ordered bazaar presupposes nothing, after all, in the way of common beliefs or shared values. It presupposes nothing more than acceptance of a few procedural rules. Conflicting values and beliefs do not prevent those who do business there from “haggling profitably away.” If they yearn for the company of people who share their own outlook on life, they can “retreat” to their clubs “after a hard day’s haggling.”

Rorty’s ideal world comes close to describing the world as it actually exists, at least in the United States; and many Americans are ready to accept it, I suppose, as the best that can be hoped for. Oldenburg’s book helps to spotlight what is missing from such a world: urban amenities, conviviality, conversation, politics — almost everything, in short, that makes life worth living. When the market pre-empts all the public space, and sociability has to “retreat” into private clubs, people are in danger of losing the capacity to amuse and even to govern themselves. As long as they recognize the danger, however, it is still possible to hope that they will find a way to reverse the suburban trend of our civilization and to restore the civic arts to their rightful place at the center of things.

---

**Major General Adam Stephen and the Cause of American Liberty**

By Harry M. Ward


In Washington, D.C., the National Museum of American History exhibits a military waistcoat of Adam Stephen, Virginia officer of the French and Indian War and major general in the American Revolution. Thousands of visitors casually view this article of dress each year as they tour the facility, producing the unusual situation in which a garment worn by a historical figure has become better known than the individual himself.

With the appearance of *Major General Adam Stephen and the Cause of American Liberty*, Harry M. Ward has provided a welcome addition to the growing body of scholarship which examines second-line figures in the Continental Army who have been neglected, like Stephen. Professor of history at the University of Richmond, Ward’s previous books include *General George Weedon and the American Revolution*, and *Charles Scott and the ‘Spirit of ’76*.

Scottish born, Stephen (1721-1791) was educated and trained as a physician at the universities of Aberdeen and Edinburgh. He served a brief stint in the Royal Navy before emigrating to America and settling in what is today Berkeley County, West Virginia. As captain under George Washington in the Virginia Regiment in 1754, he helped fire the opening guns of the French and Indian War at Jumonville and Fort Necessity. Elevated to lieutenant colonel and subsequently wounded with Braddock at the Monongahela, he was critical of the panicky conduct of the British regulars there but took pride in the comparatively good performance of his own men.

By 1758, the major strategic question was how the British could strike at French Fort Duquesne — via the Braddock Road or by a new route across Pennsylvania. When the latter route was selected, much to the disgust of the Virginians, Ward demonstrates that Stephen did not exhibit the petulance, defeatism and immaturity that so characterized a bitterly disappointed Washington at that time. Stephen unhesitatingly threw himself into the physical opening of the new Forbes Road when, literally removing his coat and sword, he and his troops painfully hacked their way through the mountain forests. Serving throughout the conflict, Stephen functioned as regimental deputy to Washington and then (after 1758) to William Byrd III, ultimately receiving the senior position in August 1761. He returned to duty for the Pontiac War in 1763-64. As Ward charts this period, Stephen emerges as one of the most experienced officers from the decade-long conflict. In 1774 Stephen participated in Dunmore’s War against the Shawnee Indians in the Ohio Valley.

Stephen’s lengthy relationship with Washington sometimes flared into open hostility.

Stephen’s involvement in the War for Independence began as head of the Berkeley County committee of safety, Virginia Convention delegate and Indian Commissioner. After helping to expel the British from Virginia, he was named a regimental colonel in early 1776, and promoted to brigadier general in the Continental Army in September. He fought the Hessians at Trenton and the British at Princeton in the New Jersey campaign, which led to his February 1777 elevation to major general. Ward suggests that Stephen’s quick promotions in the army, making him by that point Washington’s ninth ranking general, had fed his already considerable personal pride, thus giving him a “flippant air” and an outspoken self-confidence. In the following months, Stephen skillfully conducted a grueling “war of posts,” in which he engaged the enemy “8 or 10 times a week.” In September, at the defeat of Brandywine, Stephen commanded a division, and rumors of his supposed intoxication reached Washington’s ears. The next month, after one of the major engagements of the war — Germantown — questions of alcohol abuse and incapacitation in the field brought Stephen’s military career to a sudden and conclusive end with his dismissal. Ward, while not explaining away the matter, asserts that accusations of inebriation were hardly unknown in the army, and that Stephen was not alone that autumn in facing charges...
of incompetence before the enemy. Generals Anthony Wayne, John Sullivan and James Maxwell were each brought before a court martial, but were exonerated. Ward finds no proof that the Virginian was unable to discharge his responsibilities at Germantown, but notes that the story about Stephen being "a sor-did, boasting, cowardly sort" grew in its retelling.

The unfavorable recommendation of a court of inquiry alleged that Stephen was "seen in open view of all the soldiers very drunk" and taking snuff from prostitutes, and that he was temporarily absent from his division during its withdrawal from Germantown. Following his removal, a shocked and dismayed Stephen unwisely denounced Washington in writing, destroying any possible vindication by Congress.

One key to understanding Stephen can be found in his uneasy relationship with Washington which flared intermittently into open hostility. The insecure Washington of the 1750s may have felt inadequate beside his older, far better-educated deputy. In the Revolution, he tolerated Stephen to a point, but one gets the impression that the commander-in-chief would have rid himself of his old rival, whenever he deemed it expedient. After Stephen was cashiered, his division was quickly given to Washington's favorite, Marquis de Lafayette.

Ward also documents Stephen's little-noted political life. As early as 1761, Stephen dared to be a candidate (unsuccessfully) for election to the House of Burgesses, against Washington. He then competently held a variety of local offices such as justice of the peace, vestryman, county lieutenant and sheriff. He served rather half-heartedly in the Virginia House of Delegates (1780-1785), and was county overseer for the poor. Stephen retained enough respect to be selected as representative to the 1788 Virginia Ratification Convention for the new federal constitution. An ardent advocate of a powerful federal government, he spoke forcefully for the constitu-

tion's adoption. His stalwart support of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton's controversial plan for federal assumption of state debts made him few friends in Virginia, but gave credence to his dedication to strong central authority. Displaying his quirky intellectual bent, he penned a broadside, *The Expostulation of the Potomac*, which argued the case for locating the nation's capital on the banks of the Potomac River.

In this biography, Stephen stands out as a seasoned, mid-level military professional in a nation largely lacking a martial tradition. His experience with British regulars, provincials, militia, light infantry, riflemen, Continentals, Northern and Southern Native Americans and even seamen was superior to that of Washington. He grasped that tactical success in America could be realized only by a marriage of European and colonial modes of warfare. As he astutely put it to Washington in 1757, his Virginia forces were "well disciplin'd and have this advantage of all other troops in America that they know the parade as well as Prussians, and the fighting in a Close Country as well as Tartars."

Ward acknowledges that controversy was never far from Stephen. Contentious, boastful and probably an alcoholic, his combative personality led him sporadically into imbroglios and disputes with his superiors. The author believes that Stephen's primary weakness was his concern "with generalities of command," while ignoring military routine through over-reliance on junior officers and heavy delegation of authority to his brigade and regimental commanders. Such defects were rampant in the embryonic American service and not remedied until General von Steuben's reforms in 1778. An inept administrator, Stephen's reputation in both the Forbes Campaign and Pontiac's War was tarnished by allegations of conflict of interest improprieties. His revolutionary years were marked by rancorous questions of seniority for promotion in the Virginia Line by Congress. The demands of divisional command were perhaps beyond him, and his personal conduct could be offensive and unbecoming for that of a major general. On the other hand, after being sacked, Stephen conducted the balance of his days with decorum and a certain grace, displaying little permanent animus. Even his plan to publish a defense of his actions at Germantown never materialized. An apparent lifelong bachelor (a daughter, Ann, was born out of wedlock in 1761), Stephen had his failings and vices, but as presented by Ward, he emerges as a patriot devoted to the welfare of his adopted nation.

Although few of Stephen's personal papers survive, the author has done an outstanding job of locating the relevant primary sources, thereby permitting a balanced and revealing view of the Virginian's career. Professor Ward has effectively liberated Stephen from unjust obscurity in a museum case.

J. Martin West
Fort Ligonier Association

---

**Discoursing Sweet Music: Brass Bands and Community Life in Turn-of-the-Century Pennsylvania**

By Kenneth Kreitner


The publication of Kenneth Kreitner's study of brass bands in the life of selected eastern Pennsylvania communities coincides with a revitalization of the brass band movement in this country. As Kreitner points out, from the Mexican War to World War I the amateur band was arguably the most conspicuous and influential musical institution in the United States. Its music served a kind of "aural logo" for countless community events. This heyday was followed by such a marked decline that brass bands...