

*Van Tyne: Causes of the War of Independence* 327

his Baltimore experiences, will say, "It is one thing to be a Roman Catholic in this country and another to be an Irish Roman Catholic." Perhaps that is the key to many of Carroll's administrative difficulties. It is a pity that in a work of great merit like this, which will surely be a source-book for the history of this period, a more rigorous critical method was not employed. Arguments, reduplication, and irrelevant matter removed, the volume would lose half its size and gain twice its value.

*The Causes of the War of Independence: being the First Volume of a History of the Founding of the American Republic.* By CLAUDE H. VAN TYNE, Professor of History in the University of Michigan. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1922. Pp. x, 499. \$5.00.)

THIS book, carrying the story of the American Revolution through the outbreak of hostilities at Concord and Lexington, is the first of a projected series of three volumes which together will portray the founding of the American republic to 1789. Had the present volume appeared twenty years ago, it would have created a sensation and have marked an epoch in American historiography. Appearing, however, in the year 1922, its chief service is to correlate and synthesize the results of special researches into Revolutionary history made by a host of students in the intervening period, and, by showing the essential harmony of their conclusions, to give to their findings a new validity. The general reader and the busy teacher will thus find this volume a convenient and trustworthy short-cut to an extensive and somewhat specialized literature. The author's attitude throughout is even-tempered and unruffled and shows no traces of the stormy controversies which have been raised in recent years by certain well-meaning men who seemed to fear that a dispassionate disclosure of the facts surrounding the nation's birth would be destructive of American patriotism.

As the foregoing suggests, the major conclusions of the work rest upon the labors of others. Thus seventy-four different foot-notes contain citations to a single monograph; and two other studies are referred to as frequently as twenty-five times each. The author's selection of secondary works seems at times capricious. For instance, Wallace's *Henry Laurens* receives repeated citation, whereas Gipson's valuable *Jared Ingersoll* is not once mentioned. The author has made use of the familiar collections of printed sources, though chiefly for purposes of illustration. Only three citations to colonial newspapers are made in the entire volume. Although the author alludes to his researches in English and French archives, only thirty-two foot-notes of the one thousand and forty contain references to foreign manuscript material. Further analysis reduces these citations to twelve different documents; and of this number, at least four might have been consulted in the form of transcripts in the Library of Congress. There is apparently only one citation to manuscript material found in the United States.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXVIII.—22.

The author's individuality is best expressed in chapters XII. and XIII., wherein he discusses those underlying divergencies in social, cultural, intellectual, and religious training and ideals which since early colonial days had tended to create misunderstanding between the colonists and Britain. In later chapters he never loses sight of these influences and he shows their bearing upon the development of each new crisis. He makes no mention, however, of the working union of the Presbyterians and the New England Congregationalists formed in 1764, which Gallo-way declared was a factor of prime importance in promoting the independent spirit.

Students of the Revolutionary period would have been grateful if Professor Van Tyne had supplemented the investigations of the research specialists of recent years by exploring some of the unknown territory which still lies between the newly marked trails. The activity of British trading bodies and of the absentee West Indian planters merits careful inquiry for the light it is almost certain to throw upon the successive acts of Parliament concerning America in the period 1763-1776. The whole matter of colonial paper currency, both from the American and British points of view, forms another fertile field for investigation. The administrative activities of the American Customs Board require exhaustive study before we can begin to write definitively of the causes of the colonial revolt. The complex framework of the popular party, with its interrelated parts and differentiated functions, needs much further analysis if we are to understand how an energetic minority succeeded in committing a majority of the population to armed revolt and independence. A thorough examination should also be made of the methods of anti-British propaganda employed by the popular leaders. Such an inquiry would touch lightly upon the constitutional grievances recited in state papers and the more serious pamphlets, and concentrate upon the appeals to passion and prejudice to be found in broadsides, bits of popular doggerel, patriotic songs, caricatures, newspapers, slogans, emblems, etc. The author does well to lay stress on the pulpit as an agency of agitation, but I believe he is mistaken in repeating the usual opinion that pamphlets were more potent in shaping colonial opinion than the newspapers. Thirty-nine new papers were established during the period of agitation, most of them by radical sympathizers; and there is plenty of evidence to show that the popular leaders were masters of the technique of newspaper propaganda.

To enter very fully into criticism of details would give a false idea of the value of the book. However, a few things need to be noted. Professor Van Tyne pictures British commercial control as being more repressive in its actual regulations than most recent students have believed; and he is in error in stating that colonial traders and planters were permitted to "sell only to England" (p. 66). He discusses the royal review of colonial legislation without knowledge, apparently, of

*Du Pont: E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company* 329

Dr. E. B. Russell's exhaustive treatise on this subject (see p. 150, note). At the same time he ignores the control of American legislation exercised by the king in council through appeals from the colonial courts. Here, rather than in the former case, do we have a true analogy to the action of the Supreme Court in annulling legislation (pp. 151-152). The author's use of the term "Loyalist" is frequently puzzling when applied to individuals and groups prior to the momentous year 1774. Who were not loyalists in that period? The author's statement of the terms upon which the port of Boston might be reopened under the statute of 1774 is only partly correct (p. 393). The exemption of South Carolina from the non-exportation regulation of the First Continental Congress was probably omitted in the interests of compression (p. 442), but thereby the author neglected a fine opportunity to reveal the mutual suspicions and the clash of competing economic interests involved in the carrying-out of the radical programme. Of the typographical errors the most serious are those involving an incorrect citation of pages or other data in foot-note references, as on pages 146, 361 (fourth note), and 370 (fourth note).

ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER.

*E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company: a History, 1802-1902.*

By B. G. DU PONT. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1920. Pp. 196. \$3.00.)

VERY few of the great business enterprises of the country have remained long under the management and control of their founders, but to this generalization E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company furnishes a notable exception. Pierre Samuel du Pont de Nemours, student of philosophy and literature, pupil of Quesnay, friend of Turgot and councillor of state, was the active, vigorous forebear of a long line of descendants who have carried on this concern. The original idea was for a land development and trading company with a capital of four million francs each, most of the company's activities to be in Virginia, but with an office in New York.

A series of unforeseen difficulties prevented the carrying-out of the first plans, as well as many of the other varied ideas of du Pont de Nemours, but the keenness of young Eleuthère Irénée du Pont, his son, at that time only twenty-eight years old, led to the formation of a powder-manufacturing company, the total capital available at the outset being \$23,000. In order to meet the difficulties presented by the differences between French and American corporation law two companies were formed—Du Pont de Nemours, Père et Fils et Cie. of Paris, and V. du Pont de Nemours and Company of New York. They were ready to sell powder in the spring of 1804.

From that time until the close of this history in 1902, the story is one of ups and downs, gains and losses. Explosions occurred from time