two works will be a definitive monument.

Historical Society of Pennsylvania

BOIES PENROSE

American Silver, 1655-1825, in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. By KATHRYN C. BUHLER. (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1972. Distributed by New York Graphic Society. Vol. I, xx, 383 p.; Vol. II, 384-705 p. Illustrations, index. \$45.00; paperback, \$20.00.)

The dean of American silver historians, Mrs. Buhler, has crowned her many achievements with a definitive catalogue of the American silver in the Museum of Fine Arts. Following closely on the heels of her collaborative effort with Graham Hood, *American Silver in the Yale University Art Gallery* (Yale University Press, 1970), Mrs. Buhler has had the signal honor of being instrumental in creating two magnificent catalogues of the two greatest collections of early American silver. Scholarship in the field of early American decorative arts is thereby enormously enriched.

The catalogue has 566 entries representing more than 600 pieces of silver and gold. One of the great virtues of this catalogue is that every piece, with the exception of duplicate forms in a set, is illustrated. Makers' marks are also illustrated, all the variants of marks on the Museum of Fine Arts silver being grouped under the biographical entry for each maker. An appendix contains 123 abbreviated entries for spoons, which according to the author are repetitive of forms illustrated in the main catalogue.

The catalogue is arranged regionally starting with Massachusetts, then chronologically according to the date of birth of each maker, and finally by stylistic progression (in the absence of documentation to the contrary). The bulk of the catalogue is given over to silver made in Massachusetts with 93 entries just for Paul Revere II. Of the total 566 entries, 497 cover Massachusetts silver. The rest of New England gets short shrift, with two entries for New Hampshire, three for Connecticut, and twelve for Rhode Island. The remaining fifty-two entries are divided between New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

The Museum of Fine Arts has been singularly blessed over the years with generous donors and enterprising curators. It started collecting American silver before the end of the nineteenth century, and it held the first museum exhibit of American silver in 1906. Through the years the museum has recognized the importance of American silver by holding important exhibitions and publishing such catalogues as Mrs. Buhler's *Colonial Silversmiths: Masters and Apprentices* in 1956. No doubt this is one reason why less than thirty of the more than 600 pieces recorded in the 1972 catalogue were purchased by the museum; the vast remainder was acquired by gift or bequest.

In her introduction Mrs. Buhler gives us the outlines of the story of how the collection grew. Reading between the lines one can sense a number of anecdotes that would make interesting reading if the author could be persuaded to elaborate based on her extensive first-hand knowledge.

Design is by Carl F. Zahn and Barbara Hawley. Mr. Zahn also designed *American Silver in the Yale University Art Gallery* with which this catalogue must be compared. Both are outstanding examples of catalogues and the bookmaker's art. The Museum of Fine Arts catalogue suffers somewhat from photographs of variable quality (see for example No. 410),

although anyone familiar with the problems of photographing silver knows how difficult it is to achieve uniformly satisfactory results. A design quirk in the catalogue that makes it occasionally difficult to use is the manner of handling running heads. In small type at the bottom of the page, they give the surname of the silversmith and the geographical area. Since the individual entries usually do not include the name of the silversmith (the biographical sketch often falling on a previous page), the running heads are the only means of identifying the silversmith whose work is being discussed. With families of silversmiths such as the Hurds, the Burts, and the Edwardses, it is sometimes difficult to remember which craftsman is under consideration. This is a minor quibble in an otherwise exemplary performance.

Winterthur Museum

IAN M. G. QUIMBY

A History of Pennsylvania. By PHILIP S. KLEIN and ARI HOOGENBOOM. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973. xiv, 559 p. Illustrations, index. \$14.50.)

In the opening paragraphs of *A History of Pennsylvania*, when describing the geographical and climatic features of the state, the authors note extremes in neither, but variety and balance in both. These physical attributes of Pennsylvania pretty well characterize its history, as set forth in this book. The problem of balance, always rendered more difficult in proportion to the variety of events to be related, is almost impossible to meet to the satisfaction of every reader. But here, with due regard for the bounds of reasonableness and the multiformity and extent of the material to be covered, the problem has been adequately met. In addition to presenting even-handed accounts of political, social, and economic developments, the authors have recognized current interests and enthusiasms, as well as the fact that certain aspects of our history have been too often neglected, by providing more information on "ethnic" and cultural history than is usually found in works of this nature. Further, the balance of coverage is well matched by a qualitative evenness in the various areas considered. The political story, some parts of which should more properly be written by a grand jury, is, especially after the Civil War, appropriately candid and revealing.

Another difficult task inherent in a study of this kind involves the presentation of a great mass of facts without unduly sacrificing continuity, coherence, and interpretation. To meet this problem Professors Klein and Hoogenboom divided their history into four chronological parts. Beginning in 1609, the terminal dates for these divisions are 1763, 1861, 1900, and the present. Within these parts they have, by developing pervasive themes, tried to weave a great deal of factual material into manageable interpretive

patterns. The result, by and large, is a work that meets the requirements of comprehensiveness, reference, and analysis.

The organizational structure of this book for the period beginning in 1609 and ending in 1861, for what it implies about the character of the times, might elicit demurrers from traditionalists who prefer to see the colonial period treated as an entity in itself. Part I, catchily if dubiously entitled "The Peaceable Kingdom: 1609-1763," tells of the founding years, vicious political broils, the almost constant badgering of proprietary governors, election riots, rancorous disputes over military defense, and the sanguinary French and Indian War. By ending this part in 1763 it was obviously impracticable for the authors fully to describe therein colonial Pennsylvania's economic and social developments. Accounts of these are carried over into Part II, "Laboratory of Democracy, 1763-1861," and they do not appear until the political story has been brought down to the Civil War. Then they are made parts of four chapters which cover about one hundred and fifty years of colonial and state history.

Revolutionary historians of the social-conflict school might complain that the effect of this book is to diminish the role of the Revolution in Pennsylvania as a social and economic watershed. Although they do not say so explicitly, one has the distinct impression that the authors incline to the view that, aside from a change in government—and this mainly a change in leadership rather than philosophy or basic structure—the Revolution here was, after all, not very revolutionary. Their observation that "The cardinal points of political change do not necessarily serve to mark points of economic change," would apparently apply to social change as well, at least as far as the impact of the Revolution in Pennsylvania is concerned. Much can be said for this point of view.

As stated in the preface, this book "has been designed with special attention to the requirements of teachers of Pennsylvania history." It certainly meets those needs, but, like Sylvester K. Stevens' *Pennsylvania: Birthplace of a Nation*, which came out in 1964, it so successfully combines factual comprehensiveness with stylistic attractiveness that it should have appeal for the general reader as well. Pennsylvanians who are interested in their state's history are fortunate in having two valuable general works appear within a relatively short space of time.

Temple University

HARRY M. TINKCOM

Architecture in New England: A Photographic History. By WAYNE ANDREWS. (Brattleboro, Vt.: The Stephen Greene Press, 1973. vi, 202 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$16.95.)

As long as one views this book through its subtitle, *A Photographic History*, it offers real satisfactions. Its format allows for more than 200

architectural photographs to be printed large enough, and with fine crispness of definition, for the viewer to catch a sense of the scale and details in style of the buildings. Their size also permits the author-photographer's affinity for building materials to be transmitted effectively. Mr. Andrews makes his lens present the character, the feel, of the weathered clapboards of the seventeenth century, the bricks and stone, the horizontal and rusticated siding of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, down through the polychromy and the vagaries of shingle and stick of the mid- and late nineteenth, to the concrete of the present age of imposition of technology and design on location and function.

Only if one is looking, in a book entitled *Architecture*, for more interpretation of the purposes, characteristics, and subtleties of period styles, here divided into seven of varying duration, does some disappointment arise. The chapter headings consist of archly phrased selections from contemporary sources which may, indeed, prove to be provocative to the coffee-table reader, but seem misleading in an architectural context. "Mr. Bulfinch's Misadventures," to herald "The Federal Era: 1789-1830," is one example, while "Gothic Gloom in Hartford: The Romantic Decades, 1830-1860," is another which is not fulfilled by either the text or photographs and their captions. The captions throughout are well dated and contain considerable pertinent information, but many are a bit too taken up with biographical details and atmospheric quotations largely concerning owners, not architects or builders, and with old saws and opinions about such figures as Lord Timothy Dexter and the millionaires of Newport. At times there appears a disturbing dichotomy between the pictures and the caption material. The circular porch on the first Harrison Gray Otis house, for instance, has always been known as an element in the 1916 restoration, and actually has been removed to reveal the original doorway over two years ago. The architect of "Gore Place" has been identified for some years, and Old West Church has not been a branch library for a number of years, as the sign in the photograph would testify. Although the author has wisely indicated those properties available for public inspection by simply stating "Open," and crediting the organization extending that privilege, it is regrettable to have missed such listing, established in 1958, for the important Nichols-Sortwell house in Wiscasset, Maine.

From the fact that 139 of the illustrations exhibit truly sympathetic studies of structures dating from 1830 down to "The New Look, or Modern Times," the principal service of this volume is revealed, because New England architecture of this period, particularly perhaps the last half of the nineteenth and first quarter of the twentieth century, needs more of such visual and written documentation and appreciation while the buildings and records exist.

Daniel Webster and Jacksonian Democracy. By SIDNEY NATHANS. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973. xii, 249 p. Bibliography, index. \$10.50.)

Hesitantly and somewhat inadvertently American historians are being drawn into the study of what students of international politics have termed "political culture." While it seems clear what Gabriel Almond generally had in mind when he coined the term to describe the "pattern of orientations to political actions" within a particular society, it has never been precisely defined. However, political culture undoubtedly includes attitudes toward the legitimacy of political parties and this has recently fascinated students of early American politics. Bernard Bailyn, Richard Hofstadter, James Sterling Young and Ronald P. Formisano have added immeasurably to our understanding of how the Founding Fathers and their successors looked upon parties, and, in doing so, have forced reconsideration of our most basic assumptions about the nature of American political development.

In *Daniel Webster and Jacksonian Democracy*, Sidney Nathans focuses upon Webster's antipartyism and his attempts to come to terms with the "new politics" of the 1830s. While Nathans should be congratulated for bringing to light the way in which antiparty perspectives guided Webster's interesting career, and illustrating once again the "residual doubts about parties" which marked the Jacksonian era, his book is seriously marred by certain basic contradictions and an uncritical acceptance of some of the hoariest clichés of Jacksonian scholarship.

Nathans' thesis combines several traditional themes with the brilliant, but seriously flawed, perception of the nature of American political development presented by Lynn Marshall in "The Strange Stillbirth of the Whig Party." Webster emerges as the most prominent of "an entire generation of leaders reared to rule in a traditional world and forced to function in a modern one." These old Federalists were attuned to deferential politics and mistrustful of the voter-oriented political parties that were appearing during this period in the form of the Jacksonian Democrats and the Anti-Masons. At first they tried to convince the people that it was still best for the talented few to rule, but gradually they were forced to learn the new style of politics. This learning process bore only limited results and Webster and his "generation" were the victims of the process of political modernization which marked these years.

Aside from his focus upon Webster's antipartyism and his use of Marshall's thesis, Nathans presents a very traditional view of the period. Although removed from the center of the stage, Andrew Jackson and the Democratic Party are definitely the heroes of the piece; and the Whigs as usual are damned when they did and damned when they didn't. The tendency of the Democrats to embrace partisanship is associated with their

commitment to democracy, their modernist outlooks, and their success at transcending narrow sectional loyalties. Only gradually—in part with the help of Webster—did the elitist, traditional, and deeply divided coalition of contrasting sectional interests, which composed the Whig party, come to understand how to “delude the people” and concentrate upon “huzzah.”

The most important problem with Nathans’ general thesis is that, as Richard Hofstadter and others have shown, antipartyism was hardly limited to Federalists in the first decades of the nineteenth century and it remained an important force well beyond the era of Jackson and Van Buren. It is questionable that Webster was “the most prominent skeptic about parties” during the years from “the 1820s to the 1850s.” Obviously Nathans misunderstands Jackson’s attitude toward parties; and he has simply not read Harrison’s inaugural, since he associates him with modernist pro-party sentiments. His treatment of John Tyler, whom he strangely relates to “the long gone Federalists,” shows the weakness of his argument.

Similarly, his tendency to equate the acceptance of political parties with a modern democratic viewpoint both ignores the fact that anti-partyism in America has been as often associated with radicalism as with conservatism, and gets Nathans hopelessly into trouble in his discussion of the Anti-Masonic party. Here he follows those who argue that the Anti-Masons represented a democratic uprising against special privilege and perceives them as modernists “oriented toward voters and victory”; and yet Nathans completely ignores the fact that Formisano, in an article which Nathans approvingly quotes, has clearly shown that the Anti-Masons were vigorously antiparty!

At another level the book is marred by Nathans’ misreading of secondary sources. He refers to both Hofstadter and Formisano, but obviously misses the larger points which they sought to make. Much the same is true of the way he uses Charles Sellers on the Southern Whigs, Peter Temin on the relation between governmental decisions and the business cycle, Lee Benson on the election of 1844 and Jim Curtis on Van Buren’s presidency. Nathans follows the latter religiously—even in my opinion into error—but nowhere reveals that Curtis clearly shows that the “Fox” himself was a transitional figure, eventually consumed by the process of change. Nathans’ text is also littered with long dispelled myths too numerous to mention.

Although the career of Webster is a possible departure point for a sweeping reinterpretation of political culture and political development during these years, Nathans fails to go much beyond Marshall’s initial insight. Much of his narrative will be helpful to those who attempt to look upon this period in a new way, but Nathans seems satisfied with far more limited objectives.

The Free Soilers: Third Party Politics, 1848-54. By FREDERICK J. BLUE. (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1973. xii, 350 p. Appendix, bibliography, index. \$10.95.)

In his preface Professor Blue suggests that neither Theodore Clark Smith's *Liberty and Free Soil Parties in the Northwest* nor my *Free Soil: The Election of 1848* have fulfilled a need for "an extended account of the role of the Free Soil party in national issues as well as the relevant state and local issues of the late 1840's and early 1850's." The observation is reasonable.

But he apparently did not intend to fulfill this need. Instead he thought it appropriate to produce a "leadership study" of the Free Soil movement because the society of the late 1840's "was still somewhat elitist and deferential" and because the movement "was not characterized by a spontaneous ground swell of popular support." It is difficult to conceive how a student of the Polk-to-Pierce administrations can be so badly mistaken about the American character of the period. Perhaps it is because of the nature of his sources. His manuscript materials are heavily Whig, and his secondary materials were written primarily by authors of the Whig-Liberty persuasion—elitist sources. More significantly, despite a bibliographical list of forty-eight newspapers (ten from the then miniscule State of Wisconsin), his book shows little evidence of the use of newspaper sources. This failure, of course, precluded his learning about popular, undeferential, attitudes.

Free Soilers is divided into two equal and unbalanced accounts. In the first half the author relates the background of the partisans to and the development of the Free Soil Party through the election of 1848. The account is similar to, though less complete than, my own *Free Soil*.

There are some differences. The author has a strong pejorative attitude. Salmon P. Chase, the noted friend of the slave, becomes a man "with an opportunistic desire that took precedence over his dedication to the antislavery cause" (p. 10). Benjamin F. Butler, who had to be dragooned into public office, becomes a man with "ulterior motives" (p. 76). John P. Hale, strong man of the New Hampshire Democracy, becomes Chase's toady (p. 14), Henry B. Stanton, devoted reformer, becomes a "hypocrite" (p. 76).

The author also holds the conviction that there were behind-the-scenes "deals" (by 466 men!) at the Free Soil convention in Buffalo. So strongly does he hold this belief that he declares, in effect, that three of his favorite sources—Charles Francis Adams (pp. 71-72), George W. Julian (p. 78), and John G. Palfrey (p. 94)—were utterly mistaken when they reported that no deals were made. At the same time he presents no evidence from competent sources for his belief.

He also retrojects the modern obsession with race into the 1848 cam-

paign. He charges that all Free Soilers were racists: i.e., all Free Soilers believed that the black man, slave or free, was inferior to the white man. Very few Free Soilers of any stripe were advocates of equal rights for free blacks. He is not concerned that infinitesimally few Americans were concerned with the problem in 1848; he takes the unhistorical position that racial equality should have been an issue! Those, like the Barnburners, who truly wished to preserve the territories for "free labor," he repeatedly calls "hypocrites."

The second half of the book covers the long six years from 1848 to 1854. In it the author fails either to recognize that the electorate had voted for a moderate solution of the problem of slavery in the territories or that politics is only "the art of the possible." Instead he assumes that the only proper action for Free Soilers was preservation of the party. He concentrates most of his attention in this half on the activities of Free Soil congressmen in the Thirtieth Congress, on the Barnburner-Hunker "reconciliation," and on the efforts of Chase in Ohio and Henry Wilson in Massachusetts to form coalitions with Democrats. As far as they go these are relatively adequate accounts, though the author's disapproval of reconciliation and coalition is strongly evident. At the same time he gives little attention to Whig Free Soilers; the whole Whig Party drifts into the shadows. In addition, Liberty Party members just disappear.

His biases continue strong. Despite contrary evidence, he repeatedly maintains that the Barnburners were motivated primarily by a desire for "revenge" in 1848; he produces no evidence to sustain this charge—not even a quotation from the arch-Hunker *Albany Argus*. Nearly all Whigs (when mentioned) become noble; all Democrats become ignoble.

His account of the blending of the Free Soilers into the Republican Party in 1854 is sketchy, emphasizing sharply the general imbalance of the book. *Free Soilers* might have met with the approval of New Englanders of the Whig persuasion in the nineteenth century. It does not fulfill the need for an extended and definitive study of the Free Soil movement today.

Temple University

JOSEPH G. RAYBACK

John Brown. Edited by RICHARD WARCH and JONATHAN F. FANTON. (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., A Spectrum Book, 1973. viii, 184 p. Bibliographical note, index. \$6.95; paperback, \$2.45.)

When John Brown and his army of twenty-one brought war to Harper's Ferry, Virginia, in 1859, the strident reactions in both North and South reflected a country on the verge of rupture. Few men in American history have evoked such powerful emotion as the enigmatic warrior who saw

himself as the agent of the Lord ordained to rid the land of slavemongering. Few events have elicited such varied interpretations, both from contemporaries and from historians through the years, as Brown's brazen, pathetic attempt at Harper's Ferry to generate a slave revolt.

This little documentary study, one of Prentice-Hall's "Great Lives Observed" series, draws together selections of Brown's writings, contemporary correspondence, newspaper editorials and speeches, and views of historians from 1891 to 1970 and focuses on the Harper's Ferry raid. The editors' purpose is, through a presentation of "raw data," to enable the reader to confront the evidence about John Brown for himself and to help penetrate the cloud of legend and lore surrounding that embattled abolitionist. The book is neither a eulogy of nor an attack upon the figure of Brown, and the editorial notes are, fortunately, not corrupted into polemical quips. The introductory remarks and conclusion are cogent. The book, however, is disappointing in two areas.

The first, something over which the editors had little control, involves the format prescribed by the "Great Lives Observed" series. It is just not possible to present effectively through documentary publication a subject as complex and involved as this in 184 pages. This book, as others in the series, only whets the appetite. In addition, the documents themselves are not edited but merely transcribed or copied. The myriad of questions raised by the internal information and references within the documents are left hanging to frustrate the reader.

The second area, relating specifically to this study, involves the use of source material. A majority of the documents offered are gleaned from works which appeared in print before 1900 by such men as F. B. Sanborn, Richard Hinton, and James Redpath. With an extensive amount of original Brown manuscripts available the book begs for new material. Even more disturbing is the fact that the editors in several instances have been willing to reprint early versions of Brown letters when the original manuscripts are easily available for scrutiny. For example, Brown's original letter to his family dated October 31, 1859, cited by the editors from Sanborn, is in the Boyd B. Stutler collection. The November 30, 1859, letter from Brown to his family, also cited from Sanborn, is in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

Given these deficiencies, the book, nevertheless, stimulates interest in Brown. Was he the fighter for justice, the unselfish, highminded spokesman for liberty and Negro equality, and, as Frederick Douglass observed, "one of the greatest heroes known to American fame"? Or was he the traitorous monomaniac and the embodiment of the evils of Black Republicanism as seen by Senator Jefferson Davis?

An expanded documentary publication, drawing together the many available manuscript resources relating to the subject and employing the most careful editorial standards, would be a welcome piece of scholarship

and would provide a fuller understanding of Brown and the singularly important event of his life. This volume is at least a small step.

National Historical Publications Commission

ROGER A. BRUNS

The Politics of Continuity: Maryland Political Parties from 1858 to 1870.

By JEAN H. BAKER. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973. xv, 239 p. Appendix, bibliography, index. \$11.00.)

Societies oscillate between the desires for continuity and for change. In revolutionary times, conservatives cling to tradition as their sheet anchor; in eras of conformity, radicals challenge the established order. An excess either of conservatism or of radicalism seems to hasten the rise of its opposite. Historians constantly study such movements in society, seeking to ascertain in which direction the pendulum is swinging at a given moment, how far its swing has progressed, and at what point a reversal of direction occurred.

The concept implicit in Dr. Baker's title, *The Politics of Continuity*, seems to collide head on with Charles Waygandt's book of a decade ago, *The Mighty Revolution: Negro Emancipation in Maryland, 1862-1864*. But the conflict is more apparent than real because, while Maryland did become the first slave state to outlaw slavery, this accommodation to practical necessity did not alter Maryland's parties. The brief period of control by Lincoln's supporters in Maryland brought about the "mighty revolution" described by Waygandt; but Baker reminds us that emancipation, viewed over a longer span of years, had the effect of strengthening the pre-war conservative Democrats and of bringing them back to power at the war's end.

Conventional historical wisdom accepts the Civil War as a point when the national political pendulum reversed its direction. But for Maryland politics, says Dr. Baker, "the war did not provide a convenient dividing point." Here, political realignment had occurred before the war, "and during the ensuing decade citizens clung doggedly to the allegiances forged in the 1850s." The state "staunchly maintained political parties established in the late 1850s, and these organizations used, even in 1870, almost the same issues, structures, and leaders as they had before the war."

Baker's book deals more comprehensively with the Democrats than with Lincoln's adherents in Maryland. The latter were rent by faction, divided on issues, and uncertain of strategy and leadership. Montgomery Blair dominated the conservative Unionists who wanted to save the Union but could not accept blacks as fellow citizens. Henry Winter Davis and later Hugh Bond, leaders of the Unconditional Unionists, promoted the idea that Negroes should enter society with the same rights and duties as any

other citizens. The two factions could agree on emancipation, for only two per cent of Marylanders owned slaves (p. 19), but they split on nearly every other question concerning the post-war relations of whites and blacks.

The Maryland Democrats, with no need to conform to Republican national policy, supported the more popular local views: Negrophobia, protests against denials of civil liberties by the Republicans, and a nostalgic appeal for "the Constitution and the Union." With their control of county officials and their experienced and disciplined leadership, they controlled Maryland during the 1858-1870 period except for the few years when suspect Democrats were disfranchised by the wartime test oath.

Baker has consulted the basic manuscript, archival, newspaper and secondary sources and has produced a scholarly and readable book which is enhanced by useful statistical appendixes which present the results of careful quantitative analyses of legislative voting.

The Pennsylvania State University

PHILIP S. KLEIN