

BOOK REVIEWS

EDITED BY NORMAN B. WILKINSON

America—1603-1789: Prelude to a Nation. By Lawrence H. Leder. (Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1972. Pp. 300. Cloth \$7.95. Paper \$4.95.)

In less than three hundred pages Lawrence H. Leder succinctly explains the origins of the United States. The explanation emphasizes political developments and includes clear discussions of complicated topics such as English government (national and local) in the seventeenth century, the relationship of church and state in Puritan Massachusetts Bay, and British imperial administration. More detailed and equally clear is the discussion of political developments in the new nation. The first half of the volume treats the years before 1763 where the necessary information on English background to discovery and colonization, exploration and settlement, and the conquest of other European possessions in North America are discussed. Despite their brief treatment, social and economic developments are related to political developments with remarkable success. In addition special effort is made to point out the changes in black slavery through the two centuries.

Less successful is Leder's attempt to point up the diversity in national origin of the white population. For some undisclosed reason, the large Scotch-Irish and Scottish populations, by implication, are labelled foreigners. The explanation for German immigration does not tell why the largest numbers came to America after 1720. And the native American population receives little attention. A few Indian-white conflicts are mentioned; and in the discussion of one of these conflicts, the "massacre" organized by Powhattan's successor, Opechancanough, in 1622, there is some confusion in population figures. After a population of eight hundred is given for Virginia in 1621, the author concludes the discussion of the colonists' difficulties with the tragic effects of the "massacre." He writes: "Moreover, in the following year an Indian attack wiped out 400 seasoned settlers and forced the remainder to barricade themselves behind stockades, 500 more died that year." Thus more Virginians died in 1622 than lived in the colony during the previous year.

These rather minor weaknesses plus the much too sketchy relation of the French and Indian War are offset in the second half of the book by one of the best brief analyses of the revolutionary period that I have read. The colonists broke away from Great Britain to preserve their institutions from real and imagined threats, concentrated on the necessary war, organized the separate states into a confederation, and soon changed that into a national federation to prevent self-destruction.

Remarkably well-chosen pictures and excerpts from documents enhance the value of this successful political analysis of "the formation of the American nation." Each chapter also includes a selected bibliography, but omitted from the list for Chapter 5 is Merrill Jensen's *The Founding of a Nation* (1968). College students in early American history will appreciate *America—1603-1789* for its concise coverage of many complex political developments. Teachers of early American history in junior and senior high schools and in colleges and universities will find Leder's account a good summary of high points and refreshing in its explanations.

University of Wisconsin,
Stevens Point

RUSSELL S. NELSON, JR.

The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, Volumes 16-17, January 1, 1769, through December 31, 1770. Ed. by William B. Willcox *et al.* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972-1973. Pp. 359, 430. Each \$17.50.)

The Papers of Benjamin Franklin scarcely need an introduction, especially to those who deal with Pennsylvania history. The project to publish all Franklin wrote, and also in full or abstract all correspondence to him, has earned a prestigious reputation since the first volume appeared in 1960. Abundant superlatives have flowed from the pens of scholars such as Carl Bridenbaugh, Bernard Bailyn, Samuel E. Morison, Richard B. Morris, Max Savelle, Frederick B. Tolles, Clarence L. Ver Steeg, and a host of other academicians and interested commentators. Frequently reviewers of professional journals in fields other than history, newspapers, and magazines alert the general reader to a collection which will enrich, delight, fascinate, and titillate. By now only an extraordinary vocabulary or thesaurus could provide unused accolades to extol these most recent volumes.

As Leonard Labaree, Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., and their associates forged a reputation for excellence in editing, they helped change the nature of historical editing. Not content with flawless reproduction of original material, they went on in invaluable headnotes and footnotes to explain the historical context of documents and to provide extensive amounts of annotation. Although most scholars agreed with Max Savelle's opinion that the latter features give this edition "its unique and lasting value for scholars and places it far above any other editions of Franklin's writings ever printed," some reviewers appeared a bit uneasy. Such thoroughness marked a departure from past practices, and some feared it might overwhelm the general reader or beginning scholar. Such rarely expressed misgivings seem to disappear from record, particularly after Lester Cappon's "A Rationale for Historical Editing Past and Present" (*William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, XXIII [January, 1966], 56-75). Cappon drew attention to a new model for historical editing which the staffs of the Franklin, Jefferson, Madison, and certain other papers had pioneered. We have come to appreciate the "historical editor as historian . . . [a] knowledgeable scholar concerned with the meaning of the sources at his command."

After completing fourteen volumes, Leonard Labaree relinquished his

position as editor to William Willcox. Clearly the series continues in its excellent tradition. Extensive annotations still fill footnotes on virtually every page. Both volumes sixteen and seventeen, however, contain far fewer and decidedly briefer headnotes than most past volumes. Perhaps the reason for the change stems from the nature of the documents in these volumes or from the editor's reluctance to emulate his predecessors before immersing himself a bit longer in his materials. Whether this change represents temporary hesitancy or a transition to another pattern will become evident in ensuing volumes. The point is significant, for infrequent headnotes of half a page or less will not produce the same results as abundant headnotes which often ran up to six or seven pages of small type.

Volumes sixteen and seventeen contain about 180 to 190 pieces each, precisely reproduced from originals in the care of more than three dozen institutions or individuals. Franklin corresponded about numerous subjects with a wide variety of individuals and spent six weeks of 1769 in Paris. Despite that, the correspondence which he received (as reproduced in these volumes) emanated mainly from Pennsylvania (30 percent to 40 percent) and England (20 percent to 30 percent). Information from individuals or groups in about five other colonies came predominantly from Massachusetts, New York, and Georgia. Scarcely any correspondence originated from the continent of Europe.

During 1769 and 1770 Franklin's life continued full and exciting, though his public activities are more evident in the latter year. This stems from the fact that in 1769 the colonial issue faded in contrast to previous or subsequent years. The uproar surrounding John Wilkes in 1769 helped draw the king's attention to Lord North who, in 1770, began a long and arduous ministry. Although Franklin worked diligently to obtain total repeal of the Townshend Acts, elaborating in "The Colonial Advocate" the reasons for his stance, the confusion of the disintegrating Crafton ministry thwarted him. Ultimately Lord North cast the deciding vote against total repeal. These volumes demonstrate the increasing difficulties and lack of effectiveness colonial agents experienced in the changing situation. To Franklin's dismay, many powerful politicians agreed with Lord Hillsborough who seemed "to think Agents unnecessary (perhaps troublesome) and says all applications from the Colonies to Government here ought to be thro' the hands of the Respective Governors." In such an atmosphere, Franklin, who had increased his contacts with Massachusetts especially after the Boston Massacre, was appointed agent for that colony's assembly. By late 1770, Franklin thus represented four colonies. Ironically, though he now represented more colonies, understood the Americans and their desires better than previously, and had worked out his own views more thoroughly, he exerted less effective influence upon British decisions.

Franklin encountered further frustration when his efforts to sustain the non-importation agreement fell victim to a parliamentary compromise. This proved especially disappointing. Franklin viewed non-importation as highly beneficial to America. He hoped that the crisis of the times which precipitated non-importation would pass "like a summer Thunder Shower" but asserted that the "Advantages of your Perseverance in Industry and

Frugality will be great and permanent." Although he displays glowing faith in America's endless expansion and development, his outlook is not entirely optimistic. In November, 1769, for instance, he prophesied that repression would provoke resistance, and thus more repression, etc., in a vicious circle.

An innovative aspect of the papers is the appearance of extensive marginalia. The editors wisely present the marginalia and the text upon which it comments in separate columns. This format seems superior to that employed in volume thirteen which integrated marginal notes and text. The marginalia turns out to be highly significant material and alters certain prevailing opinions about Franklin. In terse comments Franklin worked out his concept of the economic and constitutional position of the colonies. In the process he became less pragmatic and changeable and more doctrinaire and adamant. He expressed his inner feelings and thoughts which he concealed from public discussion and hardly revealed in private correspondence even to trusted friends. For example, in 1769 some people believed that William Bradford republished Franklin's denial of Parliament's right to tax the colonies in order to embarrass and discredit him in England. In that year Franklin's inner thoughts went far beyond rejecting parliamentary taxation of America to outright denial of the sovereignty of Parliament in America. Though he had been moving toward that position as early as 1766, neither his published pieces nor private correspondence reveal that radical position until June, 1770. Then he decided to "unbosom myself," fully aware that the Lords and Commons would view his thoughts as "little less than Treason." Lest Franklin's radical stance be exaggerated, it is worth recalling his faith in the British sovereign, George III, expressed in marginalia as well as in private and public statements. Also, as late as January, 1770, Franklin still pushed efforts to make Pennsylvania a royal colony.

As the editors point out, in the marginalia Benjamin Franklin appears more spontaneous, vivid, and human than often granted, even in certain recent scholarly accounts. Franklin makes the reasoned comments one anticipates; he also pleasantly concurs with some opinions by recording "true," "just," and similar adjectives. Here, however, lies no dispassionate discussion. British polemics roused his ire. Exclamation points fly, indicating strong emotional attachment to opinions. Time and again he exclaims "Nonsense!," "A most impudent Assertion!," "O God!," "A Vile Lie!," and "Another infamous Lie! . . . you lying Villain!" These are strong emotional outbursts for a man remembered for his criticisms of zealots and "enthusiasticks." If the marginalia represent a deeper and truer level of thought and conviction than Franklin usually revealed, it is indeed unfortunate that in these years we know only his response to British pamphlets and not American ones as well.

Scientific endeavors also attracted Franklin's ever-active mind. Correspondence with Pennsylvanians such as Cadwalader Evans, Humphrey Marshall, John Ewing, Samuel Rhoads, John Bartram, and those from other colonies such as John Winthrop and Dr. Benjamin Gale prove fascinating. Franklin also corresponded with Joseph Priestly, Edward Maskelyn (Royal Astronomer at Greenwich), and Jean-Baptiste Le Roy, to name a few others. Subjects covered ranged from astronomy and botany to fireproof roofs,

smoky chimneys, lightning rods, improved ploughs, and the cultivation of silk. On one occasion he advised his old friend John Bartram to decline his "long and dangerous peregrinations, in search of plants . . . [and to write] a Natural History of our country." The Transit of Venus excited much interest in 1769, and Franklin assisted colonial observers by acquiring telescopes and other equipment for their use. He also helped bring their significant accomplishments to the attention of the larger scientific community.

As usual, the many-sided Franklin deals simultaneously with several of his many interests. The man becomes ever more remarkable as these fine volumes continue to appear.

*University of Wisconsin,
Stevens Point*

RANDOLPH S. KLEIN

Franklin and Galloway, A Political Partnership. By Benjamin H. Newcomb.
(New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972. Pp. 332. \$12.50.)

A new dimension has been added to the political partnership of Benjamin Franklin and Joseph Galloway during the twenty years prior to the American Revolution when they were forging their political organization in Pennsylvania. In particular, this study adds to the understanding of Galloway's role in that partnership. The duo's success in forming an anti-proprietary party by 1755, although based in Philadelphia, had all the elements of a local political party; the partnership was to last until 1770. With Franklin in London much of the time, Galloway met the challenge of proprietary officeholders, many Presbyterians, some Quakers, and the Pennsylvania Germans, who opposed their petition for a royal charter.

As Galloway faced the emerging leadership of John Dickinson and a new proprietary coalition, Franklin made his case in London for taxation of proprietary lands, popular selection of judges, and fewer proprietary restrictions on governors. At first the partnership depended more on Franklin's charm and general reputation than upon Galloway's legal training and oratory, but this monograph presents Galloway as a full-fledged equal, thus giving the latter a greater share in party leadership than do most biographers of Franklin.

The Stamp Act tested the partnership, for Galloway firmly supported accommodation within the British empire whereas Franklin began to realize that British policy was a more immediate challenge to colonial legislative rights than proprietary policy. Galloway opposed non-importation when Franklin was moving toward a more vigorous stance. Repeal of the Stamp Act healed the crack.

The Townshend duties created a second crisis when the Massachusetts circular letter appeared in Philadelphia. Dickinson increased his attacks, and Franklin appeared to favor non-importation as he worked for repeal. When Philadelphia merchants adopted an anti-British measure, Galloway was dealt a mortal blow—he lost his seat from Philadelphia in the assembly in 1770; and the partnership of fifteen years was broken. He retreated to Bucks County to win a seat from a "rotten borough" and to retain his hold on the speaker's chair, but his broad political base had disappeared.

Franklin, in 1770, added Massachusetts to the three other colonies he represented in London; but his effectiveness as a colonial agent was destroyed by the Tea Party of 1773, for British retaliation was inevitable. His failure to get the British to remove the duty on tea convinced him of the corruptness of the British system and strengthened his conviction that American liberties had to be maintained. Galloway, in the same period, was seeking to recoup his political losses but failed in 1774 when he was unseated as speaker.

British punitive acts in 1774 prevented the revival of the partnership; and Galloway, still seeking accommodation, put forth his plan of union, which was rejected by the Continental Congress. Franklin could not accept the plan for its basic weakness was that it did not provide the colonies with any voice in determining imperial policy. Galloway resigned as a delegate and awaited Franklin's return. Each attempted to convert the other to his point of view, but all efforts failed. Galloway fled to Britain, condemning Franklin as an arch rebel, and their friendship turned to bitterness. According to Newcomb, Franklin was not a typical patriot; Galloway was not a typical Loyalist.

Newcomb's treatment of Franklin is, in general, the accepted one, but his portrait of Galloway reveals greater depth. Their anti-proprietary party was successful for fifteen years. Franklin's anti-British stand is placed about the time of the tea duty of 1770. The work is highly readable and a welcome addition to the political history of the period. Although some historians have Franklin attempting to make the system work until the mid-seventies, the author is convinced that the abandonment of his petition for royal government for Pennsylvania is evidence that Franklin had little confidence in British policy after the Townshend duties were imposed, working instead to bolster colonial opposition.

Slippery Rock State College

ROBERT D. DUNCAN

English Defenders of American Freedoms, 1774-1778: Six Pamphlets Attacking British Policy. Compiled by Paul H. Smith. (Washington: Library of Congress, 1972. Pp. 231. \$2.75.)

One might ask why historian Paul H. Smith compiled the pamphlets contained in this volume as part of the Library of Congress Publications Series for the Bicentennial of the American Revolution. In his introduction Smith reminds us that "during the past two decades scholars have focused greater attention on the intellectual qualities of the American Revolution than ever before." To ignore the writings of British Whig intellectuals in defense of American rights on the eve of revolution, Smith points out, is to narrow the intellectual milieu of revolutionary ferment in the strife-ridden Anglo-American world. Thus the compiler has pulled this collection of pamphlets together, not only to recover them from obscurity but also to allow historians who "have generally veered from the study of English radical influence on America after 1774" in favor of questing after emerging American republicanism, at least to consider the ongoing impact of English radical consciousness on the course of the Revolution.

The compiler's premise makes sense, but the pamphlets in their totality seemingly lead nowhere. They do prove that English Whigs feared for the fate of "liberty" and saw ministerial leaders as corrupted by arbitrary power in not recognizing that American rights were being violated by parliamentary taxation schemes. Moreover, more than one pamphleteer perceived Americans as "a new and uncorrupted people" who were defending "the spirit of liberty" which had been all but crushed by corruption in England, as Matthew Robinson-Morris, Baron Rokeby, stated it in his *Considerations on the Measures Carrying on with Respect to the British Colonies in North America* (1774). No doubt such laudatory expressions about the meaning of the American cause spurred some patriots at home to redouble their efforts in the defense of liberty during the critical years of 1774 and 1775. What long-range impact such statements had is another question left basically unanswered in a volume seemingly dedicated to raising such questions.

If the reader must draw his own conclusions about the significance of the pamphlets, the compiler could have done more to help. A list of other radical Whig pamphlets written by Englishmen during the Revolution would have aided in putting this collection into perspective. Except for a few hints in footnotes, bibliographical aids are non-existent. Moreover, the pamphlets form no chronological chain of thought. All but the last were dated 1776 or before, and most written in reaction to the rather arbitrary Coercive Acts of 1774. Moreover, one of the pamphlets, a series of rambling essays by John Cartwright, takes up nearly one-third of the text in the volume. As the compiler states, Cartwright had a way of being "prolix and tedious." In response, the reviewer can state: "Excruciatingly so!" Why was the verbose Cartwright allotted so much space when others, perhaps more insightful, were left out? There can be no real basis for measuring the significance of such pamphlets without some sense of the compiler's criteria for inclusion.

This volume, then, is valuable in that it rescues several pamphlets from obscurity and makes them readily available to an audience of scholars currently fascinated with the intellectuality of the American Revolution. The meaning of such writings, though, will only become clear when some scholar looks at the extent literature in its totality. If Smith's purpose was to make historians aware of the topic by sampling the literature, then we apparently have found an answer to the question why.

Rutgers University

JAMES K. MARTIN

John Woolman in England, 1772: A Documentary Supplement. By Henry J. Cadbury. (London: Friends Historical Society, 1971. Pp. 142. \$4.00.)

For more than twenty years Henry J. Cadbury has been collecting material on John Woolman's visit in 1772 to England, a trip which was terminated by his death from smallpox. The effort to supplement Woolman's own meager account of his English travels in his journal involved a diligent search for relevant materials in libraries in England, Ireland, and the United States. The result to date is published in this book.

The work is divided into five short, chronological sections, starting with

his preparation for the journey and running through his stay in York, where he attended a Quarterly Meeting, became ill, and died after only one hundred twenty-two days in England. For each division the work adds new information and corrects the errors of earlier authors. The end result adds to our total picture of John Woolman and provides a model study for this kind of historical sleuthing.

Much of this study is based on scraps of information in minutes of Friends meetings Woolman visited, journals of English Quakers who met him, and journals and letters of other American Friends then in England. Some of Woolman's own travel notes and letters are also included. For the most part, however, it is a picture of Woolman as seen by others, rather than any new insight into his thoughts or spiritual growth.

Woolman's English journey is traced with care and detail. Included is biographical information about those who came in contact with him and recorded their impressions. In his conclusion Henry Cadbury states that the study began as an experiment to see how a very limited segment of Woolman's life could be illuminated beyond his own brief report. He evaluated the results as meager "but not so meagre as was to be expected." He found Quakerism to be well documented for the period and confirmed again the existence of a transatlantic Quaker community. Obviously this work has a specialized appeal, but anyone who seeks a fuller picture of John Woolman's last trip than is provided by his journal or any of his biographies will find it indispensable. It was a labor of love, carried out with patience and care, and this adds to its usefulness.

Wilmington College

LARRY GARA

The War of 1812. By John K. Mahon. (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1972. Pp. 476. \$12.50.)

The history of the involvement of the United States in warfare is spotty and uneven. To explain civil-military relations in this country is a difficult task. To understand the unique relationship between civilians and the military in the history of the United States requires a many-faceted approach. *The War of 1812* by John K. Mahon is an excellent example of one of these techniques—the historical narrative. To provide a lucid and readable history of the War of 1812 is not an easy task, especially if one sets out to write a detailed and definitive narrative as well. To put together an intricate mosaic of operations on many fronts, and to do it with style and accuracy, is quite an accomplishment.

To facilitate this understanding, Dr. Mahon has divided the narrative into various time periods and topics. The land campaigns and naval operations are considered primarily by years, and other themes are interspersed within the chronology as the story develops. The War of 1812 may be compared to a gigantic collage with its numerous overlapping events and subjects. The Mississippi Delta; the Niagara Theater; the Creek War; the burning of Washington; the defense of Baltimore; the frustrating naval activities on Lakes Erie, Ontario, and Champlain; and the short-lived successes on the high seas against the Royal Navy are the areas of major coverage. Each has

been treated in a detailed account, and at times there seems to be no way of determining which are most important. The reader must remember that all the many details fit together for a composite picture of the war.

A note of the present (Vietnam and after) seems periodically to appear between the lines. The uneven support of the war effort by the states and the ever-present military-political nature of wartime leadership impart a sense of frustration in the conduct of the war. Mahon has shown that the War of 1812 was a wrong war at the wrong time for both participants. Aware that military history cannot be written in a vacuum, he has sketched in some relevant social and political details so that the war can be placed in proper perspective. Along this line there is perhaps a need for more information on the effect and influence of the war on the home fronts of the two nations.

Character studies of the important military and civilian participants lend much to an understanding of the human side of the protagonists. Illustrations of those involved, along with maps drawn from contemporary sources, enhance the overall treatment of the story. Pertinent interpretations of the roots of the war receive only passing attention; and the narrative, like the war itself, fades off into the peace negotiations. Professor Mahon has used a wide variety of sources and has included two excellent bibliographies for further reading. Although the placement of footnotes is usually beyond the control of an author, it is distracting to have to refer to the back of the book for citations.

The War of 1812 is an important contribution to the continuing history of American military affairs. As a companion volume to other studies of the war, it tends to round out the picture of one of America's lesser known military endeavors. Finally, those who balk at reading narrative history should be reminded that this is a factual, detailed account of the War of 1812. The author does survey historical interpretations of the war, however, with special attention to the views of British military and naval historians. *The War of 1812* brings into focus once more the difficulties of decision making encountered by practitioners of the Anglo-American military tradition on both sides of the Atlantic.

Davidson County Community College
Lexington, N. C.

SAMUEL R. BRIGHT, JR.

John Quincy Adams: A Personal History of an Independent Man. By Marie B. Hecht. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972. Pp. 682, \$14.95.)

There is something peculiarly American yet uniquely foreign about the Adamses. For three generations John, John Quincy, and Charles Francis served the Republic in its highest offices, and in the fourth Henry and Brooks made brilliant attempts to explain it. Their successes, however, were extrinsic in foreign affairs, where formality vaguely unsettles native sensibilities. The failures of the first two generations in that American invention, the office of the presidency, troubled the family into the fourth. Even the explanations of Brooks and Henry are too far from the main stream, too "aristocratic," for native comfort.

The life of John Quincy, with his masterful diplomacy, dismal presidency, and long career of gadfly to the House of Representatives, a blend of ambition and squeamish unwillingness to use the power realized ambition brought, seems the epitome of this family whose history ran coextensively with the nation's birth and growth. Perhaps if we could explain the contradictions and paradoxes in John Quincy's character, a linchpin in that series of wheels within wheels we call the American character might be released to our understanding.

In her subtitle, Mrs. Hecht boldly announces that hers will be a "personal history" (presumably one that will show us Adams as a "person," rather than as a diplomat, cabinet member, president, or congressman, as did the earlier works of Samuel Flagg Bemis, Walter Lafeber, or Leonard Falkner). This may be precisely what is wanted to help us understand a man who Stratford Canning, British ambassador during Monroe's presidency, described as "much above par in general ability, but having the air of a scholar rather than a statesman, a very uneven temper, a disposition at times wellmeaning, a manner somewhat too often domineering, and an ambition causing unsteadiness in his political career." Except for the scholarly air, that description might pass as a general American characterization.

Unfortunately as one gets into Mrs. Hecht's book, it raises the question: What is the difference between history and gossip? Must we know that while John Quincy was cramming for admission to Harvard, "he reacted negatively to his uncle's bluntness Consequently, Johnny grew thin and suffered constantly from sore eyes"? What are we to make of his insomnia and depression after graduation from Harvard, and that he then "turned into a social butterfly"? Does it matter that Louisa Adams found the White House full of an "assortment of rags and rubbish", . . . that their eldest son, George Washington, drowned himself in a fit of depression, . . . that John Quincy finally had to give up swimming in the Potomac for his health when he was seventy-eight?

Perhaps all these things are necessary for our understanding. However, it is the job of the biographer to make clear how it is so. This Mrs. Hecht does not do. Her work is organized around no theme. She does not show us how his successes were connected with his failures. Rather she lays it all out from birth to death, leaving the reader bewildered.

Of course it's not all laid out. Many more things happen to a man in eighty years than can be contained in nearly seven hundred pages. She could not hope to give us an account of all the recorded events in a life of so many records. What she has done gives us John Quincy Adams through her eyes, so that the "personal history" in her subtitle is really the personal history of Marie Hecht's study of John Quincy Adams.

How can a biographer organize his subject so as to turn gossip, idle information, into history, a systematic account of the connections between events? Perhaps we might take a clue from Aristotle, although as every historian knows he found poetry "something more philosophic and of graver import than history." Earlier in the *Poetics*, however, his statements about the "unity of plot" had broader significance than he knew. Plot, he said, could not consist of one man's life, for "an infinity of things befall one

man." Rather, a plot must be a "complete whole, with its several incidents so closely connected that the transposal or withdrawal of any one of them will disjoin and dislocate the whole." When incidents are so connected, it is possible for us to understand the meaning of a plot; and only when they are so connected, can understanding be reached.

History, in its way, is much more difficult than poetry, for as Aristotle pointed out, the difference, history, "describes the thing that has been, and [poetry] a kind of thing that might be." While poets are free to invent plots, historians must struggle to discover the connections between what they must have already established as actual events. Lacking connections in poetry, disjointed images remain; failure to develop connections in the struggle to write history leaves only idle gossip.

It is for this reason that Robert A. East's *John Quincy Adams: The Critical Years: 1785-1794* (New York, 1962) is a more satisfactory study than Mrs. Hecht's. Professor East found the critical period in Adams's life mirrored the critical period in the nation's life. "Definitions of purpose became clarified for both himself and his country only in the face of difficulties." Samuel Flagg Bemis's two volumes on Adams show the possibility of drawing connections throughout a complete life, although it is necessary to focus the biography as he did in his first volume, *John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy* (New York, 1949), with a "diplomatic biography," and in his second, *John Quincy Adams and the Union* (New York, 1956), upon Adams's struggle for a "Union of Liberty with Power."

In spite of his own reservations expressed in both prefaces, and in the dedication, "To The Future Biographers of John Quincy Adams," in his second volume, Professor Bemis's work is the most satisfactory yet to appear. There is work on Adams still to be done, work that will be best approached through a grasp of the foundations underlying historical investigations.

University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown

WILLIAM R. SMITH

Dickinson College: A History. By Charles Coleman Sellers. (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1973. Pp. 626. \$20.00.)

This is an outstanding example of the institutional history prepared, in this case, in celebration of the founding of Dickinson College. It is the culmination of an effort begun in 1967 which was designed to achieve the further development of the college archives and to produce a definitive single-volume history of the institution. While the archival work was a team effort, the preparation of this book is clearly the work of the author who has served Dickinson for many years as a faculty member and librarian.

Dr. Sellers does not take a narrow view of the history of the college. Rather, he relates it to major developments in the larger society and in higher education in the nation. He has ranged widely for his materials, finding primary sources not only in the records of the college but also in those of legislative bodies and the supporting denominations. Among the secondary sources are found the major works in the history of higher education in the United States.

The author has chosen to organize his material largely about the major presidential administrations in the history of the college with two exceptions—two periods in which the affairs of the college were dominated by powerful trustees, George Duffield and Boyd Lee Spahr. Among other things, this illuminates an important aspect of the governance of the college in two periods of its history—the fact that the office of the president of the board of trustees could and did become more powerful than the office of the president of the college. Indeed, in the first of these periods (1783-1833), the president of the college, or principal, was not even an *ex officio* member of the board. Understandably, with two possible exceptions, the longer presidential terms have come in the past eighty years as the college matured and as its financial base became more secure. Still, the second longest tenure, a period of twenty years from 1784 to 1804, was that served by the first president, the Reverend Charles Nisbet, whose intellectual vigor and broad erudition brought students seeking higher education to this new college located in frontier Pennsylvania.

In reading this history, one again finds familiar answers to basic questions raised about the many American colleges. Why was Dickinson founded? In part, it was established because of a commitment by dedicated clergymen, some of whom had been educated in Scottish universities, to continue on the American frontier the intellectual heritage in which they had shared in the homeland; in part, because of the deep concern for the education of enlightened and virtuous citizens to preserve and extend the revolutionary victory won in 1783; in part, to provide dedicated and committed clerical and lay leadership for a denomination—first, the Presbyterian and later the Methodist; and in part, in the expectation that a college would stimulate the economic development of the town and region in which it was located.

Why did a college survive and grow? In a very large part, survival, particularly in the early years, was due to the determination of a few individuals—at times faculty members, on other occasions presidents or board members—not to permit the college to die. In critical moments these men found necessary funds with which to recruit faculty, maintain buildings, and attract students. Even so, despite heroic sacrifices, Dickinson was closed on two occasions in the early nineteenth century. In large part, growth was due to the slow but certain adjustment to various pressures. The curriculum was broadened to provide increasingly for instruction in modern languages, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. The religious emphasis was altered to one which was increasingly secular as the college responded to a secularized society.

Student demands for autonomy and individuality were acknowledged in permitting the organization of the literary societies, at a later date, of fraternities and intercollegiate athletics, and, more recently, of student participation in decision making. Even the demands for sexual equality were grudgingly admitted with the introduction of coeducation in 1887. In many ways, the most appealing individual in the book is the first coed, Zatae Longsdorff, who with great courage survived the open hostility of her male classmates so that she not only graduated but in addition won the college's most coveted honor, the Pierson oratorical prize. Moreover, colleges survive

and grow despite intense and damaging personality conflicts between leading figures in the faculty, administration, and boards of trustees.

Always, this effort, this commitment, this dedication, is made, as Sellers reminds us, because: "Education is the life of the civilization, always religious at heart, linking present truth to far or farthest ideals, its traditions cherished and guarded, innovations held back by elemental fears."

This book is rich in explanatory materials to which approximately two hundred pages are devoted. In addition to footnotes and an index, both of which are copious and accurate, the appendices include a complete list of the presidents and members of the boards of trustees, of the faculty, and of administrative officers; a series of chronological sketches describing the development of the various academic disciplines, a brief history of the various undergraduate organizations, and an account of the various buildings which were erected to serve the purposes of the college. The book also gives adequate attention to the history of several collateral institutions, the School of Law, the Grammar School, Conway Hall Preparatory School, and Emory Female College.

With this volume, the celebration of the bicentennial of Dickinson College, the second oldest institution of higher education in Pennsylvania, has had an auspicious beginning. In every respect, it is worthy of the many people who for two hundred years have worked successfully to build and maintain a small college distinguished as " . . . a bulwark of liberty."

Bethlehem

MAHLON H. HELLERICH

Journey Through a Part of the United States of North America in the Years 1844-1846. By Albert C. Koch. Translated and with an Introduction by Ernest A. Stadler. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972. Pp. 177. \$12.50.)

Journey Through a Part of the United States of North America in the Years 1844-1846 is an interesting addition to the literature of travel in the United States in the nineteenth century. Unlike most of the books by foreign visitors, however, Koch is not interested in the manners and morals of Americans so much as in the paleontological treasures which abound beneath their soil. Indeed, this is more of a book for the geologist, geographer, paleontologist, and historian of science than for the cultural historian. It also offers excellent descriptions of some of the details of American life, especially of steamboat and canalboat travel in the 1840s.

Albert C. Koch was an untrained but passionate German paleontologist who lived in and visited the United States for extended periods of time and, indeed, is buried in Golconda, Illinois, where he became proprietor of a lead mine. He first came to public attention in 1836 when he opened a museum in St. Louis where he displayed some of his fossils along with other curiosities. A few years later he was back in Europe, having sold a reconstructed mastodon whose bones he had found in America to the British Museum, where it may be seen today. In 1844 he returned to America for a two-year hunt for specimens which took him from Martha's Vineyard to New Orleans, passing several times through Pennsylvania. His journal of

this expedition constitutes the book which Ernest A. Stadler has so ably translated and introduced. Mr. Stadler is also to be commended for the excellent illustrations which adorn the text, though Charles Willson Peale's famous painting, "Exhuming the Mastodon," would have been a welcome addition. Indeed, one thing I missed in the introductory materials was an attempt to place Koch within some kind of context of scientific discovery in the United States and the early development of geology and paleontology in particular.

More specifically, one does not know, after having read the book, how seriously to take Koch as a scientist. He seems a good deal dependent upon scripture to explain his findings, as when he discovers "irrefutable proof that Noah's flood, or the deluge, as it is called in the Holy Scriptures, also flooded America." He sometimes seems comic, almost a parody of the doddering scientist or professor, going about the American landscape with his ungainly boxes of bones under his arms. One tends to picture him with a pith helmet and magnifying glass. Nothing stops the indefatigable Herr Koch. On the frozen Mississippi he dismounts from his steamboat to search for fossils, limping along on his bad leg. One admires his perseverance, but, at the same time, his single-mindedness sometimes reached absurd proportions, as when he hurries to save his bones from a conflagration which has a great part of New York City ablaze. At the same time, Koch's enthusiasm for his fossils is communicated to the reader with such poignancy that I, for one, shall never take exhibits in natural history museums for granted again. There is so much poetry in Koch's descriptions of his findings and specimens that tends to liken him more to Thoreau than to foreign commentators such as Tocqueville, Dickens, Trollope, Sarmiento (who visited America around the time Koch flourished), or other scientists contemporary with Koch.

For the non-scientist, especially for the canalboat and steamboat buff, Koch is a veritable gold mine of detail. Probably the same instinct, which led him to go to such lengths in describing his specimens, accounts for the fullness of his discussion of water travel, which most other foreign commentators pass over lightly. He begins with an extraordinary description of his Atlantic crossing, and during the rest of his travels he seems to be perpetually mounting and dismounting from steamboats and canalboats. One learns that canalboats carried extra sets of horses or mules aboard, which replaced tired ones at intervals. One learns that steamboats caught on sand bars were freed by organizing the passengers to rush from side to side until, by rocking, the boat was again afloat. The tremendous availability of public transportation as compared with our own day is apparent, as are the dangers attendant upon such travel. "I heard the remark from one of the pilots," Koch recounts, "that, if one counted the steamboats which were wrecked between St. Louis and Cairo in the last ten years, one would find that at least every three English miles one had sunk." Indeed, when Koch sends his great collection of fossils from New Orleans to New York, they are almost lost in the wreck of the ship, one of the many narrow escapes his boxes of bones were to encounter. The hardships Koch experienced in traveling, not least of which was in trying to find porters who would agree to help carry his wooden specimen boxes, are suggested by this passage describing the ac-

commodations he and a fellow paleontologist were put up in at one point: its few windows were for the largest part deprived of their glass, which had its good side, since most of the prevailing evil smells, caused by the most terrible filthiness, were able to escape. Added to that was the fact that partly on the floor and partly on some beds lay several drunken men who called themselves gentlemen and who would have started a fight immediately if they had not been shown proper respect. We were both very tired, . . . so we lay down for a few hours on a single bed assigned to both of us, which could not, despite the weak glow of our light, hide the dirt.

One comes away from Albert Koch's journal delighted that his book is now available in English, admiring the man and glad to have made his acquaintance, and grateful to Mr. Stadler for bringing him to our attention and for entertaining us so well.

Douglass College
Rutgers University

MICHAEL A. ROCKLAND

Stephen A. Douglas. By Robert W. Johannsen. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973. Pp. 993. \$19.95.)

Stephen A. Douglas has waited many years for a biographer who would thoroughly explore his important life and complex personality with historical impartiality. Professor Johannsen has given us such a study, a weighty book of nearly a thousand pages which, nonetheless, reads easily and sustains interest. The book necessarily tells the story of national politics during the years when Senator Douglas was an acknowledged leader of his party, but it holds a steady focus upon the man himself. And it adds a dimension often lacking in analyses of the middle period by bringing the West into view as a unique and powerful section quite as self-conscious, self-righteous, and arrogant as the ante-bellum North or South. Lincoln's career has been so overlaid with his wartime presidency that his westernism scarcely shows. But the career of Douglas illustrates graphically western traits, ideas, methods, and aspirations. Douglas personifies the western drive for status, power, and achievement.

The author makes a persistent and largely successful effort to maintain the perspective of historical detachment. He sharply etches Douglas's faults and failures as well as his best qualities and successes. But he occasionally lapses, as when he accepts Douglas's own assertion that he was a "regular" and that Administration Democrats in 1858 had defected from their party. He also overemphasizes Douglas's claims of standing on principle when political expediency clearly shows through. Politicians habitually make such claims, but historians need to be skeptical. On the whole, Johannsen attains commendable impartiality in treating a man who inspired fierce loyalties and bitter hatreds among his contemporaries.

The character of Douglas, as he emerges from this biography, casts an interesting light upon what the American voters wanted in a political personality. Professor Johannsen paints the Little Giant as a man of paradox and contradictions—a man of principle and yet a pragmatist; a man of vol-

canic emotions, "ambitious, reckless, and sometimes unscrupulous"; a man who loved furor and had the instincts of a prize fighter; a man who often placed ends ahead of means; a shallow and short-range thinker on constitutional theory who nonetheless staked his career on a technical constitutional controversy; a man whose most vital pronouncements came in support of the idea of rule by a "majority," but who never fully perceived the meaning of the term and found no conflict when he defied the will of a large majority of the Democratic party in order to sustain the presumed will of a small and dissenting majority in a federal territory; a man who proclaimed, "I will make no sacrifice of principle," but when the consequences of intransigence finally became too frightful to contemplate, could abandon a lesser principle in an earnest quest for peace.

Douglas claimed that his interests were national, not sectional, but he never quite realized that his western experience made the interests of that section appear to him to be the entire national interest, just as spokesmen for the North and the South exhibited a similar environmental interpretation of the national interest. That this remarkable and tempestuous man should become one of the most powerful political leaders of his age tells us much about the instincts of the American electorate.

Professor Johannsen gives us a rich and varied portrait of ante-bellum political life; but despite prodigious research, he does not find conclusive answers to some of the enduring conundrums of the era. I might cite as examples the author's traditional but still unsatisfying explanation of Douglas's sudden rejection of a planned reconciliation with the regular Democratic party in the spring of 1858; or his too brief exposure of the relations between Douglas and Robert J. Walker during the developing Le-compton crisis; or his cursory treatment of Douglas's part in the Covode investigation and its influence on the Democratic nominating conventions of 1860; or, finally, his simplistic explanation of Douglas's reasons for running for president in 1860 when his political acumen should have foretold the large improbability of his success and the terrible risk in his failure. Since Douglas found so much fault with President Buchanan, it might have been useful for Professor Johannsen to consider how Douglas's announced policies and his well-known personality might have affected the nation, had he been in the White House and responsible to a wider constituency than he faced as senator.

Douglas's family life and personal habits and troubles form a sad chapter of his experience. He gave his time, energy, devotion, and, in the end, his good health to his political career. His successive wives and his children lived apart from him much of the time simply because he was too busy. His plans for home building and domesticity in surroundings of wealth never fully materialized. His home life, as his political life, brought more aspiration than fulfillment.

This admirable biography, sympathetic to its subject without being laudatory, rests on years of meticulous and insistent investigation. Much of the material has been culled from contemporary newspapers, but the breadth of search in manuscripts is awe inspiring, and the use of secondary works exhaustive. The book contains nearly a hundred pages of endnotes and a

good index, but no formal bibliography. Obviously, space limitations precluded this. While the price tag is high, this book is indispensable for any student of pre-Civil War American history, and it will prove interesting and rewarding reading for the generalist.

Pennsylvania State University

PHILIP S. KLEIN

By Myself, I'm a Book: An Oral History of the Immigrant Jewish Experience in Pittsburgh. By the Pittsburgh Section, National Council of Jewish Women, under the direction of Ailon Shiloh. (Waltham, Mass: The American Jewish Historical Society, 1972. Pp. 166. \$6.50.)

"By myself, I'm a book," an immigrant respondent said to one of the large groups of women associated with the Pittsburgh Section of the National Council of Jewish Women who selflessly worked as interviewers and editors on this book. I am sure he was right. Probably every immigrant to America is a book, and this attempt to capture the sights, the sounds, the *feel* of the Jewish immigrant experience in Pittsburgh during several decades before and after the turn of the century deserves our appreciation. "I liked the plumbing in my brother's house . . . I flushed the toilet for hours," one immigrant is quoted as saying. "I thought of the United States as a place where even the bricks were unkosher," another said. There are some beautiful things in this book. It takes up the Jewish immigrant at the point where "Fiddler on the Roof" leaves off, and its oral history technique occasionally provides intellectual excitement of which conventional histories are incapable.

At the same time, I feel that this book fails to realize its potential. Much of it is simply a reproduction of statement after statement, many repetitive. In between the statements are editorial remarks, many of them inept because they do little to illuminate the primary materials. For example, one respondent suddenly is quoted as saying, "When the Hebrew University was dedicated in Jerusalem we had a grand academic procession here in Pittsburgh. Thousands of doctors, lawyers, etc.—Jews and non-Jews—who had academic degrees, marched through the city wearing their caps and gowns." The editors do not tell us when this seemingly remarkable event took place, who were its organizers, what significance the reader should assign it, etc., leaving one with the nagging doubt as to whether it occurred at all or whether the respondent may have been exaggerating. The authors insist in their *Conclusion* (why here, instead of at the beginning?) that they checked all references for authenticity as well as they could, but surely the reader could have profited on this occasion as well as on many others by the inclusion of an explanatory remark or footnote.

As a tape, record, or radio program, no doubt this book would make fascinating listening. But its authors have not gone nearly as far as they might have to turn their materials into literature. They have done the research. But too often when reading it, one feels that they have not yet quite finished writing the book.

One difficulty is simply mechanical. The reader is often confused because he is not certain whether one or several immigrant voices are speaking, as all

comments on a particular subject are lumped together in such a way that it is difficult to differentiate among them. Perhaps skipping a space between each response (instead of just paragraphing), or using a dash before each, would have alleviated this problem.

More substantively, it is almost impossible to understand the responses within a historical or cultural context, because the introductory materials which would have oriented the reader are incomprehensibly found in the appendix. One finally learns in the appendix, for example, what the size of the Pittsburgh/Jewish community has been over a period of time, something which the reader should have known from the start. I would urge all readers to consult this appendix before proceeding with the rest of the book.

More important still, one finishes the book without much sense of what has been the special nature of the Jewish immigrant experience in Pittsburgh. One learns that Pittsburgh's Jews were active in the cigar industry, but how did their experience differ from the experience in New York City? One hears much about the special nature of the Jewish community in Pittsburgh. But after reading this book, it is difficult to tell how it may differ from other Jewish communities around the nation except that it was commendably self-conscious and interested enough to attempt to write part of its own history. Maps of Pittsburgh in 1880, 1924, and today, showing areas of Jewish settlement, would have been extremely helpful, especially for readers unfamiliar with Pittsburgh and the various neighborhoods referred to. How do these neighborhoods relate to the areas where other ethnic groups have settled throughout the city, and how have Pittsburgh's Jews interrelated with these ethnic groups? Not having satisfied these questions, the book's authors leave one with the impression that they were dominated too much by nostalgia, that they had too precious an attitude toward the materials at their disposal. The erroneous impression is given that the community is living in some kind of vacuum, unconnected elsewhere through either space or time. There is a parochial aspect to the book. It too often communicates the sense of having been written by and for the Pittsburgh Jewish community. It lacks much of a wider appeal.

The problem may simply be that committees do not write particularly interesting books as a rule. While reading this book, one comes to crave the informed hand of a historian to organize and marshall the materials into a cohesive and dramatic story. Putting it another way, one almost wishes the committee had indeed heeded the respondent's exclamation that, by himself, he was a book and had somehow concentrated on him.

To sum up: a magnificent attempt, but not a book likely to make much of a permanent dent. The book states that "Other ethnic groups may wish to do the same for their people." One shares this hope but further hopes that other ethnic groups will learn from the mistakes of this book.

*Douglass College
Rutgers University*

MICHAEL A. ROCKLAND

The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume 15, 1903-1905. Edited by Arthur S. Link *et al.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973. Pp. 608. \$20.00.)

The pace of publication of the Wilson papers continues with steady tread. In this volume Wilson is serving his first years in the presidency of Princeton. So there will be much of academic doings here. But in his day such a position was also a forum of national leadership for non-academic matters as well. There are also the familiar personal notes as his wife journeys to Italy for an eventful expedition that takes in Rome, Assisi, and Florence. And in these pages dealing with committee reports and the appointments and resignations of scholars we can, I suggest, glimpse adumbrations of a future president of the United States. There may not exist an exact correlation between his behavior as the chief executive of Princeton University and that of the nation as a whole, but there is a relationship nonetheless in Wilson's style of leadership in both posts.

We see Wilson offering an appointment to President James Garfield's son without so much as consulting a faculty search committee. This was a marked departure from the usual procedure under Wilson's predecessors—indeed, so marked that the editors report it “represented a turning point in the history of Princeton University.” Wilson's solicitousness could also prove detrimental. A case in point was that of Arnold Guyot Cameron, a professor of French. The editors use some of Cameron's writings they consider “suggestive of the highly eccentric personality of their author.” But for whatever reason it soon becomes evident that Wilson meant to remove Cameron—and this despite the opposition he might have to face in achieving that end. One correspondent warns that Cameron's dismissal would cause “a manifestation that will surprise you, and that will do harm.” Another writer wished that “Dr. Wilson can be made to realize that there are breakers ahead.” Wilson's critics were muttering “some pretty hard talk about ‘high handed’, ‘obstinate’, ‘whole show’ ” against him. Wilson succeeded in ousting Cameron—confident of “a sort of vague residuary power” which made Princeton's head “a sort of court of the last resort in all matters.”

There was also the question of curriculum change. A movement had developed to turn away from a free-wheeling elective system and adhere to a more structured program for the undergraduates. A lingering loyalty to classicism in the Bachelor of Arts degree made for the retention of Greek as the required language. Once the “reform” of the curriculum had been adopted—described as “the first thoroughgoing reorganization of the curriculum of Princeton University in its history,” Princeton had the distinction of being “one of the first major institutions not only to call in question the free elective system but also to formulate a new course of studies to remedy its abuses.” The editors ascribe Wilson's initial reluctance to openly participate in the original formulation of these changes to an unwillingness to be identified with a “cabal” which was planning to take the governance of the university out of the hands of former President Patton. It was only when Wilson himself assumed the presidency that the modifications were finally

promulgated that identified Princeton "as a kind of symbolic leader" against the elective system.

If the school evinced a cautious conservatism in its educational policies, there was evidence present to indicate Princeton's long-known Southern connection. One correspondent suggested that Princeton students wait on tables to earn their way through college. Wilson's response reveals more than a casual rejection of what grew into a fairly widespread custom among American undergraduates. Admitting that "such practices are often rendered by the men in New England Colleges," Wilson retorted that the question took on an entirely different aspect "where menial service of that kind is ordinarily rendered by negroes." To make explicit the assumptions underlying that statement, one has only to read Wilson's answer to a certain J. R. Williams who inquired about the possibility of a black student entering Princeton. Conceding "there is nothing in the law of the University to prevent a negro's entering," Wilson answered his correspondent that "the whole temper and tradition of the place are such that no negro has ever applied for admission, and it seems extremely unlikely that the question will ever assume a practical form." The editors immediately take note that black students studied in the graduate and theological schools, but there was no record of one earning an undergraduate degree until the class of 1948.

There were other similar unpleasant attributes of genteel America. Anti-semitism had been on the rise since the closing decades of the nineteenth century. And with the growing interest in the imposition of religious quotas, it was going to seriously affect American academic life. One of Wilson's own classmates, Jacob R. Wright, a Wilkes-Barre businessman and Democratic political leader, wrote Wilson in reference to the son of one of his business associates. The prospective Princetonian was a member of the Jewish faith and possessed a strong affinity for music. Wright wrote Wilson, imploring him to see to it that the youngster's religious antecedents would not bar him from participating in the university orchestra. "If he should merit a place, and chance favors his winning on his merits," Wright wrote, "I do not want him to be 'thrown over' in this or any other question because of his religious belief." Wright admonished his quondam fellow Princetonian that "both you and I know that it is the fashion to look at the Jew unsympathetically, simply because he is a Jew." Yet there was a goal Wright thought Princeton ought to represent—a rather noble one indeed: "That you should not allow this boy, or any other boy, in fact, to be discriminated against because of his race, color, belief, or otherwise." The editors note that the student Wright mentioned, John Coons, did graduate from the university. They do not state if he ever did become a member of the orchestra.

Wright closed his letter with a political allusion. After wishing Wilson the best in parting, the writer could not but express his hopes for Wilson in the future when "I shall have the pleasure of voting for you as the Democratic nominee on the national ticket, for President." This is the first overt reference by a correspondent to that possibility this reviewer has noticed. It was not, of course, to be the last. Immediately in this year of 1904 Wilson thought there was another Democrat available—one who had lectured that year at Princeton about his role in the Pullman strike and had tragically lost

his young daughter the previous winter. The man was Princeton's own president-in-residence, Grover Cleveland. In June of 1904 Wilson wrote Governor Franklin Murphy of New Jersey to "heartily re-echo your sentence about Mr. Cleveland" and wishing "with all my heart that it might fall out in that way." But there was no draft to blow in a Cleveland candidacy. Instead there was the spectacle of another Democratic electoral debacle that caused Wilson to speak out as a Democrat and as a Southerner.

The occasion was a dinner given in New York City by the Society of Virginians. The tenor of Wilson's remarks can be gathered from the manner in which they were later headlined in the newspaper: "BACKING THE MEN WHOSE CONSERVATISM ALONE BALKS THE PARTY WRECKERS." Wilson sounded like the old guard coming back and with a vengeance. He began his speech apologetically. What concern was it to a university president that the Democrats were in such disarray? Eliding quickly over that problem, Wilson thought he had found a new and outstanding service the South could perform for his fellow Democrats. He demanded that "as the only remaining part of the Democratic party that can command a majority of the votes in its constituencies," the South should work "a rehabilitation of the Democratic party on the only lines that can restore it to dignity and power."

Here Wilson specifically repudiated Bryanism and all its pomp and works. "Since 1896," Wilson's reported comments continued, "the Democratic party has permitted its name to be used by men who ought never to have been admitted to its counsels, men who held principles and professed purposes which it has always hitherto repudiated." Wilson castigated these "populists and radical theorists, contemptuous alike of principle and experience." It was to them he attributed Democratic defeats. And he pleaded with his Southern auditors in New York to remedy the situation by summarily dismissing Democrats of Bryanesque predilections. One's reaction to Wilson's very strong language on this occasion is only offset by our hindsight knowledge of Bryan's dramatic endorsement of the future New Jersey governor at the 1912 Democratic Convention in Baltimore.

Wilson's message to his fellow Democrats to return to the traditional ways of the party's fathers and to shake off the malady of the Bryan incubus did not go unheeded. To Wilson's summons for a party of "conservative reform" which would be able to garner votes which petulant radicalism lost, the New York *World* answered that "if the country wants no party of discontent, of course it must be contented with existing conditions." The votes Wilson sought to gain for the party were the ones the *World* thought it could do without: "Votes . . . between Trinity Church and the New York Sub-Treasury." This editorial comment was enclosed in a letter George Foster Peabody wrote the Princeton president in reaction to his speech. Peabody is an interesting figure in his own right. New York banker and philanthropist, he had served as the treasurer of the Democratic National Committee in 1904. Because of his experience in the New York financial community, Peabody wrote Wilson of his "very complete sympathy" with the editorial. Based on his "fairly close observation as a banker in Wall Street for more than twenty years," Peabody concluded that "Mr. Bryan and other

radicals are right in their contention as to the tremendously serious tendency of present conditions." Peabody proposed another role for the Democracy rather than the one Wilson had set before it. His argument was that the Democrats should become "a really democratic party . . . seeking only for the true welfare of the great masses of the people whose prosperity is seriously limited by the unquestioned control exercised by corporate aggregations of capital in all branches of Government." Strong words indeed! And stronger irony as well when a New York banker must lecture a Princeton don on the necessary democratization of our political system.

This was Wilson's first public foray into the counsels of the Democratic party this reviewer has encountered in the many volumes of the papers he has already pored over. This volume contains much of private forays as well. There are lengthy accounts by Wilson's wife of her stay in Italy—complicated by the serious illness that overtakes one of the daughters accompanying her. Attending a "great papal function," she was close enough to study the face of Pius X, "a very beautiful and noble one," which she contrasted to those of others in the Papal entourage. Her most moving religious experience was in a small chapel of Assisi which St. Francis had used—not the grand basilica that adorned his memory. And she could not help but write her spouse that in her travels she found "this certainly the woman's century." Wherever she went she found "women traveling alone—women of *all* nationalities . . . all, all equally emancipated." Her poignant account of her daughter's fight for recovery marked her as one of these and as a woman of equal heroism.

University of Connecticut

VINCENT A. CARRAFIELLO

from Temple

The Peoples of Philadelphia

A History of Ethnic Groups and Lower-Class Life, 1790-1940

Edited by Allen F. Davis and Mark H. Haller

Fourteen outstanding young scholars have contributed to this first major attempt to reconstruct the life of Philadelphia's blue-collar groups historically and to examine their place in the social and economic development of the city. \$9.95 cloth; \$3.25 paper

The Challenge of Urban Reform

Policies and Programs in Philadelphia

Kirk R. Petshek

Foreword by Martin Meyerson

Prof. Petshek brings an insider's understanding to the surprising reform government of Philadelphia under Mayors Clark and Dilworth. He describes the reform's history and policy-making methods, providing case studies of specific developmental programs. \$10.00

The Irish in Philadelphia

Ten Generations of Urban Experience

Dennis Clark

Foreword by William V. Shannon

Tapping new local sources, Dennis Clark shows how Philadelphia's special opportunities made the Irish experience there different from that of Irish immigrants in other major cities. "A valuable contribution."—Oscar Handlin \$10.00

Skid Row and Its Alternatives

Research and Recommendations from Philadelphia

Leonard Blumberg, Thomas E. Shipley, Jr., and Irving W. Shandler

Foreword by Maxwell N. Weisman

At a time when urban redevelopment is gaining top priority, this book candidly appraises years of work done at Philadelphia's Diagnostic and Rehabilitation Center, evaluating the Center's methods and success, and considering the opinions of its clients. \$10.00

Temple University Press
Philadelphia, Pa. 19122

