BOOK REVIEWS


Dr. Jennings is fond of eye-catching titles; his book is not about an Iroquois "empire"—he calls the term "a mockery"—but an account of the Iroquois tribes' relations with their neighbors, primarily with the English colonies but with some attention to other colonies and neighboring Indian groups as well. "Covenant Chain" was a figure of speech, a bit of shorthand, denoting those alliances; the term itself, chain (sometimes silver chain) reflects European contacts but is distinctly Indian in character. Its precise meaning varied with changing circumstances but was perfectly understood by council spokesmen at any given time.

Numerous historians have dealt with colonial Indian relations; Jennings's purpose is to trace these as seen from the Iroquois, rather than the colonial, side. This is a far-from-easy task, since the documents are colonial rather than Indian, and since the various colonies pursued separate and sometimes discrepant policies. Within the Iroquois confederacy itself policies and practices also varied with time and circumstances. About 1701, Jennings tells us, "the Covenant Chain had become an empty form and the Iroquois stood almost alone" (p. 213). They recovered, however, to play an important role well beyond 1744.

Jennings thinks of the present volume as the second in a trilogy, with his 1975 The Invasion of America as a predecessor volume. His present study cannot stop at 1744—he goes beyond that date in some tangential matters—; he speaks of the need for a third volume and assures us that he is at work on that necessary supplement.

Since the present volume does not directly continue The Invasion of America, Part One of its three divisions is largely prefatory, devoted to diverse factors relevant to the study. It is therefore not light reading, but it includes such useful items as the importance of firearms in the Indian trade and the excellent advice to students to think of early European colonies in terms of population rather than as expanses of land on a map. The remainder of the present volume, except three appendixes and an index, is a narrative account of the Covenant Chain—the course of Iroquois diplomacy—to 1744; and the first appendix is a reprinted record of a 1743 council, illustrating such Indian formalities as the use of wampum belts and of figures of speech, including the "chain of friendship."

Some of the difficulty and labor in reconstructing an Indian-oriented account is reflected in Jennings's twenty-one-page bibliography, in itself a boon to scholars. (The Harrisburg entry, p. 408, can be updated: the items there listed are at the Historical and Museum Commission, in the divisions of Archives and Land Records.)

No historical research can be considered exhaustive and final. Nevertheless, to
describe Dr. Jennings' present volume as stimulating and helpful to other students must be taken as an understatement.

The book is well printed. Typos are few and mostly trifling. On page 369, however, the Covenant Chain has been transposed into China. The maps, mostly adapted from earlier publications, are not entirely satisfactory; some, for example, adapted from large-page publications (pp. 26 and 75) are reduced halfway to illegibility.

The attention given in the book to the so-called “Walking Purchase” of 1737 seems disproportionate; this notorious affair had only incidental bearing on Iroquois relations, and its climactic episode, the “Enquiry” of 1756–1762, is beyond the stated scope of the present volume. Dr. Jennings has already expressed his strong opinion of this matter in “The Scandalous Indian Policy of William Penn’s Sons” (Pennsylvania History, January 1970), and he reiterates it in the present volume, pages 330–342 of the text and pages 388–397 of Appendix B, “Documents of the Walking Purchase.”

Of the three episodes in the “Walking Purchase” story, the first is known by “a preliminary draft of a deed” (p. 332), dated 1686, and references to a trial walk, perhaps in 1684 (Jennings suggests in 1700). The Iroquois were not involved in this. In the second episode, a 1737 deed was awkwardly grafted onto the earlier document and a “walk” was performed in a different direction. Iroquois participation occurred in this when, in reaction to protests, the Proprietaries persuaded an Iroquois chief, Canasatego, to lecture the Delawares for their “misbehavior.” In the final episode, the “Enquiry,” an anti-Proprietary faction, criticized for not supporting military measures, retaliated by using a Delaware chief, Teedyuscung, to embarrass the Proprietors. (This receives attention in an article by Boyd Stanley Schlenther in the July 1983 issue of Pennsylvania History, too late to be included in Jennings’s bibliography.)

If the “Walking Purchase” cannot be defended, it can be explained; and in appraising it an objective examination should have more effect than an outright condemnatory approach.

Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania  
WILLIAM A. HUNTER

Germans in America: Retrospect and Prospect. Edited by Randall M. Miller.  
$5.00 paper.)

Alex Haley’s Roots has stirred descendants everywhere. It is not surprising that Americans of German descent—forty-nine million according to Kathleen Neils Gonzen—were excited about their tricentennial (1683–1983). And almost like Haley these Americans have trouble finding themselves, whether they came in trickles before 1683 or at full tide in 1683, because they appear to have acculturated so fast that it has not always been easy to find the root. As Don Yoder points out “no culture form transplanted to a new ground can grow exactly as it did in the old setting,” Frederick C. Luebke writes that the “Germans in America were a remarkably diverse and divided group.” He also refers to LaVern J. Ripley’s statement that we are an Anglo-Teutonic center around which much of America still turns. This bears out Gonzen’s findings that “the 49 million Americans who reported some German ancestry were a very close second to the 50 million of English ancestry.”
It appears that these German ancestors became part of a stream best described by Randall M. Miller in his introduction to his edited *Germans in America*. In a haunting and poetic statement he says, “In the end and in sum, the essays suggest that in locating the elusive Germans in America, many Americans are, in several ways, likely to find themselves.”

*Germans in America* is an attempt to find bits and pieces about the average German ancestor, giving the modern American a sense of *Volkgeist* which according to Miller most immigrant Germans did not share.

The German Society of Pennsylvania sponsored these seven tricentennial lectures delivered at the German Society in 1983. Readers must remember that everything cannot be said in seven essays and the essays naturally would be selective.

Even though the cover of the book features Pastorius, who was influential in bringing the first big wave of Germans to America, this is not a book about him or the Muhlenbergs, the Schurzes, and the like. Nor is it a book about homey daily life. Nor is it about German heritage vacation spots like Old Economy in Ambridge, Pennsylvania. The book is about anonymous daily life as it proliferated in politics, cities, and religion.

According to the essayists, assimilation was rather rapid. But not too rapid. Kathleen Neils Gonzen in “Patterns of German History,” James M. Bergquist in “Germans and the City,” and Frederick C. Luebke in “German Immigrants and American Politics: Problems of Leadership, Parties, and Issues” report German resistance and division about political parties. It was noted that some of this unsettled behavior was brought about by the older American Know-Nothing attitudes toward the fledgling Americans.

Furthermore, a German phobia consumed this country on several occasions. A war was justification to kill dogs of German breeds, burn books, and ban music ad nauseum.

Diversity and division carried over to religion, especially in Pennsylvania, as seen in Reinhard R. Doerries’s “Church and Faith Among German Americans,” Don Yoder’s “The Palatine Connection,” John A. Hostetler’s “The Plain People and the Art of Survival,” and Klaus Wust’s “Germans in America.” While the first three mentioned emphasized the richness of diversity, Wust noted there was a common faith in God “whether it was inspired by the Pietism of the 18th century or by liberal movements and philosophers of later periods.”

Another outstanding quality was the strong German sense of values. This was embodied in their skills and work ethic indispensable to the American economic structure. On the lighter side, the Germans shared a cultural pride in their music and holidays. All in all, good roots.

*Grove City College* 

**HILDA ADAM KRING**


The first sentence of the introduction explains why this book ought to interest readers of this journal. “Philadelphia, more than any other American city,” the
authors assert, "represents the history of architecture in the United States." Considering the generous number of early examples which have survived and are now complemented by newer ones, there is good reason for that claim. The research group which prepared this guide intended it to be usable by professional historians and architects as well as by the general public, and it should be. Since they also wanted to keep the book concise enough to be portable, they had to be somewhat selective. Although anyone might quibble with their decisions as to which buildings got included and which did not, again they have been admirably successful.

There are two parts to the book. The first is a catalog of 375 buildings or groups of buildings. These examples are divided into three chapters: "The Colonial City," "The Industrial Metropolis," and "The Contemporary City." Each chapter begins with an introduction giving the socio-economic and cultural background, as well as with a helpful glossary of architectural terms. Paragraph definitions of major architectural styles—Federal, Queen Anne, and so forth—are set off in red type and scattered throughout the chronology in the approximate places where they come up. Frankly, since the buildings are arranged in absolutely chronological order, this creates a bit of initial confusion: any reader who follows a first impulse to assume that the placements of these definitions imply sub-divisions in the text or architectural categories will be quickly disabused of that, or else will wander about the city falsely thinking that the Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul is an example of Early Gothic Revival. At the end of the three chronological chapters, a time-line chart helps to summarize developments. There are also capsule biographies of a few major architects.

Part two of the book is a set of nine walking and driving tours to the buildings. Sites which did not fit into any of the tours are placed on a separate, general map. Why, considering the number of items in that area, no separate walking tour was prepared for the Rittenhouse Square area is a puzzle, however. Following standard practice, the buildings are listed on the colorful tour maps and throughout the book according to their original names. Usually, the authors are careful to warn users of modern changes. For instance, no one should be surprised to find Jacob Reed's Sons no longer in their Chestnut Street store, or to find that the building of the Pennsylvania Institution for the Deaf and Dumb is now used by the Philadelphia College of Art. But occasionally the authors slip: an unwary reader arriving at the corner of 21st and Walnut will be at least temporarily perplexed to find that, as a result of a merger of congregations, what the guidebook calls the Second Presbyterian Church is now the First Presbyterian Church—and has been for over thirty-five years.

Despite a few minor annoyances such as that, this guide can be used with pleasure and profit by Pennsylvania historians. It is done up in an oblong shape so that it can fit handily into a handbag or a pocket, if you have a large one. So, lovers of history, grab your cameras and copies of this book, and head for Philadelphia this summer. And then, come September, those of you who teach can tantalize your students with fabulous illustrated lectures.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Charles D. Cashdollar

Two features of this little book will quickly become apparent to even the most casual browser: its excellent organization and its copious, high quality illustrations. The volume is divided into three parts. The first is a four-page overview (by Lewis) of iron-making in America from colonial times to mid-nineteenth century that provides historical context for Part Two's detailed examination (by Hugins) of Hopewell Furnace, a facility that is representative of the "iron plantations" that flourished in the mid-Atlantic states. Hopewell's cold-blast charcoal furnace was in almost continuous operation between 1771 and 1883, producing pig iron and castings. Part Three chronicles the efforts begun in the 1930s by the U.S. Department of the Interior to restore the furnace, the cast house, the iron master's mansion, tenant houses, and other parts of the village as they were during the peak production years of the 1830s and 1840s.

The illustrations—many in color—range from photographs to maps to artwork. They depict virtually all aspects of the manufacturing process and give insight into the everyday lives of the workers and their families.

Words and pictures are interwoven to capture the essence of what in effect was one of America's first industrial communities. Obscured by the Jeffersonian idyll of the early national period, Hopewell and dozens of other iron plantations were precursors of a later age. The ceaseless roar of the furnace and creak of the waterwheel, the ever present smoke and dirt, the work schedules that were determined by the unyielding demands of technology—all contrasted sharply with America's pastoral self-image. Surrounded by forests, farm lands, and clean-running streams, Hopewell hardly resembled an English mill town. Yet with its company-owned houses and general store, and its owners' paternalistic attitude toward employees, Hopewell was not unlike communities that were to spring up in Pennsylvania's coal fields and industrial regions.

This is a fine guide book, and visitors to Hopewell will be well served by its step-by-step approach. It does contain a fair amount of information, however, so visitors would be well advised to read it beforehand rather than try to digest it all at once while touring the site. And because Hopewell was in many ways so typical, persons inspecting other ironmaking facilities (there are at least ten fully or partially preserved furnaces in Pennsylvania alone) will surely find the book enlightening, as will readers who simply desire a well-written introduction to the technology of ironmaking and its social and economic impacts.

Pennsylvania State University


The study of the American textile industry has almost invariably focused upon New England. This is true of both the traditional descriptive histories and the more recent econometric analyses. More specifically the growth of the Lowell
mills has served as a model of American industrial development. In *Proprietary Capitalism*, Philip Scranton, who teaches at Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science, has attempted to counter this bias by not only detailing the scope of textile manufactures in nineteenth-century Philadelphia but also insisting the organizational structure of the city’s industry offers “a fully realized alternative to the corporate industrial model” found in Lowell. He uses the term “proprietary capitalism” to describe the collection of firms that throughout the century remained owner operated through individual families or partnerships.

The bulk of the book is devoted to an interesting and useful description of the growth of the textile business in Philadelphia from its eighteenth-century origins until the mid-1880s. When the Boston Associates hatched their plan to construct the Lowell mills, Philadelphia already had a thriving textile industry of thirty-nine establishments with capital of $584,000 employing 1,135 men, women, and children. The largest number, 59 percent of the employees, were producing cotton goods. In fact, 1820 was a depression year and just four years previously the labor force in textiles had been 3,820. At the time the system employed large numbers of out workers, “craft shop proprietors using hand methods,” small “powered mills,” and only five large factory operations.

Although the industry was hurt by the depression following the Panic of 1837, it had grown impressively by 1850. In that year Philadelphia had 326 textile firms employing 7,141 men and 5,228 women. The output had become much more diversified. The largest number of firms were in carpet manufacture followed by cotton, cotton-wool and hosiery. Sixty percent of the workers produced cotton or cotton-wool. Not only the adherence to noncorporate forms of ownership, but the dominance of men, the large number of small firms and the extensive use of hand looms set Philadelphia off from the pattern developed at Lowell.

While the Civil War was a disaster for Lowell and wiped out one of Philadelphia’s largest companies, that of Joseph Ripka, it brought general prosperity to the city’s mills and laid the basis for further expansion. By 1882 there were nearly one thousand firms operating in Philadelphia employing 57,780 workers. A number of changes had taken place since mid-century. Woolens had outpaced cotton. The leading sectors were hosiery and carpets. Hand looms had given way to steam-powered machinery. Finally, the majority of employees were women. However, the “greatest textiles manufacturing center in America” remained one of many small “separate establishments” employing a technology “directed at flexible output” and a traditional financial structure of partnerships and single owners. These men who were “largely brought up in shops and mills and were immigrants ... shared a cultural framework with their work forces.”

In order to flesh out his story Scranton effectively combines detailed sketches of leading firms or districts with the numerical data on the industry collected in various census and industrial reports. A quick summary can not convey the wealth of information collected in this book on both proprietors and workers. Thus, the author has clearly attained the first and most important of his three goals given in the introduction by detailing “the emergence of a vital and complex textile industry in Philadelphia, a manufacturing enclave characterized by the multiplication of small, separate, specialized firms.

In other areas he is less successful. The introduction and conclusion contain-
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ing his thesis seem tacked on to the body of the book. While Scranton is associated with the Philadelphia Social History Project, this is not a typical product. Numbers are well employed, but statistics are not. Beyond the attempt to introduce the vague concept of "the matrix of accumulation," little economic theory of any kind informs this book. The author talks about profits and accumulation—both certainly quantifiable—but actually deals with neither. While some readers will find it a blessing, Scranton's mind simply does not run toward either economic theory or hypothesis testing. Thus, most of the major points he raises are never systematically addressed. While the book is quite readable, its organization is a bit eccentric and it unravels at the end. The editors should have eliminated some of the repetitious phrasing and use of "buzz words" such as "trajectory." There are ungrammatical shifts of tense and numerous pronouns in search of antecedents. In the conclusion, he says after ending a sentence with "manufacture in two locales" that, "Recapitulating the main elements of each matrix will thus both stress their differences and check any tendency to collapse them into a single-issue dichotomy." Odd usages abound.

Trimmed of some of its fatuous self-praise and extraneous claims—it hardly charts a program for our "time of persistent economic crisis"—this is a generally good book on a truly worthwhile subject. Let us hope that future American economic historians and theorists of economic development take note of the Philadelphia example so clearly delineated by Professor Scranton.

Lehigh University

WILLIAM G. SHADE


This book, whose author was president of the Pennsylvania Historical Association from October 22, 1966, until his untimely death on October 10, 1967, remains the best single volume on the Gettysburg campaign. After its initial publication in 1968, I reviewed it in this journal and said that "as a study in the command of both armies it is in a class by itself; no other rounded study of the campaign, seeking to discover the motives and actions of both headquarters, can match it" (Pennsylvania History, 36 [July, 1969]: 253). That judgment needs no amendment.

Yet somehow the book has not made the impact upon Civil War scholarship that it should have, either in terms of inspiring comparable studies of other campaigns emphasizing not so much tactical actions as command decisions, or even in receiving general recognition of its high place among Gettysburg books. Perhaps its author's death before its publication helped deprive it of due notice. Even had he lived, however, Edwin Coddington of Lafayette College was a gentleman historian of a very traditional sort, not a practitioner of historianship who would have thrust his book forward by any aggressive devices of salesman-ship. The original edition published by Charles Scribner's Sons was followed by a second publication in 1979 (Dayton, Ohio: Morningside Bookshop) without substantially remedying the book's fall from sight. Let us hope that this paperback reprint of the Morningside Bookshop edition (essentially unchanged from the original) may at last earn some of the attention that Coddington's magisterial work deserves.
As I indicated in my original review, part of the book's stature derives from Coddington's success in finding fresh information about Gettysburg, notwithstanding all the books and articles already written about the battle and campaign. Most importantly, Coddington made good use of the neglected papers of Colonel John B. Bachelder in the New Hampshire Historical Society, Concord, New Hampshire. Bachelder was “Superintendent of Tablets and Legends” of the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association and some time after 1876 was named by Congress Government Historian of the Battle of Gettysburg; his papers reflect his immensely detailed research into the battle.

Impressive as Coddington's compilation of evidence was—and his book is a model of what can be accomplished with a seemingly hackneyed subject by returning to the primary and near-primary sources—*The Gettysburg Campaign* is yet more impressive for its mature judgments on generalship. No one should consider venturing into the perennial debates over whether the South might have won the battle if General Robert E. Lee had done this or that differently, or about how the Union might have made its victory less costly or more complete, without reading and heeding Coddington.

Most conspicuously, Coddington elevates Major-General George Gordon Meade to the first rank of Civil War commanders. He demonstrates with surpassing cogency that on the battlefield of Gettysburg, at least, Meade was a superior general to Lee. He excelled Lee especially in the clarity with which he let his subordinates know what he expected of them and thus in maintaining control over the battle. (It is not intended to turn that compliment to Meade into a lefthanded one by making the almost obligatory observation that at Gettysburg it was not so difficult to do better than Lee when it came to issuing clear orders.) Again and again, moreover, the right Union officer was at the right place at the right time to overcome the crises of the battle because Meade foresaw the crises and dispatched trusted subordinates to be ready for them. This was true of Major-General Winfield Scott Hancock's opportune arrival during the retreat of the First and Eleventh Army Corps on July 1, 1863; of Brigadier-General Gouverneur Kemble Warren's presence on Little Round Top on July 2; of Hancock's reappearance to assume command of the Union left as it was faltering later on the second. Finally, Coddington stoutly and persuasively defends Meade against the charge that he could have substantially destroyed Lee's army with a more vigorous pursuit after the battle.

Whether or not the new publication stimulates as much interest in *The Gettysburg Campaign* as it ought to, in time to come this book will surely be accounted a military classic. Indeed, after sixteen years it is possible to judge it as more than the best single volume on Gettysburg. In the reviewer's judgment, it has established itself as nothing less than the best history of a given battle in all of American military literature. The Pennsylvania History Association can well be proud that Edwin Coddington once wielded its presidential gavel.

*Temple University*  

**RUSSELL F. WEGLEY**


This thoroughly researched book aims to present a fresh interpretation of reconstruction politics across the Southern states. It argues that Southerners saw
railroads as the key to economic resurgence after the Confederacy's defeat in 1865. Professor Summers maintains that, from the first, Southerners of all political persuasions, whether Conservative, Democratic or Radical Republican, believed in the importance of railroads and actively supported state aid for them. He demonstrates that pre-Reconstruction Southern state governments immediately launched into programs of state-assisted railroad building. The Radical Republicans, who followed, merely continued this tradition. Politicians might quarrel over which group received state support for their railroad plans, but few, if any, opposed the concept of state aid.

Professor Summers' book has several major themes. He attacks head-on the idea that Southern railroad building was the result of Northern carpetbaggers who came south to exploit a prostrate region. Summers argues convincingly that not only did Radical Republican railroad aid programs build on Democratic precedents but that railroad aid programs were genuinely popular with Southern people. The key to Summers' book is the concept of the "gospel of prosperity" which asserts that railroad building would both revive Southern agriculture and initiate industrialization. Southern politicians actually believed that railroad-induced prosperity would help solve many acute problems such as the plight of the freedmen and hostility between the black and white races.

Although the South saw the attractions of the gospel of prosperity, the system broke down because no state had a comprehensive plan for transportation development. All towns wanted railroads. This led to a proliferation of projects all competing for state aid. The result was corruption on a massive scale. Summers demonstrates, however, that this corruption resulted more from interregional rivalry rather than the venality of Radical Republican governments allegedly dominated by inexperienced freedmen. Corruption knew neither party nor race and Summers doubts that, had the Democrats been in power, they would have done things much differently.

This is a book about Reconstruction politics. It is not really about railroads much less about the Southern economy. The evidence is drawn primarily from state legislative journals, other government records, and Southern newspapers. The author makes it clear that Southerners had a misplaced faith in railroads as the engine of prosperity. Despite substantial railroad construction, the South remained poor. It suffered particularly in the early 1870s and as a result of the panic of 1873. The author includes one case study, that of the Alabama & Chattanooga which he terms was a "catastrophe." This line was envisaged as a crucial link in a Southern transcontinental line running from San Diego to New York. It was to connect with the Vicksburg & Meridian at Meridian in Mississippi and run northeast through the Alabama uplands and Georgia's northwest corner to Chattanooga, Tennessee. This line, most of which was in Alabama, received substantial aid from that state. Unfortunately, the railroad could not pay the interest on its state-endorsed bonds and the governor of the state forced the line into receivership at about the time it was completed. The state's management of the railroad was not happy. It faced many legal problems with the private developers and also failed in the operation of the line which fell into disrepair. The experience of the Alabama & Chattanooga and similar projects helped destroy the South's confidence in railroads. In this case, the railroad produced large state debts, a poor state credit record, a run-down system, and few immediate employment or transportation benefits.

There is no doubt that the points Professor Summers makes are valid. Yet the
book suffers from its failure to integrate political concepts and economic analysis. For example, the reader does not get a clear view of the Alabama & Chattanooga's financial structure nor of its economic prospects. The author indicates that perhaps the state expected too much from railroads too quickly. Certainly it was wrong to expect a developmental railroad to pay large interest payments on the eve of its completion. But was this railroad, which later became a profitable line, a hopeless proposition at the time of its completion? There is nothing in Professor Summers' book that would answer this question. Perhaps if the South or individual states had gone about their railroad building differently, the result might have been different. Robert Fogel, in his pathbreaking book on the Union Pacific Railroad, argued that the UP's overcapitalization and its scandals resulted from the way the Federal Government conceived the transcontinental railroad project. In short, the Federal Government's insistence that private enterprise bear a substantial portion of the cost of what was perceived as a losing proposition, forced the promoters to make their profits out of building rather than running the railroad. Fogel's book was interesting because it combined a political and economic analysis. Unfortunately, in Professor Summers' effort there is almost a total lack of hard-headed economic analysis which ought to complement the book's political side.

University of Sydney

Stephen Salsbury

(Lewisburg, Pennsylvania: Oral Traditions Project of the Union County Historical Society, 1984. Pp. 80. $9.95 paper.)

An imaginative combination of many photographs, sketches, and the results of research into traditional historical sources interwoven with the testimony of numerous eyewitness participants make Charles M. Snyder's Buggy Town a most interesting and useful addition to our understanding of late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century Pennsylvania history. Asserting that the horse and buggy era extended from 1865 to 1915, the author places Mifflinburg and its buggy manufactories into the perspective of American transportation and small business development.

Nationally, the buggy industry was characterized by the building of light vehicles in family-owned shops that often evolved into factories. Little coordination among the widely dispersed, but competitive, builders resulted in a variety of designs and models. In a few instances, specialization, the assembly line, and a large market emerged.

Mifflinburg, at the center of Buffalo Valley in Union County, was a part of these processes. After several short-lived efforts, the building of buggies became well established by the late 1870s. The industry was the town's largest employer, requiring the labor of many blacksmiths, painters, carpenters, and harness makers. Since neither local sources nor the shops themselves could supply all the parts needed, material had to be imported. This contributed to the growth of another small business, the local hardware store or parts wholesaler.

Snyder asks the logical question—why Mifflinburg as a leader when Lancaster, Scranton, and other cities had existing buggy manufacturers? Mifflinburg had a monopoly on neither raw materials (wood and iron), unique designs, nor manufacturing processes. His response is that it had three factors
working in its favor. First, Mifflinburg-made buggies (and also sleighs) were widely known for the high quality of their workmanship. The town’s family-owned shops (there were at least fifteen by the early 1900s, of which four were classed as large and eleven as small, employing a total of 159 men) built a buggy that gave long and useful service. Second, aggressive salesmen traveled great distances to the coal regions and county fairs to display the product and write their orders. Finally, each customer’s exact specifications were met and production speedily completed.

As happened on the national industrial scene just before the turn of the century, Mifflinburg’s small shops met the realities of mass production, increased demand, and labor-saving machinery by becoming factories. Alfred A. Hopp, Harry F. Blair, and Robert S. Gutelius, each with successful experience in either local manufacturing or national salesmanship, formed the Mifflinburg Buggy Company. Using an illustrated catalogue, they advertised “first class and newly-styled” vehicles which incorporated the best and most recent design features. The factory had an annual capacity of two thousand vehicles. Hopp broke away and formed his own carriage works in 1903; this, too, had an annual output of two thousand, so that, by 1910, the town’s total output was about five thousand vehicles.

The coming of the automobile forced some companies and shops out of business, but others shifted to producing auto buses and auto truck bodies (ten thousand were delivered annually in the mid-twenties) but the 1929 depression ended this, too.

The Oral Traditions Project of the Union County Historical Society and Mr. Snyder have demonstrated how interesting and useful research into local history can be. We are in their debt.

West Chester, Pennsylvania

ROBERT E. CARLSON


The authors have analyzed Milton S. Eisenhower’s life from his Abilene, Kansas, childhood, charting his early newspaper career, developing his advancement in the Washington administrative arena, examining his presidencies of three universities, into his retirement years. They have presented a sympathetic portrayal in part by judiciously incorporating illuminating anecdotes, incisive third-party opinions, and relevant personal narratives and reminiscences, in part by developing concisely presented interpretations of their subject’s achievements. Their decision to allow Eisenhower’s memoirs of his government service (The Wine is Bitter and The President is Calling) relate that significant aspect of his public life keeps their monograph fairly faithful to their purpose of writing “an important chapter in the history of higher education in the United States” and to their subtitle choice “Educational Statesman.” A more manageable, but restricted, biography has been produced because of the self-imposed limitation. The product, however, has unfortunately reduced the stature of their subject, in spite of generous generalization about Eisenhower’s involvement in American politics and society beyond his role in higher education (although their chapter “On the State of the Union,” giving Eisenhower’s views on some of
the issues of his time, both helps to fill that void and seems a belated attempt to
purge the work of the prescribed limitation.)

Ambrose and Immerman have presented Milton Eisenhower as a warm,
loving, genial man who is intellectual, objective, concerned, and dedicated. He is
shown to be an ambitious individual honed by hard work and devotion to liberal
education and democracy. He is depicted as a man shaped by and always faithful
to the basic traditional values of responsibility, honesty, common sense, and
decency—the mainstream, midwestern virtues inculcated by his family and
highly prized by his contemporaries.

Their evaluation of Eisenhower as an "educational statesman" is that his
chief motivation was to ensure his institutions' meeting their responsibilities
both to the world at large and to American democracy. At Kansas State
University his major contributions were to elevate the value of its faculty, to
reorganize its curriculum to emphasize liberal education, and to promote
research. At Penn State University he reorganized its administrative structure
and gained national and international acceptance of the institution as an
university. While president of Penn State Eisenhower scored a triumph in his
reform of the athletic program but was unsuccessful in an attempt to change the
name of the borough of State College. At Johns Hopkins University he solved its
abysmal financial problems by instituting the strictest fiscal responsibilities
while preserving and expanding its scholarly worthiness. The authors also
successfully portray him as a president whose most remarkable feature, despite
his great administrative successes, was his personal interaction with the
institutions' students.

As a study of American higher education it provides interpretations from the
perspectives of three major institutions across three critical periods of mid-
twentieth-century educational development: the World War II aftermath; the
expansion of the 1950s and 1960s; and the unrest and turmoil of the 1970s. A
feeling of what makes a successful administrator is evinced by the authors'
familiarity with the academic structure and its variables. The work could be
well used as a handbook in higher education administration.

There are problems: the date of Helen Eakins Eisenhower's death; the
statement that Penn State football had earned a "national reputation" prior to
1956; the reference to journalist Tad Szule as "Ted." These mistakes detract
from the work but do not destroy the value of the effort. The interpretation of the
man himself is sound. The events, however, sometimes seem out of context, and
the three universities are only superficially presented. The central focus is sharp
but the backdrop is sometimes blurred.

Overall the book is a lively addition to the history of higher education in the
United States. Its lucid style is enhanced by the authors' intimacy with their
subject, their familiarity with both the currents and undercurrents in American
history and society, and their knowledge of academe's ways and byways.
Ambrose and Immerman have produced a new standard in the writing of
educational history. They have done justice to both their subject and the
communities within which he lived. It is sad only that self-imposed and practical
limitations did not allow a more substantial study.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Dale E. Landon