

capacities with the British, especially in the South with its large Negro population. Professor Quarles holds firmly to the record, but permits himself a touch of irony in citing British General Alexander Leslie as thinking the Negroes might perform "a last service" in their often fatal sicknesses: "About 700 Negroes are come down the River in the Small Pox. I shall distribute them about the Rebell Plantations" (p. 142).

The negotiations respecting Negroes following Yorktown casts an odd light on the libertarian sentiments ordinarily associated with the event, though by and large Negroes gained by the Revolution. The dispersal of Negroes to Canada, East Florida, the Caribbean countries, and Africa makes an interesting cosmopolitan tale. Professor Quarles's thorough research and judicious handling of details adds much to previous accounts of the subject. A critical bibliography would have been appreciated.

Antioch College

Louis Filler

The Twilight of Federalism: The Disintegration of the Federalist Party, 1815-1830. By Shaw Livermore, Jr. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1962. Pp. ix, 292. Bibliography, index. \$6.00.)

The Antifederalists: Critics of the Constitution, 1781-1788. By Jackson Turner Main. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Va., 1961. Pp. xv, 308. Appendices, historiographical and bibliographical essay, index. \$7.50.)

Both *The Twilight of Federalism* and *The Antifederalists* challenge widely held interpretations of key developments in the early national period of American history. As the authors of these studies construct the history of the period, the Antifederalists in the late 1780's and the Federalists in the 1820's were fighting rear guard actions in defense of what each conceived to be a benign political and social order. If Professor Main is correct in assessing the Antifederalist platform as essentially democratic, it was this dynamic element in the lost cause of 1788 that persisted through to victory over the champions of an ordered society, organic in conception—the Federalists as Professor Livermore portrays them. Strong arguments for the traditional aristocratic-democratic polarity of the period are presented.

Livermore begins with the question: What became of the Federalists after the War of 1812? Were they simply absorbed into the latter-day Jeffersonian party of the Bank, the navy, and protectionism? Were they simply cast into oblivion only to reform under the National Republican and Whig banners? Neither view is sustained. The Federalists, this study shows, continued to be a potent force in American politics from 1815 to 1830, their quest for power a primary cause of the breakup of the Republican party during Adams's administration and their support a major source of Jacksonian strength.

What may appear to be an orthodox political history is in reality a remarkably able synthesis of social and political history. Leaning heavily upon his construction of the Federalist *weltanschauung*—their

deep suspicion of the people's ability to rule themselves, their nostalgic longing to return to an organic social order, and their death instinct—Professor Livermore pictures the struggle between Federalists and Jeffersonians in terms pregnant with meaning for our own troubled society. The underlying cause of Federalist failure, he believes, was a revolution in social thought which took place between 1775 and 1825, the deep penetration of the Jeffersonian creed of individualism and an atomistic society which ultimately replaced the concept of an ordered society which the Federalists had tried to build on colonial foundations.

Because of their talents, wealth, and prestige, however, the Federalists of New England and the middle states continued to appeal to large blocs of voters. The Federalists were too disorganized to offer battle in national elections, but their very unwillingness to disappear on the level of state politics confronted the feuding factions of the Democratic party with Hobson's choice: to embrace Federalist support after the Hartford Convention was repeatedly shown to be disastrous; yet not to encourage their support was to leave rivals free to win in combination with them. The result was that in the deceitful maneuvering of the election of 1824 Federalists were courted vigorously by Crawford as well as Calhoun, by Jackson as well as Adams. That Van Buren and company were able to lure more Federalists into Old Hickory's camp by 1828 than Adams' managers reveals both the meaninglessness of shibboleths and the manipulative skills of the Jacksonians, skills lacked by both Adams men and the Federalists themselves in astonishing degree. As in the 1790's, so in the 1820's, the Federalists found themselves at the mercy of others because of their contempt for the finer arts of political organizing. Jacksonians held out appointments, and scores of Federalist leaders grasped at the fruits which both Monroe and Adams, despite appearances to the contrary, failed to deliver. The war on the Bank laid foundations for a new two-party system, but a surprising number of Federalists found the Jacksonian household welcome shelter.

Professor Main's long-awaited study of the Confederation period also reveals that the price of poor coordination is defeat. The Antifederalists failed because of the superior *élan* and organization of their opponents. With their failure in 1788, Main concludes, the true federalism established under the Articles and the state governments of the Revolutionary era was overthrown. The Antifederalists were outwitted and outmaneuvered, leaders truly representative of the mass of Antifederalists were not elected to the Philadelphia Convention or to the state conventions, and the result was, in the author's view, a defeat for democracy. By and large, the victorious Federalists were, as Beard insisted, men of opulence, large property holders in contrast to the great majority of Antifederalists. It is also highly significant, Professor Main points out, that Federalist spokesmen by contrast were men of superior education. With all the refinements and research in depth that mark this study in comparison with Beard's primitive analysis, Professor Main reaches conclusions not markedly different on large issues. The division on adoption of the Constitution was not, however, between personalty and realty interests, but between sections having access to navigation and outside commerce and those that were

isolated and, to a great degree, self-sufficient agrarian areas. Thus Orin G. Libby and Beard are, in this study, shown to be closer to the truth about the overthrow of the Articles than such revisionists as Robert Brown and Forrest McDonald.

This is certain to be an explosive book, not only for its substantial agreement with the Beardian diagnosis, but also because the author believes Progressive historians to have been right in regarding class conflict as an essential feature of the history of the period. It becomes increasingly apparent that consensus, if it is ever to be found, will rest largely upon some more satisfactory definition of "class" than the economic orientation gives us. May the insights of social history such as those used by Livermore not be of use in this arena also?

That Professor Main is correct in maintaining that the Anti-federalists were far more friendly to popular checks upon government than the Federalists and that more poor men belonged on the losers' side than on the winners' side may be granted without conceding that the contending forces were classes in any sense acceptable to contemporary thought. Whether Main's socio-geographic alignments will be accepted by experts in what is now an historical problem of labyrinthic complexity remains to be seen. To this reviewer they are convincingly constructed in this substantial, carefully documented, but highly controversial work.

Wabash College

Stephen G. Kurtz

Cavalier and Yankee: The Old South and American National Character.

By William R. Taylor. (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1961. Pp. 384. Notes, index. \$6.00.)

By the time of the Civil War, says Professor Taylor, Americans had come to look upon themselves as constituting two distinct civilizations with different historical and racial origins. The author's purpose is to discover "what social problems produced the need for this kind of historical rationalization, . . . what kind of men and women contributed to its growth and dissemination—what sort of mentality, in other words, created this legendary past and this fictional sociology, and what sort of needs it satisfied" (p. 16). Taylor undertook this study because of his conviction that the belief in separate cultures was an important cause of the Civil War.

The author points out that Americans of the ante bellum period were intensely introspective, obsessed with identifying and examining their national character. As this character—or rather, characters—emerged, it proved to have disturbing flaws. The North did not like the image it projected: the Yankee sharper, the product of a "grasping, soulless world of business." So the North turned to the southern planter in an effort to find those desirable qualities that the Yankee lacked. It also created a "Transcendent Yankee," who, while superficially conforming to the unpleasant stereotype, turned out to be a noble, selfless, nonmaterialistic being.

There were many other tensions that elicited literary solutions. For example, both northerners and southerners were concerned about