reader is given information which is adequate to meet the objectives of the book. The National Park Service is to be congratulated for their effort.
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It was a thin line indeed that separated rebel from loyalist in the American Revolution. An excellent illustration of this is a comparison of Benjamin Franklin and Joseph Galloway. For twenty years — 1755 to 1775 — Franklin and Galloway joined forces to dominate Pennsylvania politics. They shaped a powerful party organization which brought them firmly into control of the Philadelphia Assembly. But it was a partnership doomed to failure. When British imperial policy began to challenge the role of the provincial legislature, Franklin held inflexibly to his stand for colonial autonomy — Galloway could not, and the partnership fell apart. Franklin went on to be one of the great American rebels; Galloway seeped into the obscurity shared by most loyalists.

Benjamin Newcomb has demonstrated care and imagination in capturing the genesis, fruition, and demise of the Franklin-Galloway partnership in Franklin and Galloway: A Political Partnership. He makes his way — ploddingly at times — through the complexities of Pennsylvania politics and the procession of crises that led to the split of the colonies from England and Galloway from Franklin.

On the surface, one wonders why Franklin chose someone so different from himself to be his political partner. Galloway was almost twenty-five years younger than Franklin, and he lacked Franklin's intellectual passion, his charm, and his broad view of the British Empire and the place of the colonies within it. Actually, Franklin was attracted to Galloway precisely because he was different from himself. He recognized that Galloway would fill in areas of his own inadequacy: the junior partner was well born and could move in circles of Philadelphia society where Franklin was unwelcome, he was a renowned orator while Franklin was untalented as a public speaker, and he was
an adept lawyer whereas Franklin had little knowledge or interest in the intricacies of Pennsylvania law. The two men, equally ambitious and firmly committed to strengthening representative government in Pennsylvania at the expense of the proprietors, complemented each other in their respective abilities. Together they engineered one of the few genuine parties of the colonial era by the use of patronage, solid organization, timely assaults upon opponents, and an effective propaganda mill. Galloway proved himself just as resourceful and determined in the political infighting as his senior partner. With Franklin running affairs from England and Galloway in charge of the Philadelphia Assembly, they presented a formidable transatlantic attack upon proprietary government in Pennsylvania and responded with conviction to the shifting imperial policy of England.

The Stamp Tax of 1765 exposed the first fissures in the political partnership. Both men opposed the parade of British taxation designs that followed, but while Franklin consistently held to the principle that the Pennsylvania legislature was supreme, Galloway ignored the question of rights and called for restrained resistance. The partners struggled to cement together again the crumbling empire with paper money schemes and plans of union. As one effort after the other failed, Franklin grew increasingly militant, while Galloway held out for reconciliation. Franklin asserted colonial rights, while Galloway subordinated them to imperial considerations. With the failure of Galloway's Plan of Union in 1775, the failure of the political partnership was assured. Franklin joined the patriots, and Galloway exiled himself to England, a bitter, beaten man.

Newcomb has done an admirable job of tracing the decay of the political partnership under pressure. His account reads clearly, although it tends to drag from time to time, as on the details of internal Pennsylvania politics — a seemingly inevitable mark of a revised doctoral dissertation (this one done under the direction of Richard Dunn of the University of Pennsylvania). Newcomb's study offers little that is new on Franklin, but it enriches the works of Paul Connor, Theodore Thayer, Cecil Currey, Ralph Ketcham, and others who have dealt with him as a political figure. It is in the study of Galloway that Newcomb has the most to contribute. Unfortunately, he never quite brings Galloway as clearly into focus as he does Franklin — the junior partner remains something of an enigma. No doubt this is because there is simply far less material on his life than on Franklin's, a reflection, in part, of the relative obscurity to which Galloway was
destined after his fateful decision to oppose the rebellion. How different our memory of him might have been had the Revolution not destroyed his political career in midstream.
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The "Oberlin-Wellington Rescue" of 1858-1859 was one of those passionate, portentous events that both reflect and direct the course of history. In August 1858, a slave catcher came to Oberlin, Ohio, in search of runaways. His mere presence in the town alarmed the community, particularly those at Oberlin College who had made the school a center of abolitionist and reform sentiment. The college and the community had long since distinguished itself in the service of the black man — the college and the community's schools were racially integrated, Oberlin was an important station on the underground railroad, blacks held important local positions, and the people prided themselves on their devotion to the "law of conscience," the "higher law," a law, they said, which invalidated such statutes as the despised Fugitive Slave Law of 1850.

When word spread that a local black man, one John Price, had been lured out of Oberlin, captured as a fugitive slave, and carried off to nearby Wellington to await the train south, the community reacted. A swarm of townspeople, both whites and blacks, along with students and faculty from the college rushed to Wellington, rescued Price, returned him to Oberlin, and helped him escape to Canada. Here was an open, flagrant violation of the law and repudiation of the federal government. Federal marshals moved in immediately, arrested some thirty-seven "rescuers," and began prosecution proceedings against them in Cleveland where the United States district court sat, and where Democrats, vocally unsympathetic towards abolitionists, were in the majority. (The jury was made up exclusively of Democrats, the rescuers charged.) The twenty who eventually stood trial included students, professors, and prominent professional people of Oberlin. One of the indicted was Jacob R. Shipherd, a freshman at Oberlin.