

BOOK REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTES

EDITED BY NORMAN B. WILKINSON

The Best Poor Man's Country: A Geographical Study of Early Southeastern Pennsylvania. By James T. Lemon. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1972. Pp. 295. \$12.00.)

James Lemon's fact-filled book on colonial Pennsylvania is one more example of the inability of historians to protect their academic empire against invaders from other disciplines. A geographer, Lemon has searched the sources thoroughly, organized his findings well, and applied them throughout to put forth various interpretations. His central argument is that an attachment to liberal individualism explains early Pennsylvania development, or, as he would say, "the processes on the land's surface." Extensive agriculture, rural restlessness, dispersal onto isolated farms, and the failure of proprietary plans for orderly settlement were all connected, in an important way, to the tendency of men to make individual decisions, based on a natural desire to improve their material well-being.

This states the case a good bit more boldly than does the author, and consequently weakens it. The reader must consider his impressive evidence before demurring. No doubt Lemon is basically correct. Perhaps no single phenomenon has been more important in modern western history than the growth in the importance of the individual, and beneath that, the growth in the strength of the individual ego.

Lemon first considers who occupied land in early Pennsylvania and how it was used. While elsewhere de-emphasizing the importance of cultural factors, he finds settlers drawn to places where their fellow countrymen were already seated. But Germans and Scotch-Irish alike ignored the orderly plan of occupation envisioned by the feudal-minded proprietors who failed to anticipate the strong trend in "the individualization of decision-making." Many people did not stay settled long. In 1747, Pastor Henry Muhlenberg reported that half his congregation was missing after six years, and this, Professor Lemon tells us, was not unusual.

A significant portion of this movement may have represented an early flight from the farm. At least the country towns of southeastern Pennsylvania grew at a rapid rate in size and number after 1730. The locations and functions of these towns were determined in large part by the organization of commerce in the Philadelphia trading area. Lemon correctly points out that country towns too close to Philadelphia did not flourish in contrast to those which were forty or fifty miles removed.

Having analyzed the patterns of land use, he turns to the nature of that usage. He is especially interested in explaining why Pennsylvania farmers practiced extensive agriculture. He concludes that it was primarily

because individuals were satisfied with the profits they were making without intensifying their efforts. But I wonder whether the semi-developed nature of the commercial system, and in particular, the limited markets of that time, were not as important as individual decisions. Pennsylvanians were just not as much in control of their fates as the author implies.

A recurrent note struck in this historical geography of southeastern Pennsylvania is that neither the Germans nor the Scotch-Irish were as good or as bad as their reputations. Maybe not, but contemporary Americans and visiting Europeans thought they were. "The Germans are certainly the best farmers of any people in America," a New England traveler recorded in his journal in 1751. "If a German places his eye on an Irishman's land, he gets it in a little time." If untrue, why did the myth spring up and persist? Perhaps, as Winthrop Jordan suggests in the case of blacks, and Roy Harvey Pearce in the case of the savage, English assessments of other ethnic groups in early Pennsylvania tell us much more about Englishmen than about other ethnic groups.

California State College, Long Beach, Calif.

JOHN P. WALZER

American Loyalist: Jared Ingersoll. By Lawrence Henry Gipson. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971. Pp. 432. \$12.50 cloth, \$3.95 paper.)

Seldom has a historian lived to preside like the late Lawrence Henry Gipson over two reissues of his doctoral dissertation a half century after it first appeared in print. When such an event occurs it obviously requires a fresh look at the book and at the man.

The justification for republishing is more understandable (and the feat of longevity the more startling) because when Gipson finished writing *Jared Ingersoll* in 1919 he was already a mature scholar, in fact a man of middle age. His research had been thorough, his inferences sound, his treatment of the intricate background fresh and impeccable; so that during fifty years of historical discovery and reinterpretation he found no reason to alter what he had written on this subject. The first reprint appeared in 1969. The latest printing differs from the two that preceded it only in title and by the addition of an "Author's Foreword, 1971." This last contains a brief essay on the political origins of the Loyalists and an up-to-date discussion of the principal writings, of Loyalists and about them, that had come to Gipson's attention.

The key to the book's coherence is sympathy, born no doubt of the author's identification with his subject. Gipson, a Congregationalist, Rhodes Scholar of the very first generation, later trained at Yale, emerged as an American historian just when the British Empire attained its greatest extent. His supervisor at Yale, C. M. Andrews, communicated some of his own respect for an imperial and institutional approach. Gipson must therefore have been greatly excited when he learned of an opportunity to study the career of Jared Ingersoll, a theologically liberal Congregationalist, Yale graduate, eighteenth-century admirer and servant of Britain's Constitution and Empire. The possibility of identification is pointed up in fact when

Gipson passes implicit moral judgment on the infrequent human inconsistencies of Ingersoll. For Gipson the stance of Loyalist or of Patriot was an understandable political decision, but candor and constancy belong to a higher realm. He judges Ingersoll by the standard that doubtless he and Ingersoll shared.

The loyalism of Jared Ingersoll becomes evident as a fusion of many elements. His social standing was high and therefore conceivably threatened by any popular movement. He was an Old Light Congregationalist (Arminian) in Connecticut where many Old Lights became Anglicans. He served as king's attorney for fourteen years, displaying unqualified respect for law and order and reverence for legal institutions. As London agent for the Connecticut government he came to love England almost as much as he loved America, and no doubt gained a fuller understanding of the meaning of Empire. Like his friend Franklin he underestimated the reaction to be expected in America when the Stamp Act was passed, but unlike Franklin he was appointed one of the stamp distributors and so could not escape opprobrium. Later, as judge of the court of vice-admiralty for the Middle Colonies, he had a special obligation to be loyal and for a time found financial advantage in loyalty. An ambitious and highly capable man, but one lacking in popular appeal, he had sought preferment by dignified maneuver in Whitehall instead of competing for the votes of Yankee farmers.

Jared Ingersoll is in fact one of the best products of the older school of biography and exactly what the author intended: a public life interpreted from all the primary sources with artistry and restraint. Its only concern is to explain the developing Loyalist. Since the story is made to emerge from hard facts without references to psychological or philosophical systems, such matters as Ingersoll's psychic life and the state of his health are almost completely excluded. Although a footnote tells us that two portraits of him have survived, neither is reproduced in the volume. The death of his wife and his remarrying are details subordinated in a footnote. His own death is reported quite abruptly and without explanation.

No one can deny Gipson's analytical and expository gifts; he treats the London maneuvering and the town politics of New Haven with equal zest. Within this model is foreshadowed the structure of all his major works. The current thesis that tends to explain early American politics as a polarizing of cosmopolites and localists finds much implicit support. Though Gipson had his obvious preference, his sympathy was broad enough to comprehend both poles.

Dickinson College

HENRY J. YOUNG

Menmonite Attire Through Four Centuries. By Melvin Gingerich. (Breinigsville, Pa.: The Pennsylvania German Society, 1970. Pp. 192. \$10.00.)

One has the feeling that this is the definitive study of its subject—but then one can also ask whether an article might not have served the

same purpose. *Mennonite Attire Through Four Centuries* apparently makes one major point: that traditionally Mennonites wore simple versions of contemporary fashions, and it wasn't until the late nineteenth century, and primarily in the United States, that "regulation garb" became an issue. The probable reason put forward is that high fashion became generally available and an atmosphere of toleration threatened to weaken Mennonite cohesion.

The Mennonites oppose fashions, according to a 1921 dress code, because "They drive the poor away from the Church. . . . They excite lust, (and). . . . To conform to the world means to 'walk in the counsel of the ungodly.'" On a more practical level the Mennonites who had been able to survive centuries of persecution felt that now that they could live in peace, their distinct nature was being eroded. The church leaders recognized that plain clothes or a "uniform" could help keep the faithful in the fold by setting them apart from society in much the same way that the Salvation Army chose special garb for its troops. Perhaps the book's most interesting text concerns the evolution of the prayer bonnet.

To extend the study to monograph length there is a good deal of information about other plain-garbed people including the Quakers, the Amish, and the Hutterites. The latter two, of course, have roots in the same European land mass as the Mennonites.

While the book appears to be adequately researched and indexed, there are scholarly lacunae. Prime among these is the lack of a bibliography. Author Gingerich should be especially commended for the illustrations he has ferreted out. They are an invaluable supplement to the text and immeasurably add to the value of the study.

Capitol Campus, Pennsylvania State University

IRWIN RICHMAN

The Glass Gaffers of New Jersey and Their Creations from 1739 to the Present. By Adeline Pepper. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971. Pp. 332. \$17.50.)

The term glass gaffer generally refers to a master glass blower. *The Glass Gaffers of New Jersey and Their Creations from 1739 to the Present* is a glasshouse by glasshouse treatise on New Jersey glass blowers and their products. It is designed to appeal not only to collectors of glassware, but also to those interested in the craft of glassblowing, and those with a historical interest in glass. Miss Pepper has struck a happy balance both in illustrative material and in text between considerations of the artifacts and accounts of the people who created them. Although the book is an analysis of a New Jersey industry, much of the merchandising and some of the ownership were by Pennsylvania entrepreneurs. The nature of the New Jersey trade is neatly characterized by Benjamin Franklin's statement cited by Miss Pepper: "New Jersey is a barrel open at both ends. One end is Philadelphia and the other is Manhattan."

The book is popularly written, finely illustrated by both black and white and color illustrations, and it successfully handles the problem of

creating a readable text with essentially a handbook format. An index, a glossary of glass-related terms, a section on glass care, lists of illustrations, and an extensive bibliography all contribute to make this volume a fine reference tool. A prodigious amount of research is exhibited by the detail of the accounts of the various glasshouses, yet the author does not overwhelm the reader with minutiae. Again Miss Pepper has skillfully arrived at the proper balance to best serve her varied readerships.

A great diversity of material is found within the accounts of the individual glasshouses. Some selected examples include some of the labor problems created when machines were introduced to blow bottles; the various fruit jars—noting that the Mason jar was neither the first nor adjudged the best; the results of the various glasshouse archaeological explorations; the unique rose paperweights and a picture of crimpers used to fashion some of them; the cylinder method of blowing window panes; the history of the flamboyant Dr. Dyott—who operated much of the time out of Philadelphia; the historical flasks commemorating everything from George Washington to Jenny Lind; and of course, the booze bottle—pictured with the mold used to blow it. Fortunately the excellent index enables one to locate information from a variety of approaches.

My criticism of the book is methodological. Miss Pepper does not footnote her accounts nor correlate the references in the bibliography to the sections where they apply, although in some cases in the text she mentions her oral interview sources. This is not meant to be a reflection on the authority of the author nor the scholarship of the volume, but a comment on the growing sophistication of the readership. The hobby of collecting has taken on new depth of interest. It takes a seriously interested party to spend the \$17.50 for the book instead of buying a piece of glass for the same money. For many collectors the book is not the ultimate authority, but the starting point.

The Glass Gaffers of New Jersey is an important glass book in the respect that it does present much new information, and presents it in a logical, readable and retrievable form. It can well serve the collector, historian, and those wishing an attractive and intriguing book to have on the coffee table.

Hagley Museum

ROBERT A. HOWARD

The American Shakers: From Neo-Christianity to Pre-Socialism. By Henri Desroche. Translated and edited by John K. Savacool. (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1971. Pp. 357. \$9.50.)

The current interest in communal ways of living makes timely the issue of this book on the Shakers, one of America's largest and longest existing utopian movements. Originally published in France in 1955 as *Les Shakers Américains: D'un Neo-Christianisme à un Pre-socialisme?* by the sociologist Henri Desroche, it appears for the first time in the English language translated and edited by John K. Savacool. This study was written at the time of the Christian-Marxist dialogue in Europe and

reflects some of the questions of that day concerning the relationship between Christianity and socialism. The Shakers serve as a vehicle for that concern, but the book is also a stimulating examination of the organization, growth and influence of the Shakers in America.

The focus of the study rests upon the questions Desroche asks of the Shakers. Were they a revival of early Christian movements, as the Shakers themselves claimed, or were they the forerunners of modern-day socialism? Desroche, by bringing to bear the analytical tools of Troeltsch's typology of religious movements on the existing studies of Shaker history, concludes that they were neither, but that they contained elements of both early Christian and socialist movements. Thus, because the two different trends momentarily came together in the Shakers they might be considered the "missing link" between Christianity and socialism.

Desroche's desire to study the Shakers within this framework produces the dramatic tension in the book. He finds, for example, that Shaker claims of primitive Christian antecedence emerged *a posteriori*, and instead attributes the religious excitement of the French Cevenoles exiled in England and the societal shattering impact of the Industrial Revolution as the precipitating factors in the revolt that led to Shakerism. By the same token, even though the Shaker persuasion had social consequences and reflected symptoms of social revolt, such as their refusing to reproduce, to work in industry, to take oaths, to serve in the military, or to use money among themselves, they were not a proletarian socialist protest organization. Desroche's analysis of the development and change of Shaker practice and doctrine as well as their relationships with socialistic utopias in America tends to support his view.

Yet while Desroche's categories of concern illuminate these and other areas of Shaker life, there are some weaknesses to the study. By his own admission Desroche has not attempted to add anything new to the study of the Shakers, such as the discovery and analysis of new source materials. This original intent was preserved in the current edition by the failure of the author and translator to update the scholarship to include work completed since 1955. Such inclusions could possibly have helped surmount the difficulty Desroche has explaining the growth of the Shakers in America. Other than labeling their rapid growth as "parasitic" he fails to explain the forces in this country which made their growth so dramatic.

Readers wishing an introduction to the Shakers may feel somewhat burdened by a ponderous style and by a limited proper name index. They may also find the topical organization of the book difficult to follow. However, students of the Shakers and of utopian movements will find this a valuable book. It is valuable not only in terms of the questions raised as to where the Shakers belong in the history of American millenarianism, but also in terms of the Shaker relationship to neo-Christian and pre-socialistic utopian movements.

Stephen Douglas: The Last Years, 1857-1861. By Damon Wells. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1971. Pp. 342. \$10.00.)

"My interest in Stephen Douglas goes back to the evening in 1959 when I watched a Broadway dramatization of the Lincoln-Douglas Debates. The performance was entertaining enough, but I left the theater with the uneasy feeling that the playwright felt that in order to make Abraham Lincoln a hero, he had to make Stephen Douglas a villain." With this disarmingly frank admission, Damon Wells begins his account of the last years of Stephen Douglas. The author tries to escape from the hero-villain framework, to treat Douglas as a dedicated nationalist who was "far too long out of step with his times." The finished portrait is sympathetic but in many ways imprecise.

Wells chooses to study Douglas's final political battles, especially the break with Buchanan, the Illinois senatorial campaign and the election of 1860. After a cursory summary of Douglas's upbringing and political career, Wells embarks on a description of the confrontation between "Douglas and Goliath." Wells leaves little doubt of his estimation of James Buchanan: he "was a good man and a bad President." How easily Wells rescues his hero by creating another villain! Buchanan serves the purpose well; he becomes in these pages a perfect scapegoat. The President's errors are colossal blunders. Douglas's are tragic mistakes. Although Buchanan bears the blame for mishandling the festering Kansas controversy, Douglas escapes severe criticism for his role in generating that conflict. The indictment might be more convincing had Wells drawn upon the Buchanan papers to clarify the relationship between Douglas and the President.

After disposing of this feud, Wells fashions a very competent chapter on the principles of popular sovereignty. He uses this loose amalgam of ideas to establish Douglas's involvement in the territorial controversy. Wells makes no attempt to portray Douglas as a master of consistency. Nor does he defend popular sovereignty as a political panacea. He carefully distinguishes between the abstract "hard side" of the doctrine and its more ambiguous "soft side." These distinctions are crucial and Wells's analysis is persuasive.

This discussion of popular sovereignty naturally leads to the Illinois senatorial campaign of 1858. Although there was more to this canvass than the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates, Wells focuses on these dramatic encounters to show that the differences between the protagonists were more apparent than real. In studying the slavery question as raised during the debates, Wells is a bit too charitable; he never explores adequately Douglas's peculiar neutrality. Wells treats the debates as a national concern and pays scant attention to Illinois politics. There is passing reference to the geographic distribution of Douglas's electoral strength, but this does not satisfactorily relate the man to his constituency. Once the election contest concludes, both Lincoln and Illinois lapse into obscurity.

In recounting Douglas's efforts to retain Southern support, Wells is at his best. He clearly describes the Little Giant's vacillation and the growing impatience of Southern extremists. Like so many Northern poli-

ticians before him, Douglas could not prove his allegiance to Southern interests. By 1859 both he and his doctrine of popular sovereignty were beginning to look shop-worn, a fact Wells makes clear in his analysis of Douglas's famous *Harper's* magazine article.

Like Douglas, Wells tends toward fatalism in his approach to the election of 1860. After a skillful narrative of the stormy Charleston convention, he follows Douglas's supporters to Baltimore where the Democrats made a final but vain attempt to preserve unity. Clearly Douglas's nomination exacted a fearful price, as the candidate himself realized. Despite the ominous atmosphere, Douglas waged a vigorous campaign that left him and his party shattered in body and spirit. Wells tries to turn this defeat into triumph by detecting in Douglas a vital transformation. He sees the confusing nationalism of the 1850's giving way to "the more specific stuff of Unionism."

Despite this attempt at a dramatic conclusion, this remains a useful, but by no means a penetrating insight into the career of a major political figure. In part the weaknesses of the book result from the narrowness of Wells's focus. Douglas's actions during his last senatorial term are the direct result of his stand during the critical controversies of 1850 and 1854. Wells refers to these but analyzes neither in detail. Nor has he uncovered a wealth of new information about these last years. He relies heavily on standard secondary accounts, published correspondence and newspapers. He has listed only ten manuscript collections in his bibliography, few of them relating to Douglas's political and congressional contemporaries. By broadening his research, Wells might have added dimension to his portrait.

University of Delaware

JAMES C. CURTIS

Yankee Cavalrymen: Through the Civil War With the Ninth Pennsylvania Cavalry. By John W. Rowell. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1971. Pp. 280. \$7.50.)

It is refreshing to find a university press occasionally willing to publish a Civil War regimental history. *Yankee Cavalrymen* provides just such an account via an ingenious blend of original soldier diary material with modern narrative writing. The result should appeal not only to students of the Civil War, but also to fanciers of soldier life and devotees of Pennsylvania history.

The basis of the account emerges from the diaries of the author's grandfather, Cornelius Baker, and his colleague William Thomas, both of whom served with the Ninth Pennsylvania cavalry in Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia and the Carolinas. When Rowell added material from multi-archival and other published sources he gained a measure of feeling of nineteenth century American life caught in the cauldron of civil war.

The Ninth Pennsylvania, raised in the central part of the state—Perry, Cumberland, and Dauphin counties—served in the Middle war theater, more often on scouting, raiding, and forage duty than in major combat.

Indeed, this is why Rowell's book proves so rewarding; we often forget that most wartime events relate only peripherally to battles. Soldiers such as the Pennsylvanians of the Ninth Cavalry spent far more of their time on monotonous guard and fatigue duty, preparing for combat or recuperating from the same, and of course, searching for food, shelter, and entertainment.

Rowell carefully describes "Mr. Lincoln's Plain People" of the central part of the Keystone State and how they provided the common soldiers or "the real heroes" of the conflict. Boot camp at Camp Cameron near Harrisburg receives its due before the youthful troopers depart for war. Rowell always sets the stage for his narrative by a brief diary entry at the head of each chapter.

The Pennsylvanians proved to be a high morale outfit which enlisted in the wave of patriotic fervor after the attack on Fort Sumter. This patriotism held up through 1864 when more than three-fourths of the outfit re-enlisted. Members of the unit boasted that they never were beaten in an equal fight and never "skedaddled" when faced by greater odds. Their opponents generally came from the famous commands of Nathan Bedford Forrest, Joseph Wheeler, and John Hunt Morgan.

Students of small unit actions and cavalry maneuvers will be interested especially in the accounts of Carters Station, Mossy Creek, Thompsons Station and Readyville—some of those countless skirmishes far overshadowed by our knowledge of Chickamauga and "marching through Georgia." Even the unit's participation in the Perryville battle—"the western Antietam"—will add to the usefulness of the work. Pennsylvania history enthusiasts will wish to add additional dimensions to their understanding of that state during wartime and how its native sons acted on distant service. The maps and illustrations are good as is the final chapter entitled "The Old Soldier" which illustrates so well what role was played by the veteran of the Civil War. This latter element may prove of particular interest to the present generation of Pennsylvanians, some of whom have returned from Vietnam.

U. S. Army Military History Research Collection—Carlisle

BENJAMIN F. COOLING, III

William Augustus Muhlenberg: Church Leader in the Cities. By Alvin W. Skardon. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971. Pp. 343. \$15.00.)

William Augustus Muhlenberg (1796-1877) was an Episcopal clergyman in Philadelphia, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and New York City, hence the sub-title of this biography by Alvin W. Skardon, "Church Leader in the Cities." Although baptized a Lutheran, the church of the four generations of Muhlenbergs in America who preceded him, he was almost by accident reared as an Episcopalian to be ordained a deacon in 1817 and a priest in 1820 in St. James Episcopal Church in Philadelphia. In 1820 he transferred to Lancaster as a co-rector in the St. James Episcopal Church

there. Six years later he moved to a church in Flushing, Long Island. In 1828 he shifted from the ministry to education as founder and headmaster of the Flushing Institute. In 1838 he opened St. Paul's College at College Point, Long Island.

After twenty years in education he returned to the ministry in 1846 as rector of the Church of the Holy Communion in New York City. For three years, during his ministry there, 1851-53, he was editor of *The Evangelical Catholic*. In 1858 he resigned as rector to concentrate on the direction of one of the first church hospitals in New York City, St. Luke's, where he lived until his death. One last enterprise was an experiment in community living, St. Johnland on Long Island, incorporated in 1870. This list indicates Muhlenberg's broad interpretation of the ministry's calling embracing educational, health, and social as well as spiritual service to the community.

Muhlenberg was a leader and innovator in all these areas. In the church he concerned himself not only with hymnal and liturgical reform but, more significantly, with efforts to democratize church membership. The Church of the Holy Communion, which he opened, was a pioneer "free church." A most significant contribution was his leadership in efforts to bring about church unity, culminating in 1853 in a Memorial to the House of Bishops calling upon the Episcopal Church to seize leadership in the ecumenical movement. In education he experimented, on the one hand, with curricular flexibility to meet the individual student's needs and potentialities and, on the other, with Christian education that would transcend sectarianism. He founded the first Episcopal sisterhood, The Sisterhood of the Holy Communion. It became the mainstay of St. Luke's Hospital which, though open to all who needed its services, was organized by him around the Episcopal Church, as an exercise in "practical Christianity."

He called himself an evangelical Catholic and in the periodical publication with that title that he founded and edited his writings indicate what that meant to him. Skardon quotes him: "Whatever be the points of [doctrinal] differences among us [Christians] we are all sufficiently sound in the faith to be far more abundant in the fruits of good works." "Practical Christianity" meant facing up to and solving the social problems of growing urban America—not merely providing free churches and free hospitals, rehabilitating prostitutes and fighting slum lords, but also advocating the ideals of "the socialism of brotherhood in Christ. . . ." The industrial community called St. Johnland was his effort to bring Christian principles to bear in experiments in human relationships to cope with the social consequences of industrialization.

Most of Muhlenberg's creative leadership and constructive contributions have been recognized by American scholarship in the fields of religious, social, urban and educational history. However, this recognition has been piecemeal. Skardon, giving due recognition in a comprehensive bibliographical essay to such scholarship, observes that these works deal "usually with those aspects of his career in which the authors were inter-

ested." An impressive array of monographic material has also accumulated. However, until the appearance of the biography under consideration here there has appeared no comprehensive study of Muhlenberg's activities with the man himself as the focal point, except for a biography written shortly after his death by Anne Ayres, the first member of the Sisterhood of the Holy Communion. Skardon furthermore has made an exhaustive search of relevant primary sources, all of which have been brought to play for the first time to present this integrated and complete biography of "the most influential figure produced by the [Episcopal] church in the nineteenth century."

A complete bibliography of works by and about William Augustus Muhlenberg and the activities with which he was associated is included, although there is no reference to the biographical sketch in the DAB by G. H. Gentzmer, which was obviously used. The inconvenience of placing the footnotes at the end of the book as backnotes has been overcome by an indication at the top of each page of notes as to the pages of text to which they apply.

Lafayette College

ALBERT W. GENDEBIEN

Ulysses S. Grant. By John A. Carpenter. [Hans L. Trefousse, ed., *Twayne's Rulers and Statesmen of the World Series*, 14.] (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1970. Pp. 217. n.p.)

In his preface, Professor Carpenter of Fordham University states that he sought "a balanced view, one that gave due recognition to the positive achievements of Grant's presidency, and especially to his Southern policy which needs a new evaluation in the light of current Reconstruction historiography." The author fails to accomplish his objectives. The book is, in fact, an uneven, cursory narrative of Grant's life. Initially, there is the familiar account of his early years and precipitate rise to military fame in the North. "A down and out failure in 1861," Carpenter writes, "he had emerged the nation's foremost hero with a reputation that would endure through the many trials of the post-war years especially those of the presidency." By 1866, caught up in the Reconstruction political morass, Grant "was determined to protect the army and carry out the will of Congress as expressed in the Civil Rights Act, the Fourteenth Amendment . . . , and other legislation." Hence, he became the logical presidential nominee in 1868 because the Republicans "were fully conscious of his great popularity with the white voters of the North, and incidentally, the colored voters of the South."

The presidential years, with major emphasis upon the Grant coterie, are delineated in ninety-two pages of rigidly chronological and often imprecise prose. Because the author avoids taking sides (in this sense the volume is balanced), and because of apparent space limitations, "positive achievements" are essentially concealed in the monotonous chronicle of politico-economic "wheeling and dealing" and executive incompetence. According to Carpenter, Grant's accomplishments included: (1) the com-

pletion of Reconstruction (“ . . . we are prone to forget that Reconstruction officially ended . . . on February 24, 1871”; (2) the resolution of the *Alabama Claims* controversy (“ . . . Grant should also be allowed to assume at least some of the glory for the magnificent handling of foreign affairs . . . ”); (3) the humanization of Indian policy (“[unsupervised] Indians [should be placed] on reservations as quickly as possible, . . . to be treated in a humane, Christian manner”; and (4) civil service reform (“ . . . the President, to his credit did introduce the first serious reform into the government service. . . .”)

Concerning “intervention” in the South during the first administration, the author states that if Grant “erred it was on the side of restraint rather than excessive zeal.” Why? “Grant’s sense of duty, and occasionally his partiality to the Republican regimes. . . .” Neither should he be censured for the failure of Reconstruction policies, particularly the treatment of blacks, inasmuch as (1) “Northern whites . . . would not follow through with the policy of equality initiated during the Civil War and brought to a climax in the legislation and amendments of the Reconstruction years,” and (2) the “determined and often violent opposition to the uplifting of the black race on the part of virtually all the white population of the South.” This is hardly a new evaluation. However, the Southern Question is traced to its unsavory denouement rather than being truncated as in most Reconstruction studies.

The Notes and References are located, most inconveniently, in the back where shoddy editing produced numerous inexplicable errors, e.g., double citations of the same source in one note. There is a “Grant” chronology, a useful Index, and a sketchy annotated bibliography. Maps and illustrations would have improved the format. Carpenter relied heavily on primary sources, especially personal papers. The secondary works are standard; a number are unnecessarily ancient. The issues of the Grant “era” are not analyzed nor is the literature synthesized. The publisher’s book jacket describes the work as “fascinating and unique.” This reviewer must demur.

California State College, California, Pa.

JOHN K. FOLMAR

Immigrants to Freedom: Jewish Communities in Rural New Jersey Since 1882. By Joseph Brandes in association with Martin Douglas. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971. Pp. 424. \$12.50.)

Readers interested in the Jewish experience in America will find *Immigrants to Freedom* by Joseph Brandes in association with Martin Douglas a useful and unusual volume. The book deals not with the lives of Jewish immigrants to big city ghettos, described in works such as Jacob Riis’ *How the Other Half Lives*, or Moses Rischin’s *The Promised City*, but rather with Jews transported to agricultural colonies in southern New Jersey. In this narrative account, based on research from the Jewish press and from manuscripts left by the leaders of the colonization movement, Brandes establishes the place of the South Jersey communities in the perspective of the past ninety years of Jewish history.

In the early 1880s when Russia's Jews were suffering severe persecution, a group of Russian Jewish intellectuals formed the Am Olan (Eternal People) movement dedicated to national revival through a return to the soil. Am Olan received substantial financial support from wealthy German-Jews both in Europe and in the United States who saw in it not only an opportunity to aid in the resettlement of their beleaguered co-religionists but also the chance to destroy the anti-Semitic slur that Jews were too city-bred and physically weak to become farmers. Aided by Baron Maurice de Hirsch and the French-based Alliance Israélite Universelle, a small band of Russian Jews arrived in Vineland, New Jersey, in 1882 to begin new lives as farmers.

The philanthropists had chosen the site near Vineland because it offered cheap, hitherto undeveloped land located within a short train ride from the large Jewish populations of New York City and Philadelphia. The immigrants, who were expected to work off mortgages on their homes and as yet uncleared farmland, soon discovered that South Jersey had disadvantages. Mosquitoes swarmed in the low swampy pine barrens which yielded crops reluctantly. Try as they might, the immigrant farmers were lucky to break even raising truck crops for the nearby cities during the 1880s and 1890s, years of agricultural depression throughout America.

Although the Vineland area Jewish communities, especially Woodbine and Alliance, proved to be the only such colonies among several founded throughout the United States to survive their initial settlement period intact, Brandes questions their value. "In light of the difficulties confronting agriculture" [in America], he says, "the recurrent enthusiasm for rural colonization schemes among American Jewish leaders from the 1880s even into the 1930s may well be questioned." The German-Jewish philanthropists with their self-help ethic, Americanized religious practices, and concern to prove to the gentile world that Jews could be farmers, were unprepared to deal effectively with the struggling farmers' problems. As soon as they had the opportunity, many of the young people in the rural communities moved to the city in search of better opportunities for education and employment just as did the sons and daughters of many American farmers in the 1880s and 1890s.

Nonetheless, the New Jersey communities were kept alive, in part by the introduction of small clothing factories into the area. During the 1930s and '40s the Vineland area absorbed many Jews fleeing from Hitlerite persecutions in Europe. Today these rural communities with their synagogues and other Jewish organizations are still an important part of South Jersey, although their main crop has changed from truck to poultry.

Brandes tells the story of the colonies with care and compassion, but his narrative is marred, I think, by an ill-defined sense of purpose. It is not always clear if he is addressing a local audience that wants to know, for instance, the names of the South Jersey Jewish boys who died in World Wars I and II, or a wider audience of scholars. This is a typical problem for authors dealing with local history subjects, and one gets the feeling that Brandes' solution is to include everything for everybody. At some

points the book should have been more analytical. In the section on the early difficulties of the colonies, for example, Brandes notes the nationwide agricultural depression, but he does not include any specific data on falling prices in the New Jersey truck crop business. Finally, I had the feeling that the author was unsure about his theme. Although in the passage cited above he criticizes the rural movement as impractical, yet in other places he seems to be defending the colonies as nurturing places for many prominent Jewish professionals and national leaders. One wonders if these able and ambitious men and women would have had the same opportunities had they been reared in the more typical urban ghettos.

Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation

CAROL E. HOFFECKER

The Croatian Immigrants in America. By George J. Prpic. (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1971. Pp. 519. \$11.95.)

Pennsylvania has a rich and diverse culture. People from many lands have continually moved into the state since the days when William Penn advertised for settlers throughout Europe. One of the most important of these migrations took place in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when thousands of Slavic immigrants left eastern and southern Europe and came to America. No state received more of these people than Pennsylvania. Yet, if one were to list the serious works of scholarship dealing with Slavic groups in this state, the amount would be small indeed. Besides several dissertations, we have the out-dated works of Emily Balch, Frank Warne, and Peter Roberts, and the more recent inquiries of Wytrowski on the Poles, Govorchin on the South Slavs, and Victor Greene's study of unionization of Slavs in the anthracite region. With George Prpic's *The Croatian Immigrants in America*, we now have, finally, a comprehensive and scholarly account of a Slavic group.

The Croatians are a South Slavic people, along with Slovenians, Serbians, Macedonians, Montenegrins, and Bulgarians. All the South Slavs, except the Bulgarians live in present day Yugoslavia. Croatians have been leaving their homeland ever since they were forced into Western Hungary and Lower Austria by Turkish invasions in the sixteenth century. By 1800, many Croatians from Dalmatia were sailing regularly to the United States in windjammers. These early sailors were responsible for the development of Croatian communities in California and in the Delta Country of Louisiana. Tales of these early settlers in America from the Dalmatian coast were spread inland into Croatia by Slovenian pack-peddlers who traveled through the inner regions.

The bulk of the Croatian immigration came after 1880. Prpic gives us some of the most detailed information we have so far received concerning the causes of the "new immigration." Coming mostly to the Pittsburgh area, Prpic modifies the recent stress on economic motives. He argues persuasively that political forces were just as important, such as high taxes from the Austro-Hungarian rulers of Croatia, the terror of gendarmes, imprisonment for political activity, and the mismanagement by Austria-

Hungary of the forests which ruined Croatian industries. Prpic challenges the conclusion of the Immigration Commission which attributed South Slav immigration chiefly to economic forces.

Perhaps Prpic's most fascinating segments deal with his research in Croatian sources in Europe which depict scenes of the migrants farewell. In one particular passage he relates the ceremony the people of Karlovac performed the day before a group would leave for America. There was first a mass and all received holy communion. The priest would then impart a special blessing, a last meal would follow with relatives, and then, after a sleepless night, the migrants would march through the village singing a song which expressed the feelings "of a sore heart."

The largest Croatian settlement in the country grew up around Pittsburgh and its steel mills. But other significant concentrations were to be found around the mills of Sharon, Farrell, and Steelton. By 1916, Prpic estimates that Pennsylvania had some 100,000 Croatians. In fact, as early as 1902, there were eighty-five lodges of the National Croatian Society in the state. They could be found nestled between 25th and 30th Streets in Pittsburgh and housed close to the tracks of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad in McKeesport.

Some of Prpic's most important contributions come when he discusses the dilemma second and third generation Croatians faced during the Second World War. The Croatian government in Zagreb was openly pro-German and pro-Italian. The Yugoslav government in exile, however, was predominantly Serbian and was an ally of Churchill and Roosevelt. Yugoslav diplomatic representatives in Washington disseminated official propaganda falsely accusing all Croatians as traitors and "pro-fascist elements." Much of the American press, Prpic argues, willingly accepted Serbian charges as true, thus making the position of American Croatians difficult. When the Croatian government of Ante Pavelic in Zagreb declared war against America in December of 1941, American Croats were especially suspect. The FBI even searched the editorial offices of certain Croatian publications in Pittsburgh and confiscated copies of the *Croatian Almanac*.

Although Prpic does not mention the implications of these events, his work implicitly provides us with one explanation of why so many of the so-called "white-ethnics" in this country became "super-patriots." Croatians, as other Slavs in America, were particularly intent on proving their loyalty to Washington. In 1941 the Croatian Fraternal Union, with headquarters in Pittsburgh, sent a long telegram to Roosevelt pledging the loyalty of all American Croatians and stating that no sacrifice would be too great in the war effort.

Prpic's extensive treatment misses nothing. Thus, in addition to the immigration of Croatians and their problems of adjusting to a new culture through several generations, we are even treated to a chapter on Croatian literature in America and an extensive bibliography. His accounts of the painter Maksimilijan Vanka and his murals at Millvale, Pennsylvania, and his references to the origin of the mythical Croatian folk-hero, Joe Magarac, among the steel workers of Pittsburgh, should fascinate all those who are

interested in the cultural history of America's ethnic groups. Indeed, it is unlikely that we will ever get a more comprehensive and detailed account of the Croatians. It is only hoped that we can see similar work done on the rest of ethnic America.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission

JOHN BODNAR

The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume 10, 1896-1898. Edited by Arthur S. Link, et al. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971. Pp. 610. \$15.00.)

Opening in the midst of a heated presidential campaign and closing with the termination of a foreign war, this volume of the Wilson Papers documents a young professor's similarly varied academic career. Chosen as Princeton's Sesquicentennial Orator, Wilson utilized that position of pre-eminence to "speak . . . plainly to the scientific fellows" about the value of a humanist education. Later correspondence reveals the negotiations to induce him to accept the leadership of the University of Virginia and the stratagems adopted by his Princeton admirers to have him remain at Old Nassau. These included a privately-financed salary supplement. One notes an increasing number of speeches and articles on topical issues as Wilson enlarged the scope of his contacts beyond the ivied walls.

There were also the familiar social restrictions of academic communities in the Victorian era: students are forbidden the use of the golf links on the Sabbath and a petition signed by newcomer Grover Cleveland to allow beer and wines in the Princeton Inn chagrins the strict adherents of more traditional mores. The after-effects of Wilson's stroke were evidenced by his wife's concern that he keep receiving massages and by his own complaints of writer's cramp from over-exertion at composition. Present, too, was the usual futility of intra-campus politics as Wilson struggled mightily to obtain a chair of American history for his old friend from Johns Hopkins' days, Frederick Jackson Turner. That project soon floundered when men like Andrew West "showed the most stubborn prejudice about introducing a Unitarian into the Faculty."

Because Wilson applied his thought to the affairs of the world about him, these papers also serve as an admirable introduction to the intellectual conundrums over which his contemporaries puzzled. None was so frustrating as the question of national identity. The earlier hints Wilson gave as to his own views on that subject now broadened into a comprehensive treatment of the issue. One could expect nothing less from a scholar one reviewer described as "too young to have absorbed the bitterness of the civil war . . . a catholic American, combining the sympathies of every section, representing the new generation which knows no sectionalism." Wilson was not so sanguine about his own generation's unity when he witnessed "a great movement like . . . Populism, to remind us how the country still lies apart."

Walter Hines Page of the *Atlantic Monthly* asked the Princeton don to "make a historical statement of the growth of national feeling . . . a

statement of what constitutes American nationality." Wilson again faced a dilemma: when did America become a "nation" using that word to express "the idea the German has in mind when he uses the word 'Volk'"? Had Americans come into their own consciousness at the adoption of the Constitution, the War of 1812, or the Civil War? Wilson thought otherwise: even in 1897, Americans still waited for the nation's "economic and spiritual union." The problem was that despite their loyalty to the institutions of government and the concept of nationalism, Americans remained divided "in respect of . . . What policies will best serve . . . in giving . . . strength and development." One might suppose such skepticism would lead to a loose interpretation of Americanism—one which would allow a multitude of styles to define the national spirit in plural terms. But Wilson's search did not end—or begin—with such an open frame of reference. He conditioned his definition by certain presuppositions of what Americanism meant from the beginning of our history. How could it be otherwise from a lecturer who drew his inspiration from Edmund Burke, Walter Bagehot, and Sir Henry Maine?

Wilson suggested what those premises were in his Sesquicentennial Address. In a passage which he did not deliver but was included in the original draft, he described the American experience in terms of "mighty processes of a great migration" by which "the vast spaces of a waiting continent filled almost suddenly with hosts bred to the spirit of conquest." The American saga then emerged as ". . . a stupendous growth, a perilous expansion." Unlike their French and Spanish rivals, the Anglo-Americans appeared in a history he wrote as "stout-hearted determined men, who . . . were much better fitted for the rough work of colonizing a new continent than the dependent proteges of a distant government." Reminding an audience at a Hampton Institute commencement that "it is a credit to have subdued so much of this continent to our own use," Wilson quickly added: "a puny race could not have done that." Political leadership played an essential role in achieving the peculiar nationalism that was on his mind. So George Washington was especially to be commended because he "had been among the first to see the necessity of living . . . by a continental policy." Viewed from this perspective, even the slavery struggle became only an argument "for or against the extension of slavery, not for or against its existence." Such an interpretation—reflective of Turner's definition of Americanism—made the moral issue of slavery "a mere episode of development." It had been decided as "a question of growth, not of law"—moral or otherwise. And if America needed a national statesmanship to help in defining itself, it had to be above all a statesmanship of temperance and moderation. Wilson pointed to Grover Cleveland as "the sort of President the makers of the Constitution had vaguely in mind." The outline of his article on the former President referred to Coxe's Army and the Pullman Strike—examples of a social atomization Wilson did not care to expand upon. Such divisiveness was of a piece with the "sectionalization of the national idea" which "preceded and foretold the civil war." Who would deny that "Abraham Lincoln was

more human than William Lloyd Garrison?" After all was it not "the practical Free-Soilers who made emancipation . . . not the hot impractical Abolitionists?" The aim of this national statesmanship was, then, never to pursue anything in excess.

It called for a unique brand of temperance and moderation, however. The leader who would direct this "leadership government" was much like "your thorough Presbyterian . . . not subject to the ordinary laws of life . . . too stubborn a fibre, too unrelaxing a purpose, to suffer mere inconvenience to bring defeat." Wilson described this leadership more pointedly in a memorandum on the impact the Spanish-American War would have on the course of American development. Passing over requests to write an article on Mahan's navalism or some heroic exploit in Santiago harbor, Wilson provided a profound insight into his personal views in this private paper. It was obvious to its author that "we did not enter upon a war of conquest." Rather it was a moral crusade wherein the "work of war seems ennobled" when waged by righteousness of the American elect—"with a manifest earnest passion for service, but with no love of slaughter—with a great pity . . . for those whom they destroy—like the Christian gentlemen we would have them be." In a previous piece, Wilson discerned the duty of the Christian "to carry the war into the enemy's country." Now those ancient verities were especially relevant in the new world of imperial relations America was entering. The nation was facing a testing time when "civilization has become aggressive." The Spanish-American War made us "aware that choices are about to be made as vital as those which determined the settlement and control of North America." As one of the keepers of the national covenant, Wilson treated the issue of America's future course not merely as one of balancing political interests but as "a question of moral obligation." There were, then, deeper, more thorough American strains in this man whom Beatrice Webb once superficially described as possessing "an attractive mind . . . with a peculiar un-American insight into the *actual* workings of institutions."

University of Connecticut

VINCENT A. CARRAFIELLO

The Reinterpretation of American Economic History. Edited by Robert William Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman. (New York: Harper & Row, 1971. Pp. 494. \$12.95.)

This collection of essays, selected and edited by two of the group's most active participants, is an excellent assemblage of the products of the new economic historians. As noted in the preface, the essays were chosen either because they represented new departures in the interpretation of American history or because they showed the power of simple economic theory and mathematics in illuminating the problems of American life. While the volume is basically designed for use in undergraduate courses in American history, economics or economic history, it provides readers with a convenient and fully understandable review of how American eco-

conomic history has been expanded and reinterpreted since the end of World War II.

The extent to which the reinterpretation of American economic and social history has been concerned with major topics is suggested by the following list of revisionist positions argued in the book:

It was developments in Mexico and Great Britain, rather than Andrew Jackson's war with the Second Bank of the United States, which explain the boom and bust of the 1830's and the early 1840's.

Slavery did not cause the economy of the antebellum South to stagnate. Quite the contrary. Between 1840 and 1860 per capita income in the South grew more rapidly than in the rest of the nation.

There is no evidence to support the contention that the Civil War accelerated the rate of industrialization or of economic growth.

Railroads had a relatively small impact on the settlement of the West. At least 95 percent of the land in agriculture in 1890 would have been in production even if there had been no railroads.

Fiscal policy under the New Deal was neither a success nor a failure. Despite appearances to the contrary, it was never really tried.

Anyone familiar with the subject matter of most surveys as well as many specialized courses in American history will appreciate the serious challenges these interpretations offer to long-accepted generalizations. And while they might not be persuaded by the evidence, scholars in the field can hardly afford not to be familiar at least with the arguments advanced.

The volume, however, has more than a discussion of controversial topics to offer. The essays on Investment in Education, its Magnitude and Significance, for example, are a major contribution to a previously neglected aspect of American social and economic development. This is likewise true of the essays that offer a quantitative measure of the growth of the economy, the contributions of immigrants, and an analysis of the factors leading to greater efficiency in agriculture and industry.

Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation

HAROLD F. WILLIAMSON

Pierre S. Du Pont and the Making of the Modern Corporation. By Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., and Stephen Salsbury. (New York: Harper & Row, 1971. Pp. 722. \$17.50.)

Many books and many articles have been written about the du Ponts, the Du Pont Company, and General Motors. Some of them deserve the overworked word excellent, but for the business historian none of them approaches the book that Chandler and Salsbury have written. As the authors make clear, this is not a complete biography; nor is it simply a business biography of Pierre du Pont. It is really a history of Du Pont and General Motors in the most important of their formative years. To be sure, there is enough about Pierre to give us the flavor of the man.

Like Carnegie and other highly successful businessmen, he was devoted to his mother. He did not marry until he was forty-five. His father, who

died early in Pierre's life, was for his day as square as square could be. He admired the Protestant ethic, thought that A-men made the grades and C-men made the money, and tried to make Pierre a stereotype American boy. He did not completely succeed, but despite what psychologists might say, Pierre turned out remarkably well. He never overcame his early shyness, but his inferiority complex may have impeded but never paralyzed his decision-making power.

Chandler and Salsbury have not spun any new theories about business development. We do learn more about the du Ponts than we ever knew before even though other studies have treated the family history exhaustively and well. What makes this book so immensely valuable is that its 626 pages of text contribute a mountain of evidence to support the generalizations that business history needs so desperately. Unlike many projects in business history, this is not the product of an author whose first acquaintance with the business world came the day before yesterday. It was directed by scholars who have thought considerably about the evolution of the business firm and about business problems. It, therefore, tells us much about how a growing firm approached such age-old business problems as competition, pricing, and capital budgeting.

Although the du Ponts were continuously interested in controlling their industry's prices and production, they did not strive to achieve a complete monopoly. They believed it advisable to have some smaller producers in the field, so that when "slack times" came, they could continue to produce at capacity by expropriating part of the market served by the smaller producers. Pricing policy conformed to the competitive strategy followed by so many other spectacularly successful firms. Like Standard Oil, Du Pont charged enough to make a profit, but not enough to attract competition.

The book contains little information on labor and marketing problems, but there is abundant information on business-government relations and anti-trust. We are again reminded that an unbridgable philosophic gap makes it impossible for business and politics to exist compatibly. The du Ponts found it impossible to understand Robert Brookings when he said in World War I that if he had to choose between a contractor who charged a high price with no profit and one who charged a low price and made a large profit, he would choose the high-price, no-profit contractor. Most businessmen would share the Du Pont puzzlement as, I hope, most economists would.

Pierre suspected all statesmen and politicians. T. Coleman du Pont, his cousin, who was usually shrewd, was politically naive even though he was a member of the Republican National Committee. The wary Pierre, therefore, understood the government's anti-trust action far better than the aspiring Coleman did.

The central theme of the biography centers around the difficulties of transforming a family firm into a collective, professionally managed enterprise, and the accompanying frustrations involved in divorcing executive decision making from routine administration and operation. The authors

understand that building a successful business is a ruthless affair. It does not thrive on sentimentality and it does not breed happy families. The du Pont family was never a happy one. Brothers did not speak to each other; cousins sued one another; and executives hated each other. Pierre's great achievement, Salsbury insists, was to change Du Pont into an impersonal institution where the good of the company took precedence over family interests. Yet Du Pont remained essentially a family enterprise. It may have become a bureaucracy, but if so, the bureaucrats had a much larger ownership stake in the firm than most bureaucrats have.

If any criticism can be made of what Chandler and Salsbury have done it is that there is an overdose of Pierre. No man is a hero to his valet, but every man should be a hero to his biographer. Here, however, the authors try to make too much out of Pierre's contributions. Like all successful companies, Du Pont was the product of many talents, not of one man. The authors strive valiantly to convince the reader that Pierre was very much *primus inter pares*, but I don't think they succeed. Too many other people were too equal. It was Alfred I. du Pont the family *persona non grata* who took the initiative in persuading the three cousins to buy the firm in 1902. Coleman was chiefly responsible for the purchase of Lafin and Rand, the major competitor. He was also the chief strategist in reorganizing the managerial structure in 1911. Hamilton Barksdale was "probably the most able of the company's professional managers." Arthur J. Moxham was "probably the wisest of them all . . . certainly the most analytical and innovative thinker . . . of the group." If all this is true, what was Pierre's contribution? He had the elusive qualities that are almost impossible to put on paper, but that are indispensable for a firm's success. Barksdale and Haskell couldn't delegate; Moxham had as many ideas as Leonardo, but he was not interested in carrying them through. Pierre was the conciliatory agent in two of America's largest corporations. Firm and sometimes ruthless, he kept Du Pont from exploding in the years from 1902 to 1920, and he kept General Motors from disintegrating in the critical early 1920s. He was what a chief executive in a large firm should be—the conductor of a brilliant symphony orchestra. He could harmonize brilliance as he did with Barksdale and Moxham. He could ride herd on the likable Durant, encourage Sloan, and exile Alfred I. Pierre was like Lincoln Lord and the other protagonists who bring together the world of ideas and the world of action in the novels of Cameron Hawley and other business-novel writers.

Business historians should read *Pierre S. du Pont* or turn in their union cards. But the very qualities that make the book so valuable as business history may repel the general reader. Business, although immensely important, is a dull affair; even the du Ponts found it dull. Alfred I. preferred waging family battles to running a business. Coleman thought the powder company tame compared to national politics. Pierre himself longed for Longwood—its gardens and its fountains. Unfortunately, most general readers may feel the same way.

New York University

HERMAN E. KROOSS