BOOK REVIEWS


This handsome book about Philadelphia by Philadelphians should be a source of pride to all members of Penn's Great Town. The claims of its sponsors that it is the first general survey of Philadelphia architecture to appear, has long been needed, and constitutes "a kind of history of American architecture seen in microcosm" are all true. The volume is notable, however, for other reasons as well: the visual delight of its format and illustrations; the distinguished and extensive collaboration that lies behind it, the first-rate, scholarly contribution of the author; and the complete success with which it communicates to the reader the various, rich, and forceful way in which architecture has served the changing needs and aspirations of one urban community. In this architectural biography of a great American city, it is not just Philadelphia or American architecture that is illumined, but American life itself.

The history of this book is, in itself, a Philadelphia story. Prompted by a request in 1959 from the American Institute of Architects that a suitable exhibition be prepared for its Philadelphia meeting of 1961, the Philadelphia Art Alliance Committee on Architecture decided to organize a memorable display that would be "a polished mirror of architecture from the very beginnings of Philadelphia," and to forgo an exhibition catalogue in favor of a book. Dr. George B. Tatum of the University of Pennsylvania's Department of the History of Art was asked to write this, and the University of Pennsylvania Press to publish it. Sponsorship in planning, preparation, and publication was undertaken by the Art Alliance, the Atwater Kent Museum, the Fairmount Park Art Association, and the College of Fellows of the A.I.A. The great bulk of the illustrative material was volunteered from a dozen library, museum, and historical society collections in the city, and much of the wide range of counsel and assistance requested and given came from its citizens and students and is generously acknowledged.

Penn's Great Town is not a footnoted monograph for professional architects, nor a complete or definitive history of Philadelphia architecture. It is a skillful blend of art and social history intended for the intelligent layman, written with well-bred sophistication, deceptive simplicity, and charm. Its strength lies not in original judgments or new discoveries, but in an admirable synthesis of much material, some well known, much of it scattered,
unfamiliar, inaccessible, or unpublished. (Many of these sources are dis- cussed and listed in the useful general bibliography, and others in the notes to the illustrations.) It admits gaps of information, recognizes but declines to enter controversies, offers thoughtful aesthetic evaluations (more frequently at second hand than first), and makes numerous useful generalizations. It is comprehensive, balanced, and unified; it is conscientious, and self-assured in conception and execution. It brings to mind what, in other ways, Walter Whitehill has done for Boston in his Topographical History and John Kouwenhoven for New York City in his Columbia Historical Portrait. It is, in short, a very fine achievement.

In content, the one hundred and twenty-eight pages of text successfully weave together four general themes: a historical survey of seven major American architectural style periods, with a deft analysis of the characteristics of each and the extent and manner of its derivation from European antecedents; highly selective and nontechnical descriptions of key structures in each period and the notable persons and events associated with them; biographical notes on the clients who ordered and the architects who designed these structures; and the social-cultural forces which both conditioned and were reflected in their style, design, ornamentation, materials, and construction. It should be added that the procession of structures taken under review includes private, municipal, state and Federal buildings ranging from row houses and country villas to churches, waterworks, banks, hotels, bridges, and railroad stations.

The fine text makes full and careful use of an equally fine set of beautifully reproduced illustrations. There are one hundred and forty-five of these, painstakingly selected from a great mass of 25,000 prints and drawings assembled for the purpose, many never published before. In a seven-page introduction to the notes to the illustrations, the author helpfully discusses this material. The decision to exclude photographs as a matter of “visual continuity and pleasant bookmaking” results in both gain and loss. Plans can be shown that were never carried out (e.g., Lebrun’s proposed façade for the Academy of Music) as well as conjectural restorations (e.g., the entrance to Franklin Court); but the unfamiliar 1870 oil painting of Cliveden, for example, does not show as much useful architectural detail as the familiar photographs in Wayne Andrews and Wertenbaker.

The notes to the illustrations fill fifty-eight pages, and are an important part of the whole. In addition to technical information about the structures and the illustrations, they supplement the text with significant details, often give the source for statements made there, and suggest where fuller treatments can be found. A full index completes the scholarly organization of the book.

In any work covering so much ground and produced under such pressure of time, there are bound to be errors of fact, and apparently a second edition is already planned which will catch many of these. Fault will be found with the treatment of particular subjects. This reviewer, for example, felt that
the “distinctive plan” of the Philadelphia town house, and the interrelationships of the Late Georgian, Federal, and Roman Revival styles were not made sufficiently clear. Few, however, will deny that this book documents the many superlatives claimed for Philadelphia architecture, and, in particular, the author’s judgment that “it is the buildings of Philadelphia more than those of any other city, that must be taken into account in any general discussion of American culture.”

Henry Francis Du Pont Winterthur Museum

E. McClung Fleming


A comprehensive social and cultural history of American architecture represents so ambitious a literary and scholarly undertaking that it has been attempted only rarely and perhaps never with complete success. For this reason, if for no other, great credit is due not only the American Institute of Architects for having had the imagination to commission such a history in commemoration of its centennial, but also the authors, both members of the faculty of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for having had the courage to undertake so arduous and controversial an assignment.

Fortunately, in this case there are other sound reasons for praising the authors and their sponsor. No one could be expected to agree completely with the selection of the subject matter to be included in a general history of this kind, and even though the exact relevancy of some of the facts cited is occasionally obscure, there is no denying that the authors have brought together an astonishing amount of useful material relating to the American scene. If anything, there would appear to be almost too much material; in many sections of the book fact is heaped on fact and name follows name until there is danger that all but the best informed or most dedicated readers will find themselves buried under a mass of unfamiliar details. For although presumably addressing themselves to the general public, the authors must, in fact, assume that, if their remarks are to be meaningful, the reader will be able to call to mind at least some of the hundreds of buildings which are mentioned but not illustrated. Yet the real problem raised by this rich repast is not so much that many readers may suffer from a kind of intellectual indigestion as that there is so little space left for analysis and interpretation, both essential if historical writing is to be raised above the level of mere description.

Perhaps most important in a book of this length, Dean Burchard and Professor Bush-Brown write with clarity and force. Remarkable especially
for its condensation, the text of *The Architecture of America* abounds in apt characterization and perceptive comment. But here again such proficiency is not without its hazards. In search of the neat and well-turned phrase there is always a temptation to distort fact for effect; it is not always easy to be informative without appearing to be condescending, and attempts to be concise often have a way of sounding didactic. To many it may seem that in this case the authors are frequently more interested in directing the thinking of their readers than in stimulating it.

In recognition of the complex nature of the task before them, Burchard and Bush-Brown devote their first forty pages to as thorough an examination of the “nature of architecture” as is likely to be found outside the covers of a book on aesthetics. While maintaining that the merit of a building is capable of being assessed on grounds that transcend personal taste, they wisely reject the modern materialistic and structural criteria as the only valid basis of design, recognizing, instead, that architecture has meant different things to different peoples at different times. This view of the changing nature of architectural style is the only one which a study of history will support, and, having recognized this fact, the authors make a conscientious effort to apply it to their own judgments of the past. They have a sympathetic eye for most of the places and architects discussed, a few like Colonial Williamsburg and Thomas Jefferson excepted.

But, more than any other period, it is the twentieth century which interests Burchard and Bush-Brown. This fact emerges clearly in several ways, but especially by the arrangement of their book: the last seventy-five years are allotted three hundred pages while all of the preceding two hundred and seventy-five years are dealt with in but half that number. A division of this kind may perhaps be justified on the grounds that the American Institute of Architects was founded as recently as 1857, or that the earlier periods have previously been the subject of more comprehensive study. But, however it is explained, only the most avid modernist is likely to find that such an arrangement contributes to a balanced view of the country’s architectural achievement.

Not the least praiseworthy aspect of this many-sided history is its accuracy. Although an occasional minor error has been noted, there are far fewer incorrect names and dates than are usually to be found in books of this size and character. It is when the authors attempt to generalize that criticism seems most justified. To be sure, in many cases the issue may be reduced to a matter of emphasis or interpretation, but occasionally there occur statements which are patently false. As an example of this latter category, the readers of *The Pennsylvania Magazine* should find especially interesting the comment that “after the early handmade crude pieces there was very little American furniture and until 1795, when Duncan Phyfe began his work, almost everything was imported” (p. 60).

For the average reader, however, the most serious defect of the book will probably be the dullness of the format and the lack of illustrations. By any
standard, seventy pictures, many of them quite small, are simply not sufficient to illustrate a comprehensive book on American architecture. Although an impressive piece of writing and in many ways a useful and an important book, until this and some of the most serious of its other defects are corrected, The Architecture of America is not likely to be widely regarded as "the major work on American architecture of the past century" for which its sponsors hoped.

University of Pennsylvania  George B. Tatum


This is a fine and beautiful book. And it is an important photographic record of American architecture. It is a book which should be explored with Mr. Andrews' previous book, Architecture, Ambition and Americans, at one's elbow. Although it is essentially a book of remarkable photographs, there are crisp and illuminating captions with most of the photographs. These captions pique the curiosity and lead one to the fuller explanations of the earlier volume.

Mr. Andrews has divided the first part of his book into four historical sections beginning with the Colonial Period and including the Federal Period, the Romantic Era, and the Age of Indecision. Thus, he covers the times from 1642 to 1840 and architecture from the Franciscan Mission at Acoma, New Mexico, to the charming house "The Three Bricks" at Nantucket. From there on, he groups the photographs chronologically by architects.

It is not an easy task to select two hundred and fifty-seven illustrations and say, this represents American architecture. Mr. Andrews has made an excellent selection. Certainly, one will find a few of one's favorites missing. For instance, there are no examples of the work of Paul Cret or George Howe, two men who had a profound influence in this century. But then, he has included the little-known and extremely sensitive Watsek House in Portland, Oregon, by John Yeon. It is a catholic selection.

Quite properly, a great deal of space is devoted to the work of Frank Lloyd Wright and Louis Sullivan. Those who have read Mr. Andrews' earlier work on American architecture remember his admiration for McKim, Mead and White and will not be surprised at the number of examples of the work of that famous partnership included in the book, nor his statement that they "became the most influential firm in the history of American Architecture." A nice evening in proper surroundings could be spent discussing that statement with Mr. Andrews.
It is indeed gratifying to read what is probably the first public recognition of the extraordinary design ability of Julian Abele, "a gifted Negro," who for many years was the designer in Horace Trumbauer's office and who conceived, among the many distinguished buildings of that office, the Philadelphia Museum of Art.

Mr. Andrews is an expert and sensitive architectural photographer. The photographs in the book were taken by him over a period of better than twenty years. In his preface he remarks: "In my judgment, a good photograph is not a record of a building. It is an invitation to the beholder to go and see the building for himself." Most certainly, this collection of photographs is provocative to that end. There is not space to mention several in particular, but, indubitably, one of the most beautiful architectural photographs in existence is that of the ruins of Windsor Plantation at Port Gibson, Mississippi. It expresses the ineffable sadness attaching to a ruin of what must have been a truly great house of the Romantic Era.

To those who are familiar with Russell Lynes's writings, it comes as no surprise that his introduction to this book is written with the acute understanding and sensitiveness to American art that he exhibited in his last book, The Tastemakers. He is a master of cryptic and penetrating phraseology, such as, "We no longer need to squirm in our Eames chairs at the thought of Hunt's 'cottage' for Mrs. Vanderbilt at Newport, 'The Breakers,' or at the befringed Gothic revival houses of A. J. Davis, as misguided attempts to make Americans into a falsely romantic image of themselves."

A large amount of credit goes to Harry Ford of the publishers for the design of a beautiful book and to the printers for a fine job of typography and illustration. It was a generous and thoughtful gesture for Mr. Andrews to dedicate his book to his very good friends Alan and Frances Burnham, for Alan Burnham is himself an architectural historian of very considerable ability.

This is a book which belongs in the library of everyone interested in American architecture. It is a book to which one goes back frequently for a fine visual impression of the best efforts of American architects and early builders.

Villanova

Villanova

Theo B. White


Professor Wish of Western Reserve University has written a useful survey of American history writing from the Puritans down to the present, a survey which can be of real use to the general reader when he has occasion to investigate the professional American historian, and to historians them-
selves who wish a convenient manual to use in their courses in American historiography. The publication of this book is another example of the continuing and growing interest of the historical guild in writing about our past, exemplified most persistently by discussions concerning the work of Turner and Beard. Wish has attempted, more than have other authors of books of this type, to treat American historical writings "from a social-intellectual point of view." Before discussing the historical works themselves, for each historian considered, some statement of the historical situation and the intellectual climate which produced him is given, along with a few biographical facts.

Wish's aim and approach are well illustrated by the sharply contrasting types of historical writing discussed in the first two chapters. The first, "From Bradford to Mather: the Puritan Mission in History," points to the theology-centered writing of these years whose Christian interpretation of history was to be challenged by the writers next discussed, those of the Enlightenment whose new outlook was "reflected in the fact that the chief American historians of this era were successful businessmen, lawyers, or land speculators rather than ministers or theologically minded officials."

The most important material by American historians is covered, although historians such as Prescott and Motley "who have dealt primarily with non-American themes have been omitted." Wish has met the problem of handling contemporary American historiography by concentrating on the work of Allan Nevins and a few other outstanding figures of our times. Nevins was chosen because "Few American historians of the mid-twentieth century represented so effectively and in such varied ways the chief trends of recent history-writing."

There is no bibliography, but the bibliographic notes list important relevant published materials. The social-intellectual background and biographical data are generally brief, although the aim of the volume is more fully achieved beginning with the chapter on Richard Hildreth when a greater degree of concentration becomes possible; in every case, Wish includes in his discussion many more historians than the several chapter titles suggest. The account is analytical and descriptive, serving to invite the reader to continue the discussion where Wish stops. Thus, the evaluation of Turner and Beard does not involve a complete statement of the latest developments of the continuing discussion which their works have aroused.

The volume has several notable merits. It presents, for example, the positions of influential and justifiably famous nineteenth-century historians (such as Rhodes) and seeks to assay the more or less permanent value of these older points of view. Wish succeeds, despite the considerable ground staked out, in attaining the central objective of showing how the writing of American history has been affected by social and intellectual currents. The comparison of the approaches of several historians is of real interest. In his chapter on Parkman, for example, one finds a comparison of Parkman,
Theodore Roosevelt, and Carlyle. Indeed, among the more valuable portions of the volume are many thoughtful paragraphs which succinctly present Wish’s matured judgment. They can be read with value by the professional historian, who will thus again be made to realize how his craft in America has evolved and how important have been the advances made in seeking to narrate and to analyze the meaning of the nation’s past. And Wish concludes: “Historiography demonstrated the wreckage of elaborate interpretations that told more about the historian than about the event. And such warnings could only spur on a more meticulous and critical search for a reasonable view of the past.”

Muhlenberg College

John J. Reed


This is a disappointing book. At times it seems almost like a parody of Richard F. Hofstadter’s The American Political Tradition and the Men Who Made It. Mr. Padover’s new volume begins with an explanatory introduction: this is “a study of men who have had a special impact on the formation and development of what is historically a unique polity: the United States of America.” The author argues that (a) America possesses a distinct political character, and (b) that character has been shaped by its political and intellectual leadership. When readers recover from the shock of such profundity, they will then discover nineteen essays with some remarkable titles. George Washington becomes “The American as Archetype.” Thomas Jefferson is “The American as Democrat.” John Adams is “The American as Aristocrat,” while Hamilton secures “The American as Conservative.” And so on. Emerson is made over into a philosopher. Thoreau is an anarchist. Franklin Roosevelt is simply “The American as Reformer.” Only one escapes Mr. Padover’s zeal for tags: Lincoln has to be content with the ultimate accolade—“The American.”

Of the nineteen essays, thirteen are devoted to the first half of our national existence. Only three twentieth-century Presidents gain admission to Mr. Padover’s curious roster—the two Roosevelts, and Woodrow Wilson. This reviewer likes to think that the book’s chronological imbalance comes less from a recent scarcity of formative leaders (Mr. Padover argues for a negative impact on occasion) than from the author’s greater familiarity with earlier history. Many will recall that Mr. Padover is a Jefferson scholar. He has probably gleaned more published ore from the Jefferson lode than any other living historian (excepting Princeton’s Julian P. Boyd). It is the more astonishing, therefore, that even in the early essays there is so little insight or originality.
Perhaps this is due to the evident physical limitations Mr. Padover has imposed upon his work. His essays average about twenty pages in length. He supplies some biographical information along with his intellectual appraisals, so there is very little room left for depth or illumination. Since the Americans studied were generally men of some political and intellectual mobility their ideas were rarely static. Unfortunately, in his efforts at simplification Mr. Padover removes his reader from a needed sense of circumstance and sequence. We consequently meet John Adams, for example, as a matured opponent of democracy who dislikes frequent elections. And yet this is the same John Adams who declared at least twice that there was no more infallible maxim than “‘where annual elections end, there slavery begins.’” Adams was an immensely complex person, and Mr. Padover has barely skimmed the surface of Adams’ ideas. Instead, we are treated to an attitude of condescension: how nice for America to have had such an earnest intellectual for a Revolutionary, but what a pity Adams did not see the democratic light as did Jefferson! Mr. Padover rather resents Adams’ political pessimism, and suggests that if he could return and view modern America, Adams would see the error of his intellectual ways. This is a highly dubious hypothesis. More likely we would hear an emphatic “I told you so!”

At least we can concede this to be a provocative volume. As each reader reaches his particular area of competence he will react strongly to Mr. Padover’s treatment. Apart from Mr. Padover, there are few modern scholars who see Jefferson as primarily a frontiersman. It is as though William E. Dodd is still alive and Marie Kimball, Douglass Adair, and Dumas Malone had never written a word. It may be comforting to read that Jefferson “said Yes to life,” but it is dismaying to reflect on the antiquated stereotypes that Mr. Padover’s essays frequently portray. “Here was Buried Thomas Jefferson” reads the conclusion of “The American as Democrat.” How true.

The book offers a short “Selected Bibliography” of questionable value; the omissions provide food for thought. At least Benjamin Franklin has been spared. No genius probably.

Indiana University

H. Trevor Colbourn


The fruit of a lifetime of dedicated scholarship, these volumes reflect the mellow learning of a historian who, during forty years of teaching at the College of William and Mary, has spent countless research hours in the field of local history, ferreting out the significant facts about this important area of early American history and synthesizing them with meticulous care and ripe good humor. These are volumes which the student of the Old Dominion
cannot neglect and which those interested in American colonial history might read with profit. Not only is this history the product of intensive research in the sources over a long period of time, but it impresses the reader by its evidence of Dr. Morton’s complete familiarity with, and affection for, his Virginia environment. Obviously, he has walked its roads and tramped its woods, so he easily brings them to life with his disciplined imagination.

The two volumes are of approximately equal length, roughly four hundred pages each. Since the first volume brings the story from 1607 to 1710 while the second carries it to 1763, it is immediately apparent that the first hundred years receive a less intensive treatment than the subsequent fifty, a fact accounted for not only on the basis of the increasing complexity of Virginia history in the eighteenth century, but also the fewer number of sources for the seventeenth. In both volumes, as the author says, he has tried to avoid the pitfalls of provincialism on the one hand, and the danger of approaching the past from the viewpoint of the twentieth century on the other; and he has succeeded. He shows his reader that he knows all the literature on the controversial aspects of Virginia history, as, for example, the Virginia Company’s management of the colony, or Bacon’s rebellion. At the same time, he sets forth his own position on these points without entering into the controversy. Typically, Dr. Morton is fair-minded in his estimate of those figures who were not well loved by contemporaries, e.g., Governors Harvey, Culpeper, and Effingham. As he says so well, Governor Harvey’s fundamental weakness was his failure to maintain a working balance between the demands of the Crown and the independent spirit of a pioneer English people. In this judgment, as in others throughout the book, Professor Morton concurs with Thomas Wertenbaker’s view of the Virginians as a freedom-loving people. Very rarely does he make a debatable statement, such as: “Had the spirit of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 been extended in full to the American colonies, there might never have been a revolution in 1776.”

Although the books are generally organized on a chronological basis, the author comprehends within each period the multiple aspects of human living; social, economic, political, and religious developments are all brought into focus. The author places special emphasis on what he considers to be a comparatively neglected phase of Virginia colonial history, namely, the constant westward expansion, and, in the first volume, he highlights one of the early pioneers in this movement, Abraham Wood. Volume II tends to be more topical. Approximately eight chapters are devoted to Governor Spotswood’s administration, dealing with land grants, expansion, tobacco laws, relations with the Assembly, and difficulties concerning church affairs. The last chapter, “Virginia in 1763,” gives a skillful account of the maturity Virginia had achieved on the eve of the Revolutionary conflict.

What the author intends and what he presents is a valuable factual exposition which informs the reader on a wealth of subjects: the inauguration of slavery, the character of indentured servitude, the origin of the plantation system, the reasons for the failure of the Virginia Company, the
nature of relations with the Indians, the difficulty of regulating supply and demand in tobacco production, conflicts between clergy and people, political controversies, legislative procedure, relations with the mother country, etc. In addition, the reader comes to know the outstanding personalities of the colony. Yet, the book leaves room for the specialist to ask himself a good many questions which it does not raise or attempt to answer, and which, possibly, cannot be answered for lack of necessary evidence. Could it be possible that, allowing for local variations, Governor Berkeley's downfall in Virginia and the revolt against the Green Spring clique was an overseas version of Clarendon's fall and the repudiation of the Long Parliament of the English Restoration? G. N. Clark's explanation of the latter, that it was the refusal of the nonprivileged to remain submissive any longer to the privileged for the sake of maintaining a stable political order known to them only by its burdens, seems completely relevant here. Professor Morton does not draw the parallel, but he gives copious facts to document such a thesis. Again, this reader would like a more extensive analysis of the switch made by Robert Beverley and Philip Ludwell from being ardent supporters of the governor to being leaders of the opposition. Professor Morton hints at an explanation when he says that "though Berkeley became arbitrary and autocratic, his interests were rooted in Virginia," but this is not probed. The same is true in dealing with Commissary Blair's political influence in the making and unmaking of Virginia governors, and there is no mention of John Locke's collaboration in unseating Governor Andros in favor of Nicholson. On the other hand, it may be impossible to comprehend adequately the objectives of such men as Blair, Ludwell, and Beverley, or the complex personalities of men like Nicholson. Professor Morton's two volumes do have the virtue of making these men better known to us and of putting them into a well-synthesized perspective of their times.

Physically the volumes are well constructed, attractively bound and boxed, and illustrated with copies of paintings or artifacts (including a most attractive frontispiece in color of Queen Elizabeth I by Marcus Gheeraerts the elder), as well as excellent original maps. The bibliography is divided between the two volumes, and there is an accurate, complete index at the end of the second volume. In short, Colonial Virginia lends well-deserved distinction to the reputations of Dr. Morton, the Virginia Historical Society, and the University of North Carolina Press.

St. Joseph's College for Women
Brooklyn, N. Y.  
Sister Joan de Lourdes Leonard


Dr. Hagan's book provides an admirably succinct and intelligible account of a confused and confusing subject, that of the theory and practice of
United States Indian policy. The historical antecedents of Federal policies, those of the British colonial governments, are discussed in the first of the book’s six chapters; Federal policies, from their inauspicious beginnings through the era of military subjection and reservations, diversity of schemes for assimilation or segregation, and assorted fraud, ineptitude, and misplaced good intentions to the more enlightened, if not uniformly wise, programs of recent years, are dealt with in the remainder of the volume.

From their first contact with European civilization the static Indian cultures were doomed, though that fact may not have been immediately apparent. Indeed, some cultures, like that of the Plains Indians, were stimulated to new growth, though such late flowering usually was brief. That of the Plains lasted long enough to give us our stereotyped picture of the Indian, but died with the destruction of the buffalo herds.

The extreme solution of the Indian problem, eradication of the Indians themselves, seems to have had few serious advocates. Eventually, the question was to be one of the degree and rate of assimilation or adjustment to white culture and of the means to be used in bringing this about. In practice, many whites and Indians were slow to admit that acculturation was either desirable or necessary; and difficulties were increased in the first place by the fact that British settlers and their governments, both before and after independence, usually regarded Indians as outsiders, and, subsequently, by the fact that a long period of intermittent hostility interfered with the administration of any Federal program other than the obvious military one.

It seems unlikely that any replacement of one race or culture by another has occasioned so much soul searching, disagreement, and self-criticism on the part of the victors. Dr. Hagan does not belittle or excuse the blundering and dishonesty that so damaged the effectiveness of even the best intended Federal programs. On the other hand, he makes it clear that many difficulties were unavoidable. Lack of responsible governments made Indian groups difficult to deal with; Indians did not agree among themselves, or questioned the need for changing their living habits; among the Indians’ friends the most devoted were not necessarily the wisest, and they, too, disagreed about what policies should be followed; finally, diversity of Indian background and condition made it impossible to set up a program equally applicable to all groups.

Inevitably, a few errors will creep into so inclusive a study. Readers no doubt will point out that King Philip was shot, not captured (p. 14), and that the peace terms of 1764 did not separate white captives from their half-Indian children (p. 24): these children, too, were to be surrendered. Typographical errors are few, and Jeffrey Amherst probably illustrates the natural impulse to “correct” the general’s own spelling. Such European political terms as “empire,” “liege lords,” and “balance of power” (pp. 6, 17) may be deceptive when applied to Indian groups, and Pennsylvanians may feel that statements about Quaker failure and the expulsion of the Delawares (pp. 15–16) deserve clarification; but, in general, one of the chief
merits of the book results from the author's ability to condense. A selection of thirteen illustrations, documenting various stages of Indian transition from native to European culture, are well reproduced, and the book is well printed.

The brevity which is a virtue in the text is less fortunate in the title, however, which seems to promise an ethnological treatment; and even the reader aware that this volume is one in the Chicago History of American Civilization must learn from the text that it is a history not of the American Indians but of Indian-white relations.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission

WILLIAM A. HUNTER


This book deals mainly with the financing of the American Revolutionary War and the solution of the resulting financial problems by a new and stronger government and Hamilton's funding system. The weakness of the Continental Congress led to the use of fiscal devices which have long been regarded as unfortunate, though possibly the best which could have been devised in the emergency. The general economic results were the inadequate supply of the American troops, the inequitable apportionment of the economic burden of the war, a currency of uncertain and depreciating purchasing power, and the emergence of a class of new rich. Philadelphians will be especially interested in the description of the role which Robert Morris played in the administration of American finances.

Fiscal chaos led to a demand for a stronger government, one strong enough to practice “sound” finance. This volume gives an extended account of the power struggle called forth by this financial situation. Then, as now, the power to appropriate public money, the ability to borrow, and the capacity to tax were matters of lively controversy.

This study is comprehensive and thorough. Wherever possible, quantitative data are given. Of especial merit are the accounts of the conflicting attitudes of interest groups. No lecturer on early American history can afford to neglect this thorough presentation of the relations between politics and economics.

Claremont Men's College

WALTER B. SMITH

This is a fascinating, almost intuitive, inquiry into the background of the generally conservative pattern of social behavior noted in early nineteenth-century United States. The study begins with the grouping of forces to withstand the threats of the French Revolution; it ends with the rupture of the “united front” through denominational differences.

Of interest is the degree of intimate contact, by its critics called British colonialism, even in time of war, between British and American groups engaged in the effort to maintain the status quo by improving the manners and morals of the rank and file; the importance of such informal forces as the British “Clapham Sect” and its American counterparts, the “Andover group” and others like unto it. By the use of modern terminology, Professor Foster suggests the emergence of an American “united front,” eminent individuals of different religious persuasions standing firmly together and pressing on with an “ideological warfare,” a struggle for the minds of men. Lawyers they were, judges, politicians, businessmen, and clergymen, operating through organizations of their own making outside the churches, using principles now known as mass production, and spreading tracts, posters, Bibles, all packaged, priced, and advertised, throughout an expanding national market. Though the “united front” did not emerge formally as a political faction, its methods were surely political, and it most certainly held that free institutions withered without “the strong control of God’s government.”

The “united front,” born of the hour of need when a new nation was in danger from internal discord, convinced that it had conquered that threat, ventured its protecting arms toward the South, the West, the city and the world; unity disappeared before the increase of sectarian concerns and dissipated the front’s efforts. Perhaps the Young Men’s Christian Association a few years in the future was to be its spiritual descendant.

Rutgers University
Russell E. Francis


In many respects this book is a fine survey in brief compass of a dynamic period of our national history. It traces in ten chapters of less than two hundred pages the course of the nation from the beginning of the nineteenth century until 1846, when sectional conflicts reached increasing heights of bitterness before resolving themselves in civil war. Mr. Wiltse has brought to this book the keen insights, the pithy characterizations, and the lively
writing that we have come to associate with him. One is struck, for instance, by his dubbing Andrew Jackson "a latter-day Joshua who would at last lead his people into the promised land that Jefferson, for his political sins, had only glimpsed from the mountain top" (p. 96).

Mr. Wiltse's conclusions are that "the United States by 1846 had indeed become a nation"; that, given the circumstances of that year, "the internal struggle was capable of only one ultimate solution," despite the growing unity of the South; and that the "kind of particularism represented by state rights became obsolete when the advance of the industrial revolution concentrated physical power at the only governmental level with resources adequate to support the new technology, and enough disinterestedness to seek reconciliation of conflicting interests."

Such an interpretation is an interesting one, but it seems to be simply one more variant of the usual story of developing sectional conflict, differing chiefly in its emphasis upon the inevitable defeat of the South as a result of the growing spirit of nationalism. Under these circumstances, the book seemed less "frankly revisionist" and the interpretation less "fresh" than the editor's introduction would lead one to suppose.

It is not for this reason that the book is a disappointment. This arises from its unreliability in matters of fact. Considering that it was written by Mr. Wiltse and that it forms part of a series under the editorship of David Donald, both of whom have long since supplied overwhelming evidence of their historical competence, this seems almost incredible, but it is nevertheless true. One of the six volumes of The Making of America Series, "designed to make the best historical scholarship available to the general reader who is not a specialist in American history," the book should certainly stress accuracy since the laymen for whom it is written would lack the background to detect misstatements. The eternal repetitions of factual errors once committed to print are all too well known to historians.

Book reviews should avoid quibbling over typographical errors and obvious slips of the pen, but the mistakes in this volume do not seem to be of that variety, and the worst of them could be highly misleading to any layman attempting to use the book as a source of information. Some of the minor errors relate to state and regional history, such as the statements (p. 8) that the Pennsylvania Germans were "largely of Amish faith" and that Buchanan's forebears in Pennsylvania "remained in the vicinity of Lancaster." Similarly, it is more picturesque than accurate to describe the region south of the Cumberland River (p. 11) as being made up of "pine barrens and canebrakes." Whether there are similar misstatements in generalizations on other local areas, I cannot say.

More significant are the erroneous statement (p. 134) that Robert Owen purchased the site of New Harmony, Indiana, from the Shakers rather than Rapp's Harmony Society, and the assertion (p. 49) that the British fleet in September, 1814, was "based" at Cape Cod. Even the unmentioned British invasion of Maine during that month would hardly justify this last asser-
tion, and certainly the few raids on the shores of Cape Cod do not. Here could be the starting point for an interesting bit of folklore.

Most surprising of all is Mr. Wiltse's apparent lack of understanding of the series of laws which made up the Jeffersonian restrictive system. He has quite evidently confused nonimportation and nonintercourse, leaving the latter almost without reference in his pages. On page 36 he asserts that "after March 1, 1809, only the nonimportation act which had gone into effect at the same time as the embargo, remained in effect. . . ." On page 38 he states that David Erskine "offered to exempt all American vessels from operation of the Orders in Council if the United States would only repeal non-importation [sic] against Great Britain and continue to impose it on France." Nonintercourse is mentioned only on page 39, when Mr. Wiltse discusses the maneuvers of Napoleon to take advantage of the provisions of Macon's Bill No. 2 (not mentioned by name).

It is regrettable that a book otherwise so rewarding must be reviewed in this fashion, but it is quite clear that here is a good book which cannot be relied on with confidence in its statement of historical facts.

Rice University

S. W. Higginbotham


Charles Francis Adams is the latest in the distinguished Adams line to become the subject of a full and careful study. Overshadowed by his father, John Quincy, much of whose life is important history, and by his son Henry, who had so much to say to the twentieth century, Charles Francis has offered the biographer few attractions and much difficulty. What is one to do with a man whose natural bent was for solitary scholarship,* whose unwillingness to become a crusader or an office seeker was as strong as his sense of duty, whose public career was a series of almost disconnected scenes? From "the greatest Iceberg in the Northern hemisphere," as Marcus Morton called him, came no flashing phrases, no dramatic friendships or quarrels, not even the tension of strong ambition frustrated or achieved.

Mr. Duberman's work accepts his subject in his own terms and presents a thorough and balanced account of Adams' career based on meticulous use of the sources. As we know, the sources are nothing if not ample: besides the almost overwhelming bulk of the Adams Family papers, the author lists eighty-six "other manuscript collections used." This is a major effort of scholarship, dealing with the various issues in American public life from 1832 to 1872 in which Adams took part.

*It might be noted that he contributed an address on John Hancock to the first volume of The Pennsylvania Magazine.
Far from certain as a young man where his career should lie, or indeed whether he would not accept a life of obscurity, Adams' first actual brush with politics came in the anti-Masonic movement in Massachusetts. This did not lead very far, but before long he entered the Massachusetts House as a Whig, thus inaugurating a twenty-year period of party activity which eventually brought Adams to national importance and which is the core—and nearly half—of Mr. Duberman's volume. This is not to say that Charles Francis or any other Adams was a good party man. The author follows in detail the kaleidoscope of change in Massachusetts parties: Cotton and Conscience Whigs, Free Soilers and Democrats, coalitionists and Know-Nothings, finally Republicans. Through all changes we see Adams moving as the independent man of conscience; rejecting elective posts he could have had; refused, until over fifty, the nomination to Congress he would have liked; constantly gaining in prestige and lacking in influence. Despite his family connections with Washington and his nomination as vice-presidential candidate of the Free Soil party in 1848, it was really only during his seventeen months as a Congressman (1859-1861) that he was an actor on the national scene. It was apparently these months that clinched another Adams career. As one of the most active, firm, and moderate Republicans during the secession winter, Adams figured prominently as a possible cabinet member. In the issue, Seward secured his appointment for the mission to England in which he won the solid esteem of contemporaries and posterity alike.

Mr. Duberman's work would probably have satisfied Adams himself, whose clear and dispassionate mind and strong sense of traditional right the author well understands. The reviewer, however, must confess to doubts that the work as a whole is an entirely satisfactory solution to a difficult problem in relating history to biography. If the former, the long central section on the politics of the 1840's and 1850's is too completely Adams, lacking the breadth and clarity of a historical study as such. The same comment applies to the English mission, where, despite the dust-cover claim of a "complete account," a definitive rewriting of this chapter of diplomacy is impossible on such a limited scale and with this approach. (The glut of cotton in Europe in 1861 is documented by a single letter, from a bishop, in the Seward Papers!) On the other hand, Mr. Duberman has kept the more biographical side under terribly rigid control. No introduction or explanation is given of Adams' long and important connection with Seward; the quarrel with Sumner lacks its personal dimension; there is no development of the social and political contacts—or the coin collecting—which the London mission entailed. Only the most tantalizing peeps at Adams' domestic life are permitted. One cannot but wish that the author had been allowed a larger canvas, or that he had decided on some limitation of his subject.

Clark University  Henry Donaldson Jordan

Despite all that may be said against Louis Agassiz, and one is tempted to say a good deal, he was a major influence not only on the popular conception of science, but also on the teaching of science in the United States in the nineteenth century. The great museums of natural history in this country are a direct outgrowth of Louis Agassiz's conceptions and of his work and that of his students. He was partly a charlatan, and the American audiences whom he held enthralled were part educated and part taken in. But even the Bostonians who contributed so liberally to support Agassiz's large plans were taken in as much by their own intellectual pretensions as by Agassiz's charm.

Edward Lurie presents a vivid picture of Louis Agassiz, and Agassiz was a man of such strong personality that one cannot be indifferent to him even now, eighty-eight years after his death. Mr. Lurie is scrupulously fair in presenting the quarrels and controversies in which Agassiz was involved and is presumably sympathetic toward Agassiz; yet, taken in the kindest light, the case he presents against him is damning.

To begin, we see Agassiz as a young man of insatiable ambition with a very romantic conception of himself and his future role in the world. From 1833, when he published the first part of his work on fossil fishes, Mr. Lurie says that Agassiz was "convinced that it was his mission to command the entire world of natural history" (p. 80) and the rest of his life was to represent his effort to accomplish this mission. If there is one weakness to Mr. Lurie's treatment of Agassiz it is his failure to be critical of the neurotic and even megalomaniac nature of these ambitions. Moreover, he makes no judgment of the conduct into which Agassiz's ambitions led him nor does he permit himself pity for Agassiz's victims. Agassiz's first wife Cécile left his household because she objected to the moral character of one of his assistants, whom Agassiz nevertheless refused to dismiss. Later, she became ill and died after Agassiz had gone, without her, to America. Lurie sympathetically describes Agassiz as grief-stricken at her death. He does not mention the fact that it would have been more to the point if Agassiz had treated Cécile properly while she was alive.

Agassiz's furious attack upon James D. Forbes, his grossly unjust treatment of James Dwight Dana when Dana had the temerity to criticize false information given in a geological map by Jules Marcos, one of Agassiz's friends—these, and more, Mr. Lurie presents in full, scrupulous, and exact detail, with excellent documentation, but without one word of protest at the character of a man who could do such things. Mr. Lurie still seems to take Agassiz at his own romantic estimate of himself. In truth, Agassiz was a romantic in natural history when natural history was ceasing to be romance and beginning to be science. Despite the scientific reputation which Agassiz possessed when he came to America, he had in a few years fallen sadly
behind other American scientists in his understanding of the significance of contemporary developments in geology and natural history. The reason for this, in part, was that he was spending his time in lecturing, traveling, raising money and amassing collections rather than in the patient accomplishment of scientific research. Threatened periodically with financial bankruptcy, he was in 1859 overtaken by intellectual bankruptcy when the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species* brought him face to face with a theory, based partly on facts he had discovered, which he could neither understand nor successfully oppose.

Great as was Agassiz's scientific activity, it is difficult now to point to his actual contributions. The glacial theory is his only theoretical contribution of permanent value. His books are no longer read. Yet, in old age Agassiz was still respected as a naturalist by such a discerning person as Asa Gray, who had fought with him over Darwin's theory. Agassiz's identifications and descriptions of fossil and living fishes are doubtless still consulted by taxonomists. But it is as a showman and an organizer—as a startling personality on the stage of science—that Agassiz is remembered. It is a measure of Mr. Lurie's success as a biographer that this memory is fully and successfully evoked in this book.

*Yale University*  
Leonard G. Wilson


Power is the gate through which individuals and groups proceed toward the satisfaction of their goals. By the middle of the nineteenth century the many pressure and special interest groups in American society were dividing into two antagonistic superpower structures known as the North and the South. Aristo-agrarians versus industrialists, free traders versus protectionists, proponents of a laissez-faire concept of government versus those advocating encouragement to corporate enterprise, and slaves versus wage workers and independent farmers represent the major contesting groups. Leaders in both sections recognized that those who pursue power assiduously are likely to exert a strong influence on the character of their fields of endeavor; they also recognized the political and economic advantages accruing from control of the Federal government. Their struggle for the acquisition and retention of such power in the years 1845–1877 outlines the central theme of Professor Nichols' *Stakes of Power.*

In the 1840's, the South still retained the dominant role in the national government that it had long enjoyed, but during that decade an evolution in the sectional power structure began. The Republican Party came to the
forefront, and the power pendulum swung toward the North. Through the Civil War and the years immediately following, the Republicans retained their dominance, but gradually they went into an eclipse. As public attention was focused on the nation's growth, "power was passing into the hands of men of enterprise outside of politics."

To contribute to an understanding of this central theme, Professor Nichols has skillfully interwoven numerous secondary power skirmishes. For example, during the war both Lincoln and Jefferson Davis were confronted with persistent opposition. Davis understood the advantages of centralized power in the war years, but the southern heritage of individual state dominance forced him "to strain every resource to establish a government and mobilize a war machine." Lincoln endured a similar fate. He was called upon to repress not only the Radicals within his own party in order to retain control of the war, but also the Democrats who "continued their battle for existence by seeking possession of state power."

After the war both sections experienced new departures. In the South, power passed from the great planters to farmers with relatively few acres and little imagination; in the North, the "man of money, not politics" provided the new leadership. These trends are portrayed as parts of a national reconstruction, a political and economic reordering in which the "Southern problem" is treated as an integral part of the more complex changes affecting the nation.

Serving as the watershed of this dramatic era, the Civil War has inspired more literature of varied types than any other event in our national history. The author himself has contributed substantially. The Democratic Political Machine, 1850-1854, Franklin Pierce, and the Pulitzer Prize-winning Disruption of American Democracy indicate his fitness to synthesize and interpret the prewar struggle; without the benefit of such extensive scholarship in the Civil War and Reconstruction years Nichols has provided an equally provocative interpretation in these last parts of The Stakes of Power. David Donald, editor of the projected six-volume Making of America Series, of which this is the second to appear, has properly concluded that "it stands alone as a perceptive treatment" of these critical and controversial years.

With the centennials of various phases of the Civil War now occurring with each passing month, the already voluminous literature relating to the era is being copiously supplemented. Battle and campaign histories, military and political biographies, accounts of individual states and cities at war, the publication of diaries, memoirs, and reminiscences, all accentuate the need for reader perspective if these more specialized writings are to be understood and enjoyed fully. The Stakes of Power supplies such a view to the forest of Civil War literature and makes it possible to identify and appraise individual trees.

*University of Pittsburgh*  
James A. Kehl

This book is a companion piece to the author’s well-known work, A Decade of Sectional Controversy, 1851–1861, published in 1942. In both volumes the approach is political rather than social and intellectual. The organization and functioning of the abolitionist movement are treated only incidentally, and the antislavery argument is analyzed only briefly. Anti-abolitionist sentiment and agitation—North and South—are dealt with somewhat more fully. In this connection, as in the rest of the work, the author has made extensive use of contemporary newspapers, and the footnote citations may be useful to other researchers. Among abolitionist journals, the Pennsylvania Freeman, started in Philadelphia by Benjamin Lundy in 1836, is cited quite often. Little reference is made, however, to the manuscript sources relating to abolitionism.

The heart of this well-organized book is found in a group of chapters treating the relation of the Federal government to slavery and the slavery issue in national politics during the Jacksonian era. The efforts to eliminate abolitionist propaganda from the mails, the Congressional controversy over the handling of antislavery petitions, and the fight over annexing Texas are traced with considerable detail and precision. The complicated history of the various “gag resolutions” and their repeal is thoroughly explored, with numerous citations to the Congressional Globe. Parties and elections are the subject of one brief chapter, and the church splits over slavery supply the theme for another. The last chapter emphasizes international ramifications of the slavery question, especially in relation to Great Britain and the slave trade. There is no conclusion, and the author offers no summary of the results of his researches. The reader is left to find his own answers to such questions as whether the abolitionists did more harm than good and whether the Civil War was an avoidable conflict.

Despite its title, the book is quite unexciting. The handling of this highly controversial and emotionally loaded subject is unusually bland and dispassionate. There is little biographical color and no sensational anecdote. The miscegenation issue connected with Richard M. Johnson’s campaign for the vice-presidency, for example, is completely omitted from the discussion of the election of 1836. Few of the personalities are described or characterized, and even John Quincy Adams, the central figure in the fight against the “gag rule,” does not emerge as a real person. The author’s extraordinary restraint in matters of style and interpretation has resulted in a book less interesting than the subject warrants. There are occasional grammatical lapses and typographical errors, which suggest that the volume was inadequately edited and proofread. There is no bibliography, but the footnotes are comprehensive and appear in their proper place.

Pennsylvania State University Ira V. Brown
The Liberty Line. The Legend of the Underground Railroad. By Larry Gara. (Lexington, Ky.: University of Kentucky Press, 1961. xii, 201 p. Index. $5.00.)

Few readers of this review, I'm sure, have missed the pleasant experience of visiting an old house or inn and having a host or guide point to the trap door in the floor, the passage behind the fireplace, or the tunnel under the barn, and identify it as part of the underground railroad. From Pennsylvania west to Iowa and north into New England it has become an article of faith that virtually every otherwise unexplained empty space once harbored its quota of shrouded fugitives on their way northward to the land of freedom. That one's ancestors were among the righteous folk who served as engineers, conductors, or stationmasters on the "Liberty Line" frequently lends virtue to the ritual of examining these dark and musty corners. Common sense assures us that most of these places never saw a single fugitive, much less a steady stream of runaways. It also reminds us that weak memories, garbled history, and the sales talks of unscrupulous real estate pitchmen have done much to create and perpetuate a legend.

Professor Gara, himself a lover of legends, has no interest in destroying this bit of American folklore, for, as he notes early in this splendid book, "legends are usually compounded of both fact and fancy, and the legend of the underground railroad is no exception." His purpose, rather, is to reconstruct the history of the legend and distinguish between the fact and fancy that have contributed to its growth. Understanding from the beginning that "there is a great deal that will never be known about the underground railroad and its impact on slavery and on the sectional controversy," Gara nevertheless believes that "the legend itself reveals something of the American character and aspirations, and as such is worthy of its own history."

As popularly portrayed, the underground railroad has all the elements of a melodrama. "The villains are the slave catchers with their vicious bloodhounds. The abolitionists, on the other hand, are idealists of fortitude and courage." The railroad itself is a highly articulated and centrally directed mechanism for carrying great masses of meek and defenseless Negro fugitives northward. The entire operation is cloaked in the deepest secrecy, with movements normally taking place only on dark and stormy nights. The details of the legend have been filled in by novelists ranging from Harriet Beecher Stowe to Philip Van Doren Stern. Popular histories such as those of Henrietta Buckmaster and William Breyfogle have carried the legend to a large modern audience, and even professional scholars have not proved entirely immune to its attractions.

Gara argues, after a very thoughtful and comprehensive survey of the entire fugitive slave story, that a would-be runaway slave was never presented with a neat and powerful mechanism for spiriting him off to Canada, that "the relatively few slaves who did escape were primarily dependent on their own resources"; that the abolitionists played a less important part than their memories and reminiscences would have us believe; that there
was little need for the secrecy so frequently portrayed; and, that there never was a national organization or even a clearly defined system covering as much as a state. Finally, Professor Gara maintains that the legend of the underground railroad had its origin in the antebellum period in the recollections of elderly abolitionists, and that its significance lies in “the part it played in the verbal battles which preceded the Civil War” and not in any practical effect it may have had on the institution of slavery itself.

Gara’s book is moderate in tone, closely reasoned, and devastating in its effect. It materially modifies the view of the underground railroad heretofore available to us in the reminiscences of Levi Coffin, Robert C. Smedley, and William Still, as well as the scholarly work of Wilbur H. Siebert. It is the work of a fine historical craftsman.

University of Maryland

David S. Sparks


This book is far more important than the title implies. The author has taken a few threads out of the tapestry of American history and has examined them closely. The significance of threads such as these is often overlooked when the tapestry is viewed as a whole. From the title, and at first glance, the book appears to be the biography of a local eccentric and a contribution to a county’s history. The reader is soon surprised to find that he is exploring fields far beyond the confines of a rural county.

Daniel Drawbaugh (1827–1911) was born in Pennsylvania, the son of a blacksmith. Showing mechanical aptitude as a boy, he followed the pattern of making clocks, rifles, and other devices. He set up a shop at Eberly’s Mills and achieved local prominence as the inventor of such items as a stave joining machine and a measuring faucet. An electric clock, powered by an “earth battery,” was another of his inventions.

Had this been all, few people outside the Cumberland Valley of Pennsylvania would have heard of Daniel Drawbaugh, and his name today would be buried in a few paragraphs in a county history. But, among many other things, Daniel Drawbaugh claimed to have invented a telephone, and this claim, tenuous as it was, was used by others to spearhead years of litigation in the battle against Alexander Graham Bell and his associates. Finally, by the narrow margin of 4 to 3, the Supreme Court of the United States decided in Bell’s favor.

Those interested in the history of American business will find a clear picture of the beginning of the telephone industry and its growth into a great system. Perhaps some of the material given in the book is not new, but even this is worth retelling. Those interested in the history of technology in America will find much of value. One does not need to be a trained engineer to understand the various developments of the early telephone as
outlined in this book. But above all else, the book gives a picture of the American mind in the expansive days marking the beginning of the second century of independence. Men everywhere were seeking opportunity and wealth through technology. A group of such men found Daniel Drawbaugh and used him to wage war against a growing monopoly and at the same time make a profit for themselves.

Alexander Graham Bell was granted a patent March 7, 1876, and his telephone was shown at the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia. Daniel Drawbaugh claimed to have invented a “talking machine” several years before this and to have shown it to many people in the Cumberland Valley. His explanation as to why he had not patented his invention was that he was poverty-stricken. The People’s Telephone Company, made up of a group of financiers, championed Drawbaugh’s cause after he had assigned his rights to the group. The author reproduces the full court decisions in facsimile and these are probably the best part of the book. Unfortunately, the method and care of reproduction leaves much to be desired.

However, the decision of Justice William J. Wallace of the lower court, who found against Drawbaugh, clearly defines the issues and gives a shrewd analysis of Drawbaugh’s character. The justice pointed out that during the period in which Drawbaugh stated he was too poor to pay for a patent, he was able to raise and borrow money for other purposes, as well as being able to buy some real estate. The United States Supreme Court decision is equally interesting. In the clear light of the analysis of the evidence it is apparent that Drawbaugh made a poor showing indeed. Yet the decision was only 4 to 3. Associate Justice Joseph P. Bradley, in the dissenting opinion, defended the cause of the little man against a monopoly when he wrote, “It is perfectly natural for the world to take the part of the man who has already achieved eminence. . . . This principle of human nature may well explain the relative feeling toward Bell and Drawbaugh in reference to the telephone.”

Incidentally, these court decisions call attention to a fact often overlooked. Court decisions are excellent sources for research in history. Often a great amount of data will be found arranged in a clear and orderly manner.

The author studied the hundreds of pages of depositions that were taken before the courts arrived at their decisions. He visited sites and interviewed many people. This has added a human touch to the book. Naturally, it was difficult to organize the vast amount of material gathered and sift the important from the unimportant. The author has handled this difficulty quite well.

The book is obviously a labor of love on the part of Warren J. Harder, the author. He has devoted years to searching out all that it was possible to find on Daniel Drawbaugh. The reader senses the author’s enthusiasm and sincerity. The writers of books such as this one should be encouraged, for in no other way will a vast amount of unusual but important historical data be gathered together, preserved, and made readily available.

Philadelphia

GEORGE H. ECKHARDT

Richard Harding Davis was one of those rare figures whose careers seem to distill the very essence of a time. Perhaps more than any of his contemporaries, he caught the imagination and lived out the dreams of middle-class America at the turn of this century. The son of a literary mother and a father who edited the Philadelphia Public Ledger, he passed effortlessly through a spotty education at Lehigh and Johns Hopkins universities to quick success in fin de siècle New York. As a man about town, Davis flitted through the 1900 equivalent of café society on both sides of the Atlantic. Charles Dana Gibson copied his rugged good looks for the male equivalent of the Gibson Girl; he could take credit for introducing the avocado to United States palates; his second wife was a reigning music hall favorite.

But it was as a reporter, popular writer, world traveler, and war correspondent that Davis gained his greatest renown. He moved easily and successfully in the newspaper world of Arthur Brisbane and William Randolph Hearst. He wrote stories and novels of gallantry and romance which sold as widely as they were reviewed unfavorably, and he quickly became an associate editor of Harper's Weekly. As a reporter for Hearst, Davis made a substantial contribution to American impressions of the Spanish-American War with vivid descriptions of inept logistics and Rough Rider bravery. More Americans learned about Latin America, Africa, and the East from him than from anyone else. He described King Leopold’s bestialities in the Congo, and reported on conflicts remote and strange: the Russo-Japanese War, the struggle between Greece and Turkey.

Thus, he brought images of the outside world to a people newly conscious of their place in the international order. His was the same role as that of the African explorers of the latter 1800’s, or of the young Winston Churchill of the Boer War: to purvey the exotic and the violent to the urban, humdrum, bourgeois societies of pre-1914 England and America. Appropriately enough, Davis died in 1916 while covering World War I, the end of the society for which he was the beau ideal.

But there were unsuspected complexities to “Richard the Lion Harding.” His first marriage was to a woman who wanted a traveling companion and who declared of her relationship to Davis: “We will simply be as brother and sister.” Even after his second and more normal marriage, Davis remained a compulsive traveler, convincing himself that duty—and not violence, adventure, romance—called him to the Balkans or to the western front. Mr. Langford perceptively sees that Davis’ personality—his devil-may-care innocence, a perpetual youthfulness which marred his writing and gave his career an inescapably ludicrous cast—depended heavily upon his relationship with his mother. Rebecca Harding Davis earned a literary reputation in 1861 by publishing “Life in the Iron Mills,” a pioneering piece of American realism, in the Atlantic. Able, strong-willed, intensely
practical, she asserted a classical dominance over her son. He wrote to her almost daily in the course of his peripatetic career, and married for love only after her death, when he was forty-eight. His literary career, and his emotional maturation, were stunted by the intensity of his maternal dependence. To many of his contemporaries he seemed like an overgrown child—one of Hemingway's "great American boy-men." While Davis shared friendship and adventure with Stephen Crane, he never matched the other's creative self-discipline. What might have been a literary talent never was more than an adjunct to his public image.

Davis' experience may be read as an analogue of pre-World War I America. The air of frivolity and weightlessness characterizing his career was the source of his special appeal to contemporaries. Booth Tarkington recalled that Davis bade the youth of his time "see that pain is negligible, that fear is a joke, and that the world is poignantly interesting, joyously lovable." But these were hardly viable values after 1914. It is not surprising that Richard Harding Davis and his writings faded quickly from the educated American consciousness.

This is a peculiar story, rich meat for the literary or historical symbolist. There is, perhaps, pathos in the mother-son relationship, and in this flawed figure serving as the surrogate of his age and class. Or perhaps there is high humor, almost farce, in the situation. Mr. Langford steers clear of either. He tells his tale in a straightforward tone and style with little interpretive analysis beyond the insight of the mother-son relationship. His treatment thus is peculiarly like his subject: in his hands a character whose role is complex and suggestive becomes, at base, an American innocent.

University of Pennsylvania

Morton Keller


Two hundred years ago, Montreal, French stronghold in Canada, fell to the British Army, and its capitulation brought to a close the American phase of what Lawrence Henry Gipson has called "the great war for the Empire." It is appropriate that this year the Associates of the John Carter Brown Library should choose this major date in North American history as the theme for one of their publications. Using maps, prints, broadsides, and title pages of pamphlets from the Library's collections, they have issued an attractive documentary album which highlights the important places, battles, and personalities of the French and Indian War. The actions represented range the Atlantic frontier from Canada to the West Indies. The thirty-seven illustrations are handsomely reproduced by the Meriden Gravure Company, and are followed by a catalogue in which each picture is annotated. Copies of this album may be purchased from the John Carter Brown Library.

There has been such a concentration of books published on the Civil War that it is refreshing to be reminded that our history did not come to a halt in 1865. Mr. Blay’s picture book has caught many an important aspect of life in America during the years which followed the great conflict.

His pictures, supported by brief but sympathetic descriptive paragraphs, are drawn mainly from periodicals of the day—Harper’s Weekly, Scribner’s Monthly, The Century Magazine, and Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper—and they are organized under such headings as Reconstruction, Everyday Life, Politics, Town and Country, Capital and Labor, The Arts in America, Progress and Growth, The Last Frontier, and War With Spain. The result of this somewhat kaleidoscopic treatment is a pleasant and attractive volume which should do something to focus attention on a part of our national development currently in eclipse.

Hagley Museum Fellowships

The University of Delaware, in co-operation with the Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation, will award two Hagley Museum Fellowships in April, 1962, for the academic years 1962–1964. Recipients of these grants take graduate work in history and related fields at the University of Delaware. In addition, they spend half of each week during the academic year at the Hagley Museum, Wilmington, Delaware, where they receive training in museum work, and at the Eleutherian Mills Historical Library, where they conduct research. They complete their work, including a thesis, in two years, and graduate from the University of Delaware with a Master of Arts degree in American history. The program is of special interest to those who wish to study the development of American industry and technology.

Each fellowship carries an annual stipend of $1,800, and is renewable upon satisfactory completion of the first year. Applications should be received by March 5, 1962. For further details, address the Chairman, Department of History, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware.