Professor Gwyn, with a wealth of exact scholarship, traces the history of Warren's investments first in America and Ireland and later in Britain where he purchased an estate and bought heavily into Government stock. He sees Warren as a “war entrepreneur,” who, unlike many other officers, was interested in trade and happy to associate with merchants. Warren’s acquisition of wealth, and his mode of investing it is contrasted with, it is argued, the conservative and cautious policy of his widow and her descendants. One wonders whether too much can be made of the methods used by Warren in his investments. Could it not be argued that his first ventures arose in America because his marriage settlement concerned American properties, and not only he, but even more, his relatives were at hand to manage them? With the rapid accession of prize money from 1744 onwards — and given the fact that this was one of the few times when the Admiral had to devote considerable attention to his naval duties in America — where else could he have put his prize money except into government funds, no matter whether they were depressed by fears of Jacobites or not. Even here one assumes he acted at least initially on the advice of his brokers. Certainly Warren’s actions after 1748 — purchasing his estate in Hampshire and entering Parliament — were exactly what one might expect of a successful parvenu. We cannot say what Warren might have gone on to do if his life had been longer, but this reviewer cannot condemn his widow’s investment policies quite as much as does the author. True, neither she nor her sons-in-law were speculators, but why should they have been? Was not the aim of 18th century man to become a gentleman and live in the style and dignity requisite to that station? Warren’s fortune was large enough for this purpose and the end of the eighteenth century saw it still intact. Few in those times would have hoped for anything more.

These comments notwithstanding, Professor Gwyn has written an admirable book which in its use of difficult and even now under-utilised sources, should encourage everyone in the field of socio-economic history to persevere in pursuit of the grimy facts. Too much may be made of Warren as an example of the 18th century naval career, but the history of his fortune fully justifies the work.

Keith Matthews,
Memorial University of Newfoundland.

* * *


Aspects of Early New York Society and Politics is a scrapbook of papers and pictures from a conference held in Tarrytown in October, 1971. This miscellany would certainly never have been assembled and published except that, in the words of the editors, “as part of its educational service to the academic community and general public, Sleepy Hollow Restorations sponsors occasional conferences on various aspects of American history” and prints the results. “The results” in this case consist of three research papers by Patricia Bonomi, Thomas Archdeacon, and Edwin Burrows on such disparate subjects as local government and politics, Leisler’s Rebellion, and military service and the origins of Federalism and Anti-Federalism; a “gloria” to New York as the “prototypical” American colony by Milton Klein; two brief critical commentaries on the above by Lawrence Leder and Jackson Turner Main; and an after-dinner talk by Richard Morris about John Jay and the Revolution.

In addition to this conference material, and in an effort to bring some order to the proceedings, the editors have included a few pages of introduction that
suggest how the several articles may be seen to relate to a number of political and social developments in colonial New York. They have added as well nine illustrations that serve either to explain or to decorate the text. (My favourite is the portrait on p. 53 of “Edwin Hyde, Lord Cornbury, Governor of New York, 1701-1708, in female attire”; this particular aspect of early New York society is certainly not discussed in the present work, and one wonders why the editors chose to use it all, especially without a word of explanation in defence of poor Cornbury!)

The first essay in the book is Professor Klein’s celebration of the glories of early New York. It is just the kind of ceremonial paper one might expect to hear at a conference on colonial New York held at Tarrytown, and ordinarily it would not be taken too seriously. But here it is in print, and Klein seems very sober indeed about his claim for New York as the “new contender for the honor of initiating the American tradition” (p. 8). As a native New Yorker myself, I am appalled by the pious and parochial tone of the article in general, but I am amused, I admit, by some of Klein’s oneliners. Take, for instance, his closing remark, “that amateur historian, Theodore Roosevelt, may have been more perspicacious than he intended when he wrote in his little history of New York in 1891: ‘The most important lesson taught by the history of New York City is the lesson of Americanism’” (p. 28). My god! But then there are any number of other equally sanctimonious and silly statements, and every reader will come up with his own example.

The last essay in the book is the dinner address by Professor Morris, “The American Revolution comes to John Jay.” This is another tailored-for-the-occasion piece and, therefore, is appropriately casual in tone. It tells in an interesting and easy style of the “ambiguities, the hesitancies, the political trimming” of Mr. Jay during the fateful year that ended with the Declaration of Independence and Jay’s commitment to the “nationalist” cause.

Sandwiched in between these two ceremonial contributions are the three remaining articles, all essentially monographic in tone and all designed to “give some evidence of the quality of ongoing research in New York history as well as make a contribution in their own terms” (p. vii). Of the three, far and away the best is the piece by Professor Bonomi on “Local Government in Colonial New York: A Base for Republicanism.” The focus of Bonomi’s analysis is the town government of Kingston, a small but important Hudson River port. More specifically, she has studied 135 men who served on the Kingston Board of Trustees from 1711 until the Revolution and has established, where the record permits, their length of term in office, their age, their occupation, their wealth, and their family and political connections. Her conclusion is that “all in all the records of eighteenth-century Kingston reveal a fairly consistent pattern of strong and independent local government, with citizen participation coming from a broad spectrum of the community” (p. 44). She goes on to suggest that this experience of vigorous self-government at the local level was probably “fairly representative of the other chartered towns and cities of the province,” and that it was precisely this “reality” that helped shape the revolutionary and Republican consciousness of eighteenth-century New Yorkers and Americans generally ((pp. 46-47).

The final two essays represent excursions into quantitative history. In studying “The Age of Leisler — New York City, 1669-1710,” Professor Archdeacon, as one of the commentators has remarked, “instead of relying on a few illustrations has examined all the evidence” (p. 93). Unfortunately for this social and demographic interpretation of Leislerian politics, however, “all the evidence” is only
all the evidence remaining. As a result assertions apparently based on "hard data" such as — "The Leislerians captured 78% of the voters who wed between 1676 and 1685 and 61% of those who took spouses between 1686 and 1695" — only barely conceals a reliance on a certain kind of impressionistic history wherein numbers and percentages of people and groups represent only more or less accurate estimates of some "total universe," to use the language of computer technology.

Professor Burrows' study of "Military Experience and the Origins of Federalism and Anti-Federalism" presents more of the same kind of problem, except that here "the sample" is not the total of what evidence remains for the historian to pick over but only a small part of the total. The result, as Professor Main has noted in his critique, does not make for confident generalization and is suggestive only.

In olden days scholars held to the belief that papers presented at conferences represented work in progress, work as yet incomplete and therefore unsuitable for publication. In this time of scarce resources perhaps we need to resurrect such beliefs.

* * *

Joseph A. Ernst,
York University.


The last ten years have witnessed renewed interest in the dynamics of the abolition of slavery in Brazil. This has been one aspect of the general resurgence of scholarly concern with slavery and race relations in Latin America — renewed concern due, in no small measure, to the increasing tensions within the society of the United States. Brazil, in particular, has received extensive attention from North American social scientists because of the vast numbers of slaves imported, the centrality of slavery to its socio-economic development, and the myth of racial democracy.

With this study, Robert Conrad has made a significant contribution to our understanding of one aspect of the larger question of the nature of race relations in Brazil. While seeking to avoid many of the controversies which are raging over slavery in the United States, he has delineated and analysed the process of abolition in Brazil. While dealing with the great complexities of this process, Conrad has interwoven a subtheme comparing developments in Brazil with those in the United States.

The study is divided chronologically into two periods — 1850-1879 and 1879-1888. It begins with a brief discussion of the socio-economic significance of slavery, but is primarily concerned with an analysis of the key modifications in the status of that institution — the end of the slave trade and the Rio Branco Law. The general treatment of slavery can be characterized as belonging to the revisionist school which disputes the Tannenbaum thesis. While the author does not elaborate fully his perspective of the nature of slavery, preferring to deal with this topic in a forthcoming monograph, it clearly permeates the study. It is, for example, essential to his view that the end of the slave trade doomed slavery "to eventual extinction" since Brazil, unlike the United States, was unable to satisfy its labour needs by slave births. It is also implicit in his treatment of the internal slave trade which is portrayed as having had a disastrous impact on the slave family and having sealed the fate of slavery by creating a regional imbalance.