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if they remained at home. For the civilian patriots among the classes, revolutionary and postrevolutionary changes influenced their futures. Most members of this cohort settled into lives that were comfortably mediocre: moderate prosperity, local respect, and social position. What they had in common was that the turmoil of the revolution caused most of them to get a late start at family and career formation, which in turn shortened what Wright calls their “age of responsibility” (p. 136). Alumni who aspired to leadership in their fields faced daunting challenges. Financiers and merchants expanded their business universe to the early American frontier and international trade, because traditional settlement patterns and markets no longer sufficed in the aftermath of revolution. Those in the professions who wanted to mentor newcomers no longer could simply take them on as apprentices. Now they had to find and join professional schools, professional associations, and private societies to preserve standards and protect their own status. Aspiring civic leaders at the state and national levels found more opportunities than in provincial America, but the decline of deference in the wake of the revolution brought greater competition and greater suspicion of the elite. As a result, a smaller percentage of these classes found success in politics, and those who did came from humbler origins than their predecessors. Moreover, all who embraced politics found themselves in a new universe of partisan competition largely driven by ideology. A similar divide appeared in religion, for the long simmering differences between orthodox and liberal interpreters of Christianity began to formalize in the decades after 1780. Many Harvard alumni chose orthodox Congregationalism, but those who chose Unitarianism outnumbered them. Of the thirty-five members of these classes who aspired to be clergymen, only twenty-seven actually received calls, and one-fourth of these relationships did not work out. It was harder to become an established minister after the revolution than before, but most of those whose tenures ended prematurely engaged in mundane rather than ideological disputes with their congregations.

If Wright’s cohort of prerevolutionary Harvard students differed in life course from their predecessors, there was much continuity in their life cycles. He discusses them as they move through eight stages from early childhood to late old age (he makes clear his methodology in a brief appendix). For each stage we learn the behaviors and expectations appropriate to genteel males and are provided with examples of how this generation of Harvard students met (or failed to meet) them. Drawing on a considerable array of appropriate secondary studies, Wright describes child-rearing patterns, schooling, the choice of college or work, the life of the college student, career choices, choices regarding marriage and family, as well as the responsibilities of full adulthood and the decline into old age. All of these topics are the subject of specialized studies, but Wright discusses them briefly and cogently and illuminates them with the experiences of real people. It is this last technique that generates one of the few criticisms I have of this study. Wright too often focuses on the same people to illustrate his generalizations. No doubt this stems from the availability of information, but the biographies of about a dozen graduates such as John Trumbull (the artist) and Fisher Ames tend to dominate the narrative. My other concern takes the form of a question. If the lives of the classes of 1771–1774 were affected by the revolution, why were not those of some or all of the classes from 1775–1783? Would Wright’s conclusions be modified or reinforced by analysis of this larger sample?

David W. Robson
John Carroll University


Revolutionary New York’s remarkably heterogeneous population fulfilled every aspect of John Adams’s three-part assessment of the revolutionary populace. One group wagered everything to win independence from Britain; another took similar risks to defeat colonial insurrectionists; and a third hoped to survive the war by not joining either side. Although historians have explored how New Yorkers participated in the American Revolution, much of that work has focused on people who lived in New York City or Albany. Most New Yorkers, roughly ninety percent of the population at the time of the revolution, lived not in cities but in the countryside. To correct what they see as an imbalance in the historiography, evident in the literature on nearly every other northern state as well, the editors and authors of this collection study how the American Revolution changed the lives of people who inhabited the state’s vast rural landscape. To be fair, historians have been studying the impact of the revolution on rural New Yorkers for some time. Indeed, all the authors in the collection have written on rural New York and the revolution, and they cite an extensive literature. This book, however, puts the stories of these regions during the Revolutionary War into a single volume.

The book is divided into three sections that move from the downstate region north to the Hudson Valley and, finally, to the far reaches of the state. In the first, Edwin G. Burrows, Joseph S. Tiedemann, John G. Staudt, and Phillip Papas describe the revolution in Kings, Queens, Suffolk, and Richmond counties. In the second, Jacob Judd, Thomas Wermouth, and Stefan Bielinski examine events in the Hudson Valley. And in the final section, Robert W. Venables and Paul R. Huey outline the rebellion on the eastern and northern edges of New York. Even though most of the authors begin their narratives before 1763, they tend to adhere to a traditional periodization and follow the more conventional notion that the national revolution gave greater...
meaning and credibility to ongoing local movements even if they started before 1763 and ran long after 1787. The essays follow a structural pattern. Before discussing their region specifically, each author outlines the geography of the county, enduring political alliances, and the racial, religious, and social make-up of the population. Not surprisingly, that populace was incredibly diverse, a characteristic the authors rightly highlight. For example, New Yorkers owned nearly nineteen thousand slaves when the revolution ended and, although some New Yorkers argued for immediate manumission, slavery persisted into the nineteenth century. Similarly, even though some Native American groups sided with the revolutionaries, at the end of the war they all faced a new colonial threat posed by the United States and the state of New York. But keeping with conventional time constraints prevents some of the authors from exploring fully how independence for some inhabitants of the region led to further subjugation and even extermination for others.

New Yorkers also characterized themselves and others through their religious beliefs and their relationship to the land. Anglicans, Quakers, Dutch Reformed, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Methodists all vied for souls. In nearly every essay, the authors demonstrate how colonial New Yorkers' religious differences exacerbated lingering political or social disputes. The revolution heightened the inherent relationship between religious beliefs and political alliances and left New Yorkers rolling in turmoil. Social discontent matched religious upheaval. Rural New York contained some of the largest landed estates and one of the largest tenant populations in the mainland colonies. While some tenants farmed the land contentedly, others disagreed with what they saw as the economic, social, and political constraints of a system designed to funnel goods, resources, money, and power from tenants to landlords. Rebel tenants resorted to violence after they had exhausted peaceful approaches to the problem. As a result, tenant rebellions rocked the Hudson Valley in the twenty years before independence, and those conflicts continued through the revolutionary period. Unfortunately, the authors studying regions shaken by insurgency during the revolution chose not to discuss the events extensively.

After setting the colonial background, the contributors describe how rural New Yorkers reacted to British attempts to exercise greater control over the colonists. Not surprisingly, in such a varied community, not every British act affected every New Yorker to the same degree. Some New Yorkers reacted more violently to the Townsend duties or the Coercive Act than to the Stamp Act. Freehold and tenant farmers, for instance, found restrictions on their trade that resulted from colonial boycotts far more burdensome than the Stamp Act. Thus, boycotts of British goods laid the groundwork for loyalism among some farmers because they limited their economic opportunities. Some rural New Yorkers did not act one way or the other until after the skirmishes at Lexington and Concord, while others did not pick a side until after the Declaration of Independence. Other New Yorkers hoped to avoid picking a side at all. While these choices muddied the water in New York, as they did elsewhere, the authors clearly demonstrate how New Yorkers made their longstanding racial, social, political, and religious disputes part of the revolutionary movement and thus part of the new nation. In doing so, they turned the American Revolution into a personal, local event.

Nothing epitomized the local and personal nature of the revolution in New York like military violence. Soldiers and military leaders rejected neutrality; war compelled people to make choices. This was especially so in rural areas, whose inhabitants endured years of depredation as both armies stomped through the countryside, living off the land, taking what they needed, and trying to force locals to join one side or the other. New Yorkers witnessed every aspect of war. Great military battles raged across their fields and traitors almost single-handedly sank the war effort. At the same time, revolutionaries and loyalists practiced a brand of guerrilla fighting that turned much of the once fruitful New York countryside into a frightening wasteland. The contributors are, in general, at their best when recounting the military conflict in their regions and demonstrating how conflict could deteriorate into brutal civil war that pitted neighbors and family members against each other. Invariably, such a high level of military exposure and depredation profoundly shaped people's political alliances.

Taken together, the authors argue that the War for Independence fundamentally changed the lives of rural New Yorkers as new men from the lower ranks of society jumped into the political fracas and claimed lasting power. They held power because revolutionaries needed more men to serve in rebel political institutions. Those men increasingly came from lower down the social ladder, and they held on to their positions because, once in power, they and other like-minded men democratized landholding, the basis for political power in New York. Moreover, revolutionaries expanded religious toleration and, so the editors claim, slavery "was put on the road toward legal extinction" (p. 229). While the volume has its limitations, it is a clearly written collection of essays that demonstrates how local populations embraced a broad movement, made it their own, and became a state in an emerging nation.

Thomas J. Humphrey
Cleveland State University


The seeds of this book were planted in Rhys Isaac's celebrated 1982 work, The Transformation of Virginia, 1740–1790. After making brief cameos throughout that text, Landon Carter, a Virginia planter and slave master, took center stage in the appendix. Isaac's insightful interrogation of a passage of Carter's diary was a last