The reviewer was impressed with the revelation of the provisions furnished the Indians by the British. Probably the Americans, as they were called at an early date, have no record of such humane bounty.

Years ago Milo Quaife, in Detroit, said Western Pennsylvanians were guilty of underestimating the ability of Alexander McKee and Matthew Elliott, though he had nothing to say in defense of Simon Girty.

Quaife, a great regional scholar, was familiar with the documentary material covering much of the contents of this volume.

The scholarship of this volume is indicated in the Bibliographical Note and demonstrated in the Notes (really footnotes). The technique of the footnotes is definitely superior.

The great defect of this work is found in its printing. Much of the typography is bad. Word spacing is often poor (p. 1, line 20; p. 83, line 37). Line spacing is sometimes unsatisfactory (e.g., p. 4, lines 13-14; p. 69, lines 16-17; p. 101, lines 19-20). Another defect is the lack of maps. The excellent map (opp. p. 23) is not enough.

The price of the book is little short of appalling to a "senior citizen," but it is doubtless worth its price in inflated money. It has much historical value.

Professor Emeritus Alfred P. James
University of Pittsburgh


Each generation of Americans develops its own views of the Declaration of Independence. It follows that there will be a series of disagreements about it. What Professor Hawke has done in the present volume is a study of the differences between Thomas Jefferson and John Adams. Obviously it was part of his task to consider those matters upon which they were not at variance. In both phases of his work he has taken into account the findings of other writers of recent times. Thus he quotes George Santayana as insisting:

The Declaration ... was a piece of literature, a salad of illusions. Admiration for the noble savage, for the ancient Romans (whose republic was founded on slavery and war) mixed with the quietistic maxims of the Sermon on the Mount, may inspire a Rousseau, but it cannot guide a government. The American
Colonies were rehearsing independence and were ready for it. That was what gave to the Declaration...its timeliness and political weight. In 1898 the United States were rehearsing domination over tropical America and were ready to organize and legalize it; it served their commercial and military interests and their imaginative passions. Such antecedents and such facilities made intervention sooner or later inevitable. Domination was the implicit aim, whatever might be the language or event or thoughts of individuals.

To be reminded of such opinions is a service to both the pragmatic and the idealistic schools of the Twentieth century. Professor Hawke has provided an anthology in effect for the accommodation of modern scholars who may wish to choose between Jefferson and Adams. He likewise provides methods and means for discrimination between Greek and Hebrew ideologies. For example, he cites Reinhold Niebuhr as contending:

The final vulgarity is to equate the ultimate ends of life with the dubious goals of “happiness” and to equate happiness with creature comforts. Our nation, despite its so-called religious revival, is today threatened by this kind of vulgarity. It is what creates the ironic similarity between the technocratic approach to life, despite the emphasis we place on the dignity of the individual in our culture, and the absence of such an emphasis in the communist culture.

In pure history, as distinct from any other kind, Professor Hawke is concerned that it should not be forgotten that both Jefferson and Adams were well endowed for their work in the Continental Congress and for the writing of its most important utterance. Both had been educated by experience as well as by philosophic texts. When they took antagonistic positions it was not because they had hostile purposes or ends. Their methods were less dissimilar than certain of their contemporaries imagined. It was their common destiny to be associated even before they first met in 1775. Paradoxical as it may seem, their occasional quarrels brought them closer together. Surely it is one of the most impressive coincidences in the American saga that they departed this earth on the same day and that they both had been privileged to watch half a century of progress in the national experiment they had sponsored.

Professor Hawke does not omit proper credit also to Benjamin Franklin, Richard Henry Lee, Thomas Paine, Benjamin Rush, Roger Sherman and the original Signer, John Hancock. He does not query such latter-day American moulders of human fate as Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, William Jennings Bryan, Nicholas Murray Butler, Harry W. Laidler, Henry Louis Mencken, Walter Lippmann and William Allen White concerning their procedures had they been faced with the same problems in 1776, but the hint is available for readers to consider, if they wish.
Only a little more than ten brief years hence the heirs of the Declaration of Independence then living will celebrate its bicentennial in what sunshine or what shadow? Professor Hawke unquestionably has some suggestions — as to preparation, for instance. His book is a teacher’s book in the broadest sense of the phrase.

Pittsburgh

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT