Jackson’s main contribution is to situate Benezet within an Atlantic framework, where he rightly belongs. Otherwise, *Let This Voice Be Heard* recounts a story familiar to specialists and leaves a number of important issues unexplored. For instance, Jackson writes that “we can easily understand why [Benezet] joined the Quakers” (9), despite the fact that his father and a few siblings opted instead for the Moravians after the family settled in Pennsylvania in 1731. Jackson also proleptically locates Benezet within an “antislavery movement” (44) stretching back to the seventeenth century, whereas most current scholarship would hold that there was no coherent “movement” prior to the third quarter of the eighteenth century. Jackson thereby passes over the question of exactly why such a movement emerged when it did and what Benezet’s role was therein. Most important, Jackson offers little insight into Benezet as a Quaker—his life’s most important affirmation—either in terms of his personal faith or his extensive involvement within the Society of Friends’ structure of meetings and committees, which could have been gleaned from extant records. Finally, the case for Benezet’s popular influence in the second half of the book is more asserted than proved. While testimonies to Benezet’s impact from the likes of Rush and Sharp are well documented (and well known), Jackson has not established his broader claims that Benezet inspired “the masses” (137) or “had done much to change opinions about slavery in the mainland colonies and in Britain” (153) by the end of his life. His conventional, top-down research strategy simply cannot reveal the attitudes of anyone other than the articulate leaders whose writings he cites.
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*Citizen Bachelors* studies how unmarried men went from being objects of state-sponsored supervision—like unmarried women subject to criminalization and severe taxation—to fully enfranchised citizens with all the privileges of manhood, “including personal, sexual and political liberty,” in the early United States (2). Studying bachelors primarily in the context of the family, earlier historians have identified the turn of the twentieth century as the “age of the bachelor.” They emphasized how, in the nineteenth century, young unmarried men flooded cities, lived for the first time away from parental supervision, delayed marriage, and developed a subculture that allowed for the emergence of a bachelor identity. Sidestepping the familiar heteronormative family focus, McCurdy discovers more important changes that began in the late 1600s. He demonstrates how key
legal developments in the eighteenth century coordinated with the American colonies’ transition to political independence. Our contemporary view of bachelorhood emerged as a consequence of these significant legal and political changes.

McCurdy maintains that “Early American bachelor sexuality . . . cannot be confined to a simple homosexual/heterosexual divide because it often contravened and confused this anachronistic division.” Furthermore, “being homosexual is not simply about sex acts” but also “about the disavowal of traditional marriage, the building of a subculture made up almost entirely of other men, and the assertion of a greater degree of sexual license. . . . The emergence of the bachelor is integral to the history of gay men” (9–10). His careful study, however, prioritizes legal and political shifts. In the early colonies, unmarried men without means were excluded from the legal categories of mastery and subjected to communal supervision, stringent legal penalties, more severe terms of military service, and heavier taxation. McCurdy’s study here is especially rich. It compares British laws with developing colonial laws, both northern and southern, and shows how, early on and differently from England, American colonies began paying differential attention to men and women. As early as the late seventeenth century, bachelors in America began enjoying more freedoms than their British counterparts, even as they continued to suffer significant penalties.

Given the emerging cultural prioritization of and legal support for benevolent fatherhood in the eighteenth century, McCurdy highlights the surprising achievement of single men, who ascended—regardless of class status—to the rank of citizen by century’s end. And indeed, McCurdy argues, it was the ideology of the “affectionate patriarch” that paved the way. By midcentury, “the husband/bachelor dichotomy became so great that legal considerations of wealth and age fell away,” resulting in the extension of bachelor laws to men with means (75). As unmarried men as a class contributed more taxes and more military service than their married counterparts, both categories came to be seen as contributing essential community service. Simultaneously, bachelors were “separated out from other dependents” (162). In this shift that crucially coordinated with the American Revolution, “bachelor laws all but disappeared within a few years of the creation of the United States” (163). McCurdy convincingly establishes the centrality of the bachelor to the consolidation of American citizenship through an increasingly inclusive category of white, manly independence.
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