The vastness of the American wilderness of the eighteenth century made the colonists realize that the surveyor was an important and learned man. His knowledge of mathematics and astronomy and complex optical instruments was required to mark the metes of a settler’s farm, to lay out a proposed town or to establish the boundary line of a colony. Often the surveyor-general of a colony commanded a salary exceeded only by that of the governor.

A number of the colonial surveyors achieved international recognition for their scientific contributions. Rittenhouse, Lukens, and Baily of Pennsylvania and Leeds of Maryland were known in the eighteenth century scientific world and had papers published in the leading technical journals of the day.

Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon, mathematicians, astronomers, and surveyors, were called to America by the Penn and Calvert families to survey the boundary between Pennsylvania and Maryland. Although the local colonial surveyors might have been successful in laying out the boundary, Mason and Dixon, being from the mother country, automatically enjoyed a reputation of being experts. They deserved this respect. They were internationally known astronomers and surveyors and had the finest optical instruments that could be fabricated at the time.

Mason and Dixon would be relatively unknown today if it had not been for the ethical and political differences between the North and South. Because the boundary line that they surveyed is considered to be the geographical separation between the North and South, their names have become household words.

Reams of paper have been written and published on the Mason-Dixon Line. Most have been from the viewpoint of the lawyer or historian and deal largely with the territorial controversy between the Calverts and Penns. The few papers about Mason and Dixon’s technical achievements have been buried in scientific journals. Very little has been published on Mason or Dixon’s personal adventures in the American wilderness. Dr. Cummings's book attempts to fill the gap and describes Mason’s and Dixon’s work on the survey of the boundary from the viewpoint of their daily activities. For the most part, the book is a day by day recital of their efforts and is based upon Charles Mason's original survey journal, copies of which are in the National Archives and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Dr. Cummings has supplemented the knowledge obtained from
Mason's diary with research in many official records still in the possession of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. An excellent bibliography is included, which lists the latest publications on Mason, Dixon, and their work.

Mason's original journal is disturbingly laconic. The reader is constantly disappointed that Mason did not include more detail about the wilderness through which he passed, his encounters with the Indians, colonial personalities whom he must have met, life in the frontier forts, and his journeys to New York and Williamsburg when surveying activities were suspended during the winters. Instead the diary is filled with survey notes relating to geodesy and positional astronomy, esoteric subjects even today known only to a few specialists. Dr. Cummings has necessarily added color to Charles Mason's technical journal to describe adequately the surveyors' journeys along the boundary line in the settled portions of the colonies and across the wilderness of the Endless Mountains of Pennsylvania. Restraint, however, has been used, and the result is a book which is both historically and technically accurate yet readable. Dr. Cummings has been able to put in writing some of the feelings of enthusiasm and technical achievement that Mason and Dixon must have had for their work.

*The Mason and Dixon Line* is well printed, and its illustrations are many and generally excellent. Pictured are the types of surveying instruments used in the eighteenth century, existing boundary monuments set by Mason and Dixon, and landmarks along the survey line. A few times highly technical surveying techniques are described which could have been omitted. Dr. Cummings's work is an excellent reference book on the Mason-Dixon Line and is a worthwhile addition to one's library.

*Wilmington, Delaware*  
ROBERT E. SEDDON


Two of the major themes of this book will meet objections from some specialists. One is Bridenbaugh's view that Anglicans on both sides of the Atlantic sought to introduce episcopacy into America with the fundamental—though usually veiled—design of employing bishops to limit, ultimately, American political and religious liberties. The second is Bridenbaugh's incisively expressed opinion that "the American Revolution of 1760-1775 resulted quite as much from a religious as from a political change in the minds and hearts of the people." On each of these points Bridenbaugh skillfully marshals strong evidence, but this reviewer, although impressed, is in the end unconvinced. In my opinion the most important contribution of this important book is along another line.

In 1749-1750 and 1760-1770 Anglicans in England and America launched vigorous movements to establish bishops in the colonies. Both of these movements climaxed long, if erratic, trends in ecclesiastical policy, yet both of them utterly failed. Bridenbaugh tells us why they failed in this tightly and crisply written book. His sophisticated explanation of the twin Episcopalian failures is the greatest virtue of *Mitre and Sceptre.* Briden-
baugh states at the outset that he does not intend to replace Arthur Lyon Cross's old study, *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies* (1902). But he is too modest, for his book does replace the older work. True, the existence of Cross's monograph makes it possible for Bridenbaugh to skip the extensive textual digests of the pamphlet wars that were Cross's forte. However, at the level of explanation Bridenbaugh answers many fundamental questions that were left unanswered by Cross. One of the reasons that Bridenbaugh's work is so much more satisfactory is that *Mitre and Sceptre* truly gives us—as the subtitle states—transatlantic history. Bridenbaugh's success in explaining the Anglican failure is strongly rooted in his attention to the story on both sides of the ocean.

The struggle over an American episcopacy was a contest between English and American Episcopalians on the one hand and American and English Dissenters on the other. Bridenbaugh shows that the Dissenters triumphed in both 1749-1750 and 1760-1770 because of superior organization, information, and communications. Organization emerges as the key to both victories, but the nature of the organizational triumph was significantly different in each case. The key to Dissenter victory in the contention of 1749-1750 was an English lay group called the "Protestant Dissenting Deputies." The Dissenting Deputies were in turn the outgrowth of a less potent interfaith group of Dissenter clerics, the "Body of the Three Denominations." Bridenbaugh's pioneering use of the Dissenting Deputies' minutes is the research tour de force of the book. The Dissenting Deputies performed at least two crucial functions: (1) they were a vital organ of contact between American and English Dissenters and exerted a most important influence on American Dissenters, especially the New England Puritans, in the interest of greater religious toleration, and (2) they developed machinery by which the large American and English Dissenter community, could communicate and deal with the top Whig politicians of the British government. Hence, the Dissenting Deputies embodied an eighteenth-century "pressure group."

Crucial to the successful performance of both functions was the flow of information back and forth across the Atlantic. Here the Dissenters had a clear advantage, for their superior communications system meant that the Dissenters in England were always better informed about the real situation than their Anglican foes, who depended too much on the word of the fanatical Society for the Propagation of the Gospel missionaries in America. Most illuminating is Bridenbaugh's description of the Dissenters' defeat of Bishop Thomas Sherlock's 1749-1750 campaign to establish American bishops. In effect, the scheme was checked by the cooperation of the high Whig leaders, led by the Duke of Newcastle, and the Dissenting Deputies, headed by their astute and able chairman, Dr. Benjamin Avery. Newcastle, and before him, Sir Robert Walpole, did not wish to alienate the Dissenters who were staunch supporters of the Whig-Hanoverian regime in both England and America, and, more specifically, Newcastle and his brother, Henry Pelham, counted very strongly on the vote of the Dissenter interest in Parliament—thus affording Dr. Avery a leverage which he shrewdly exerted against the government. Not only did Newcastle brusquely oppose Sherlock's
campaign, but Henry Pelham and Lord Hardwicke kept Avery informed of Sherlock’s every move. And not only did Newcastle et al. willingly play Avery’s game of opposing Sherlock, but they succeeded in hushing the whole thing up so that Sherlock never gained any public support to speak of, hence the government was spared the politically embarrassing spectacle of an open contest between English Dissenters and Anglicans over an American bishop.

Rather different was the Dissenters’ organizational triumph of 1760-1770. Following Bridenbaugh, one might say that the success of 1749-1750 was a victory of hidden maneuver, but the triumph of 1760-1770 was essentially a propaganda victory based upon the superior intercolonial ties of the American Dissenters. The Episcopalian campaign of the 1760’s was headed by the primate, Thomas Secker, in England and the Reverend Thomas Bradbury Chandler in America. Led by the likes of Ezra Stiles, Jonathan Mayhew, Andrew Eliot, Francis Alison, and William Livingston—all of whom received direct or indirect inspiration, encouragement, and instruction from the doctrinaire English libertarian zealot, Thomas Hollis—the American Dissenters struck back in a shattering propaganda counter-offensive mounted on the triple front of pulpit, pamphlet, and newspaper. Having skillfully traced Dissenter communications across the Atlantic and within the colonies, and having cited Jonathan Mayhew’s 1766 plea to James Otis for a political correspondence system based on ecclesiastical modes, Bridenbaugh goes on to say:

Of the several sources from which proceeded the inspiration of those formidable organizations, the revolutionary committee of correspondence, none had been tried out so successfully over a long period or were more obviously right at hand than those of the Congregational and Presbyterian ministers, as Samuel Adams was quick enough to perceive. The nonconforming divines of England and America had invented and proved this device.

Thus one of Bridenbaugh’s key concepts is that the American Dissenters’ organization patterns of the 1760’s and earlier were prototypical for the political organization of the American Revolutionary movement of the 1760’s and 1770’s. The quotation above perhaps unduly glosses over the role of the colonial assemblies’ standing committees of correspondence, but Bridenbaugh’s perceptive exposition of Dissenter organization and correspondence techniques does indeed throw much light on one of the spectacular but still rather mysterious success stories of American history—the organization of the American Revolution.

Rutgers University

RICHARD MAXWELL BROWN


The two volumes now published are the first in the estimated twenty or so that will comprise the Adams Family Correspondence. A second
series of *Diaries* was begun with four volumes of John Adams's diaries and will be continued. A third series, of which nothing has yet appeared, will be the *General Correspondence*. The two volumes of family correspondence under review begin in 1761, but after ninety pages reach the year 1774; so the volumes are devoted largely to the next four years and consist of exchanges between John and Abigail and a few members of their immediate family, plus a number of letters to and from Mercy Otis Warren, who was no relative, and occasional ones to other friends. They end with John Adams's departure as United States minister to Holland.

This family correspondence, as can only be expected, lacks the meat to be found, for instance, in the *Adams-Jefferson Letters*, where every letter delights with its perceptiveness, philosophy, or humor. Here, by and large, the best letters are those exchanged by John and Abigail, if only because they permit us to know them better. The difficulty about historical personages is imagining them young, before they had achieved fame. Visually we picture them from portraits painted after middle age. Who could imagine President John Adams as a young man addressing his sweetheart as Diana and signing himself Lysander? Their early letters remind us that here was a well-matched couple, much in love and only slightly affected by the ripples of politics. After 1774 our admiration for Abigail grows from her cheerfulness, her resourcefulness, and her courage in the frequent and prolonged absences of her husband. She particularly earns our sympathy in 1777 when she suffers an uncomfortable fourth pregnancy and then gives birth to a stillborn child.

The opinions expressed by John and Abigail are especially interesting to read in retrospect. Both were always warmly admiring of George Washington; but they also much admired Charles Lee, even after his foolish capture. John Adams wished that Schuyler, Putnam, Spencer, and Heath would resign as generals. In March 1777 he predicted that America would lose nothing if Howe captured Philadelphia, and in July he declared that Howe and Burgoyne would never be able to meet. Abigail remarked in the same year that “Posterity who are to reap the Blessings, will scarcely be able to conceive the Hardships and Sufferings of their Ancestors.”

Early in the controversy John Adams wrote that the Whig newspapers in Massachusetts were imprudent in publishing resolves, boasting of local manufacturing, and retailing inflammatory statements, because they only provoked the ministry and merchants of England to measures of restraint: “The printers are hot, indiscreet men.” In another letter of 1774 he commented sarcastically: “A notion prevails among all parties that it is politest and genteel to be on the side of administration, that the better sort, the wiser few, are on one side; and that the multitude, the vulgar, the herd, the rabble, the mob only are on the other.” This notion infects some of our historians, and especially such novelists as Kenneth Roberts.

Another aspect of the conflict made clear in these letters of 1774 is easily forgotten: it was not the tenor of debate in Parliament that aroused men like Adams to hate their government. Rather it was the accumulation of local incidents and the poisonous atmosphere around Boston. Adams and
his compatriots saw bribery and corruption, venality and hypocrisy, a spirit of debauchery, insolence, and dissipation, all brought about by ministerial measures and the soldiers sent to enforce them. The killing of a boy by a customs officer was more resented than the king's speech from the throne.

Unfortunately for us, when Adams attended the first meeting of the Continental Congress he was so suspicious of the post "that I am determined to write nothing of consequence." The correspondence contains no mention of Lexington and Concord, and Adams was home when Washington took Trenton. Abigail received and transmitted a garbled account of Bunker Hill, and the usual false rumors prevalent in wartime were related. The Howe and Burgoyne campaigns, however, were followed closely.

It is not easy to draw the line between antiquarianism and historical interest. It is chiefly a matter of degree: both deal with the past, but one concerns itself with trivial matters, which may be interesting in themselves, and the other with significant facts and trends. In earlier publications of letters, nineteenth-century editors sought to avoid antiquarianism by omitting the insignificant and along with it the indecietate and unflattering, as well as correcting grammatical errors and occasionally changing words. As a result, scholars have felt themselves deprived and misled, especially the social historian. To avoid these sins, modern editors have decided to omit nothing, allowing the reader to examine everything, just as if he were leafing through the original manuscripts. But this method is not completely satisfactory, for in printed form it gives a kind of equal representation to the trivial and the significant. The editor abdicates any responsibility for selection, which is a virtue, albeit a limited one, but it is consonant with the demands of modern scholarship. Perhaps it is no criticism to remark that some of the letters in these two volumes possess no interest except to the Adams aficionado. And inevitably there are startling juxtapositions: a letter of no moment next to one of considerable importance.

The editing is highly satisfactory and rewarding. Any changes in printing are carefully noted. Persons mentioned are identified. The only disappointment is occasional references to footnotes already published in the Diaries which are not repeated here. Then there are long and wonderful notes, which are actually brief essays, such as the one to John Adams's letter of July 3, 1777. New volumes will be eagerly awaited.

William L. Clements Library,
The University of Michigan

Howard H. Peckham


Among that constellation of distinguished visitors who viewed the American Republic in its formative years is to be found the Marquis de Chastellux. No outstanding luminary, he has none the less shed light on our national
history and culture and has, moreover, provided delightful and leisurely reading in his *Travels*. While the editor of this handsome new edition has seen fit to call part of the Marquis's travels a "philosophical tour," the reader would do well to consider Chastellux's own appraisal that his is a "plain journal," however one very much enlivened by a felicitous style and engaging descriptions.

The truth is that this work displays no sustained, penetrating analysis or imaginative reflection on life in revolutionary America. Here and there in the journal one finds arresting comments, but only in the epilogue, an essay on "The Progress of the Arts and Sciences in America," does Chastellux truly philosophize, making a number of interesting remarks on government, society, and taste.

Chastellux, French man of letters on military duty, moves easily through American society and graciously introduces his reader both to the ruling elite and the common men of the American nation at that time. In this reviewer's opinion, the value of the work principally resides here, for Chastellux is a warm and engaging human being who enjoys the *bonhomic* that Americans invariably show him: a glass of Madeira with George Washington, a visit to the Schuylers, dinner with the very best of Philadelphia society, casual conversations with innkeepers. All in all, these are pleasant travels, made so by the author's earthy attitude, "for what are the disappointments that cannot be solaced by a good fire, a good supper, and good company?"

While Chastellux tends to be harsh in his commentary on the Quakers and suggests an American lack of imagination, he is, throughout his travels, favorably and happily impressed by the environment, both social and natural. His jaunty manner, ever-present vivaciousness, restrained curiosity and gentle French conceit keep the reader ever alert. There are few disappointments and many rewards, as the following excerpts demonstrate. "The fortune of the day was like that of America: the fog suddenly dispersed. . . ." Or, "politeness here is like religion in Italy, all in practice and nothing from principle." Finally, a description of the environs of West Point: "But in this wild and warlike abode, where one seems transported to the heart of Thrace and the retreat of the god Mars, we found, on our return in the evening, pretty women and an excellent cup of tea." Even in his capacity of amateur naturalist and student of Buffon, Chastellux maintains an appealing style, whether he is describing the Natural Bridge of Virginia or a hummingbird.

What the modern American reader most obviously encounters in this work is the active mind of a member of the eighteenth-century aristocratic *res publica literaria*. Here in America, serving under Generals Lafayette and Rochambeau, Chastellux was all the more attractive to the local inhabitants because he spoke English well. This distinct advantage, plus his own intellectual stature and open manner, allowed him to see and understand the new world in which he briefly served and lived. He provides us with a sophisticated and refreshing observation of the American scene.

The Institute of Early American History and Culture, which sponsored this publication, and Mr. Rice, the editor of the two volumes, are to be
commended. A pleasing format, useful maps, and well-produced photographs of homes in which Chastellux stayed embellish this edition. The translation, basically that made by George Grieve shortly after the first French edition of the entire work went to press, is effective. The introduction provided by Mr. Rice is intelligent and very useful.

Only one problem stands out in this edition, and that is the current one which plagues most scholarly works: the use and location of footnotes. As the notes comprise over 200 pages of the two volumes, the editor has wisely made them backnotes, but the reader desirous of glancing at references will sense mild frustration in using the present arrangement. The notes include lengthy and often interesting comments by Grieve, the few original notes of Chastellux and, finally, some notes of the present editor. The result is very weighty and here and there annoying. One cannot but wonder at the value of a note such as: "General Burgoyne's position . . . is marked today by the obelisk-like Saratoga Battle Monument, a historic site administered by the New York State Education Department," or of the comment: "See State Historical Marker E-18 on U. S. Route 1. . . ."

No one will doubt the value of the Travels or the wisdom which suggested the present republication of them. Casual and serious readers alike will find much pleasure and information in reading these two attractive volumes.

Grinnell College

RAYMOND BETTS

*Just South of Gettysburg: Carroll County, Maryland, in the Civil War.*


*Just South of Gettysburg* turns out to be Carroll County, Maryland, as reported during the Civil War in nearly a hundred excerpts drawn mainly from contemporary letters, journals, diaries, and newspapers. The editor and two collaborators, W. Harold Redcay and G. Thomas LeGore, have added explanatory sections and included dispatches from The Official Records of the War of the Rebellion. An attractive county map, which could use an end pocket, provides useful reference to the text.

The book will serve different ends, depending on the reader's involvement in Civil War history. It holds little for the scholar, with perhaps one exception. Professor Klein re-emphasizes the importance of the defensive line General George Gordon Meade had planned to establish along Pipe Creek just below the Pennsylvania border—planned, that is, until Gettysburg changed his mind. Professor Klein's article, reprinted from the Maryland Historical Magazine (Vol. 57, No. 2, June, 1962), contains a detailed map and description of Meade's line. From childhood Professor Klein has been spending summers in the ancestral home at Union Mills, which was built in 1797 by two brothers, Andrew and David Shriver. The Shriver manse is on Pipe Creek near the center of the proposed defense. The author's aim is to correct what he calls the geographical confusion of most historical maps of the area, and especially to locate a seldom-shown railroad from
Baltimore to Westminster. The presence of this supply and communications line adds support to Meade's choice of the position.

The book has more to offer Civil War buffs who love even the minutiae peripheral to the campaigns. From June 29 through July 2, 1863, five of the seven corps comprising the Army of the Potomac moved up through Maryland's Carroll County on the way to Gettysburg. Jeb Stuart's Confederate cavalry also passed through, pausing long enough for a skirmish near Westminster, to give countians about the only fighting they could boast. But the pens of inhabitants were already busy describing wartime activity. Secesh coddled the Johnny Rebs; Union sympathizers in greater numbers pampered soldiers of the North.

Among these writers two Shriver families of Union Mills, divided in their allegiance, left vivid accounts of feeding and entertaining officers and men on their respective sides and of "sassing" the enemy. Union troops took horses and forage from William Shriver but spared Andrew in the manse across the way. Stuart reversed the act. Thus the Union Mills letters perfectly illustrate the pain and embarrassment endured by well-intentioned persons of conflicting loyalties who struggled to keep their sentiments from destroying family itself. In another village the diary of a thirteen-year-old girl is equally absorbing.

Not all the selections in the book are as successful. Too much is included from recollections long after events; many of the dispatches from the Official Records are extraneous and out of tone; many scraps of passing local reference are likely to interest only the most dedicated countians. Often the editorial comment covers the same ground as the content it introduces, resulting in repetition and anticlimax. Generally the less effective material deals with events preceding and following the Gettysburg campaign. Because hardly enough happened in Carroll County, to flesh out the four years of war, there seems to be some straining for substance on the part of the editor. Only during late June and early July of 1863 did the county really "enjoy" its day(s) in the sun. And yet, fortunately, for this period the maternal ancestors of Frederic Shriver Klein, with able assists by several others, produced a record that decidedly merits its publication.

The Pennsylvania State University

Edward J. Nichols


The Maryland and Pennsylvania Railroad has been dying for an unconscionable length of time. Today it consists of 34 miles of questionably maintained single track from York to Delta, both in Pennsylvania, a property verging on the "streak of rust" category. Better known as the "Ma & Pa," especially to the hundreds of rail fans who enlivened its declining years, this living artifact betrayed evidences of its narrow gauge heritage in every inch of the 77.2 miles from York to Baltimore.

The right angle bend in the line at the Pennsylvania-Maryland border
was the result of predecessor companies, built for widely divergent purposes. The Pennsylvania corporation was the oldest, chartered as the Peach Bottom Railway Company in 1868 by Stephen G. Boyd, a school teacher turned legislator. This was to be the middle section of a narrow gauge empire connecting the Huntingdon County coal fields with Philadelphia. The eastern section was envisaged as running from Philadelphia to Peach Bottom, Lancaster County, where a ferry would connect with Peach Bottom, York County. A bridge over the Susquehanna was in the plans. The Peach Bottom Railway was projected to York or Hanover Junction. The western section was expected to overcome several mountain ranges and come to rest at Orbisonia.

Mistake number one was the retention of Colonel John M. Hood, Union Army veteran and future president of the Western Maryland Railroad, as the first chief engineer. A competent practitioner of his trade, he was currently a victim of "narrow gauge fever," and the eastern and middle sections were saddled with the short radius curves only possible when rails are a mere three feet apart. The eastern section pursued an independent existence as the Lancaster, Oxford & Southern Railroad, succumbing to its third receivership in 1919. The western section mercifully was never built.

A stock subscription of $50,000, promoted by York businessmen, secured the northern terminus for that city, and by July 4, 1874, the first nine miles to Red Lion were in operation. On April 15, 1876, the road reached Delta, with its slate mines that were to be the major source of revenue throughout the Ma & Pa's history. The first reorganization came on March 17, 1882, the company now being known as the York & Peach Bottom Railway Company. The branch from Delta to the latter point was completed in March 1883, justifying the name.

The southern half of the Ma & Pa was also cursed with the three-foot gauge. Commencing as the Baltimore & Delta Railway Company in 1879, it reached Delta January 21, 1884, having changed its name along the way to the Maryland Central Railroad. Completion was celebrated by the inevitable receivership in October of the same year, the road emerging in December 1888 as the Maryland Central Railway. Boyd was superintendent until the receivership and thus can be considered a factor of inspiration in both halves of the railroad. The rejuvenated Maryland Central leased the York & Peach Bottom, and in May of 1891 they merged as the Baltimore & Lehigh Railroad. Another bankruptcy occurred in 1893. This time the Pennsylvania portion became the York Southern Railroad, and the Maryland, the Baltimore & Lehigh Railway.

The York Southern converted to standard gauge in 1895, while the Baltimore & Lehigh did not follow suit, for financial reasons, until 1900. The author does not enlighten us on the difficulties this must have caused at Delta for five years, unless perchance the York Southern retained mixed gauge during the period. Standard gauging paved the way for a merger of stock interests, and February 12, 1901 saw the emergence of the Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad. This is still the corporate title, although the Maryland track was removed in 1958.
Author Hilton has not written for the historian; there are no footnotes and no bibliography. This book is designed for the railroad enthusiast. Better than half of the pages are devoted to photographs of operations, motive power, and rolling stock, profiles of the right-of-way, and facsimiles of old maps, annual passes, and timetables. The appendices consist of rosters of locomotives and passenger equipment of all component companies. 

Until the arrival of the diesel locomotive on the property in the mid-1940's, the Ma & Pa had a definite fin de siécle atmosphere. What would have been shabby gentility elsewhere was transformed into a graceful antiquity. The author confesses to a love affair with the line since 1941, stimulated by his perusal of a magazine article. This reviewer, who has made a dozen trips over the road since 1935, pleads equally enamored.

Mr. Hilton was on the faculty of the University of Maryland subsequent to 1949 and took advantage of his proximity to the property to acquire a thorough appreciation of its physical problems and evidently an excellent rapport with the management. He is sympathetic toward the latter's efforts to survive in an alien world, reminding us that the Ma & Pa was not created as a work of art but with the hope of pecuniary gain.

Hagley Museum

Hugh R. Gibb


This is an inspiring book. It places in clear light one of the great ideals of the people of the United States, their vigorous efforts to realize it, and the need of even greater effort to satisfy it as the objective becomes ever more difficult to attain. The great purpose is education for all American youth to the extent of their intellectual capacity, an education which must in large part be provided or aided at public expense. The centennial of the passage by Congress of the great act which marked public acceptance of this responsibility caused one of the Land Grant Colleges thereby established to invite a distinguished alumnus to deliver four lectures in celebration of this event. These lectures are this book.

Intellectual liberty for all in an open society where there is opportunity for self realization to the extent of each individual's capacity was the basic concept moving a series of dedicated founders. When the initial success was achieved, the Act of 1862, the real problem remained to be solved. How could certain acres of land given to each of the United States be translated into a series of more than thirty new institutions of higher learning, institutions with programs different from those prevailing? These colleges were to give training in agriculture and the mechanic arts. How could education regimented to the classics readjust? For a quarter of a century, it almost seemed as though the new organizers must be a series of Don Quixotes aided only by inept Sancho Panzas. The difficulties overcome and the courage and ingenuity of those who overcame them give cheer to those now worrying about the population explosion.

By the twentieth century men, money, freedom and leadership had been
created and mobilized, and in the next half century came building, growth and the creation of quality, the record of which makes one of the brightest pages in American educational history. The projected ideal seemed in sight. The elite and the masses could be adequately trained in an atmosphere of liberty and equality of opportunity. Agriculture had been exalted to a profession, the mechanic arts were transformed into academic disciplines. Co-education had become standard and university training a secular intellectual function.

As the republic passes into the second century of the operation of this act, thoughtful directors of public education are conscious of new determinants. We are both an affluent society and a species of welfare state. We exist in the midst of a cold war. We are desirous of both large-scale scientific concentration and a greater measure of general education. Also we must learn how to deal with numbers much greater than ever before. Freedom to inquire, to discuss and to disseminate must be maintained at the same time that our cherished ideal of equal opportunity must be preserved despite the expense. Already there are encouraging evidences of new bursts of ingenuity, but there are likewise signs of taxpayer resistance and anti-intellectualism. But as it was a century ago, so it is today. The future of democracy depends upon our ability to solve the problem of adequate education in the arts of successful maintenance of liberty. Effective education alone supplies this insurance. This last century solved many of the problems of maintaining this education, and this enlightened and inspiring history gives us faith to believe that the new problems will be handled with equal skill. Because of this hundred years of success, the American people "front the new century with more zeal, more conscientiousness and far more talent than they ever commanded before."

University of Pennsylvania

Roy F. Nichols


John Siney (1831-1880) was an early figure in American labor history. Irish-Catholic by birth, he was raised in Lancashire, England, and immigrated to Schuylkill County in 1863. He was the leading force in establishing the Workingmen's Benevolent Association (soon to become the Miners' and Laborers' Benevolent Association throughout the anthracite region), in the formation of the Miners' National Association, and in the Independent Party, which merged with the Greenback Party. It is debatable whether or not Siney's misfortunes warrant the subtitle of "Miners' Martyr." He did, however, suffer repeated failures due to the circumstances of his times.

The industrial anarchy of small mine operators in Schuylkill County allowed successful labor organization and the effective strike of 1869; this disunity of mine ownership gave way to Franklin B. Gowen's Reading Railroad empire, which absorbed a large majority of the independent mines. Siney's advocacy of arbitration, moderation, and reason proved too civilized
for the direct-action instincts of the mine laborer of that day. Moreover, the visionary sliding scale arrangement, which attached wages to the market value of anthracite coal, backfired as over-production, competition between the four hard coal basins, and the descent into the depression of the mid-1870's drove coal prices down to new lows. Siney's usefulness as president of the Miners' National Association was impaired by the low prices and massive unemployment. His attempts to get political support of labor's aims beyond Schuylkill County were nullified by the Independent Party's absorption into the Greenback movement.

Siney was an orator, not a writer. Since he did not leave a corpus of writings, a surviving organization, or a body of thought on the organization of labor, history has dealt harshly with him. Outside of Pennsylvania historians and specialists in labor history, he is virtually unknown. Edward Pinkowski has made the resurrection of John Siney's career a labor of love. An impressive bibliography reflects years of widespread searching for scattered remnants and fugitive materials, but the basic flaw remains. There is not enough evidence to bring John Siney alive. Despite Pinkowski's constant protestations, the image of the man is lost in an overly-long, journalistic potpourri of newspaper gleanings and partisan conjecture. Most of the notes—grouped by page at the rear of the volume—refer to newspaper accounts which do not seem to have been used critically. In one instance, Siney's words at the 1869 Avondale disaster are documented by Terence V. Powderly's autobiography in the *United Mine Workers Journal* of 1916.

Although the dearth of materials contributes to the uncritical scrapbook flavor, there is less excuse for the lack of perspective. Pinkowski substitutes melodrama for perspective and features the clash between the labor "goodies" and the capitalistic "badies"—especially between Siney, the "Sirius," "Spitfire," or "Sage" of St. Clair, and "bellicose" F. B. Gowen, "the blistering bull of the Reading Road," "riproarer of the Reading." Any serious attempt to place Siney objectively within his times is called into question by the omission from the bibliography of Rowland T. Berthoff's *British Immigrants in Industrial America* (1953), C. K. Yearley's *Enterprise and Anthracite; Economics and Democracy in Schuylkill County, 1820-1875* (1961), and Charles E. Kileen's unpublished University of Wisconsin Ph.D. thesis, "John Siney, the Pioneer in American Industrial Unionism and Industrial Government" (1942).

Inferior design, printing and production of this book should further dim the chances for proper recognition of Siney's role in Pennsylvania's labor history.

*Eleutherian Mills Historical Library*  
RICHMOND D. WILLIAMS


Professor Pollack has made a significant contribution to the continuing dialogue among historians of Populism by suggesting a different dimension to the movement than the one emphasized particularly by Richard Hof-
stadter. In contrast to interpretations of Hofstadter, Victor Ferkiss, and others who have characterized Populism as retrogressive and deteriorating finally into opportunism, theories of conspiracy and anti-Semitism, the author finds Populism a mirror of America and its criticism of industrial society "extraordinarily penetrating." The study focuses upon the midwestern aspects of the movement, using as source materials untapped newspaper files and the manuscript collections of Ignatius Donnelly, Governor Lorenzo D. Lewelling of Kansas, and Henry Demarest Lloyd. Pollack portrays Populism as acutely sensitive to the alienation of man in an industrial society, eager to join hands with the urban laboring class in directing governmental power toward reform objectives— perhaps ultimately to socialism—and finally fusing with the Democratic party in 1896, not as a surrender but as an expedient to preserve a radical program.

This book is something more, however, than an attempt to set straight a record by emphasizing qualities of Populism that do not fit the image of a social movement seeking Utopias in the past, not in the future. Unfortunately, when the author turns to his principal objective—to re-define Populism as a progressive social force—both the methods employed and the conclusions reached must be treated with considerable skepticism. The key question is whether Professor Pollack's evidence is sufficient to support the generalizations made, in a generic sense, about Populism. For example, we learn that a single editorial in the *Farmers' Alliance* (Lincoln) "captures the very essence of the Populist critique of industrial society"; or from a further commentary by the same paper that "here the Populist labor theory of value becomes meaningful." Perhaps the selection of twelve newspapers, primarily the *Alliance* and the *Topeka Advocate*, does represent a fair and representative sampling of the nearly nine hundred Farmers' Alliance journals, but this is not a matter to be accepted upon faith. It seems incumbent upon the author both to explain and justify his method of selection. Even within the confines of these sources, Populism emerges as a strangely abstract phenomenon, divorced from the agrarian base where traditional historical accounts have firmly situated it, and concerned in large measure with theoretical issues such as individual alienation and the power structure of industrial society. Are we to infer that these issues were more important in the Populist rhetoric than immediate economic grievances? Again, some empirical test (perhaps a form of content analysis) of the relative importance of specific and theoretical issues in the selected sources seems necessary.

Furthermore, one may wonder why Henry Demarest Lloyd was chosen as the major spokesman for the Populist movement. He receives fourteen references in the index compared with nine for Governor Lewelling, four for Ignatius Donnelly, one for Herman E. Taubenec, the national party chairman, and one for James B. Weaver. Actually, a question may be raised as to whether Lloyd's relationships with Populism were ever more than temporary and expedient. For example, in a letter written to the organization he represented at the Populist-Labor unity convention at Springfield, Illinois, in 1894, not cited by Professor Pollack, Lloyd declared himself in favor of a "temporary union" with the People's party and added:
"The People's Party is a middle class party; a permanent union of the workingmen with it might prove to be unnatural and unprofitable for as this party contains too many dubious and unprogressive elements." (Letter to Typographical Union No. 9, Chicago, July, 1894, Lloyd Papers, State Historical Society of Wisconsin.) Lloyd, an urban-based intellectual with humanistic and mildly socialistic sympathies, had advocated a consolidated political movement for social reform before his attempts to fuse a Populist-Labor alliance in Illinois, and he continued the endeavor after his disillusion with Populism in 1896. Apart from the ambivalent position of Lloyd, a political movement using the People’s Party label that centered among Chicago socialists, and at its peak strength in 1894 won only 6.96 per cent of Illinois’s popular vote, is an insecure base for generalization about Populism.

“There was no pattern to fusion; Populists differed on timing, reasons for its adoption, and intensity of commitment,” Professor Pollack writes, describing the endorsement of Bryan in 1896. Perhaps here is a principle that might well be applied to the Populist movement as a whole. Without clear methodological guidelines to indicate otherwise, it appears that from a diverse and many-faceted movement the author has selected evidence that points up but one dimension—the progressive one. Moreover, from Professor Pollack’s text it can be inferred that there were other faces to Populism. The author notes, for example, that the Topeka Advocate, one of his principal sources, was “in the radical vanguard of Populism”; he notes that the choosing of county newspapers from the seven strongest Populist “areas” in Nebraska might result in “biasing the evidence in a radical direction.” The views of James B. Weaver on fusion “reveal the conservative position in a highly different light.” Herman E. Taubeneck is noted as a “dissenter” from the radical “Populist” position of support for Coxey’s army.

One cannot but wonder that from a study using parallel methods but the papers of Taubeneck, Weaver, and Governor Waite of Colorado, and a different selection of newspaper sources, a quite contrary image of Populism might emerge. Ironically, then, there may be a substantial element of right in the analyses both of the critics and defenders of Populism. Perhaps what is called for is a new frame of reference, approaching Populism as a diverse political movement and seeking to delineate in a systematic way the stress between radicals and conservatives and the relative importance of these and other possible factions. This reviewer agrees with Professor Pollack that “another general history of Populism” is unnecessary, but a new approach is clearly needed.

San Francisco State College

JOHN L. SHOVER


Professor Keller’s superb monograph is a useful reminder that entre-
preneurial history is much more than a simplistic story of growth, greed, and consequent public reaction and regulation. Instead, Keller also surveys the operations of the great insurance companies from within, and finds that both internal and external limitations have fashioned the contemporary role and nature of the life insurance business. Synthesizing previous insurance company histories with original research, the writer vividly sketches the organization, domestic and foreign growth, ideology, and quest for public and private power of these companies before 1900. He then traces the abandonment of that quest, the public harnessing of the companies, and their purgation and rejuvenation to a present status of socially useful, viable, and responsible private corporations—or, in the writer's well-chosen phrase, as "giants without power."

The life insurance enterprise burgeoned after the Civil War. The dramatic display of the transience of human life coupled with the demands for capital investment outlets accounted for the spectacular rise. While nothing comparable to Standard Oil dominated the business, five companies—the Mutual, Equitable, New York Life, Metropolitan, and Prudential—accounted for most of the life insurance in force. And, similar to much of the other corporate enterprise of the period, distinctive and controversial leadership characterized the insurance business. Such figures as Henry Hyde of the Equitable, Richard McCurdy of the Mutual, John McCall and George Perkins of the New York Life, John R. Hegeman of the Metropolitan, and John F. Dryden of the Prudential were deeply committed to the aggressive pursuit of business, and the growth of their companies was, in part, a testament to their energies. But beyond this, they ardently opted for power outside their realm—particularly, in high finance and politics.

The companies' phenomenal growth resulted in their being a prime source of investment capital, and by 1900, participation in high finance became the most important expression of the drive for power. Professor Keller's statistical accounts of the companies' assets conspicuously display the changed character of investment. The relatively stable items of mortgage loans and premium notes declined from 59.2% and 20.5% respectively of total assets in 1860 to 28.8% and 0.9% in 1900. The short-gain returns of United States government bonds also proved less attractive, declining 2.7% in the same period. Meanwhile, corporate bond holdings rose spectacularly from 0.9% to 32.2%. Most strikingly, by 1904, the companies held 10% of the national rail securities. At the turn of the century the companies played vital roles within high finance circles and were eager allies of the great titans of the day as illustrated by the New York Life-Morgan and Equitable-Kuhn, Loeb combines. Such investment practices demanded centralized decision-making, and consequently, more power (and opportunity for greed) accrued to top company officers. In time, Keller notes, they devoted more effort to their roles as financial magnates than as insurance marketing men. George Perkins of the New York Life, and later a Morgan partner, epitomized this corporate leadership: "an ideologue, a man driven by a vision of the corporation as an institution of great social and political and economic power."
Such ambitions, however, ultimately proved unsatisfactory to the state and self-defeating for the companies. The insurance business had never wholly escaped the scrutiny of government. Even the judicial system, usually a ready instrument for corporate enterprise in the late nineteenth century, firmly adhered to the principle of regulation. Moreover, judicial decisions often favored the policyholder, as evidenced by the modification of warranty rules and a liberal attitude toward lapses in premium payments in order to save policies. The rapid growth of the insurance business also spurred legislative activity. But the companies' techniques of political influence softened the effects of such laws until the Armstrong inquiry in New York, conducted by Charles Evans Hughes in 1905. That investigation's disclosures of greed, nepotism, mismanagement, corruption, and unrestrained economic and political power and influence, stimulated new and effective regulations. Within five years, the companies abandoned their bid for power; their leadership, corporate goals, investment activities, and political relationships rapidly changed. And as they concentrated on the business of life insurance they paradoxically achieved new heights of business success over the next half century—despite the competition of Social Security, government insurance, pension plans, and mutual and trust funds.

The end of the quest for power, however, was more than a morality play involving the companies and the commonwealth. Professor Keller's most instructive contribution is his emphasis upon the internal restraining factors in the companies' drive for power. For example, their financial successes and bold bids for power clashed with their ideology of advertising themselves as quasi-public and social service institutions. The very assertion of such doctrine encouraged public and political watchfulness which had profound consequences. Further, the impressive growth of the companies required a bureaucratized system which hampered internal policy and decision making. The foreign marketing ventures, the political operations, and the investment activities all proved troublesome and expensive. The companies' multifarious activities thus developed internal constraining forces that with the application of external countervailing checks effectively braked their bid for power.

Professor Keller has written a well-organized and perceptive study. Specifically, his meticulous regard for the subtleties and complexities of corporate enterprise, coupled with a crisp style, make The Life Insurance Enterprise a fascinating book and a paradigm for the writing of business history.

San Diego State College

Stanley I. Kutler
The Pennsylvania Historical Association has available copies of three numbers of the Pennsylvania History Studies. A fourth number, written by Dr. George Swetnam about the Pennsylvania transportation industry, will be ready in October. These Studies will supplement reading assignments in Pennsylvania or American history courses in both colleges and secondary schools. They are valuable guides for libraries, historical societies, museums, and the general reader.

A 20% discount is available for orders of twenty-five or more of the same title.

To order, please complete and detach the form below.

Enclosed please find a check payable to The Pennsylvania Historical Association in the amount of $\ldots$ for the following numbers of the Pennsylvania History Studies:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Gilbert, A Picture of the Pennsylvania Germans ($0.75)
  \item Comfort, The Quakers ($0.75)
  \item Miller, Pennsylvania's Oil Industry ($0.50)
  \item Swetnam, Pennsylvania's Transportation Industry ($0.75)
\end{itemize}

To be mailed to (PLEASE PRINT):