The publication of Volume I of the Franklin Papers in 1959 was greeted with universal acclaim. Its format, type face, and editorial excellence did full justice to the wide-ranging and articulate texts of Franklin and his correspondents. The high standards and editorial guidelines were indicated in the introduction of that volume, a statement, incidentally, that every laborer, amateur and professional, in any facet of historical production might do well to review.

Volume IX of the projected forty volumes in no way diminishes the glowing record of accomplishment achieved by its predecessors. It encompasses the years 1760 and 1761, which Franklin spent in England as agent for the Province of Pennsylvania. At first glance it seems a less exciting period of Franklin's life. Gone are the pithy essays of the editor of the Gazette and the homey wisdom of Poor Richard. While scientific pursuits are not forgotten, they are less prominent during these years, and the roles both of spokesman for colonial interests to a hostile British government and of philosopher-diplomat for a young republic are still in the future. And yet the pages still sparkle as the already famous scientist continues to indulge his omnivorous interests as he pursues the business of the Province.

The most important paper in Volume IX is the "Canada Pamphlet" of 1760, Franklin's rebuttal to suggestions that the French sugar island of Guadeloupe rather than Canada should be sought as the spoils of the expected British victory. The versatile Franklin revealed his awareness of the economic realities that postulated the simple truth that the Northern colonies were more valuable to the Mother Country as fast-growing markets than were the tropical sugar-producing islands. Buttressing his contention with incisive statistics, Franklin rebuked the anonymous author of the Remarks on the Letter Addressed to Two Great Men, who had called for the retention of Canada by the French in order to check the American colonies, and stated the relation between the granting and protecting of liberties on the one hand and loyalty on the other. It is an important document because it reveals Franklin's growth as an imperial theorist and as a statement anticipating in many ways the conflicts of the next decade and a half. The editors' introduction, which proves the Franklin authorship of the "Canada Pamphlet," is a masterpiece of historical sleuthing.

For the Pennsylvania historian, the correspondence between Franklin
and Isaac Norris, Speaker of the Pennsylvania Assembly, is of the greatest importance. Here one finds a running commentary on politics in the Province and on the continuing contest with the Proprietary. Financial affairs were involved as Franklin was called upon to honor bills of exchange drawn on him by Provincial officials. He had to justify both the Pennsylvania issues of paper money and the taxation of Proprietary lands. He received Pennsylvania's portion of the royal disbursements, which he invested partially in "stocks," actually annuities or bonds of the British government. The forty-eight and fifteen-page excerpts, devoted respectively to the "Board of Trade's Report on Pennsylvania Laws" and the subsequent "Order In Council," seem overly generous at first glance, but actually they reveal the editors' skill at incorporating enough adjunct documents into their work to give a continuity that earlier Franklin collections lacked.

The general reader will find especially delightful the correspondence between Franklin and his landlady's teen-age daughter, Mary Stevenson, or "Polly," as Franklin addressed her. The young lady must have been awed and flattered at Franklin's long letters on such scientific subjects as the tides, waterspouts, and the relation of color to heat and cold.

Letters to his wife Deborah, whom he addressed as "My dear Child"; to his new Scottish friend, Lord Kames; to the London mercer, Peter Collinson, who had so much to do with making Franklin famous; to and from his printer-partner in Philadelphia, David Hall, and many others—personal, social, scientific, business, and public in nature—combine to reveal the breadth of Franklin.

Volumes of letters and documents may seem formidable at first exposure, but this reviewer suggests that any lover of history who overcomes his first trepidations will find that the happy combination of expert editing and an articulate, literate, and interesting subject can make perusal of these pages a memorable experience.

Rider College

ALBRIGHT G. ZIMMERMAN


Benjamin Franklin served in France from 1776 to 1785, a period of eight and a half years during which he symbolized America and was one of the most famous men alive. Engaged in the task of enlisting support for his emerging country, he moved in brilliant and congenial society. His struggles and pleasures are scheduled for re-enactment, after a fashion, exactly two centuries later; for sometime between 1976 and 1985 the lengthening bookshelf of The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, sponsored by the American Philosophical Society and Yale University, will traverse the French period. But the assistant editor in charge of French materials, Claude-Anne Lopez, saw in the documents already assembled "a story so human and so fresh" concerning Franklin's social life that it seemed a pity to wait ten years or more to tell it. We can be grateful for her impatience. She has given us an entrancing book.
The story is indeed human and fresh, but not because of the discovery of new pieces of paper; most of the manuscripts that Mrs. Lopez cites have been at the American Philosophical Society since 1840. She has simply been able to get more than anyone else out of scrawled letters in eighteenth-century French, many of them undated, unsigned, and almost illegible. She has made a noble attempt to put the documents in the right order, has given them translations of her own, and has drawn upon them, along with other sources, to produce a connected narrative that is scholarly and readable, humorous and sad.

At last we have a more rounded picture of Madame d’Hardancourt Brillon, who carried on a spirited correspondence with Franklin (103 surviving letters from her, 29 from him) and evoked some of his most sparkling literary gems. She was a recognized artist on the harpsichord and piano, beautiful, in her thirties, married to a wealthy man who was twenty-four years older than she but not nearly so old as Franklin, who was in his seventies. She was frustrated, self-centered, self-pitying, moody. In the twentieth century “she would be spending long hours on the analyst’s couch.” Instead she followed her instinct, which told her to look for what “we would call today a father figure,” a man not only older than herself but revered as a sage. And at her every cry of distress Franklin (whose plain wife had died a few years before) summoned “the infinite resources of his warmth and wit, offering them half in reckless gallantry, half in paternal tenderness.” The atmosphere was “more than close friendship and less than love of the flesh—what the French call amitié amoureuse.”

Mrs. Lopez divides their association into three phases, to which she devotes three chapters with the following titles: “Madame Brillon’s Suitor” (he reproaches her in many witty ways for not allowing him more privileges, and she parries in equally light vein); “Madame Brillon’s Papa” (instead of the pseudo-papa with whom one flirts, he becomes the father whom one loves, and she begins referring to herself merely as his daughter); “Madame Brillon’s Genius” (gradually her pathetic need of Franklin the man and Franklin the father gives way to a serene pride in Franklin the statesman, the genius).

But it was Madame Anne-Catherine Helvétius, an exuberant, earthy noblewoman only thirteen years younger than Franklin, who was “the queen of them all, the only one to whom he wrote more often than she answered, who did not call him papa, but, as an equal, mon cher ami, the one woman with whom he did not want to have merely a flirtation, a passing adventure: he wanted her for a wife.”

Mesdames Brillon and Helvétius dominate four of the book’s eleven chapters. Among the lively throng of lesser characters we find: the Chaumont and Le Veillard families, men, women, and children all devoted to Franklin; the King and Queen, who showed no warmth for him; certain other aristocrats who did, including the Countess d’Houdetot (Sophie of Rousseau’s Confessions); the chemist Lavoisier and his wife; the electrical authority Le Roy and his wife; the printer Fournier and his wife; the waxworkers Madame Tussaud and Madame Biheron; the painter Rosalie
Sibleul; John Adams, appalled by Franklin, who was appalled by him; Mesmer and his animal magnetism, investigated by Franklin; the first aeronauts and their balloon flights, witnessed by Franklin; one Finck, his achieving maître d'hôtel; Temple Franklin, who emerges from this book without credit (but Mrs. Lopez maintains that his distinguished grandfather had ruined his life, though unwittingly, by bringing him to France).

Terms of endearment went back and forth between Franklin and many French women, not just his two favorites. Kisses and embraces are mentioned a lot. As Mrs. Lopez says, Franklin mastered the game of flirtation and played it with elegance, wit, and detachment. Women, young and old, loved him because he took a keen interest in them as people; he listened to them and he was not afraid of them. The author, like Carl Van Doren and others, found no support for the old myth (newly fed by a Broadway musical) that Franklin in Paris "behaved like an old lecher having a jolly time."

Mon Cher Papa is handsomely illustrated, though the pictures are not always well coordinated with the text. There is an interesting sixteen-page bibliographical essay. The source notes, which are at the back of the book, are numerous but extremely brief. For example, more than two hundred references to manuscripts at the American Philosophical Society tell no more than "APS, XLVI (i), 47," or "APS, CVIII, 123." Additional documentation, including evidence on the probable time when letters were written, is deferred to the 1970's along with the full texts of the documents themselves. Mon Cher Papa has a different purpose. Even so, it seems to me that the notes often carry succinctness too far. I noticed also that some of the documentary quotations from sources I could readily check are not transcribed with perfect accuracy. Such discrepancies ought to be cleared up in later printings and probably will be; but in any case they are far too minor to interfere with the fun of reading this delightful book.

Cambridge, Mass.

Max Hall


The reviewer concedes that his initial reaction to this book was essentially that of the Vermont farmer who when asked by a tourist for the route to Barre replied, "If I was going to Barre I wouldn't start from here." Sober analysis, cognizant of the basic orientation of the volumes in the New American Nation Series, now holds the choice of starting point to have been completely logical and the road traveled by the author one which contributes much to the understanding of American expansion in the late colonial and early national periods.

In common with many other volumes in the series, The Rise of the West, 1754-1830, has a strong political emphasis. This bald statement is not made in derogation but rather to indicate that a very substantial part of the story is concerned with the administration of the Trans-Appalachian
West, both by British and Americans, and that much attention is paid to the influence of the region on our foreign relations in the years from 1783 to 1815. This section, which comprises roughly three-fourths of the book, demonstrates the author’s long, careful research in basic materials, his command of the monographic literature, and his training in the methods and practices of the lawyer-historian. The reader frequently feels that there are overtones of a brief in his presentation. This is especially apparent in the handling of the Wilkinson-Burr affair; one will hesitate in future to apply to it the term “conspiracy.”

In common with Billington’s The Far-Western Frontier, 1830-1860, and with the projected study of the post-Civil War frontier, the Philbrick volume concentrates on a single major theme and travels down a longer road, whereas the major political landmarks are examined in greater depth by the other works covering shorter periods. Editors and author have commendably avoided unnecessary duplication; enough material is provided so that the book fills its appropriate segment in the fabric of American history. Philbrick recounts the main threads of that westward movement which occupied two generations and more, taking the line of settlement from the crest of the Alleghenies to the Mississippi. His narrative serves as an antidote to those who interpret the American frontier in terms of what occurred beyond the Mississippi, who are prone to forget, ignore, or de-emphasize events in that period when “the West was East,” and who feel that possibly the older West was too prosaic to warrant scholarly study.

The initial expectation of a tale of traders, Indian expulsions, land speculators, pioneer farmers, and then the auxiliaries of a post-frontier civilization will be but partially satisfied by the brief treatment accorded these themes in the last quarter of the book. However, in retrospect, it is well to recall that the real outpourings of population into the vast interior basin, certainly into the Gulf South and the Old Northwest, came in large measure only after the conclusion of the War of 1812; that the earlier spasms of expansion had left only enclaves of settlement in Trans-Appalachia; and that indeed the important developments of the earlier period were political in tenor. The student of the Eastern frontier, aware of recent and impending works dealing with the broader aspects of pioneering, will appreciate the real contribution made by The Rise of the New West to an understanding of these political considerations.

The author makes occasional generalizations which ought to have been buttressed or qualified; e.g., “Occupation of Detroit would presumably have given all Canada to the United States in the peace [of Paris]—whether for good or ill would be much disputed today.” Also, to declare that the road through Cumberland Gap “was soon to become and for years to remain, the most traveled of all western routes” appears a heavy exaggeration; while to aver that “... geography forced all New England emigration to be southward through Connecticut and then westward along New York’s Mohawk valley...” indicates no real awareness of the routes used by those trekking from northern New England. A most egregious slip occurs between title and contents, for dust jacket, cover, and title page
promise the starting date to be 1754, while the author commences his narrative in 1763.

The thoughtful reader, while appreciative of the careful, exhaustive footnotes, will nonetheless regret the omission of a bibliography, a hallmark of other volumes in the series. Instead, Turnersians and others will read respectfully an appendix devoted to "Further Comments on the Turner Thesis," feeling that perhaps at this point Philbrick is rattling dry but substantial bones in a dignified but not entirely necessary fashion.

The Pennsylvania State University

Neil A. McNall


A great medical school is like a pre-Keynesian business cycle; it has its fluctuations up and down. This in essence is the theme of Two Centuries of Medicine, as Dr. Corner traces the development of the School of Medicine of the University of Pennsylvania from its upbeat inception to its expansionist present. But the disputes and tribulations along the way give the story human scale.

The philosophical basis for the beginning of formal medical training in America was laid down by John Morgan in his Discourse upon the Institution of Medical Schools in America, an extraordinary document so in advance of its time that it was not until after the Flexner Report stirred the medical school to new action in 1910 that all of its pertinent implications were realized. The only aspect of modern medical training that Morgan did not foresee was that every student should gain pre-clinical laboratory experience instead of relying on the lecture platform performance of his instructors.

The medical school, though nominally established as a department of the University of Pennsylvania, was for many years, in fact, very close to being a proprietary institution in its own right. Its professors, themselves, received tuition fees, and with their income directly related to attendance figures, they always tended to increase class sizes unduly and to "knock the competition," as in the well-known story of Penn's attempt to prevent the chartering of Jefferson Medical College. The steps by which medical teachers were transformed from part-time businessmen into full-time salaried professionals is an interesting tale, as are the machinations which led to the establishment of the University of Pennsylvania Hospital (the first medical-school-administered hospital in America), and the introduction of the school's emphasis on research.

The roles played by all of the great names associated with medicine at the University of Pennsylvania are delineated, ranging from William Shippen and John Morgan, through William Osler, John B. Deaver, and George E. de Schweinitz, and up to Alfred Newton Richards and Isidor S. Ravdin—and of course, the Pepper dynasty.

Dr. Corner's volume demonstrates a masterly ability to correlate vast
amounts of diverse materials into a coherent, important story. By the use of a well-selected phrase here and there, the author is able to relate the medical school’s activities to movements in the medical world at large. In addition, the book is often fascinating reading up until Chapter 14. From that point on it is encyclopedic. This reflects the multiplicity of personalities dealt with and the relative calm being experienced within a maturing institution.

*Two Centuries of Medicine*, in its scholarly approach and lucid prose, should serve as a prototype for other institutional histories of its kind. Monographs are needed for Pennsylvania’s other medical schools. Today their histories are available only in sketchy, out-dated, or amateurish editions.

*Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission*

Irwin Richman

The Changing Political Thought of John Adams. By John R. Howe, Jr.


The historical reputation of John Adams has never been higher than during the past two decades. Once recalled in history books as the somewhat pompous, irascible, and vain man who happened to occupy the Presidency between George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, Adams is now regarded among an increasing number of historians as one of the most astute leaders of the Revolutionary generation, a diplomat of high talents, a President of merit, and a political thinker of the first order. This enhanced appreciation has been fostered by the growing number of books about him. In addition to the project for publishing his papers, which is well under way, the past fifteen years have seen the publication of an excellent two-volume biography by Page Smith, appreciations of his accomplishments as President by Stephen Kurtz and Manning Dauer, an account of his political philosophy by Zoltán Haraszti, and, most recently, a study of his political thought by Edward Handler. In *The Changing Political Thought of John Adams* John R. Howe, Jr., has added an important title to this list.

Howe’s thesis is that between the 1770’s and early 1790’s Adams’s political thought underwent fundamental alterations. What were they? In the 1770’s Adams had believed in a natural aristocracy but had not identified its interests as distinct from those of society generally; by the 1790’s he viewed aristocracy as opposed to the interests of democracy. In the 1770’s he had stressed the broad distribution of power in the United States; by the 1790’s he “believed that the movement toward economic inequality in America was gaining momentum,” encouraging the consolidation of power. In the 1770’s he had emphasized the unique virtue of the Americans; by the 1790’s he was highlighting the breakdown of American morality. In the 1770’s, as well as in the decade of the eighties, he had centered his attention on the individual states; by 1788 his attention had shifted to the Union. In brief, Howe concludes that by 1790 “Adams’s conception of American society had dramatically changed” (italics mine). He attributes this change to the frustrations Adams endured during his decade-long diplomatic mission in Europe. Adams’s disillusionment with his fellow-
countrymen appears to have been caused (though Howe does not explicitly say so) more by personal pique than by valid observation. Disturbed by what he believed to be Congressional distrust of his diplomatic conduct, he responded by equating lack of appreciation for himself with a decline in the virtue of the American people and their representatives. That he found his diplomatic missions difficult is incontestable. But did resentment at the alleged neglect of his countrymen or disappointment at the refusal of European diplomats to share his vision of the special virtue of the American people cause a dramatic shift in his political philosophy?

That his political ideas underwent some revision is doubtless true, for to Adams, as to other Federalists, one's political thought was conditioned by "experience," that key concept in eighteenth-century political philosophy. Yet Dr. Howe over-emphasizes the extent of the change. It was, even judging by the evidence he presents, neither dramatic nor radical; it was more a shift in emphasis than a revision. It may be, as Howe says, that during the Revolutionary period Adams "had approached the problem of social regulation confidently," whereas during the 1790's he approached it pessimistically. But a change in mood is not a change in substance, and the important point is Adams's persistent emphasis on the same problems and his consistent solution to them. Since a similar shift took place in the political thought of other Federalists, the most satisfactory account of it would focus less on personal idiosyncrasies than on a common reaction to social and political change. Adams's reaction to the French Revolution, moreover, was doubtless as much responsible for changes in his political philosophy as his experience during the Confederation. The example of France caused him, as Howe remarks, to question both the efficacy of "religion and education as effective guarantors of social order" and "the ability of men in general to use their powers of reason constructively."

In thus contesting Dr. Howe's thesis I do not wish to detract from the merits of his book. Although I think he rides his thesis too hard, his dissection of Adams's political thought is a contribution not only to the growing library on John Adams but to the abundant literature on eighteenth-century political philosophy. In attempting to show the relationship of Adams's political thought to his complex personality, Howe undertook and successfully carried out a difficult assignment. American history would be the richer if we were to have similar studies of other major men of this era.

Lafayette College

JACOB E. COOKE


The publication of a new book on the Constitutional Convention of 1787 has more often than not been the occasion for some special pleading regarding the motives of the Framers. Mr. Rossiter's work is no exception to the rule. He does not, however, offer any novel approach to the subject. Rather he attempts to buttress with fact and speculation a view widely accepted for years, but one that has sustained a number of attacks
by revisionists in more recent times. To Mr. Rossiter, as to generations of Americans, the men of Philadelphia were heroes. He defines a hero as a man "who engages with clear eye and stout heart in an uncertain enterprise for some purpose larger than the gratification of his own ambition or the rewarding of his own friends, and whose deeds work a benevolent influence on the lives of countless other men." He adds that the Founding Fathers engineered no counterrevolution; to the contrary, they built upon the concepts that undergirded the American Revolution, resting the system they created on the broad base of popular sovereignty. In so doing, they gambled upon the soundness of the principle that free men can effectively form and administer their own institutions.

Some may question the need for another book upon a subject that has been treated as often and as extensively as has the Convention of 1787, especially in view of the absence of any significantly new material. Mr. Rossiter supplies an effective answer to the query. To him, no event as memorable as the framing of the Constitution can ever be delineated with finality. As he suggests, the Constitution of 1787 is a viable instrument in a ceaselessly changing world, and its impact yesterday, today, and tomorrow can be determined only with the passage of time. There was a time, he reminds us, when constitutional democracy was regarded as the final solution of man's political problems, and when it was believed that by the force of its example the institution was destined to overspread the world. Today this assumption has been riddled by the competition of rival polities that are attracting the support of countless millions. Doubts regarding the relevance of the constitutional principle to modern needs have arisen, even among the system's staunchest supporters. Given these circumstances, Mr. Rossiter suggests that it is essential for us to take a fresh look at our political origins for instruction and inspiration, and that is precisely what he has done in the work under review.

In a series of sixteen chapters, divided into four sections, the author elucidates the conditions that led to the calling of the Convention, defines the choices before the delegates, explicates the decisions they made, and limns the struggle over ratification. Within this arrangement, he also provides the reader with interesting and instructive analyses of the personnel of the state delegations accredited to the Convention, a short but satisfying account of the first years under the new Constitution, and some references to the subsequent careers of the delegates. Two appendices, including a select bibliography and pertinent documents, together with notes and an index, complete the organization.

A student coming to this work with the expectation of adding significantly to the factual knowledge to be found in earlier studies of the Convention will no doubt be disappointed. He will find here, however, the re-creation of a supremely important event in American history, told with intimate detail and dramatic effect; provocative speculations that will engage his interest; and, altogether, a stylistic report of some matters that should constantly be kept in mind.

*Muhlenberg College*  
*VICTOR L. JOHNSON*

The shade of Mark Bird, the ironmaster who founded Hopewell, served in the Revolutionary War, and went bankrupt in its aftermath, could well wonder which among several twentieth-century ironies of history qualifies as most surprising: the fine and costly restoration of the Furnace and some of its appurtenances by the National Park Service, the visiting of "Hopewell Village" by more than 100,000 people in 1963, or the recording of the life story of the enterprise he had launched in Joseph Walker's carefully researched and clearly written history.

Hopewell was neither the first nor the largest nor the most long-lived of the cold-blast charcoal furnaces of Pennsylvania. Judgment as to its typicality must wait on research in depth in the records of the others. With candor the author makes these observations at the outset—and never in the text does he claim more than the subject merits and presently available data support. Clearly Hopewell Village deserves a full book-length history if only because of the restoration and its popularity. Walker in structuring his has chosen to concentrate on the social and economic, to restrict the straight narrative history to a mere seventy-one pages, and to set all the rest in categories: the Physical Village, the Industrial Village, the Commercial Village, the Vocational Village, and the Social Village. Under these headings he presents, analytically as well as descriptively, the geography and the business, labor, and social history of an iron works which had, over the years, to adjust to problems posed by wars, changing market conditions, technological innovations, and the ups and downs of the American economy between 1771 when it was founded and 1883 when the furnace was blown out. In its prime phases the enterprise was owned and run by members of the families of Daniel Buckley, Thomas Brooke, and Matthew Brooke, Junior. In partnership they bought Hopewell Furnace in 1800. From a descendant, Mrs. A. Louise Brooke, the United States Government in 1935 purchased most of the large land holdings of the old iron works, and it is on a relatively modest portion thereof that the restored Hopewell Village stands.

The book largely rests on the good data collection assembled by the National Park Service in the Hopewell Village Library. This includes many Hopewell business papers and photographs along with unpublished studies, archeological data, and microfilm copies of documents in other places found pertinent to the plant, the enterprise, and the restoration. Walker has quarried it painstakingly, and he scrupulously acknowledges in correct footnoting his indebtedness to it and to the authors of the books and articles listed in a large and discriminating bibliography. While there are gaps in the surviving primary records, a skillful blending of data from other furnaces, diaries of the period, and recorded interviews with old-timers of the neighborhood has provided an effective base for an essentially modest but interesting and significant economic and social history.

What does it tell us? At one level, this is the record of a community of
that more or less special sort called, at least of its earlier stages, the iron plantation. The late Arthur Bining provided the basic picture: a large, self-sufficient assemblage in a remote place, the ironmaster, his workers, and their families. The master lived well, worked hard in a gamut of entrepreneurial and managerial functions that would now be divided among specialists, and, when things went right, made money. The workers, paid in credit at the company store, buying there and in other places to which their home credit carried, labored long and strenuously and achieved subsistence or a bit more. In Walker’s version of life at Hopewell, “management” was kindly. The store was mainly for the workers’ convenience, not for their exploitation and the owners’ larger profit. To them got dispensed medical and legal advice, moral counsel, facilities for schooling (on a tuition basis until 1836 when a public school was established), and moderate job discipline. The skilled labor force was quite stable, and so were wages. Only one strike is recorded, without indication of its effects. Some molders joined a union organized in Philadelphia in 1855, with what consequences we are not told. While Walker cites only one instance of blacklisting and one case of collusion among employers in the lowering of wages, joint action by the ironmasters probably loomed large in price and wage policies, in minimizing loss of skilled hands to other plants, and in preserving industrial peace and relative stability—in everything but profits. Minimally it must have been at least as important as the paternal relationship of ironmaster to employes on which Walker puts much stress.

Somewhat surprisingly, the differences between Hopewell and the iron plantation in Bining’s classic version seem slight, though Walker’s is an intensive treatment of an, in the main, nineteenth-century furnace community, and Bining’s a generalization built up from scattered data on eighteenth-century Pennsylvania iron works. Was there so little change over so long a period? Was Bining’s treatment so effective as to shape the very categories and terms of analysis in which later scholars approach their iron industry data? To what degree were the iron plantations or the iron-making villages unique?

Such questions arise because, at another level, Walker’s is a picture of a segment of American life. Hopewell’s people blended the agricultural and the industrial in their daily lives. Ownership and management were tightly joined and on the scene. Some workers were indentured, and Negroes were employed and suffered little discrimination. Otherwise one could argue that there was slight difference between their work, play, and community activities and those of, say, textile workers in a rural New England mill town. In patterns of labor recruitment and training, employee housing, socio-economic mobility, schooling, church-going, and amusement and recreation there were many parallels. If little of what transpired at Hopewell strikes a knowledgeable modern reader as surprising, it is probably because of the large correspondence between the particular, Hopewell Village, and the general, industrial America prior to the Civil War. Walker writes: “Working conditions on the iron plantations would have horrified a present-day labor union leader or social worker.” They would presumably shock
modern Americans in general. But they were, in the main, "normal" for
the time and for much of our early industry. Might we usefully stop using
the word "medieval" in connection with early iron works, or ought we to
extend its use to other industries of the period?

Despite his working in categories which must in some degree overlap
e.g., "The Worker and His Job," "The Worker and His Boss," "Labor
Recruitment, Training and Tenure"), Walker has managed to keep repeti-
tion to a minimum. His conservative handling of data leads to perhaps too
much qualification in the making of claims and the drawing of inferences,
as when he writes: "Samuel Williams and Samuel Witman apparently
suffered from hernias as they purchased trusses at prices ranging from
$.75c to $2.50." The obvious is not always left unsaid, as when he indicates
that since clothing, etc., had to be provided, the pay collected by a parent
for work his child had done at the Furnace was not all profit. Such
blemishes, however, are dwarfed by findings, summaries, and tabulations
whose development required skilled and imaginative working over of ac-
count books and other business papers. While the strictly technical part
of iron-making is left to others (not necessarily as definitive in the field
as Walker suggests), one gets in this book an excellent picture of how
iron was made, sold, and distributed. More important still, what in another's
hands might have been a dull exercise in business history or a nostalgic
proclaiming of local glories turns out to be a broad and useful study,
mercifully free of sociological jargon, of the whole range of interactions
in the community which was Hopewell. A solid and attractive book joins
company with a splendid restoration.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

E. Neal Hartley

Yankee Rebel; The Civil War Journal of Edmund DeWitt Patterson.
Edited by John G. Barrett. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina
Press, 1966. Pp. 207. $6.00.)

Scores of Civil War journals have been published in the past decade,
ranging from almost illiterate accounts of mostly insignificant events to
grandiose narratives in stilted language in which the writer seeks to glorify
himself.

This journal of Edmund DeWitt Patterson is not only none of these
things, it is the best written, most informative, and generally most interest-
ing Confederate journal I have ever read. There are a number of reasons
why this journal excels.

Patterson had real literary ability. Using simple, matter-of-fact language
he can graphically describe a battle in such a way that the accuracy and
sincerity of his record cannot fail to impress the reader. His best battle
narratives are those written some time after the event when he has had
full time to assemble his thoughts, but his daily entries are also often
impressive.

This journal is of most value historically because of the contrast it
provides between two Northern prisoner-of-war camps, Fort Delaware and
Johnson's Island. Fort Delaware, on Pea Patch Island in the Delaware River, was apparently everything that a prison should not be, with the barracks situated in a vast mud hole. The place was so bad, Patterson writes, "that a respectable hog would have turned up his nose in disgust at it." But the food was worse than the lodgings. Officers' rations, consisting of "three small musty crackers, and a piece of salt pork half cooked about the size of my three fingers," were placed on planks and the men were forced to eat them without knife, fork, or plate. The prisoners washed themselves and their clothing in ditches where the water was covered with a green scum. "The men died by hundreds," Patterson writes, "and no effort was made by the authorities to better this state of things." Actually 2,500 died out of an average monthly population of 8,000. Patterson sums up by saying the prison "would answer very well for a second class hell."

He was later transferred to Johnson's Island in Lake Erie off Sandusky, Ohio, which, Patterson writes, "we all like much better than any other [place] we have found since leaving Dixie." Here they had large and comfortable quarters, no guards standing at the doors, satisfactory bunks, and plenty of blankets, along with stoves. Copious rations were issued to the prisoners, who cooked their food themselves and washed the knives, forks, and plates they used. While Patterson, as every prisoner will, found some things wrong with the way the prison was run, he had no really serious complaints of his treatment. During the war 206 prisoners died there, although the average monthly population was about the same as at Fort Delaware.

The editor makes much of the fact that Patterson was a native of Lorain, Ohio, and had been in the South less than two years when the war broke out. During that time he had become as fervent a Southerner as any other member of the 9th Alabama Volunteer Infantry with which he served. The only significance of his birthplace seems to be that while he was a prisoner at Johnson's Island his father and brothers, who lived nearby, visited him occasionally, urging him to take the oath of allegiance, which he steadfastly refused to do. He resented these preachments from his family and especially their failure to send him any clothes or food such as other prisoners were receiving.

Patterson had joined the 9th in Alabama in May, 1861, and was third corporal when the regiment arrived in Richmond. During the stay there he made many friends among Richmonders, and his descriptions of life on the home front are also of value.

Arriving just too late to be engaged in the First Battle of Manassas, he received his baptism of fire at Williamsburg on the Peninsula during the next spring. He saw some action at Fair Oaks where his humor interspersed throughout the whole diary, is brought out, especially in telling of his dismay at having to get rid of some loot captured from a Union camp in a hasty retreat.

The best battle narration is probably that of the Seven Days Battles where he fought at Gaines Mill and was seriously wounded and captured.
at Frayser's Farm. He was touched by the tender care given him by a Union soldier before his recapture by the Confederates.

Then followed a long period of recuperation in Richmond at the home of a friend, a Mrs. Quarles. When he was able to sit on the porch he received a great thrill when Jefferson Davis, who lived nearby, spoke to him on his way to his office. Morning and evening after that, Patterson writes, "he never passes without speaking and I like to look upon his face, always so pale and careworn and yet such a pleasant one. We know each other."

Later when he became ambulatory he visited sessions of the Confederate Congress, describing the principal statesmen from Alexander Stephens to Louis Wigfall, "who generally looks as if he had taken one too many drinks."

Patterson himself liked a drink once in a while, and he liked the ladies as well. Some of the happiest days of his war years were spent at Inglewood, a girls' school run by Charles Quarles, brother of Patterson's Richmond friend. After a furlough there and at his home in Alabama he returned to the army, where he found he had been promoted to lieutenant. He was in the reserve at Fredericksburg, but was actively engaged at Marye's Heights and at Salem Church during the Chancellorsville campaign.

He tells vividly of the invasion of Pennsylvania and of the fight on the second day at Gettysburg, when he was captured and started his long imprisonment. Patterson was exchanged as a prisoner on March 22, 1865, and was spending another furlough at Inglewood when the war ended.

The editor, a professor of history at Virginia Military Institute, has written a competent introduction, but his numerous footnotes sometime contain inaccuracies, such as the date of W. F. Smith's attack on Petersburg, and one wonders why he quotes a description of Fort Delaware written by a prisoner who was never there to back up Patterson's story, when there are so many eye-witness accounts of actual prisoners at the fort. His worst failing, however, was not to provide an index for this extremely valuable book.

Edmund Brooks Patterson, grandson of the journalist, writes of the postwar history of his grandfather, who became a member of the Alabama State Senate and a circuit judge, and gives a fascinating appraisal of his personality.

Wilmington, Del. W. Emerson Wilson


It was of Edwin Lawrence Godkin that William James wrote: "To my generation, Godkin's was certainly the towering influence in all thought concerning public affairs, and indirectly his influence has certainly been more pervasive than that of any other writer of the generation, for he influenced other writers who never quoted him, and determined the whole
current of discussion." As editor of the *Nation* and the *New York Evening Post*, Godkin was the ideologue of classical liberalism in nineteenth-century America. For several decades, Godkin gave voice in his writings to the aspirations and discontents of cultured, educated Americans, i.e., the Mugwumps. This volume of Godkin's essays, first published in 1896, is a mirror of the liberal thought of the times. Since eight of the eleven pieces included appeared in the years 1890 to 1896, the focus of the book is obviously on the decade of the nineties. One might suggest that a judicious selection from the writings of Godkin over the span of his journalistic career would have been more revealing, yet let us be grateful for the republication of this significant work by the John Harvard Library.

Professor Keller has enhanced the volume with a penetrating analysis of Godkin's career which places him in proper social and intellectual context. He astutely observes that Godkin's view of American democracy became progressively disillusioned and jaundiced with the passage of time. Coming to the United States in 1856, the young Anglo-Irishman was swept up in the moralistic fervor of abolitionism and the Civil War. His early writings in defense of the Republic against its European detractors optimistically portrayed the United States as a force for freedom and progress in the world. Godkin's essay of 1865, "Aristocratic Opinions of Democracy," is of special interest as a pre-Turner statement of the influence of the frontier and westward movement on American society. Yet during the Gilded Age Godkin became increasingly alienated from the mainstream and emerged as an acerbic critic of American politics and culture.

As Keller notes, the central tension which flavors these essays is the conflict between Godkin's theoretical commitment to democracy and his growing misgivings about its practical consequences. A recurring theme is the baneful effects of the exclusion of educated men from political office in "modern mass democracy." For Godkin and his Mugwump readers, this denial of a proper role in public affairs to the "scholarly, thinking, philosophical class" constituted a personal grievance as well as a fatal defect in the political structure. The sordid spectacle of venal politicians and lobbyists trafficking in legislation moved Godkin to despair of the future of representative government. Issues such as the "money question" and the tariff, he argued, should be left to the experts. Civil service reform as a means of curbing political corruption and bringing trained intelligence to bear on public policy, therefore, was a primary requisite for good, honest government.

Godkin, himself, however, revealed the grave intellectual limitations of the educated elite of his day. An acute critic of democratic politics, Godkin's belief in unalterable laws of economics prevented him from developing a comparable critique of the evils of industrial capitalism. While eschewing tooth-and-claw Social Darwinism, as a devout follower of Malthus and Ricardo, Godkin believed that little could be done to alleviate the poverty of the masses. "'The labor problem,'" he could write in 1892, "is really the problem of making the manual workers of the world content with their lot." Whatever his merit as "observer-critic of the Gilded Age," Godkin's
influence was an intellectual straitjacket which had to be burst before Americans could come to grips with the problems of an industrial society.

The editor is to be congratulated for making his notes to the text few, brief, and to the point, particularly since they are located in the back of the book. An index is included.

University of Illinois

RUDOLPH J. VECOLI


The more we can learn about George Catlin, the better. He contributed mightily to the understanding of America's rich Indian heritage. In this volume we are served a large slice of his family's correspondence between the years 1817 and 1874. Of particular interest to students of Pennsylvania history will be the portion on Catlin's early years. Here the figure of his father, Putnam Catlin, one of the Connecticut settlers in the Wyoming Valley, provides a worthy glimpse of Calvin's breed. Much of the correspondence is of a definitely personal nature, speaking of health, love, money, and the everyday problems besetting a large family. Occasionally, an especially illuminating letter appears. But anyone familiar with Catlin's published writings cannot help but feel his books and paintings will outlast his epistles.

The most important value of this volume is the added information it will provide some future biographer of George Catlin. Otherwise, it is little more than a pleasant ramble through the contents of a dusty attic trunk. The interlarding of narrative by Marjorie Catlin Roehm is well-meant but leaves something to be desired in historical accuracy. To say "Wilkes-Barre was named for two distinguished Englishmen" is to give the Gallic Isaac Barré a grave spin. Or to suggest that John Wesley preached to George's mother in the Hopbottom, Pennsylvania, of 1804, is to provoke another ghost. Frankly, this reviewer is surprised and a bit disappointed that the distinguished University of California Press could not have had at least one member of the Berkeley or Los Angeles history faculty read proof. It might have saved some embarrassment.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission

DANIEL R. MACGILVRAY


A study of George Norris should excite the interest of every historian of modern America. After all, probably no other politician in this century can offer a greater variety of legislative interests and political alliances; certainly none possessed greater energy or persistence in the cause of reform. The fight against "Cannonism," the debate over our entrance into the First World War and then over the League of Nations, T.V.A., the Norris-LaGuardia Act—this is the stuff of American politics in the twentieth century. With such materials at hand, then, it is all the more
Part of the trouble with Mr. Zucker's book is its organization. It is not a full-scale biography (Richard Lowitt's study "promises to be the definitive biography," he says); it is an attempt to "outline selectively the political record and philosophy of Senator Norris and relate them to the twentieth-century political reform tradition." In order to facilitate this analytic approach the chapters are arranged topically. A brief review of Norris's life is followed by chapters on "Political Democracy" and "Economic Democracy"; then a chapter on Norris's activities in the fields of agriculture, labor, and natural resources; one on foreign affairs; and a final, summary appraisal. This organization is convenient, but it tends to turn what is complex and dramatic history into a mere catalogue of the Senator's positions and achievements. Norris and his times are dehydrated. But the abstract quality of the book's organization would not matter so much if the scholarship and analysis were impressive or interesting. They are not.

Despite the jacket assertion that the book is "based on primary sources" and "reveals new knowledge of various aspects of Norris's career," Mr. Zucker in fact relies very heavily on popular secondary accounts. For instance, more than a third of the citations in the section on labor are either from the textbooks by Arthur S. Link and Foster Rhea Dulles or from Irving Bernstein's *The Lean Years*. The famous crack by William Allen White about the progressives catching the Populists in swimming is taken from the George Mowry pamphlet put out by the American Historical Association's Service Center for Teachers of History! The result is a highly derivative book that does not satisfy the specialist but surely is not meant for the beginner. A series of textbook-like glosses are strung together which are overly-pat ("The [muckraking] movement began in 1902, reached militancy in 1903-1904, by 1911 was ebbing, and ultimately, in 1912, merged into progressivism") or so simple as to be virtually meaningless ("Senator Norris adhered to a conception of American democracy . . . predicated on immutable, easily apprehendable, and uncomplicated principles." Those "clearly stated in the Declaration of Independence . . ."). Many matters are not investigated in sufficient depth. Norris had "Populist leanings," we are told, yet he came to Washington with "an implicit faith in the virtue and wisdom of the Republican party." Why? Why did he join the Republican insurgents? What were the issues in the assault on Speaker Cannon's privileges or in the Ballinger-Pinchot affair? Mr. Zucker is not enlightening.

But the author's most serious fault is his excessive sectarianism. He uses Norris to illustrate what he terms "morality in politics." ("He had merged the ethics of religion with the practice of politics and achieved a political career characterized by integrity and courage.") In practice, this consists in measuring the Senator's legislative record against the latest consensus among political scientists about party regularity, civil service reform, the electoral college, etc., and in defining "correct" and "incorrect" political positions. Norris scores high on Zucker's scale, but the judgments
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are pseudo-moral. They are, as Herbert Butterfield has put it, "mixed and muddy affairs, part prejudice, part political animosity—with a dash of ethical flavoring wildly tossed into the concoction. They come blithely from impetuous adjudicators who have a rough idea of Henty heroes shining brightly against the background of something which is not cricket." We are supposed to share Mr. Zucker's opinions, to nod our head at each turn of an adjective. Surely no one is well served by such facileness.

Wayne State University

STANLEY SHAPIRO


Studies of American historical writing typically take the form of descriptive bibliography (e.g., Michael Kraus's The Writing of American History), topical comparison (Wesley Frank Craven's The Legend of the Founding Fathers), thematic unity (David Levin's History as Romantic Art), and tracing the effect of the political, social, and economic factors upon the development of the craft (David D. Van Tassel's Recording America's Past). Dr. Skotheim now gives us a chronicle of how "ideas" have been treated in American historical writing from Moses Coit Tyler and Edward Eggleston to Daniel Boorstin and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. Prefaced with a brief account of how "ideas" were treated before historians self-consciously became social, intellectual, or cultural historians in the late nineteenth century, the book is appended with an incompletely convincing attempt to document increased attention to the history of ideas in the twentieth century, using such evidence as the increase in the number of intellectuals listed in the DAB over the number in the National Cyclopaedia of American Biography (1891-1894). Since Skotheim tells us in his preface that Thomas J. Pressly's Americans Interpret Their Civil War "was a model for my study," we should expect a topical comparison shaped by an attempt to show how political, social, and economic factors influenced the historians and their writings.

This expectation is fulfilled. Skotheim picks the topic—what role has thought in American historiography?—and tells his story by comparing and contrasting various answers by historians recognized as "intellectual." This begins with an opposition drawn between Moses Coit Tyler, whose "view of the virtual autonomy of ideas over events . . . [was] characteristic of one approach to the writing of American histories of ideas which was followed later," and Edward Eggleston, who "not only coined the phrase the "New History" (under which the history of ideas would first be publicized after the turn of the century), but he also expressed many facets of the ideological position shared by these 'New Historians.'"

Although Eggleston's "followers never referred to their predecessor," James Harvey Robinson, Charles A. Beard, Carl Becker, Vernon L. Par- rington, and Merle Curti developed a tradition of progressive criticism of the American past, which Beard, Becker and Curti modified, under the impact of totalitarianism, toward positive affirmation of the value of American life. This "progressive tradition" was challenged, beginning in the
late 1920's, by dissenters "whose only predecessor was the late nineteenth century pioneer, Moses Coit Tyler—[these] were Samuel Eliot Morison, Perry Miller, and Ralph Gabriel." The challenge was both to ideology and methodology. Ideologically, the dissenters tended to affirm traditional beliefs as the basis of the American political system, while the progressives held the American past up to a standard of what democracy ought to be. Methodologically, the progressives tended to look upon ideas as the product of the real political, social, and economic causes, whereas the dissenters tended to look upon economic, social, and political conditions as the effects of ideas.

After the Second World War, the histories of men like Henry Steele Commager, Stow Persons, and Daniel Boorstin show a convergence of the two strands in American historiography. Following Parrington, Commager emphasized "the power of ideas, but minimized Parrington's equal emphasis upon the socio-economic determinism over ideas." Persons followed Gabriel's method, but had "more unreserved praise for twentieth century reform thought." Boorstin's work is an example of "an outspoken environmental interpretation of ideas with an ideological affirmation that the greatness of traditional American thought and life has been caused primarily by the American environment." Skotheim concludes this survey with a look to the future that sees more specialized studies and fewer attempts to sum up the "American mind."

*American Intellectual Histories and Historians* organizes roughly the same material David W. Noble used in *Historians against History* (Minneapolis, 1965). Noble, viewing the work of George Bancroft, Frederick Jackson Turner, Beard, Becker, Parrington, and Boorstin as arguments designed to preserve the national covenant, used this material to produce a book more interesting to historians, as well as the common reader, than Skotheim's. Skotheim restricted his audience to professionals when he chose to show how the times affected historiography rather than using historical writing to illuminate the times, as did Noble. Further, the method of topical comparison, however effective it may be when treating topics like the Civil War or the Revolution, is more frustrating than enlightening when dealing with things like "ideas" or "thought," which need to be analyzed before they are clearly comprehended. I am not at all sure that when Boorstin talks about the ideas of the Puritans he means the same thing that Parrington, Miller, or Curti meant. Before concepts can be usefully compared they have to be analogous. A more interesting book would have dealt with this problem first.

Historians interested in historiography should become familiar with the work on philosophy of history done in England and the United States in the last dozen years. A convenient place to begin might be William Dray's *Philosophy of History*, a text in the Prentice-Hall Foundations of Philosophy Series. With some of the tools of "critical philosophy of history" at hand Skotheim might not have chosen this subject, but if he had, he would have formulated it in a more interesting way.