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FRONTIER REVISIONISM: AN ESSAY REVIEW
BY FRANCIS JENNINGS


A historian cannot be objective in writing about the American Indian in the same way as when he writes about people of his own culture until he takes a preliminary decision not required for intramural studies. He must take that step because there is an extra issue before him, antecedent to the work he will do, when he looks outside "civilization" to contemplate "natives." We write and think from the vantage point of conquerors, and our thought has never escaped from the constrictions and distortions of conquest mythology.

Our ancestors attacked, pillaged, and enslaved persons who lived at great distances and had never done them harm. Since Christian morality denounced such conduct as sin when it was practiced against civilized human beings, children of God, it was justified and rationalized by defining the victims as wild, beastly, heathen, or demonic. Thus, what was sin within the recognized human family became a divinely inspired mission when projected outward, and atrocities were transfigured into glorious heroism. The issue is forced upon us by our own history. Before a historian can hope to penetrate to a reasonably accurate professional understanding of fact, he must make an assumption—take a side—on a question that logically allows only two possible answers: were the American Indians of historical record fully human people? Yes or No. Any equivocation means No.

In the strong resurgence of Indian studies that now follows upon interest in Black studies in the 1960s, yes and no are both in evidence in various ways. We have learned—most of us—that Blacks were not enslaved because they were really cattle; we know now that the legal definition was merely a way to becloud the morally indefensible facts. A good many of us have yet to commit ourselves fully to the proposition that Indians were not really savages, and what we call frontier history generally echoes the sentiments of the idolized Father of Our Country. To wit: "the gradual extension of our Settlements will as certainly cause the Savage as the Wolf to retire; both being beasts of prey tho' they differ in shape."
Although the myth of savagery has lately come in for much exposure, its adherents manage to keep it alive by the utterly simple device of denying the Indian his day in court. In his New England Frontier, Alden T. Vaughan announced that he had not "for the most part, attempted to account for the actions and reactions of the natives," adding that he took this course "by inclination" as well as "necessity." Douglas Edward Leach wrote his Northern Colonial Frontier "frankly within the perspective of the Anglo-American settlers who inhabited the colonies from New England to Pennsylvania, and not within that of the Indians."

Fortunately, historians have other choices, and the books now before us demonstrate the good things that can happen when the alternatives are chosen. They differ considerably in purpose and form, but each is useful in its own way.

C. A. Weslager seems to have started life with an intuitive awareness of Indians as human beings. He studied under the University of Pennsylvania's revered Frank G. Speck, and he has continued during a long and productive career to dig away, metaphorically and actually, for the facts of Indian life in the mid-Atlantic region. Now he has capped this work with The Delaware Indians. No one has previously attempted the labor of tracing the Delaware people from their aboriginal homeland through the shock of first meeting with European intruders and the successive migrations westward and northward to present-day habitations in Oklahoma and Ontario. It was a massive job of finding and sorting mountains of data, and the author has fulfilled his purpose of "a comprehensive account in a single volume... that can be enjoyed by the general reader, including intelligent young adults." It can be enjoyed in even greater measure by the scholar who can appreciate the skill and erudition that characterizes the book.

I do not agree with everything that Weslager says. We have argued fiercely over such matters as whether the Susquehannocks conquered the Delawares, and neither of us can comprehend how the other can continue so stubbornly dunderheaded when the evidence has been so patiently laid before him, but such disputes are family fights over matters that—it must be admitted—are probably open to various interpretations. On the big issues, Weslager is unhesitatingly, unswervingly right. There are no "savages" in his pages. The Delaware people live there, not merely as a collective entity, but as individual persons with distinct names and characters. They are neither prettified nor ennobled. The wars and tortures and factions and hysteries are given their due place in the account. But there is a huge difference between portraying events as manifestations of innate savagery and showing the same events with their causes as human responses in agonizing circumstances. Weslager's book now stands as indispensable in its field and probably will hold that standing for a long time to come.

Barbara Graymont shares Weslager's attitude and approach though she has worked on a much more limited subject. As usual, there are both advantages and disadvantages in the narrower focus. A disadvantage is that Graymont does not really understand institutions that evolved over a period of time long antedating her period of research, as in the case of the Covenant Chain network of alliances in which the Iroquois played a central
role between their Indian tributaries on the one side and the English colonies on the other. Such disadvantages are offset, however, by the bright new light that Graymont shines on a number of critical issues in the Revolution. We have not earlier understood how these "savages" were drawn into war against their own reasoning and desires through the intrigues of belligerent missionaries—the agents of the Anglican Society for the Propagation of the Gospel versus those of the Calvinist Boston Board of Commissioners. Graymont draws no inferences. She simply presents the deadly facts and lets the reader decide for himself. Her candor is the more to be appreciated when one considers that she teaches in a missionary college.

Perhaps this author will forgive us for finding wider uses for her book than she seems to have intended. Her purpose—rigidly adhered to—is a history of the Iroquois themselves rather than an appraisal of their significance to Euro-American history. Yet the significance cannot be escaped, and this book dictates an overhauling of all the textbook accounts of that military turning point in the Revolution, the battle of Saratoga. The glories of Yankee militiamen must now be somewhat dimmed as we perceive that the outcome of Saratoga was made inevitable by earlier struggles in Indian country. Here, as elsewhere, Graymont eschews historiographical combat, but her facts, though sometimes recited to tedious excess, are devastating.

Wilbur R. Jacobs's Dispossessing the American Indian is more of a mixed bag. The title is misleading insofar as it seems to indicate a systematic study of dispossession phenomena. The chapters of this book are mostly separate essays which were published in various journals in what the author calls "pilot versions," and they are rather inconsistent in attitude. Jacobs changed his outlook considerably in the process of writing these essays, and the book would be more useful if the chapters had been presented in chronological order of production so that the change could be traced. As it is, the chapters have been grouped by topics so that we get some apparent confusion instead of clarity of development.

Jacobs's present outlook has formed about what he calls the "ecology of the frontier," which represents conversion from a former admiration for the mythology of the frontier. His biographical and historiographical works on Francis Parkman and Frederick Jackson Turner are well-known and valuable though their judgments frequently need discounting. What now appears is that Jacobs has altered his view of Parkman and of Parkman's subject. In "Some Social Ideas of Francis Parkman," published in the American Quarterly, V. 9, (1957), Jacobs wrote that the validity of Parkman's histories had not been seriously affected by his evident racial bias. Now, however, Jacobs sees that Parkman "sometimes obscured the truth to capture reader interest" by presenting "a familiar but questionable stereotype of Indian treachery.

It seems to be love of nature and respect for the conservators of nature that have worked this welcome change of thought, and Jacobs deserves full praise for opening his mind to it. A very special value of his book, unique to my knowledge, lies in its transcendence of old subject matter with new insights. In chapter 11 Jacobs assesses the "Price of Progress" for "native people on the European frontiers of Australia, New Guinea, and North
America." The lessons he learned from personal observations of Pacific aborigines called up echoes from his studies of American aborigines, as for instance in the revelation that the men of the villages were far from being the lazy brutes of myth. "My initial observations led me to think that men . . . spent almost all their time talking and smoking . . . . But I was mistaken and found that the main occupations of the men in the villages were varied, physically exhausting and complex, resembling those of the male in an American Indian village." A change in attitude—a desire to observe the actual behavior of human persons instead of accepting the stereotypes attributed to "savages" by mythologists—brings about the discovery of "new" facts. With such lessons in his mind, Jacobs went on to write his final remarks on "what we owe the woodland Indians," and they are well worth attention.

In their different ways, Weslager, Graymont, and Jacobs have contributed substantially not only to our knowledge of Indians and other natives but also to our understanding of what we fondly call civilization. If revisionist studies like these continue to appear, we shall have no choice but to throw away our textbooks and think anew about Indian civilization.

Editor's note:
The following review of C. A. Weslager's The Delaware Indians: A History, by James H. Howard, anthropologist at Oklahoma State University, was accepted before it was known that Francis Jennings, colonial historian at Cedar Crest College, was also including it in his essay review on frontier revisionism. Both are published because we believe it will interest our readers to note how the same book is evaluated by an anthropologist and by a historian.


In this thick volume Mr. Weslager, who has been studying and writing about the Delaware Indians and neighboring groups such as the Nanticokes for years, has drawn upon several decades of research to produce the first definitive history of the tribe. The task which he has undertaken is a formidable one. Unlike many North American Indian tribes, who are only sketchily documented, the Delawares are mentioned in numerous archival sources extending from the early seventeenth century to the present. Thus there are literally tons of colonial and state records bearing upon the tribe to be read, digested, and evaluated by the historian bold enough to attempt to write their history. Furthermore, most of the contemporary writers were biased by commercial, political, or religious motives and did not understand the language or culture of the Delawares. Thus the writer of Delaware Indian history must constantly ask himself when assessing some antique account, "What did this person really see?" In other words he must critically evaluate what a certain White observer has written about the Delawares in terms of our knowledge of Delaware culture as revealed by archeological and ethnographic studies of the tribe.
Weslager has done an admirable job of absorbing, critically analyzing, and then passing on to the reader a concise and eminently readable synthesis of this vast body of information. The book begins with a short account of present-day Delawares, their life styles, and locations. It then leaps back in time to describe the ancestral Delaware homeland on the Atlantic coast and marks the locations of the various tribelets which later fused to form the Delaware tribe. This is followed by a short ethnographic sketch of the aboriginal Delaware. Weslager then considers the collection, history, and content of the controversial *Walam Olum* or Red Score, purported to be a native mnemonic history of the tribe tracing its migrations over a period of several hundred years. The remaining chapters trace the Delawares from their earliest contacts with the Dutch through their various travails with the Swedes, English, and Americans, and their removals to their final homes in Oklahoma, Wisconsin, Kansas, and Ontario. Throughout, Weslager does an excellent job of noting the pertinent details while still focusing on the overall panorama of Delaware cultural history. Unlike many "Indian histories," the book is well grounded in both ethnology and history. Readers in the old Delaware homeland on the Atlantic coast will be fascinated to learn that many of the local place names in the area such as Rockaway, Passayunk, and Rancocas are corrupt forms of Delaware names.

Only in respect to the most recent period in their history does Weslager's treatment seem weak. His short description of the Delaware pow-wow, for example, fails to separate the daytime and early evening activities, which are largely pan-Indian and not traditionally Delaware in nature, from the traditional Delaware "night" dances. I would also have liked to find more than two paragraphs on John Wilson or "Moonhead," the Caddo-Delaware peyotist, in view of this man's importance in disseminating the peyote religion to other Oklahoma tribes. These are very minor points, however, and by and large the work succeeds in capturing the *ethos* of the Delaware. My high opinion of Weslager's book in this respect is shared by several present-day Delaware Indians who have read the book and have adopted it, along with the writings of M. R. Harrington and F. G. Speck as a basic source of information on their tribe. The illustrations and maps, though too few, have been well selected.

A valuable addition to the work is the inclusion, as an appendix, of Charles C. Trowbridge's 1823 account, "Traditions of the Lenee Leneapee, or Delawares," which makes this primary source generally available to scholars for the first time.

*Oklahoma State University*  

JAMES H. HOWARD


As the tercentenary of the founding of Pennsylvania approaches, it is good to have this up-to-date, comprehensive, and analytical state history from the pens, or typewriters, of Philip Klein and Ari Hoogenboom. Although their book is longer than other recent surveys of Pennsylvania history—I am com-
paring it with Wayland Dunaway's textbookish *History of Pennsylvania* (1935), Paul Wallace's literary *Pennsylvania, Seed of a Nation* (1962), and Sylvester Stevens's attractive *Pennsylvania, Birthplace of a Nation* (1964)—it does not attempt to be encyclopedic. The authors aim to be selective and to concentrate upon major themes, utilizing, among other materials, a good share of the more than five hundred doctoral dissertations that have been written on Pennsylvania.

The general scheme is chronological, and the emphasis on political history is heavy, with some attention to each gubernatorial administration from Thomas Mifflin's to Milton Shapp's. The major divisions of the book are entitled "The Peaceable Kingdom" (the colonial period); "Laboratory of Democracy" (from 1763 to 1861); "Laboratory of Industrial Society" (the late nineteenth century); and "An Age of Transition" (which McGraw-Hill mistakenly calls an "Age of Transportation" in the table of contents). A generous share of space is allocated to recent history, as is indicated by the fact that a photograph of Boies Penrose appears on page 373 of a book with 504 pages of text.

Short accounts of many of the individuals mentioned, from Johan Printz, Swedish governor, to George Howe, Philadelphia architect, add liveliness and appeal to the text. It is indicative of the authors' determination to be selective that they devote almost five pages to John O'Hara, James Michener, and John Updike, and fail to mention such other writers as Hervey Allen and Conrad Richter. Similarly, but much more briefly, they mention among historians only Henry Charles Lea, John Bach McMaster, and Ellis Paxson Oberholtzer. On the whole, it is good that they avoid the trap of listing names in endless and meaningless catalogues, but selectivity has its dangers. Philadelphia and Pittsburgh receive so much attention that the middle-sized Pennsylvania cities are at times forgotten. According to the index, there are but six references to Scranton, five to Erie, two to Reading, and only one (and that one very slight) to Allentown. The musical tradition in Bethlehem is never mentioned.

Each chapter is followed by an interesting and helpful bibliographical essay, frequently mentioning sources that are little known, such as obscure magazine articles, government documents, and masters' theses. Illustrations are well-chosen; maps are clear; quotations are relevant and sometimes striking, as is the case with the statement of William ("Bouie") Hayden, of Pittsburgh, excerpted on page 448. The style of the authors is sometimes quite dramatic (e.g., their account of the Johnstown Flood, pp. 337-341), but at other times, as in their description of recent gubernatorial programs, the reader's attention could wander. Unfortunately the publishers have set this book in a type so small that the large pages present a crowded and tiresome appearance when no illustration or section heading break the monotony of the print. A larger type face and more pages would help make this good book more attractive.

It deserves a second edition, which would enable correction of some minor errors, to which the authors seem especially prone when their narrative approaches or crosses state boundaries. For example, it was not Charles II but his brother who granted New Jersey to Berkeley and Carteret
in 1664. Mason and Dixon did not survey the southern boundary of Pennsylvania to a point fifteen miles beyond the present western terminus of Maryland; they stopped far short of that point. Fort Nassau (at or near Gloucester, New Jersey) was not on the shore of Delaware Bay, nor would a line dropped fifteen miles south of Philadelphia reach that body of water. Pieter de Vries is not the proper name of the Dutch sailor the authors quote on page ten, nor is John M. Dunmore the correct name of the Virginia governor they mention on page 169.

But such factual slips are minor in connection with so good and useful a book as this one, which should not only be in every library in Pennsylvania (and in every scholarly library in the nation) but in the possession of every sincere student of Pennsylvania history and on the desk of every high school social studies teacher.

University of Delaware

John A. Munroe


James Hutson touches upon various political events in Pennsylvania from the time Thomas Penn became principal proprietor until the disintegration of the attempt to end his authority. The author’s real interest, however, lies in the election of 1764 and the effort to make Pennsylvania a royal colony. Within a few pages he glosses over more than a decade in order to devote his attention to the early rumblings of the campaign. Antipathy between the Quaker Assembly and the proprietor festered for years. The Assembly, very self-conscious of its rights and privileges and resentful of Penn’s “tax-dodging” schemes, particularly detested the proprietor as an outside authority. When the threat to law and order precipitated by the march of the Paxton Boys forced the Assembly’s capitulation to external control, the serious drive to remove the proprietor commenced.

Previous authors, Hutson notes, have ignored or slighted this and other significant results of the march. The Quakers allowed their horror of the Paxton Boys to expand into violent denunciations of all Presbyterians. The latter responded in kind. Soon intense identity crystallized within each group, and both sides viewed each other as adversaries during the ensuing years of “hyper-denominationalism.” Within this atmosphere, the Quaker party launched its drive to overthrow the government. It gathered 3,500 signatures favoring royalization. Hutson’s analysis shows that the majority came from Philadelphia and vicinity; he extrapolates that 33 percent of the eligible voters in Philadelphia favored change enough to sign, whereas only 3 percent in the rest of Pennsylvania did. This illustrates an important “tension between rural conservatism and urban experimentiveness [which] is an enduring phenomenon in American history.” Although the Quaker party was well organized and the Proprietary party not a political party in any real sense, the movement failed. About 15,000 people petitioned against royalization. At the polls anti-royalization forces, which Hutson explains consisted of Presbyterians, Germans, defectors from the
Quaker party, Proprietary party men, and those influenced by Provost William Smith, delivered a damaging setback to the Quaker party. Hutson believes that the major reason for the Quaker failure lay in its complacency and in not providing the electorate with sufficient information.

Royalization efforts and their failure in 1764 brought about the most significant realignment of political parties in the province's history, Hutson believes. The Quaker party still hoped to achieve its goal; thus from 1765 to 1768 it adopted a stance of "political ingratiation" toward British ministries. It ceased to be the "popular", anti-prerogative party and sought British approval by exerting considerable effort to restrain opposition to new imperial measures. Hutson finds it soon closely resembled the Proprietary party. The author claims that because the established parties frustrated the popular will, a new group, the Presbyterian party, emerged to lead the movement against British measures. He reaffirms Charles Lincoln's opinion that the underrepresented West and underprivileged urban working class pushed Pennsylvania into the revolutionary camp, though he demonstrates that the alliance appeared slightly later than Lincoln suggested.

Generally, Hutson carefully develops his ideas. His attention to details and meticulous reconstruction of the royalization movement indicate painstaking effort. He provides the fullest coverage of that movement. The thrust and thesis of the book are clear; however, the organization falters halfway through the work when Hutson realizes that he has described the Penn-Assembly controversy in a "political vacuum between abstractions" and retracts his steps to fill in important matters such as the nature and influence of contending sides. Though a diligent researcher on this side of the Atlantic, neither his essay on sources nor footnotes indicate consultation of manuscripts in England. This serious omission requires some explanation.

One intriguing aspect of Hutson's approach lies in his view that the campaign for royal government prefigured the movement against British policies and George III. Though enticing, the argument is not well thought out and creates some misleading distortions. The author believes that a basic similarity existed in the resistance to "outside" control which focused first on Penn and then on George III. The choice in 1764, however, was not between "outside" control and autonomy but between two different forms of what Hutson calls "outside" control. Furthermore, to deal with a proprietor and a king as essentially similar seems peculiar. Certainly Thomas Penn never occupied a monarch's status in the minds and hearts of Pennsylvanians. Finally, Hutson's claim in the concluding chapter that "the people" felt impelled to overthrow the government in 1764 contradicts his evidence and opinion in the heart of the book.

To enhance the broader significance of his study, Hutson asserts that Pennsylvania reflected the intensity of revolutionary sentiments in other colonies. He provides no substantial evidence that his conclusions drawn from Pennsylvania's experience may be applied to other colonies. He asserts that Pennsylvania was prepared for revolution in 1764 and fulfilled John Adams's often-quoted observation that "the revolution was effected before the war commenced." Pauline Maier's From Resistance to Revolution more convincingly contends that even the harshest critics of British policies were
emotionally and intellectually incapable of declaring independence around 1764-65. Beyond that Pennsylvania did not rebel but confirmed the past by retaining the proprietor.

Hutson’s views on the Paxton Boys, royalization, and the political contest and realignments which they triggered certainly merit consideration. His two lengthy articles in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* on the movement for royal government and a thoughtful piece on the White Oaks of Philadelphia in the *William and Mary Quarterly* foreshadowed much of this study. This analysis of Pennsylvania politics is useful, though it often goes over much the same ground and evidence previously explored by Theodore Thayer in *Pennsylvania Politics and the Growth of Democracy, 1740-1776*. At times, however, the focuses differ, and close attention to Hutson provides some rewards.

*University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point*

**RANDOLPH S. KLEIN**


Mr. Jones has combined a natural storyteller’s instinct for drama, tragedy, and human interest with a fine writing style to produce a rollicking good tale of the Reverend Mr. William Smith. In his eyes, Smith was a giant of a man whose desirable and undesirable gifts far exceeded those of most mortal men: a first-rate organizer, administrator and fund raiser, an inspiring teacher, an inveterate politician, a brilliant speaker, and a vital force in the evolution of the College of Philadelphia; but at the same time a selfish, egocentric, crude, slovenly Scotsman with an inordinate fondness for the bottle and no preoccupation with bathing. Smith rose from obscure origins in Scotland to a position of power, influence, and high status in colonial Philadelphia through his innate talents, his position in the Anglican Church, and his cultivation of the mighty in both England and America. He then antagonized the Patriots, missed his opportunity to wear the Lawn Sleeves (become an Anglican Bishop), and finally lost control of the college he had done so much to create because of his irascible personality, his feudal cast of mind, and his heavy drinking.

Much of the book’s entertainment, its levity, comes from the author’s sharp and witty thumbnail character assassinations: William Penn, “even in his best days . . . vain, bumbling, and capricious”; Dr. Benjamin Rush, for whom “the one cause of all disease was ‘excessive excitability or spasm in the blood vessels,’ and therefore the one cure was bleeding”; and poor David Rittenhouse, a failure at life who missed the transit of Venus because he “orgasmed [sic] and fainted” during the telescopic observation. This may be amusing, and it may at times be of value in putting things or people into perspective, but converting gods into devils, or idols into fools, simply exchanges one distortion for another and seldom brings us closer to an understanding of the real people and institutions involved.

This in turn raises the more fundamental question of the value of this type of biography to the serious student of the past. The book is derived largely
from secondary sources, adds little to our understanding of the major developments of the period, and is completely unrelated, in a systematic way, to any broader conceptual structure. The study of an individual life may be valuable as a data base from which to draw verifiable hypotheses or as a test case against which to measure hypotheses drawn from existing theory. In either instance, it takes its significance from its contribution to an evolving body of theory. Smith's experience might shed valuable light on such questions as the process of social mobility, the impact of English connections on the American social structure, the tendency of colonial societies to imitate the metropolis, the role of the foreign missions as an avenue of advancement in the Church, or the relationship between religion, higher education, cultural conflict, and domestic politics. Unfortunately, Jones's anecdotal, narrative, didactic treatment minimizes the value of his work in this direction.

It is obviously unjust to fault the book for not being what it was not intended to be. Within its limits the book achieves its stated goals: it is both funny and serious and very readable. However, these limits severely restrict the contribution which this study can make to the professional historian or the serious layman interested in understanding past or present human behavior.

S. U. N. Y. College Brockport, New York

Owen S. Ireland


Reviewing the eleventh volume in a series of edited documents places one at a disadvantage. The reviewer finds himself in the same position as the latest spouse of an overly-enthusiastic consecutively polyandrous heiress: he knows what's expected of him, but how does he make it interesting?

Volume XI draws to conclusion the published account of the saga of an uniquely American dilemma; appropriately, the solution was also uniquely American. The saga is, of course, of the struggle between Pennsylvanians and Connecticut settlers over who should have permanent title to huge tracts of land within the Commonwealth. In the Old World tradition, one group would have lost. Perhaps there would have been a massive exodus of the displaced. In America both sides "won"—only not as completely as they would have liked. The problem in Pennsylvania was finally resolved by a massive infusion of money from the legislature which allowed the Yankee settlers to hold onto most of their land and which enabled the Quaker State claimants to acquire some territory and sizeable amounts of cash. The basic scenario of two power groups—each with a lot to lose—who have their differences smoothed over with governmental monies is a perennial within our history.

For the colonialist, the scholar of the federal period, or the student of the westward movement, this is an invaluable volume climaxing an extraordinarily useful series. In its thoroughness and careful attention to detail it is an exemplar of modern scholarship.
In undertaking the publication of the Susquehannah Company Papers, the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society began an uncommonly ambitious venture for a local historical society. The leaders were determined, but the project was haunted by bad luck. The first four volumes were delivered to the society in 1936—just in time to be completely destroyed by the flooding Susquehanna River. These first volumes were eventually re-done, and the series brought to completion just a few months before the results of Tropical Storm Agnes which devastated Wilkes-Barre. This time the books were safe—they were at Cornell University Press—but many of the original documents were severely damaged.

The completion of the series represents another example of the aptness of the cliche: Scholarship can triumph over adversity!

_The Pennsylvania State University Capitol Campus_  
IRWIN RICHMAN


This handsome book, as its dust jacket says, the “definitive” biography of Benjamin Banneker (1731-1806), if by definitive we mean simply that the work contains everything that the most diligent and persistent searches, carried out over a period of many years, have turned up. Banneker, a black American, was born to a free family that lived on its own farm near Ellicott Mills, Maryland. He helped his father grow tobacco on the farm; when he was twenty-two, he built a clock with wooden works, complete with striking mechanism; in 1791, when he was sixty, he assisted Andrew Ellicott in surveying the site of Washington, D.C.

In 1791, also, he sent to Thomas Jefferson, then secretary of state, a manuscript copy of an almanac that he had calculated for the year 1792. Jefferson sent it on to Condorcet, secretary of the Paris Academy of Sciences, as an instance of remarkable intellectual attainment by a black man. During the next six years Banneker supplied the figures for almanacs published as _Banneker’s Almanack and Ephemeris_ in Baltimore and other cities from Philadelphia to Richmond. Beyond these events, almost nothing is known of Banneker, nor is much more ever likely to be known. It is a pity, for the mathematical skills that he taught himself are by no means elementary, and one could wish for much more information about the circumstances and influences that led to such an estimable accomplishment.

In the absence of adequate information about Banneker, Bedini, who is an authority on timekeepers and scientific instruments, has resorted to a “life and times” approach. With the exception of the chapter on calculations for the almanac and ephemeris, a chapter which is based upon Banneker’s manuscript notebook, most of the book is “times” rather than “life.” Whether this is justifiable will be considered presently. First, however, a few remarks on the “times” are in order.

One interesting passage has to do with the Ellicott family, founders of Ellicott City. Banneker’s life was deeply influenced by the Eliccotts, who around 1772 moved from Pennsylvania and built a large flour mill on a most
unlikely site; a mile from the nearest road and in a region where almost no wheat was being grown before their mill was completed. Nevertheless, the first mill was successful, others were built, and Ellicott City became an important milling center. Bedini is mistaken in placing Oliver Evans's automatic milling machinery in the 1775 mill, although the Ellicotts were among the first to adopt this radical new invention of Evans, which was first patented—in Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland—in 1787.

Another chapter that includes much peripheral yet fresh material is the one on almanac publishing. I was surprised to learn that the selection of filler matter—the wise sayings, poems, and the like—was up to the almanac printer; Banneker supplied only the tables of sunrise, sunset, the rising and setting of the moon and of constellations, times of tides, weather forecasts, and the like. Here, as elsewhere, more peripheral material is included than a reader's patience will easily tolerate. Some material, indeed, is well beyond the periphery. Yet that became inevitable if the mission of the book was to be fulfilled.

If the length of the narrative were to depend on the available primary material directly related to Banneker, the book would be very thin. On the other hand, if the book on the library shelf, glanced at, riffled through, referred to, but not often read all the way through, is to represent the measure of a remarkable human being, then the author and publisher have surely decided wisely in producing this attractive volume. Just as today's black man of modest accomplishments must have higher abilities and a vastly greater capacity for dealing with discouragement than do his white peers, so Banneker's attainments quite properly stand out because he was a black man.

The texts of forty-five documents, some of which are in private hands and none of which are readily available, are included in an appendix. An exhaustive bibliography of titles by and about Banneker and a well constructed index complete the work.

University of Delaware and Hagley Museum

EUGENE S. FERGUSON


In this attractively written book, Professor Cassell presents a scholarly biography of a political, military, and business leader he claims has been too long forgotten. Except for an unpublished family history by a descendant, Mrs. Cary Nicholas Fink, a dissertation by John Silas Pancake (University of Virginia, 1949) which established the chronology of the subject's life, and Dr. Cassell's own dissertation (Northwestern University, 1968), there has been no full-scale biographical treatment of General Samuel Smith of Maryland. His relative obscurity historically can be explained in part by the paucity of personal correspondence and business records extant and in part by the belief that he was not a political or military leader of first rank.

Despite Cassell's implied claim that this distinguished Marylander was a major figure not only in his beloved Baltimore and in his home state, but
also on the national scene as legislator, soldier, and adviser to seven presidents, Samuel Smith must be relegated to the second rank of leadership and influence. Not a Washington, Jefferson, or Jackson, Smith properly belongs on a list of minor historical notables whose lives and contributions were either significant or representative but not decisive or epochal. Thus he joins such early American leaders as Rufus King, George Clinton, and William H. Crawford (to name only a few contemporaries of similar status) who lived during exciting and critical times, exerted a modicum of influence (usually in a local geographic area or in a particular branch of government), and then died "full of years and honors." Smith's life was one of solid accomplishment rather than brilliance and grandeur.

With grace and clarity, Cassell describes Smith's many-faceted life as a merchant, soldier, local political leader, legislator, and presidential confidant with perhaps a little too much sympathy and approbation. Living as he did during turbulent and spirit-stirring times, this "gallant General" of Maryland participated in or was a close observer to many of the more important and exciting events of our early history. However, close association can distort. For example, Smith's Revolutionary War experiences as an officer with Washington's army in such crucial battles as Long Island, White Plains, and Brandywine, and in lesser engagements such as the spirited defense of Fort Mifflin, are not such as to merit undue praise. Samuel Smith appeared to have been a competent Revolutionary soldier who performed his martial duties during heroic times under the American "Cincinnatus", George Washington. Close proximity to military greatness does not necessarily produce military greatness.

Likewise, Smith's long and varied career as a national legislator in both the Senate and House attests more to his stamina and local political influence in Baltimore and Maryland than to brilliance or greatness. His voting record over forty years of congressional service shows Smith to have been not a legislative leader of the caliber of a James Madison, Albert Gallatin, or Henry Clay but rather a hardworking representative of the country's increasingly important shipping interests. Thus he consistently supported, as expected, military preparedness, a national bank, internal improvements (especially those that would benefit Baltimore) and opposed with equal consistency tariffs and other commerce-inhibiting legislation. Smith's claim to legislative renown rests more on longevity and accurate representation of certain interest groups rather than on authorship of important and far-reaching legislation or adherence to high principle.

General Samuel Smith is best remembered, and rightly so, for his courageous defense of Baltimore during the darkest period of the War of 1812. Professor Cassell is perhaps at his best in recounting the exciting events of mid-1814 when the American democratic experiment was seemingly close to being extinguished by the British. With 15,000 regulars and militia, Smith organized and successfully directed the defense which resulted in abandonment of the assault and eventual withdrawal of all British land and sea forces from the Chesapeake Bay. It is at this point that the uniqueness of Samuel Smith is revealed. He possessed in proper proportions the necessary qualities of great energy, shrewdness, a free-wheeling style, and audacity to accomplish the seemingly impossible.
Cassell's sympathetic treatment of this colorful and ambitious man is an example of good biography. The author successfully treads the thin line between a "life and times" perspective where the subject becomes almost non-existent and a narrowly constructed narrative where the subject lives in a historical vacuum. A mastery of voluminous source material, lucid language, and adequate documentation help to make the reading of this foray into historical microcosm both pleasurable and worthwhile.

Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago

JOSEPH C. MORTON


In this ambitious work Rothman tries to identify a common outlook that supposedly underlay efforts in ante-bellum America to deal with four types of what reformers once liked to call the "dangerous and dependent classes" of society—criminals, juvenile delinquents, the mentally ill, and the poor. The title of his book stems from his taking as a point of departure the fact that all four of these types of people were subjected during this period to institutional treatment, whereas during the colonial era they had been punished or given charitable relief within the confines of the communities in which they lived.

Rothman traces the reasons for this shift to a purported belief among ante-bellum reformers that the mobile and ever-changing environment of the new republic exposed its citizens to enormous temptations and pressures resulting in deviance, insanity, and improvidence. The only way to combat these tendencies was to take persons who could not resist them away from such unhealthy surroundings and subject them to separate treatment in some form of asylum. Reformers who took this point of view were, according to Rothman, inspired in part by a vision of colonial society as having been characterized by stability and order, which they in turn tried to duplicate in the penitentiaries, insane asylums, and almshouses of the nineteenth century. These institutions, they believed, would serve a double purpose by bringing order into the lives of those who were placed in them and by holding up before the American public in general the benefits of discipline and restraint.

The most notable flaw in this analysis is that Rothman fails to substantiate his claim that ante-bellum reformers actually held the view of colonial society which he imputes to them. Even so, the intriguing thesis which he advances might be given more credence were it not pushed so hard and relentlessly as a master key to a complex subject that cannot be so neatly explained. To his credit, Rothman has discovered significant similarities in the types of treatment given to a variety of deviant and poor people in the pre-Civil War period. In addition, the reform attitudes which he describes may help to enlarge our understanding of the dominantly conservative streak that is so apparent in many of the causes and crusades that flourished in America during the closing years of the eighteenth century and the first few decades of the nineteenth and which culminated in such dubious ex-
periments as the Auburn and Pennsylvania systems of penal discipline. But in arguing that these attitudes were still paramount during the more hopeful period that followed, particularly in the 1840s, Rothman obscures the significant differences that separated such organizations as the New York Prison Association from the earlier Boston Prison Discipline Society and that distinguished a William H. Channing or Eliza Farnham on the one hand from a Louis Dwight or Elam Lynds on the other.

Rothman's insistence on reducing a varied pattern of events to the demands of a unifying thesis leads him to distort his subject in at least three important ways. His need to magnify the uniqueness of ante-bellum reform results in his slighting European precedents in correctional, penal, and charitable activity. His efforts to contrast the alleged secularism of pre-Civil War reformers with the Judaean-Christian orientation prevalent in the colonial era cause him to underestimate the importance of religion in helping to mold and shape ante-bellum social thought. In this respect his work can be usefully contrasted with Carroll Smith Rosenberg's persuasive book, Religion and the Rise of the American City (1971), which emphasizes the significance of religious impulses in ameliorative activity among the ante-bellum poor. Above all, Rothman's analytical framework makes it virtually impossible to explain how anybody who looked at American society with anything but a panic-stricken attitude (it might be instructive to count the number of times the word "panic" appears in his text) could have played a meaningful role in the treatment of the deviant and poor throughout the entire era from the Revolution to the Civil War. At a number of points he tries to indicate that there was an optimistic side to the pattern of thinking he delineates, but it would appear to have rested upon the hope of a headlong retreat into an imagined past.

In other writings I have argued the case for a cyclical interpretation of reform currents in the ante-bellum period. This too may have its limitations, but at least it allows for the interplay of diverse forces and ideas in our cultural past, including the optimistic humanitarianism and perfectionism that surfaced so strongly in the decades preceding the Civil War. In my opinion, Rothman's sweeping analysis belies the actual richness and variety of the elements that have constituted the American reform tradition.

Auburn University
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This book is a self-portrayal of the Church of the Brethren, a comparatively small but well-known American denomination, the membership of which is concentrated primarily in areas settled by eighteenth century German immigrants. Originally written for translation into German and publication in a series on the churches of the world, the Brethren Press has published this English edition for members of the denomination who want "information about past current beliefs and practices."
Brethren and others interested in American religious history are likely to find this book rewarding. Nine essays and additional documents and statistics, written and compiled by active leaders, present a rather complete description of the Church of the Brethren. The unintentional theme unifying the essays is the transformation this group has experienced since it emerged in what is now Germany during the early eighteenth century. Although no group remains as it was, modern technology has changed this one from a radical pietistic sect which had withdrawn from a sinful world into one of many American denominations, now hardly distinguishable from others.

Fortunately, the editor, Donald F. Durnbaugh, Professor of Church History of the denomination's Bethany Theological Seminary and author of several excellent studies of Brethren history, presents the specifically historical portions of the analysis. He organizes it into chapters on "Early History," "Recent History," "Statistics and Addresses," and "Documents." These passages are accurate and well written, which readers have learned to expect from Durnbaugh. In addition, his footnotes and bibliography provide helpful leads to further information.

Professor Durnbaugh has assigned other topics to knowledgeable and effective writers who are scholars and participants in the areas they describe: Vernard Eller on the denomination's beliefs; Dale W. Brown on its liturgical practices; Warren F. Groff on its polity; Desmond W. Bittinger on educational endeavors; Roger E. Sappington on social action; B. Merle Crouse on missions; and Edwin K. Ziegler on ecumenical relations. These names are familiar to observers of ecclesiastical affairs and readers of religious journals. Although most of these writers are not professional historians, they write historically, emphasizing development over time within their assigned topics and documenting their conclusions adequately.

Vernard Eller's essay on Brethren beliefs is exceptional. In comparison to the other writers, Eller passes lightly over the historical development and emphasizes instead his impressions of current religious views held by the Brethren, which he occasionally phrases in the words of Soren Kierkegaard and Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Eller is correct when he claims the Brethren never developed a systematic theology; however, he seems to overlook the numerous individual and corporate statements of faith by the Brethren during the past three and one-half centuries. Some readers need more of the historic background in order to comprehend clearly the current situation. Consequently, Eller's description of the Brethren's beliefs would have been more credible if he had worked with more of the historic documents which are now easily accessible in libraries and archives.

Despite this omission and several other less important defects, Professor Durnbaugh and his associates have made another contribution to an understanding of the Church of the Brethren.

The Pennsylvania State University

JOHN B. FRANTZ

Merchants and Manufacturers: Studies in the Changing Structure of Nineteenth-Century Marketing. By Glenn Porter and Harold C.
Unlike most economic studies of industrial development, this book focuses on distribution rather than production. Consequently, the authors have produced an especially valuable monograph which not only sheds light on marketing techniques which have heretofore not received in-depth analysis, but, equally important, also contributes to a better understanding of changes taking place in the structure of the American economy during an exceedingly important formative era. More specifically, in describing the evolution of new marketing mechanisms serving the industrial sector, this volume reconsiders from a fresh perspective trends in industrial development which have long interested economic historians.

Livesay and Porter argue that the method employed to market manufactured goods at any given time was a function both of the characteristics of the product being distributed and the nature of the market in which it was to be sold. During the first quarter of the nineteenth century markets in the United States were extremely small and diffuse, and virtually all domestic manufacturers concentrated on the production of what are classified in this study as "generic" or simple standard goods. Since none of these products presented peculiar distribution problems related to such factors as perishability or complexity, all could be marketed similarly. Under these conditions most manufacturers dispatched whatever portion of their total output they could not sell locally to unspecialized merchants operating out of the nearest major urban center. Whatever the details of such transactions, the merchant was an essential factor in both production and distribution since his financial resources and marketing expertise were absolutely indispensable to the small undercapitalized manufacturing establishments which characterized this era.

During the second quarter of the nineteenth century this pattern changed somewhat as the volume of manufactured goods sold in the American market increased. This trend encouraged specialization on the part of merchants who formerly had handled a broad spectrum of manufactured goods. However, in most instances the services, and hence the crucial role, of the independent wholesaler remained unchanged. Influential merchants continued to provide manufacturers with financial services and absolutely essential knowledge of the market place which would have been far too expensive to provide for themselves. This was so because, despite increases in sales volume, the goods being sold had changed very little, and, equally important, markets in the United States remained extremely dispersed. Under these circumstances the basic mechanisms of distribution remained virtually unchanged.

The first departures from these marketing procedures were a reflection of significant alterations in the markets being serviced by certain industries or the appearance of a host of new products which presented peculiar marketing problems which independent wholesalers were either unable or unwilling to cope with. In regard to markets, two trends in the nineteenth century economy were, according to the authors, responsible for significant
alterations in the manner in which manufactured goods were distributed. First, the inexorable march toward oligopoly in American industry meant that manufacturers, particularly in the producers'—goods field, sold their products to a relatively few customers. As this concentration of purchasers took place, it became more economical to deal directly with the customer rather than pay for the services of middlemen. Secondly, the rapid urbanization, and hence concentration, of the population of the United States during the nineteenth century also acted to reduce the manufacturers' reliance on independent merchants whose services were most valuable when markets were small and scattered.

The authors also assert that technological innovation in production and marketing techniques acted to diminish the importance of middlemen in many key industries. For example, in the new electrical equipment industry product complexity and cost coupled with the scarcity of trained personnel for installation acted to draw producer and consumer together. This pattern was repeated in many other highly technological industries after the Civil War. A somewhat different impetus for direct distribution was felt by producers of perishable goods whose profits depended on the availability of elaborate and expensive facilities to prevent spoilage. In this case the necessary investment evidently discouraged the independent merchant from entering these fields.

This book is an important work whose contribution lies not so much in enunciating the not so startling thesis that nineteenth century marketing techniques were a reflection of the nature of markets and products being distributed, but rather in the painstaking and thoroughly documented description of the marketing procedures themselves. From this analysis flows considerable insight into the broader and more significant issues raised in the study of the dynamics of industrial growth. For example, by elaborating the function of wholesalers, the authors discover that manufacturers were frequently dependent upon merchants for crucial financial services which were generally not available elsewhere. They thus demonstrate that the significance of the independent merchant in the early stages of industrial development clearly was not limited to distribution. This importance was, again according to the authors, severely eroded during the Civil War when many manufacturers were, as a result of high profits, able to achieve a much greater degree of financial independence. By affirming that the Civil War was, after all, a watershed in American industrial development without trotting out the stale statistical arguments which have for so long dominated this perennial issue, Livesay and Porter have provided a provocative new analysis of the economic impact of the war.

The major weakness in this otherwise generally excellent study is its almost total emphasis on the importance of markets and technology in determining the way goods were distributed. Although these factors were of undeniable importance, other factors were highly significant especially for the trends they presaged and receive only passing mention. Such problems as the need to adjust supply to demand and the trend toward product differentiation through mass advertisement became increasingly significant in
determining how goods were marketed during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and deserve more detailed consideration.


The process by which America became an urban and industrial nation stretched throughout the nineteenth century. Only recently, however, have historians begun, often through the techniques of other social sciences, to discover the pervasive effects of urbanization on American life.

In this volume of ten essays, an attempt is made to explore the experience of the silent participants in American history—"those groups in American society which have largely escaped traditional historical inquiry." Five of the essays seem to add significant dimensions to our understanding of the inarticulate in American history and how they were affected by the forces of urban and industrial growth. The remaining chapters, while providing interesting glimpses of nineteenth century social history, do not seem to stimulate a reconsideration of the period from new perspectives.

Stephan Thernstrom's and Peter Knight's study of urban population mobility in nineteenth century America and Paul Worthman's essay on working class mobility in Birmingham, Alabama between 1880 and 1914 are pioneering pieces of fundamental importance and should demonstrate the value of using quantitative methodology when mining the bedrock of the urban social structure. Thernstrom's and Knight's article questions the fundamental assumption that American cities were static environments "ensnaring, enfeebling, and corrupting their inhabitants." By using a complicated methodology of their own for Boston, the authors provide evidence that for each decade between 1830 and 1890 two huge streams of in-migrants and out-migrants nearly cancelled each other, the residual being the population growth for that decade. After a cursory attempt to trace out-migrants from Boston, the authors venture seven tentative conclusions about the meaning of their data. Two in particular serve to focus the reader's attention on the more important macro level of American history: 1) America in the nineteenth century was not, as Robert Wiebe suggests in The Search for Order, a nation of loosely connected islands in a simple demographic sense. A vast majority of city dwellers, at least, travelled between the islands providing for a continual regional and inter-local interaction. 2) It is possible that geographical mobility did not provide, as previously thought, an avenue of upward economic mobility, and that many mobile workers could instead have been permanently disinherit from the social structure and buffeted about by the vicissitudes of the casual labor market.

Speaking more directly to the problem of economic mobility, Paul Worthman's examination of the careers of 1500 workers in Birmingham between 1880 and 1914 provides evidence that race, geographical persistence, and residential mobility within the city were all important in-
ingredients in predicting the extent and nature of material success. Although there are a few serious methodological problems with the essay (e.g. he could not provide the men's ages who were working in certain occupational categories), his study extends our knowledge of the process of urbanization. In particular, he found limited upward mobility and greater geographical persistence among nineteenth century blacks in Birmingham, incredibly high turnover rates for white workingmen, and significant rates of upward occupational mobility for those who stayed, mostly within craft lines, though quite a few moved from blue collar to white collar positions. The unique contribution which Worthman has to offer is his study of residential mobility and the emergence of distinct residential, business, and manufacturing districts. Much like nineteenth century Philadelphia, early Birmingham had been a city with an affluent core surrounded by increasingly poorer sections. By the early twentieth century, Birmingham's heterogeneous residential and racial pattern had been replaced by the residential segregation of the city's industrial workingmen by occupation and race. He concludes his essay by warning that these patterns of occupational mobility and residential dispersion need not have inhibited working class consciousness.

The effects of urbanization also play a vital role in the arguments of Timothy Smith. Smith's study of American immigrants after 1880 suggests that the ethnic diversity found in European and American cities was the result of urban growth which brought a diverse population together. Smith noted a marked tendency toward initiative and voluntarism on the part of laymen in immigrant congregations. After surveying manifestations of immigrant lay initiative such as the founding of the Polish National Catholic Church at Scranton in 1898 and the lay challenges of the Rusin Greek Catholic Union, Smith corrects views such as those of Oscar Handlin which have pictured the "new immigrant" as blind adherents to religious and ethnic traditions. He argues that our diverse, urban society has encouraged lay initiative and denominational pluralism not only among older Protestant congregations but among newer Catholic and Orthodox as well.

Gerald Grob, in an essay on the mental hospital in the nineteenth century, illustrates how the rise of the mental hospital coincided with the emergence of urban expansion. Since the majority of its patients were from low socio-economic groups (especially immigrants) in urban areas, American mental hospitals assumed a dual role that provided for therapeutic care for the insane as well as welfare for the poor and needy. In fact, by the last half of the nineteenth century mental hospitals came to be looked upon as welfare institutions. This view caused them to receive the same level of funding as other welfare institutions, thereby undermining their medical roles.

Richard Sennett's concluding essay on middle class families and urban violence is particularly suggestive and provocative. Sennett studied a middle-class neighborhood in Chicago in 1880 which he calls Union Park. Looking at Union Park after the Haymarket Riot, a series of burglaries, and a murder, Sennett observed that the area's citizens called for the destruction of "immigrant anarchists" and constant police surveillance and patrolling of their homes. He also discovered that the sons of most families in Union
Park, eighty percent of whom were from small, tightly knit nuclear families, kept close to their first homes and did not venture outside the middle-class area either geographically or occupationally. Sennett concluded that middle-class sons, in the face of industrial disorder, were making few entrepreneurial ventures outside Union Park and, instead, were clinging to the intimacy of their families. The pleas for police protection against anarchists and criminals, Sennett writes, were a result of their own personal defeats in the new urban industrial order.

The remaining essays include studies of growing up in rural New England, the views of emancipated blacks, slave songs and slave consciousness, and the use of melodrama in listening to the "historically voiceless." While all are valuable contributions to our social and cultural past, they do not stimulate a rethinking of nineteenth century social history to the extent that Thernstrom, Knight, Worthman, Smith, Grob, and Sennett do.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission
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An invitation to run for the State Senate of New Jersey was extended to Professor Woodrow Wilson in 1901. A self-styled "Old Fashioned Democrat" proposed his name to the editor and readers of the Indianapolis News as the most available presidential candidate for that party in 1902. All apparently to no avail as Wilson seemed to follow the admonition he penned to a fellow academic that "it is best for college professors, as such, to appear as little as possible in politics." The justification he presented for this withdrawal syndrome was that he did not consider "their attitudes toward affairs typical or normal." Yet for all this eschewing of partisan involvement, Wilson assumed the presidency of Princeton in the years covered by this volume—a goal he achieved not without rancorous charges of "ratting" by the Ivy League participants appointed to the search committee. And—as important for the historian who reads this volume as the mirror image of intellectual trends among leaders of educated opinion—Professor and President Woodrow Wilson did his best to demonstrate that he was at least one don whose own attitudes toward affairs were typical and normal.

The Filipino insurrection continued to rampage thousands of miles removed from American academic groves. Controversy over our role continued to rage within the United States. How could one reconcile American ideals of self-determination with this blatantly colonial career of conquest? Wilson was not above entering this fray and on behalf of the imperial cause. A Wilmington, Delaware newspaper reported him asking a lecture audience there "whether the form of liberty we now embody, are we to say this is the same form it must have for the undisciplined Filipinos?" At Trenton, commemorating the American surprise of the Hessians during our own revolution, Wilson addressed the anti-imperialist among Americans and in a fashion which—despite all his protestations as to accepting them as
fellow Americans—called into question whether they fitted his definition of Americanism. "Is there," he queried, "here some cardinal test which those amiable persons have overlooked, who have dared to cheer the Filipino rebels on in their stubborn resistance to the very government they themselves live under and owe fealty to?"

After such outspoken vindications of American imperial ventures in the Far Pacific—described by Wilson as the "new frontiers for ourselves beyond the seas"—it was no cause for astonishment that Wilson's future foe, Theodore Roosevelt, requested an appointment with him to discuss how best "to arouse among our young college students, and especially the seniors, an active interest in politics." Perhaps to return such a compliment, Wilson drew applause from one audience when he lectured his fellow citizens for continuing to call "an interesting gentleman—Teddy" once he had assumed the office of the presidency. Even Tommy Wilson insisted on proper etiquette for his fellow directors of the Republic.

And directors of the Republic there must be according to Wilson. The complexities of modern administration now called into question the democratic heritage of an earlier and agrarian age. Wilson indicated our theory of government for paying "little heed to efficiency." He described it as "a theory of non-professionalism in public affairs" which inevitably resulted in "non-efficiency." This new professionalism would have effects not only upon the United States but would also reach universal proportions in its consequences. If Wilson sought to have "the East . . . opened and transformed, whether we will or no," it was only because he likewise sought to have "the standards of the West . . . imposed upon it." It was only when those on the new frontiers of the Pacific recognized "the compulsions of that character . . . and those standards" that they would be entitled to a part in our adventure into professional modernity.

The underlying presupposition of Wilsonian political theory was that "the whole impulse of government must come from small groups of men." These groups—Wilson's own professional class, perhaps?—were unlike the "average of the nation." Fortunate, no doubt, because the "average man is not prepared to conduct government . . . does not know enough to do so." So there develops a society governed by the well educated and the well trained. Wilson, of course, assumed that this scheme of things would not necessarily mean government by the well born as well. His attachment to the notion of all careers open to all signified that even "the man humbly born is as free to make his way to the front as the man born in the privileged class." The only governmental intervention he would seek—adumbrating themes of the future 1912 campaign—would be to insure that there would be "no fouling on the course, no man put to an artificial advantage." Naturally, the accidents of birth and class could be easily overcome. After all, they were not of the essence of the America of Woodrow Wilson's dreams.
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