



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

make a somewhat better showing in numbers. It is worth noting, however, that the Massachusetts press is by no means a true exponent of the literary activity of the New England writers, by far the larger number of their productions being printed in England.

Taken in connection with the work of Mr. Hildeburn for the Pennsylvania press, and his announced work of the same character for New York, we are evidently very fast approaching towards a bibliography of printing in the English colonies down to 1700, and it is to be hoped, since so much of the ground has been gone over in the present works, that before long some one will prepare a list of Massachusetts imprints on an equally elaborate scale with Mr. Hildeburn's books. The mysterious 1680 Virginia imprint and the Maryland imprint of 1697 would still be gaps, but such small ones, that we should practically have a list of the issues of the press of the English colonies for the seventeenth century.

PAUL LEICESTER FORD.

*The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King, Comprising his Letters, Private and Official, his Public Documents, and his Speeches.* Edited by his Grandson, CHARLES R. KING, M.D. Vol. III., 1799-1801. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1896. Pp. xxv, 580.)

THE present volume deals with only three years of King's life, covering but a part of his service as minister at St. James. Thus, so far as his letters and notes are concerned, the subjects treated are almost wholly those in question between America and Great Britain, commerce, neutrality, and impressment being the prevailing bones of contention; but many minor questions growing out of the treaties of 1783 and 1794 were still able to cause friction. In addition, King's correspondents in America tell us much about the party struggles of the day, and the old stories of Virginian supremacy, of Jeffersonian Jacobinism, of the Federalist split, of Adams's waywardness, and Hamilton's rashness are again told, and readably told. King's closest correspondents were Pickering, Cabot, Sedgwick, Ames, Troup, and Gore, and all were interesting, if biassed, writers. There is little of the editor's own work, except in the constant evidences of careful editing, almost the whole of the six hundred pages being original documents, many hitherto unprinted, and scarcely one of which is not of distinct value.

The negotiations of King with the British government, while not involving any great feat of diplomacy, were difficult in the extreme, not so much through the actual questions involved as through the complications introduced by the new problem of independence, and the war actually being fought. The disposition of the English government was distinctly amicable. King's complaints are listened to with invariable courtesy by Grenville and Hawkesbury, many of his requests are promptly complied with, and if long delays occurred in the righting of others, the press of work on the ministry and the difficulties of communication at the time seem adequate excuses.

It is true that there was ill-feeling still burning in English hearts towards their former colonies, but this nursing of old passions was no worse than the political appeals in America, mentioned by Cabot, "to every popular prejudice and especially the inexhaustible one of animosity to the English."

The British seizure of American vessels and the impressment of sailors were certainly good material to use in domestic politics, and that use in time produced its logical results in the most useless war ever fought by the United States. The condition, in fact, was a difficult one. On the one side, owing to the war, American shipping had grown till "at present [1799] it absorbs an immense capital. . . . Indeed nearly all our Capital as well actual as nominal is engaged in Commerce. Scarcely any is left for any other object"; for, as Cabot, who was closely in touch with the commercial classes, ably pointed out, "It is to my mind perfectly clear that the doctrine of 'Free Ships make Free Goods' is the most pernicious to Neutrals that cou'd be devised. Neutrals necessarily derive great pecuniary advantages from the universal insecurity of Belligerent property on the Seas: But let this property be allowed the protection of a Neutral Flag and those advantages are at an end. The profit to Neutrals of merely carrying the goods of the Belligerent is contemptible and wou'd be overbalanced at the close of every war by the great excess of shipping on hand which wou'd be of little or no value — the profit of Neutrals does not arise from carrying the property of Belligerents but it arises from the opportunity which war produces of selling extremely dear and buying extremely cheap — that is of trading where the market is under supplied with what they sell and overstocked with what they buy." And that in this view he was largely correct is proved by King himself half approving of the famous decision of Sir William Scott, as of probable advantage to America, even while he questioned the system which made the judge of the High Court of Admiralty also a member of the Privy Council, and thus "occupied in the discussion of . . . those maxims . . . which are employed to increase and preserve the dominion of England upon the seas." The fault, however, King showed to be in the main due to the "discretion given to the Commanders of several hundred cruisers and privateers . . . when it is considered that few of these Commanders belong to the wealthy classes, and for that reason many of them are more anxious to make prizes than to gain Victories," and to the vice-admiralty courts, the judges of which were only paid in fees from condemned captures, and therefore were virtually bribed beforehand. This latter evil King succeeded in having remedied, and this feat constituted his greatest diplomatic achievement of these years.

Turning from commercial to party questions, there is much that is striking. King's correspondents were nearly all profound pessimists as to the future of their country. The one exception to this view is furnished by Gouverneur Morris, who wrote, with almost prophetic vision, "nil desperandum de Republica is a sound Principle. Let the Chair of office be filled by whomsoever it may, Opposition will act as an outward Conscience, and prevent the Abuse of Power. As to the discarding of it, we may fairly

trust the Ambition which seeks Office for holding the Power which it confers." King himself shared this hopeful confidence; when his American agent proposed to sell his government securities, as the election of Jefferson became probable, he replied, "I have no notion that our Government, or the security of our property can or will be, in any material degree, affected by any changes that have happened or that in my opinion are likely to happen. I should be sorry for the important change that you [mention] but which I do not think will take place; should your conjecture however prove true . . . I should not from thence conclude that the Government was lost, that the public faith and character were destroyed, and that property would be thrown off its foundation—really if I did believe so I should consider it the highest folly to approve not only an useless but a criminal conduct to endeavour to Support a Constitution, which at each periodical election would expose the country to so great and critical a risque," and again, he writes, what is evidently the original of "there is a special providence for fools, drunkards, and Americans," to the effect that, "Steuben used to say, since the Jews were cast off, the Americans had become the chosen People; it may be, and that in this way we are to be saved in spite of ourselves." Otherwise a profound distrust is expressed of the democratic experiment, and of Jefferson. "Possibly a French President may be elected," wrote Cabot, and this, with constant references to the "visionary atmosphere of Virginia," are the chief charges against him. Nor did Marshall escape from suspicion of this latter defect, Sedgwick writing that "like all gentlemen . . . from that State," he was "too much guided by refinements of Theory." This distrust of the state had certainly a basis in its recent acts; for as Ames expressed it, "The Antis were buzzing with their work of sedition and electioneering, and seemed sure of getting the State Govts. into their hands to play them like batteries on the U. S. govt.," and Sedgwick went so far as to declare that "the leaders have decided on the actual force of its friends and enemies. This appears to me evident from the conduct of the government of Virga. and its satellite Kentucky. With regard to the former, it has displayed an anxiety to render its militia as formidable as possible, and to supply its arsenals and magazines, and for those purposes it actually imposed a tax on its Citizens."

Much is said on the side of practical politics, and the inauguration of the spoils system in Massachusetts (p. 71), Pennsylvania (p. 353), and New York (p. 409), with the carrying of each of those states by the Democratic party, together with its introduction into our national government by Jefferson, suggests some relationship that has not yet received philosophic treatment. The Federalists seem to have been confident that Jefferson would only fill vacancies, and charged bad faith when he made removals, their explanations being that the President had so displeased his party by his conciliatory inaugural, that he was forced to depart from his own system to pacify them. One result of the spoilsman's work in New York is told in a letter of Troup, apropos of one "William Coleman, who was the

clerk of our Court for this City—an office that brought him in at least \$2500 a year. He came here under the patronage of Mr. Sedgwick, is a native of Massachusetts. We have set him up, in consequence of his removal from his office by the late proceedings of the Council, as a printer. His first paper will make its appearance in October next, and I have little doubt from the specimen given by the Pamphlet, it will be ably conducted." It seems poetic justice that the paper so started should have come to be the great standard-bearer in the fight against this very system.

There is much more of true interest that must be passed over with mere mention. Pleasant glimpses are given of two Loyalists, Rumford and West, trying to serve their country, and expressing love for it; and of Wilberforce, engaged heart and soul in the abolition of the slave-trade. The obverse of human nature is shown in Lansdowne's charge that the Peace of 1783 was "a stock jobbing one . . . D'Aranda and the French Minrs gambled in the English Funds," and again in Talleyrand's offer to make a satisfactory peace with England, "the price or bribe of a million sterling to be divided among the Directory, ministers, & others," the agents being the same as those employed in the X. Y. Z. negotiation. On a smaller scale, we are told how "In the famous case of *Le Guen vs. Gouverneur Kemble*, he [Burr] was assistant counsel with Hamilton, who was the leading counsel, and whose talents and influence we all know pushed the cause through. Hamilton would take no more than \$2500 for his services, and Burr (having got previous loans from the Frenchman) worked him out of about \$6000." Not less interesting is Simcoe's statement that he was ordered by Lord Dorchester to attack Wayne's army, thus to begin a war between America and England, and Gouverneur Morris's contention that "a direct Tax, unpopular everywhere, is really unwise in America, because Property here is not productive."

PAUL LEICESTER FORD.

*The Industrial Evolution of the United States.* By CARROLL D. WRIGHT, LL.D. (Meadville and New York: Chautauqua-Century Press. 1895. Pp. 362.)

MR. WRIGHT's book is a popular account of the growth of manufacturing industries in the United States. Its four parts of approximately equal length deal with the evolution of manufactures during the colonial period, the era since 1790, the labor movement, and finally with the influence of machinery upon labor.

In the first part we are told how one leading industry after another gradually secured a precarious foothold in the New World. The establishment of distinct manufacturing industries went hand in hand with the development of technical processes, and particularly with the application of mechanical motive power. This involves the oft-told tale of the early inventions in the textile industries. But this early history is a brief record of the establishment of mills at different points. Too often our knowledge