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The editors of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* are traveling more exciting and stimulating historical ground with the last three volumes published. The travail and dullness of war correspondence is well and truly over as volume eight picks up the Jefferson story in February, 1785, and these new volumes will interest historians well beyond the immediate Jeffersonian orbit.

While these new installments of Jefferson's papers possess very wide appeal, they will most powerfully attract the diplomatic historian concerned with post-war problems, including the protracted negotiations with the Barbary pirates, and efforts toward commercial *ententes* with nations such as Portugal. Of more general interest is Jefferson's entertaining account of the difficulties of life in Europe, as a representative of the embarrassingly impoverished Confederation.

Jefferson's sojourn in France extended from 1784 to 1789, and the three volumes under review cover many of the most interesting segments of his French existence, providing fascinating insights into the social as well as political concerns of Jefferson and his many distinguished correspondents. We find John Adams arranging to import great quantities of French wine, but feeling obliged to stop shipment on learning of the heavy English revenue duties. We are continually reminded of the financial straits of America's representatives abroad, as Adams writes bitterly to Jefferson:

> I begin to be very uneasy about our Funds . . . and unless we have fresh supplies, we shall all be obliged to embark, in the first ships we can find before next March, for Want of bread. . . . The Doctor [Franklin] was lucky to get out of the Scare, in Season. You and I shall soon wish ourselves at home too.

Jefferson was never very happy in Europe, and frequently noted "The domestic loss I sustained [the death of his wife] was the only circumstance which could have brought me to Europe." And to Francis Eppes, he commented that "We all pant for America, as will every American who comes to Europe." But, if Jefferson disliked Europe generally, he certainly preferred France particularly—"The English are still our enemies"—and he wrote to Abigail Adams that the French "have as much happiness in one year as an Englishman in ten." Of course Jefferson was a politician, and could therefore change his mind: it was on August 9, 1786, that he de-
scribed the bliss of life in France to Abigail, noting casually "There are some little bickerings between the king and his parliament, but they end with a sic volo, sic jubeo." And only four days later Jefferson was writing to his friend and mentor George Wythe, explaining "The people of England, I think, are less oppressed than here [France]." The Wythe letter enjoys other curiosities, including Jefferson's observation on the expansion of French naval installations at Cherbourg: this threat, claimed Jefferson, would "oblige the English to keep up a great standing army, and there is no king, who, with a sufficient force, is not always ready to make himself absolute." Clearly, the English revolution was yet just around the corner!

For the present reviewer, the most charming of the Jefferson letters in these volumes must be the delightful exchange with the enchanting Maria Cosway. But less familiar than this famous Jeffersonian affair of heart and head is an intriguing Jefferson letter on the proper education of a young gentleman. The object of this particular educational attention was Thomas Mann Randolph, whose reading Jefferson undertook to guide. Professors of history may note with some dismay Jefferson's casual dismissal of their very existence as he urges Randolph to:

> proceed by yourself in a regular series of historical reading. It would be a waste of time to attend a professor of this. It is to be acquired from books, and if you pursue it by yourself, you can accommodate it to your other reading so as to fill up those chasms of time not otherwise appropriated. There are portions of the day too when the mind should be eased. Particularly after dinner it should be applied to lighter occupations. History is of this kind. It exercises the memory.

It is hardly necessary to add that the level of editorial scholarship remains on the exalted plane achieved with the very first volume of The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. The continuing splendor of Dr. Boyd's production must be somewhat appalling to the editors of the forthcoming Franklin and Adams papers. There must exist a very real danger of an editorial inferiority complex when faced by such persistent excellence. There are far too many instances of superb editorial research for a reviewer to accord but haphazard mention of a few examples: there is the vexing question of why Jefferson broke off his friendship with Charles Williams so harshly; the editors, with extensive research, suggest that Jefferson belatedly discovered Williams to be a British spy—reason enough for abrupt dismissal! Franklin students will also be grateful for the intelligent examination of the Franklin autobiographical documents lent Jefferson by Le Veillard and copied by William Short [IX, 484-498]. Finally, admirers of the fine work of Millicent Sowerby will be gratified that Dr. Boyd has found frequent occasion to acknowledge Miss Sowerby's contribution to our knowledge of Jefferson the book collector. It is indeed time we realized that a man's reading interests can be as revealing as his personal papers—even when the man be as prolific a correspondent as Thomas Jefferson.

The Pennsylvania State University

H. Trevor Colbourn

This book is an excellent case study of a phenomenon which has passed from the memory of most elderly Americans despite its parallelism in certain respects with the present. As the author makes abundantly clear, the "Palmerism" of 1919 and 1920 ran only less rampant than our own "McCarthyism," and had the sympathy of the ailing Woodrow Wilson. Palmerism showed the same disheartening ability to class together all shades of liberalism and radicalism and to paint them with the glowing red of revolutionism.

Over half of the narrative is devoted to an examination of the psychological background and to the events which brought the red scare to full flower. It is the author's contention that a budding reaction against progressivism and war promoted nativism and isolationism—movements which were aided by capital's efforts to portray unionists and strikers as part of a widespread revolutionary conspiracy. The preliminary barrage of bombs and the May Day riots of 1919 had little if any connection with the ensuing Seattle general strike and the strikes by Boston policemen, steel workers, and coal miners, but a sensational press deliberately misrepresented the facts. Communists, anxious to promote chaos and willing to have the workers goaded to desperation, joyously sought to give the impression that these strikes were steps toward revolution. The public, never given to analyzing fine political distinctions on the left, reacted violently and cried for both vengeance and preventive measures. Indeed, these strikes were far from having political implications but were desperate attempts to remedy truly pathetic wages and conditions of labor. Nevertheless shrewd publicity convinced the American people that the real issue was radicalism and removed "the last remaining barrier to hysteria."

The war-time desire for conformity now spread into schools and churches; negroes were mobbed, and Wobblies in Centralia, Washington, were lynched. Attorney-General A. Mitchell Palmer, under public pressure, organized a General Intelligence (or antiradical) Division under J. Edgar Hoover, and staged two massive raids which gathered in some eight thousand presumed radicals. Most of them had to be released, but over eight hundred were convicted at administration hearings and deported. The states joined the game, acting under their criminal syndicalist laws. New York had been stirred to early action by its Lusk Investigating Committee, and now the legislature refused to seat five socialists, some of whom had previously served. Their cause was championed by Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., and Governor Alfred E. Smith vetoed five anti-radical bills intended to outlaw the Socialist Party and impose a loyalty oath on teachers.

Curiously enough the struggle over the seating of the five New York assemblymen, so the author states, marked the beginning of the ebb in the red scare. More and more prominent public figures took their stand against the popular hysteria, and newspaper editors began to reverse their position and warn of the growing threat to representative government. Assistant
Secretary of Labor Louis F. Post, director of deportation proceedings, cancelled warrants by the thousands and examined the remaining cases with more care. Palmer was now left holding the bag which he had seized at public request, and his campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination bogged down. Even the bombing of the House of Morgan (September 16, 1920), failed to revive the popular hysteria.

And yet, says our author, the receding red scare left a number of pebbles on the beach. Among these were a reversion to isolation from international affairs, the long refusal to recognize the fact of the existence of Red Russia, the repression not only of radical parties but of socialism, the deterioration of organized labor, a backlog of criminal syndicalist legislation, a decline in liberal thought, an apathy toward reform, and the growth of the atmosphere which made possible the tragedy of Sacco and Vanzetti.

This is one of those rare books in which there is nothing to criticize unless one deliberately rejects the limits imposed by the author or denies his right to adopt the moral approach which he freely acknowledges as his bias. He disclaims the possibility of being completely detached and he is to be commended in this, for it makes his study the more valuable. It is well to break the mold set by too many historians when they identify their leanings with objectivity. In the opinion of this reviewer the author has handled his subject with all honesty, balance, and dignity.

In closing it should be noted that the book contains several amusing cartoons, a valuable “Note on Sources,” and a good index. The binding is perhaps unimaginative, but that can not be attributed to the author.

University of Pittsburgh

LELAND D. BALDWIN

Benjamin Franklin and American Foreign Policy. By Gerald Stourzh. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1954. Pp. xvii, 335. $4.50.)

This book is an interpretation and analysis of “the principles of Franklin’s approach to foreign policy,” rather than a detailed recital of Franklin’s specific actions as diplomat and mentor of diplomats. The author is a young Austrian scholar who completed this project in the United States, primarily under the direction of Professor Hans J. Morgenthau of the Center for the Study of American Foreign Policy.

Mr. Stourzh has given us a fresh evaluation of Franklin’s attitudes toward the relationships between two groups of interests: the interests of the thirteen American colonies and later the American nation, and the interests of the European nations and their other North American colonies. His viewpoint is that of a central European who proves his ability to conduct skillfully a balanced study in the field of American foreign policy. Stourzh appears to reflect the affection with which Franklin was regarded by many Europeans of the eighteenth century Enlightenment; at the same time, as a twentieth century European, he admires Franklin’s efforts to improve international relations by comprising conflicting national ambitions and by promoting a reasonably generous treatment of other nations without losing sight of America’s national self-interest. He attributes to Franklin a greater con-
sistency in thought and action than do some American critics. Indeed, although he does not attempt to whitewash Franklin, Stourzh appears to be in sympathy with most of his philosophy.

To attempt to unify and re-interpret Franklin's varied interests in even one sphere of human activity is an extremely difficult task, yet one that Stourzh handles with care and dexterity. A few examples may be cited to illustrate some of his conclusions. The author discredits the myth of Franklin's "pacifism" and points out the gulf between Quaker belief and Franklin's more pessimistic view of "human nature," which smoothed the way for his advocacy, on occasion, of coercion, war, and even the violent overthrow of government. He emphasizes Franklin's "expansionism," which led "Poor Richard" to advocate the acquisition of Canada—first by the British Empire from the French Empire, and later by the United States from the British Empire. (Despite Franklin's rationalization of his desire to obtain Canada, he appears from his own proposals to be an advance agent for the type of agricultural imperialism which was particularly in evidence during the War of 1812.) We find a sympathetic account of the transition in Franklin's thought from respect for the British Empire and fear of the French to disillusionment with the British and friendship for the French. Stourzh commends Franklin's attempts to play the game of diplomacy squarely with France during the American Revolution and his post-Revolutionary efforts to enlarge this concept of enlightened fair play into a means of promoting international amity through "equality and reciprocity" of interests.

The scholarship upon which this book is based is massive. The footnotes cover fifty-eight separate pages. The author has naturally relied heavily on Franklin's published writings, but he has not hesitated to use Franklin manuscripts where necessary. The quantity of secondary material cited, covering both Franklin and his environment, is quite impressive.

The author's conclusions are stated firmly yet tactfully and urbanely. Since his work is basically one of interpretation, he submits theses which will undoubtedly continue as subjects for honest debate among scholars and laymen. Certainly he has produced a well-reasoned defense of Franklin's positions on foreign policy. Readers who place less emphasis upon power and security and more upon the economic factors in society may suspect that Franklin's personal interest in land speculation may have been a more important motivation in his expansionist outlook than Stourzh suggests; and admirers of Penn and the other founders of Pennsylvania may not view so tolerantly Franklin's almost gleeful cynicism as he helped to subvert Pennsylvania's Quaker "foreign policy."

One uncommon aspect of this work is its author's ability to penetrate some of the moralizing that attempts to obscure the power-politics aspects of present American foreign policy. Stourzh is too polite a visitor to our shores to say much by way of direct criticism, but it is obvious that he understands our former so-called "isolationism" to have been, not an immoral, immature attitude, but rather, as Franklin himself saw it, an attempt to promote enlightened national interests in a way that would safeguard the democratic
and libertarian gains of the Revolutionary period and at the same time cultivate a policy of peace, commerce, and friendship with other nations.

West Virginia University  William D. Barns


In his second contribution to the Rivers of America series, the editor, Carl Carmer, has turned his attentions to the historical events of the Susquehanna Valley. The more important of these events are related in the first twenty-two chapters of the book. The last chapter, entitled "Down the River," contains thumb-nail sketches of the more important towns along the river from Cooperstown, New York, to Chesapeake Bay. Such events as Capt. John Smith's exploration of the mouth of the Susquehanna, Etienne Brulé's expedition down the river, Thomas Cresap and the Pennsylvania-Maryland boundary dispute, the Yankee-Pennymite wars, the Wyoming Massacre, Sullivan's expedition into northern Pennsylvania and New York, Coleridge's pantisocratic experiment, the Fishing Creek Confederacy, and the Molly Maguires, are vividly portrayed by Mr. Carmer. In the final chapter he relates some of the best of the valley's folklore.

His choice of a chronological rather than a geographical approach seems to have been unfortunate. It forces the author to jump from one end of the river to the other as he progresses from chapter to chapter. The book becomes merely a series of pen-pictures each one complete in itself and independent of the others. As a result the importance of the Susquehanna River in Pennsylvania history is almost totally neglected. One is struck by the failure of the author to discuss such important episodes as the construction of the Pennsylvania Canal, the steamboat era on the river, the shad fisheries, the lumbering industry, etc., each one an important factor in the development of the area drained by the river.

The quality of the book has been enhanced by the fine set of black and white sketches by Stow Wengenroth. The bibliography at the end of the book is by no means definitive, nor is it meant to be. Several works, however, have been omitted which should be included in every bibliography of the history of the Susquehanna Valley. The Frontier Forts of Pennsylvania is one such work. John G. Freeze's History of Columbia County, Pennsylvania should also be included in the bibliography of any book dealing with the "Fishing Creek Confederacy." There are also a few errors in the text which should be mentioned. On page 299 "Bloomsbury" should read "Bloomsburg," and on page 406 "Tuslin's" should read "Tustin's." These minor errors and bibliographical omissions, however, will in no way hinder the reader's enjoyment of Carmer's lively treatment of the major events in the history of the Susquehanna Valley.

University of Pittsburgh  William W. Hummel

Alexis de Tocqueville, unquestionably the best informed and most widely quoted European chronicler of the American scene, wrote in his Democracy in America: “The great advantage of the American is that he has arrived at a state of democracy without having to endure a democratic revolution . . . he is born free without having to become so.”

Using this as his point of departure, Professor Louis Hartz, Associate Professor of Government at Harvard University, analyzes the American political development with a view to discovering and explaining its staunch adherence to a “liberal” tradition. At the same time he poses both at the opening and the close of his book two salient questions which emerge from an analysis of that tradition: “Can a people ‘born free’ ever understand peoples elsewhere that have to become so? Can it ever understand itself?”

Maintaining that the only way the American political scene can be perceived in its proper perspective is to relate it to Western political development as a whole, Professor Hartz attempts throughout his highly-interpretative study to integrate, or more often contrast, American political philosophies and actions with those current in the Western world as a means of achieving a better understanding of what actually was occurring here. To the informed reader this provides a stimulating and rewarding experience; but it presupposes on the part of the reader at least a cursory knowledge of both American and European political theory from Plato through Locke and Calhoun to Marx. In short, this is not a book for laymen, nor even for the lazy-minded academician.

Professor Hartz’s basic thesis is fascinating, although not entirely novel, and it is argued brilliantly. Since American society was non-feudal at base, he claims it lacked both a genuinely revolutionary tradition and a tradition of reaction. Americans were indeed “born free.” Hence, this American society, which he chooses to call “liberal,” gave rise on the one hand to “frustrated aristocrats” and on the other to “frustrated radicals,” while the majority of citizens always remained in the “liberal” middle. Indeed, the author maintains that American society enshrined “a fixed dogmatic liberalism of a liberal way of life” as its basic touchstone and achieved through it a “moral unanimity” unlike anything found in Europe. Herein lies a significant paradox, says Hartz. While Lockian in our doctrine, our devotion to that doctrine “has been so irrational that it has not even been recognized for what it is: liberalism.”

Professor Hartz feels that this liberal society concept validates the uniqueness in American history while at the same time making it an extension of the European culture of which it logically was a part. It also helps to explain both the American similarities and diversities vis à vis Europe as well as point up the conflicts in our own domestic situation. By this concept he explains our “non-revolutionary” Revolution, the rise and fall of Federalism, the success of Jacksonian democracy, the machinations of Whiggery, the downfall of Southern planter “aristocracy,” the Horatio Alger idyll, the
collapse of Progressivism, the nine mad years at the ticker, the Depression debacle, the New Deal, red scare hysteria and so on. That this is a large load for any one basic idea or assumption to carry, I think even Professor Hartz might agree because he seems to be overarguing the case at certain points almost as if to convince himself. Nonetheless, this does not detract from the basic value of the work itself. One might disagree with the author's "non-feudal" assumption as "the" basic characteristic of the American tradition, one might even have qualms about his highly relative use of such terms as "aristocrat," "middle class," "upper middle class," "mob," "capitalist," and "petitbourgeois" when applied to the fluid American scene; but one most certainly cannot help but be impressed by his erudition, his breadth of scholarship, his ability to write, and his fresh contribution to intellectual stimulation. All too few books can combine these admirable qualities.

At the very outset the author acknowledges his task is a difficult one and admits that a "liberal society" analysis of his variety might prove less popular than normal "progressive" historical scholarship. The liberal society analyst, he says, "tends to criticize and then shrug his shoulders." Professor Hartz, to be sure, does some shoulder shrugging (he never does answer specifically the two salient questions he poses at the opening and the close), but more often than not he is sending sharp lefts and rights to the reader's jaw. This reader, for one, was glad for the pounding. No serious student of American history should seek to escape a similar fate.

Pennsylvania State University

ROBERT K. MURRAY


The title, Federalist Delaware, 1775-1815, promises a thesis which the author never succeeds in developing satisfactorily. The implied promise is not merely to give a descriptive survey of various and sundry aspects of Delaware society, which the author accomplishes, but also to explain why the predominantly agricultural state of Delaware was the first state to ratify the Constitution and remained Federalist more consistently and for a longer period than any other state. There is much interesting information in the book on a host of topics: size of state, division into industrial north and agricultural south, population, towns, farms, slavery, medicine. These would be more appropriate if the title were simply Delaware, 1775-1815, but the author does not tell the reader why these various topics made Delaware the Federalist state that it was. Sometimes the account appears confusing or even contradictory. There were few causes for internal revolution, we learn; yet when the state elected a constitutional convention it elected "conservatives" as opposed to the "radicals" who promoted the Revolution, and there was armed insurrection in Sussex County in 1776. The people were particularistic, agrarian, conservative, and intolerant of outside interference, yet the mercantile aristocracy was allied with similar groups in the Delaware Valley and the state elected outsiders such as Thomas McKean, Philemon
Dickinson, and Samuel Wharton to represent it in the Continental Congress. The Federalists were the party of the landed gentry, yet most Federalist support came from small farmers. International affairs helped to keep the Federalists in power, yet the Louisiana Purchase, the Leopard-Chesapeake affair, and the war fever of 1810 helped the Democrats, Republicans, or Democratic-Republicans, as the Jeffersonian party is variously called. The author does not make the common mistake of saying that the Constitution was put over by merchant capitalists and their financial allies and then showing that most of the voters were farmers. But the question why agrarian Delaware was a Federalist stronghold still remains unanswered.

Michigan State College

ROBERT E. BROWN


Abraham Wagner was a German immigrant who practiced medicine in the rural environs of Philadelphia during the middle years of the eighteenth century. Had he not been a Schwenkfelder, the present glimpse of German culture in the New World might easily have remained undisclosed, for it is doubtful whether Abraham Wagner would have attracted the attention of historians lacking a particular slant. The fortunate theological association has permitted Mr. Berky not only to introduce a thoroughly fascinating character but to write an important page in the history of American medicine.

Practitioner in Physick is less a biography, in the usual sense, than an evaluation of a man in his time. A brief narrative transfers Abraham Wagner, fugitive from religious persecution by the Roman Catholics in Silesia and something less than tolerance by the Lutherans in Saxony, to the free air of William Penn's "Holy Experiment." From this point, the character of Wagner is developed in four major areas: religious, medical, literary, and humanitarian.

Exposed from early childhood to the doctrine of Caspar von Schwenkfeld, and steeped in the religious writings of this sect, Wagner was throughout his brief life a devout Christian and a persistent theologian. In the New World, he proved himself a most liberal pietist, never failing to bear witness for his faith but skillfully avoiding the pitfalls of dogmatic sectarianism. He counted among his friends such outstanding religious scholars as George deBenneville, the Universalist, and Henry Muhlenberg, patriarch of the Lutherans. It seems clear that, while Wagner earned a good livelihood from the practice of medicine, theology was his main preoccupation.

As a physician, Wagner was competent and progressive. His medical education was preceptorial, but his scholarly habits and keen powers of observation adequately substituted for a university course. Liberal excerpts from Wagner's "specimen book of remedies" and other medical writings indicate that, while this colonial physician followed the empiric and frequently irrational patterns of his colleagues in most respects, he was certainly bound no more by medical than by religious dogma. His description of a virulent
epidemic of "pleurisy" (probably lobar pneumonia) is a classic of terse clinical writing.

In addition to his theological discourses and medical journals, Abraham Wagner wrote upwards of seventy poems. Many of these were occasional pieces and all were strongly devotional in flavor, being, in effect or actuality, hymns. Numerous examples are included in the text, and an appendix lists the first lines of sixty-nine of Wagner's verses.

The clearest picture of Wagner the humanitarian may be found in his will, quoted fully in a second appendix. After providing for his only living blood relation, and for the members of his household, he bequeathed the remainder of his estate "unto poor and needy Folks," regardless of "religion or Persuasion," through four carefully chosen trustees and according to a definite time schedule. It is of more than passing interest that the trusteeship was faithfully fulfilled over a period of seventeen years.

Practitioner in Physick is a sensitive book, clearly written and pleasant to read. Physically, the work is a credit to the craftsmen who conceived and fabricated it. The reviewer is mildly puzzled by the discrepancy between the birth date of Abraham Wagner as prominently displayed on the cover and title page and that recorded in the text; the blemish is minor but unfortunate. The historical setting of the portrait, especially the careful handling of eighteenth century medical philosophy and practice, contributes greatly to the reader's appreciation of this remarkable individual who was "a consummate scholar at the age of twelve and an established physician at twenty—all of this in an age when formal education was practically non-existent and legitimate medical practice was just beginning to emerge from a haze of superstition and medieval alchemy."

University of Pittsburgh

Paul L. McLain


Elisha P. Douglass' volume is a projection of J. Franklin Jameson's theory of the American Revolution as a social movement into the struggle for political rights that culminated in the making of state constitutions. This struggle was one of internal proportions within the Whig Party, developing into two factions: the one conservative and aristocratic and the other democratic and radical. In essence both supported the American forces in the war of rebellion, but in the eyes of the radicals the Revolution was not an end in itself.

In the book Rebels and Democrats the author studies the making of eight state constitutions during the American Revolution, with emphasis placed on North Carolina, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania. A chapter is also devoted to Jefferson's position in early American democracy. In the study of the pattern of political conflict Mr. Douglass adheres mainly to Jameson's statement, "In most states the strength of the revolutionary party lay most largely in the plain people."
Possibly the author, in seeking to develop patterns within the framework of constitutional struggle, oversimplifies the evolution of ideologies of the aristocrats and the democrats within the Whig Party. He holds that John Adams’ *Thoughts on Government* was the paramount guide in five states in composing the first instruments of government and in creating the Federal constitution of 1787. Yet this is in essence oversimplification for, if anything, the new state constitutions merely codified colonial experience.

By far the best treatment of constitutional development in Mr. Douglass’ book is that on North Carolina and Massachusetts. The basis of discontent in North Carolina was found mainly on a county level, for here was to be found flagrant malpractices reminiscent of the graft uncovered by the Muckrakers of more recent times. That the democratic revolution in this state did not go much further was because the yeoman farmers had a natural identity of economic interests with the rich planters.

According to the author, Pennsylvania’s struggle for democracy in the American Revolution was shaped by a distinct organization of political parties. In this section Mr. Douglass evaluates the rise of Pennsylvania democracy through the “associators” and the Philadelphia Committee of Public Safety. One weakness of the author is his picturing the call for a constitutional convention as solely an urban gesture emanating from Philadelphia. In matter of fact this work was of a provincial nature circulating from county to county. That the constitutional convention of 1776 was a radical device was determined by the Provincial Convention of June 18, 1776. One major factor the author fails to delineate is the fact that the internal revolution in Pennsylvania was an effective political alliance between the eastern and western democrats, an alliance that was to dominate state politics throughout the remainder of the eighteenth century.

One can not say that the theme of this monograph is new. Nevertheless, this in no way detracts from the work, for here is crystallized a concise and interesting study of the struggle for equal political rights and for government by the majority in the Revolution.

*West Chester State Teachers College*  
Edward G. Everett

In our last issue, the review of *Pennsylvania Politics and the Growth of Democracy* by Theodore Thayer incorrectly stated that this work was originally a Ph.D. dissertation. Dr. Thayer’s dissertation topic, supervised by Professor Richard S. Shryock, was “Israel Pemberton: King of the Quakers.”