
Having assembled, at the request of the Holland House Corporation of the Netherlands, an exhibition of articles which had once belonged to the colonists of New Netherland, Maud E. Dilliard found herself impelled, by “the great interest taken in the heirlooms . . . to compile the present work.” Not only has she been able to draw upon the collections of various museums in the New York metropolitan area and in the Hudson River valley, but she has also had the privilege of access to “family treasures . . . seldom, if ever, . . . displayed publicly.”

The book begins with a general introduction, historical in nature, which, together with a chapter entitled “Fifty Years of Dutch Dominion,” forms a historical backdrop for the succeeding chapters which discuss the settlers, religion, domestic architecture, house furnishings, and household chattels and personal belongings of the colonists. These divisions are followed by a bibliography, and by two locating maps entitled “Communities in New Netherland” and “The Heart of New Netherland.” The individual chapters consist largely of illustrative plates, but each has a few pages of introductory comment, as well as informative legends to accompany the carefully chosen illustrations.

As is generally true in a transplanted culture, the Dutch builders and craftsmen brought with them the styles they were familiar with and the skills they had developed in the Netherlands. One is not surprised, therefore, to find, among the churches pictured, some examples of the polygonal style of church architecture (e.g., the church of 1680 pictured in plate 41, the one of c. 1700 pictured in plate 54, and the one of c. 1708-1711 pictured in plate 55), and among the non-ecclesiastical buildings some with overhanging roofs, and others with “crenelated” stepped gables. Here, as in the church buildings, a strong Dutch influence persisted for a long time after the loss of Dutch sovereignty in 1664. A good many of the household furnishings and chattels, as well as personal belongings that have survived were brought across the Atlantic, but some (e.g., the chairs of c. 1680-1700 pictured in plates 84 and 94, the recessed bed of 1758 pictured in plate 90, the early eighteenth-century pine kas pictured in plate 95, the early eighteenth-century silver porringer pictured in plate 105, and the late seventeenth-century silver spoon pictured in plate 122) were made in New Netherland. Such crafts, however, were obviously less well established than those of
the house and church builder, and their continuing influence would perhaps be difficult to trace.

What the people of the colony looked like, and what they wore, may be inferred (with caution) from the portraits reproduced in plates 18 through 39. Here are not only the strong-featured Director-General, Peter Stuyvesant, and other (lesser) members of the government: a schepen (or magistrate), an alderman, an assessor; but the clergy is also well represented, and the merchant-craftsman group, along with representative portraits of the women and children who shared in the life and work and play of the colony. One regrets the absence of pictures of the laboring group, but there apparently was no Breughel in the colony to catch such likenesses. It does come as a matter of some surprise to find, in such a select company of the colonial Dutch, the imposing presence of Johan Printz, the Governor of New Sweden, and of the Swedish lady to whom he was married (plates 27 and 28), but these are striking portraits, whatever the reason for their inclusion may be.

New Netherland, it is true, was but sparsely settled by the Dutch. Today, however, the descendants of this colonial strain, many of them still dwelling in the state of New York, constitute an important element in the population of the United States. Persisting Dutch names like De Hart, Ryerson, Suydam, and Vandervoort (or geographical names like Brooklyn [Breukelen], Hempstead [Heemstede], and Gravesend [s' Gravensande], for that matter) are a constant reminder of this part of our heritage, even if other relics of the seventeenth-century speech from which they derive now turn up only sporadically—if at all.

Miss Dilliard's historical material is presented with a Dutch bias, which is understandable in view of her partially Dutch ancestry and her lifelong interest in the history and culture of the Hudson River region. New Sweden is said to be "a settlement made in New Netherland by the Swedes without permission from the Dutch," but there is polite dissent from England's view that New Netherland was a settlement made in her territory by the Dutch government.

*An Album of New Netherland* was manufactured in Japan and carries a Japanese copyright. Whatever this may mean in the economics and the legalities of book publishing, it remains to be said that the volume is, for the most part skillfully done. Apart from a few misprints and errors in spelling the work is short of perfection in but one respect: the dual appearance of pages 11 through 16 of the text.

Miss Dilliard's work, on the whole, is competently done and successful within the limits which she herself has set. In the words of Miss V. I. Miller (a member of the staff of the Museum of the City of New York), who contributed a foreword, "For anyone interested . . . in the culture and life of our ancestors, this book will add enlightenment and foster enthusiasm for the further study of these arts and crafts."

*University of Delaware* 

A. R. Dunlap

There is much truth in the old pronouncement that history is a story agreed upon. Once a particular interpretation becomes entrenched in the literature, it may long remain there through sheer inertia, often because it has not occurred to anybody that a view which has received such general acceptance could profitably be challenged. The "bad" kings of England furnish familiar illustrations of this, and of these royal scapegoats John and James II are possibly the most maligned. The initial bad character given to each stemmed of course from the antagonisms of the contemporary situation. It was perpetuated by constitutional interpretations anachronistic in character, for the king was judged by the constitution as it later became, not by that of his own day. In the case of James, the bias was reinforced by a religious prejudice which, strong in his day, has persisted to our own in certain segments of English society, a prejudice that holds that Catholics are not merely mistaken in matters of religion, but that they cannot be trusted loyally to support English interests. This view persisted in spite of some rather clear illustrations to the contrary, Governor Thomas Dongan of New York furnishing a good example.

The sinister historical picture of James has made it more difficult to understand the mutual affinity existing between him and William Penn. One says more difficult advisedly, for it is hard to understand at best. The two men present fundamental differences, and the truism that opposites attract will hardly suffice for an explanation here. Macaulay solved the problem, logically though unsoundly, by attributing to the Quaker subject the moral obliquity which already besmirched the reputation of the Catholic monarch. This view was promptly challenged, however, and was never widely accepted. The paradox has thus persisted, though it has lessened as historical research has come to place a progressively more favorable interpretation upon the character of James. There now appears in the present work an avowedly revisionary interpretation, which claims that James was right in his policy and that therefore Penn was right in supporting him.

The author would not insist that the two were right in all respects. He finds the crux of the situation in the efforts of James to obtain religious toleration in the face of an uncooperating Parliament. This, of course, he sought to do by means of the Declaration of Indulgence. We are told that James and Penn both agreed that it was necessary for Parliament to repeal the Test Act, but also that if Parliament failed so to do, James was justified in suspending it. One does not need to be an orthodox Whig in order to have some difficulty in following this argument. More important, perhaps, is the author's insistence that James desired, not toleration for Catholics alone, but multilateral toleration, and that while he might be prepared to pack Parliament as a matter of political expediency, he had no desire to abridge parliamentary powers. Much could be said by way of speculation on both sides of each of these issues, and James did not remain on the
throne long enough for history to give us the concrete answers. Dr. Buranelli certainly makes out a good case for his client, but one is left with the feeling that the Scottish verdict of “not proven” might be more appropriate here than the English verdict of “not guilty” which he evidently wishes us to accept.

This is a thought-provoking little volume, well written and well argued, and should be read by everyone interested in Penn the Quaker and his relations with the last of the Stuart kings.

University of Pennsylvania

LEONIDAS DODSON


“Though the Quakers imposed qualifications on the extent and the nature of their participation, they became valuable members of the body politic.” This modest statement, made in the next-to-last sentence of Mr. James’s A People Among Peoples, is characteristic of the reserve of both the author and the Quaker Church in eighteenth-century America. To the unwary it can be misleading.

For, although Quakers fought and won in no military wars in that century, Mr. James pictures them embattled in the more than numerous problems, political, religious, and social, which then confronted the colonies and presently the United States. They were not a people of fugitive and cloistered virtue “who slank out of the race where the immortal garland was to be run for not without dust and heat.” However much to their own sincere convictions they stood for an apartness in their faith, they never stood far from the front of any and every moral crisis, were it in Connecticut and Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, or North Carolina. Here is a book which narrows Quaker activities into no close geographic confines. Never prone to think of themselves as saints or heroes, Quakers here appear again and again as the most sensitive moral and social leaders. They appear so from the time of William Penn and Robert Barclay on through that of Thomas Eddy and Anthony Benezet.

The first rule of their life was they should be guided by the Inner Light, the body mystical of Christ; be guided by it, not for the sake of making converts, but that they might dwell in love and peace, offending no other men. But the needs of other men, the sufferings of Negro slaves, the poverty of landless Indians, whose numbers were ever increasing, and whose dearth of education made their condition the more appalling, were constantly in evidence.

Moreover in Pennsylvania, where at the close of the seventeenth century Friends looked eagerly forward to the success of the Holy Experiment as a political state, and where by 1750 it had proved a failure in the province, they had now to learn they could do more for the body politic by serving other men and their needs with benevolence, rising to every call. When the
Holy Experiment became genuinely social, only then did it really succeed for them.

A People Among Peoples moves backwards and forwards within chapters and between chapters. His chronology is always clear in the author's mind. Quaker activities are most scrupulously related to events. But John Woolman, Israel Pemberton, "King of the Quakers," Dr. John Fothergill, and Samuel Fothergill, are all in and out of chapters bearing these headings: "The Quaker Religious Fellowship in the American Colonies"; "The Rise and Progress of 'Charity' among the People called Quakers"; "Mutual Aid in the Monthly Meeting"; "Charity in Education"; "Charity among Meetings"; "Charity to Neighbors outside the Membership"; "Charity and the Negro Slave"; "The Victory of Abolitionist Principles among Friends"; "Government, Benevolence and the Quaker Revival"; "Coping with the Crisis of 1755"; "Private Societies to Do Good"; "Justice to the Negro"; "American Quakers and Social Service during the Revolution"; "The Society of Friends in Post-Revolutionary America"; "The First Flowering of Humanitarian Concerns"; "Humanitarianism among Friends."

If there be a sameness in chapter-title, and much apparent repetitiousness of phrasing, in content there is a very considerable variety. At great pains, amid a great complication of yearly meetings in far extending areas, of Monthly Meetings, Men's Meetings, Women's Meetings, and Meetings for sufferings, Mr. James makes clear Quaker acceptance of "the two traditional branches of the theological description of the church: the totality of souls united with God, or invisible church; and the organized religious fellowship on earth." It may well be doubted there was ever a more tightly organized church body; hence much of its health and long enduring power. Its Quaker "Inner Light" could suffer no harm from either Cambridge Platonists' Reason or the third Earl of Shaftesbury's moral sense "which responded with pleasure to acts conducive to society's well being."

As humanitarianism grew more and more acceptable as a practice—the impulse to it was always there—among Quakers, it became a guiding principle in their mission work for the Senecas, or Cornplanter Indians in northwestern Pennsylvania and nearby New York, a work led by Joel Swayne, Henry Simmons, Jr., and Halliday Jackson, and the most successful of all eighteenth-century Quaker work in the Indian field. Nor was there any feeling of risk as the young missionaries came into contact with the mystical new Indian faith of Handsome Lake.

Slave holding, even more than the problems of the Indians, had long been breaking down the limitations of "charity" to outsiders. Between Quaker and Indian was implicit equality. But the Negro was an owned person, belonging to a Quaker by purchase or inheritance, or belonging to an outsider by purchase or inheritance. How to justify with "charity" ownership in either instance?

To the Quaker mind the slave traffic became repugnant: seizure of Africans, sale of them, their wives, their children into the agrarian white families in America, and adoption of them in the household, created problems as trying and difficult as they were macabre for owner and for owner's
friends in the Society. How to own, to live with Negro slaves, to let fellow Friends live with theirs? How to have a Friend die, settle his estate, sell his slaves and to exercise a right “charity”? How to manumit one’s own slaves and to provide a proper protection and guidance?

It was the preacher John Woolman who saw most clearly every problem involved in slave ownership and in manumission. The abolitionist effort had by mid-century become general among colonial Friends. It was Woolman who supplied “one partially new concept to the antislavery point of view that slave-owning, as a flagrant violation of the divinely ordained brotherhood of man, might bring God’s wrath down on Friends for tolerating it.” As Woolman saw it “the duty of Quakers to their Negroes in the religious sphere was to use proper means for their acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures, and the advantage of true Religion, prepare them for liberty in Christ as much as possible, but not necessarily draw them into the Religious Society.”

James’s *A People Among Peoples* is a great work dealing with a great subject, supplied with a most comprehensive bibliography of sources, with notes and index. It demonstrates more than well how the eighteenth-century Quaker Church purified itself, and by its philanthropies “showed the way of virtue and public policy to fellow Americans.”

_Hubertis M. Cummings_

The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, Volume 6, April 1, 1755, through September 30, 1756. Leonard W. Labaree, Editor, Ralph L. Ketcham, Associate Editor, Helen C. Boatfield and Helene H. Fineman, Assistant Editors. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963. Pp. 581. $10.00.)

One might expect that arranging chronologically the papers of a man as versatile as Benjamin Franklin would make each volume a slice of miscellanea. On the contrary, each new installment exhibits considerable unity of theme. Imperial organization dominates volume five, electrical experiments the preceding volume, and military affairs the current volume. Franklin was a man of many sides, but he concentrated on one side at a time.

To be sure there were many non-military diversions in the eighteen months this volume covers. Franklin’s description of a whirlwind and correspondence concerning electricity demonstrate his continuing interest in science; he adds further honors (a Master of Arts degree from William and Mary and election both as a Fellow of the Royal Society and as a corresponding member of the Royal Society of Arts) to his already impressive list; he continues his light correspondence with Catherine Ray; Poor Richard issues yet another almanac; and Franklin hoaxes friends with his “Parable against Persecution” recited while apparently reading Genesis.

Nevertheless, the defense of Pennsylvania dominates these pages. Members of the Pennsylvania Historical Association will recall Editor Leonard W. Labaree’s dinner address at Washington, Pennsylvania, in 1961, published in *Pennsylvania History* (XXIX, 7-23) as “Benjamin Franklin and
the Defense of Pennsylvania, 1754-1757." Here are most of the sources that talk was based upon. In the spring of 1755 General Edward Braddock desperately needed 150 wagons, which Virginia and Maryland, despite their promises, had failed to supply. Within a few weeks Franklin procured the wagons in Pennsylvania at considerable financial risk to himself. Braddock, eternally grateful (not so long in his case), acknowledged that without Franklin he could not have marched over the mountains, and that this wagon contract was almost his only contact with ability and honesty in the colonies.

After Braddock's defeat Franklin was involved in the struggle over financing the defense of Pennsylvania. The assembly wished to raise money by taxing all land including the Penn proprietary estates, while Governor Robert Hunter Morris wished to exempt these estates. By August, 1755, Franklin abandoned his earlier role of mediator and led the assembly's antiproprietary party. The impasse continued even after the Indians began to ravage the Pennsylvania frontier in October. Quaker reluctance to abandon their traditional pacific Indian policy and vociferous frontiersmen demanding action further complicated politics. By late November, however, the impasse was temporarily broken when both a defense appropriation bill (the proprietary lands were not to be taxed, but the Penns gave the province £5,000) and an act written by Franklin creating a voluntary militia, were passed.

The toll of the controversy exceeded frayed nerves and ruined friendships. "You will see," Franklin exploded, "the Difficulties this Province has been under by Proprietary Restraints, so that we could not obtain a Bill for raising Money for the King's Use, till it had been sent home to England, and the Proprietary's Leave obtain'd for Passing it; and in the meantime the King's Service was obstructed, our Publick Affairs went into the utmost Confusion, Hundreds of Families were driven from their Habitations, and the People ripe for an Insurrection. If we cannot have a Governor of some discretion (for this Gentleman is half a Madman) fully empower'd to do what may be necessary for the Good of the Province and the King's Service, as Emergencies may arise, this Government will be the worst on the Continent." If it wasn't for his love of Pennsylvania, Franklin claimed he "would remove immediately into a more quiet Government, Connecticut."

Instrumental in gaining defense legislation, Franklin became an administrator of it. By the terms of the £60,000 defense appropriation he was one of seven commissioners appointed to dispense the funds and became engaged particularly in early 1756 with the defense of Northampton County. Appointed commander of that county after an attack on Gnadenhütten (Weissport), Franklin spent over a month north of the Blue Mountains supervising the construction of Forts Allen and Norris and one later called Fort Franklin. Returning to Philadelphia in early February he was elected colonel of the City Regiment, a position of more political than military significance. Franklin's enemies in the proprietary party were now painfully aware that he had under his command 1,000 militia. Displaying more
energy and ingenuity in field and assembly than any other Pennsylvanian, Franklin was more popular than ever.

The sixth volume of these papers continues the high editorial standards of the preceding volumes. We have come to expect model introductions, such as the one to the "Parable against Persecution," and we are not disappointed. It is, however, in tracing the tortuous course of Pennsylvania politics and Indian affairs in this crucial period when the "Stiffrumps" (Quakers) withdrew from the legislature that the editors particularly demonstrate their skill. They do not interpret the Franklin papers narrowly, but include, for example, Governor Morris's tirade against Franklin in his long letter to Thomas Penn concerning the defense appropriation and the militia act. Integrating documents with their notes, the editors create a meaningful narrative which students of Pennsylvania history will read with profit and enjoyment.

"Life, like a dramatic Piece," Franklin wrote his evangelist friend George Whitefield, in July, 1756, "should not only be conducted with Regularity, but methinks it should finish handsomely. Being now in the last Act, I begin to cast about for something fit to end with." The act was as handsome as it was long, and it is a pleasure to anticipate subsequent volumes of this "variorum" edition.

Pennsylvania State University

Ari Hoogenboom


When it came to portraits, Benjamin Franklin was as practical minded as he was about things in general. Though little concerned with "the poetry of art," he did prize a good resemblance; moreover, "he knew the persuasive force of pictures," and in an age increasingly addicted to them he was fully aware of the uses of portraiture in establishing the image of a public personage. Therefore, says Mr. Sellers at the outset of his survey, Franklin "was to take pleasure in having his own portrait made and in giving it away to others, a thing which he did more liberally than any other American of his time."

Benjamin Franklin in Portraiture contains a well-nigh exhaustive record of these makings and givings; for with the thoroughness of the true scholar Charles Coleman Sellers, one of the ablest historians of early American art and best known as the authority on the Peales of Philadelphia, has traversed not only the main trail that he set out to follow but diligently has penetrated the bypaths branching from it in order to broaden understanding of the terrain. The result is a work of solid value in its field, written in a clear and lively style, one that provides enjoyable reading in itself as well as being an addition of prime importance to any shelf of Franklinia.

The works discussed and illustrated range in time from a curious posthumous painting of Franklin's younger son (d. 1736) to his own death mask, and in media through those of oil painting, watercolor, pencil draw-
ing, black silhouette, engraving, enamel, and the sculptor's materials of marble, bronze, wax, and plaster. They are represented in 44 plates containing more than 150 cuts, plus a colored frontispiece of the enamel miniature of Franklin by Jean Baptiste Weyler. Quality of reproduction is only fair—often details are lost in blackly printed areas—but in this case a well chosen quantity of illustrations is more useful by far than their inherent brilliance, and for its purpose the coverage here is ample.

In nine chapters of narrative Mr. Sellers deals chronologically with all the known life portraits of Franklin. Demonstrating in the process the many-faceted nature of portraits as artifacts, he discusses the circumstances in which each was made, the persons involved in addition to the subject—artists, patrons and peripheral figures, documentation and at times the problems of uncertain attribution, and of course the nature and qualities of the works themselves. By its fullness of detail the study evinces and justifies the decade of careful investigation on both sides of the Atlantic that went into its preparation; nevertheless, in his handling of minutiae Mr. Sellers is characteristically and refreshingly unstuffy—he can be lightly apologetic for "all this zany background to a Franklin portrait," and his numerous capsule identifications of people are warmly human as well as informative.

It is the author's conclusion that there is no "standardized" portrait of Franklin. Among those best known, David Martin's popular "thumb portrait" of about 1766 shows his subject "at the climax of the British years," the 1777 sculptured bust by Jean Jacques Caffieri is judged "the truest likeness," and that by Jean Antoine Houdon (1778) "the truest characterization." Around 1780 Charles Philippe Amédée Vanloo painted "the greatest private portrait"; but according to Mr. Sellers the highest accolade goes to what he terms "the supreme public portrait of Franklin" painted in 1778 by Joseph Siffred Duplessis. Of its two versions, the "Fur Collar" oil in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and the "Gray Coat" pastel in the New York Public Library, Mr. Sellers regards the pastel as the original and the oil as a salon picture made after it. The fact that the best portraits of Franklin were executed in England and in France is indicative not so much of any possible inferiority of American artists (unhappily he was never painted by Copley) as of the role that he himself so long played as his country's most respected European representative.

Following the narrative section is a catalogue of "the matrix portraits," listed alphabetically according to names of artists, wherein the factual material pertaining to the originals, significant derivatives and copies from them is summarized. In itself the catalogue, which runs to 240 pages, constitutes a scholarly reference work of enduring usefulness.

Here, then, is a definitive treatment of "that iconography which did so much to sustain Franklin's historic position and to prolong his popular fame." The book is beautifully printed, and for its size and format seems modestly priced.

*Pennsylvania State University*  
HAROLD E. DICKSON

William Fitzhugh may not have been the "typical" seventeenth-century founder of a Virginia landed family, but he approached this ideal in many ways. His middle-class English origins, the time of his emigration, the general, if not the specific pattern of his politics, and, of course, his concern with building an estate, all fit the pattern fairly closely. He was, however, atypical of his time and class in that his personal papers, presented here with an excellent introduction and with careful annotation by Professor Davis, have survived in some quantity.

The youngest child and younger son of a Bedford woolen draper, Fitzhugh apparently arrived in Virginia during the early 1670's with little more than good connections and some learning in the law. As a lawyer he prospered and won a reputation in the colony for his erudition. His letters on legal matters show him as a conservative who could build a case on precedents and authorities, although, as Professor Davis demonstrates, these citations were taken largely from the marginal notations in the Statutes at Large and from Coke's Reports and Institutes. Thus, while Fitzhugh criticized other Virginia lawyers for their tendency to make new law without proper concern for the old, he displayed at this early date the common American tendency to find the old in a few pre-digested sources.

If the law was the way to repute, tobacco planting was the route to wealth. The Fitzhugh letters are an unusually rich source for tobacco cultivation and trade in the late seventeenth century. We see, for example, Fitzhugh's early dependence on and preference for Negro field labor as against indentured servants. His letters to English commission merchants are full of the vexations of the trade: insufficiency of ships, bad prices, bad leaf, and factors who exceeded their authority. Fitzhugh also looked for alternative forms for this commerce. He offered to gather whole shiploads of the leaf in return for English goods which he would sell on commission, and asked for recommendations for men to operate "trading towns" in Virginia.

Upon his tobacco and legal profits, Fitzhugh built a landed estate far in excess of his own needs or those of his immediate descendants. This was comparatively easy in that proving ground of American land speculation, the Northern Neck of Virginia. Fitzhugh was in a central position in this development. He was closely associated with the Proprietary and, during the last years of his life, was its resident agent. It is not inconceivable that these associations bolstered Fitzhugh's generally Toryish political tendencies. Whatever the case, he could much more often be found on the gubernatorial side in the struggles of the times than most of his usual political allies. Most of these, though of an anti-Baconian complexion, found little merit in the governors who followed Sir William Berkeley.

In spite of its real interest, the question might be raised as to whether
this book needed to be done. Of the edited materials, only William Fitzhugh's will and inventory are printed whole for the first time. The bulk of the letters, taken then from a nineteenth-century copy of the Fitzhugh letter book, were published in the early volumes of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, while a letter and petition of Fitzhugh to the Stafford County Court appeared in the same publication in 1937. The only other items included in the present volume, three speeches to the House of Burgesses, were printed in H. R. McIlwaine's edition of the *Journals* of that body. This, then, is not "new" material as such. The older versions of these papers have been used and re-used by historians. Still Fitzhugh was a significant figure and probably deserves as complete a collection of his writings as this one is. Professor Davis also lends value to the volume in his introduction, which adds considerably to earlier treatments of its subject and his milieu. The letters are transcribed here from an early eighteenth-century copy and are presumably much more accurate than the older published versions. Professor Davis has also provided as complete annotation as is possible for obscure seventeenth-century Americans.

This reviewer has only one reservation on the editing of these papers. Why, since they have no real literary or philological value, were they not normalized in punctuation and in abbreviation along the common sense lines followed by the editors of the Jefferson, Franklin, and Adams papers? This would have given greater readability to a significant historical source without damaging either its meaning or style. It would have also avoided the badly reproduced pages in this volume where archaic scrivener's marks were apparently added by hand in page proof and were then printed from photo-offset plates.

*University of Delaware*  

GEORGE F. FRICK


Director Karl Landstrom, of the Federal Bureau of Land Management, once the General Land Office, found himself in the midst of two anniversary seasons: the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the creation of the Land Office, and the Centennial of the Homestead and Land Grant College Acts. The responsibilities of his office and this "rash" of celebrations suggested the desirability of "more research in the public land records." So he called into being an advisory board. These associates recommended the publication of a selection of significant scholarly contributions to the history of the public lands and their administration, not only to emphasize what has been done and can be done by such studies, but also to emphasize what has not been done.

Vernon Carstensen, of the University of Wisconsin, together with Philip M. Raup, Thomas LeDuc, Allen G. Bogue, and Marion Clawson have selected twenty-four of the best articles dealing with the past of land management and pointing out present problems. These articles are supplied...
with appropriate introductions by the editors and supplemented by seven appendices which supply statistical, graphic, and bibliographical guides to the material which is available in such abundance and so little used.

These very carefully selected articles show a confused and confusing story. The land system was contrived in a rational age which believed not only in order and in reason but in the power of the rational to maintain the cherished order. So a rectangular survey was decreed despite the irregular contours and the great variety of terrain punctuated by forests, rocks and waters, rivers, swamps and mountains. It was truly an incongruous system. Then too, there were human limitations in the face of such hazards and difficulties of administration.

Besides these problems were others produced by optimism, altruism and greed. The combination of these traits suggested gifts to the individuals and subsidies to the interests, all in the name of advancing the strength and power of the nation. Vast estates were allotted to railroads, even greater empires presumably to the hardy homesteader. Much of this great congeries of gifts enriched the speculator, despoiled the citizen, and corrupted governmental administration.

Nowhere can be found a more graphic and more convincing picture of this century and a half of confusion, maladministration, great achievement, and heroic battle for honest government in the interest of the public welfare. As the editors point out, however, the story has not been told, much work needs to be done in materials which though available are difficult to handle, so intricate are they. The field is white for the harvest but the laborers are few. Those who have conceived and contrived this compilation deserve high praise for their skillful efforts. Let us hope their call will be heeded. We need to know the whole story, not only of our great achievement, but also of the unfortunate elements of failure.

University of Pennsylvania

ROY F. NICHOLS


This book illustrates one aspect of what Max Lerner meant when he stated in _America As a Civilization_ that "The most continuous American revolutionary is the American woman." One of the most noteworthy facets of the nineteenth-century feminist crusade, but one which has received far less attention than the concomitant struggle for political rights, was the invasion by women of many professions which had previously been barred to members of their sex. Taking her theme from Margaret Fuller's confident assertion that women could fill the requirements for any occupation—"let them be sea-captains, if you will"—Madeleine B. Stern has sketched the careers of fourteen female professional "firsts," including such persons as Louise Bethune in architecture, Sarah G. Bagley in telegraphy, Lucy Hobbs Taylor in dentistry, Ellen H. Richards in chemistry, and Candace Wheeler in interior decoration, along with such well-known figures as
Belva Ann Lockwood in the field of law and Victoria C. Woodhull, “America’s First Woman Stockbroker.” Of special interest to students of Pennsylvania history is a chapter devoted to the life of Rebecca Lukens, who served throughout the second quarter of the nineteenth century as manager of the Brandywine Iron Works, predecessor of the modern Lukens Steel Company at Coatesville.

Miss Stern is an experienced biographer who has previously written lives of Margaret Fuller, Louisa May Alcott, and Mrs. Frank Leslie, as well as Imprints on History, a book of essays on the careers of various American printers and publishers. With commendable enthusiasm, an engaging prose style, and a capacity for digging into obscure and half-forgotten sources, she has helped to sustain public interest in a few well-known figures from the past and has rescued a number of comparatively minor ones at least temporarily from historical oblivion. Although We the Women displays a tendency toward occasional overstatement and becomes at times tiresomely eulogistic, the information it contains and the verve with which it is written make it a welcome addition to the present secondary literature on American feminism, a field in which really satisfactory works are frustratingly meager. Perhaps it will stimulate further efforts to learn how women established themselves in a variety of professions and lead to book-length studies of some of the more important pioneers involved in this struggle. Ellen H. Richards, for example, would appear to be a promising subject for such treatment.

According to Miss Stern, three considerations influenced the selection of the women discussed in this book: “the problem of establishing priority; the problem of coupling with priority a colorful life and an interesting, fruitful career; the problem of locating an abundance of source material on this subject.” Even with these criteria as guides, the reader may question the inclusion of certain individuals in this work and the omission of others. Elizabeth Blackwell is the most obvious example in the latter category, especially since one would think that the first female medical doctor deserves mention alongside the first female dentist, Lucy Hobbs Taylor, and the first female ophthalmologist, Isabel Barrows. One also wonders why Antoinette L. Brown was excluded, leaving the ordained ministry without representation in Miss Stern’s list of “firsts.” On the other hand, if the unifying theme of the volume is to be the way in which American women invaded professions formerly closed to them, one might question the appropriateness of including such figures as Mary Ann Lee and Ann S. Stephens, however colorful the details of their lives. Although it may justly be said that Miss Lee was “The First American Ballerina to Capture the Nation” and that Mrs. Stephens was “The Author of the First Beadle Dime Novel,” the fact remains that the fields of professional dancing and the authorship of books were not opened by these women. Finally, even if Harriet Irwin may have been “the first woman actually to patent an architectural innovation for a dwelling,” she was hardly what one would call a professional architect.

Such objections are likely to be encountered by any author writing a book on a little-explored theme. A more serious reservation, at the risk of
criticizing Miss Stern for failing to achieve a goal toward which she did not aim, involves the question of whether We the Women approaches its subject matter from the most potentially meaningful perspective. From the scholarly point of view, one of the most pronounced shortcomings of many works on the history of feminism to date is that they are written primarily to celebrate and eulogize rather than to understand and analyze. It is good to have the interesting career sketches contained in this book, but we are even more in need of works which will attempt to make significant generalizations about the backgrounds from which important female pioneers came, the motives which stimulated them to achievement, the obstacles which confronted them, the aspects of American life which permitted (and in some cases actually helped to facilitate) their rise, the nature and extent of female influences in various aspects of our national development, and the ways in which women have sought to fulfill the complex functions they are called upon to play in modern society. Miss Stern has provided us with some raw material for this task, but has not addressed herself directly to it. In this respect it is particularly interesting to contemplate the forthcoming publication of Notable American Women, a multi-volume biographical dictionary currently being prepared at Radcliffe College under the editorship of Edward T. James. With the completion of this project, to which Miss Stern herself has contributed a number of sketches, we may at last have at our disposal a mass of information from which the generalizations we need may be drawn, and a new phase in the historiography of American feminism will begin.

The Hayley Museum

W. David Lewis


Although this volume is small, it nevertheless constitutes a fairly detailed history of the Library of Bucknell University; and were it not for the dramatic achievements of the last dozen years, it would be a drab history. It is true that in the earliest years of the University (then known as the University at Lewisburg), its first president, the Reverend Howard Malcolm, took an active interest in its incipient library, and through the solicitation and encouragement of gifts, a collection of more than 2,000 volumes was got together by 1854; but support for the Library authorized by the trustees seems to have amounted to little more than $300; and thereafter, for many years, the Library was left entirely dependent upon gifts. As in other institutions of the period, some assistance was gained through small collections of books gathered by student literary societies; but down to the end of the 1870's the progress of the Library was slow. An overly conservative board and administration resisted spending money on book acquisitions.

Thereafter, there was a change for the better. Pressure from students, faculty, alumni, and generous friends resulted in considerable additions to book collections. A reading room (supported by student subscription) was
provided, and the Library was kept open longer hours. But as late as 1887 there was still no fund (either from endowment or appropriation) for the purchase of books, no usable catalogue, and no full-time librarian.

From the end of the 1880's to the end of World War I, the University itself was in the process of transition from a conservative small liberal arts college to a real university with an expanded curriculum in full touch with the changing world about it; and the Library was gradually transformed along with it.

A catalog of sorts was completed by 1897. Collections had by then grown to some 16,000 volumes, and the trustees were making occasional appropriations for the purchase of books. At long last a separate building was erected for the Library through a gift of $30,000 from Andrew Carnegie in 1904-1906. Thereafter growth was steady but not dramatic, and was still mainly the result of gifts.

By the end of World War I, collections had grown to some 40,000 volumes, but there was still no full-time librarian or staff of professional assistants. The Library was, so to say, taken for granted by students and administration and trustees. "It stood as a glaring example of what can happen to a library that is compelled to live, for the most part, on charity. It had not kept pace with the growth of the institution of which it was a part."

In 1922, Bucknell got its first full-time librarian in the person of Miss Eliza J. Martin, daughter of Professor William E. Martin who, for the past twenty-eight years, had administered the Library as a part-time position along with his professorship. Miss Martin was an enthusiastic, hard-driving administrator, but without professional training. Under her, important advances were made. By the time of her death in 1938, collections had grown to some 63,000 volumes. The Library got its first budget in 1923-24. A staff of three professional assistants was added between 1927 and 1931.

Miss Martin was succeeded by Harold W. Hayden, a fully-trained and experienced librarian, and under his leadership, and that of President Marts, the new era in Bucknell's Library history may be said to have begun. The Carnegie building was now hopelessly outgrown, and a campaign to raise funds for a new building was soon undertaken. World War II caused a serious interruption; but the campaign was resumed soon afterwards and was brought to a triumphant conclusion in 1950 through the magnificent benefactions of Mrs. Ellen Clarke Bertrand. The new building, named after her, was occupied in 1951, and she contributed a maintenance fund of almost a half-million dollars. Finally, upon her death in 1960 her bequest to the Library was so great as to provide an annual income of about $225,000. Growth of collections during the 1950's had also been spectacular. By 1961 they had reached a total of 187,000 volumes.

Professor Oliphant's volume is not easy reading, but it is well documented and gives us the impression of care and accuracy in its preparation.

_Mystic Seaport Library, Mystic, Conn._

_Charles W. David_
Samuel Insull has long held a conspicuous place in the pantheon of prototypal American figures. He has served, now, for a generation or more of American historians as a prime symbol of the thrust to large, and ultimately disastrous, corporate combination that characterized the 1920's. Nothing, it is commonly held, was more evocative of the dangerous developments of that decade than the holding company; and no set of holding companies was more awesome in its majority, or more dismal in its collapse, than was Insull's Middle West utilities empire.

But Forrest McDonald's unusual biography offers us a dramatically different picture of the man and his work. McDonald's Insull was a stupendously able and responsible man of business. He trained himself to be an expert stenographer, read widely in "classic works in political economy, history, and literature," and quickly achieved his boyhood goal: to be the secretary and confidant of Thomas A. Edison. While still in his early twenties, Insull became the major financial adviser of the great inventor, and played the primary role in creating the Edison Electric Company. There he established a "model for American manufacturing companies" by championing good labor relations, low prices, and the largest possible market for his product. Deviled by narrow-minded New York financiers and by opponents in the Edison coterie, Insull left to head the Chicago Edison Company.

After the panic of 1893 Insull became his own financier; a portentous step, for “Chicago had set out to overthrow New York as master of the continent. Before it could do so, Chicago itself needed a master.” Now it was to get one in Insull: “The perceptive among [Chicago financiers] . . . must have sensed that they stood to him roughly as the second and third consuls stood to Napoleon; he would not deal with them as equals very long.” McDonald tells us that Insull in his prime could lay claim to considerable personal courage; substantial and anonymous charitable work; a beautiful, virtuous ex-actress wife; and a remarkable set of eyes. By 1900 Insull was in firm command of the Chicago electric market; for the next three decades he was “perhaps the most consistently successful and powerful political operator in American business.” He pioneered in corporate financing devices such as the open-end mortgage and in the development of rural electrification; is credited by McDonald with the source of the term “mass production”; actively and successfully sought the lowest possible electric rates and beneficent labor relations; and favored government regulation of public utilities. As McDonald several times phrases it, Insull, Chicago—and the author—came to believe that this magnate was “power’s safest repository.”

Possibly spurred by personal difficulties with his wife, Insull plunged into ever more grandiose ventures in the second and third decades of the century. During World War I he was the spark plug of the Illinois Council of National Defense. There he learned techniques of public relations and ad-
vertising that he was able to put to good use during the 1920's in selling the securities necessary for the financing of his utilities empire, and in developing a public climate favorable to the utilities business. Thus equipped, Insull was able to break through the "regulatory bottleneck" of the war period and push on to new levels of productivity and business "rationalization" (Insull's—and McDonald's—euphemism for consolidation).

Thus Insull's utilities empire came to its full grandeur in the 1920's. His Committee on Public Utility Information widely disseminated "the fundamentals of utility economics." His employe relationships (which included putting union chieftains on the company payroll, and pressuring white-collar employes to participate in community activities) produced an esprit de corps "seldom equalled in modern industrial history."

But an unsavory lot of enemies conspired to destroy this kindly giant. The crew included the elite of Chicago's Gold Coast, put off by Insull's humble origins and by his business acumen; what McDonald constantly refers to as "perennially unsuccessful" reformers; and, most important of all, the New York Establishment—banks, trust companies, and investment bankers (Morgan at their head) who were determined to gobble up Insull's fresh and magnificent midwestern venture.

After the stock market crash, the harpies closed in. Ambitious or embittered politicians—Franklin Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, Harold Ickes—stepped up their attacks on Insull. "An era was dawning, the era of trial by newspaper, by smear and innuendo, by headline-hunting politicians who made spectacular hit-and-run charges." The New York banking community began to put financial pressure on Insull, and finally brought him down. Reluctantly, the magnate removed himself to Athens. But the government put "extralegal" pressure on Greece to get him expelled; and he returned to America. Put on trial as the scapegoat of the business community for the disaster of the depression, he was thoroughly exonerated. "For his fifty-three years of labor to make electric power universally cheap and abundant, Insull had his reward from a grateful people: he was allowed to die outside prison."

What are we to make of this remarkable case of special pleading? First, let us note the first-rate quality of much of the book. McDonald's explanations of Illinois politics and his descriptions of the construction of Insull's empire are models of historiographical clarity, understanding, subtlety, and sophistication.

It is cause for profound regret that an historian with such strong gifts of expression and analysis should be so lacking in balance and perspective. McDonald goes far beyond the normal need or prerogative of the biographer to feel sympathy with, to identify with his subject. Insull is presented as a man motivated almost always by the strongest of altruistic purposes. His enemies, however, are all too fallible. Harold L. Ickes's opposition is explained primarily as the consequence of a snub administered by Insull during the World War. Adolf Berle's hostility is linked to his belief that Insull's utilities organization had his Modern Corporation and Private Property suppressed in Illinois. That these men might have more broadly-based
reasons for looking on Insull's work with some scepticism is not within the author's realm of possibility.

There is a flaw in this book even more serious than its special pleading. Quite rightly, McDonald views Insull as a business magnate whose chief role was the consolidation and systematization of an American industry in the early twentieth century. (Incidentally, this role was not as rare as McDonald apparently thinks it was.) But by viewing the consolidation process strictly as a device for the public good, McDonald totally ignores its social hazards. Thus, the popular revulsion against this process becomes for the author something evil, small-minded, myopic, instead of what it was: a development no less widespread and justified than business "rationalization" itself.
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