BOOK REVIEWS


Charles Coleman Sellers' sudden death prevented his seeing this book, of which he would certainly have been proud. It is not unlike a portrait by Charles Willson Peale of a friend he knew intimately and could paint with personal feeling and understanding. Sellers knew the Peales as no living scholar does, and although he felt very warmly toward them, he was as bound as his illustrious ancestor to the need for the most accurate rendition he could attain. This account of the Museum permitted him to focus his broad knowledge to produce a new and satisfying interpretation.

The book itself is physically attractive and pleasant to handle. The illustrations, both the black and whites which run through the text and the color portfolio, are well chosen and effectively reproduced. The only jarring aspect of the design is in the notes, which are hard to locate at the back of the book because no page headings are provided there, and hard to read because book titles are rendered in roman type and everything else italicized—reversing established practice.

Charles Willson Peale dominates this story of the Museum; both the real institution and the ideal which his successors cherished in varying measure were extensions of the elder Peale. His was not the first American museum, but it attained unprecedented success and it set the course later museums follow; indeed, they are still seeking in some respects to come up to Peale's aspirations. He built the Museum upon predecessors, especially Pierre Eugene du Simitière's American Museum, whose collections he obtained, and upon the best European models: the British Museum, the Leverian Museum, the Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle in Paris, and the Swedish Royal Academy. His was primarily a museum of natural history displaying a wide variety of well-preserved and mounted species, from the spectacular mastodon he "exhumed" to "minute insects" and Indian, Chinese, and Pacific island artifacts. He classified his holdings following the best current taxonomy, and he pioneered in presenting some of them in habitat settings.

All early museums tended to collect wide varieties of unrelated objects. Peale was well disciplined in expanding his natural history holdings, and his sons, especially Rubens, Rembrandt, and Titian, continued his practices, but the Museum from the beginning included two other, unrelated
components: historical portraits and technological objects. The Peale portraits of Revolutionary leaders represented a great record, better known than other Museum holdings, but not much noticed in this book because Sellers had elsewhere discussed them exhaustively. Sellers’ major emphasis here was upon the natural history objects, many of which he traced to their present locations in a variety of continuing museums. The third component of Museum collections was always small and has been least well preserved in the originals, but it was of real importance to Peale and his sons. This was the models and mechanisms, ranging from Peale’s own patent wooden bridge model to the replica of Redheffer’s perpetual motion machine.

It was a great museum, by far the best in its day in this country. Peale kept it on a high intellectual level which won the support of the science community here and of several European scientists. Yet, within the constraints of good science, the Museum boasted good design and imaginative showmanship. Peale used the magic lantern, introduced moving pictures, as his “Perspective Views with Changeable Effects” were known, offered lectures, and published occasional writings. The Museum encouraged research in selected areas, Titian developing into a competent naturalist out of this setting, but Peale always saw the Museum primarily as an educational institution. He and his sons were most fundamentally keyed to communication with viewers. It was exceedingly fortunate that the artist’s eye moulded this first important American museum.

Ultimately the Museum failed, dispersed and overwhelmed by commercial competitors who lacked Peale’s dedication to science and truth. The required support could not be maintained. Early government support, in the form of free rent for the Museum in Independence Hall, faded when the City took over. This was not, however, a Philadelphia phenomenon, for decreased public support of such institutions was demonstrated as well in the contemporary collapse of the New York Institution and in the failure of the Peale Museum extensions in New York and Baltimore. Private support, too, proved inadequate against the rising tide of Jacksonian democracy. Peale’s great dream of making his a national museum was not to be, either. In fact, not even James Smithson’s great bequest was enough to achieve that result except after a long succession of fights and struggles.

Understandably, Sellers had no time for P. T. Barnum, who seemed an unprincipalled agent of the destruction of Peale’s ideal. Yet Barnum was a very important figure in his own right who showed the route to certain objectives within the society of his day. He and other museum promoters who were guided by the profit motive expressed the dominant force behind the concurrent climb of the United States to industrial leadership. And fortunately, the Peale ideal did not die. It continues within all the more favored museums of the present and in this book it is given renewed freshness.

Smithsonian Institution

Brooke Hindle
"Momentous and Tragic Beginnings" is the foreboding caption applied by Professor Bridenbaugh to Chapters I through VII of this two-part study. Chapter I offers a succinct account of the motives for "The English Invasion" of the New World, motives that led in 1607 to the settlement of Jamestown. The arrival of the adventurers, in the dark words of the eminent author, "signaled the inception of a profound and lasting human tragedy." Chapter II promotes an hypothesis advanced in 1953 by Fathers Lewis and Loomie in their *Spanish Jesuit Mission in Virginia* to the effect that Opechancanough, the Indian chieftain who engineered the 1622 and 1644 massacres of settlers along the James, was one and the same as the young Indian who, in 1561, was ferried off to Spain by Spaniards exploring the Chesapeake Bay, and who, known in Hispanic circles as "Don Luis," returned to his native land in 1570 with a band of Spanish Jesuits seeking to establish a mission on a tributary of the Chesapeake. Professor Bridenbaugh promises more on this puzzling possibility in a study to be published in 1981.

Succeeding chapters in Part One treat the cultivation of tobacco, that Indian legacy which even more than the massacres of 1622 and 1644 was to haunt the future of the colony; the appalling cost in human life, mainly to whites and Indians, in establishing an English foothold in Virginia; the failure of Jamestown to emerge as the religious center of the colony, suggesting between the lines a dismal contrast with English settlements farther north; the surfacing of self-government in the colony following the first meeting of an elective assembly at Jamestown in 1619; and the failure of Bacon's Rebellion in 1676 to effect political and social reforms.

The second section of the study—designated "James Cittie in Virginia"—is covered by Chapters VII through X. But the stark title applied to Chapter VIII—"The Jamestown Community: A Conspicuous Failure"—is the dominant theme of the entire volume. Chapter IX follows with a survey of "The People, the Site, and the Port," which, while emphasizing that "The story of Jamestown is one of continuous tragedy," acknowledges that "Jamestown was the first enduring English settlement in America, and as such, deserves a history." It does indeed! And Professor Bridenbaugh, in plain, level prose, has summarized the story with dispassionate—and with what many Virginians would consider unfeeling—objectivity. Chapter X, the final chapter, entitled "Jamestown: Symbol for Americans," yet again stresses the failure of the Jamestown community to develop as a city in the wilderness, but concedes that self-government in America can be traced to the legislative assembly which convened at Jamestown in 1619.

Voluminous footnotes, citing documentation—mainly from contemporary sources—in support of the author's judgmental analysis of the Jamestown experience, follow the final chapter in the volume. The footnotes are suc-
ceed by several appendices devoted respectively to a "Jamestown Chronology, 1544-1699," a brief note on archeological investigations of the settlement, a selected "further" reading list, and a roster of the governors of Virginia to 1699.

Virginia Historical Society

JOHN MELVILLE JENNINGS


Dr. Frost, a professor of religion at Swarthmore College and Director of the Friends Historical Library, has given us a collection of thirty-four documents relating to the Quaker testimony against slavery during the period from 1676 to 1796. It provides a useful supplement to Thomas E. Drake's well-known work, Quakers and Slavery in America (1950), and to the documentary source book, Am I Not a Man and a Brother (1977), edited by Roger Bruns, reviewed in the April 1978 issue of this journal. Bruns's collection of antislavery literature, which covers approximately the same time period, is more comprehensive, but Frost's book appears to be better edited.

The documents in this work include minutes of Quaker meetings, petitions, correspondence, pamphlets, and legislation. The editorial matter and most of the selections are reproduced in typescript. Some of the longer pieces are facsimiles of original printed pamphlets. However, more than two-thirds of the items are taken directly from previously unpublished manuscripts. The original spelling and punctuation of the documents have been unchanged "except for the omission of abbreviations and the occasional addition of periods."

The book is one of a series of documentary histories dealing with "the Quaker impact on America." In an illuminating twenty-eight-page introduction, Dr. Frost suggests reasons for Quakers having been in the vanguard of the antislavery movement: their belief that each person contains a spark of divinity, their refusal to sanction the use of force in human relations, and their unwillingness to accept biblical sanctions for slavery.

The book is divided into four parts, each begun with a short introduction by the editor. The first part, "Initial Responses to Slavery," includes selections covering the period from 1676 to 1715. Of these the first and one of the most interesting is Gospel Family-Order, an address delivered by George Fox in Barbados in 1671 and printed in 1676. Fox urged his fellow Quakers to teach their slaves Christianity and to free them "after a considerable Term of Years." In behalf of his argument Fox, like most of those who were to take part in the antislavery crusade, cited Christ's "Golden Rule." In 1688 a small group of Germantown Quakers prepared the first formal protest against slavery, also printed here. They suggested that
slavery would discourage white settlement in the colony and open it to the
danger of slave revolt. George Keith's protest of 1693, the first one to be
printed and circulated, is not included. (Frost may have omitted it intention-
tionally, since it is available in Bruns's book.) Nor is William Penn repre-
sented; he was, alas, a slaveholder himself.

The second section covers the period from 1715 to 1758, during which
time most Quakers turned against slavery. The most significant selection
in this group is from John Woolman's Some Considerations on the Keeping
of Negroes (1754). In 1758 the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting made the
purchasing of slaves an offense for which a member could be "disciplined
and suspended." Nothing is included from the fiery works of Ralph Sandif-
ford and Benjamin Lay, but their writing may be sampled in Bruns's book,
which Frost undertook to supplement, not duplicate.

The third section, "Freeing Slaves," offers documents of the pre-Revolutionary period, of which the most interesting are the works of Anthony Benezet. While Woolman's argument against slavery was based largely on
scripture, Benezet appealed to the developing natural rights philosophy.
Surprisingly, the measure by which the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting
provided in 1776 for the disownment of slaveholders is missing from Frost's
book as well as that of Bruns.

The fourth section, "Converting Others," features Warner Mifflin's
Serious Expostulation with the Members of the House of Representa-
tives of the United States (1793). This is followed by the constitution of the Pennsyl-
vania Abolition Society (1787) and the text of the Abolition Act of 1780.
The last selection gives the minutes of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting
(1796) directing its affiliates to admit members without regard to race or
color. A short bibliographical essay concludes the book. There is no index.

The Pennsylvania State University

IRA V. BROWN

A Book for a Sixpence: The Circulating Library in America. By DAVID
Kaser. (Pittsburgh: Beta Phi Mu, 1980. xiv, 194 p. Illustrations,
bibliography, index. $9.00.)

To warp a TV commercial to a cultural use: "When David Kaser speaks,
the book world listens"—or should. He is one of the soundest historians
of American book publishers and printers. In presenting A Book for a Six-
pence he throws light on an aspect of books, libraries, and reading habits
in the United States that has been largely—but not completely as his
copious notes indicate—slighted by scholars of American book culture.

The earliest commercial lending library in the British American colonies
of which a record survives was that inaugurated in 1762 by William Rind
in Annapolis. Kaser's monograph deals solely with circulating libraries
operated for the profit of their proprietors and not with social, subscription,
or shareholders' libraries for common benefit. Since some of these latter allowed nonmembers to borrow books, it is not quite clear what the overriding advantages of the commercial libraries were. Before the Revolution the annual fee of the eleven known circulating libraries ranged from the Bostonian John Mein's £1.8.0. to the Philadelphian Lewis Nicola's three dollars reduced to two. Although a share in the Library Company of Philadelphia cost £2 in 1731 and $40 in 1793, annual dues were only ten shillings early and $2 late.

The point is made by Kaser that the availability of a large selection of novels combined with an appeal to readers of the female sex and location in a shop with convenient hours was responsible for the success and spread of commercial libraries. Was the admission of Sarah Wistar in 1769 as a member in the Library Company a challenge to Nicola's New Circulating Library? Certainly it seems that the emphasis on entertainment was the prime factor, taking advantage of the increased leisure of urban middle-class females.

The spread and economic viability of the for-profit ventures was curtailed by the Revolution, but with peace came a burgeoning, matched by the publication of fiction in both quantity and quality. Before the end of the century Hocquet Caritat in New York boasted 30,000 volumes, a larger number of books than any other library of any kind in the country. As an indication of that size, it should be noted that at the time of the 1850 national survey the Library of Congress had only 50,000 volumes.

The boom continued through the first half of the nineteenth century. The proportion of novels in the lending collections grew. The appeal to women continued. It is interesting to learn that some libraries sprang up as adjuncts of millinery shops and fancy goods stores, hardly the gathering places of men. Kaser proposes that one of the magnetic features of some circulating libraries was their offering of reading rooms. Some subscription libraries before 1800, and surely the numerous Athenaeums in the early nineteenth century, had this amenity. He does not make quite clear that women would have been uncomfortable in these. Was that the case?

Kaser's detailing of the places, proprietors, charges and selection is the meat of the book. The information gathered here was not available only piecemeal elsewhere, if at all, except in primary sources. Bibliographers, librarians, bookmen will assimilate these findings with appreciation. It is, however, an aspect of American culture that sociologists and economists would do well to look at. The for-profit circulating library declined in the second half of the nineteenth century, not because of the rise of free public libraries, but because the price of novels decreased drastically, from $1.50-$2.00 to 50 cents in paper and 75 cents in cloth.

We still would like to know how many read what. Did Scott's Ivanhoe circulate x times a month, as compared to Cooper's Spy at x-2? It is probably impossible to recover statistics of this kind, but, as all of us who have worked in book availability know, we parade titles and not use.
Kaser's appended "Checklist of American Commercial Literary Enterprises, 1762-1890," and "Subject Analysis of Circulating Library Catalogues" are basic starting points for anyone who would further trace taste and accessibility. Comparison with subscription libraries still remains a desideratum. Is there a library school doctoral candidate who would make a subject analysis of the Library Company accessions as they were printed regularly in the second half of the nineteenth century? We are moving toward a better understanding of the cultural life of our ancestors. Kaser's work is a valuable step in that direction.

Library Company of Philadelphia


Despite the importance traditionally accorded Philadelphia, New York, and Boston in colonial America, Gary Nash is only the second historian to synthesize their history in the crucial seventy-five years before the Revolution. The work he has produced is a first-rate book by any measure. In its depth, sophistication, and focus it eclipses Carl Bridenbaugh's impressionistic, almost antiquarian studies—the Cities in the Wilderness volumes—and simultaneously demonstrates that the traditionally neglected middle period of colonial American history, from 1690 to 1760, as well as the cities of the middle colonies, shaped America as decisively as did the first century of settlement, the Revolution, and New England.

This is a self-consciously comparative history that concentrates on two major themes. The first is the lurching, erratic economic history of the three cities. Boston actually experienced economic decline in the pre-Revolutionary era. Quick profits earned from the colonial wars stimulated no long-term growth and development, while the patriotism that city fathers foisted on younger lower-class males, all potential consumers as well as skilled laborers, killed them in alarming numbers. By contrast, New York and Philadelphia knew long-term prosperity even though each city experienced frequent numbing rides to the bottom of the economic trough. Appropriately, perhaps, prosperity sometimes also rode poverty's back. Philadelphia's pre-Revolutionary building tradesmen, for example, prospered out of the increase in European redemptioners whose forced residence in the city stimulated roominghouse construction.

Nash's second theme centers on the steadily deepening popular participation in urban politics produced by the erratic economy. The later gave birth to increasingly competitive partisan political groups whose search for support broadened the franchise and steadily eroded the sharply deferential political vocabulary of eighteenth-century English political rhetoric. But true to Nash's sensitive ear for complexity, manifestations of this deve op-
ment in each city often proved anomalous. In Boston early artisan agitation and long-term economic decline and stagnation failed to create a working-class political movement even in the 1770s. In New York the broad franchise served the city's dominant wealthy merchants with startling effectiveness. Only in Philadelphia, with its ebullient prosperity and comfortable Quakers, did a separate working-class movement take shape in the era before the Revolution.

Nash's analysis rests on an economic interpretation of evidence. He is not an economic determinist. He takes great care to explore subtleties of relationships among economics, social development, and political behavior. But the directing analytical force behind the work clearly is a delicately muted, soft-core Marxism. The five chapters that describe the urban economies always serve as the necessary prelude to the discussions of urban politics in the remaining eight chapters, while the analysis of discrete happenings customarily concludes by establishing the economic and class foundations of political, social, and religious behavior. Thus Nash essentially accounts for differences in the Great Awakening in the three cities by exploring differences in the urban economic and political structures.

The work is not without flaws. Conservative historians will note that evidence of lower-class quasi-radical political activity too often comes from fearful conservative contemporaries rather than from the rhetoric and behavior of the lower-class citizenry. Left-leaning historians will fault Nash for his academic fussiness in so consistently hedging and qualifying the themes of class consciousness and economic causation in the colonial political structure. Some problems of balance are bothersome. The interpretations of pre-Revolutionary religious and political rhetoric by Philip Greven, Bernard Bailyn, Alan Heimert and William McLoughlin are awkwardly tacked to the opening of Nash's concluding chapter. The second chapter often lacks focus, however much some historians may be taken by Fifth Monarchists in Boston and Keithians in Philadelphia. William Molineux is unwittingly introduced to readers twice (pp. 333 and 355) and Nash's carefully prepared indices of wealth-holding, population, poor relief expenditures, paper currency values, ship tonnage, per capita imports, and wages are made almost meaningless by their separate appearance in a lonely appendix at the end of a long book. Too many readers will tire of turning pages to find them.

Still, these problems are minor intrusions into a major work. Through exhaustive research, keen if controversial analysis, and clear prose Nash has uncovered the perplexing economic and political evolution of the northern colonial cities for the first time. It will be required reading for years because it is good and challenging, not just because it is the only one available. And were the matter in doubt, it caps Nash's entrance into the top rank of early American historians.

University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

Jon Butler

During the American Revolution, the Assembly of Pennsylvania expropriated from the heirs of William Penn the Pennsylvania land originally granted to the founder but not yet sold or given to others; all prior grants were recognized, and the Penns were allowed to keep their own private manors. By this measure, the state gained some 24,000,000 acres of land. Norman B. Wilkinson’s doctoral dissertation, reproduced in this volume, explains how that land was managed from 1779 to 1800 and specifically considers whether it was made available to the public in a democratic fashion. He concludes that the state failed to live up to its own high ideals. Inadequate laws and inept or corrupt administrators permitted venal speculators to monopolize large portions of the best land to the detriment of the state, of future settlers, and even of themselves.

What was particularly unfortunate was mismanagement by the speculators. If they had carefully bought the land and sold it with proper titles to newcomers, their services could have been very useful. No one would have begrudged a fair profit to the middlemen who provided skillful help in locating and acquiring legal titles to good land. Instead, in their compulsive haste to own as much land as possible, the speculators, using shady or outright illegal methods, often filed overlapping, conflicting, or incomplete claims through collusion with Land Office officials. Furthermore, the clumsy business practices of both the speculators and the Land Office employees produced confused and inaccurate records. This incompetence penalized everyone. Uncertain titles caused litigations that tied up the disposal of approximately one-third of the commonwealth land for fifty years, depriving the state of income and settlers of land ownership.

Wilkinson focuses especially upon the machinations of Robert Morris, financier of the Revolution, and John Nicholson, Comptroller General of Pennsylvania from 1782 until 1794, when he was forced to resign. Both were driven to acquire more land than they could pay for, pay taxes on, dispose of, or even keep track of. When the hordes of immigrants they expected in the 1790s did not come to Pennsylvania after all, Morris and Nicholson were left in desperate straits, scrambling to save their estates, pressed by creditors on all sides, and ultimately committed to debtors’ prison.

This reviewer wishes that Wilkinson had reconsidered some of his explanations and removed ambiguities from his dissertation. For example, he reports on page 47 that the land act of April 8, 1785, put no restrictions on the number of applications for land that a person might file; yet on page 73, without further clarification, he tells us that “the law, until 1792, prescribed only one land warrant to a person.” Furthermore, his description of how land was distributed by lottery under that act differs from the
wording of the act itself. If practice varied from legal requirements, this should have been explained, at least in a footnote. In addition, one wishes the publisher had provided an index; its omission makes the book difficult to use as a reference.

Still, in spite of these reservations, this book is worth reading. It is a generally well-written study of what happened to land in Pennsylvania in the early post-Revolutionary period. In addition, it reminds us once again of what happens in all speculative booms when people permit their greed to override their good sense.

Michigan State University

Anne M. Ousterhout


The editors of Lafayette's papers have devised a formula which has much to recommend it. They have first of all decided not to publish all the products of the Marquis' pen, so that the present volume contains about three-fifths of the extant Lafayette materials for the period covered. This may offend purists and those who believe that because a man was important his old laundry lists must also be; but this arrangement spares the reader the trivia and repetition inevitable in such collections and is probably the only practical solution with a writer as prolix as Lafayette. To these writings are added letters from his respondents and "third party" materials, that is to say a selection of writings about the Marquis by his contemporaries. This three-sided approach, supplemented by copious explanatory notes, makes for more satisfying reading than is usually the case with the published papers of great men.

This second volume of the series covers the Marquis' military service in 1778, during which he reveals himself to be a competent soldier. The editor suggests with some justification that had Lafayette not relinquished command of his detachment to General Charles Lee on the eve of the Battle of Monmouth, the outcome might have been more favorable to the Americans. Also covered in this volume is Lafayette's return to France early in 1779 and his role—a considerable one—in the planning and preparation of the expeditionary force under Count Rochambeau.

Readers of this volume will find in it reassuring images of the Lafayette that all Revolutionary America loved and Fourth of July orators never tired of evoking: brave, generous, enthusiastic for the cause of liberty, and naively, charmingly young. But there is another Lafayette in this volume as well—one less known and certainly less charming: a young man with an ego and a self-confidence as ill-matched to his youth and inexperience as
his rank of Major General. In his letters Lafayette was sometimes cloyingly sycophantic, sometimes downright devious. Here and there the reader can catch a glimpse of that hidden engine of ambition which drove him. Occasionally contemporaries saw it too; Henry Laurens once wrote that Lafayette's preoccupation with personal advantage drew him "wholly from the general interest." Whoever reads this fine volume must acknowledge the sad truth that the only foreign demigod in our national pantheon was distressingly human.

University of Georgia  

Lee Kennett


Although the achievements and failures of the Continental Congress, America's first national government, 1774–1787, have long been argued among historians, it is only in the last decade that major books have been published to replace Edmund C. Burnett's *The Continental Congress* (New York, 1941). In *The Beginnings of National Politics—*originally a 1975 Harvard doctoral dissertation—Jack N. Rakove boldly challenges primary assumptions of Nationalist, Progressive, and "Ideological" historians concerning the operation of the Continental Congress, the origins of national political parties and the Confederation era in general. His significant four-part study provides a persuasive new interpretation of confederation politics and of the origins of American Union.

Rakove's central thesis is that policy making in the Continental Congress was based not on republican ideology, economic conflict, regional rivalries, or political representation but was dictated by practical, narrowing choices that delegates had to make each day as a result of the exigencies of war and politics and the evolution of a system of administration. In part I he demonstrates how congressional authority was derived from the local committees of correspondence throughout the colonies and how the delegates themselves called upon the authority of the Congress to strengthen their local mandates. Rakove argues, for example, that the decision for independence was not manipulated by the so-called Adams-Lee junto, but rather "emerged as a logical conclusion flowing from principles and opinions that most delegates commonly shared and as a response to events they could neither control nor evade" (p. 102). From the beginning, then, Congress was a deliberative body where no single group controlled or dictated national affairs and where members frequently accepted less than they desired on issues because these "process democrats" believed such action was "vital to the success of the common cause" (p. 103).

In parts II and III of this study Professor Rakove traces the framing of
the Articles of Confederation, the subsequent problems and conditions shaping congressional administration, and he examines the "crises" marking the final years of the war with England. Here, as elsewhere, he differs sharply with the scholarship of Merrill Jensen, E. James Ferguson, H. James Henderson and others. In playing down the factional character of Congress, he does not deny that significant differences existed; Rakove is rather inclined to believe that partisan divisions, such as developed over the Deane affair of 1779, were the occasional clashes in a "Gentlemen's Club," not of disciplined "nascent legislative parties." He also dispels the notion, popularized by Merrill Jensen, that the Articles of Confederation embodied a distinctive set of convictions. The final structure of the confederation, concludes Rakove, was the result of a step by step process that reflected the needs of Congress itself; it was not a product of mercantile interests planning to control national politics.

With this interpretive framework, he skillfully treats the subjects of federalism, congressional administration (from standing committees to administrative boards), procedures, and the working habits and attitudes of the delegates. Respecting the division and location of sovereignty Rakove asserts that the framers of the Articles of Confederation intended to vest certain sovereign powers in Congress and to subordinate the states to its decisions. The early plans of union of Benjamin Franklin, John Dickinson, Thomas Burke and others are superbly analyzed. He also concludes that delegates found service at Congress demanding and unsatisfying because "politics was still far more of an avocation than a career" (p. 217) and service there did not "conform to the leisurely ambience of colonial politics" (p. 223). Rakove contends, furthermore, that Robert Morris labored to strengthen Congress under the Articles and that he did not intend an unauthorized redistribution of power between Congress and the states with his financial program. Although many will agree that Morris never controlled Congress and frequently failed to get his way, fewer might accept this reassessment of Morris' motives.

Part IV entitled "Reform," which is clearly the least innovative section of the book, completes the coup de grace of the "Progressive" school of history. Although he passes lightly over problems of capital, revenue, land and foreign policy, which troubled Congress during the mid-1780s, Rakove adequately summarizes the dynamics of these issues and how they fostered a desire to strengthen the national government over the states. The emphasis and importance that H. James Henderson placed on the western land issue and the subsequent struggle over and defeat of the Jay-Gardoqui Treaty is closely followed. According to Rakove, the Philadelphia Convention was a desperate rather than a calculated move. The achievement to transform the structure of government proved greater than expected because the members of the Federal Convention had transcended the "limited and static boundaries within which previous discussions of the problems of the union had been confined" (p. xvii). The idea of national
government that slowly evolved from the convention thus “combined elitist and popular politics.”

Based on extensive research, this study is well conceived, effectively organized and lucidly written. Not every reader will accept Rakove’s persuasively presented conclusions, but this study will long influence the scholarship on the Continental Congress. There is, however, much that we still need to know about the Confederation era and new researches should be facilitated by the recent appearance of a new series of delegates’ letters and of an “Index to the Papers of the Continental Congress, 1774–1789.”

*Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission*

**Roland M. Baumann**


“Who is not more familiar with transportation and travel than with industrial production?” asks Louis C. Hunter, emeritus professor of history at American University (p. 538). Historians have extensively written about the mobile power involved in canals, steamships, and railroads. Less well known is the general progress of stationary power as used in mills, mines, and factories. Professor Hunter has chosen this for his theme and explains, “The key innovation in the Industrial Revolution was the mechanization of hand operations and the use of mechanical power to drive machinery. The kind of power adopted was a secondary consideration, the choice depending chiefly upon such basic factors as availability and cost” (p. 161.) Until the 1870s, he points out, water, not steam, was principally used to generate energy for industry in the United States. Water power was cheaper, more efficient, and freer from mechanical difficulties than was steam. It ceded first place to steam power only when the urbanization of industry increased the importance of a convenient location and dependability.

Professor Hunter amply documents these assertions, which supply the justification for a major work in three volumes, of which this concerning water power is the first. (The other two will deal respectively with steam power and developments in the transmission of power occurring from 1850 to 1930.) He concentrates on technological innovations in the spreading use of water power for industry in the United States, locating this concentration within a geographical and economic context and relating it to corresponding developments in Europe.

He is kind to readers who know nothing of engineering, although he expects them to be familiar with economic history. He has in other words
designed the study for historians rather than engineers. He educates readers in the simpler principles and jargon of the technology, taking them step by step from the construction of early tub wheels to the design of the more complicated turbines, passing by the way through overshot, undershot, and breast wheels and the hurdy-gurdy and tangential waterwheels of western mining districts and ending with millwork, the means of transmitting water power to machinery. Maps, charts, tables, and diagrams are plentifully used to help readers along. By the time a reader finishes the book he may not know how to build a waterwheel or a turbine, but he should understand their operation and importance in the perspective of power needs of American industry.

The study is breathtaking in scope. Professor Hunter would have contributed to industrial history by limiting his efforts to an analysis of the technology. Instead he has gone far beyond this and has considered the interaction of the technology with life in an agricultural society, the early stages of manufacturing in villages, and the growth of the first large American industrial cities. He has explained the legal complications arising from the harnessing of lakes and streams. At the same time, he has made no attempt to cover all regions and situations with equal thoroughness. He has concentrated on developments which motivated changes in the socioeconomic structure and selected for special attention the regions for which information is plentiful. Hence, the Midwest with its sluggish rivers is given little consideration, and not much is paid to the use of water power in Pennsylvania, in which in any event the novel developments lay in an application to mobile rather than to stationary power. By contrast, New England receives the lion’s share of attention. One chapter specially describes the development of the water resources of the Merrimack River in Massachusetts and the subsequent rise of the textile industry in Lowell, Manchester, and Lawrence.

The footnotes form an important part of the book. They are grouped at the bottom of the pages and contain much supplemental information of substantive and bibliographical sorts. To some extent the footnotes make up for the lack of a separate bibliography, although one hopes that a subsequent volume will contain a complete bibliographical section. Nine short essays have been grouped as appendixes rather than included in footnotes.

The presentation is not without flaws. The amount of repetition is greater than the use of the book for reference can justify. Some of the tables, especially those in the chapter, "The Decline of Direct-Drive Waterpower," give absolute figures which to be meaningful should have been reduced to percentages. These provide minor irritations and do not seriously detract from the value of the book as a whole, which this reader found not only highly informative but also fascinating. One looks forward to the next two volumes.

_Lehigh University_  
W. Ross Yates

Mr. McFarland has invented or stumbled on a new way of writing biography. Sojourners is not the life-history of one person. It is composed of many biographies packaged together, with the story of Washington Irving as the "container" which holds them all. The figures besides Irving who receive full treatment are a seemingly incongruous gathering: John Brown, Aaron Burr, Sir Walter Scott, members of the family of Emily Foster (with whom Irving was possibly in love), the actor John Howard Payne, Shelley and his circle, and John Jacob Astor. Sorting out all the characters who appear on this vast stage would be a little difficult because many of them, Byron and Gerrit Smith for example, are only walk-ons. Surprisingly, all of the main characters, with the exception of Brown and Shelley, touched Irving's life. He knew Mary Shelley as widow and just possibly may have proposed to her. Brown, the first to come on stage, is here because he was hanged at Charles Town, Virginia, on December 2, 1859; Irving was buried the day before. "The sun that sets in the evening" of the burial "rises the following day on a different world." A new era in the development of the nation was soon to begin, and Brown was its harbinger. He is here also, I think, because his passionate and lonely life shadows the pleasant gregariousness of Irving's sojourn.

Irving was an excellent choice for the container. He traveled widely in this country and abroad and was always a man about town wherever he went. He was also a successful tuft-hunter and he kept an abundant record of his successes in meeting the great ones of his time. Since his adventures were mostly of the mind, the placidity of his life could be counterpointed against the high-pitched lives of Brown, Burr, Scott, Shelley and Astor. Sojourners makes no pretense of providing the latest scholarly findings about the lives which combine to form this polymorphous biography. Mr. McFarland's aim was to affirm through his many sketches "the abundant possibilities inherent in the human adventure." He has succeeded in doing this. Whether he has also enabled his readers to "move with fortitude and grace into the cold reaches of the future" is yet to be learned.

Though he relies heavily on his sources, he has, most of the time, treated them with respect. He condenses and paraphrases skillfully. On occasion he colors and embellishes. His inevitable choice of a source for his container was the standard biography of Irving by the late Stanley T. Williams, published in 1935. This orderly work, exceedingly rich in detail, is written in the manner believed appropriate for biography at the time. Williams is never at a loss to know what Irving was thinking or feeling at any given moment. Mr. McFarland also uses the omniscient mode. (Did he borrow it from Williams?) It was, as I have said, the current mode in the 20s and 30s. Strachey, in Queen Victoria (1921), imagined much of the Queen's inner life that is not in the record. André Maurois' Ariel (1923) makes fiction of the biography of Shelley. No harm is done the reader in such
excursions from literal fact if he knows he is permitting himself to be titillated. It must be said, however, that Mr. McFarland's fondness for speaking through the consciousness of his many characters gives their biographies an old-fashioned tone.

One word more about method. To get from an episode in one life to an episode in another life and then on to another and another, Mr. McFarland builds bridges from Brown to Irving; from Irving to Burr; from Burr to Irving; from Irving to Scott—and so on. Some of these bridges are shaky because they are built on the most tenuous of relationships. When they are sturdy, there is a viable connection between the two subjects: a meeting, a letter, a friendship in common. The shaky bridges are constructed after this model: “On that very day Irving was . . . .”

Reading Sojourners is like reading a suspenseful detective story. The author brings us to the climax in one biography and then crosses over to an episode in another biography. When this tactic works, one is tempted to leaf ahead to see at once how Episode X comes out. Perhaps a register of each breaking-off and resumption should have been provided: viz., “John Jacob Astor's biography is continued on pp. 413, 427, 476”!

Princeton University

Willard Thorp


I opened this handsome book at random, and the first thing I saw, apropos of the first Mrs. Astor and her husband John Jacob was: “She encouraged him to become a Mason because of the company he would keep—among others, George Clinton, a future Vice-President of the United States, his brother, Dewitt Clinton . . . .” Bemused by this condensation of Clinton history, I determined not to be influenced. Anybody can make a mistake. The mistake was mine. It became obvious as I read through the book that this was par for the course. Virginia Cowles knows no more about American or New York political and social history than she has been able to pick up around the fringes of the Astors. Into this almost perfect vacuum she has dropped the tale of America's first stupendously rich millionaires like a big lump of suet into cold water. If nothing much gets cooked, it's not surprising.

This historical vacuum in which she works necessarily presents the Astors at their own evaluation—Kings of Gold, Queens of Society, Self-made Royalty. That this evaluation was supported by the sensational press and a fringe of sycophants and rivals and perhaps devoutly believed in darkest Dakota doesn't mean that it was valid. The social picture is more complicated. For the very first time in all history, Americans, in the persons of Astors and others, were able to compete with the very richest Europeans
eye to eye. The previous upper classes of America, landed or mercantile, had developed an elegant way of life, but one much more modest than the grandiosity of the European Baroque. One has only to compare the most splendid of Virginia plantation houses with Blenheim to get the picture. Now some people could afford to challenge Blenheim, and the question was: how? The problem of what to do when you don’t have to do anything and can afford to do everything had to be fully faced for the first time in American history. The Astor solution was conspicuous consumption. While the older gentry looked on with various degrees of disdain, envy, or emulation, the Astors and their like in New York started to build palaces, float yachts, race horses and cover their wives with good jewels and their walls with bad pictures. They did little else. Europeans snapped up the heiresses. The heirs snapped up wives from the older gentry. (The Astors allied themselves with Livingstons, Schermerhorns, Roosevelts, Delanos, Gibbes of South Carolina, Willings and Pauls of Philadelphia etc.) But alas what should have happened, and probably would have happened anywhere else but in nineteenth-century New York—the gradual absorption and gentling of all that naked dough—did not happen. The Astors never got assimilated, but continued to live isolated in their gilded cages. The American branch of the family withered away. The branch that moved to England became absorbed in precisely the proper way, and the Astors there are now numerous and thoroughly gentrified. It was this failure on the part of New York to domesticate its wild beasts that has caused Philadelphians, Bostonians, southerners and such to look down on it as permanently parvenu. The Astors remained parvenues generation after generation.

Lack of insight on the part of the author might have been forgivable if Ms. Cowles could write. The shiny, silly pageant of Astorism does have possible color and dash. If she could tell an anecdote or turn a phrase one could perhaps overlook total lack of perspective. But no. Clumsinesses like, “Yet Astor’s ruthless outlook created a pyramid of scoundrels” (this apropos of the fur trade) abound; no cliché is left untouched. She is properly indignant about New York’s richest family living in gilded mansions on the rents of unspeakable slums, as she and all should rightly be; but her heart is really with the Mrs. Astor’s jewels.

What does one get? The chronology of this not very interesting family, and a few not uninteresting individual portraits, mostly of women. The male Astors seem to turn out alike: ugly, disagreeable, tightsfisted boors. It’s the women who do the glittering—doughty Caroline Schermerhorn, Mrs. Wm. Backhouse Astor, Jr. who single-handed created newspaper “Society” with her balls, diamonds and Four Hundred; wayward, foolish Nancy Langhorne, Lady Astor, who did so much to liven up the House of Commons as the first woman to sit there. Ava Willing, whose family had already played the Astor game of “richest in America” with far more eclat and charm during the Republican Court (Cowles obviously never heard of the Binghams) emerges with sulky charm. Poor Mary Paul, the other Philadelphia
bride, doesn’t have much to say, despite her husband’s rash effort to set her up as the Mrs. Astor in place of redoubtable Caroline. (Curious pattern of billionaires marrying Philadelphia girls in their third or fourth generations—vide Rockefellers and Kennedys).

A specimen of solecism that gives a hint of the shallowness of the book, anent Mrs. Astor’s queenship: “People said that J. P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller preserved their dignity by never trying for her favour.” That is, they were afraid of being snubbed. People that silly shouldn’t be quoted. Perhaps the only thing on which the Puritanical Baptist and the Epicurean Episcopalian could agree was their scorn for the fatuous Astorbilt world of show and glitter.

But on the whole even the glitter isn’t really in this book, the fun is missed. No serious thought intrudes, but the stories aren’t very amusing. It is a beautifully gotten up volume, but the best thing about it is the book jacket. At first I believed the numerous errors were those of proofreading, but when misspellings like “Livingstone” occurred more than once, and those Clinton brothers persisted, I began to suspect that even “Ft Sumpter” was the author’s fault. Of the many recent books about the rich—Mellons, du Ponts, Rockefellers—this is the most trivial. Yet it is easy enough to read. It is short, it is not totally malicious, it does tell the bare story; if you want to know it. But what a wasted opportunity either for an examination in depth, or for a gilt-edged romp. You’ll get neither one here.

Princeton, N. J.

Nathaniel Burt

As We Saw Them: The First Japanese Embassy to the United States (1860).

Masao Miyoshi, Professor of English at the University of California, Berkeley, has written a monograph which is highly informative for those with special interest in modern East Asian history, the record of U. S. diplomacy, or Japanese-American cross-cultural relations. His book has been attractively produced by its publisher, and its illustrations, some in color, add much to its value.

Miyoshi’s work is broken down into four segments of roughly equal length. 1. “The Travelers”: the personnel chosen for this first official Japanese mission abroad since the imposition of Tokugawa isolation, and their experiences in America. 2. “Views”: an analysis of the numerous diaries and travelogues kept by the Japanese, revealing how they regarded a world so alien to them. 3. “Minds”: a study as to why they emphasized or omitted certain aspects of their experiences. 4. “Lives”: what happened to the mission’s members after their return to Japan. By the nature of their material, “The Travelers” and “Lives” are the least revealing; “Views”
contains much of substance, but it is especially in "Minds" that Miyoshi rewards his readers.

In this section he illuminates how difficult it was for men of that closed, group-oriented feudal nation to come to terms with the individualistic, mobile, and materialistic mid-nineteenth century America. As he says (p. 122): "For scholars and activists alike, knowledge still responded to the calls of an insular society requiring ever-renewed affirmation of inherited values, not systematic information for adapting to a new philosophy, nor a universalistic perspective on a world mediated by an individual's unabridged life experience." He forecasts well the future directions of the Meiji Restoration when he points out that the mission's naval officers found their American sojourn much more rewarding than the others (p. 116): "Somehow one cannot help seeing here an early example of that important by-product of technology: achievement, by circumventing and supplanting ordinary language and personality, of a smooth and efficient intercultural 'communication' by profession and technical experts, not rivaled by diplomatic and cultural representatives."

The contrast between how Townsend Harris, the first American Minister to Japan, described his meeting with the Shogun in December 1857 as opposed to that of the chief envoy Muragaki Awaji-no Kami Norimasa when he was received by President James Buchanan during May 1860 is particularly stressed. Harris' narration is confident, intensely curious about every detail of costume and furnishings, and remarkably self-centered; his description being dotted with the first person singular pronoun. Muragaki, to the contrary (p. 139): "never once uses an 'I', the action invariably being recorded in the plural. He never singly initiates any action whatever. . . . it is a group effort, planned and carried out by the group as a whole."

As We Saw Them does have some minor drawbacks. Constant references are made in the text to place names from which the envoys came or to which they went, and a detailed map of late Tokugawa Japan would have been helpful. The index is very poorly done. Commander David McDougal, who established close contacts with Japanese naval officers at San Francisco, is prominent enough to have a full page photograph, but he is not listed in the index. Even worse, there are no subdivisions; Muragaki, for instance, has twenty-six separate page listings, with no guidance provided.

In toto, however, Miyoshi has written a first-rate work. As author of Accomplices of Silence: The Modern Japanese Novel he knows well that country's literature, and the intricacies of its grammar. The depth of his research is demonstrated by twenty-one pages of notes, both in foreign language and in Tokugawa and later Japanese sources. And in focusing upon a single brief episode in the record of Japanese-American relations he has augmented his reader's comprehension of not only the Japan of yesterday but the Japan of today.

University of New Hampshire

David F. Long
A History of Baltimore County. By Neal A. Brooks and Eric G. Rockel. (Towson, Md.: Friends of the Towson Library, Inc., 320 York Road, Towson, Md. 21204, 1979. viii, 555 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. $15.95.)

The last history of Baltimore County appeared in 1881, therefore this comprehensive new work fills a large void in Maryland history. The history of this county has been inextricably linked to Baltimore City, the municipality which it surrounds on three sides. Together, the county and the city of Baltimore have accounted for most of Maryland's wealth, power, and population for the last 150 years.

The authors describe the settlement of Baltimore County in the 1660s and indicate how the area quickly became part of the Chesapeake agricultural region. Landholdings varied greatly in size. Half of the landowners held less than 200 acres, but a number of men owned estates of several thousand acres. Brief descriptions of colonial life in the county include women, poor farmers, and slaves—a welcome change from the usual elitism of so many local histories. The chapters on the colonial and Revolutionary eras are a nice synthesis of recent scholarship supplemented by the authors' own archival research.

It is with the chapter on the Revolution that the book's major theme appears—the growing breech between Baltimore Town and the surrounding county. Since the eighteenth century, Baltimore County resisted entanglements with Baltimore City. County residents pretended that the city which was going up in their backyard could be kept entirely separate from the rural splendor and comfortable courthouse politics of the county. The self-deception continued into the twentieth century when the county as a whole had finally come to resemble the city it had for so long sought to ignore. Baltimore City supported the Revolution while most of the county remained loyal or neutral. The city endorsed the Federal Constitution while the county was opposed. City and county argued over their proper share of the costs for jointly administered public facilities until the two governments were completely separated in 1851. The county government moved from Baltimore City north to Towson, where it remains today.

Two chapters cover the development of transportation in the county from the turnpikes of the late eighteenth century to the street railways of the 1880s and 1890s. One is struck with the paradox of the city and county drawing farther apart administratively during the very years they were becoming more closely linked by transportation. There is an excellent chapter on county politics in the period 1870-1910, focusing on the rural "machine" of J. F. C. Talbott. His base in Baltimore County made Talbott a major force in state politics during these years. More studies of rural-based county "machines" such as this might begin to dispel some myths about the uniquely urban nature of local machines in the American past.

Perhaps the most valuable sections of this work are the 148 pages
devoted to the history of the county in the twentieth century when it was transformed from a largely rural hinterland into one of the nation's largest urbanized counties. It is the fascinating story of an antique local government attempting to adjust to a staggering influx of suburban housing developments and increasing industrial-commercial growth. The unhappy result was wasteful, thoughtless land use along with a system of corruption and influence peddling which sent one of the county's most powerful politicians to prison and sent the other, Spiro Agnew, to an even more disgraceful and ignominious end. As a result of these shocking events, the county elected a reform administration in 1974 lead by Theodore Venetoulis who brought a youthful honesty into county government. Baltimore County's problems of housing, pollution, racial discrimination and transportation require more than youth and honesty, but there appeared some recognition that the county was no longer remote from the problems of urban life.

While one can question the interpretations of the authors at many points in this last section, they have made a major contribution by attempting to examine the history of this county during the most critical years in its entire history. It would have been very easy to have concentrated on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and added a final chapter summarizing "recent developments" in a few pages of vague boosterisms and platitudes. Authors Neal Brooks, Eric Rockel, and William Hughes tackled the complex and painful events of 1940–1978 to give us one of the better histories we have of the impact of suburbanization on a local administrative unit. The book draws upon an impressive array of published works, local newspapers, and archival material. It is remarkable that in only four years the authors, in spite of heavy teaching loads at their community college, produced a carefully researched and well-written history of one of the nation's oldest and most important counties.

University of Maryland, Baltimore County

JOSEPH L. ARNOLD


One of the most notorious—and memorable—headlines carried in a modern newspaper appeared in the Chicago Tribune the morning after the 1948 Presidential election. "Dewey Defeats Truman" proclaimed the paper that modestly called itself "The World's Greatest Newspaper." The impact of the headlines and the embarrassment of the Tribune was heightened by a picture splashed in newspapers across the country of a jubilant President Truman holding the headline for the cameraman and all the United States to see. "This is one for the books," Truman crowed.
The reason why the paper went to press with the headline is one of the anecdotes in a fat 800-page history of *The Chicago Tribune: The Rise of a Great American Newspaper* by Lloyd Wendt, a former Tribune reporter and chronicler of Chicago’s history.

The gaffe was natural and understandable. All the pollsters in that pre-scientific era of surveying predicted the Dewey-Warren ticket would bury Truman and his running mate, Senator Alben Barclay of Kentucky. Arthur Sears Henning of the *Trib* sampled voter sentiment on a national tour.

“He had been wrong once in twenty years—not a bad record,” Wendt writes, “and in 1948 everyone agreed with him that Dewey would win.” There was a printers strike of the Tribune that forced the paper to go to press hours earlier than usual—long before the results were in. The later editions carried the more prosaic headline “Democrats make sweep of state offices.”

The rise of the Tribune into prominence as a really great conservative paper started in 1855 when Joseph Mendill and Timothy Wright bought the paper which had been in existence for eight years. In the modern era the feud between Colonel Robert McCormick and President Franklin D. Roosevelt, both of whom had been to Groton School, was long and bitter. Mendill himself had a run-in with his President, Abraham Lincoln. In 1864 the Army sought an additional enrollment of 6,000 men from Cook County. Mendill thought this unfair, although he was a strong supporter of the war. He met with Lincoln and asked for a reduction in the quota. Thirty years later he recalled the tongue-lashing Lincoln gave him:

“You called for the war until we had it. You called for Emancipation, and I have given it to you. Whatever you have asked you have had. Now you come here begging to be let off from the call of men which I have made to carry out the war you have demanded. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. I have a right to expect better things of you. Go home, and raise your 6,000 extra men. And you, Mendill, are acting like a coward. You and your Tribune have had more influence than any paper in the Northwest in making war. You can influence great masses, and yet you cry to be spared at a moment when your cause is suffering. Go home and send us those men.”

Mendill recalled: “I couldn’t say anything. It was the first time I ever was whipped, and I didn’t have an answer.”

Wendt interweaves the changes at the paper with the happenings and news of the day. The result is a lively, if sketchy, chronicle of the period between the Civil War and the present. On June 9, 1919, the paper had an exclusive under another three-word banner headline: “Tribune has Treaty” with the disclosure of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles.

Another beat, called “a publishing miracle” by John Chancellor of NBC, was the forty-four page special section on April 31, 1973, of the full text of the transcribed Richard Nixon tapes. In the same tradition, the Trib
had a major exclusive on the "Tania Interview," the fascinating inside story of Patty Hearst’s experiences with the Symbionese Liberation Army.

The days of Colonel McCormick’s vendetta against the Roosevelt New Deal are past. Wendt calls the Colonel "the last of the effective practitioners of personal journalism in America." Asked by a Mendill School of Journalism student what the primary duty of a newspaper was, Colonel McCormick shot back—"To return a profit."

Under its new management, the Chicago Tribune has the reputation of being a great paper—some even call it a liberal paper, maybe by comparison. But the Trib, in an editorial, said: "If we must have a label, we prefer conservatism, open-minded conservatism in the enlightened sense that we wish to build upon values that have been tested and established and not toss them aside."

So, a great conservative paper and an American institution.

Chester Springs, Pa. Pierre C. Fraley


This book introduces its readers to a neglected segment of our history, the interaction of national interest and private industry. The coining of the term "military-industrial complex" is generally attributed to President Eisenhower, and, although he probably did not so intend it, it has been seized upon by opponents of military spending and of big business as a term of opprobrium. The author, while far from believing that the nation’s good was the sole concern of the political, naval, and industrial leaders who formed this complex long before Eisenhower brought it to the public attention, treats it as the inevitable result of national expansion and growing international interests, an interplay of industrial growth and the need for a convincing military presence in a world of tensions and potential strife.

While naval construction has today no monopoly on military spending, in the period before military aircraft and a mechanized Army made their demands upon industry the new steel Navy and the ordnance and armor plate that it required brought the sea service into a natural partnership with the steel makers. It worked both ways: new developments in the production of steel opened new doors for naval constructors; new demands by those same constructors challenged industry to meet them.

The pages of this book are crammed with detailed information on its specialized subject. The main theme is the interdependent growth of the steel Navy and the steel industry, slowed down or speeded up in accordance
with the vagaries or convictions of succeeding national administrations, but becoming ever more interlocking. Cooling traces their development from its first symptoms in the post Civil War era, with the Navy's increasing dependence on steam propulsion and steel construction, through a long series of ups and downs to the aftermath of World War I, by which time the military-industrial complex had become a fact of life. The many conflicts and tensions that beset this development: the economy of cheaper foreign imports versus the need to encourage home production; rivalries between steel manufacturers; disagreements in the Navy as to its needs and friction between older line officers and increasingly assertive engineers; differing philosophies of political parties and differing pressures from prominent politicians; the attempt to meet the Navy's needs through government shops, surviving in the Naval Gun Factory but in general doomed by the greater flexibility of private industry; all this and much more is here in surprisingly readable form.

There is no cover-up of the way in which unscrupulous politicians, industrialists, and military leaders can bring on such a relationship the censure which it often receives, and cases in point are cited, though in the early days no one seemed to worry about conflict of interest and such matters. The author neither condemns nor condones, but contents himself with a statement of the facts, and despite the critics it is hard to see how in an imperfect world the nation could survive without this teamplay. In the two major wars of this century our contribution to victory was as much out-producing the enemy as out-fighting him, and it is shortsighted and could be suicidal to undermine the alliance between industry and the armed forces because it contains the inevitable imperfections of bigness. An objective reading of this interesting book should make this clear.

Blue Bell, Pa.  

John Cadwalader


In the late Theodor Siegl the Philadelphia Museum was fortunate to have a rare conservator who cared fully for both the physical and spiritual life of pictures. It is his distinguished legacy to have left us one of the supreme groups of American paintings sensitively preserved for posterity, and as well to have compiled an equally intelligent and sympathetic catalogue of these works by one of our greatest artists. In brief, this catalogue is completely worthy of its subject and one full-time curators might well envy.

Former director of the museum Evan Turner has provided an informative and thoughtful introduction, commenting on the nature and character of
Eakins' life. He summarizes some of the key elements in the artist's early training and the subsequent course of his own teaching career: for example, the dual influences of the Ingres and Delacroix traditions, Eakins' study of the seventeenth-century old masters, and such innovations of his drawing classes as sketching subjects directly in paint. There follows a section on the role of Eakins' family and friends, most notably the financial and psychological security rendered by his father, the special closeness of his sisters, students, and wife, and the bonds of older friends, including his in-laws. Turner offers some interesting remarks about the Quaker background of Eakins' family, the seriousness of purpose and the moodiness which marked much of his life, and the misunderstandings about the painter's attitudes toward nude figures of both sexes. His concluding observations concern contemporary views and tastes as a larger context for appreciating Eakins' art. Such biographical information that is not included here then appears in a full chronology.

Sieg's catalogue entries are all one could wish for: concise, thorough, and readable. He places each work in the larger stylistic evolution of Eakins' career, and includes significant technical considerations. Admirably, he achieves a fine balance between solid scholarship and a personal tone, which together bring this unique collection fully to life.

And what a collection Philadelphia possesses, thanks to the early initiatives of Fiske Kimball and the generosity of Mrs. Eakins after her husband's death. Just about everything is here: early figure charcoal drawings, oil sketches, perspective drawings, outdoor landscapes, portraits from all periods, wax models, bronzes, anatomical studies, watercolors, photographs (perhaps the one relatively weak area of the collection), plasters, studio props. Above all, there are some of Eakins' greatest achievements—*The Concert Singer*, *Between Rounds*, *Mrs. Frishmuth*, *Suzanne Santje*, and *The Old Fashioned Dress*. Completing the catalogue are appendixes, respectively devoted to related works by Eakins' students, x-ray details, and other relevant miscellaneous. Whether in the laboratory or library, Sieg's attention to Eakins was scrupulous, perceptive, and compassionate.
Henry Varnum Poor, with pleasure; but I never seriously tackled the footnotes in the Theodore Roosevelt papers, nor the Eisenhower papers either for that matter; despite three attempts, I have always stuck halfway through *Strategy and Structure*; and his *Visible Hand* still lies reproachfully unread on my desk. Would this be different? Had Stephen Salsbury, his coauthor, managed to inject a more spritely note into the prose? Or, perhaps, would the subject matter itself lend inspiration?

As it turned out, the task proved not at all unpleasant, and my judgment is that most of the credit must go to Pierre du Pont himself. Biography is, admittedly, one of the more civilized varieties of historical writing; and when dealing with a personality like this, and with a record so richly documented, could anyone be dull or pedestrian? Well, perhaps. But not in this case. Be advised, however, that the authors expressly disclaim any competence as psychoanalysts. That is an assignment, they say, that calls for professional skills they do not possess. And the caution is appropriate. The reader, however, can hardly avoid speculating. Pierre du Pont, it is clear, had remarkable financial skills, learned mostly in the street traction business and applied later to explosives and General Motors. But he had in addition a skill rarer and more valuable: the ability to get men of diverse temperaments, interests, and ambitions to work together as a harmonious team. Where had he learned this art? As guardian, after his father’s death, of a large family? Or in some other way? Not all the du Ponts had it—mere membership in that large clan was not enough.

Pierre is, of course, the main actor in this book, and his personality provides much of its human interest. But, in a sense, the book’s main concern is not with him but in a more abstract matter, which is, as the title indicates, the making of the modern corporation. This has been the central focus of all of Chandler’s recent work, and it is a subject to which Salsbury also, in his monograph on the Boston and Albany Railroad, has made important contributions. The word “making” in this context has a double meaning. It refers first of all to the techniques by which a large corporation was assembled, as it were, out of earlier and smaller constituent firms. Here we are concerned with the way in which large corporations emerged to dominate a variety of American industries in place of the looser trade associations and holding companies that had previously served to restrain and regulate competition. The second connotation of the word refers to the way in which these corporations, in themselves mere legal entities, were converted into truly integrated enterprises under central management. This was a further and analytically separable step which not all mergers took at the same time or for the same reasons. Pierre du Pont emerges as a pioneer and innovator in both these respects: first as one of the three architects of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Company, and secondly in the reorganization of General Motors. I may be wrong, but my suspicion is that it was by hammering out the ways in which great, vertically-integrated enterprises could be successfully managed that he staked his claim to a
place in history. The financial techniques necessary to the building of mergers had been evolved by others, notably in railroads and the utilities. But central management of an industrial bureaucracy was a new art. One of the keys was control by statistics: here the railroads had lessons to impart, and also the federal government's arsenals, as Roe Smith's research has made clear. But it was Pierre du Pont who, for good or ill, taught twentieth-century corporate executives how to do it.

What is to be said by way of criticism? One must confess that the book's wealth of detail can prove wearisome. And no one need feel ashamed if, after 500 pages or so, he finds it difficult to tell one du Pont from another. But it is hard to suggest how these problems could have been avoided. It is precisely the empirical detail and the careful documentation that makes the book convincing and distinguishes it from all the myriad company histories and entrepreneurial biographies that are really thinly veiled propaganda. And if the complexity of the du Pont clan's interrelationships is a trifle overwhelming—well, that is really part of the story, and neither the authors nor their readers would stand a chance of understanding the interactions of family and firm if they oversimplified the matter. I would, however, have welcomed a few end-of-chapter summaries; certainly they would have added to the length of an already large book, but they would have been very welcome to a reader interested in distinguishing the forest from the trees. Pierre du Pont would probably have approved of them.

Amherst College

Hugh G. J. Aitken


This is the second, considerably expanded edition of the New Jersey Historical Society's Guide to its manuscript collections, necessitated by a three-fold increase in the number of the Society's collections since the publication of the last guide in 1957. The result is an excellent introduction to 1,057 of the Society's historical collections. Some users may be disappointed that the compilers chose to exclude groups of manuscript genealogical notes, but their decision was certainly a practical one. Had they included the genealogical notes, the guide's name index might well have been as long as the guide itself.

As it is, the index contains many more names than subject headings. And some of the subject headings are somewhat presentist: collection descriptions incorporating the terms slave, negro, black and certain proper names have all been indexed under the rubric of Afro-Americans. However, the arrangement will present no real problems. Present, too, is a very useful
chronological list of the Society’s manuscript groups arranged by decades. The list clearly shows that the bulk of the Society’s collections are middle and late nineteenth-century materials.

Those unfamiliar with the New Jersey Historical Society collections and with the workings of older historical societies may be somewhat perplexed by the organization of the guide. The compilers note in their introduction that certain of the collections contain materials that have been added since the first edition of the guide. In newer repositories where accession records are adequate, such new materials would be separately described. But because older repositories have generally wretched provenance records, the compilers have correctly chosen to follow the logic of research by incorporating “newly discovered” materials into existing collections.

Completing the guide is an agreeable selection of illustrations drawn from the manuscript groups, a brief description of the Society’s own archives, and a list of the microform holdings. In sum, a very satisfactory guide.

Historical Society of Pennsylvania


In this well-researched volume the author assumes that there was an American character during the American War for Independence. His approach is that of analytical history rather than a series of narratives, although in assessing the relationship between the Continental Army and the American character, he has adopted a chronological approach.

Liberty could survive, many Americans believed, only if the people were able to demonstrate that they were worthy defenders of that liberty. And to make independence safe, many revolutionaries contended, there had to be realized rigorous ideals of national character and civil policy in the final victory. One matter that greatly motivated the revolutionaries was an awareness of posterity, and they constantly told themselves, that if a generation enslaved itself, it also enslaved its posterity, a posterity who would never know freedom. And as for those who fought against England, they seemed to expect their posterity to revere them even more than they revered their own ancestors.

The first year of fighting and the creation of a Continental, or regular army, was the beginning of Americans’ response to the problems of reconciling lapses in revolutionaries’ conduct with the rigor of absolute ideals. There were two kinds of failure that threatened to undermine the cause: battlefield defeats, which seemed to call the Americans’ native courage into doubt, along with the army’s lack of discipline and decorum, which
seemed to fall far short of the revolutionaries' hope for an army of Israel. But one year's experience convinced most American officials that they needed a strong standing army with which to fight the war. In fact they were so convinced, that in 1776 they were willing to create what they considered to be a dangerous institution as a means of winning independence, but still they were not willing to infringe upon personal liberty by drafting men for the duration of the war.

By the end of the first year the Continental Army had begun to develop the character it was to hold throughout the war. And because of the unique character of the American soldier, the Continental Army remained quite different from European armies. European officers who expressed amazement at the soldiers' lack of discipline in 1777 were even more surprised at their ability to withstand hardships and suffering during the following winter.

And the army's growing capacity to flourish amid hardships and to stand up to the enemy more effectively made the Continentals the center of resistance to British power. Yet the year 1780 saw the worsening of relations between the soldiers and their society, which gave rise to an antagonism that was relieved neither by adversity or victory. For instance, soldiers saw the agricultural plenty of a country that gave them but little support and a marginal supply of food. And the soldiers blamed not just the quartermasters and commissaries, but the people who had deserted them.

In 1782 the Continental Army reached the apex of its military professionalism. For the first time the regiments encamped along the Hudson were fully uniformed and had developed professional pride and parade ground drill to their greatest peak during the war. The Continentals seemed to have developed a tradition of perseverance and victory that gave them confidence in their own strength and enabled them to increase their professional pride by their own and their fellow soldiers' former conduct.

In general, this book offers evidence that allegiance to the "American" or revolutionary side of the War for Independence was the prevailing sentiment of people in the United States. And the author rather pointedly argues that the national character of revolutionaries formed one of the principal bases of their wartime allegiance. These then are the premises on which the author's discussion of the Continental Army and the American character rests.

There was but one minor mistake that might otherwise mar this excellent book. It was General John Cadwalader rather than John Laurens who wounded Thomas Conway in a duel (p. 209).

This is a fine book, beautifully written, and should be in the library of everyone interested in the American Revolution—and on the bookshelves of many of those who aren't so interested.

Tulane University Hugh F. Rankin