
Joseph Reed was a moderate in the Revolutionary era. That is to say, he did not find the developing break with the home country easy to accept, and sought to prevent it by conciliation. Yet when the die was cast, no one was more earnest and active in embracing the patriot cause. Some there were in this period who found in the parting from Great Britain no real severance of cherished bonds. For men like Reed, it represented the loss of much more than simply a joint inheritance of language and culture. He had acquired stronger loyalties through study at the Inns of Court in London and by winning as his wife a girl born and reared in the English homeland. Indeed, at one stage of his life, Reed took steps to establish himself permanently in England. Only an unexpected development in the affairs of his family caused him to abandon the idea and return to America.

Although a native of Trenton, New Jersey, Reed settled his family in Philadelphia. As a lawyer in the Quaker City, he rose almost at once to a position of eminence. We have the word of John Adams that by the eve of the Revolution, Reed was at the head of his profession in the city. His initial efforts to stem the rising tide of hostility in imperial-colonial relationships took place between December, 1773, and February, 1775. In this period he bombarded Lord Dartmouth, newly appointed Secretary of State for the Colonies, with a series of letters interpreting the colonial reaction to Whitehall's policies. He hoped by means of this correspondence to help resolve the existing difficulties. It was his belief that the Colonial Secretary was receiving prejudiced and false information about conditions in the colonies. He proposed to correct this in the interest of harmony.

With the failure of all attempts at reconciliation and the onset of war, Reed found himself engulfed in the struggle. It was to be his lot to serve the cause in a variety of capacities. As General Washington's confidential secretary during the early stages of the conflict he contributed to the efficient operation of the commander-in-chief's office. Later, during the Trenton-Princeton campaigns, while holding the post of adjutant-general, his knowledge of the terrain prepared the way for the brilliant stroke by which Washington achieved his notable victories. Although high military office was now within his grasp, Reed chose not to accept it. This decision, however, did not close out his military activities. He saw considerable service in the campaigns of 1777, 1778, 1779, and 1780, but as a volunteer without commission.
Sandwiched between Reed's military services was considerable activity on the state political level. Beginning in 1778, this became his chief concern. Elected to the presidency of the Executive Council of the State of Pennsylvania in that year, he undertook again the role of conciliator. The state constitution, adopted in 1776, had been the object of bitter attack by the conservative element in the commonwealth since its inception. By this instrument of government the democratic elements within the province had achieved the most dramatic and far-reaching internal revolution the war produced. Partisan strife, as a consequence, had reached a dangerous level. To Reed and others, the patriot cause itself in Pennsylvania seemed in danger of collapse. In the succeeding three years, during which time he retained the presidency of the state, he sought to prevent this.

Reed had often avoided taking sides in political controversy in the interest of compromise, but now he was forced to identify himself with the so-called Constitutional Party. Thereafter he became the Party's acknowledged standard-bearer. It was this situation that brought upon him perhaps the most painful experience of his life—charges of wavering in his support of the Revolutionary cause at one of its most critical moments. Reed's political opponents hurled this accusation at him in the hope that by destroying his reputation they would simultaneously undermine the strength of the Party he led. Unhappily, his last years—he died in 1785—were marred by enforced efforts to defend himself against these unjust charges of tainted loyalty.

Joseph Reed's story is not the story of a fiery radical, emotionally charged by Britain's alleged tyranny, and quick to identify himself with extreme measures. Rather was he of the group that treasured the overseas connection and only slowly came to a full acceptance of the need for breaking it. There must have been many like him in the patriot ranks. Most of them will undoubtedly remain anonymous, for few have left such complete records of their views as Joseph Reed. Mr. Roche, in describing Reed's decision to cast his lot with the popular cause, has performed a real historical service. He has illuminated an aspect of the Revolutionary movement about which we know all too little.

Muhlenberg College

Victor L. Johnson


For two decades, since The New England Mind, The Seventeenth Century was published, Perry Miller's star has been a guiding one in New England studies, and in recent years his mounting work has transcended regional significance. Yet it is startling, after three stout histories and three or four other volumes, that such a book as Errand Into the Wilderness—a slender volume of reprinted "pieces" as he calls them, essays and addresses dated from 1931 to 1955—should be the publication to clarify suddenly the larger bearing of his work. For the many there must be who know his scholarship only by reputation or by a little
sampling, this new book may be recommended either as an introduction, or as a considerable representation, of the author's cumulative effort.

Here, as in no previous single volume, Miller follows phases of New England thought through a long span of time, from Puritan theology in the making in Elizabethan England to Transcendentalism in Concord just before the Civil War. The author also ventures outside his familiar region. In one chapter he discusses the spirit of early Virginia. In another, "Nature and the National Ego," he discusses an important factor in the nationalistic expression of the generation before Sumter, the period covered last year in The Raven and the Whale.

One of Miller's devices is the insertion of a few pages of introductory comment before each chapter. This ties the book together, and makes for uncommonly personal communication. In conversations with himself, the writer sometimes says what his first intention was in writing the piece, confesses the degree to which his point of view has changed since writing, and occasionally tells how readers have misunderstood what he said. The text of the chapters has been revised a little here and there, but mainly the original version has been permitted to stand.

As early as when he was a graduate student at Harvard, Miller began the publication of trial balloons of research and writing a couple of years before the book for which the research had been done had been fully written. Thus the earliest essay here reproduced, "Thomas Hooker and the Democracy of Connecticut," which first appeared in The New England Quarterly, not only explains how the principles of early government in Connecticut were essentially like those of the Massachusetts "theocracy" (Miller employs this controversial term), but it states the main ideas which Miller later developed in his distinguished first monograph, Orthodoxy in Massachusetts. Likewise the reprinting of the 1935 essay "On The Marrow of Puritan Divinity" makes conveniently available Miller's first, most compact, and most readable account of the covenant theology, the Puritans' special and considerably modified brand of Calvinism. This essay also gives us the core of his best known, but over-extended and difficult work, The New England Mind, The Seventeenth Century. The present editing of old materials, and the stating of their coherence, may bear the same relationship to the large-scale work on the history of American thought, which Miller is reported to be undertaking, as these essays had to the books which followed them.

Some readers will notice that Miller is, much more than they may have suspected, preoccupied with F. J. Turner. The wilderness is to him a mighty metaphor, a figure of speech which has engaged American thought and affected it deeply; it is not, as it was to Turner, a condition which forced home a set of governing processes in American history and which determined the national character. "Form controls matter," Miller believes, rather than the other way round. "I have been compelled to insist that the mind of man is the basic factor in history." This is heady doctrine; it is a modern Puritanism which substitutes the mind of man for the mind of God. It is the more welcome because so frequently his-
torsians of the intellect in America have been environmentalist in their interpretations.

Remembering a plea Miller recently made for understanding American thought as always multiform, always pluralistic, I must be tentative when I object to just one phase of the argument in this volume. He tells us that he first chose to study the Puritans because they offered a certain unity, a more coherent tradition than that of other early Americans. Searching always for tradition, and for national meaning, Miller assumes, as of a century and more ago, the existence of a "national ego." He asserts that "nature versus civilization" was "the theme, the American theme," of that period. I question whether "ego" is not an overwhelming exaggeration, a figure of speech which imputes a coherence which did not exist, even half a century ago.

Win or lose on that point, I would ask further: though "nature versus civilization" was unquestionably a great theme, let us agree the theme of American literary expression, was it ever the great question of American thought? I believe that the metaphor obscures where it might illuminate the moral feeling of a century and more ago. At that time was not civilization versus justice—justice in the sense of the right of self-realization, a sense which connected alike with ideas of freedom, of equality, and of harmony and of regional autonomy, and which was not altogether different from the intuition of salvation once entertained by Puritan believers in the covenants—the truer and deeper question? Was not concern for justice, under God or under nature, among America's many varieties and locations of men, in the common background of our historic anxieties? Was not hope for justice the common impulse of the mighty dreams?

*The Johns Hopkins University*

CHARLES A. BARKER


This is the second scholarly life of Eli Whitney to appear in recent years, the first having been Jeannette Mirsky and Allan Nevins' _The World of Eli Whitney_ (1952). Mrs. Green's book constitutes a volume in _The Library of American Biography_ and in accordance with the purpose of that series it emphasizes what the biographer considers the most important contributions of Whitney to the United States, and his interactions with the society of his time.

As the title of her book indicates, Mrs. Green considers Whitney's greatest bequest to his nation to have been his pioneer work in the development of machine tools, which could counteract the scarcity of skilled labor in the early Republic and which could turn out standardized, interchangeable parts. In other words, Whitney's inventions contributed to the development of mass production techniques based on an improved tech-
nology. Although Mrs. Green devotes ample space to Whitney's invention of the cotton gin, she properly emphasizes the industrial undertaking in which he was absorbed during most of his career, but which, nevertheless, has been largely neglected by the writers of our standard history textbooks—the manufacture of muskets for the United States government.

Undoubtedly Whitney was a mechanical genius to whom American invention and industry are greatly indebted. Furthermore, his genius has often been unappreciated, both in his own time and afterward. Mrs. Green, like Mirsky and Nevins, adds to Whitney's weight in the balance of history. No doubt this is as it should be. Whitney suffered more than his share of misfortune and sometimes appeared to be dogged by some malevolent fate. The worst injustice done to him, of course, was the cavalier piracy of his cotton gin, in defiance of his patent rights, by Southern cotton gin operators and planters. Mrs. Green is not uncritical of Whitney; she admits his selfishness in the patent matter, and his neglect of friends and relatives because of the press of business. Yet her entertaining literary style and her ingratiating picture of the inventor almost persuade the reader that it would be caviling to criticize Whitney for any such shortcomings.

Whitney's attitudes were remarkably similar to those of many scientists of the twentieth century. In particular, he appears to have had little thought or concern for the social and moral consequences and implications of his inventions. To him social problems and ideas were "politics," and he presumably attempted to disassociate himself from responsibility for what others did with his productions by asserting that he was no politician. Unorthodox as he was in the fields of technology and engineering, he was a conservative elsewhere. Witness his detestation for Tom Paine (p. 154), or his collaboration with the United States armory at Springfield in blacklisting workingmen (p. 171). The role of the cotton gin in spreading the plantation system and Negro slavery disturbs Mrs. Green (p. 191), but did not bother Whitney. Nor did Whitney appear to entertain any question of the value to society of munitions makers like himself. Interestingly, Mrs. Green does not raise this question. Almost the only hint she gives of antimilitarist opposition to Whitney's munitions contracts is the remark on page 130 that the Pennsylvanian, Albert Gallatin, "disapproved of large military expenditures," and therefore the handling of Whitney's arms contracts was moved from the Treasury Department to the War Department shortly after President Jefferson's inauguration.

Mrs. Green's undocumented biography is considerably shorter than the earlier work by Mirsky and Nevin. She does not basically alter their account or their conclusions. She expresses her indebtedness to the biography by Mirsky and Nevin, just as in their book they acknowledged the "valuable information" which Mrs. Green had provided them. Nevertheless, "A Note on the Sources," which takes the place of a regular bibliography, indicates that she has made a fresh examination of most of the sources on Eli Whitney, particularly the Whitney Papers in the Yale University Library. She has condensed the non-technical aspects
of Whitney's life and has largely omitted the background essays on scientific, economic, social, and intellectual conditions in the United States and elsewhere which are characteristic of the biography by Mirsky and Nevins.

Mrs. Green’s life of Whitney possesses many fine features which make it a worthwhile addition to the literature of American history. Above all, she has brought into the book her detailed and comprehensive knowledge, based on many years of research, of United States industrial and technological history. She has sharpened and pointed up Whitney’s contributions to American manufacturing and agriculture. Avoiding the lengthy quotations from Whitney’s papers and other sources which are so noticeable in Mirsky and Nevins, she tells her story in colorful, simplified language which can be understood and enjoyed by a gamut of readers from the high-school student to the scholar.

West Virginia University

WILLIAM D. BARNES


When James Knox Polk returned to his native Tennessee, a graduate of the University of North Carolina in 1818, he was entering law and politics in a most significant era. The political mechanism of American Democracy had not yet been created and he was to become one of the key constructors and operators of that complex engine, the political party. Professor Sellers has designed a biography of him in more than one volume and this, the first, relates the story of his life down to the eve of his Presidency. In this quarter century after his graduation, the blueprints for the American political party were drawn.

When Polk entered politics in Tennessee, he was going to perform his part on a stage more recently constructed than that of the earlier seaboard communities. Tennessee had not become a state until 1796 and was still in its first decades of political independence. Here politics was a highly personal, unorganized procedure. In the various frontier communities, society was forming and a structure of leadership was only in embryo. It was an individualistic period in community development and men chose and followed leaders in a highly personal manner.

Thus, the study of Polk’s early life is one in which rudimentary community behavior must bulk large. Under Professor Sellers’ guidance we thread through a labyrinth of complex personal relationships, as the politicians in Tennessee conduct their maneuvers. Despite the fact that Jackson was a Tennessean, there seems little trace of anything like a Democratic party organization. The politically minded were supporters of Jackson on a highly personal basis because he was of their state and a hero, but as soon as he attempted to impose a New Yorker on them as his successor, enough of them turned to another Tennessean, Judge Hugh L. White, to carry the state against Jackson’s wishes in 1836.

When White’s star declined, Polk sought to be the third Tennessean
to secure the state’s support for national honors, though only on the Vice Presidential level. His success in Washington as Congressman, Jacksonian floor leader against the Bank, and Speaker of the House, together with a spectacular campaign which made him Governor of Tennessee, seemed to justify his hopes, despite two later defeats for the gubernatorial office. Here the story stops.

This is a careful analysis of Polk’s early career which sheds much light on an obscure period in American politics. Professor Sellers has had much more material at his disposal than had McCormick, Polk’s earlier biographer, and he has exploited it shrewdly, if at perhaps undue length. We have a clear picture of this intense, somewhat narrow, and indefatigable politician who must compensate for youthful ill-health and various frustrations by political success. We shall await with great interest his portrait of the President.

University of Pennsylvania

ROY F. NICHOLS


To the student of the Civil War who in recent years has almost come to expect that forthcoming works will concern subjects of command and strategy, Professor Cornish’s volume indeed develops an interesting phase of the war. While there are several earlier works which treat of Negro participation in the war, this study has a new approach which emphasizes the gradual development of administrative policy as well as the successive steps through which the Union reached the stage of employing Negroes as combat troops.

The author first traces the course of the fast changing events bearing upon the Negro issue during the first two years of the war. The struggle had hardly begun when voices from widely divergent sections of the country urged the immediate employment of colored troops in the Union Army. The outstanding Negro spokesman, Frederick Douglass of New York, in September insisted that colored soldiers should “share the danger and honor of upholding the Government” (p. 27), and the Emporia News (Kansas) bluntly stated that the slaves should be freed and be made to fight for the Union. Radicals in Congress who urged abolition of slavery as well as enlistment of Negroes as fighters were gradually gaining the upper hand. The cautious Lincoln, early in January, 1862, decided to rid himself of Secretary of War Cameron’s embarrassing presence in the Cabinet, due in part to Cameron’s stand favoring the arming of Negroes. His successor, Edwin M. Stanton, while first holding aloof from the position of the Radicals, eventually, on August 25, granted Brigadier General Rufus Saxton of the South Carolina district the authority “to arm, uniform, equip and receive into the service of the United States such number of volunteers of African descent as you may deem expedient, not exceeding 5,000, . . .” (p. 80). Thus, instead of the unauthorized enlistment of colored troops by enter-
prising officers such as James Lane in Kansas, David Hunter (replaced by Saxton) in South Carolina, and Ben Butler in New Orleans, these troops were now mustered into service by War Department authority. Saxton's order constituted a major change in the war policy of the Lincoln administration.

Lincoln had not reached a decision in the matter of arming Negroes. It was becoming apparent, however, that emancipation and arming the Negro were necessarily complementary steps, and that both called for solutions. The course of military events in the summer of 1862, notably the failure of the Peninsular Campaign and the disaster at Second Manassas, had much to do with persuading Lincoln to resolve these problems. By September 22 he had made up his mind to take the initial step and issued his preliminary proclamation of emancipation, which would become effective the following January 1. Lincoln's pronouncement represented an important shift in Union war aims which now included an anti-slavery crusade. Not until his final proclamation on emancipation in January, however, did Lincoln publicly endorse the use of Negroes in the armed forces, thereby reversing his stand of August 6, 1862, to employ them only as laborers in the army. Still considering the sensitivity of the Border States and of loyal slaveholders who, like Southerners, feared widespread slave insurrections, Lincoln chose to limit the use of Union colored troops to the confines of fortifications or to the Navy.

Professor Cornish deals ably with the current of events which led eventually to the Negro's emancipation and to his employment on a large scale in the Union Army. In the final chapters special emphasis is placed upon the accomplishments of Negroes in combat. Statistically, it is noted that at the war's close, a total of 123,156 Negroes were serving in the several branches of the service. The estimated total of 180,000 colored troops in the Union Army during the war constituted nearly ten per cent of the total Union soldiers engaged.

The volume contains a critical bibliography which points to considerable material that apparently was not available to earlier writers.

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

The Gingerbread Age, a View of Victorian America. By John Maass

This book is a lively defense of American architecture from 1840 to 1880, the era of Victoria, so long considered a period of deplorable taste. The author disclaims any pretense to formal historical or architectural scholarship. It is rather a broadside aimed at the American public to demolish their long-entrenched prejudices. In a cheerful, informal way, John Maass gives a history of the period with its tremendous expansion and momentous social changes, and then proceeds to prove that "this enormously creative and progressive era produced an enormously creative and progressive architecture."
He defends his architects from the crime of copying styles, pointing out that at that time there were no architectural schools, only a few could afford to travel, or had access to libraries of architectural drawings, but designers all over the country were producing buildings of vitality and boldness seldom seen in ages of more conformity. The Victorians for all their reputation for prudishness, for sentimentality and moralizing, were never restrained, but threw themselves wholeheartedly into any and every facet of life. They were unashamedly romantic, superbly confident, and their buildings were the perfect symbols of the era.

Following the formality of the classical or Greek Revival period, the exuberant Gingerbread Era, whether Gothic, Italianate, Egyptian, or Mansardic is most entertainingly portrayed. There are hundreds of photographs, drawings, paintings, and engravings interspersed with Mr. Maass' lively comments. Government buildings, houses big and small, railroad stations, shops, churches, fire houses, fashion plates, and advertisements are presented in all "their warmth, color, dignity and good cheer" and contrasted devastatingly with the confusion of the 20th century community. He maintains that we are unimaginative imitators, whether in the dreary rows of "government classic," or the "shoddy veneers of Pseudo Tudor, False Colonial, Imitation Mission, or Cheapjack Ranch Style."

Modern architects should remember that American Victorian houses were the first to have central heating, hot and cold running water, bathrooms, cooking ranges, and indoor toilets. Gervas Wheeler in 1854 wrote "an architect who has the interests of his noble science at heart will always insist on studying the site and the tastes or habits of life of the future occupants." In Mr. Maass' view, "The Victorian house broke free from this academic scheme. It is planned from the inside out, the free layout of rooms determines the outward look; the broken 'picturesque' exterior makes the most of the effects of sunlight, shade and foliage. These are good houses to walk around, to view at different times of day and year. Inside, they have a happy, hide-and-seek quality of surprise."

The word gingerbread, he tells us, is from the English cake, flavored with ginger and cut into fancy shapes. The carved and gilded decoration of sailing ships was first called by this name, and finally in the 18th century it was applied to architectural ornament. Wood fretwork, he feels, is true folk art whether hand carved in Switzerland or cut with a scroll saw worked by foot treadle or steam as in America. It is the vigorous and pleasurable "design language" of a happy era.

The reason that Victorian buildings are considered gloomy today is that they are all too often found in blighted areas. The house so beloved by Charles Addams and many novelists is all decay and poverty, surrounded by weeds, with factories or gas stations as neighbors. Artists, he points out, have seen the drama and character of these buildings since the nineteen twenties and thirties. Grant Wood, Edward Hopper, Ben Shahn, and Steinberg are a few who have made American Victorian their own.

It is revealing that John Maass is a native Austrian who, according to the jacket, was immediately struck with the unique quality of American
Victorian architecture when he arrived in this country. His fresh appraisal of a discredited style makes this an uncommon book and a highly entertaining one. The binding, typography, and placement of the pictures (often without margins) are strictly 20th century. The format of many pages could be found in any architectural magazine today. Why, since he writes glowingly of "beautifully lettered signs" and the "vivid qualities of directness and overstatement," did he not insist that his book be as bold and imaginative in its form as it is in its substance?

Wilmington, Del.

Victorine duPont Homsey


Based upon a microscopic examination of masses of printed and manuscript material, this book analyzes and interprets most aspects of Theodore Roosevelt's role in the rise of the United States to world power. The Herculean labor that went into the writing of the book is apparent from the bulk of the notes, which, though in fine print and abbreviated to the hilt, fill 117 pages, as compared with 462 pages of text. Even so, Professor Beale has not brought his bibliography up to date since 1953, when he delivered, at Johns Hopkins, the Albert Shaw Lectures, of which this book is an expansion. The results of the omission are apparent at several points, including his long account of the Algeciras Conference of 1906, which is more meagerly documented on the French side than need have been the case.


The theme is well worn, but Professor Beale's treatment is fresh because this is the first time that T. R.'s record has been submitted to painstaking analysis by a mid-twentieth-century anti-imperialist. Yet the picture he draws is by no means all dark, for he has obviously been impressed by Roosevelt's technical virtuosity. Throughout the book Beale seems to alternate between admiration for Roosevelt's diplomacy and scorn for his statesmanship. The latter prevails in the end, and we are left with the impression of a whitened sepulchre, haunted by the twin spectres of colonialism and imperialism. On the one hand, Roosevelt succeeded in his effort to form an entente with Great Britain; on the other, Britain was an imperialist power and the basis of his policy was "his sense of a common task of Britain and America in ruling 'colonial peoples'" (p. 160). Again, Roosevelt "directly helped shape our twentieth century China policy," but he shaped it in such a way that the United States "missed perhaps the greatest opportunity of its twentieth-century career when
the premises of world power and imperialist ideology made it fail to become the friend and guide of the 'new spirit' in China" (p. 252).

Historians are much indebted to the author for bringing together so much information and so many incisive comments in a book which, to the specialist at any rate, is never dull. Inevitably a work of such broad scope, particularly when it comes from the forthright pen of Professor Beale, provokes many dissents. A mere listing of this reviewer's would fill several pages, and he thinks it regrettable that the concluding chapter fails to come to grips with several of the fundamental questions posed in the Preface (pp. vii-x). Yet he feels we should all be grateful to Beale for giving us this succulent bone to gnaw on.

The largest lacuna in the book is the unexplained lack of a systematic discussion of Roosevelt's policy and ideas regarding Latin America. The only long passage on this subject is embedded in a chapter on Europe and, as Beale himself admits, is historiographical: this is Beale's defense of Roosevelt against the aspersions which some historians have cast on the truth of his well known claim, made in 1916, that in the Venezuelan crisis of 1902-1903 he averted a German threat to the Western Hemisphere by an exercise of what might today be called "brinkmanship." For the rest, the references to Latin America are brief, fragmentary, and sometimes misleading. In the absence of any explanation of this neglect of Latin America, we may assume that it reflects current attitudes. It certainly does not reflect Roosevelt's own attitude, and it obscures a fact which seems to have escaped Beale's attention: that Roosevelt's enduring contribution, so far as the power position of the United States was concerned, was in the establishment of this country not as a world power (that came later), but as the preponderant power in the Western Hemisphere—a position which, in the nineteenth century, had been held not by the United States but by Great Britain.

University of Pennsylvania

ARTHUR P. WHITAKER


"This is the greatest night of my life." So spoke President-elect Franklin Roosevelt to his mother, Sara Delano Roosevelt, as he arrived at his home on Sixty-fifth Street, New York City, late in the evening of election day, November 8, 1932. Here is the "triumph" that Professor Freidel points toward in this third volume of his monumental biography of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The book opens with Roosevelt's inaugural as Governor of New York State on January 1, 1929, and closes with his election as President of the United States. During the events which led from the one to the other the reader is always aware, as Professor Freidel states, that "Roosevelt acted as though he personally had a rendezvous with destiny." The result is a truly amazing and intriguing story.
Superficially there was little to indicate on January 1, 1929, that the pleasant man who took the oath of office as chief executive of the Empire State was destined for greatness. Most observers dismissed him as a political lightweight. Yet he firmly seized the reins of government in New York, gave the State good, though not brilliant, leadership and, more important, worked diligently to remodel and rejuvenate the disunified and bickering Democratic Party. Of his Albany days Professor Freidel writes, "Here was no bewildered political tyro elevated by events into a great office beyond his capacities, but one of the most skilled of political craftsmen, who without waste effort quietly erected . . . the scaffolding for both the governorship of New York and the candidacy for President in 1932."

This is the real key to an understanding of Roosevelt during the years 1929-1932. He simultaneously acted as New York's chief executive and as a President-to-be. Roosevelt had two goals in mind: to present a forward-looking, mildly-liberal program which would command more than state-wide attention, and to build up the strength of the Democratic Party both locally and nationally.

No one understood better than Roosevelt how closely these two goals were entwined. His stand on such matters as farm relief, old age security legislation, and public power served as important stepping stones to the Presidency, while his careful handling of the pro-Smith and anti-Smith elements in the battered Democratic Party rubbed soothing balm in old wounds and brought urban and rural voters closer together. Through judicious publicity FDR kept himself in the limelight—not too much, not too little—and gave the impression that he was the modern champion of moderate progressivism.

Professor Freidel clearly shows that FDR's Albany experience was of extreme importance in molding both a future President and a workable program. As governor, Roosevelt learned much about dealing with legislators. He sharpened his ability to handle men and to "pick" the brains of experts. While governor he had his first contact with depression problems, and slowly developed those ideas and even the basic agencies which characterized the later New Deal. He gained valuable skill in appealing to public opinion. But he learned also that political success usually rested on the regular politicians who controlled party machinery.

In late December, 1931, the pundit of the New York Herald Tribune, Walter Lippmann, observed, "[FDR] is a pleasant man who, without any important qualifications for the office, would very much like to be President." One might dispute part of Lippmann's contention, but there is no doubt that FDR had his sights on the Presidency. Freidel carefully describes the frenetic pre-convention activity of 1931 and 1932, the meticulous planning for the Roosevelt "boom," the prodigious work of Howe and Farley. How the "Roosevelt team" constantly outflanked the Smith-Raskob faction, how Southerners and Westerners were enticed onto the Roosevelt band wagon, how Roosevelt skirted dangerous issues—all this makes fascinating reading.
The pièce de résistance, however, is the story of the Chicago convention itself. The last-minute "Stop Roosevelt" movement, Farley's gathering in of stray delegates, Howe's lying panting on the floor of his hotel room, the open telephone circuit to the Executive Mansion in Albany, the decisive role of Garner, Roosevelt's precedent-shattering appearance, the reassuring acceptance speech—these are woven into a moving and spectacular narrative.

This is not to imply that Professor Freidel engages in sensationalism, or brings to his subject an attitude of hero worship. On the contrary, the author displays an admirable objectivity in dealing with this controversial figure. There is enough material in the pages of this book to satisfy and outrage both Roosevelt haters and lovers. Dr. Freidel portrays FDR's willingness to learn, his buoyancy, his capacity for growth, his brilliance in formulating programs for action, his consummate political skill. He also indicates FDR's lack of depth, his duplicity, his refusal to face up to unpleasantness, his opportunism, and his inclination to play one faction off against another. If Professor Freidel commits any error in this regard, it is his tendency to make FRD's periodic vacillation on crucial and ticklish questions appear to be a virtue rather than a defect, and to credit FDR with political prescience when, in reality, a favorable result rested more on sheer luck than on reason.

Nonetheless this third volume of Freidel's biography of Roosevelt is a masterful product. His style is pleasing and sometimes flashes with brilliance. His organization is clear and his grasp of the subject is readily obvious. Should Professor Freidel maintain the same high standards for the subsequent volumes as he has in the first three, especially The Triumph, he will have achieved a notable success and will have given the historical profession a work of first rank.

Pennsylvania State University

ROBERT K. MURRAY


This book is a history of nativism in the United States from 1860 to 1925. It describes the process by which a major change was brought about in the American ideology; for at the end of this process the majority of Americans no longer believed that their land should offer a haven to the oppressed of Europe, they no longer were confident that their society could assimilate persons of varied cultural backgrounds. Professor Higham analyzes the development of nativism in terms of cyclical movements; he measures the ebb and flow of nativism in the various eras of the post-Civil War period until it resulted in the passage of the highly restrictive immigration legislation of 1924. But this volume does much more than describe the impact of public opinion upon the formation of immigration legislation. It tells of the development of ideas, the relationship of ideas to forces making for social and economic change, the transformation of institutions, and the significant changes in the group behavior of Americans.

The author identifies nativism as one expression of American nationalism.
He defines this movement "... as intense opposition to an internal minority on the ground of its foreign (i.e., "un-American") connections." He finds its roots in ideas which appeared in the early national period: anti-Roman Catholicism, anti-radicalism, and a vague concept of the superiority of an Anglo-Saxon "race." According to Higham these ideas remained the bases of nativism throughout the post-bellum period. To this ideological complex must be added another phobia which became significant in the post-Civil War period—anti-Semitism. In this later period nativism became an important force in American society as a reaction to the economic and social problems which arose from industrialization and urbanization.

At this point in his analysis Professor Higham makes an important contribution. He holds that the rise of nativism was not a direct result of the new immigration. Rather, this movement was well under way even before the peoples of eastern and southern Europe began to arrive in the United States in large numbers. But they "... had the very bad luck to arrive en masse at a time when nativism was already running at full tilt ...", at a time when the nativists required a new stereotype at which to direct their attack. The Italian, the Russian Jew, the Hungarian, and the Pole of the new immigration provided this stereotype. Beyond this, three other developments made nativism a force of irresistible power in the early twentieth century. First, a racist doctrine was developed by such men as Madison Grant. This doctrine extolled the superior virtues of the Anglo-Saxon or Nordic "race"; it held that this "race" would be extinguished if the unrestricted immigration of southern and eastern Europeans continued. Second, the experiences of World War I implanted in the minds of many Americans the concept of "100 per cent Americanism"; moreover, not only were Americans convinced of the reality of this idea, they were also convinced that both government and private organizations should compel conformity to this image; and the foreigner was suspect because per se he was not "100 per cent American." Finally, the disillusionment of the immediate postwar years found expression in the resurgence of nativism. If neither domestic reform nor international progress was possible, then, at the least, the strengths and virtues of the older America had to be preserved by subordinating, if not eliminating, foreign-born minorities.

This book is an admirable example of the newer trends in historical writing. The author has made excellent use of concepts and data previously accumulated by sociologists and social psychologists. He has traced the development of a significant idea. He has described changes in public opinion in various periods. He has related the growth of nativism to other important ideological movements. His analysis of the impact of progressivism upon the growth of nativism is most illuminating. He writes well; succinctly and tersely he analyzes complex ideational relationships or narrates significant events. Even though he writes about ideas and men who aroused strong emotions and created deep prejudices, he writes dispassionately. Finally, it must be observed that the author has erected this structure upon a base of painstaking and thorough research.

Students of Pennsylvania history will find numerous interesting references
in this book. From these references it would appear that Pennsylvania was
not a center of any particular nativist movement nor were Pennsylvanians
leaders of such organizations. This is of some consequence when one con-
siders the large number of immigrants who settled in the state. This does
not mean that nativist activity and tensions between immigrant and native-
born were absent from Pennsylvania. If nothing else, this volume suggests
that a careful study of nativism in Pennsylvania from 1860-1925 might prove
rewarding.

The publishers are to be commended for the attention which they have
given to the physical preparation of this book. The type makes for rapid
and easy reading; an excellent collection of contemporary cartoons, photo-
graphs, and printings is reproduced; the index is adequate. In addition, the
book contains a lengthy bibliographical essay.

This is an important book which makes a significant contribution to our
knowledge and understanding of recent American history. It should prove
to be the definitive study of American nativism in the period, 1860-1925.
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