

BOOK REVIEWS

The Fur Trade. By PAUL CHRISLER PHILLIPS. With concluding chapters by J. W. SMURR. Two volumes. (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1961. xxvi, 686; viii, 696 p. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, indexes. \$16.50.)

In her introduction to the 1954 edition of Hiram Martin Chittenden's *The American Fur Trade of the Far West*, Grace Lee Nute, Research Associate of the Minnesota Historical Society, noted how well Chittenden's work has stood the test of time since its publication in 1902, but suggested that, because of the specialized monographs published since that time, "a vast literature is now at hand for anyone capable of welding it into a unified, comprehensive history of the fur trade of the North American continent." The attempt has now been made and the result is a qualified success.

Paul Chrisler Phillips devoted his life to the task; he died before its completion. J. W. Smurr provides the concluding chapters to this massive two-volume work. Publication of the book, handsomely accomplished by the Oklahoma University Press, has been aided by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

Here is the entire history of the North American fur trade from its inception as a gleam in the eye of European explorers and merchant-adventurers to its decline in the mid-nineteenth century with the shift in consumer interest to cheap textiles. The story is told in a basically chronological form, although the vast area of the trade and the variety of European and American traders who conducted it require a constant process of starting again and again in time. The research is exhaustive. Though based principally on printed primary sources, extensive use has been made of manuscript materials.

Let it be said at once that Phillips' study helps correct the view held by most about the importance of the fur trade in inciting, maintaining, and expanding European settlement in North America. The evidence marshaled by Phillips goes far to prove that the lowly "trade," so readily ignored or slighted by kings at the time and by historians later, played a more important role than is normally assigned to it. Indeed, one can wonder whether the very establishment of English and French colonies on North American soil would have been accomplished but for the existence of fur-bearing animals and the Indian who was willing to trap them and exchange their pelts for European goods. Nevertheless, by concentrating so exclusively on the fur trade, Phillips tends to see all political movement in terms of a

struggle for beaver. The Great War for Empire between France and Great Britain is presented in such a context, as are other events which may, perhaps, legitimately be assigned more complicated origins.

The integration of the sources mined by Phillips and the formal expression of his interpretation of them leave something to be desired. The sentences, except in Smurr's concluding chapters, flow in a harsh monotony. In a two-volume work, the unvarying style and the massive accumulation of fact become burdensome to the reader. The text is unrelieved by sensitive passages of summary interpretation or imaginative insight. The personalities of the traders do not "live" as they do in Chittenden's still useful, though geographically and temporally more limited, history.

The book is splendidly illustrated with many original drawings of furbearing animals by Mary Baker, as well as with more conventional illustrations drawn from a variety of sources. It has excellent maps. It is well designed and carefully printed. Its two volumes are indexed and paged separately. The indexing is reasonably full, but, as is usually the case in university-oriented publications, it omits direct reference to the material objects (trade goods, costume items, etc.) associated with the trade, and thus makes the museum scholar create his own index. In sum, the book is a significant achievement and an important contribution to our knowledge of our past.

Smithsonian Institution

WILCOMB E. WASHBURN

The Pennsylvania-Kentucky Rifle. By HENRY J. KAUFFMAN. (Harrisburg: The Stackpole Company, 1960. [xii], 376 p. Illustrations, glossary, bibliography, index. \$12.50.)

The growing interest in the historic rifles made in early Pennsylvania has stirred up a demand for documentary information on these interesting arms. To the beginning as well as the advanced student and collector, *The Pennsylvania-Kentucky Rifle* is a most welcome addition to the bookshelf. Coming out about the same time as Joe Kindig's book on the Kentucky rifle in its golden age, we have a double-barreled impetus which makes one wonder how much longer connoisseurs of early American art can close their eyes to the superb carving on many curly maple rifle stocks that is comparable to that found on the finest Philadelphia furniture of the period.

At the outset of his book, Henry Kauffman decided to side-step the endless argument over the rightful name for the famed American long rifle, whether it should be named after Pennsylvania where the gun was made and developed, or named after Kentucky, the vast wilderness area where the gun was carried with the advancing frontier. So the author satisfied everyone with the appropriate title of Pennsylvania-Kentucky rifle.

Particularly adept at research, Mr. Kauffman has assured lasting prestige to his book with a surprising amount of documentation from early newspapers, journals, letters, tax lists, wills, inventories, indentures, etc. The use of many of these documents, effectively reproduced on the pages of the book, along with detailed photographs of numerous rifles, has resulted in a pictorial as well as a textual study. A comprehensive story of the rifle is incorporated into eight chapters.

Chapter 1, "The Rifle in Europe," traces two hundred years of development and change in the early rifles of central Europe, from matchlock to wheel lock to flintlock, all of which enlightens the reader on the ancestry of the Pennsylvania rifles.

Chapter 2, "The Rifle in America," shifts the scene of rifle making from central Europe, across the Atlantic, into Pennsylvania's woods and hills. Among the disembarking German immigrants came trained artisans and rifle makers. The reader is taken through a colonial period of experimentation and adaptation in rifle making until a new rifle was developed in Pennsylvania that "met the needs of a nation that was truly perched on the frontier."

Chapter 3, "County Characteristics," presents the intriguing study of variation in design and pattern, followed by makers or groups of makers, as was the case in Europe, in different geographic areas. Several Pennsylvania counties or areas are identified with their own peculiar details and style. Kauffman describes these rifle-making styles by area and period variation through to an unusually late date—even to the Great Western Gun Works, at Pittsburgh, in 1879.

Chapter 4, "Other Guns," comments upon and illustrates firearms other than rifles made by the gunsmith, such as muskets, multiple barrel guns, pistols, fowling pieces, and match guns.

Chapter 5, "Locks of Pennsylvania Rifles," covers the ignition mechanisms from the early flint to the late percussion locks. Although many of the old puzzling questions on the sources of rifle locks have been partially answered by Kauffman's research efforts, the full answer indicates a need for further study. Gun collectors will welcome the directory of English and American gun-lock makers inserted in this chapter.

Chapter 6, "Accoutrements," can be summarized by quoting from a letter ordering the bearer of a firearm to "compleat" himself with "a Worm, Priming Wire and Brush,—Bayonet, or a Tomohawk or a Hatchet, a Pouch—a Jack-Knife and Tow—six Flints and one pound of Powder, forty leaden Bullets,—, a Knapsack,—."

Chapter 7, "The Gunsmith," offers a new and wider concept of the activities of the gunmakers than was heretofore possible. Not only the text, but illustrated documentation is the reader's reward.

Chapter 8, "Biographies," is a two-hundred-page listing of documented research on American gunmakers in the flint and percussion period. The

reader is offered priceless new data on rifle makers, supplemented by detailed photographs of rifles made by many of these makers.

Freeville, N. Y.

WES WHITE

The Annals of Murder. A Bibliography of Books and Pamphlets on American Murder from Colonial Times to 1900. Compiled by THOMAS M. McDADE. (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1961. xl, 360 p. Illustrations, index. \$15.00.)

"The purpose of this bibliography," explains Mr. McDade, "is to list separate publications devoted primarily to a single murder case which took place in what is now the United States and which occurred prior to 1900. It also includes murder on the high seas in which courts of the United States have jurisdiction of the offense. Manslaughter cases have not generally been included," though confessions, lives of murderers, and accounts of trials have. Altogether there are 1,126 of them, arranged alphabetically, from that of John Acker who in 1879 killed a fellow gambler in an Indianapolis shoe store, to that of George Zecker who in 1856 was acquitted of murder in Madison County, New York. In between are intimations in plenty of immorality, revenge, or anger, each briefly summarized, provided with pertinent bibliographical information, and with an incomplete but useful indication of more than seventy-five libraries in which one or another of the accounts can be found.

The literary genre here formalized by bibliographical systemization is old among us, for the first book printed in Boston in 1675 is said by Mr. McDade to have been *The Wicked Man's Portion*, a sermon preached to two rascals who at its conclusion were executed for the murder of their master. But Americans, we assume, are not more bloodthirsty than other people, so that Mrs. Martha Grinder, a celebrated mid-nineteenth-century poisoner who confessed, "I love to see death in all its forms," cannot be taken as a national norm; nor can poor, untidy Adam Horn who was convicted because, after chopping up his wife, he left pieces of her about the house; nor Lydia Sherman who poisoned her husband and six children because she considered families inconvenient. Most students of murder will not approve of Stephen Arnold who beat his niece Betsey to death in 1805 because she could not learn to pronounce the word "gig," but some will feel illicit understanding of John Banks who knocked down his wife with a coal shovel and then cut her throat because she served him pot-liquor instead of coffee. Brief sympathy may be felt for Patience Boston, who drank and cursed more than she should, and who drowned young Benjamin Towne in a well, but who was converted toward desire for a better life just before her execution in 1735; but little can be felt for Patience Chapman, whose Latin

lover was convicted in 1832 of giving arsenic to her husband, while she (apparently not all that she should have been) went scot free.

Best known of all the cases is that of Lizzie Borden, who is said to have hacked her father to pieces, and her stepmother also, without getting a speck of blood on her frock, a circumstance which, among others, has caused some people still to believe in her innocence. Among the most curious in its side issues is that of Elma Sands who provided New York's first great murder mystery when her body was found stuffed into a well in Lispernard's Meadow in 1799, and whose accused killer was defended jointly by Alexander Hamilton and Aaron Burr who just a few years later engaged in a tragic duel. Most talked about—in eighteen contemporary publications—seems to have been what Edmund Pearson has called "America's classic murder," that in 1849 of the prominent Dr. George Chapman of Boston by Professor John H. Webster of the Harvard Medical School, who did not quite have time to finish the task of burning dismembered pieces of his victim's body in his laboratory furnace. Represented by ten separate entries is the revengeful tale of Jereboam Beauchamp, about whose slaying of Solomon Sharp, who had wronged the girl Beauchamp married, Poe, Simms, and Robert Penn Warren have all written. Chester Gillette, about whom Dreiser wrote in *An American Tragedy*, is not here because he killed too late; nor is Mary Rogers, whom Poe made famous, because no separate book or pamphlet seems at the time to have accompanied the frenzied newspaper coverage of her mysterious death.

The generous introduction which Mr. McDade, formerly an agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, supplies is filled with useful, professional, and memorable information about arsenic, drunkenness, insanity, and the legal rights of murderers as interpreted by our fathers. Few readers will forget Mark Codman who, after being hanged in Charleston in the fall of 1755, was gibbeted in chains for public exhibition so expertly that in the spring of 1758 an observant South Carolinian recorded, "His skin was but little broken, altho he had hung there over three or four years." The publication of this useful and curious volume was aided by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

Columbia University

LEWIS LEARY

Alexander Wilson, Naturalist and Pioneer. A Biography by ROBERT CANTWELL. With Decorations by ROBERT BALL. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1961. 319 p. Illustrations, appendices, bibliography, index. \$15.00.)

This handsomely illustrated volume, with eight reproductions in full color and twelve in black and white from Alexander Wilson's original engravings, is the first full-length biography of the author of *American*

Ornithology. Alexander Wilson was the first man to make a systematic catalogue of American birds and to describe their habits. He journeyed through the wilderness from New England to Georgia and from Niagara Falls to New Orleans in search of specimens. It was at Louisville on one of his expeditions that he showed Audubon some of his drawings and undoubtedly gave him the idea for his own great work. Wilson first identified many of the warblers—the Cape May, Kentucky, Tennessee, and that which bears his name. He knew the great naturalists of the period. He visited Jefferson in the White House, John Abbot in Georgia, and William Dunbar in Natchez. Meriwether Lewis brought him skins collected on the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

The life of Alexander Wilson falls into two distinct periods: that from 1766 to 1794 when he was an impoverished weaver, itinerant pedlar, and struggling poet in his native Scotland; and that from 1794 to 1813 when he came to America and gave his main attention to ornithology. Born in Paisley in a family of weavers, he knew hard times from early childhood. He was almost completely self-taught. As he worked at the loom, he kept copies of Milton, Pope, or Goldsmith by his side. Soon he began to put the happenings of the day into rhymed couplets and to enjoy a modest success as a poet. In 1791, he won second prize for a rhymed disputation at the Pantheon in Edinburgh. In 1793, however, because of his democratic leanings he came to the notice of the authorities and was imprisoned for writing a poem, *Dr. Shark*, in which he attacked a mill operator for dishonest practices.

Therefore, as soon as he was released, he decided to make a break with the past and to seek a new life in America. He emigrated to Pennsylvania in 1794 and took a position as schoolmaster first at Milestown, near Bristol, on the Delaware River, and later at Gray's Ferry, near the Tinicum marshes. Soon he began to devote his spare time to nature study. He became excited by the variety and beauty of American birds and conceived the idea of compiling his *American Ornithology*. Resigning as schoolmaster, he worked for Bradford and Inskip, the Philadelphia publishers, who were to bring out his book. In order to collect information and also to solicit subscriptions, he journeyed up and down the land. His first volume was printed in 1808. Then followed countless delays; the War of 1812 disrupted the schedule of publication. Wilson fell ill. Exhausted by incessant labor, before volumes eight and nine of his book went to press, he died on August 13, 1813, and was buried in Gloria Dei churchyard in Philadelphia.

Students of history will find this biography particularly interesting for the account of the west coast of Scotland in Wilson's youth. Mr. Cantwell went to Paisley to study the local records. He describes the poverty of the weavers, the flourishing trade in smuggled goods, and the religious quarrels which drove Dr. Witherspoon to America.

In the discussion of Wilson as a naturalist, although it is to be regretted that the names of birds in common usage today are not employed and that

it is not indicated that some of Wilson's observations have since been corrected, Mr. Cantwell succeeds admirably in conveying the quality of Wilson's vision of the American wilderness. "His birds," he writes, "were wild and it was their wildness that absorbed his genius." "All his work taken together," he continues, "form a rough . . . photographic record of the country. But there was a line of color woven in his gray fabric . . . and it was exemplified for Wilson in the variety and ceaseless activity of the birds—something elusive and brilliant, diffusing a peculiar radiance through fields and orchards and forests."

Bryn Mawr

ALLEGRA WOODWORTH

In the Midst of a Revolution. By DAVID HAWKE. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961. 235 p. Bibliography, index. \$5.00.)

As a thesis for a doctorate, this little volume is much to be commended. It tells succinctly and with good prose of the power struggle in Pennsylvania between radicals and moderates in the late spring and early summer of 1776, resulting in the forming of the state's first constitution. It provides some interesting insights into the propaganda ability of James Cannon, and places that gentleman's achievements in better focus than heretofore. Unfortunately, the author does not carry his detailed study beyond the momentary ascendancy of the radicals in the establishment of the constitution.

His bibliography is almost overpowering in its extensiveness. It perhaps spends too much space telling how wrong other writers have been, but certainly demonstrates the author's exploratory instincts. If he had journeyed beyond the reading and manuscript rooms of The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, and examined the papers of Captain Hamond of the *Roebuck* in the University of Virginia Library, he would have been less positive of the trade-throttling effect of the British blockade of the Delaware. However, it is the impression of this reviewer that Dr. Hawke's failure to comprehend the naval influence is prevalent with most historians covering the period of the Revolutionary War.

Brevard, N. C.

WILLIAM BELL CLARK

Peter Oliver's Origin & Progress of the American Rebellion: A Tory View. Edited by DOUGLASS ADAIR and JOHN A. SCHUTZ. (San Marino, Calif.: The Huntington Library, 1961. xxii, 173 p. Frontispiece, appendix, index. \$5.00.)

During the current revival of interest in the American Revolution, the Loyalists have been neglected. Moreover, they have not received comprehensive treatment since the appearance of C. H. Van Tyne's *Loyalists in the American Revolution* (1902). Admittedly, there have been volumes dealing

with the Loyalists in the various colony-states, but such works have been largely dry and unimaginative—long on statistics about the Tories, but short on thoughtful interpretation of their attitudes. Indeed, the most useful analysis of the Loyalist mind is to be found in an article: Leonard Labaree's "Nature of American Loyalism," *American Antiquarian Society Proceedings*, New Series, LIV (1944), 15-58.

For at least two reasons, Loyalism has not had the serious attention it deserves. First, the Loyalists were not good Americans, according to the national ethos. The robber barons, the Huey Longs, the Liberty Leaguers, and the other problem children of American history were still within the so-called American norm. Since the Loyalists contributed nothing to the national tradition, it has been assumed that they are hardly worth studying except in a military connection; besides, it has been argued that they are unreliable historical witnesses since they did not know right from wrong. Second, it has been difficult, even when the desire existed, to study seriously what the Loyalists had to say, because their writings have been virtually inaccessible. Thomas Hutchinson's *History of . . . Massachusetts Bay* and Samuel Seabury's *Letters of a Westchester Farmer* have stood almost alone as Tory literature that has been reprinted in recent years. The complete writings of such men as Jonathan Boucher, Daniel Leonard, and Joseph Galloway have not been republished in more than a century and a half.

In light of all this, the appearance of *Peter Oliver's Origin & Progress of the American Rebellion* is a hopeful sign. One virtue of Oliver's account over several other Tory histories of the Revolution is that Oliver dealt mainly with the colony he knew best: Massachusetts. Related to the powerful families of Massachusetts, graduated from Harvard, and prosperous as a merchant, Oliver held various political offices, eventually becoming chief justice of the Superior Court. Oliver, his brother Andrew, and their relative by marriage, Thomas Hutchinson, were the big three of Massachusetts politics in the early 1770's. Oliver, therefore, was in a position to know much about revolutionary events in the Bay colony. Simultaneously, he was in a position to lose much when the rebellion succeeded. He could hardly be totally objective when writing about an upheaval that drastically altered his own life. But for the same reason could a Jefferson or a Washington be wholly detached? John Adams knew the answer: "WHO SHALL WRITE the history of the American revolution?" he asked. "Who can write it? Who will ever be able to write it?"

The editors, both excellent historians, make no special plea for Oliver; rather, they ask us to examine his history for what it is: "a Tory view of revolution in Massachusetts." Oliver considered the Revolution to be the work of ambitious fire-eaters, men without principle who stirred up the masses for their own sinister ends. One can reject Oliver's basic premise and still accept much that he says. Who can deny that James Otis was power conscious, that Samuel Adams was an agitator, and that patriot leaders were frequently more interested in winning support by emotionalism

than by reason? Who can discount Oliver's assertion that the rebels were guilty of gross hypocrisy when they berated the Pope in one breath and appealed to French Canadians in the next? Who can disregard his claim that when patriots spoke of a free press they meant a patriot press?

Nor can one quarrel with his contention that Britain had ruled over the one empire in the world where individual freedom and liberty were a reality. Why then, asked Oliver, could the child rationally desire to leave the benevolent parent? Oliver never realized that the child had grown up and that the parent was no longer benevolent. Oliver believed that had the parent administered firm discipline at the time of the Stamp Act opposition, the refractory child would have stepped in line. In view of Edmund Morgan's findings on the extent of American determination to resist the Stamp Act, it seems that Oliver made a highly dubious assumption. In fact, as late as 1774, Oliver felt that stern measures on the part of General Gage in Massachusetts would have brought the rebellion to an end. Gage knew that the reverse was true, that force would lead to civil war. It was the London Ministry, not the General, that made the decision resulting in Lexington and Concord.

Louisiana State University

DON HIGGINBOTHAM

Daniel Morgan, Revolutionary Rifleman. By DON HIGGINBOTHAM. (Chapel Hill, N. C.: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1961. xvi, 239 p. Illustrations, bibliographical essay, index. \$6.00.)

As the bicentennial of the Revolution approaches, attention is focused on a reinterpretation of the history of the events leading to the founding of the republic and, in the process, numerous military and political figures are being rescued from obscurity and their contributions to the cause of independence are now being seen in proper perspective. Although many of the leading military names are well known to historians of the period, some have suffered from the lack of adequate biographies. A combination of modern scholarship, more thorough use of manuscript and newspaper sources, and the introduction of the "human element" is resulting in wholesale rewriting of the careers of many of the nation's early leaders.

Among the secondary figures associated with General Washington were a number of hard-working and hard-fighting men whose talents were often overshadowed by the daring and brilliance of Nathanael Greene, Anthony Wayne, the Marquis de Lafayette and others. Heading this group was the New Jerseyite-Virginian, Daniel Morgan, often referred to as the "rifleman from the Valley." After James Graham, the husband of Morgan's granddaughter, wrote an acceptable life of the general in 1856, more than a century passed before a reappraisal of Morgan's military career, colored with details from his personal life, was undertaken. During the past year

two new biographies of Morgan have been written: *Daniel Morgan, Ranger of the Revolution*, by North Callahan of New York University, and *Daniel Morgan, Revolutionary Rifleman*, by Don Higginbotham, a member of the history faculty at Louisiana State University. This review deals only with Professor Higginbotham's study, in which he tries to throw more light on Morgan the man and on his contributions as a military leader, utilizing documentary sources not available to Graham a century ago.

A veteran of Braddock's campaign in the French and Indian War, Morgan led the exciting life of a frontier farmer and trader near Winchester, Virginia, constantly falling into debt and appearing in court to defend his property from his creditors. Frequently called upon to defend the frontier from Indian depredations, these men of the Valley of Virginia were recognized as formidable fighters with their Kentucky rifles. When the Revolution broke out, they were in great demand to support the regular Continental forces. The long, arduous march through the Maine wilderness and the disastrous attack on Quebec, which resulted in capture and imprisonment, both had lasting effects on Morgan's health. The terrible conditions of this campaign were recorded vividly in the long diary of Dr. Isaac Senter of Newport, Rhode Island, one of Morgan's companions.

After his exchange, Morgan again took up arms in the Saratoga campaign and then was transferred first to the Middle and then the Southern areas where in January, 1781, with the assistance of Lt. Col. John Eager Howard, he routed Tarleton and the Tory Legion at Cowpens, the high point in his military career. This defeat, a glorious day for the frontier riflemen, was a factor in disrupting Cornwallis' plan to recover the southern states.

Returning to "Saratoga," his newly completed home in the Valley, Morgan resumed his life as gentleman farmer, not above physical combat with his foes if circumstances so required. He invested in a gristmill and speculated in the mercantile business as the southeastern portion of the country opened up. When protest against new taxes threatened open rebellion in western Pennsylvania, Morgan led a band of Virginia troops to Pittsburgh in support of the President's call for law and order. After service there as military commander, he returned home to run for a House seat, winning on the second effort in a bitterly contested election. He was a stanch Federalist, warning his colleagues to beware of the Francophile Democratic Republicans, once declaring, "The Democrats are a parsell of egg-sucking dogs." The final resting place of Morgan's remains (he died in 1802 at sixty-seven) is still a matter of dispute between South Carolina and Virginia officials.

The author is to be commended for his concise narrative and the omission of lengthy documentary quotations. He has made Daniel Morgan a living figure without overstating his case. The short bibliographical essay should prove most useful to those desiring to pursue Morgan's career further.

To the Farewell Address: Ideas of Early American Foreign Policy. By FELIX GILBERT. (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1961. viii, 173 p. Appendix, bibliographical essay, index. \$3.75.)

The issues raised and the broad questions posed in this volume, as well as its scholarly significance, are out of all proportion to its size. Although Dr. Gilbert commits himself to no stated objectives in a prefatory note, he does tender a gentle caveat in the subtitle, "Ideas of Early American Foreign Policy," to the effect that he is *not* writing a history of the development of early American foreign policy. In the absence of any prefatory statement of intent, which, because of the book's organization and the vagueness of the main title, is rather unfortunate, one is kept unduly long in doubt as to the author's chief purpose. Early enlightenment as to objectives would have enhanced the reader's appreciation of this fine study. What he is attempting to do, within the space of one hundred and thirty-six pages of text, is to analyze the influence eighteenth-century European ideas and practices had on the philosophy and administration of American foreign policy from the Declaration of Independence to Washington's Farewell Address. Each of the five chapters, or essays, rather tenuously held together, is broadly interpretive and suggestive, so much so that at least three of them would serve as prolegomena for extensive monographs on the areas they cover. They are all solid, erudite, and seminal.

When the American Revolution plunged the United States into foreign affairs, it entered that complex field with certain attitudes regarding Europe that had been inherited from colonial experience. One of these, dual and ambivalent in character, stemmed from two basic motives for colonization itself: materialism and utopianism. All the colonies had exhibited an awareness of the need for economic ties with Europe, but at the same time this was combined with a desire for idealistic experimentation, and each motive consequently "implied one of two distinct and contrary attitudes to the Old World." Thus, when the United States looked to Europe, especially to France, for aid in 1776, it sought the positive good that would accrue from material, or commercial, relations, but at the same time it evinced fear of the corrupting influences which close association might bring. Already convinced that their actions and traditions manifested an idealism superior to that of the European states, Americans would enter the international world with a sense of high mission.

But to enter it with any hope of success they needed something else. However illiberal or corrupting European diplomacy might be, they still had to know how it functioned. As mere appendages to England, the colonies had experienced no concerted action in foreign affairs, and now they had to look abroad for instruction. Of course, many colonials were not entirely ignorant of European diplomacy, particularly of British experience. They had read English pamphlets and books on the subject and had talked to knowledgeable visitors. But of supreme importance in molding public opin-

ion were the views of that recently transplanted Englishman, Thomas Paine, as set forth in *Common Sense*. In formulating America's diplomatic needs, Paine outlined a course to follow. "For a long time, every utterance on foreign policy starts from Paine's words and echoes his thoughts." Central in his thinking was his insistence that America should concentrate on trade and avoid close political alliances.

The above are some of the basic ideas and motivations, Dr. Gilbert believes, that informed early American foreign policy, gave it form and direction. An excellent illustration of the play of these ideas is shown in the Model Treaty with France that Congress approved in September, 1776. A major objective of John Adams, chief architect of the treaty, was to obtain trade and aid without entangling the United States in a political alliance. A precedent for this was found in the Peace of Utrecht, a new departure in international relations which made a distinction between political and commercial alliances between countries. In short, since economic ties could be secured without political or military strings, or so it was hoped, the treaty makers proffered trade to France and precious little else. If the agreement should involve France in the war with England, the United States promised only that it would not assist England; no political or military co-operation was offered to France. Americans were so convinced of the value of their trade to France, and to other nations as well, that, however desperate their situation in 1776, they thought they could still get help without entangling commitments. Thus, in this respect—in so liberalizing trade relations as to permit their extension to all nations of the earth—the treaty became a "pattern for all future diplomatic treaties."

American views on international relations, Dr. Gilbert points out, were greatly influenced by the Philosophes. In an excellent section on those thinkers, he shows how their distrust of power politics, their advocacy of free trade and the rule of reason conditioned American attitudes. They were of significant importance "in determining the course of American foreign policy" through and beyond the American Revolution. As to the charge that American foreign policy was isolationist, Gilbert is sure that if the policy is studied with close regard for the ideas of the Philosophes, "it becomes clear that the isolationist interpretation is one-sided and incomplete: American foreign policy was idealistic and internationalist no less than isolationist."

Temple University

HARRY M. TINKCOM

Philadelphia Unitarianism, 1796-1861. By ELIZABETH M. GEFFEN. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961. 323 p. Illustrations, appendices, bibliography, index. \$6.00.)

This very useful book about the early history of the First Unitarian Church in Philadelphia is based on extensive research in the manu-

scripts of the church, of the American Philosophical Society, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, and the Athenaeum, and the correspondence of William Henry Furness (given the author by Horace Furness Jayne), as well as a long list of books, pamphlets, articles and periodicals. Students of Philadelphia history and genealogy will find Dr. Geffen's work a mine of information about a variety of persons, some only briefly connected with the Unitarians. One appendix lists the officers of the Unitarian Society; two others enumerate the occupations and the organizational activities of the church members.

Many distinguished citizens at one time or another formed a connection with the First Unitarian Church, one characteristic of which, greatly stressed by Dr. Geffen, was its constantly changing but not greatly increasing membership. Although active hostility changed into more or less respectful acceptance during these sixty-five years, and the churches of Philadelphia increased from twenty-seven to three hundred and twenty-seven in the same period, the Unitarians failed to show any comparable gain. In contrasting this with the flourishing condition of New England Unitarianism, Dr. Geffen suggests several factors that must be considered. In Philadelphia, the Unitarians were a group of English immigrants and they continued to draw recruits from England. The church they established lost members by marriage and other means to churches more deeply rooted in the traditions of the city. Of course, an occasional recruit was drawn in, but only in sufficient numbers to maintain, along with the new arrivals from England, the status quo. In New England, the Unitarians developed from long-established congregations and in an atmosphere often thought to be much more favorable to religious enthusiasm and activity.

In the summer of 1796, encouraged by the recent visit of Dr. Joseph Priestley, some twenty-one men organized the first Unitarian Society in Philadelphia. They used a room for their meeting made available by the University of Pennsylvania at Fourth and Arch Streets. Dr. Priestley again preached to them in 1797, and his friend William Russell, like himself a sufferer from the rioters of Birmingham in 1791, was briefly of great assistance to them. But the times were troubled by political controversy and by the horrors of the yellow fever. Between 1800 and 1807, this first Unitarian congregation dispersed. In 1807, however, twenty-eight men, of whom five had belonged to the early group, reorganized the society, incorporated themselves, and by 1813 met in an octagonal chapel designed for them by Robert Mills and erected on the corner of Tenth and Locust Streets. By 1828, a new Doric structure planned by William Strickland replaced Mills's chapel and was subscribed for by two hundred and fifty-eight persons. Here Dr. Furness preached his famous antislavery sermons and here ministered to the Unitarians for more than a quarter of a century. Dr. Geffen's article about the reformer has already appeared in the pages of this *Magazine*. In 1860, seventy-five families and fifty-seven individuals regularly contributed to Dr. Furness' church. From the handful who met

in the small room at Fourth and Arch Streets to this prosperous congregation progress had been made, but disappointingly little.

Dr. Geffen has examined the role of Dr. Priestley in the founding of the Unitarian church. He did not accept any responsibility, nor was he one of the organizers. He preached, but he preferred to live in distant Northumberland. Yet, in another sense, he was the creator of the church, since those English immigrants who founded it were from those centers of Unitarianism most affected by Priestley's earlier teaching. Perhaps the most interesting among the many characters described by Dr. Geffen is John Vaughan. A pupil of Priestley's, he acted for the good doctor in all his business affairs after teacher and student had both settled in Pennsylvania. Vaughan was a man of many interests and much benevolence and his was a continuing influence in the Unitarian church. A full-length life would be a valuable addition to Philadelphia biographies. Another distinguished immigrant Unitarian was Thomas Sully, the artist. Yet another, in a very different role from either of these, was the actress Fanny Kemble, married unhappily to Pierce Butler, son of Dr. James Mease, one of the more prominent native Philadelphians among the Unitarians. Fanny Kemble while in the neighborhood worshipped at the church and received a warm tribute from the great Dr. Furness. But the book must be read to enjoy the many varieties of persons who were numbered among the Unitarians at this time.

Dr. Geffen disclaims specifically any intention whatever of describing or discussing the theological aspects of Unitarianism. A couple of sentences, one from Dr. Mease and another of her own, briefly summarize all the definition there is here. The book is, therefore, a biographical study of the congregations of Unitarians and is not an examination of the role of Unitarianism in Philadelphia. Nor does it probe deeply into differences between the Unitarianism of the City of Brotherly Love and that of Boston. Surely, without some fuller examination of ideological differences the character and perhaps limitations of the Philadelphia Unitarians cannot be fully understood. The very interesting individuals who composed the congregations in succeeding years tend to obscure the role of the religious society in the community at large, or was it confined to their individual activities?

Bryn Mawr College

CAROLINE ROBBINS

The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy: New York as a Test Case. By LEE BENSON. (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1961. xii, 351 p. Appendices, index. \$6.00.)

This study, one of a series undertaken at the Bureau of Applied Social Research of Columbia University, is a work of major importance. It begins with an examination of political tendencies in New York in the decades immediately after 1815 when Republican factionalism was rampant, the

egalitarian impulse was being transmitted by the Anti-Masons, and when the Transportation Revolution proved a major stimulant to political activity. By the 1830's there were, Benson contends, two new parties which were far more than "a reincarnation, lineal descendant, or close replica of the Hamiltonian Federalists and Jeffersonian Republicans." Leaders came from the same socioeconomic strata but the parties were different and, indeed, we are told, "the Whigs come closer than the Democrats to satisfying the requirements of historians in search of nineteenth-century precursors to twentieth-century New Dealers."

From this preliminary survey the author turns, with remarkable thoroughness, to the Liberty and American Republican movements, to an effort to demonstrate the existence of voting cycles in New York, and thence to a detailed analysis of the election of 1844. Significantly, he rejects (for both city and countryside) an interpretation of voting behavior based on economic class lines. Instead, he believes "that at least since the 1820's, when manhood suffrage became widespread, ethnic and religious differences have tended to be *relatively* the most important sources of political differences."

The general theory of voting which guided Benson in the preparation of this study rejects the economic determinism of the Beard and Turner schools in favor of consolidating and extending theses advanced more recently by Richard Hofstadter and Louis Hartz. Benson disclaims an ability to offer at this time a comprehensive theory of voting behavior and seeks here to develop a classification system for voting determinants as a step toward the formulation of a general theory. He states: "The theory may be summarized in propositional form: the wider the area of agreement on political fundamentals, the more heterogeneous the society (or community), the larger the proportion of its members who have high levels of personal aspirations, and the less centralized the constitutional system, then the greater the number and variety of factors that operate as determinants of voting behavior." This statement is followed by one which suggests a new breadth and meaning for the study of American politics; "all American history [*Benson writes*] is reflected in past and present voting behavior."

Finally, the author seeks to analyze the meaning of the concept of Jacksonian Democracy and to weigh its value in advancing the understanding of American history. He concludes that this concept, based as it is on a major causal relationship between Jackson and the egalitarian movement of the period, as well as on other basic assumptions, is for New York "untenable." There, he suggests, democracy advanced "in spite of rather than because of the 'Jackson Men' and the 'Jackson Party.'" Furthermore, "The concept of Jacksonian Democracy has obscured rather than illuminated the course of *New York* history after 1815." Benson would call the period the "Age of Egalitarianism" and proposes for further study the hypothesis "that the egalitarian revolution after 1815 was largely, although by no means exclusively, the product of the Transportation Revolution

which occurred after 1815 and fostered, stimulated, and accelerated tendencies already present in American society and culture."

The application of terms and concepts derived from the social sciences constitutes a distinctive feature of this study. Because of its specialized nature, it will probably not have the wide reading it deserves. But it has much to offer, in terms of methodology and in terms of conclusions which may prove generalizable beyond New York's borders. We are all in Mr. Benson's debt and if, in the years ahead, he provides us with all those books he promises, we will be even more so. In these, I am sure, there will be additional food for thought and reflection and (unless I miss my guess) controversy, too.

Muhlenberg College

JOHN J. REED

Robert John Walker, A Politician from Jackson to Lincoln. By JAMES P. SHENTON. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961. xviii, 288 p. Bibliography, index. \$6.00.)

There is an element of the fantastic present in the politics of democracies. The contest for office produces a tendency to exaggerate good and evil in governmental policy and in personal character. Moreover, in the early days of the United States when the vast store of unmobilized wealth stimulated speculation of a highly inflationary character, the flights of individual imagination sometimes passed the bounds of the comprehensible. Thus, in American history there appeared a number of figures who today resemble caricatures. After the men of reason and virtue, such as Washington, Adams and Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and John Quincy Adams, came Jackson, Benton, Clay, and lesser lights, among whom was numbered the now almost forgotten Robert J. Walker, a product of frontier Pennsylvania and wilder Mississippi.

He was a pygmy-like figure, five feet two inches in height and weighing only about a hundred pounds, but he had a large head, a boundless imagination, and a soaring ambition. He wanted wealth and public office, and he became a plunging speculator in both land and office holding. For a time he had tolerable success. He piled up a rickety series of stock speculations on credit which grew progressively precarious. As a ranting demagogue, he got into the United States Senate as a Jacksonian coat-tail rider, and in that august body sought to add Texas to the American empire, to be a presidential Warwick, and to advance his political fortunes. Texas was acquired; Polk became President; and this careless speculator became Secretary of the Treasury during the exciting finance of the Mexican War. So far, success had crowned most of his efforts, except that his wealth was largely paper, illusory and dependent upon the complaisance of Washington banking interests.

After 1849, all he could command was the ruins of a bizarre personality progressively weakened by tuberculosis. He did not succeed in Pacific railroad promotion, although he had some transient success in silver mining in California. Pierce gave him a chance at diplomacy in China, which, after tedious flirtation, he jilted. Buchanan sent him out to an impossible assignment in Kansas where, like everybody else, he failed. This failure killed Walker politically. During the Civil War, he endeavored to recoup his reputation by chores for Lincoln in Europe. But he was too old and too depleted in health to capitalize on his real service to the Union; he returned to Washington to lobby and to die. Strangely enough, in the last months of his troubled life he was able to free himself from debts and to leave life without either the wealth or the fame for which he had striven so hard and with such irrational abandon.

Dr. Shenton is to be complimented on finishing what several others had undertaken and abandoned. He has had the persistence to mobilize the widely scattered and fragmentary materials which survived this fabulous career. The highly imaginative statesman whose reach so often exceeded his grasp stands forth in this book as an example of what could frequently be the great American tragedy. He takes his place with such men as Benton, Clay, Calhoun, Douglas and Webster, men who could not achieve the goals of their ambitions.

University of Pennsylvania

ROY F. NICHOLS

John Fiske: The Evolution of a Popularizer. By MILTON BERMAN. [Harvard Historical Monographs XLVIII.] (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961. [xiv], 297 p. Bibliographical note, index. \$6.50.)

John Fiske bulked large in life—he weighed more than three hundred pounds—and in the life of his times, but to the casual acquaintance he has the marks of a stereotype. He was, as fat men are supposed to be, fond of beer, jovial, exceedingly charming, a loving husband happiest in the midst of his family. Also, he was a typically parochial New Englander, convinced that the rest of the world, except possibly England, failed to measure up to his “country.” He went to Harvard and, of course, found it a bore. The religious radicalism of his youth vanished with age. When Spencer became the rage, he propagated Spencerian ideas, it is generally assumed. He had a brilliant mind and “a charming literary style,” but for all that, the historian of ideas still treats him for what he seemed to be—a typical Protestant intellectual who reflected the views of the elite of the latter half of nineteenth-century America. Milton Berman’s highly competent study of the man and his ideas both dispels and re-enforces this notion.

Fiske, for those who know him, resists easy classification. He was a “loner” in an age when togetherness of a sort was shaping up in the academic world. He cannot be called a philologist, for that breed disowned him, yet

his "background for comparative linguistics [was] matched by very few Americans" (p. 30). He was a historian "who remained essentially a solitary figure in the historical world and took little part in the round of professional societies and activities that grew up as scholarship became recognized as a full-time profession . . ." (p. 230). He was an intellectual who dared to earn a living outside the academic world without debasing his talents. If his tastes had been more spartan, he would have managed the feat without depending on substantial subsidies from relatives, for at the peak of his career he was bringing in more than \$10,000 a year in an age when a dollar bought something. Even as a youngster, he fitted no mold. He was born Edmund Fisk Green, but quickly decided, despite family objections, to become John Fisk; then, because an "e" on the end of any name obviously adds distinction, he altered it to John Fiske. While settling on a suitable name, he also determined his goal in life—to master all knowledge. The ambition never completely deserted him.

For all his "inner direction"—Fiske, as a literary man, would have shunned the phrase but admired the man who coined it—Berman has, as his subtitle indicates, pigeon-holed Fiske as a "popularizer." He makes the reasonable argument that Fiske succeeded as a writer-lecturer because he expressed the needs of the elite of the time by stressing "the kindest aspects of the topics he covered," and that he adjusted religion to a changing world and "rendered an irreplaceable service in providing his generation with ideas and concepts that permitted intelligent Americans to achieve a workable intellectual accommodation with the rapid social and intellectual changes of the nineteenth century" (p. 271). Berman threads this theme through his book without skimping any aspect of Fiske's varied career or subjecting the man to a warped "profile" treatment. He tells the story in prose which, though it might have been pruned of a few adverbs and repetitious statements, is otherwise clean and to the point. Fiske lived when a richness of new ideas confronted intellectuals; this biography fills in enough of that complex background to make Fiske comprehensible without becoming buried in the period. One wonders, however, if Berman's "popularizer" has not obscured the boldness, originality, and imaginative streak that possibly lurked in Fiske's thinking. Does Fiske end up, even after this carefully researched biography, still pretty much as he has always been pictured—an intellectual cliché?

Fiske has generally been regarded as the American "transmitter" of Spencer's ideas, and Berman does little to disabuse us of that idea. He says that Fiske's occasional disagreements with Spencer were "minor" (p. 100) and that he "deviated from his master in his tendency to lay greater stress on religious implications . . ." (p. 38). This was no minor matter, especially when the deviation was shaped by the ideas of Alfred Russel Wallace. Wallace, as Professor Loren Eiseley has pointed out, was the first anthropologist to assert that man's "latent mental powers" could not be explained "in terms of the simple utilitarian struggle for existence as portrayed

by the Darwinists." He shied off from the agnosticism of most Darwinists and held that a superior force must lie behind evolution that gave a unity and direction to it. Fiske, the first prominent American to appreciate Wallace's view, spoke of it as opening up "an entirely new world of speculation." Wallace did more than satisfy Fiske's increasing religious conservatism; he forced Fiske to discard some basic assumptions in Spencer's "social Darwinism"—that "natural selection" and the "struggle for existence" applied to man in society as well as to animals in the forest. Fiske's audiences, whether they knew it or not, were imbibing a radically different view of evolution. What Spencer was to Darwin, Fiske was to Wallace; he propagated something that might be called "Fiskism."

"Fiskism" might be the word, too, for the brand of history he created. Fiske had defects as a historian, and Berman raps them effectively. But it hardly seems fair to come down hard because he avoided original research; by this standard, Carl Becker would rate even lower than Fiske. It is less than fair to say "Fiske wrote too rapidly and too easily" (p. 265): who is to judge what "too rapidly and too easily" are for any man? It may be reasonable to remark that Fiske had a "wide though superficial knowledge" of many subjects, but it also tends to repeat the judgment of the academicians of his own day. Cannot Fiske be judged in new terms? Today, when "cross-fertilization" is the fashionable word, and the best scholarly minds are attempting to apply findings and methods from other fields to their own specialties, it is possible to look upon Fiske as something of a pioneer who used philosophy, science, linguistics, and anthropology, as well as history, to enlighten Americans about the past and present. His Protestant New England background often clouded his view. He never faced the urban development of America. He knew little about the West. He never mastered all knowledge. But no one in his time could dismiss John Fiske lightly, and no one can do it now.

Pace College

DAVID HAWKE

Elijah P. Lovejoy, Abolitionist Editor. By MERTON L. DILLON. (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1961. xii, 190 p. Bibliography, index. \$4.75.)

On the night of November 7, 1837, Elijah P. Lovejoy was killed by a mob as he attempted to defend his press in Alton, Illinois. Lovejoy's martyrdom to the causes of abolitionism and freedom of the press made him an important figure in the antislavery movement. Abolitionist propagandists made good use of the incident to arouse sympathy for their cause. Among other things, it brought the very respectable Wendell Phillips into the abolition crusade.

Lovejoy's background was New England. There he was born and spent his childhood. In 1826 he was graduated at the head of his class from Maine's Waterville College, and after a stint of schoolteaching he ventured

west. Arriving in St. Louis in 1827, Lovejoy operated a private school for several years and then became part owner and editor of a Whig paper. In 1832, following a dramatic religious conversion, he returned to the East to study theology at Princeton. After a year of study, he again went to St. Louis to edit a reform newspaper and work as an agent of the American Home Missionary Society.

At first Elijah Lovejoy's St. Louis *Observer* espoused the cause of temperance, but its strong Presbyterian bias included a virulent anti-Catholicism which evoked considerable opposition from the city's large Catholic population. Lovejoy also moved from a mild antislavery and colonization position to what appeared to be a more extreme one. In 1835, though Lovejoy denied being an abolitionist, the *Observer* published the American Anti-Slavery Society's statement of principles. After a series of incidents involving threats to himself, his family, and his property, and culminating in a mob's destroying \$700 worth of printing materials, Lovejoy decided to move to Alton, Illinois.

In Alton the reform editor continued to face opposition and potential violence. At the time of his move, he publicly stated that his policy would be to emphasize religious matters rather than antislavery ideas, but he soon shifted his focus of attention to abolition. Calling a meeting to form a state antislavery society in the summer of 1837 provoked a mob to destroy the *Observer's* press. Friends of civil liberties were unable to control the local situation, and well-organized gangs of ruffians destroyed three different presses before the riot which resulted in Lovejoy's death.

Professor Dillon pictures his subject as a representative of the New England Protestant zealots motivated by a desire to battle with sin. Such inconsistencies as Lovejoy's early pronouncements in Alton are not fully explained. Nor does the author document his statement that the abolitionists believed in racial equality; there is no evidence in the book that Lovejoy held such a mid-twentieth-century view. The question of what actually caused Lovejoy's difficulties is also unresolved; he was clearly a contentious person. Although Professor Dillon underemphasizes the matter of anti-Catholicism, his sources contain numerous references to it. Lovejoy himself attributed his difficulty in St. Louis to the *Observer's* "opposition to Popery" (p. 69). Some scholars would also disagree with Professor Dillon's assertion that the St. Louis riots convinced many northerners that moral suasion was inadequate to destroy slavery. Certainly, the Garrisonians did not believe that.

The larger part of this book treats the years that Elijah Lovejoy spent in the West, and it includes an excellent narrative of the events leading up to the fatal riot. Professor Dillon has presented his material in a clear, readable style. He has used a variety of manuscript and newspaper sources to produce this useful addition to the growing literature of the antislavery movement.

The Edge of Glory. A Biography of General William S. Rosecrans, U.S.A. By WILLIAM M. LAMERS. (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1961. x, 499 p. Maps, bibliography, index. \$6.95.)

The Civil War centennial is delivering an apparent surfeit of Civil War writing, but while the Lincolns and Lees and Gettysburgs receive repeated treatment in books we could often do without, some generals and some campaigns remain inadequately considered. Such a general has been William S. Rosecrans, and such campaigns have been almost any that he fought, with the possible exception of Chickamauga, from West Virginia in 1861 to Missouri in 1864. Happily, Rosecrans and his campaigns have now found a capable historian. The title of this biography expresses its author's theme: that Rosecrans reached the edge of glory, that he possessed the ability to cross over into the glory of the national pantheon of military heroes, and that he might well have done so but for misfortunes that were not of his making, or at least had nothing to do with his merits as a general.

There is much to support such contentions. George B. McClellan's West Virginia victories in the light of Lamers' account seem more than ever to have been less McClellan's than Rosecrans'. In a thorough review of the neglected campaign of Iuka and Corinth, Lamers compels us to regard Rosecrans' role there with new respect, revising even the findings of Kenneth P. Williams' painstaking research. Lamers demonstrates that if one reason the Union trap did not close at Iuka was the slowness of Rosecrans' approach march, which the pro-Grant Williams emphasizes, an at least equally important reason was Grant's failure to instruct Rosecrans that he rather than E. O. C. Ord was to make the initial attack. Also, Lamers explains why Rosecrans could not close the Fulton Road, over which the Confederates escaped; Williams regarded this matter as unexplained. Lamers goes on to detail Rosecrans' skillful defense of Corinth, to portray Rosecrans as a stout opponent of counsels of retreat after the first day at Stone River, and to bestow new praise on the praiseworthy Tullahoma campaign. He demonstrates that much more than is often recognized—especially by those who rely largely on Grant's testimony—Rosecrans contributed to the opening of the "cracker line" to Chattanooga after Chickamauga.

A biographer intent on rehabilitating his subject is tempted to go too far, and Lamers sometimes succumbs to the temptation. Kenneth P. Williams' strictures upon Rosecrans' conduct of the pursuit after Corinth seem more convincing than Lamers' defense of Rosecrans; surely Rosecrans should have led the pursuit. Rosecrans took dubious risks in his pursuit of Braxton Bragg into Georgia in September, 1864, and by failing to make clear just when Rosecrans recognized the trap Bragg prepared for him, Lamers blurs the problem of how well Rosecrans remained in control of his situation. Lamers is charitable to Rosecrans also in his report of Chickamauga, which was hardly a well-handled battle on the Union side even before the staff

blunder which opened the line to Confederate penetration. But the biography is not uncritical. Especially does Lamers stress that Rosecrans manufactured much of his own trouble with the War Department and Grant, through his tactlessness verging on insubordination and his utter insensitivity where others were concerned, combined with acute sensitivity toward anything resembling an affront to himself.

The book is a thoroughly military biography, with only one short chapter covering Rosecrans' life before the Civil War and an epilogue on the postwar years. There is so little of Rosecrans' nonprofessional life here that the reader feels deprived of insights into the general's character that might further have illuminated his generalship. Lamers affirms that Rosecrans was deeply religious. His religious convictions might well have influenced his generalship. But those convictions are so little explored that even Rosecrans' conversion to Roman Catholicism does not appear until it is an accomplished and unexplained fact.

Edge of Glory contains too many lapses of the sort that are minor taken individually but disturbing when taken in total. For example, on page 75, it is made to appear that an army would cross the Blue Ridge to travel from Woodstock to Staunton, Virginia; on page 222, Richard W. Johnson's division is referred to as a brigade; on page 310, the XI Corps is referred to when the XXI Corps is obviously intended. Nevertheless, the book is a thoughtful and refreshingly well-written study of a soldier of importance and ability.

Drexel Institute of Technology

RUSSELL F. WEIGLEY

Sheridan in the Shenandoah: Jubal Early's Nemesis. By EDWARD J. STACKPOLE. (Harrisburg, Pa.: The Stackpole Company, 1961. Illustrations, maps, appendices, bibliography, index. \$5.95.)

"The combination of ambition, combativeness, intolerance, self-assurance, an inquiring mind that sought to penetrate directly to the heart of every situation, a restiveness under disciplinary supervision of superiors, and finally—above all else—that caustic wit whose barbs were never dull, all tended to set *Early* apart from his associates" (p. 15).

"There must have been something electric about Sheridan, a magnetic quality that attracted enlisted men and officers alike, without apparent effort on his part. Like *Stonewall Jackson*, his mere appearance on horseback before his troops seemed to generate a spontaneous enthusiasm that puzzled his closest friends as well as himself" (p. 120).

These quotations depict the author's personal image of Early and Sheridan.

On June 12, 1864, Jubal Early was summoned to the quarters of General Lee. Early was instructed to take his Corps on an independent mission,

"hasten to the defense of Lynchburg, dispose of Hunter's Federal force in the Shenandoah Valley, and then move down the Valley, cross the Potomac, and threaten Washington" (p. 22). These plans were executed with tremendous speed. "*Early's* long march through Charlottesville, Lynchburg, and Salem, down the Valley and through the South Mountain passes to the outskirts of Washington, driving en route the forces of Hunter, Sigel, and Wallace, was a feat that has seldom been equalled in War" (p. 78).

Early's threat to the Capital, however, served "the Union cause better than the Confederate in exposing the weakness of the Federal command structure in Washington" (p. 84). Grant, therefore, proposed to Lincoln that he "appoint a single commander whose jurisdiction should include all four of the separate military departments concerned, to provide the necessary co-ordination of the armed forces. . . ." The President, as a result, placed Halleck in command of the consolidated departments.

Grant now selected Sheridan to lay waste the Shenandoah Valley. Sheridan's first effort was crowned with victory in the battle of Winchester, which won for him the rank of brigadier general in the Regular Army. A 100-gun salute was ordered to take place in Washington for his "great battle and brilliant victory" (p. 233).

Early retreated to Fisher's Hill where he lost a second battle to Sheridan on September 22. The Confederates now retreated to Cedar Creek. This second defeat of Early enabled Sheridan to use his cavalry to lay waste the Shenandoah Valley, the breadbasket of the Confederacy. Meanwhile, Early and his aides planned to execute a surprise attack, which was performed with amazing precision. The Federal troops were taken by complete surprise in the morning of October 19, so they went pell-mell toward Winchester. "This was the moment, in the thinking of General John B. Gordon . . . for the reunited Confederate army to exploit its stunning initial success by an all-out, concentrated, renewed attack which *Gordon* believed would complete the route of the Union army . . ." (p. 310). But Early hesitated, then marked time, until victory was transformed into a shocking defeat.

In Winchester, Sheridan, asleep in bed, was wakened by an officer with the report that he heard irregular artillery firing at Cedar Creek. Sheridan went back to sleep, but became so restless that he arose, ordered the speeding up of breakfast, the horses saddled, and everything readied for a quick move. After late breakfast, Sheridan's party rode toward Cedar Creek. He soon heard the bad news, which is described in these words: "Just as we made the crest of the rise beyond the stream (Mill Creek) there burst upon our view the appalling spectacle of a panic-stricken army . . ." (p. 321).

Sheridan now decided to "return to his army as rapidly as possible and either salvage what he could from the early morning debacle or go down to defeat with his men" (p. 322). This decision led Sheridan on his historic ride, but it was a ride of moderate speed. The retreating soldiers about-faced and shouldered their muskets to follow their commander. Sheridan's per-

sonal appearance electrified officers and soldiers alike. Within two hours after Sheridan's arrival, a new line was established, and the renewed battle resulted in the rout of Early's forces.

The victories of Sheridan at Winchester, Fisher's Hill, and at Cedar Creek had brought the entire Shenandoah Valley into the hands of the Union. They also brought fame and glory to Sheridan. What is more, they assured the re-election of Abraham Lincoln.

This excellent book is composed of sixteen chapters, fifty-four illustrations, fifteen maps, a selective bibliography, and useful appendices. It is well indexed and annotated. It is factual, yet interesting. The literary style is clear, forceful, and beautiful.

Lehigh University

GEORGE D. HARMON

Virginia Railroads in the Civil War. By ANGUS JAMES JOHNSTON, II. (Chapel Hill, N. C.: Published for the Virginia Historical Society by the University of North Carolina Press, 1961. xvi, 336 p. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. \$6.00.)

The Civil War was the first massive conflict in which railroads played an all-important role. Curiously enough, it is only in recent years that there have appeared extended studies, such as Robert C. Black's *The Railroads of the Confederacy*. The present volume concentrates on Virginia, which possessed more railroad mileage than any other southern state and in which railroads dictated military strategy.

At the start of hostilities, Stonewall Jackson was the first to demonstrate the meaning of modern, economic, total war by his astounding destruction of the Baltimore and Ohio at Harpers Ferry and Martinsburg. At that time, moreover, he established the pattern followed throughout the war of raiding enemy communications, not only to cut off supplies but to influence the movements and dispositions of armies. A month after Jackson's raid, General Joseph Johnston used the Manassas Gap Railroad to show how a battle might be won by quickly moving troops to strategic points. Unlike the North, which possessed and used water transportation as much as railroads, Virginia and the South relied primarily upon their interior lines of rail communication. The neighboring Baltimore and Ohio was to be raided again and again, its bridges burned and its rolling stock destroyed, but methods for speedy restoration were devised and used by both sides as Virginia's railroads passed back and forth under the control of opposing forces.

In view of the fact that not a single bar of railroad iron was rolled in the South during the entire war (the foundries being monopolized for the Ordnance Department), and since few supplies could be brought in from abroad, it seems miraculous that the southern railroads were able to func-

tion as long as they did. Late in the war, rails and rolling stock were taken from abandoned or less important lines to those that had to be maintained through sheer military necessity. As late as the spring of 1864, the South could open up an entire new railroad, the Piedmont, connecting Danville and Greensboro, North Carolina. Unreliable and frail, the new line, in connection with the Richmond and Danville, relieved the food shortage in the Confederate capital and provided a second communication with the South, one that was safer than the more vulnerable Petersburg Railroad.

In the final year of conflict, northern strategy had as its object to break every railroad in a full circle around the Army of Northern Virginia. As Grant's troops cut railroad after railroad, Lee's problems became increasingly acute. When, at last, Sheridan reached the South Side Railroad in April, 1865, the defense of Petersburg and Richmond instantly collapsed. And in the final harrowing week of the war, it was the "desperate hope of finding railroad trains laden with food for the starving survivors of his army that led Lee westward toward the fatal ground of Appomattox."

Dr. Johnston has provided a lively and most readable study based upon critical use of a wide variety of sources. It was suggested by the late dean of Virginia historians, Douglas Southall Freeman, who recommended an investigation of Virginia's railroads as "the least explored aspect of the war." Illustrations include nine Matthew Brady photographs of wartime railroads; but the maps are in small scale, and a large folding map, such as that provided in Freeman's first volume of *R. E. Lee*, might well have been included.

Princeton, N. J.

WHEATON J. LANE

Reconstruction: After the Civil War. By JOHN HOPE FRANKLIN. [Chicago History of American Civilization.] (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961. x, 258 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$5.00.)

For all too many years, Dunning's *Reconstruction* (1907), Fleming's *Sequel of Appomattox* (1919), and Bowers' *Tragic Era* (1929) have reigned supreme in personal libraries and on college collateral reading lists as standard treatments of this important period in American history. Now at last we have a lucid and judicious synthesis of the so-called "revisionist" view of Reconstruction which has found expression in various articles and monographs during the past two decades. Here is a book which the college teacher can recommend almost without reservation as a good modern summary of this controversial aspect of our national story.

The focus of this study is largely on the South rather than on the North or on the Federal government. While the contents is largely factual and narrative in form, Dr. Franklin offers some significant interpretive judgments that are worth noting. The point is emphasized that former Confederate leaders were largely in control of southern affairs for the first two

years after the war. It is suggested that they made a serious tactical mistake in not granting the franchise at least to literate and propertied Negroes and in not making adequate provisions for Negro education. Southern opposition to the Freedmen's Bureau, Dr. Franklin says, was based partly on resentment against the schools it supported. Not only was there strong southern hostility toward advancement of the freedmen; in many cases there was an unwillingness or inability on the part of the Johnsonian governments to guarantee even ordinary bodily safety to Negroes, to southern Unionists, and to northerners in the South. In the context of considerations such as this, as well as the notorious Black Codes, the Radicals' overthrow of Presidential Reconstruction is more easily understood.

The struggle between Johnson and the Radicals is treated rather briefly. While reference is made to Johnson's "careless and irresponsible harangues," there is no effort to justify the impeachment proceedings. Radical rule in the South is discussed in more detail. Perhaps the most notable feature of this book is its treatment of the role of Negroes in Radical Reconstruction. While freely admitting that the great mass of the newly enfranchised freedmen were unprepared for the responsibilities of citizenship, Dr. Franklin points out that there were at least a few Negroes who were reasonably well qualified for officeholding and leadership. He emphasizes the variety and complexity of the motives which drew "carpetbaggers" into the South. He maintains that southern whites, by no means all "scalawags," played a much larger role in the Radical constitutional conventions and in the new governments than is generally recognized. He also presents evidence to show that the strength and influence of United States military forces in the South under the occupation were not as great as has been usually assumed. The constructive achievements of the Radical governments are featured, and Dr. Franklin points out that no party, no race, and no section had a monopoly on political corruption during this period. In discussion of the overthrow of Radical rule in the South the role of the Klan is particularly emphasized, though not to the exclusion of other factors.

The author neglects one aspect of the story which this reviewer feels would have some relevance, namely the impetus given to civil rights legislation in the northern states during this period. Pennsylvania, for example, which had developed a pattern of racist repression in the ante-bellum years, adopted under the pressure of Radical Republicanism a variety of measures designed to reduce discrimination against Negroes.

The weaknesses of this excellent book are largely due to the format and space limitations of the series to which it belongs. It is impossible to do full justice to such a vast and complicated panorama of events in the brief compass of this small volume. The chapter on "economic and social reconstruction" is especially thin. While there is an excellent bibliographical essay, there are no footnotes, which at many points would be desirable.

Imperial Democracy. The Emergence of America as a Great Power. By ERNEST R. MAY. (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1961. viii, 318 p. Bibliographic notes, index. \$6.75.)

"Some nations achieve greatness; the United States had greatness thrust upon it." This rather shopworn epigram is the last sentence of the book under review and possibly its only stylistic lapse. (Professor May's writing is fresh, vigorous, and lucid.) Banal or not, the final punch line neatly summarizes the evidence and argument of this penetrating study.

Between 1893 and 1900 the United States became a great power. Its attainment to this high estate was not the conscious design of the policy makers whose decisions and actions shaped events in America and Europe during the period. Great-power status was simply conceded when the United States began to look beyond its borders and found no one able or willing to challenge its right to do so.

Presidents Harrison, Cleveland, and McKinley were partly responsible for America's entrance onto the world stage, for their policies involved the United States in overseas affairs and in controversies with European powers. But their own foreign policy objectives, as the author describes them, were far removed from the fulfillment of any imperialist or great-power ambitions. They led the United States toward unaccustomed entanglements abroad either because of a moralistic concern with other people's problems (as in the case of Cleveland's initial interest in Venezuelan boundary claims against British Guiana) or in response to pressures arising out of domestic politics. McKinley's decision to intervene in the Cuban situation and later to annex the Philippines is, as Professor May explains it, a classic example of the latter type of involvement. Uncertain and reluctant, McKinley bowed before an inflamed public opinion.

In Europe, British and Continental statesmen were equally oblivious to the emergence of great-power status for America as a possible consequence of the actions they took or failed to take. Until a very late hour, Spain remained indifferent even to the prospect of American intervention in her war against the Cuban insurgents, despite a rising tide of indignation in the United States at the continuing holocaust. Six months before the outbreak of hostilities with America, "the Spanish government was not yet concerned with anything McKinley said or did, except as it seemed likely to affect rebel morale." Nor were the other European powers of this era much quicker to view the United States as a force to be reckoned with. Although the young American giant was held in some quarters to be a threat to Europe's political and economic security, European policy makers could not agree among themselves concerning the nature of the threat or the means of dealing with it. After the Spanish-American War, it was too late. "The United States, in a very real sense, became a great power when it came to be thought one."

Neither the title nor the subtitle of this book hints at the riches in store for the reader in those chapters that dwell on European politics and

diplomacy. The author's discussion of the ill-fated Cuban policy of the Cánovas and Sagasta governments is most illuminating, as is his tracing out of the other European powers' reactions to Spain's ever-deeper engulfment in the Cuban morass—reactions almost totally unrewarding to Spain. These accounts of European myopia and disunity add much to our understanding of how the United States could spring fully armed into the company of the great powers.

The study has many other merits, among them the well-drawn portraits of major figures of the day. Those dealt with include Lord Salisbury, Joseph Chamberlain, von Bülow, the Russian Foreign Minister Muraviev, and a number of others. The following brief extracts do not do justice to the author's sketches but perhaps suggest their deftness. Cleveland was "cautious, conservative, and strikingly unimaginative," McKinley so enigmatic that it is "extremely hard to plumb the motives beneath his policies." Maria Christina, Queen Regent of Spain, was a "solemn, humorless, homely Hapsburg Archduchess [who] had no concern but to save the throne for her twelve-year-old son." Lord Salisbury's "shrew-tongued Colonial Secretary, Joseph Chamberlain, despite his monocle and the habitual orchid in his coat lapel, was a political tactician with few equals in imagination and energy."

The bibliographic notes are cryptic but wide-ranging. Especially impressive in a book by a student of American history are the numerous citations to documentary sources and secondary works in Spanish, Italian, German and Russian.

University of Pennsylvania

HENRY WELLS

Frank B. Kellogg and American Foreign Relations, 1925-1929. By L. ETHAN ELLIS. (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1961. xii, 303 p. Bibliography, index. \$7.50.)

Unlike many younger and less able scholars who feel that no study of the past is worthwhile unless it offers a new thesis or revises old interpretations, Professor Ellis has been content to explore with infinite pains and cool detachment a short period which, he rightly says, has received "somewhat cavalier treatment" from historians. His aptly titled book, resting on a broad array of public and private records, printed and manuscript, contains the fullest and best balanced account now available of foreign policy under Coolidge and Kellogg. If the work fails to alter markedly the picture which specialists had drawn previously from fragmentary sources, it does add useful details and does enable one to speak with greater confidence.

The author deals with both Kellogg and foreign relations. He discusses the Secretary's personality and the men around him. Neither training nor temperament fitted Kellogg for the job. Age and irascibility were a handicap, as were an unwise deference to a lazy and uninformed President and an

undue dependence on such men as Charles Evans Hughes and Elihu Root. In Mexico, Kellogg virtually surrendered control of policy to Dwight W. Morrow; in Nicaragua, to Henry L. Stimson. The Secretary tended to be more cautious than his envoys abroad; he yielded to rather than molded public and congressional opinion. "Industrious, devoted, and frequently harassed" are the words Professor Ellis applies to the man who steered an established course in some areas and veered on new tacks only under pressure. Kellogg, he concludes, cannot be called "an imaginative or dynamic Secretary; he is most fairly viewed as a busy mediocrity operating in a period when most Americans were preoccupied with domestic affairs" (p. viii). Some change occurred during his tenure, but Kellogg kept mostly within the limits imposed by the temper of the times.

Professor Ellis allots five chapters to the problems raised by Mexico, Nicaragua, China, disarmament, and the World Court. He combines into one the Tacna-Arica dispute, the Havana Conference, and the Clark Memorandum; in another he takes up arbitration, war debts, and the World Court. On these topics he is very detailed and exploits materials that have been little used—the State Department's files in the National Archives, the Kellogg Papers in the Minnesota Historical Society, and the transcripts of Coolidge's press conferences in the Forbes Library at Northampton, Massachusetts. He relies heavily on the *Foreign Relations* series and has drawn upon the diary of William R. Castle and the personal papers of Hughes, Stimson, Morrow, Joseph C. Grew, and others. He cites foreign sources infrequently, and his account may have to be modified at places when scholars gain access to the archives of other nations and the manuscripts of foreign statesmen.

It is difficult to find flaws in the book Professor Ellis has chosen to write. Excessive detail is offset by frequent summaries and forthright generalizations, as well as by a final "overview." This reviewer would have preferred a little less concentration on problems that loomed large to men at the time and a little more attention to those of enduring significance. The author says nothing about relations with Russia, save as they affected armaments, and nothing about the future of Germany, save as it related to war debts. He discusses oil in Mexico, but not oil in the Middle East. There is no probing into Kellogg's views on isolationism as a governmental policy, or into his thinking on neutrality—not even mention of the executive agreement of May 19, 1927, by which the United States promised not to press diplomatically for or demand arbitration of its citizens' claims against England for damages inflicted during World War I. A deeper inquiry into Kellogg's stand on international issues while he was in the Senate and in the London embassy would have helped to explain his course as Secretary of State. But Professor Ellis is entitled to have his work judged on his own terms, and we can only be grateful that he has done so competently what he set out to do.

THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA

President, Boies Penrose

Vice-Presidents

Richmond P. Miller

Ernest C. Savage

Wm. C. Tuttle

Roy F. Nichols

Harold D. Saylor

Charles Stewart Wurts

Secretary, Penrose R. Hoopes

Treasurer, George E. Nehrbas

Councilors

Thomas C. Cochran

Henry R. Pemberton

Frederick B. Tolles

William Logan Fox

Grant M. Simon

David Van Pelt

J. Welles Henderson

Martin P. Snyder

H. Justice Williams

Sydney E. Martin

Thomas E. Wynne

Counsel, R. Sturgis Ingersoll



Director, R. N. Williams, 2nd

DEPARTMENT HEADS: Nicholas B. Wainwright, *Research*; Lois V. Given, *Publications*; J. Harcourt Givens, *Manuscripts*; Frank W. Bobb, *Library*; Sara B. Pomerantz, *Assistant to the Treasurer*; David T. McKee, *Building Superintendent*.



Founded in 1824, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has long been a center of research in Pennsylvania and American history. It has accumulated an important historical collection, chiefly through contributions of family, political, and business manuscripts, as well as letters, diaries, newspapers, magazines, maps, prints, paintings, photographs, and rare books. Additional contributions of such a nature are urgently solicited for preservation in the Society's fireproof building where they may be consulted by scholars.

Membership. There are various classes of membership: general, \$10.00; associate, \$25.00; patron, \$100.00; life, \$250.00; benefactor, \$1,000. Members receive certain privileges in the use of books, are invited to the Society's historical addresses and receptions, and receive *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*. Those interested in joining the Society are invited to submit their names.

Hours. The Society is open to the public Monday, 1 P.M. to 9 P.M.; Tuesday through Friday, 9 A.M. to 5 P.M. The Society is usually closed during August.

NEWSPAPERS ON MICROFILM

available at

THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA

<i>Pennsylvania Gazette</i> , 1728-1789	21 reels	\$155.00
1790-1815 (broken run)	4 reels	34.00
<i>Hoch-Deutsch Pensylvanische Geschicht-Schreiber</i> , 1739-1745; <i>Pensylvanische Berichte</i> , 1745-1762 (Christopher Saur)	2 reels	17.00
<i>Pennsylvania Journal</i> , 1742-1793	25 reels	200.00
<i>Philadelphische Zeitung</i> , 1755-1757	1 reel	8.50
<i>Wochentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote</i> , 1763-1779	2 reels	17.00
<i>New-York Journal</i> , 1766-1776	5 reels	42.50
<i>Pennsylvania Chronicle</i> , 1767-1774	4 reels	34.00
<i>Pennsylvania Packet</i> , 1771-1790	21 reels	168.00
<i>Gemeinnützige Philadelphische Correspondenz</i> , 1781-1790; <i>Neue Philadelphische Correspondenz</i> , 1790-1800	2 reels	17.00
<i>Federal Gazette</i> , 1788-1802	28 reels	224.00
<i>Chesnuthiller Wochenschrift</i> , 1790-1793	1 reel	8.50
<i>Pennsylvania Evening Post</i> , 1775-1779	12 reels	96.00
<i>Pennsylvania Ledger</i> , 1775-1778		
<i>Freeman's Journal</i> , 1781-1792		
<i>Independent Gazetteer</i> , 1782-1797		
<i>Pennsylvania Mercury</i> , 1784-1792		
<i>Pennsylvania Evening Herald</i> , 1785-1788	1 reel	8.50
<i>The Mechanics' Free Press</i> , 1828-1831		