

and needy veterans should have preference over the strong and affluent. By 1904 pensions had become universal for all who had war service; thereafter need or disability was not necessary for eligibility.

Numerous other topics are developed by Mr. Heck. He treats not only the G. A. R., but the Woman's Relief Corps and various lesser veteran organizations, of which the Military Order of the Loyal Legion was the most select, being a hereditary order whose high fees and emphasis upon distinction kept it above the more plebian soldier groups. When treating intra-party factions the author shows that no party in Minnesota fitted the ideal of "a harmonious band of like-minded men" (p. 131). He does not neglect contributions of the G. A. R. to community life, finding them more prominent in sparse than in more settled areas. More might have been given on the relation of veterans to civil service reform; perhaps more to patronage, though there are good bits on this theme. The word "propaganda" does not appear in the index, for which many a reader will probably be grateful; even so, it might be well if we had the G. A. R. counterpart to William Gellermann's *The American Legion as Educator*. What matters chiefly, however, is that the author, while mindful of reader interest, has served the cause of competent scholarship. In elaborate annotations one finds credentials for every statement; those interested in further study are assisted by an admirable bibliography and by other aids.

University of Illinois

J. G. Randall

English Whiggism and the American Revolution. By George Herbert Guttridge. (University of California Press, Berkley, California, 1942. Pp. i, 144. Index, \$1.50.)

Shortly after writing the Prince Consort Prize Essay at Cambridge in 1922 on the *Colonial Policy of William III*, Professor Guttridge became affiliated with the University of California. His *David Hartley, M. P., an Advocate of Conciliation, 1774-1783*, published in 1926, was the first of a series of monographs and papers which have qualified him to write authoritatively on Whiggism in the period 1760 to 1783. The present essay, originating "from a particular interest in the lesser figures of that Whiggism which was dominated by Burke," might perhaps more accurately be entitled *A History of the Rockingham Whigs*. For the other

Whig groups are treated inadequately. Possibly such Chathamites as Shelburne, Camden, Dunning, and Grafton (but not Isaac Barre) receive their due. But too much is left to the reader's imagination regarding the factions originally led by George Grenville and the Duke of Bedford. It comes almost as a shock well toward the end to discover that "the death of Suffolk and the resignation of Gower . . . left two groups leaderless within the ministry [p. 129]." Although the main theme is the relation of partisan divisions to imperial policy, the author also seeks to show the relation between the imperial problem and domestic affairs. The comprehensive documentation indicates how thoroughly Mr. Guttridge has delved into the pertinent pamphlets, letters, and state papers. A few picayunish defects might possibly be noted, but the preface takes care of most reasonable criticisms. It is to be hoped that the writer will eventually emulate Mr. Feiling and provide us with that definitive history of the Whig party which has been so long needed. No comment seems necessary on Professor Guttridge's style, as the rest of the review is couched in his own words as much as possible.

After being "submerged for forty years by the Whig tide" the Tories finally came up on different sides of the ship. They found in George III a king who could manipulate Parliament in the fashion of Walpole yet "kick away that aristocratic support which had preserved the throne since the Revolution." Many associated themselves with a new party apparently created unwittingly—a new Toryism, based on the "divine right of Crown in Parliament." Some chose an independent role, while a few joined the Whigs, who had gradually been transformed from the "reluctant revolutionaries of 1689" to "complacent conservatives." In the late 1760's, the King was directing his authoritarian policy particularly at John Wilkes and the American colonies. He was challenged at home "by the champions of individual and corporate rights, organized in some degree as a party."

The Marquis of Rockingham had become the titular leader of the main body of the Whigs. Associated with him in the House of Lords were such peers as Portland, Richmond, and Devonshire, while William Dowdeswell, Sir George Savile, the erratic Charles Fox, and David Hartley were prominent cohorts in the Commons. In addition to such staunch

party workers as Edmund Burke and George Byng, he relied on a few merchants like William Baker and Richard Champion and a few lawyers and churchmen. These men, generally speaking, had two aims, the attainment of which would satisfy both their own political interests and Whig practice of limited monarchy—to secure responsibility of ministers to Parliament and to maintain a coherent group acting as a unit either in opposition or as cabinet members. Their American policy was largely one of expediency growing out of the domestic situation. They had difficulty in accepting the American version of Locke, for while they “were the champions of political liberty, . . . they preferred that liberty in its authorized English translation.” Eventually they were reduced to the awkward situation of hearing the Americans talk like old Tories while George III attempted to uphold Parliamentary supremacy by force. True to their Declaratory Act of 1766 they insisted upon the shadow of Parliamentary supremacy until the latter part of 1775. Then Burke almost equalled Chatham in proposing concessions to the Americans but was defeated in the Commons, 210 to 105.

The alacrity with which the Rockinghams accepted the inevitability of independence after Saratoga indicated that anything was preferable to “an imperial connection through the King alone.” Their oblique attacks on the Crown not only in the matter of the conduct of the war but also of patronage, parliamentary reform, and other domestic problems rather justified independents in regarding them as being largely factious. The North ministry, prolonged by the death of Chatham in 1778 and the Gordon Riots in 1780, finally disintegrated from within, contrary to the popular notion advanced by the old Whig historians (and even including G. M. Trevelyan). Rockingham and Shelburne (the latter carrying on in the place of Chatham) headed a new ministry in 1782 made up of factions whose incessant wrangling during their years of ineffectual opposition gave evidence that the Whigs had gained little since the “sixties except experience.” The French Revolution finally forced them to give up their middle ground between the new Toryism and the emerging radicalism. Portland and Burke (Rockingham having died) chose to go to the right; Fox pursued a more liberal course.

University School,
Indiana University

M. P. Allen