
For a number of years Paul A. W. Wallace investigated the land routes of a primitive people who wrote no travel guides, carried no road maps, and planted no signposts to identify the multitudinous paths they made as they crisscrossed what is now the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Finding the pieces to this puzzle was no less a task than putting them together once found, and in gathering his material Dr. Wallace resorted to colonial maps; itineraries, travel journals and reports of early traders, Indian agents, and missionaries; and surveys and related documents preserved in libraries, county courthouses, and the Bureau of Land Records, Department of Internal Affairs, Harrisburg. In addition, he sought the assistance of informants, young and old, Indian and white, wherever he could find them.

The problem with a task like this is, Where do you stop? In 1936, for example, the Maryland historian William B. Marye concentrated his researches on one Indian trail, the so-called Choptank Indian Path, and published his findings in the Bulletins of the Archaeological Society of Delaware. This was a prodigious job, a contribution to Delaware and Maryland history, and as close to being exhaustive as one can get in a highly specialized area. In his new volume, Dr. Wallace treats of some 150 Pennsylvania Indian trails, 131 of which he numbers (for cross reference on an excellent endpaper map) and discusses in some detail. Obviously this is a big bite, and he says quite frankly that he makes no pretense at being definitive, and that he has treated only "some of the more important Indian paths." Accompanying the discussion of each trail is a line-drawing map showing its original route, and each entry tells the motorist how to follow the approximate route of each trail on the modern highway network.

In the extremely interesting Introduction Dr. Wallace explains how the Indian paths, made by a people who lacked the horse or any other draft animal, were channels of trade and cultural diffusion; how the trails evolved into bridle paths, wagon roads, and eventually motor highways. He tells us why the trails were dry, level, and direct, and that every ten or twelve miles along the more important trails were shelters of one sort or another. He explains why the best time to travel over the trails was in the spring and fall, and how the Indian sometimes lost his way because there were so many trails, and he often took the wrong one.

All paths bore two-way traffic, and the names taken from their termini were reversible. What was the Tulpehocken Path to Indians at Shamokin was the Shamokin Path to those at Tulpehocken. There were as many
Katanning, Venango, and Wyoming Paths as there were travelers going to these locations.

The Appendix contains additional information of interest, including Wallace's interpretation of the route followed by Washington in 1753 on his trip from Logstown to Fort Le Boeuf. The issue is not settled with finality, but Wallace adds new information to a question that has been much argued by Pennsylvania historians.

The book has a magnificent index for which Dr. Wallace gives credit to Mrs. Gail M. Gibson. To an author, making an index after he has labored long and hard over galley and page proofs is like beating a dead horse, but it is a feature many historical reviewers examine most carefully. Even without the index this would be a splendid volume rating a high place among the recent contributions of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission dealing with Indian history; but with such a fine index it is superb.
power beyond male hunters); (2) preoccupation with the dead; and (3) reliance on the individual who is gifted with supernatural communication (Shamanism). On this triad rest the religious structures of the Americas.

Impersonal power is another concept which is manifested in several aspects. Yet, aware as she is of Indian sensitivity to holy objects, even after ritual observance has lapsed, Underhill could not resist experimental tendencies of her own scientific culture to unroll and expose the tawdry contents of a medicine bundle beyond the drawn shades of her frightened hosts. I ask: Why did she do it?

Cosmologies form another unifying theme for the continent. The Earth-diver is known even in Asia. The spirits are the dramatis personae of myth and ceremony. In a hunter's world they are at once animal and human, and with them man enters into contracts for his subsistence, luck, and well-being. Violations bring ill-luck, possession, and disease. Acts of reverence toward these spirits (totemism) and avoidance (taboo), especially as to women and the dead, each afford material for a chapter.

Indians love their dead and delay burial by re-clothing the living in the name of the dead. Thus adoption as a widespread social custom has deep religious sanctions bolstered by ritual. The Feast of the Dead, which is known historically to entail secondary burial and processions between towns, is interpreted as a model for explaining the burial mounds and neighboring ceremonial structures in the Ohio Valley, an idea first advanced by the late Professor Frank G. Speck.

Medicine man, shaman, and priest are the first specialists to emerge in Amerindian communities. The shaman is essentially a conjurer whose skills have Siberian affinities—handling fire, resisting cold, swallowing objects, and speaking in foreign tongues—and are preserved today by his descendants in the Iroquois False Face Society. Underhill is mistaken, for they do traffic in hysterical possession.

The road to success in life begins characteristically in the vision quest and its fulfillment is through acts of ceremonialism. Underhill rightly observes that "the appeal of Indian ceremonies was not in color but in movement." And the chapters on these two topics that round out the decalogue of unifying concepts hold the key to understanding Indian religious behavior. Motion, number, direction, rhythm, and repetition are the essential ingredients.

The rest of the work develops the complexity and diversity of religious ethnography as to its purpose (hunting and gathering rites) and by culture area. A reviewer should refrain from nit-picking in the area that he knows best. But there is a major study of the Calumet ceremony and its historic derivatives, the reviewer's "The Iroquois Eagle Dance: an Offshoot of the Calumet Dance," Bulletin 156, Bureau of American Ethnology, 1953. Where the literature is mature and well-rounded, Underhill glows, as in her account of the Ceremonies on the Prairie. On the Southwest, to which she has contributed so much, she is unexcelled.
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She closes with a chapter on modern Indian religions. Here too poetry is being created.

The rocks are ringing
The rocks are ringing
The rocks are ringing
They are ringing in the mountains
They are ringing in the mountains
They are ringing in the mountains. (Wowoka)

or

Now we begin
I look to you,
Look on me and on these people
Help us as we meet here. (Peyote song)

New York State Museum

William N. Fenton


Histories of the American Frontier, a series edited by Ray Allen Billington, will comprise, as planned, eighteen volumes and extend in time from 1492 to 1960. Chronologically, Professor Leach's present study falls early in the series and, with a companion volume on the Southern colonial frontier, deals with the earliest frontier in the British colonies. Geographically, the present book includes Pennsylvania and the colonies to the north and east.

Modest in size and appearance, the book is very readable; and its brief text, only 210 pages, deals succinctly with military affairs, religion, Indian relations, trade, colonization, daily life (including a little essay on the role of fire), and the interrelations of these and other subjects. Brief passages quoted from contemporary writers underline rather than interrupt the text and add color to the portrayal. In a final summing up, the author reappraises Frederick Jackson Turner's interpretation of the frontier; accepting its general thesis, he points out that some modification is necessary for the period when the English settlements still lay east of the mountain barrier and there was no real division between frontier and older settlement.

Illustrative material includes an endpaper map, seven maps in the text, and thirty-two pages of illustrations. These last, drawing upon contemporary manuscripts, surviving buildings, museum exhibits, and modern recreations, are un hackneyed and helpful. The omission of place names from text maps requires occasional reference to other sources of information. Notes, a seventeen-page annotated bibliography, and a ten-page index occupy the last pages of the book; the notes and the bibliography are very useful, and the index seems adequate.

Pennsylvania readers may detect a tendency to turn to New England for illustrative examples, which occasionally, as when describing the pattern
of settlement, may not apply equally well to other areas. Such information is useful for comparison, however. Typographic errors and minor misstatements seem to be few and unimportant, but one or two relating to Pennsylvania may be noted. Monda Creek (p. 138) seems to be Manada; Conodoguinet is misspelled, not seriously or surprisingly (p. 159); and the Juniata, rather than Wyoming, Valley has been included in the Connecticut claim (p. 198). The letter of Thomas Lloyd, quoted on page 200, is unlikely to have been written to Benjamin Franklin, who in fact conducted the expedition that the letter describes. The release of 1758, mentioned on page 203, included only that part of the Albany Purchase lying west of the Alleghany Mountain. Readers might perhaps have been cautioned that Peter Williamson’s memoirs, briefly quoted on page 200 and mentioned on page 255, are much embellished and that the Indian-captivity episode in particular seems to be a fabrication.

May the reviewer add a general wish for agreement on whether up and down refer to the actual terrain or to a map hung on a wall? Traveling north toward Canada, one goes down the Champlain Valley (p. 124); from Harrisburg (Harris’s Ferry) to Carlisle, one goes up the Cumberland Valley (p. 140).

These matters are only details, however, and the general quality of Professor Leach’s volume promises well for the American Frontier series.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission    WILLIAM A. HUNTER


This book originated as a thesis for the Master of Library Science degree. Revised, and presented here in compact form, it stands as a model of those virtues of organization, consistency, and thoroughness common to librarians and regarded by others with gratitude and proper admiration. It covers the whole of its subject and will endure as a basic reference in the history of librarianship in this country.

The subject itself is basic. In America, libraries for public use began with Franklin’s Library Company of Philadelphia, a pattern for others in the young cities, north and south. Throughout his life Franklin accumulated one of the great private libraries of his time. He aided and stimulated the growth of the academic libraries, the medical library of the Pennsylvania Hospital, the Assembly Library from which the great Pennsylvania State Library has grown, with a system of mutually-sustaining public libraries of which Franklin would have heartily approved. His gift of a parish library to the town of Franklin, Massachusetts, itself grew into a public library. The library was implicit in all of his projects for the advance of education and the spread of useful knowledge.

Mrs. Korty has organized her subject under seven chapter headings: “The Library Company of Philadelphia,” its history, description, and influence; “The Loganian Library”; the eleven “Academic Libraries” with
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Franklin was concerned; the three “American Learned Societies,” his own, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences at Boston, and New Haven’s Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences; “Medical Libraries,” the Pennsylvania Hospital and Medical Society of New Fairfield, Connecticut; the “Governmental Libraries,” of Pennsylvania, New York, Rhode Island, and the United States Congress; and “Religious and Charitable Organizations.” The three appendices include, happily, a description of Franklin’s “long arm.” There is a bibliography and an index. The book is illustrated from contemporary prints and other sources.

Mrs. Korty has dealt clearly and succinctly with a highly specialized but at the same time very wide-ranging subject. Her theme sweeps through the intellectual life of the whole colonial seaboard, with transatlantic ties constantly in evidence. It is an affirmation of the universality of libraries, then as now, as instruments and strongholds in the advance of civilization.

Dickinson College

CHARLES COLEMAN SELLERS


Pennsylvania, the medical center of the English colonies and of the young American nation, has contributed an impressive list of firsts to the history of American medicine. The Commonwealth can claim the first hospital (the Pennsylvania Hospital), the first institutional medical library (again the Pennsylvania Hospital), the first American to attain international fame as a physician (Benjamin Rush), and America’s first medical school (University of Pennsylvania). As a necessary corollary of this last accomplishment, Pennsylvania also produced our initial professor of medicine—John Morgan, M.D.

Morgan’s career and reputation has been cyclic. His life was marked by eras of great good luck and accomplishment and also by monumental pettiness and tragedy. His historical image has been clouded in uncertainty, but now, to his reputation’s good fortune, Dr. Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., has become his biographer. A noted medical historian and librarian of the American Philosophical Society, Dr. Bell has proved sympathetic but analytical in writing about his subject—a man not always easy to like or admire.

Morgan was born to a family that had the “comfortable certainty” that it “would never want.” Despite the fact that, one of nine children, he was orphaned at thirteen, there was money enough for Morgan to study medicine, first as an apprentice to Dr. John Redman and then eventually in Edinburgh, “the cynosure of American medicine,” where he obtained his M.D.

Following the custom of his time, Morgan did not await the receipt of his M.D. before he began medical practice, and in 1756 he became both a surgeon and a regular officer in the provincial army fighting in the colonial wars. Here he demonstrated his organizational abilities and his high regard for his own rank and privileges. In a day when army physicians lacked status, he fought for their professional recognition.
In 1760 when the provincial forces were disbanded, Morgan decided to go abroad to study, and "he resolved to achieve a reputation as great as any physician in Philadelphia—or greater."

Before entering Edinburgh he studied in London under John Fothergill and John Hunter. From the great anatomist he learned to prepare organ specimens by injection and corrosion. Later when he was on his grand tour, Morgan gave a paper on this procedure before the Royal Academy of Surgery of Paris, from which he somehow omitted any mention of Hunter's having perfected the technique. Characteristically, however, Morgan made sure that a copy of his address was sent home to the Pennsylvania Gazette. As a matter of fact, he was a wondrous press agent, and he saw to it that the news of every one of his many accomplishments and his "well politicked" honors reached Philadelphia before he did. By the time he returned to America, laden with art treasures, natural history specimens, and medical books, he already had a reputation. While still abroad he charted his course for an American career, and he wrote his visionary *A Discourse upon the Institution of Medical Schools in America*.

Returning to Philadelphia, he had two aims: to be our first professor of medicine and to introduce to his native city a new concept of professional practice whereby a physician would be paid for his time, not his prescriptions. He failed in one respect and succeeded in the other when on May 3, 1765, he was elected Professor of the Theory and Practice of Medicine at the College of Philadelphia. In his determination to be first, he had out-maneuvered Dr. William Shippen, who had been presenting a course of lectures in medicine for several years, and this marked the real beginning of their disgusting feud which lasted down through the American Revolution and hurt both of their reputations.

Morgan's appointment to his coveted medical chair at age thirty was the high point of his professional life. From there on his career was downhill. He served adequately as a medical teacher until the Revolution and then, although he was not an ardent patriot, he became Director-General of the Hospital of the Continental Army. Through the machinations of William Shippen he was forced out of this post and Shippen replaced him. Then, egged on by his own venom, he forced Shippen's eventual court martial. After the war, although he retained his chair, he never taught again. He spent his last years before his death at fifty-four tending his never really extensive practice and turning out a number of essays that were often embarrassing imitations of earlier European articles.

When his wife, Mary Hopkinson, died in 1784, he went completely to pieces. In 1788 he sold most of his personal possessions at auction, and the former lover of the good life withdrew from the world. He died of influenza in what his attending physician, Benjamin Rush, described as "a small hovel."

Morgan was not a great man, but he had a dramatic career—one which is in the very mainstream of American culture. His biography gives us a marvelous insight into the politics of the early American medical and military communities. Perhaps the book's one fault is that it contains very little about Morgan's medical beliefs; rather it emphasizes the more popular aspects of his career, especially his military service.
Dr. Bell, however, has provided us with rarity—a first-rate biography of an early Pennsylvania medical figure—a person about whom few works exist. One searches in vain for biographies of many of Morgan’s contemporaries and successors, but none can be found save for a few on other physicians who, like Morgan, achieved fame or notoriety in other fields as well as medicine.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission

Irwin Richman


The subject of this biography was neither a Randolph of Virginia nor a Clay of Kentucky but a member of an old family of priests, merchants, and seamen of Philadelphia and of New Castle, Delaware. His father, Joseph Clay, secretary of the American Philosophical Society and member of Congress, was an admirer of John Randolph of Roanoke, for whom he named his second son, born in 1808. When, soon after, the father died, Randolph took charge of the boy’s education and eventually took him to Russia as secretary of the legation in 1830.

Randolph stayed in St. Petersburg only forty days, but Clay remained there for seven years, serving intermittently as chargé and as secretary to two more ministers, both Pennsylvanians, James Buchanan and William Wilkins. When at length George Dallas succeeded Wilkins, William Chew was brought along as the new secretary, and Clay went home, only to be sent abroad again very shortly as secretary to Henry Augustus Muhlenberg at the legation in Vienna. Here, once again, he became chargé when the minister went home, and secretary again when a new minister appeared. Here the English girl he had married in St. Petersburg died, leaving two sons, and here in Vienna he took a second wife, a Scottish girl who was touring Europe.

In 1845 Buchanan, now Secretary of State, sent Clay back to St. Petersburg, at first only as secretary but in reality to act as interim chargé when the Whig minister was recalled. Despite Clay’s experience, he lacked the political standing that then seemed a requirement for a ministerial post representing his country in Europe; consequently when a new minister was sent to Russia the best that Buchanan could do for Clay was to send him to Peru as permanent chargé in 1847. In Lima he was so successful, particularly in his handling of the Lobos Islands controversy, that a Whig president, Millard Fillmore, recommended him for promotion to the rank of minister in 1853. For years he enjoyed a series of diplomatic successes, negotiating treaties of commerce and navigation and exhibiting both expediency and discrimination in handling various American claims, many of them growing out of the guano business.

In 1860 he was at last called home when his government decided to break relations with Peru over a claims controversy in which he seems to have acted an unduly intransigent part. As a Democrat, he was refused any new assignment by the incoming Lincoln administration, whereupon he moved...
to England, probably to please his wife, and resided there and, briefly, in France, save for one visit home, until his death in 1885.

Though Clay had the longest diplomatic career of any American before the Civil War, the wonder is that it was not longer. With his experience and his command of languages he could have been a useful public servant for another decade. On the other hand, thirteen years in Peru were long enough, for he seems to have been growing somewhat overbearing and prone to call for battleship diplomacy. More frequent or longer visits at home might have been to his advantage. In thirty years he made only four short visits home, and apparently not one of them occurred during his thirteen years in Peru. Both of his wives were foreign, and each of them made but one visit to the United States during his active career.

Clay was able to afford a diplomatic career because he began it when he was young and had no family to support. Some of the ministers he served welcomed him into their homes; each of his wives had some money of her own; and he was fortunate in getting extra compensation for the many occasions on which he served as an interim chargé, though he often found it necessary to get friends to help push the appropriation through Congress long after it was due. Perhaps because he learned diplomatic behavior early and at an imperial court, he seems to have had a highly developed sense of diplomatic punctilio, as well as of fair dealing; and despite his long absences abroad, his loyalty and affection for his native land seem never to have waned.

This is a first-rate biography of a forgotten Pennsylvanian, based on a large family collection of hitherto unused and unknown correspondence, as well as on all pertinent archival material available in this country, plus published primary and secondary sources. It is also a valuable study of American diplomacy, throwing light not only on the conditions faced by an American diplomat but also on our relations with Russia, Austria, and Peru. On Peruvian-American relations for this period (to which guano gives importance) it is unrivaled; eleven of the twenty-six chapters are devoted to this subject, and to the best of this reviewer’s knowledge there exists no other work that gives anything like so much attention even to the whole of Peruvian-American relations in the nineteenth century.

Originally presented as a doctoral dissertation, this work, which shows the inspiration of Roy Nichols’s early study of guano diplomacy, has been a labor of love carried out over a long period in the author’s busy life. The result shows that the effort was well spent. Occasionally the work seems a bit prolix, but this fault is at least in part to be charged to the publisher’s editor, who should have saved the author unnecessary repetition, usually in identification of minor characters in the narrative.

University of Delaware

John A. Munroe


It is difficult to measure objectively the extent to which interest in
American political history is growing. It would seem, however, that scholars in increasing numbers are adding significant dimensions to our understanding of how the American political system works today and how it has worked in the past. Many are at work in the field of the history of American politics, and occasionally publications appear which constitute developments of more than ordinary significance. Such, for example, was Lee Benson's book, and such certainly is Professor McCormick's, winner of the American Association for State and Local History Manuscript Award for 1964.

McCormick has undertaken a comparative study of all of the states of the Union, with the exception of the admittedly unique South Carolina. He has grouped the states into four regions (New England, the Middle States, the Old South, and the New States of the West and Southwest) and has examined the circumstances which differentiated one region from another in the development of the second American party system during the years 1824-1840. An "Introduction" precedes a short but useful discussion of the nature of the party system during the Federalist-Republican era and contains a succinct statement of McCormick's main point:

It is the major thesis of this study that the second American party system had its origins in the successive contests for the presidency between 1824 and 1840. It did not emerge from cleavages within Congress, nor did it represent merely the revival in new form of pre-existing party alignments. The second party system did not spring into existence at any one time. Rather, new party alignments appeared at different times from region to region.

Central to McCormick's discussion, as this quotation indicates, is the Presidential question. This he calls "the most influential factor determining when alignments appeared within a particular region." The study utilizes the work of other scholars along with McCormick's own research, and it has an extensive bibliography indicating that the author has used virtually all of the relevant literature on the history of American national and state politics. There is not only a state-by-state bibliography but a listing of sources for election statistics for each state.

The core of the study consists of the four chapters in which party formation in the regions and in the states within each region is examined. Controlling constitutional and historical factors for each state and section are presented, and for each region there is a summary of the pattern as it had evolved by approximately 1840. Of greatest interest, both to the specialist and to the general historian, is the final chapter, "The Second American Party System," a chapter which contains so many points of interest and importance that in a brief review justice can hardly be done to it. Here McCormick restates his major thesis and underscores the importance of the election of 1824, which hastened the breakup of the remnants of the first party system and served to initiate the formation of new parties. The election, McCormick stresses, "was of unusual importance because it involved the revival of the contest for the presidency." Attention is directed to the Presidential election of 1828, which "stimulated the formation of
parties in virtually all of the states,” and the election of 1832, which, by contrast, “had remarkably little influence on party formation—except in New England—or upon existing party alignments.”

By 1832 the second phase in the re-formation of parties had begun; Van Buren’s candidacy for the vice-presidency in that year (which meant the presidential nomination of his party four years later) stimulated party activity, especially in the South. The grand climax appeared in the period 1836-1840 and in the election of 1840, when “for the first time, two parties that were truly national in scope contested for the presidency” and by which time throughout the Union “politics was now established on a two-party basis.” In fact, we are told, much more had happened. Parties had become institutionalized and “throughout the nation . . . the new order of politics was to be the politics of parties.” This final chapter includes a discussion of “general characteristics” exhibited by the parties in their drive toward maturity, characteristics which included a tendency toward uniformity, especially in the area of party management, the development of a new campaign style, and increased voter participation. The critical role of leadership is also discussed briefly, as is the “impressive inheritance” left to succeeding political generations.

This volume should have a wide reading. Fortunately, McCormick, in doing what few others could attempt, has made clear not only the unique features involved in the formation of parties during the period studied but has also related “what might otherwise be regarded as unique incidents in every other state in order to secure some sound basis for making generalizations about party formation.” It should be noted that while he recognizes the importance of studying voting behavior and party programs and ideas, McCormick has “not sought answers to the traditional questions of what parties stood for and what classes or interests they represented.”

McCormick’s book for some time to come will most assuredly constitute an important synthesis of progress to date, a blueprint for future research, and a subject for discussion at many an historical assemblage.

Muhyenberg College

John J. Reed


Few men invite closer description and analysis than Pennsylvania’s gift to political controversy, Simon Cameron. Other politicians shifted from the Democratic to the Know-Nothing, and finally to the Republican party; and others participated actively in politics from Andrew Jackson to Rutherford B. Hayes. But Simon Cameron has more than party deviance and longevity to recommend him as a subject for a biography. In his day, the accusations Cameron received for the political manipulations he performed were practically unmatched. Erwin S. Bradley, in attempting to tell the Cameron story as he “found it,” pleads his own objectivity and argues for Cameron’s innocence.
Bradley’s *Cameron* is the story of a poor boy who made good. In business a millionaire, in politics a “modern Caesar,” Cameron combined money and patronage to build a political machine in Pennsylvania seldom equalled in longevity or in mastery of the state legislature. Secretary of War in Lincoln’s cabinet, minister to Russia, and four times United States Senator, he transformed every office into a vehicle of patronage; indeed, whether in or out of office or the majority party he drew to himself a group of men whose loyalty to his master exceeded devotion to party or principle. Shrewd, always the consummate politician, he dispensed political reward and punishment with the sternness of a “Calvinist” and bought political bodies and souls with the bargaining talent of a “devil.” Opponents maligned him as corrupt.

Bradley finds no evidence to prove the charge. Rather, from the early Winnebago scandal through the several notorious political contests and his ten months in Lincoln’s war cabinet, Cameron’s integrity remained undefiled. Why, then, his reputation as a corrupted, corrupting, dishonorable, unscrupulous, opportunistic, and slippery trickster? Bradley finds the definitive answer in a “concluding verdict” from Alexander McClure, a politically ambidextrous Pennsylvanian newspaperman: like the generals Napoleon defeated, Cameron’s accusers derived their personal malignity from defeat in a fair fight. Thus, not merely satisfied to take the edge off Cameron’s reputation, Bradley attempts to reverse it whole. Historians convinced by Bradley, who have previously found Cameron an easy target, will have to reverse their judgment—the corrupt reputation of their prey was fed on sour grapes.

But Bradley’s attempt to refurbish Cameron’s reputation is not convincing. Such a task would be monumental. The Cameron manuscripts are not especially fruitful for this purpose; the records of his political machine in Pennsylvania and his manipulations in Washington are scarce. For this condition the author is not responsible. Still, this study does not break down for lack of Cameron materials alone. Neither innocence nor guilt is “proved” (if it must be one way or the other) because Bradley asks too few questions, relies too much on Cameron’s assertions, and omits too much available evidence. The process of acquiring office, rather than what Cameron accomplished in office, circumscribes his life; beyond detailed descriptions of Cameron’s contests for the national Senate, the reader learns little of how he coped with national issues, quite aside from what the issues were. This study is therefore state rather than nationally centered, and for the period from 1860 to 1872 it relies greatly on Bradley’s previous work. Finally, the reader fails to know Cameron as a person.

Unfortunately, to do justice to both Cameron and his critics, more research than Bradley invested in this volume is necessary. Beyond the obvious Cameron collections which have their limitations, Bradley should have cited more collateral collections of national politicians and used the *Congressional Globe* and *Record* more freely. Official government sources can still reveal much about Cameron’s administration of the War Office, particularly his appointive policies. He has read neither the report of the
war contracts committee nor the Congressional debates leading to Cameron's censure in the House of Representatives. One suspects that rather than search newspapers systematically, Bradley used only the clippings politicians chose to save. Though the book is subtitled "Lincoln's Secretary of War," the author makes no use of War Office records in the National Archives. In secondary sources, Bradley does not cite Brooks Kelley's doctoral dissertation on Cameron. He also makes some disquieting mistakes. Spelling errors abound, but more seriously, for instance, he claims that in the fall of 1861 Cameron and Salmon Chase supported John Fremont in Missouri, though the evidence, including one source Bradley cites, explicitly states the opposite.

Bradley's intention to present the story as he believes he "found it" should be respected when properly applied. His conclusion that Cameron's successful career was not based upon corruption should remain an open question. For what lies between preface and conclusion is a once-over-lightly treatment of a politician whose place in American political history deserves a closer and more analytic study.

University of Maryland

Fred Nicklason


"The English," Charles Francis Adams, Jr., wrote in 1864, "are getting to understand the art of biography for they let a man tell his own story and reflect his own character in his own words." By writing numerous books, articles, an autobiography, extensive diaries, and voluminous letters punctuated by acid comments and emotional outbursts, Adams enabled Mr. Kirkland to apply this formula, which he does most skillfully. Indeed, considering the wealth of material and Adams's stature—not merely as John Adams's great-grandson but as a railroad reformer and administrator, as a historian and an important "patrician" reformer—it is amazing that Mr. Kirkland is his first biographer. It is also fortunate; Mr. Kirkland handles the complexities of Adams's business career, particularly his managing the Union Pacific Railroad, as adroitly as Adams managed a Quincy town meeting. Kirkland's admiration and even "certain affection" for Adams does not blind him to Adams's failings; he is friendly but not adulatory, sympathetic but not apologetic, probing but not psychoanalyzing. The result is an absorbing and instructive biography.

After a rather negative start—he seemed to hate everything connected with his first thirty years, including home, God, and father—Adams resolved to play the sophist and direct public sentiment toward railroads. Railroad reform was a shrewd choice, for the rapidly developing rail system created problems the Gilded Age never quite solved. In 1869 the Massachusetts General Court passed his "railroad commissioners bill," and Adams, by pulling every available wire, was appointed to the commission, which he dominated for the next ten years. Numerous states modeled their railroad
commissions upon that of Massachusetts, thanks to Adams’s gifts as a publicist, and his “school master,” not “constable,” approach had a “penetrating and pervasive” influence on the national regulatory movement. Though his success on the commission was considerable in standardizing incorporating and accounting procedures and in codifying legislation, Adams never did solve the central railroad problem of rates. He recognized that competition failed to regulate rates, and he rejected government tinkering and regulation. The nation, however, preferred legislative tinkering to Adams’s prescription of an “informed and impartial agency” that would “investigate abuses” and “persuade railroads and the public to accept its findings.”

Railroad reform was not as important to Adams as making money. He grew rich dangerously. Kirkland shrewdly observes that though Adams “habitually characterized Wall Street men as ‘jockeys and gamblers’...it is hard to see how Adams’s way of making a fortune greatly differed from that he censured. He borrowed and he gambled on the price of stocks, sometimes outrageously.”

When in 1884 Adams became president of the Union Pacific Railroad, he had a new opportunity to shape a national railroad policy, but failure marked his administration. To induce Congress to fund the Union Pacific’s debt to the government Adams agreed to give the 1888 Republican and Democratic national committees $50,000 each, $20,000 down and the balance on passage of the bill, and ascertain the price of Senators Preston Plumb ($50,000) and George F. Edmunds (a retainer). Neither Plumb nor Edmunds received their bribes, the funding bill did not pass, and Adams—ironically, considering his pose as a political reformer—regretted his shortcomings as a corruptionist. As a railroad reformer he condemned rebates, lower rates for longer hauls than for shorter ones, lobbies, and free passes; but as Union Pacific president he could not end those abuses. Competition with other lines made unilateral reform impossible without bankrupting the road, and Adams could not prevent local officials from violating his general regulations. To strengthen the Union Pacific Adams expanded into the Pacific Northwest and secured a Chicago connection. But Jay Gould’s Missouri Pacific Railroad was threatened, and he began a drive to depose Adams. The drive succeeded in 1890; weakened by the floating debt his expansion produced, Adams surrendered.

There was a good deal more to Adams than railroads and making money. He took an active part in Quincy affairs by rehabilitating the town meeting, reforming the schools, rejuvenating the public library, and giving the town Merrymount Park. Before Adams left Quincy in 1884, the unwelcome influx of tradesmen and Irish Catholics had made him an alien in the town of his fathers. Indeed Adams was alienated from American society at large and disillusioned with politics, since there was “no place for men of his type.” He soured on democracy when it rejected his dream of intellectually elite leaders. Nevertheless Adams continued to serve society and to serve it well as head of the Metropolitan Park Commission, as a member of the Harvard Board of Overseers, and as a historian of significant influence. Three Episodes in Massachusetts History gave Adams ample opportunity
to be secular and anti-filiopietistic (perhaps his greatest contribution), to use primary sources, to widen the conventional range of history by dealing with the social as well as the political, and to fuse the literary tradition with scientific history. We are indebted to Mr. Kirkland for introducing us to another distinguished "failure" of our greatest family.

Pennsylvania State University

Ari Hoogenboom


While fame has come to many heroes of American wars, it has often passed by the "military managers" who have labored behind the scenes to make victory possible. The interesting and controversial career of one such manager, General Peyton C. March, is covered in *The Hilt of the Sword* by Edward M. Coffman. Using March's military career as a point of departure, this is also an excellent study of the development of the modern general staff system and its function during the First World War.

Though the United States General Staff had been in existence for fifteen years, like other staffs it was not the model of efficiency the war demanded. Many years of bureau control and a succession of old and ineffective officers dating from the "one shot carbine, revolver, and sabre army" had made the Chief of Staff's post into a minor position. Even after the first ten months of participation in the war, the staff numbered only nineteen officers, worked on a nine-to-five basis with no evening or Sunday work, and allowed sacks of dispatches from General Pershing and the A.E.F. continually to pile up. In short, it was not up to its potential and used peacetime methods to administer the needs of an industrial society at war. Aware that the staff needed a thorough overhauling as the nation's war machine slowly gathered steam and the draft began to function, Secretary of War Newton D. Baker searched for a new Chief of Staff who would replace the soon-to-retire Major General Tasker H. Bliss. In command of the A.E.F. artillery in France was fifty-two-year-old Peyton C. March, with twenty-nine years of distinguished service behind him. As a representative of the post-Civil War school of new officers he had participated in the initial formation of the general staff, and thus he was an excellent choice as its new chief officer.

As Chief of Staff March occupied the highest military post in the war structure of the United States. "Within his jurisdiction, he assumed responsibility, made decisions, and guided the army to its goal. In the brief period of eight months, he pushed men and material overseas in enough quantity to enable Pershing and the A.E.F. to turn the balance against the enemy." March inspired confidence, admiration, and loyalty, but not affection. His brusk manner and his cold-blooded drive for efficiency brought results during the war, but at its end he received little public recognition. One of his associates remarked that March "did not work out problems with people—he ordered."
During the war, however, Secretary Baker concluded that March was “the right man in the right place.” Aware of the significance of the industrial developments of the twentieth century and the complicated needs of modern war, March revamped the workings of the general staff, bypassed the bureau chiefs, and made the staff the brain of the army. As he interpreted it, his principal task was sending enough men and supplies to France. Acquiring sufficient shipping space was also of considerable importance, as well as achieving a more efficient flow of men and supplies to the ports. Toward these cumulative ends March bent all of the efforts of the staff. He enjoyed the complete confidence of President Wilson and Secretary Baker and ran the War Department and the general staff close to the limits of their capabilities.

After the signing of the Armistice, March faced the problem of turning the war machine around, demobilizing the A.E.F., and integrating the A.E.F. regulars into the “deflated peacetime army.” He played a dominant role in demobilization decisions, but at the same time he was greeted with a storm of criticism for his attempts to shape future military policy around a large peacetime army of 500,000 men. Coffman’s study of the determination of this policy illustrates the many facets of the postwar anti-military reaction. Baker’s tenure as Secretary of War also receives special treatment throughout this work. The many toes which March had stepped on during the war still smarted, and thus the Chief of Staff bore the brunt of much Congressional criticism of the conduct of the war, the army, and demobilization policies. The returning hero of the A.E.F., General Pershing, got all the glory, and March retired with little public fanfare. In 1953, thirty-two years after his retirement, Congress finally expressed its belated thanks by concurrent resolution. Unfortunately, as Professor Coffman points out, the public has not yet done so.

*The Hilt of the Sword* is well written with a generally even style and form. The bibliography contains a wealth of sources on the development of the modern staff system and the part played by General March in this process. The author has used many manuscript and document sources, as well as personal interviews and correspondence with many of March’s contemporaries. This study is a significant contribution to the growing history of military affairs in the United States.

*Southeast Missouri State College*  
Samuel R. Bright, Jr.

*A Bibliography of Delaware Through 1960.* Compiled by H. Clay Reed and Marion Björnson Reed. (Newark: Published for the Institute of Delaware History and Culture by the University of Delaware Press, 1966. Pp. 196. $5.00 paper; $7.50 cloth.)

Since this *Bibliography* is compiled from the Delawareana collections of the four principal libraries in the state, the University of Delaware, the Historical Society of Delaware, the Wilmington Institute Free Library, and the Public Archives at Dover, one may rest assured of adequate coverage in the 4,778 items of printed material. For obvious reasons, titles in eleven categories were omitted, e.g., newspapers, fiction, poetry, “routine” sermons
and speeches, maps, broadsides; but the exclusion of trade catalogs and promotional literature seems unfortunate.

This is a subject bibliography, classifying all activities in Delaware from the earliest printed record in the seventeenth century to the near present under thirty-nine headings which run the gamut of library classification. Although none of these has any sub-headings, with patience the reader can discern further classification of the items, whether it be geographical or chronological or by specific subject. The arrangement is never alphabetical, although under Biography and Family History, for example, one can trace the alphabetical order of persons as subjects, not as authors.

This scheme of classification makes the index quite indispensable for effective use of the Bibliography. Granting its usefulness, I find that it falls short on several counts. The compilers, when confronted with alternatives, have failed to give priority to the specific reference over the general, with cross references from the latter to the former. Indeed, this index has a paucity of helpful cross references. Take, for example, the entry “Transportation, 2229-2456.” It supplies no specific information and is redundant because it refers merely to the section on Transportation and Communication listed in the Table of Contents. (“Communication,” by the way, does not appear in the index.) There is an entry, “Railroads, 2381-2441,” followed by names of specific railroads as subheadings, but these names do not appear as main entries. Thus the user cannot find Baltimore and Ohio Railroad under letter B. Neither can he, to take another example, find anything about Republicans under letter R. Instead he encounters “See Politics”; but that entry turns out to be “Politics, 2602-2702,” a repetition of what he reads in the Table of Contents. Among these one hundred entries on politics is Progressive Party of Delaware, 2691, but it does not win a main entry in the index.

For some unaccountable reason, “Non-Delaware authors are not included in this index” (p. 175). This serious omission diminishes the usefulness of the Bibliography and frustrates the reader. Thus Dr. Alexander Hamilton and Archibald Robertson, whose diaries contain information on Delaware, cannot be found in the index. The entries under Quakers do not include Fisher’s Quaker Colonies or The Burlington Court Book; and the Pennsylvania Archives is excluded as a main entry. In fact, anything pertaining to the neighboring areas of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland gets slight, if any, consideration. It is regrettable that the twenty-two-page double-column index, with much valuable detail, should contain such serious faults as to undermine the value of the Bibliography as a work of ready reference.

Institute of Early American History and Culture

LESTER J. CAPPON


This is a fascinating volume and a fine herald of what will surely be an outstanding series. Canada has long needed a biographical dictionary of the
first caliber, and now that historical scholarship in that country is moving
into a new, more vigorous phase than ever before it is going to get one.
The principal debt will be to an expatriate English businessman who made
his home in Toronto and his fortune in, of all things, bird seed.

In his will James Nicholson provided not only the necessary sum of money
to sustain the Dictionary project but also some guidelines for its produc-
tion. Unlike most suggestions of this type they were both excellent in
themselves and broad enough to give the editors, in truth his literary
executors, room to do their work. He hoped for "full, accurate and
concise biographies of all noteworthy inhabitants of the Dominion of
Canada (exclusive of living persons) from the earliest historical period to
the time of publication." Manuscript sources as well as published materials
were to be used, and adequate bibliographies were to accompany each
entry. "National" was to be interpreted in the widest sense of anyone who
had played a significant role in Canada's history, even indirectly, and "note-
worthy" was to be judged from every point of view. Nicholson, good busi-
nessman that he was, wanted every product with which he was involved
to be the best on the market, and the Dictionary was not to be an exception.
Not only was it to meet "an acknowledged want in Canadian literature";
it should "compete with or even surpass works of a similar character pro-
duced elsewhere." In meeting his challenge the editors have done their
benefactor proud.

Clearly much attention was given to the problem of organizing a multi-
volume dictionary of this sort. After looking to existing works in the
genre, the editors arrived at a number of distinctive features for their own.
Two stand out. The whole series is planned on a chronological basis, with
the volume after this one to cover the years 1701-1740; within each volume
entries will be in alphabetical order. Secondly, from the outset contribu-
tions were accepted in either of Canada's official languages, and as from
1961, when the sponsorship of l'Université Laval was obtained, a Dic-
tionnaire Biographique du Canada was part and parcel of the project.

Whether two series will meet the aim of representing Canada's biculturalism
may be a little open to question. A single series of volumes containing
articles in both French and English might have been more true to the
ideal. But the problem of whether or not it would have been so easy to
sell such a series in Canada is a sad commentary on the extent to which
biculturalism remains an ideal. Outside the country additional marketing
problems would surely have been created.

Other interesting traits of this volume reflect the care with which it
has been wrought. Four introductory essays on the Indians of North-
eastern America, the northern approaches to Canada, the Atlantic region
before the Treaty of Utrecht, and New France, 1524-1713, briefly set the
historical scene. There is also a glossary of Indian tribal names, a useful
aid. The volume has a well constructed bibliography offering a valuable
introduction to archives and major manuscript collections.

The bulk of the volume consists of the biographies themselves, almost
six hundred of them, with no less than ten percent being those of Indians.
Naturally, they vary both in importance and quality, and some of the decisions on their relative length will cause a raising of eyebrows. Those on major figures, and many on minor ones, contain good historiographical sections. Extensive use of manuscript material is demonstrated in a very high proportion of the total. To summarize, the majority of the articles are excellent and many are quite outstanding. In case all this sounds a trifle too grave and academic, it may be well to explain the large canvas on which the sketches have been drawn. In this first volume one may find biographies of both the great and less than great, of saints and pirates, of tribal chiefs and European cartographers, of divers explorers and entrepreneurs. Nor has myth, particularly colorful in this early period, been left out. But it is clearly identified as such.

The Dictionary is therefore a genuinely national work. It meets the high standards of scholarship while providing enjoyment for any intelligent reader. In the volumes to follow, especially the next two or three, there will undoubtedly be much more material which is directly pertinent to Pennsylvania's history. Through this series Canadians may finally come to realize that their history is an intriguing, even glamorous, one. Readers in the United States may be led to a better understanding of their own history by a deeper recognition of its North American character, although historians in Pennsylvania have already been made well aware of this, at least for the colonial period, through the broad sweep of Lawrence Gipson's magnificent work. On both sides of the parallel we shall be waiting expectantly for the other nineteen volumes which are planned.

McGill University

Geraint N. D. Evans