
From the time that he was preparing his doctoral dissertation in history, Bell’s interests centered on Philadelphia, particularly in the 18th century and especially in its cultural and social aspects. During his studies he became interested in the physicians of the period and his subsequent work in medical history shows how an apparently narrow focus can brilliantly illuminate a vast area. Philadelphia we can regard as a microcosm, and the currents and cross-currents that involved Philadelphia also involved the rest of the country and much of the rest of the world.

While Bell did not neglect the outstanding physicians, he performed a particular service by studying the lesser men, the practitioners of the second and even the third rank who, nevertheless, revealed the cultural levels, the social problems, and the intellectual struggles of the era. In unskilled hands biographical studies could degenerate into anecdotal narration, but a skillful historian like Bell gives us a cross-section of the problems and achievements of the period.

The various essays here reprinted cover a wide range of subjects, written over a span of thirty years. We might note a few of the physicians discussed. Thomas Park (1749-1835), a practitioner for over sixty years, was a fixture in Philadelphia. Bell describes his background, his education in Edinburgh and London, his long service to the Pennsylvania Hospital, his various professional activities. And in the course of this we get a fine insight into the fabric of medical practice. James Hutchinson (1752-1793), also studied in London, and mingled political activity in Philadelphia along with his medical practice. He died in the great epidemic of yellow fever. Better known was John Redman (1722-1806), one of the best educated colonial physicians, who brought back to the colonies the lessons learned in Edinburgh, London, Leiden, and Paris, and became one of the leading physicians in Philadelphia. An outstanding essay discusses the Philadelphians who studied medicine in Europe in the second half of the 18th century, a survey that involves some of the most famous names in early American history, such as Morgan or Shippen, together with many others less well known. Of special interest is Bell’s seminal study on Benjamin Franklin and the practice of medicine, an essay that casts much new light on the activities of this foremost Philadelphian.

Some of the studies involve the 19th century, such as that of James Smith (1771-1841), who played such an important part in the adoption of vaccination for smallpox. Bell’s historiographic interest has also led to important
contributions on various medical historians of the 19th century, such as Thacher, Gross, and Toner. But the major interest rests with the 18th century and its physicians.

Several other essays and shorter notes continue in the vein already mentioned. Bell writes with grace and facility, enlivened by a dry wit. The book is a pleasure to read, and brings together a broad collection of historical contributions otherwise somewhat difficult of access. The volume represents an ideal way to help celebrate the bicentennial of this country’s independence. It will have wide appeal in quite diverse areas of history, with perhaps special significance in social and medical history.

Chicago

Lester S. King, M.D.


Thomas Elliot Morton, in this important work, successfully unravels the complicated history of the fur trade in New York. The various and changing roles of the Iroquois Confederacy, the Dutch traders in Albany, the French in Montreal, and the merchants in New York City are presented clearly and evaluated expertly.

The Iroquois Confederacy’s ability to achieve and maintain peace with both Indian and European neighbors as well as to continue to act as the most important supplier of furs to Europeans, and of European goods to Indians, during the eighteenth century enhances the already well-established admiration for the diplomatic skills of the Iroquois. The prowess of the Albany Dutch as traders, dependent on continuous peace with the French, remains unchallenged. Thus, the Dutch merchants agreed with the diplomacy of the Iroquois Confederacy. They did not favor English aggressiveness toward the French before the mid-1750’s, and thereby wrongfully gained the reputation as disloyal subjects from the pens of Cadwallader Colden and other English expansionists. In Canada the French wished to retain a strong hold on the Indian trade but realistically tolerated the illegal trade between Montreal and Albany. On occasion, of course, the French harassed illegal traders even to the point of constructing forts along the Lake Champlain route and in the west at Niagara. In turn the illegal traders challenged these obstacles with some success. Meanwhile the merchants in New York City took advantage of the money to be made in the trade, shipping furs to England, supplying Albany and less directly Montreal with European goods for the Indians.

Mr. Norton skillfully uses the standard published sources, enterprisingly employs the manuscript collections of merchants’ papers, and sets aside anti-Indian, anti-Dutch, anti-French prejudices that in the past have colored much of our understanding of the New York frontier. There are no heroes around whom the story of the fur trade revolves. This includes Sir William Johnson, a man of many talents, who entered the story as early as 1738.
Quite aside from the author's main concerns, the economic and political history of the fur trade in New York, Mr. Norton's study illustrates how the complex relationships between the Iroquois Confederacy and the Europeans protected the Confederacy in their possessions and blocked New Yorkers from sweeping north and west to settle until after the War for Independence. In the other English colonies the sweep west and southwest during the eighteenth century, while gradual, was relentless, as was the sweep eastward into Maine. In the broadest sense The Fur Trade in Colonial New York 1686-1776 helps to clarify the history of the eighteenth century frontier.

The University of Wisconsin at Stevens Point

Russell S. Nelson, Jr.


By altering a bit Lincoln's judgement on a book readers will find that the description fits this work: "People who like this sort of book on Franklin will find this the sort of thing they like." This is not in any way to denigrate what Buxbaum has achieved, but it does emphasize that this work has a limited though definite appeal. What has been done has been well done and should not have to be done again. It will stir some controversy, but the controversies will justify articles, not another book.

The author has attempted two distinct but closely related goals. He has analyzed the Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin as both a personal and a national propaganda piece, and has traced chronologically Franklin's involvement with the American Calvinist Establishments, especially those of Boston and Philadelphia, though Franklin's reach went beyond those cities. The author suggests the reader may move quickly through the first chapter, "Franklin's Autobiography: A Persona for the Abused" and concentrate on the second goal covered in chapters two through six. However, another look at the Autobiography by the reader will be prompted by chapter one.

The book is soundly researched and crisply written. While lacking an annotated bibliography, the listing of abbreviations of works used in the footnotes together with the forty pages of detailed notes support the preceding assertion. (Not so incidental is the fact that the author, a member of the English Department at Baruch College, is currently preparing an annotated bibliography of all writings on Benjamin Franklin.) The index is complete.

The last five chapters trace Franklin's encounters with the Calvinists. Whether supporting the Reverend Samuel Hemphill, responding to the Great Awakening, promoting and then subverting the Academy, or exploiting the Paxton massacre, Franklin was in constant battle against the Presbyterian threats of domination in the colonies. There is much contrast between the Franklin of the Autobiography and the Franklin propagandizing both publicly and anonymously against those religious leaders he felt posed
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dangers to the life of freedom in the colonies. Franklin is shown as being most skillful, if at times vicious, in his fight against the Presbyterians. Franklin, it is noted, was capable of the same kind of intolerance of which he charged his enemies. Yet there emerges from the book a Franklin who is, as the author states, "a great and good man."

In the Notes the author takes direct issue at some points with James H. Hutson’s Pennsylvania Politics, 1746-1770. While agreeing at times with Hutson’s interpretations, Buxbaum differs on such points as to when the Presbyterian Party emerged as a distinct group in Pennsylvania politics, as to the importance of the tax dispute during the attempts to make the province a Crown colony, and as to the “Lumping together all Quakers under the rubric of the ‘Quaker Party.’” The latter, Buxbaum believes, has caused Hutson to distort the facts and to ignore “the tightrope the Friends had to walk to avoid alienating their political allies and wrecking themselves as a religious entity.” (Notes, p. 254)

Such notations support the impression of the thoroughness of the book. While the work does demand initially and constantly an interest in the subject matter, the detail and the writing make for pleasurable reading. The clear type and the format of the book from this University Press are credits to its Editorial Director.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

CLYDE C. GELBACH


This work consists of a reprinting of The Jefferson Papers of the University of Virginia, first published in 1950, and an addendum describing the university’s acquisitions since that date. The number of items in the latter section are a little more than one-third the number in the original, although the editors report that in numbers of manuscripts the collection has nearly doubled in a generation—a remarkable achievement in itself. A single index has been prepared for both sections in this edition.

Entirely apart from its obvious value as a finding aid to the university’s holdings, this work will be of broader importance to Jefferson scholars for years to come. Because of the deliberate pace at which publication of The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, edited by Julian P. Boyd (Princeton, N.J., 1950- ), understandably must progress, that monumental project has only reached 1792. Most of the University of Virginia’s collection is after that date. These calendars consequently are the most up-to-date guide to many papers of Jefferson’s federal career. Enhancing this feature of the work, along with the usual bibliographic information on each item, are references to readily accessible printed versions whenever applicable. For the short period in which the addendum in this edition and The Jefferson Papers overlap, the number of items that do not appear in the Papers indicates that there will
always be a need to trace some Jeffersoniana through this guide. Although the material that Boyd omitted is relatively inconsequential for Jefferson's overall career, it undoubtedly will be significant for the research of specialists.

In this connection, too, it should be noted that publication of these calendars is part of a larger project of the university's library. This is the Jefferson Checklist, which the late John Cook Wyllie and his associates began and which the library continued in collaboration with Julian Boyd and his fellow editors. Now the checklist records in the form of a card-file, contain the location of 60,000 Jefferson items. The plan is eventually to publish the checklist with the cooperation of the Library of Congress.

In the preparation of these calendars, the guiding principle was the convenience of the scholar. In addition to the manuscripts owned by the university, the calendars also include items located elsewhere that complement the university's holdings. With Jefferson's manuscript table of mileages from Staunton to Warm Springs, Virginia [No. 2344], for example, there is noted the university's microfilm of his table of mileages from Warm Springs to Charlottesville, the original of which is at the James Monroe Museum and Memorial Library in Fredericksburg [No. 2345]. A group of items from Jefferson's gubernatorial career, which are now in the Virginia State Library in Richmond, are listed. Perhaps the most useful to scholars are references to microcopies in the university library of materials still in private hands or in depositories that are less conveniently accessible to researchers. These include Jefferson family wills and land titles in county court records and the recently acquired copies of Jefferson's correspondence with Thaddeus Kosciuszko, which is in the National Museum, Cracow, Poland.

As a reference volume, this book is well designed. It is sturdily bound for long use, and the entries are easily read. Abbreviations and technical phrases are clearly explained in the front matter. Every library supporting research in early American history should acquire it.

The College of William and Mary

John E. Selby


This is a collection of seven essays, all previously published. "The Origins and Nature of American Nationalism" dates from 1953; the others appeared between 1965 and 1972. The best arguments for gathering them into a single volume are that all essays contribute to an understanding of the intellectual and inspirational history of the American Revolution, and that all help answer the important question, how much of our revolution belonged to Western Civilization in general, and how much depended on the unique character of America?

The essays generally fit together nicely, but there are a few weaknesses that greater care might have avoided. There are no notes, no index, no suggestions for further reading, as if the book had been rushed out to take advantage of the Bicentennial. Evidently the essays themselves were not re-edited. Certain attitudes and anecdotes—even phrases—turn up a second
BOOK REVIEWS

and third time. The effect is not to develop, but merely to repeat, as in Commager's noting in several different essays that the Danish liberal Struensee fell from power and suffered a hideous execution. The point he makes of this—again several times—is that the children of the Enlightenment really grasped and held power in the United States for fifty years; in Europe they scarcely held power at all.

According to a recent directory of historians Henry Steele Commager holds twenty-four honorary degrees, and according to hearsay he remains the most effective historian for addressing and uplifting lay audiences. These essays are full of the clarity, excitement, and high-mindedness that have earned their author perhaps the widest audience of any living historian. An essay on Jefferson, "The Declaration of Independence," illustrates his literary art: . . . Happiness meant milk for the children, and meat on the table, a well-built house and a well-filled barn, freedom from the tyranny of the state, the superstition of the church, the authority of the military, and the malaise of ignorance. Jefferson, who knew and indulged himself in the Old World forms of happiness, was entirely willing to abandon them—and indeed to banish them from his own country—in favor of the more simple, the more innocent, and the more just happiness which he thought available in his own country. (p. 89)

The next essay, "The Pursuit of Happiness," takes up this theme again: . . . Was there ever a generation so obsessed with happiness? Everyone talked about it, everyone wrote about it, everyone sought it. Open where you will the theological tracts, the philosophical treatises, the histories, the poems and plays and novels of the time, the story is the same. Like the song of a whippoorwill comes the refrain, felicity, felicity, felicity. (p. 94)

Felicity indeed! It abounds in Commager's prose, making this a most pleasing introduction to the American Enlightenment.

Unfortunately Commager allows his fondness for the men and values of the Enlightenment to check his critical faculty. He discovers that most of his heroes did not actually study history for its meaning, but used it to prove what they knew already to be true. He also notes their static conception of nature, and their inability to cope with the problem of slavery. But he never follows these lines of criticism very far, returning rather to praising their positive and enduring virtues. In fact Commager personifies the Enlightenment as a living compound of moral virtue and intellectual honesty, giving a sadly false picture of how virtue and intelligence were distributed in the 18th century. The essays are sprinkled with horror stories of the reaction. One would never know from reading this book that there had been the Terror in revolutionary France, or that Jeffersonians in America silenced offending journalists both by due process of law and by mob action. Praise of Jefferson here, as is often the case, passes into idolatry. Jefferson was "the greatest educational statesman of his day" and his University of Virginia "was, at its birth, not only 'the most eminent in the United States' as Jefferson said, but the most enlightened and the most liberal, the most nearly like some of the great universities of the Old World." (p. 70) And Jefferson's Monticello was "on the very edge of the most romantic wilderness in America." (p. 135)
In an introduction written especially for this volume, Commager notes the alarming decline in recent American leadership. He asks, “How did we get from Independence Hall to Watergate, from Washington to Nixon ... from The Federalist Papers to the White House Transcripts?” Though a man of the Enlightenment, a Jeffersonian, and by necessity therefore a thorough environmentalist, he utterly overlooks an obvious, if unsettling answer. Our modern leaders are all products of an educational system which lionizes Thomas Jefferson, Democracy, and the Enlightenment. The Founding Fathers all grew up in a world of royalty, nobility, established churches, and veneration for antiquity. The classes, institutions, and values Jefferson labored to destroy evidently had some good as well as bad in them. Certainly our 18th century ancestors somehow had the wit to elevate and follow the great men who sprang up among them.

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign  

Robert McColley


Eight years ago Professor Robert Wiebe wrote a brilliant little book, The Search For Order, in which he argued that America in the 1870s was a nation of semi-autonomous island communities. Each of these island communities maintained its own set of values and institutions capable of ordering the normal daily affairs of its members. They also established intricate defenses based on class, religion, accent, or skin coloring to protect themselves from external threats to the stability of the community. In the absence of a nationally accepted value system, the homogeneity of this loosely connected network of island communities provided a unifying force to American society. When the sovereignty of the community collapsed in the face of urbanization and industrialization, and the economic maladies of the 1880s, Americans were forced to search for new threads to social stability.

In The Segmented Society, Wiebe broadens and expands upon the theme of America as an insular society. Rejecting the popular notions that one may characterize the American experience as unique, progressive, or unified, Wiebe contends that America since 1790 has been a nation divided into a variety of loosely connected segments. This segmentation, Wiebe argues, has provided the major cohesive element in American society.

Following the Revolutionary War, the family, the community, the church, and a small but influential elite set the rules, taught values, established routines and held the truths within each rural and urban enclave. Each unit defended its order from external threats and the relative permanence of its members reinforced its control. Family units bound by common values and assumptions, most often spent a lifetime within a single village. Residents of the community knew and accepted an unchanging panorama of family names, faces, institutional rules and patterns, and interpersonal relationships. The elite of the community, according to Wiebe, maintained contact with the outer world, interpreted events and negotiated with district authorities.
The compartmentalization of 18th century society provided a rigid stability within the unit and an elasticity without. Family and community members were expected to conform to the accepted norm and the church gave religious sanction to the community mores. Failure to conform, however, seldom produced violent confrontations. Recalcitrant individuals, religious groups, and political dissenters, Wiebe argues, could simply move on, often creating their own compartment wherever they settled. An abundance of open land made migration a most attractive alternative to confrontation.

By the 1830s, however, a social system designed to produce stability could not absorb the rapid changes which accompanied the onset of industrialization. The harmonious units of the 18th century became competing forces moving along parallel lines seeking economic security. Individuals and communities followed what Wiebe calls the 19th century commandment of "grow or die." Growth, however, depended upon an expansion of one's loyalties beyond the family. The rapid geographic mobility of the age destroyed the sense of permanence created by the 18th century society. Mobile workers, however, could and did carry with them a sense of community which they attempted to duplicate as they sought a place to settle. The semi-autonomous community became a source of strength in an age of mobility and change.

By the early twentieth century one's function in a producing, consuming society replaced one's identification with a particular geographic unit. A national network of occupational specialists and professionals created new segments in American society founded upon what one did rather than where one did it. Group differences were heightened and accentuated by unique experiences and training. Elite specialists identified themselves with others within their profession rather than with their family or community. Those denied elite status, according to Wiebe, "turned to personal networks and attachments as a defense against the national system's demeaning evaluation of their lives." Economic and social divisions of the twentieth century replaced the community segmentation of the nineteenth.

The various segments separating the nation in the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries were not, Wiebe argues, divisive forces. A number of pervasive fundamental conditions of American life bound each segment to the other. Wiebe suggests that factors such as plentiful land, military security, and an abundance of wealth formed the bases for American society in each century. The abundance of land permitted each segment the liberty of adopting a fixed set of values.Compromise was unnecessary. The nation's freedom from military threat and the ravages of war permitted Americans the luxury of disunity and internal bickering. Accommodation, according to Wiebe, was not only unnecessary but unnatural. The sovereignty of communities permitted differences to exist along parallel lines. America's economic abundance, derived from a variety of sources, permitted most segments larger pieces of an evergrowing pie. Groups were not competing for parts of a fixed whole, thus softening the struggle between such groups.

Wiebe's emphasis upon elite groups as developers and caretakers of the value systems within each segment suggests a wide diversity from compartment to compartment. The author fails, however, to provide
convincing evidence that one segment differed substantially from another. One wonders, for example, how the value system in colonial Boston differed from that of Philadelphia, or Pittsburgh for that matter. Or whether the rules and values of late nineteenth century physicians, businessmen, or even craftsmen differ greatly in substance from one another. If each segment was essentially similar, it mattered little to American society which segment one joined. Outsiders particularly were doomed to a life of wandering from segment to segment. Thus, it may be the similarity between each element and the commonality of value systems which provided unity to American society, and not, as Wiebe argues, the fundamental conditions of American life. If each island community was a mirror image of another, compromise and accommodation were required of all. Dissenters and outsiders may have used emigration as a means of escape. But most settled down again on another island similar to the one they left.

The latter part of Wiebe's work discusses the impact of segmentation in American society upon such fundamental principles as liberty, equality, segregation, nationalism, and on national and international politics. In this portion of his essay he provides us with a new explanation of the traditional patterns of American society. He argues persuasively that the American tradition of segmentation produced a distinct set of beliefs and actions. Liberty and equality, for example, always referred to the freedoms and rights of the various segments. Colonial Americans wished to be left alone within their segments, free from the interference of aliens. During the 19th century each compartment expected the freedom to pursue its economic interests along parallel lines with similar segments. Within each segment American egalitarianism became the synonymous with homogeneity. Americans, Wiebe contends, protecting the autonomy of their segment, would only treat others equally to the degree that they were similar. Thus outsiders were forced to assimilate rapidly. Those who could not, or would not, were looked upon with fear and suspicion. Dissenters were most frequently evicted from the segment. Those who could not assimilate, because of color or other readily identifiable characteristics, were considered inferior as well as untrustworthy and were segregated.

Wiebe's analysis of America's fear of foreign influence whether religious, ethnic, or ideological and its emphasis on consumption suggests that these two forces brought unity to a segmented society. It also suggests that as we approach an age when America's capacity to consume will be severely limited by the availability of resources, we can no longer satisfy excluded groups by the promise of unlimited goods if only they will become like us. The late 1960s as Wiebe quite properly points out shattered the American illusion of accommodation and cohesion. Residents shaken by violence in the ghettos, street crime, student demonstrations, black militancy, and women's liberation retreated to fortress America. The American capacity for surviving crises by avoiding direct confrontation proved valuable once again. What held America together in the 1960s as in previous centuries was in Wiebe's words, "Their ability to live apart. Society depended upon segmentation."

Carnegie-Mellon University

Michael P. Weber

As Chief Justice of the United States, Salmon P. Chase, William Howard Taft, and Harlan Fiske Stone left extensive private and public papers; these papers have enabled constitutional historians and lawyers to unravel many of the mysteries of case decisions and intra-court operations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. John Marshall—often considered our "greatest Chief Justice"—left no such legacy. Erudite in constitutional interpretation and opinion writing, the fourth Chief Justice was, to the surprise of many, careless in preserving documents. Moreover, he broke with the tradition of his day, retaining neither drafts nor letterbook copies of his correspondence, private and professional. The Marshall papers, then, have come to scholars in bits and pieces, often through the collections of public figures to whom Marshall had written.

Plans to publish the papers of John Marshall have existed since 1906 when Waldo G. Leland and William E. Dodd announced their intentions in the American Historical Review. Although this effort came to naught, Albert J. Beveridge was able to use many of the assembled documents in his definitive The Life of John Marshall (1916, 1919). Interest in the extant Marshall papers and documents has continued throughout the twentieth century, although, as Herbert A. Johnson writes, "it took the 1955 bicentennial celebration of the chief justice's birth to revive serious discussion about publishing his papers." (p. ix) The work has taken place at the Institute of Early American History and Culture under several editors, and in conjunction with the College of William and Mary, Marshall's alma mater.

In 1969, working on his own with some financial assistance from the American Bar Association and the reluctance of the National Historical Records Commission, Irwin S. Rhodes published The Papers of John Marshall: A Descriptive Calendar. In two volumes Rhodes brought together in chronological order a compilation of existing Marshall documents, correspondence, account books, legal briefs, and opinions. This descriptive calendar is ably annotated and, in Johnson's words, "will continue to be the most complete directory to the manuscript and printed materials that relate to Marshall's life" until all volumes of The Papers of John Marshall are published. (p. xx)

Volume I is a potpourri of materials dating through June 1788. The Introduction explains the selection and organization of the papers in detail. One is impressed by the painstaking efforts to locate and include hitherto unknown or unpublished Marshall materials. For example, more than three-fourths of Volume I have never been printed previously. One regrets the absence of a general, introductory essay on Marshall and his activities during the thirty-three years covered by this volume. Johnson, a most respected Marshall scholar, might profitably have included parts of his essay "John Marshall" from The Justices of the United States Supreme Court, 1789-1969 [Edited by Leon Friedman and Fred L. Israel. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1969]. Or he might have written a short essay
on Marshall's early military, political, and legal career. The excellent editorial notes and abundant footnotes throughout mitigate this deficiency somewhat.

Of interest to legal historians are Marshall's law notes, one quarter of which are printed in Volume I, prepared by commonplacing Matthew Bacon's *A New Abridgement of the Law*, a 1769 compilation of Virginia statutes in force, and parts of Sir William Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*. Earlier scholars (Edward S. Corwin, for example) assumed that Marshall's notes were taken from the lectures of George Wythe, his professor of law at William and Mary. Volume I also contains Marshall's appellate argument in *Hite v. Fairfax*, pending before the General Court of Virginia, the first written record of his long-standing professional concern with the proprietary interests of the Northern Neck of Virginia.

In September 1783, Marshall, the young Richmond attorney, began keeping a record of his personal accounts. This Account Book comprises about one-fourth of Volume I. As the editors indicate, most of the expenditures contained in it are commonplace. The entries under disbursements do, however, provide an interesting portrait of Marshall's legal, social, and domestic activities during the 1780's. One is somewhat reluctant to accept the editors' statement that it is "the most significant single document in his papers" (p. 292); yet without all ten projected volumes before us, it is difficult to offer a reasoned refutation. It is disappointing—especially for those interested in his years as Chief Justice—to learn that Marshall discontinued the practice of keeping an account book after 1795.

Allegheny College

ROBERT G. SEDDIG


Through articles in *McClures, Century*, and *Outlook*, and such books as *How the Other Half Lives*, and *Children of the Tenements* Jacob Riis escorted satin frocked businessmen and bodiced housewives into the human and physical squalor of New York's tenements. So vividly did Riis etch scenes of "robber's roosts" and "stale beer dives" that he seared the slum into the nation's consciousness. Not surprisingly, James B. Lane, in his *Jacob A. Riis and the American City* portrays Riis as a "premier publicist," a "crusader for a moral and political awakening to the virulent consequences of urbanization."

Lane looks at Riis' life from a childhood in Ribe, Denmark, through miserable first years in America, a long career as a New York City reporter and finally to a retirement and death in Barre, Massachusetts. Lane focuses especially on Riis' odyssey as a reporter and social critic. Like Roy Lubove, Lane contends that Riis' memory of a blissful childhood in Denmark shaped his attitude toward the city; that out of a psychological foundation laid in rural Ribe, came a moral and humane perspective on the slum, which distinguished Riis' contribution to "progressive" social reform. While social reformers like the tenement reformer Lawrence Veiller
increasingly applied modern tenets of scientific efficiency to urban problems, Riis steadfastly clung to his social and humanitarian idealism. Although Riis understood the importance of public health and echoed maxims of scientific charity, he framed the slum problem in human—not objective terms: the tenement environment was insidious and life-wasting and exposed vulnerable people to the contagion of criminality, immorality, and radicalism.

The depression of the 1890s, and the flood of “new” immigrants, convinced Riis that the slum blight demanded public intervention. An aroused people, he argued, must interdict the politician, demolish the slums, and reconstruct the city neighborhood around the park and the public school.

Using Riis’ articles and especially his autobiography Lane relates one episode in Riis’ life after another, missing few details in Riis’ career as a reporter and publicist. However, the detail eclipses the analysis, and Lane often simply accepts Riis’ opinions uncritically. At one point Lane gratuitously observes that “there was substantial upward mobility . . . among rural Americans moving into the new middle class positions which industrialism had created.” The reader is left gaping for a word of elaboration.

More importantly, despite the promise of Lane’s title, there is little in the book about the virulent consequences of urbanization. Lane fails to fit Riis into the urban context as a reformer caught between the distended society of the 19th century and the complex metropolis of the twentieth. Riis’ constituency was not the bureaucratic-minded new middle-class of the Veiller, Morris L. Cooke, and Clinton Rogers Woodruff ilk. Rather it was the amorphous population of the old middle class who harbored similar memories of a less frenetic pre-industrial society. Riis’ ambivalence about the city reflected the anxieties of many Americans about the extent of the social pathology spawned by the new mega-city. But Lane pursues none of these themes. He instead ascribes to Riis a humane as opposed to an empirical-scientific understanding of the urban condition, and then overlooks the significance of the emerging technocratic view of the city. Finally, except for the observation that “How the Other Half Lives did much to sustain the Progressive Movement,” Lane finds it difficult to deal with the thorny concept of “progressivism.”

Lane’s book is basically a useful, if somewhat uncritical compendium of Riis’ thoughts about the city with some effort to fit those thoughts into the framework of Riis’ rural psychology. As for insight into the evolution of a twentieth century posture toward the city, and more specifically into Riis’ effort to grapple with the baffling reality of urban modernization, the book falls far short of that mark.

California State College

JOHN F. BAUMAN
Frederick Law Olmsted combined the creativity of an artist, the optimism of a social reformer, the reverence for nature of a conservationist, and the quasi-religious commitment to uplifting the lives of common people of a democrat. His far-flung interests and extraordinary energies took him, at one time or another, into almost every area of public concern in nineteenth-century American life. Despite his incredible range of involvements, however, Olmsted left his permanent, deep mark on the American landscape in dozens of cities, suburbs, and universities. More than anyone else, he created the profession of landscape architecture and as the profession developed, he gave it a rigorous standard of integrity, imagination and independence.

Laura Wood Roper’s biography is a massive, meticulous, superb piece of work. The result of years of painstaking and wide-ranging research, it is the best and most thorough study of Olmsted we have. Relentlessly chronological and elegantly written, FLO follows, chapter by chapter and step by step, the complicated and fascinating development of a man with an almost compulsive desire to create and perpetuate natural beauty in a world increasingly drab and thoughtlessly destructive of its natural heritage. Olmsted’s career—and there was, as Roper shows, consistency behind his myriad activities—included farming on Staten Island, journalism in New York and across the South, a stint as director of the Sanitary Commission during the Civil War, mining in the West, a long, involved relationship with the Central Park that he codesigned, and gradual emergence as the preeminent national authority on urban and rural parks, suburban and university planning, and such special challenges as the preservation of Niagara Falls, the landscape challenges of the Capital building in Washington and its Mall ambience, and finally the creation of the site for the Chicago World’s Fair of 1893.

Beyond these activities, Olmsted wrote prodigiously for many newspapers and journals, and served on innumerable public commissions and boards. His reports for various clients in themselves constitute an unparalleled record of intelligent land use proposals, conservation, and residential and recreational planning. He was at once prophetic and visionary in his insistence that space be preserved in varied patterns for different uses while cities still had the opportunity to purchase land. Repeatedly when his advice was neglected later attempts proved much more costly and less satisfactory.

Roper’s approach is traditional and somewhat old fashioned: time and again she provides the reader with evidence and episodes that biographers with a more contemporary psychoanalytical bent would find irresistibly suggestive. Olmsted’s early wrestling with religion, romance, and a vocation, for example, contain much grist for a psychohistorian’s mill. Olmsted deeply loved his father and strongly identified with his brother. When upon his brother’s death he sheltered and then married his widow, Roper resists comment. Olmsted’s compulsion for work is recounted but not
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analyzed. He was, Roper assures us, a profoundly domestic man, but he was rarely home; his daughter went mad and Roper's account simply reads: "At the end of 1883, a few months after the birth of her third son, Charlotte became deranged." Indeed, the stresses of his youth and early manhood, more anguished and complicated than most, are similarly flattened. And once a mature man, the inner Olmsted appears only obliquely. His wife, apparently a tart and intelligent woman, we see hardly at all. Olmsted's achievements and general business dominate so completely that the man himself becomes eclipsed.

Nevertheless, FLO contains an abundance of data about the times in which Olmsted lived and the people with whom he moved—all of them, very nearly, interesting and significant figures in their own right. Roper's hand is sure and her mastery of the subjects she examines—such as the Byzantine affair of the capital in Albany—is firm. Many of the chapters contain stories which, like the Niagara Falls rescue, would easily sustain book-length studies in themselves. Clearly the problem of cloaking so varied a man as Olmsted with a biography is an exceedingly difficult task, and we can only be grateful that the author has worked with the symmetry and proportion that she has. No account of the life of the mind and the life of cities in nineteenth century America will be complete without references to Olmsted, and scholars for years will be grateful for Roper's masterful work.
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Daniel Burnham has been a controversial figure in the history of American architecture and city planning. Louis Sullivan first attacked his work, and Burnham's reputation never recovered. In this book, Thomas Hines intends to reassess the career of Daniel Burnham. He admits from the beginning that Burnham lacked the genius of a Louis Sullivan or a Frank Lloyd Wright, and yet he argues that Burnham had a greater effect upon American building techniques and city planning in his own time.

Born in 1846, Burnham's childhood and youth revealed nothing of the hard working entrepreneur of later years. Failing to gain admission to Harvard, he floated from one job to another and even journeyed West to Nevada where he ran for political office. He returned to Chicago at the age of twenty-four and entered an architectural firm, an occupation he had tried earlier without success. There he met John Root, and in 1873 the two men established a partnership. It was a perfect mixture of talents, for Root was the skilled designer and Burnham the organizational leader. Root and Burnham were important figures in the evolution of the skyscraper. According to the author, they built the first structure ever to be called a skyscraper, the Montauk Building in Chicago. Although Hines states that Burnham and Root cooperated and shared every project, he occasionally overstates Burnham's importance. When he finds fault with the Rialto Building in Chicago for its excessive ornamentation, he blames Root. On the other hand,
when he praises the Rookery in Chicago, he attributes its most important features to Burnham. Hines later admits that Root’s premature death in 1892 deprived Burnham of his “architectural gyroscope.” Without Root’s help, Burnham became more an entrepreneur and imitator and less a creative architect.

Burnham’s organizational ability was most evident during the planning of the White City at the World’s Columbian Exposition where he supervised the work of many architects, including Louis Sullivan. The White City established Burnham’s national reputation and marked the direction of his future career. In the design of buildings, he would lead the architectural profession in a retreat to classical forms. At the same time, the White City led to an interest in the reform of cities which formalized the concept of planning to cure urban ills.

Hines present extended discussions of five city plans: Washington, Cleveland, San Francisco, Manila and Chicago. In each, he stresses Burnham’s skill in planning for and with local citizens’ groups. But the author is less convincing when attempting to fit Burnham into the Progressive Era. Hines never defines what he means by a Progressive except to comment that Burnham planned cities for businessmen and the upper classes. He never clearly explains why Burnham neglected pressing social concerns, such as housing, which occupied the attention of many urban reformers during the Progressive period.

Hines does present a skillful discussion of planning concepts. Avoiding any lapses into the technical jargon which abounds in the field, he describes Burnham’s strengths in each plan. In Washington, Burnham had a proper notion of planning a capital’ city, of the need for open spaces and for grouping buildings of similar architectural style. At the same time, Hines notes the basic irony of a design for the American capital which depended upon Old World traditions. Despite Burnham’s slavish reliance on classical designs, he was adaptable. In both the San Francisco and Manila plans, he utilized local topography and historic traditions to mix architectural styles. Although unfinished in his lifetime, these plans and others affected the physical and artistic development of many American cities.

Hines also emphasizes the work of Burnham’s architectural firm which designed over 200 buildings from 1891 to 1912. The firm specialized in skyscrapers and smaller commercial buildings. Adapting the characteristic business organization of the day, Burnham institutionalized the business of architecture by employing many designers, by specializing their functions and by supervising several projects at the same time. He was an entrepreneur who built to the wishes of his clients. Because of his ability to get along with and design for his age, Burnham had a great impact upon style. His numerous trips to Europe fueled his fascination with classical models while his clients urged upon him the functional needs of business. Perhaps the Wanamaker Department Store in Philadelphia was the clearest example of Burnham’s functional approach to architecture. But there were exceptions. Hines points out that the Reliance Building in Chicago prefigured the construction of many twentieth century skyscrapers in its use of glass.

Hines describes Burnham’s personal life as the epitome of the successful Progressive. He directed his sons into respectable careers and provided
counsel and financial help to many relatives. Burnham, moreover, gave freely of his fortune to Harvard University and the Chicago Symphony. He devoted his time and energy to establishing the American Academy of Fine Arts in Rome and to drawing countless city plans. The blending of chapters on Burnham's professional and personal life results in a remarkable portrait of a remarkable man.

The author depended heavily on the large collection of Burnham Papers, but he balanced these sources with substantial work in the papers of Burnham's contemporaries. The selection of photographs to illustrate the text adds to the excellent writing and forceful argument. Thomas Hines has indeed revitalized Daniel Burnham's reputation and written an excellent book in the process.
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