

After a march made almost unendurable by cold, snow, and insufficient food, the Kentuckians reached the rapids on January 10, 1813. After Frenchmen from the settlement had begged for protection from marauding British and Indians, Winchester on January 17 ordered a detachment of 660 officers and men to the Raisin. The author describes in detail the victorious action of January 18, the defeat of January 22 in which Winchester, who had advanced with reinforcements, was captured, the massacre on the twenty-third, and the fate of the prisoners who had been taken to Fort Malden.

Brief biographical sketches of officers of the invading force and of the British and Indians and rosters of the American units follow the text. The end paper is a map showing the route of the Kentuckians. Apparently through oversight, Fort Malden is not shown. There are a bibliography and an index.

A few errors have been noticed. It was not the house of Colonel James Baby but that of his brother, Colonel François Baby, which was General Hull's headquarters (p. 167). This house is now the Hiram Walker Historical Museum in Windsor, Ontario. Billy Caldwell was a Potawatomi, not a Shawnee (p. 168). McDonall should be McDouall (p. 63n). Colonel John Anderson was not in Frenchtown in January, 1813. A manuscript autobiography in the Michigan Historical Collections states that he fled to Ohio on August 20, 1812, and returned in September, 1813 (p. 80n).

Mr. Clift's book is interesting and useful. Written largely from original sources, it contains many quotations from contemporary letters, diaries, and newspapers which bring the reader close to the events they deal with.

Michigan Historical Collections
Ann Arbor, Michigan

F. Clever Bald

The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy: New York as a Test Case. By Lee Benson. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961. Pp. xi, 351. Tables, appendices, index. \$6.00.)

The subject of this book, "the concept of Jacksonian democracy," is neither political nor social democracy in the Jacksonian period nor the Jacksonian Democratic party, but a set of six propositions based on the idea that the Democrats and "the opposing party" of the 1830's and 1840's were in leadership, mass support, ideology, and program the agents of certain socioeconomic classes and social groups. The study is an attempt, according to Benson, to answer two specific questions: What empirical phenomena can logically be designated by the concept? Does the concept help us to understand the course of American history after 1815? As the concept is not defined until the last chapter (p. 329) the unwary reader may at first be misled in earlier chapters by the author's apparent search for evidence that might give substance and meaning to the Democratic party as an institution or to democracy as a form of political behavior. The search is, in fact, a much narrower although detailed examination of evidence to validate five of the six propositions. Benson has studied partisan newspapers, party platforms,

and other party propaganda on major public issues and the "images" of various parties and has sought to relate them to the numbers of votes cast for various party tickets in New York chiefly from 1834 to 1844. In later chapters correlations are sought between the numbers and proportions of votes cast and certain "quantified" economic, social, cultural, ethnic, and religious characteristics of the population. The author's conclusions are forthright: the underlying assumptions of historians who accept "the term and concept of Jacksonian Democracy" are, at least for New York, untenable; and the concept of Jacksonian Democracy has obscured rather than illuminated the course of New York history after 1815. His findings are, in brief, iconoclastic.

Benson recognizes only three approaches to the study of American politics in this period: first, the hypotheses of Beard and Turner with their later modifications; second, the "metaphysical notions about the country's 'divine democratic mission,' or the 'peculiar political genius of the Teutonic race'" (p. 272); and third, "'chaos floating into chaos'" (p. 272). He ignores other approaches of the past hundred years: the search to discover how Americans governed themselves, who participated, at what levels, to what extent, at what times, in what ways, for what purposes, and with what consequences for themselves and for others; the role of "the court house gang"; the changing nature of political leadership. The "general theory of voting behavior" which he elaborates is not a general theory but a hypothetical statistical correlation that diverts attention from basic questions such as what was the significance of voting. He neglects fundamental problems involved in the formation of party platforms, party tickets, and political parties themselves and the functions of those institutions in American society. Heavily weighted with arithmetic and ideology, the study seems lifeless, abstract, and unreal.

Within the limits Benson set for himself his book is an outstanding work of destructive criticism, the removal of debris that historians need to do before they begin to write. It seriously weakens the arguments presented by followers of the Simons-Beard-Hacker school and to some extent those of Turner disciples without touching the main stream of Jacksonian studies. Its positive contributions are negligible.

Ohio University

Harry R. Stevens

Charles Richard Van Hise: Scientist Progressive. By Maurice M. Vance. (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1960. Pp. 246. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$6.00.)

As a scientist and historian Maurice M. Vance is a peculiarly well-fitted biographer of the pioneering president of the University of Wisconsin who was both a scientist and a maker of history. The Foreword of the book, by Conrad A. Elvehjem, acknowledges the competence of the author in giving "a scholarly but sprightly full-length picture of the man who, at the turning point in this institution's history, headed it into greatness." Undoubtedly Van Hise deserves the tribute of "great."