BOOK REVIEWS


This compilation does not belong to the usual “Letters and Papers” genre; it might better be described with editor Izerda’s term “documentary chronicle.” To be sure, there are ample writings of Lafayette himself. This volume contains well over a hundred letters, memoirs, proposals, etc.; some have never been published before, others are restored to original text, having been “pruned” in earlier publication. To this selection are added letters to Lafayette and also—a major innovation—things written about him by his contemporaries. The editors have wisely kept commentary and editorial apparatus to a minimum, for the documents speak for themselves, and very effectively, too. A seventy-page appendix contains original texts of documents in French, a boon to researchers who write in French and need to cite in that language (a spot check of translations shows them to be accurate and well turned).

Varied as the documents are, they offer the reader the pieces of a “do-it-yourself” biography; these pieces can be arranged to present an image of the Marquis quite different from the heroic portrait we are accustomed to. To be sure, some of the traits we would expect are indeed there. Lafayette is brave, generous, genuinely drawn to American life. The impetuosity of youth is there too, that youth so stressed by his best biographer, Louis Gottschalk. That writer even suggested there might have been “skillful exploitation of Lafayette’s willingness to serve” on the part of his hosts. But the documents produced here give another impression, at least to this reader: Lafayette is charming, ingratiating, manipulative beyond his years. He knows little of war, but he knows how to please, and so he obtains a command hardly justified by his limited experience. He boasts in letters to France that he is closer to Washington “than anyone else” and that he has made of Henry Laurens “a special friend.” Within a short time he has become an intermediary between the Americans and foreign officers in their service, so that a surprising amount of his correspondence deals with placing clients, friends, and protégés. Of his fellow countrymen in the New World he writes: “They do not understand why I am the only Frenchman in America who is loved”—a clue that his role was not universally appreciated. Lafayette wrote that he often had to reconcile Pulaski with the Americans, because Pulaski “insisted on being a Pole wherever he
went.” Lafayette does not make this mistake, having “adopted American customs.” And yet he remains a foreigner, and a nobleman. When he signed his letters he invariably styled himself “the Marquis de Lafayette.”

For Gottschalk, the youthful Lafayette was a prey of moods, and so his letters are in different “veins.” But it is also possible that an engine of ambition drove him to something akin to duplicity in his correspondence. While attempting to extract a command from Washington, he assures him he would be “very happy” to remain in America without one. To friends at the French court he writes: “If there is to be an invasion of England, for God’s sake don’t forget me!” To his wife he sends these reassuring words: “As soon as I can honestly desert, dear heart, I am all yours.” In short, the Lafayette who appears on these pages is a complex and not wholly admirable young man. One can only await the next volume and the traits of character—good and bad—which it will reveal.

University of Georgia

LEE KENNETT


This small work deals with the “evolution of denominational order” among the Anglicans, Baptists, Presbyterians and Quakers in the Delaware Valley before 1730. These four of the five major American Protestant groups (Congregationalists not being present in this valley) were active in an area which “offered fertile ground for the growth of democracy in church government” (p. 75). Although Christianity was in some general way supported by the various governments and charters, there was no state church with its resulting taxes, imposed clergy, etc. Yet, Butler is convinced that a comparative study of the denominational development in this Delaware Valley area challenges the “democratic interpretation of the colonial denomination order” put forth by Sydney Allstrom, Sidney Mead, and Timothy Smith (under the influence of “Frederick Jackson Turner’s democratic interpretation of American political and cultural development”). Butler limits his analysis of “the character of denominational order” to “polity and the institutional gatherings that implemented it” (p. 7), all the while recognizing that this “never expressed the whole of denominational life.” Operating on this thesis, the author puts forth his view that the Church of England failed to prosper in the Delaware Valley largely because the Anglicans “never succeeded in extending their own traditional non-democratic ecclesiastical institutions overseas.” The prospering of the Quakers, Baptists, and Presbyterians, however, stemmed
from their success in transferring their "own traditional non-democratic ecclesiastical institutions" (p. 78).

Although there is no statement in the volume to support such a view, there is much that suggests that Butler's treatment is largely a thesis or dissertation completed about 1970. There are very few references to any publications after that date. Examination of more recent studies (especially in Quakerism) would have improved the work.

There are a number of Butler's judgments that need to be questioned. For example, he says (p. 31) that the English Quaker "apparatus" was transferred to the Delaware Valley within five years of the colonization of Philadelphia. Yet there is no reference to the very important English body known as the Meeting for Sufferings (which did not make a Philadelphia appearance for some generations). Also we read (p. 75) that the state-supported churches in the South always had larger folio wings than the dissenters, something not always true at all times in all colonies.

It is this reviewer's opinion that Butler does not fully understand the character or role of "ministers" in early Quakerism. Nor does he seem to have any awareness of the early Quaker emphasis on equality. Likewise, his knowledge of Quaker organization, policy, and life appears limited to that in England and the Delaware Valley. Quakerism appeared both in Maryland and New England by 1656 and was already full grown (with Monthly Meetings and Yearly Meetings) long before Pennsylvania was established. Many Maryland Friends removed to Pennsylvania quite early, taking a more "democratic" outlook with them.

A more careful proofing would have improved this work. "Marred" should have been "married" (p. 27). Robert Lodge appears, unfortunately, as Lange (p. 18). The ringing denunciation of slavery in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting came in 1758 and not 1756 (p. 40), suggesting that Butler would have benefited from using Drake's Quakers and Slavery (which is not cited in the copious notes to be found in this volume). In addition to better proofreading, a more thorough examination of available materials might possibly have led Butler to some dates other than 1661 for the establishment of London Yearly Meeting (p. 19) and 1685 for Philadelphia Yearly Meeting (p. 6).

Southern Methodist University

Kenneth L. Carroll


Dorothy Ann Lipson's case study of Freemasonry in Federalist and antebellum Connecticut is an unusual and useful work. Beyond the numerous institutional studies, histories of lodges and grand lodges, for example,
the scholarly literature on American Masonry is surprisingly sparse. Few historians have attempted to relate Masonry to the broad social and cultural contexts in which it existed and, generally, flourished, and when they have, it has frequently been as a by-product of an interest in anti-masonry. Lipson’s concern is with Freemasonry itself—what it was, how it spread, what attracted men to it—and with the varied consequences of Masonic activities, for the members and the communities of which they were a part. An unusually rich source, the records of Putnam Lodge No. 46, founded in 1801 with its membership drawn from five towns in northeastern Connecticut, provides the material from which she is able to draw at least tentative answers to her questions.

The roots of Connecticut Masonry are traced to the “speculative Freemasonry” of early eighteenth-century England, which, Lipson holds, was consciously designed by its founders to be a useful social movement, responsive to anxieties generated by rapid social change. Freemasons gained not only a system of universal morality, communicated through ritual and symbol, but a sense of fraternity, location, and order, and an opportunity for conviviality as well. Similar combinations of the useful and the pleasurable attracted members to an Americanized Masonry in the years after the Revolution.

In Connecticut, with its established church and communitarian tradition, Freemasonry held an additional attraction: it offered an alternative to the Standing Order and an institutional platform for dissent. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, as the Grand Lodge perfected the organization of its forty-five subordinate lodges, Freemasonry, with its distinctive tenets and style, had emerged as a counterestablishment.

The relationship between Freemasonry and Christianity proved to be the most enduring source of tension. Defenders of Congregationalist orthodoxy were quick to discern the Masonic threat: “that some members used the association as if it were a religious denomination or ... an alternative to religion” (p. 8). Lipson details the efforts of Christian Masons and Masonic Christians to devise some pattern of accommodation, efforts more successful with the “countervailing churches” than with Congregationalists who stood aloof and uneasy. When, after 1826, political antimasonry erupted in Connecticut, its content was strongly religious and much of its support was drawn from old-line Congregationalists.

Lipson’s corrective to many of the studies of antimasonry is the reminder that the same society, the same culture, produced both the Masons and their adversaries. The Masons of Putnam Lodge looked much like their neighbors; they came from all income levels and occupational groups and represented the community’s full range of political and religious affiliations. If higher proportions of Masons than of the general adult male population tended to be engaged in nonagricultural pursuits, possess greater taxable wealth, and be more politically active, should this not be
expected in a group that attracted many talented young men? Yet, Lipson suggests, there were in the Masonic culture she so carefully delineates elements, acceptable and even comforting to members, that stirred in neighbors a suspicion that Masonry pre-empted important functions of both church and state. Such suspicion fueled the Antimasonic movement of the 1830s.

Freemasonry in Federalist Connecticut, 1789-1835, a revised version of the author's 1974 doctoral dissertation at the University of Connecticut, is offered as a prototype for similar case studies. Pennsylvania Freemasonry, situated in a heterogeneous and religiously diverse population, might provide an interesting contrast.

Saint Joseph's College, Philadelphia

FRANK GERRITY


These superb volumes are the first two of some dozen which will eventually be published of the Papers of Benjamin Henry Latrobe, the great architect, engineer, artist in watercolor and naturalist. The two under discussion here cover the period 1795-1798, and the third volume will comprise journals written between 1799 and 1820, the year he died. This will complete Series I. The next series will be devoted to architectural and engineering drawings; Series III will be a single folio of examples from his sketchbooks, including both sketches and watercolors, and the format will approximate that of the drawingbooks. The final series will contain some four to six volumes of correspondence pertinent to the development of his career as architect and engineer, and other material relating to his varied achievements. If the succeeding volumes match the scholarship and the beauty of the first two, the Papers of Latrobe will be a monument to American historical editing and publishing.

Volume I contains a useful plan of the work, a genealogy of the Latrobe family, a concise and brilliant introduction to Latrobe's life and achievements, a stirring account, with drawings, of his dangerous voyage to Norfolk from London, and miscellaneous journals.

The introduction points out quite rightly that Latrobe was the most important and influential American engineer of his day, but one would hesitate to agree with the editors' conclusion that he was the father of the American architectural profession. Credit should also be given to Jefferson's part in establishing it, for his ideas inspired two of Latrobe's finest buildings: the Bank of Pennsylvania and the Baltimore Catholic Cathedral. Jefferson's constant advice and support enabled Latrobe to create a noble
building at the Capitol in Washington. While Latrobe gave Jefferson some
important ideas for the University of Virginia, it was the latter who
organized the complex and produced a brilliant design for the Rotunda,
the focal point of the whole concept. Such has been the importance and
the influence of this masterpiece that it received the Bicentennial Award of
the American Institute of Architects for the best design erected in this
country since 1776. At Monticello Jefferson had trained himself in the
building arts by improving and enlarging the original concept for some
forty years. When he was minister in Paris, 1784-1789, Jefferson said that
he spent every spare moment studying the buildings of Paris. He also took
the trouble to meet some of the leading architects and critics of the day,
including Molinos and Legrand and the Baron Grimm. All of Europe was
flocking to Paris in the 1780s to study art, and when Jefferson returned
home he brought the latest ideas of the most advanced French visionary
architects. These men stressed the "natural" importance of pure geo-
metrical shapes, the power of the ancient world, and the need for social
improvements and public works. So, when our third President returned
from Paris, he had the technical and aesthetic training to produce a
masterpiece of his own, as well as assist Latrobe to produce his.

Jefferson had created his own brand of neo-classicism in the Capitol in
Richmond, which had influenced so strongly Latrobe's Bank of Pennsyl-
vania of 1798, but it was the first temple form for a public building since
the Romans. On the interior Jefferson had created a functional design
with a rotunda in the center to provide circulation to the two houses of
the legislature on each side. Latrobe utilized the idea, but expressed the
dome on the exterior of the bank.

Latrobe's great contribution to structural engineering was the fire-
proof masonry interior; and he designed the Philadelphia waterworks, the
first steam-fired one in the country. Sedgeley was built from his drawings
in 1799, and is the first Gothic Revival house in America.

But his great opportunity came when Jefferson appointed him surveyor
of the public buildings of the United States. With the President's constant
support and encouragement, he overcame great difficulties due to the
hostility of Thornton, the original designer, the lack of qualified labor and
materials, the volatile nature of congressional appropriations, and the
general reluctance of Americans to pay professional fees. His first term as
architect of the Capitol was from 1803-1812, and he rebuilt it in 1815-
1817, after the fire of 1814. He then had a free hand, almost, and he con-
verted the Hall of Representatives into a splendid classical theatre, and
he improved the design of the North Wing. He solved difficult problems
invented the lovely corn and tobacco capitals of the American order,
created spaces which formed a natural progression after the suggestions of
natural landscape, he designed creative lighting for his interiors, and
successfully tied the various portions of the building into a unified whole. While the building had great influence on American public architecture, partly through his students, Robert Mills and William Strickland, he did not regard it as his finest design.

His masterpiece was the Baltimore Catholic Cathedral. The unified concept of a rotunda and a Latin cross, it was inspired and developed with the aid of Jefferson's ideas. The latter admired greatly the Pantheon in Paris, which was being completed while he was there. He later made a drawing of it. It had been designed by Soufflot, and was lit dramatically by light filtering through the crown of an inner dome. This same system was also used at the Halle au Bles, which Jefferson had so admired, and which he persuaded Latrobe to use at the Capitol.

As an engineer his achievements were no less successful and influential. Besides waterworks, steam engines, canals, and bridges, he established engineering standards to improve both the economic and social benefits which were to be realized from large public works—the public was only just beginning to become aware of such sophisticated undertakings.

Nevertheless, in spite of all of these magnificent contributions, he died almost penniless, when he suddenly became ill with yellow fever in New Orleans in 1820. He had come to America with great expectations as the proper setting for a prosperous career. But politics and the law were regarded as the only professions in the New World. He was not the first architect from Europe to founder on the difficulties of professional life in America. Both Hadfield and Hallet were frustrated and broken by the parsimony and neglect with which they were treated by a society unused to paying fees for designs, when the builders were in the habit of erecting buildings without them. Through all the disappointments of his schemes to make money, and the frustrations of being unable to live as a professional man, he never gave in to despair, but continued to enrich American life up to the day of his death.

Latrobe's abilities as an important artist of his period is amply illustrated by the fascinating and influential Essay on Landscape, which Latrobe wrote for Susan Catharine Spotswood, probably for his own amusement in 1798-1799. It, along with miscellaneous papers, make up Volume II. Whatever his relationship with her, it lasted only briefly, but the Essay is of great interest. It not only gives instruction in drawing and watercolor painting, but it also includes sketches and comments about landscapes, travel, buildings, people and the natural world. In a word, it is an important, but little known, example of the picturesque movement in England. It appeared about the beginning of the eighteenth century, when the idea of the natural beauty of mankind and the universe were fashionable. Newtonian theories of an ordered cosmos became current, and in the arts the close connection between architecture and the English
garden of naturalistic gardening and painting are to be seen in Latrobe’s admiration of Claude Lorraine’s pictures of idealized and classical landscapes.

These first two volumes have set a high standard, indeed. Beautifully produced by the Yale University Press, even the watercolors glow with the colors and charm of the originals. With the sound scholarship and brilliant editing, these volumes are in every way worthy of the great American whose works they make available, at last, to his countrymen.

The University of Virginia  
Frederick D. Nichols


Myron J. Smith, Jr. lists eighty-nine separate works wholly or in part about Oliver Hazard Perry in his invaluable The American Navy, 1789-1860: A Bibliography. What justification can there be for yet another biography of him? The utilization of new material about him, for one. Richard Dillon, librarian, sometime university professor, and Western enthusiast, asserts in his dust jacket that his short book is based upon “primary and secondary sources, many of them available for the first time. . . .” The knowledgeable reader can discern that he has tapped a variety of pertinent materials, but he helps little the serious student of naval history, for he lacks a bibliographical essay, footnotes, or even a bibliography. We Have Met the Enemy contains no illustrations and only a single two-page map. All these deficiencies, however, may well have been the fault of his publisher rather than his own.

But Dillon himself must be held responsible for other shortcomings of his biography. Further legitimate reasons for a new life of Perry would be a different portrayal of him as an individual or a fresh interpretation of his place in history. Unfortunately the Perry presented here is all too familiar: an able, dedicated, tenacious, and courageous officer, with a sufficient sprinkling of foibles to humanize him. As to his subject’s place in the American story, Dillon is carried away by his excessive conclusion about the Battle of Lake Erie’s lasting impact, writing that it resulted in “the denial forever of Tecumseh’s dream of a British-backed Indian buffer nation blocking the United States from the Upper Mississippi River and the Far West. The Treaty of Ghent, which ended the War of 1812, made the United States secure in its boundaries, at last, even its extensive western border. But it was Perry’s initial victory, not a scrap of paper, which secured the frontier . . . (p. x).” The author fails to realize that the British by no means considered that Perry’s impressive triumph in 1813 had settled the Western issue. For instance, during the first sessions
at Ghent a year later British negotiators demanded that same Indian buffer state. Had not Thomas Macdonough won his scintillating victory at Lake Champlain—neither the man nor the battle are even listed in Dillon's index—nor Baltimore fought off the enemy invaders who had just captured Washington, D. C., very likely everything Perry accomplished at Lake Erie would have amounted to little.

Dillon also demonstrates an odd sense of proportion. On the one hand, he dispenses almost altogether with background material, allotting only a few sentences to introduce Perry's activities in the Tripolitan War, the War of 1812 (beyond the Lake Erie campaign itself), or his final and fatal mission to Venezuela in 1819. On the other, he devotes about one-tenth of his total text to two peripheral episodes: Perry's loss of his 14-gun schooner Revenge during a storm off Rhode Island in 1811, and his accompaniment, basically as a sightseer, of the U.S. Army to the Battle of the Thames two years later.

Nevertheless, *We Have Met the Enemy* is worth reading. Dillon's well-researched account of the events leading to and during Perry at Lake Erie are compelling. He has a flair for describing the combat conditions of a wood and canvas fleet; not since C. S. Forester have I been brought as vividly into the heat and horror of naval warfare. He also recognizes well Jesse Duncan Elliott's sheer malevolence, first in trying to wrest Lake Erie's laurels from Perry, and then hounding him in desperate efforts to taunt or lure him onto the duelling grounds. Yet Dillon omits the tragic finale to this story when Elliott transferred his hatred to Stephen Decatur, Perry's friend and confidant. Using James Barron as his instrument of vengeance, Elliott and perhaps William Bainbridge manipulated Decatur into his mortal encounter of March 20, 1820.

The definitive biography of Perry remains to be written. Had Dillon more properly identified his sources, broken new ground, restrained himself as to the permanent effects of his subject's accomplishments in 1813, and better allocated his space, his book could have ranked with Christopher McKee's *Edward Preble* and the works of other modern authors trying to rewrite early American naval biography in order to present more realistically the men and their times.

*University of New Hampshire*  \( \text{David F. Long} \)


Burke Davis' *Old Hickory* is a well-written and balanced biography of the seventh President that may well interest the popular audience it was written for. Mr. Davis, who had previously published twelve biographies
and histories on subjects ranging from the Battle of Yorktown to the Billy Mitchell affair, is a versatile writer and from the evidence at hand is also a competent one. He tells his story clearly and unpretentiously, enlivening it with aptly chosen anecdotes and quotations from the correspondence and publications of Andrew Jackson and those who crossed his path.

To enhance his book's popular appeal, Mr. Davis has eschewed numbered footnotes, substituting for them brief notes on each chapter, which indicate the chief sources he has relied on for general understanding and for particular quotations. Mr. Davis' reading and his acceptance of a number of modern studies critical of Jackson and his presidency help explain both the evenhandedness of his treatment of issues and events and the absence of the uncritical adulatory tone that mars some accounts of much admired men. Mr. Davis appears to admire in equal measure Andrew Jackson, Arthur M. Schlesinger's essentially uncritical version of the Jacksonian movement, and some of Mr. Schlesinger's chief critics. At some points Davis takes Jacksonian rhetoric at face value, at other points he is equally unquestioning in appraising the utterances of anti-Jacksonians. Mr. Davis may be guilty of excessive balance.

It is one thing for an authoritative scholar who is immersed in the issues to emerge with a judicious interpretation of them. The impression given by Old Hickory is that its author has no particular viewpoint toward the matters he describes, in part because he has not thought hard about them, in part because his grasp of them is unsure. Mr. Davis, whose research in the massive modern literature on Jacksonian issues is quite slight, oversimplifies most of these issues, characteristically reducing them to one dimension. Occasionally, he simply gets them wrong, as in his accounts of the Locofoocos, the early Jacksonian coalition, the Jacksonian appointments to the Supreme Court, and a number of other matters. It is most disconcerting to be told that Alexis de Tocqueville was a young English scholar or to have old Parton's and other contemporaries' apocryphal tales taken as gospel.

Mr. Davis introduces his bibliography with the startling statement that his is "the first biography of Jackson in forty years." Robert V. Remini's and James C. Curtis' recent biographies may be slim books but both are lively, well written, and important, containing forthright interpretations by scholars whose intelligence and command of the literature entitles their judgments, even when wrongheaded, to respect. Mr. Davis' book, for all its merits as popular history, has nothing in it for scholars because it offers nothing new, either in the way of evidence or analysis.

Readers who are unfamiliar with the biographies of Andrew Jackson by Marquis James, John Spencer Bassett, or James Parton will find Mr. Davis' recounting of oft-told tales interesting and instructive. Andrew Jackson was a fascinating man who lived during an exciting time and
Mr. Davis has told his story with professional competence. His book is not nearly as good as those of his predecessors, however, because it is not nearly as original or as interesting as theirs. James may have been one-sidedly uncritical, Parton perhaps erred in the other direction, but both men had a recognizable viewpoint, they cared, and they also knew a great deal about their subject. Mr. Davis' book, unfortunately, is innocent of these traits.

The City University of New York

Edward Pessen


Part of Greenwood Press's series "Contributions in American History," The Many-Faceted Jacksonian Era is a collection of scholarly articles dealing with varying aspects of the Middle Period. The book's title reflects Edward Pessen's view that traditionally too much emphasis has been placed on only one facet of Jacksonian America, politics. Pessen does not deny the importance of the period's politics. Yet he also rightly recognizes the need to comprehend the era's economic, social, and humanitarian developments. This anthology thus is divided into four sections entitled "Society," "The Economy," "Politics," and "Reform." Each section contains four selections.

The selections are all reprinted from books and journal articles originally published between 1964 and 1975. They seem to have been chosen on the basis of either a revisionist thesis, a new methodology, or in some cases both. All of the articles are likely to be familiar to scholars of the period. But this collection would be valuable for use in specialized courses on the Jacksonian era and for historians in other specialties who might wish to have available some of the best recent scholarship in a single volume. With but two inexplicable exceptions, the original footnotes are also reprinted.

Though Dr. Pessen makes no claim to comprehensiveness, at least two themes predominate. First, this anthology makes clear that the period is indeed "many-faceted." Articles range from Barbara Welter's classic treatment of "The Cult of True Womanhood" through David Montgomery's analysis of working-class riots in Kensington, Pennsylvania, to an examination of the motives of Massachusetts high school reformers by Michael Katz. Such diverse foci give the reader a sense of the complexity of the time.

A second major theme is one that Professor Pessen, this reviewer, and several other scholars have been arguing for more than a decade: that the Jacksonian period was not the egalitarian age of the common man. Pessen
has included two of his influential articles demonstrating, at least for the major cities of the Northeast, the falsity of the egalitarian thesis.

One problem with *The Many-Faceted Jacksonian Era* is that in trying to show the diversity of the period through an emphasis on revisionist interpretations a certain imbalance occurs. For instance, America in the Middle Period was still predominantly a rural, agrarian society. But only one article, Herbert Gutman’s review of *Time on the Cross*, directly relates to rural life. On the other hand, nearly a third of the collection is devoted to urban history in articles by Peter Knights, Leonard Curry, Montgomery, and two by Pessen. Similarly, the political history of the period is slighted. Essentially one would conclude on the basis of this collection that the South dominated national politics (Richard H. Brown), that Jackson’s policies were not responsible for the economic disruptions of the late 1830s (Peter Temin), that ideological differences between the parties were real (Major L. Wilson and Herbert Ershkowitz and William G. Shade), and that the rich predominated in city politics (Pessen). These are all significant conclusions. But they are ones that ignore more than they cover.

Such imbalance is probably inevitable in any single-volume anthology. Despite it, this is a good collection that should stimulate student interest in a fascinating era.

*Michigan State University*  

**DOUGLAS T. MILLER**


The growth and development of the Philadelphia region between 1810 and 1850 was the result of *intraregional* demand rather than *interregional* trade flows. To support this assertion Professor Diane Lindstrom has assembled an impressive array of statistical evidence which, in the main, supports the work’s principal hypothesis.

According to Lindstrom’s model, Philadelphia’s eastern hinterland concentrated its resources in manufacturing and forestry while the western region specialized in agriculture, metals and mining. Philadelphia, the urban core, was dominated by commerce and manufacturing. It was, Lindstrom maintains, the growing interdependence of these subregions and the increasing volume of intraregional trade, rather than intercourse with the West or the South, which accounted for the entire region’s impressive rate of growth and development. As the focal point of the area’s economy, Philadelphia reaped the lion’s share of the benefits which accrued as a result of this regional specialization. “Because of the intense competition at Philadelphia most of the savings that resulted from hinterland
specialization . . . and from lower transport costs were passed on to the urban consumer in the form of lower prices. Thus," says Lindstrom, "Philadelphia had it both ways—it gained from its own substantial productivity increases and from some of the hinterland's as well" (p. 154).

The work begins and concludes with caveats against the uncritical use of aggregative models. "Subsections or regions functioned differently," says Lindstrom, "and they cannot be aggregated to describe the overall performance of a section without qualification" (p. 8). Only when more data and partial hypotheses are available can inclusive generalizations be made on the sectoral or sectional level. "With parallel advances in economic theory," contends the author, "these may then be combined into a nationally applicable model" (p. 8). Economists might well take issue with the suggestion that macroeconomic models require such an inductive derivation just as historians may take exception to the observation that "Philadelphia's experiences in the antebellum period appear to have been replicated by the other Eastern regions" (p. 185).

The intraregional character of her work leads Lindstrom to question the applicability of models based on exogenous forces, such as exports in explaining the economic growth of the Philadelphia region. "The Eastern demand model," she writes, "finds no such simple, comprehensible mechanism. Exports—either of goods or of services—did not grow fast enough to justify an export-base approach" (p. 16). It is not at all clear why a model based on hinterland demand is less simple-minded than one based on foreign demand. Both rely on the application of the principles of absolute and comparative advantage to differing factor endowments to explain the resultant increases in specialization and productivity. As Lindstrom herself admits, her model differs from other demand-oriented models only "in the source of this demand" (p. 9).

To bolster her argument Lindstrom cites Fishlow's estimate that only 10 per cent of the East's product was exported beyond its own boundaries in 1839 and only 15 per cent in 1860. The export/output ratio for the United States as a whole in the early nineteenth century has been estimated at between 10 and 15 per cent and yet scholars have assigned foreign trade a major role in the development of the nation during these years.

Whether Philadelphia's trade was principally intraregional or not clearly depends upon how the intraregional-interregional interface is defined. Only then can we determine whether the source of demand for Philadelphia's output was "exogenous" or not. The trade flows described by Lindstrom may indeed be intraregional in a geographic context but appear to represent a classic case of interregional trade and specialization in economic terms.

Despite some conceptual shortcomings Professor Lindstrom has produced a solid and professional contribution to the economic history of the
The antebellum period. Indeed, her work may well serve as a model for future economic analyses of regional development by inspiring the imitation it so richly deserves.

Southern Illinois University

Donald R. Adams, Jr.

Happy Country, This America: The Travel Diary of Henry Arthur Bright. Edited by Anne Henry Ehrenpreis. (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1978. x, 486 p. Illustrations, index. $19.50.)

In 1943 Max Berger estimated that approximately 230 British travelers had published accounts of their experiences in the United States between 1836 and 1860. One might imagine that little of interest could be added. A happy surprise is Happy Land, This America: The Travel Diary of Henry Arthur Bright. Twenty-two years old, son of a wealthy, cultivated mercantile family in Liverpool, Bright came to the United States in 1852, bearing letters of introduction to a galaxy of distinguished Americans and Canadians, who in turn introduced him to other members of the American and Canadian elite. By railroad, steamer, stagecoach, and private carriage, he spent five months traveling from New York southward to Richmond, west to the Mississippi, northwestward on the river to St. Paul, returning eastward by way of Chicago to Niagara Falls, Toronto, Montreal and Quebec, south to Boston and Concord, and back to New York. His record of his experiences, written only for his family, with no thought of publication, reveals a lively intelligence, good humour, and ready absorption in the lives of the people he met. Happily missing are the descriptions of routine tourist attractions customary with most writers of this genre.

Bright's unassuming personal charm made friends for him everywhere. He was welcomed to New York's privileged circle of wealth and fashion through Charles Augustus Davis and others. His political acquaintances included Daniel Webster, Charles Sumner, the Prime Minister of Canada, Francis Hincks, and the Governor-General, Lord Elgin. Sharing the Unitarian faith of his family, he sought out the Unitarian clergy in every area he visited, writing at greatest length about William Henry Furness of Philadelphia, "a splendid man, so earnest and eloquent." He became aware of the upheaval within the Unitarian community through his contacts with Ralph Waldo Emerson and Theodore Parker. He was introduced to the intellectual and artistic "lions" of Concord, Cambridge, and Boston.

Bright was not a profound thinker. Most notably he failed to grasp the tragic significance of the abolitionist struggle. Although he was unique among fashionable travelers in his many conversations with Negro slaves, he believed that most of the slaves "looked comfortable and happy." His visit to a slave auction moved him to sarcasm rather than moral outrage.

Mrs. Ehrenpreis gives an account of Bright's life in her Introduction.
Eight of his poems relating to the tour, three of them written in the United States, are appended, with a memorial sonnet by Swinburne. Excellent illustrations are taken from contemporary sources.

The unstudied reactions of a bright, well-bred, personable young man provide a fresh look at life in the United States and Canada in 1852. Happy Land, This America should be of interest to both the specialist and general reader.

Lebanon Valley College

Elizabeth M. Geffen


For at least a decade now the prevailing view among Civil War historians has been that Lincoln and his party were morally tarnished emancipators whose powerful attachment to white supremacy retarded the development of full racial equality in America. At first concerned simply to quarantine slavery (partly so as to prevent the spread of all blacks into western territories), Republicans moved during the Civil War to dismantle the institution altogether. Freedom was one thing, however, racial justice quite another. "There was," notes C. Vann Woodward, "no Equality Proclamation to match the Emancipation Proclamation." What legal and political rights Republicans did grant freedmen derived primarily from selfish motives (military success, Republican supremacy) and, less forgivable, offered black Americans mere paper equality, not the genuine article.

Recently a sophisticated challenge to this still-fashionable thesis has begun to emerge. Rejecting presentist views of what ought to have been for more realistic appraisals of the political and intellectual constraints that bound nineteenth-century politicians and reformers, a small but growing number of historians have rediscovered a principled, humanitarian side to Civil War Republicanism, a side obscured by the "new orthodoxy's" hot insistence on the culpability of racist Republicans for the "failures" of Reconstruction. Herman Belz's A New Birth of Freedom is a distinguished example of this recent trend.

Belz is much too judicious and craftsmanlike an historian to deny that most early Republicans accepted the white supremacist assumptions of their day. Even radicals, he admits, disavowed social equality between the races and sought merely to guarantee to ex-slaves personal freedom and equality before the law. Indeed, the first steps in the destruction of slavery (notably the Confiscation Acts of 1861 and 1862 and Militia Act of 1862) came primarily in response to political and military pressures and sought simply to sabotage the Confederate war machine, not to promote black liberty or equality. Yet, as Belz demonstrates with commendable clarity
and detail, such measures “also reflected an ideological-humanitarian con-
cern for the freedmen’s liberty,” and led inexorably to greater and greater
legal safeguards for black civil rights.

The Militia Act, for instance, designed for the practical purpose of
placing black manpower at the disposal of Union armies, not only guaran-
teed freedom for slave soldiers and their families, but, thanks to the
American tradition of the citizen-soldier, opened the way for freedmen to
claim American citizenship. Similarly, the Thirteenth Amendment, while
it served the interests of northern and loyal southern whites by striking
at the Slave Power as well as at slavery, and while its framers at first took
a narrow view of its powers, pointed inescapably to increased federal pro-
tection of freedmen’s rights. When those rights seemed suddenly jeop-
ardized, once the war had ended and the pro-southern Andrew Johnson
replaced Lincoln in the White House, congressional Republicans moved
quickly to make them secure. “The civil rights settlement of 1866,” as
Belz calls it, embodied in the Civil Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amend-
ment, derived from the by then characteristic Republican “blend of
humanitarian idealism and pragmatic political and economic concerns,
tempered by sensitivity to northern racial prejudice.”

There were, of course, limits to the Republican Party’s program for
freedmen’s rights. Race prejudice, attachment to laissez-faire notions
which preached both the injustice and inutility of paternalism, and a
mighty reluctance to encroach upon state rights, all helped to rule out
federal programs aimed at creating a truly democratic society—one blessed
with real social and economic, as well as political and legal, equality.

And yet, as Belz observes, it is a grave mistake to judge nineteenth-
century reformers by twentieth-century standards—to belittle or overlook
the very real achievement of Civil War Republicans. “The really sig-
nificant fact,” he sensibly concludes, “is that Republicans asserted equality
before the law as the foundation of national policy toward the freedmen,
in conscious despite of the contemporary belief in inherent racial differ-
ences and Negro inferiority.” Republican Reconstruction, then, while
certainly not an unqualified success, was far from being a total failure.
Without it, the struggle for racial justice and harmony in our own day
would be immeasurably more difficult.

University of Wisconsin-Madison

RICHARD H. SEWELL

Immigrants in Industrial America, 1850-1920. Edited by RICHARD L.
EHRLICH. (Charlottesville, Va.: Published for the Eleutherian Mills-
Hagley Foundation and the Balch Institute by the University Press
of Virginia, 1977. xiv, 218 p. Index. $12.50.)

This book results from a conference in 1975 sponsored jointly by the
Balch Institute and the Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation. Ten essays
prepared for the conference explore the historical background of various immigrant groups confronted by the novel and punishing conditions of industrial society. Five essays deal with the impact of industrial work on family life and five treat occupational changes and labor problems in cities such as New York, Buffalo, and Philadelphia.

Caroline Golab in her solid contribution on Polish workers in Philadelphia comments that the forms and responses of immigrant life resulting from the encounter with nineteenth-century industry are the essence of ethnic persistence in the United States today. Studies of immigrant families by Carol Groneman, Virginia Yans-McLaughlin, and Laurence Glasco show a marked resilience among laboring families in the face of grim social problems and disabilities. Tamara Haraven reviewing experience in Manchester, New Hampshire, shows that immigrant families were able to adapt with surprising flexibility to changing labor conditions, and Michael Gordon’s analysis of an Irish labor boycott in New York City illustrates that the use of tactics known in the old country helped workers in America cope with harsh employment struggles.

The data presented by Theodore Hershberg and his colleagues of the Philadelphia Social History Project, while not as replete as the scholars would desire, does show that previous occupational analysis has been flawed by inadequate classification of workers, and that social mobility can be satisfactorily observed among various worker groups through computerized data techniques. The fitting of such data into broader historical frameworks, however, remains a difficult task. Tamara Haraven in this book provides the most acute theoretical basis for her work with a fortunate wedding of sociological and historical skills.

John Modell in his summary of the conference does not give a sufficient perspective to place these diverse essays in a full historical setting, but he does emphasize the problem that the authors share in their preoccupation with assimilation and acculturation as the matrix for interpretation of immigrant life. The use of concepts such as the “culture stream” theory employed by Daniel Elazar in his work on mid-western cities, or focus upon the transformation of ethnic identities within long-term trends of pluralistic maintenance would have added much to the insights offered. Emphasis in recent years on the social mobility or lack of it among ethnic groups focuses attention on only one set of standards for interpreting immigrant and ethnic life. Reference to the distinctive cultures and their views of social mobility, orientation toward Old Country values and the ability of various groups to compose their own subcultural ideals of success in America extend the range of possible interpretations. This collection, however, is a welcome and interesting compilation of studies that look at industrial history, not from the viewpoints of economics or executive leadership, but from the viewpoints of those who toiled to actually construct the industrial might of the nation.

*Samuel S. Fels Fund*

*Dennis Clark*

This important study of Woodrow Wilson’s life up to the time he entered politics in 1910 is scholarly, readable, and well balanced. The author describes it as an “intellectual biography,” with major emphasis on the development of Wilson’s thought.

Professor Mulder’s most important contribution to the Wilsonian canon is his detailed treatment of Wilson’s father, the Reverend Joseph Ruggles Wilson, to whom he devotes a chapter thirty-one pages long—more than a tenth of the whole book. He finds no evidence to support the notion presented by Alexander and Juliette L. George in Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House: A Personality Study and by Sigmund Freud and William C. Bullitt in Thomas Woodrow Wilson: A Psychological Study, that Wilson’s psyche was scarred by subconscious resentment of a dominating father. On the contrary, Wilson and his father had an unusually affectionate and open relationship. Believing that his son was destined for greatness, Dr. Wilson supported Woodrow in all his endeavors and gave him confidence. Mulder also points out—and this is a brand-new revelation—that while Woodrow was in his teens Dr. Wilson suffered humiliating defeat in an ecclesiastical dispute and was forced to take a relatively unattractive pastorate in Wilmington, N.C. His confidence and self-esteem were shaken. He was thus less inclined to try to dominate his son or to object when Woodrow failed to fulfill the father’s hope that he would enter the Presbyterian ministry.

Professor Mulder’s most original contribution to our knowledge of Woodrow Wilson is to show the remarkable degree to which Dr. Wilson’s religious beliefs affected the son’s thought. Since Dr. Wilson was not a highly-trained theologian and since Wilson claimed to have little interest in theology, biographers have hitherto neglected a detailed examination of the father’s teachings or their impact on the son. By examining printed and manuscript copies of thirty-odd sermons by Joseph Wilson, Professor Mulder has established the salient features of the “covenant theology” he preached to his congregations—and to his son. Then in the course of the narrative he shows that again and again ideas imbibed from his father affected Wilson’s mature views on education, politics, and society in general.

Professor Mulder makes intelligent use of recent Wilson scholarship. In dealing with the connection between Wilson’s personality and his physical health he rightly relies heavily on Edwin A. Weinstein’s illuminating essay, “Woodrow Wilson’s Neurological Illness” in the Journal of American History, LVII (1970), 324–351. Weinstein examines in detail Wilson’s two early strokes—that of 1895, when he temporarily lost the use of his right hand, and that of 1906, when he suffered permanent impairment of
the vision in his right eye. Mulder adds an extra dimension by showing how Wilson’s inherited religious beliefs helped him to cope with these disasters.

For the rest, Mulder has made effective use of The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, edited by Arthur Link. Indeed, he has worked so closely with Link and the other editors of this definitive collection that the Princeton University Press has issued Woodrow Wilson: The Years of Preparation as a supplementary volume to the Wilson papers.

Phillips Exeter Academy

HENRY WILKINSON BRAGDON


One of the most depressing fatalities of the literary scene is the simultaneous appearance of two books on the same subject. The spring of 1978 saw the birth of fat twins, books about the Mellon family by David Koskoff and by Burton Hersh. The question naturally arises: which one do you read, if either? The more basic question is: why any book about the Mellons? As a family they are comparatively uninteresting. They have none of the significance of the Roosevelts or Tafts, none of the glamour of the Kennedys or Kellys. They are just rich. One member of the family, but only one, has a valid place in history. Andrew Mellon, along with his closest friend Henry Frick and his rivals Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, Sr., and J. P. Morgan, was one of the five Titans who dominated the American industrial scene after the Civil War and before the First World War. During this period America’s ploughshares were forged into factories, and the country emerged as the world’s greatest industrial nation. Mellon was one of the principal architects of this emergence. He is in himself a curious and tragic character who served Mammon with religious fervor and was rewarded with billions and with heartbreak. He became a symbol of booming Capitalism when he served as Secretary of the Treasury in the 1920s. He became a symbol of the boom’s collapse afterward. He also gave the most generous single gift of art ever presented by a private citizen in world history—his collection and the National Gallery in Washington to the nation.

But one swallow doesn’t make a summer and one outstanding member doesn’t make a famous family. The other Mellons have their character and their charm, notably horseman and art patron Paul, son of Andrew;
but only as supporting members of the cast around Andrew. The reasons then for writing a book about the Mellons are basically venal and vulgar. Muckraking books have lately been written about the Du Ponts and the Rockefellers. Why not cash in on the trend by writing another book (or two) about another very rich family?

What emerges is to be expected. In both books we have a truncated and not deeply satisfactory biographical sketch of Andrew surrounded by a mass of detail about his forebears, siblings, and descendants. A really serious biography of Andrew, his relations with his times and peers and his secretive but decisive role as banker for industry is certainly needed, avoiding the pitfalls of syncophancy or Socialism evident in two previous cheap biographies. These books do not pretend to be such in-depth studies, but the Koskoff book comes close. If you’re going to read one of the twins, certainly this is the one. It is an attempt to be specific, detached, objective. It perhaps leans over backward in trying to avoid the pitfalls of muckraking, but one could not call it adulatory. To one ignorant of finance it has the air of being a good try at truth, fairness, serious research. It won’t dazzle you with its style and insight, and the mass of detail does pall, but it tells the story in a straightforward and comprehensible fashion.

Not so Mr. Hersh. In a style that could only be described as bedizened Byzantine, modelled after that of Tom Wolfe the Younger, Hersh is nothing if not vivid. In broad wild strokes of clotted prose, interrupted by . . . hushed pauses indicated by three dots, he attempts to present Andrew as some sort of Satanic Majesty and in the effort so confuses and overelaborates that it’s often hard to tell what he’s writing about. A comparison of the story of the New Deal’s ideologically inspired tax suit against Andrew as given in the two books demonstrates the difference. Koskoff tries to present the ineffably complicated facts. Hersh flings the facts around to produce a picture of vast but totally obscure malfeasance. Koskoff is convincing. Hersh isn’t. Gobbets of prose like fragments of bloody carcasses after a bomb explosion litter the pages. “Andrew Mellon’s wily enzyme showed up in everybody’s saliva,” or “Frick had evolved delicacy” or “Risking mental burnout Coolidge trod the pith” (followed by one of Cal’s pithy sayings, so refreshingly different in style from Hersh). Every single paragraph is studded with this sort of thing. One is tempted to quote ad nauseam. (In an adventitious essay on early Capitalism we burble “By now—it is the Presidency of Grant—we kowtow without remission toward horizons of future before which the unstable nervous present must sacrifice itself unwhimpering.”) Sometimes the Method does open colorful vistas like that of the decor of the Richard Mellon mansion or the character sketch of prosecutor Jackson of the tax fraud case. Most of the time it just obscures the issues.

Once Andrew is out of the way, both authors can settle down to scandals, money spending, and the often curious but seldom very important careers of younger generations. There is of course lots of human interest here, and
the style of both books improves markedly. Relaxation makes Koskoff less fussy and Hersh less wild. Matthew the Fascist philosopher, Billy the czar of LSD, Dr. William the Schweitzer of Haiti make good reading in either volume. The fifty-odd fourth generation descendants of grim originator Judge Thomas may indeed comprise the "richest family in America"; but they are not now movers and shakers. They have become members of the gentry, Pittsburgh edition, and the family certainly does outline a classic case of emergence from yeomanry (farming) to gentility (tenure) via two generations of go-getters. This is however a familiar story. The transition from making money to having money, and its results, is an old, old tale in places like Philadelphia or Boston, though comparatively new to places like Pittsburgh.

So there is interest in both books if you can plod along first with Mr. Koskoff (Yale, and hence rather pro-Mellon), then tumble through the Baroque jungle of Mr. Hersh (Harvard, and hence rather anti-Mellon). But are these books necessary? Lots of work has been put into both of them. (How could the family stand being interviewed by both authors?) One must admire the persistence. They will both be useful sources for a proper book about Andrew Mellon. Such a book would be really worthwhile, and Mr. Koskoff, broadening his viewpoint, editing his data and narrowing his field, could do it. God forbid that Mr. Hersh should try.

Princeton, N. J.

NATHANIEL BURT


Subtitled A Social Analysis of an American Urban Elite, 1874–1965, The Iron Barons is number 18 in Contributions in Economics and Economic History, edited by Robert Sobel. The book is a study in applied statistics, the subject being the social characteristics of 696 iron and steel executives in the years 1874 to 1901 and of their descendants. These executives were the iron and steel elites in the cities of Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Youngstown, Wheeling and Bethlehem. Pittsburgh is used as a model for the other cities and is given the greatest attention.

Following a pattern set by E. Digby Baltzell in Philadelphia Gentlemen, John Ingham shows the extent to and the ways in which these elites were incorporated into the upper class of their respective communities. In the first two chapters he describes their principal social and economic characteristics, concentrating on birth (whether native or foreign), ethnic ancestry, period of family immigration to the United States, religious heritage and father's occupation. He devotes the remaining chapters to a determination of the characteristics of these elites which might qualify them for inclusion within an upper class, namely, listing in the Social Register; place
of residence; club memberships; schools, colleges and universities attended; and patterns of intermarriage. He emphasizes variations in the characteristics of the iron and steel elites among five of the cities, with Bethlehem being dropped out for reasons given below, and provides some comparisons with other business elites. The many tables are comprehensive and easy to read. The text, although sometimes unnecessarily repetitive of material in the tables, is nevertheless clear, and the material is well organized.

A weakness stems from Mr. Ingham's misperception of the position of the iron and steel industry in Bethlehem. He gives that city little attention on the mistaken grounds that its iron and steel enterprise (the Bethlehem Iron Company) was largely owned and controlled from Philadelphia. This is simply not true, as this reviewer knows from his own research. No more than six of the twenty-seven directors serving the Bethlehem Iron Company from 1860 to 1901 were residents of Philadelphia; a majority of the stock was locally owned, although from 1879 Joseph Wharton of Philadelphia was the largest stockholder; and of the $436,606 in surety provided in 1887 for the contract with the government for the manufacture of armor plate only $150,000 came from Philadelphia (provided by Joseph Wharton)—the rest being supplied by directors living in Bethlehem or South Bethlehem. (Sources: Minutes of the Board of Trustees of the Bethlehem Iron Company; Stockholders' Receipt Book of the Bethlehem Iron Company. Both in the Schwab Memorial Library, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Bethlehem). In sum, in Bethlehem as in the other five cities the iron and steel industry was largely locally owned and controlled. Mr. Ingham should have treated Bethlehem on the same basis as he did the other five cities. If he had done so, he could have enriched his study with some striking contrasts arising from the juxtaposition of new iron and steel elites and a traditional Moravian upper class.

In spite of this shortcoming, Mr. Ingham's study is methodologically sound and useful. He qualifies in numerous important ways the image of an iron and steel elite consisting almost wholly of WASPS, and he wholly disproves the "rags to riches" theory concerning the origins of the members of the elite. To be sure, the study has an inherent limitation of all statistical exercises, namely, that of demonstrating average, modal or median positions in general situations without being able to explain anything in particular. For example, nothing whatever can be inferred for the life of Andrew Carnegie from a realization that he did not possess all of the characteristics of the average steel executive—although the study does suggest topics for further research into Carnegie's involvement with the iron and steel industry. The basic question is, where does the science of the statistician end and the art of the historian begin? Mr. Ingham has supplied a study capable of supplying fresh perspectives for research concerning governing elites in American business; but the study is not, in itself, historical.

Still, Mr. Ingham is first and foremost an historian and so may be
forgiven for allowing irrelevant historical observations to coexist with his statistical work. Most of the irrelevancies are to be found in the Preface, Introduction, and Conclusions, although to a lesser extent they are interspersed into the chapters. The most frequently found sort of irrelevancy concerns matters depending on psychological factors with which the statistical study does not deal, for example, the successes and failure of elites in social climbing, the “poignant . . . case” of Charles M. Schwab in failing to become socially acceptable and the attitudes helping to define the iron and steel elites as a class. Most of the topics in the Conclusions deal with historical material and are not really conclusions at all. Mr. Ingham in fact gives the real conclusions to his statistical study in the process of interpreting the data of the tables. He would have made his book methodologically neater by writing up the material he calls Conclusions as an answer to the question, “What is the historical significance of the findings at which the study arrives?” calling it, perhaps, “Historical Perspectives.”

Lehigh University

W. Ross Yates


This is a curious book, combining honest research and known facts with pure fiction and misleading information. The result is a fine book for the nonmuseum person to browse in and enjoy, particularly those passages which may be about his own home town or a museum of personal interest.

Some of Burt’s early portion of the book is new to the literature of the museum, and much of it is very interesting in the light of current developments in the museum field. He points out that like Franklin’s Library Company, most of the earliest organizations dealing with art were aimed at benefitting the public and were considered democratically educational. He notes their rises and falls and the difficulty of keeping the public support, whether it was for the Wadsworth Atheneum in Hartford (1844) or the Bowdoin College Collection (1802). This leads to much text on family position, social intrigue, jealousy, and competition in the various cities in which an early interest in art was expressed. Burt’s synthesis is to reduce the attitudes to two—“leather stocking” and “silk stocking” and try to summarize it that way.

But it was not so simple. He ignores the fact, for instance, that in the middle to late years of the nineteenth century, many of the collecting “barons” were not all out for themselves, but in fact espoused the earlier concept of art for the people as an enlightening and necessary ingredient of life. Many collected specifically to form public collections. One could
mention Corcoran, Walters, and a dozen others. They lived, after all, in the era of Prince Albert in whose name one of the greatest teaching and collecting institutions was founded as London’s Victoria and Albert Museum, at the same time that the Cooper Union was being put together in a far lesser way in New York. It is easy to poke fun at Morgan and his gigantic appetite for swallowing whole collections at a bid, but one must look in the long run at what he did with them in Hartford at the Atheneum, and in New York at the Metropolitan and Morgan Library.

In the more modern world of museums the emphasis of the book is all on the east, and mainly the northeast. Here there are good guides, such as Whitehill’s history of the Museum of Fine Arts, and Calvin Tompkins’ Merchants and Masterpieces which serve to summarize the information, though some of Tompkins is unsound and discolors Burt’s seriousness.

We learn all about the origins of Cleveland and Detroit, and oft forgotten Columbus, as well as the intrigues of Egyptologists in New York and Boston. It is well subtitled a “social history” of museums as it deals largely with the phenomena of society in all its wickedness and good. But such a book would not be good reading if it did not build up certain figures, tear down others, and ignore a very large part of the rest. Some of the major cities where more knowledge would have led to more amusement are St. Louis, Baltimore, Richmond, and Los Angeles. Imagine being excited about Hoving and “Harlem on My Mind,” and not getting in a single word about Richard Brown who dragged the Los Angeles County Museum out of an impossible situation, found them a site, built them a building and a staff, and got fired for it. Much more dramatic!

Then there is the incorrect information on San Francisco—a fascinating city of museums, which Burt points out, and regales one with the social affairs of the Spreckels and De Youngs. But he ignores the major contemporary point, that it was Avery Brundage—not the city of San Francisco—who forced the firing of a director who had spent years building and installing the Brundage wing on the De Young.

So there is scandal everywhere and lots of people will enjoy reading about it. However, if you want the book that Burt says has never been written, the Baedeker of American museums, buy a copy of Eloise Spaeth’s American Art Museums, which gives one the facts.

In Palaces for the People Burt does not deal with the history of art, which is the necessity of the museum, but with the tales of collectors, fortunes, and trustees, the amalgam of which produced one of the richest series of museums in the entire world. His omissions, which are many, may be forgiven by the fact that the number of museums has grown so large that a series of books would be required to cover the social history of half of them.

*The Walters Art Gallery*  
**Richard H. Randall, Jr.**
Bode's *Maryland* is a highly interpretive account of Maryland's past that will entertain and inform the layperson but disappoint the professional historian. Nevertheless, Bode has ably fulfilled the purpose of the AASLH's "The State and the Nation Series"; *Maryland: A Bicentennial History* is the finest introductory essay to the state's history.

The author terms this volume "a book of episodes, roughly chronological," describing each major aspect of the state's development through an individual or family. The billing for this performance includes Daniel Dulany the Elder, the colonial politician; Severn Teackle Wallis, nineteenth-century writer and critic; the Gilded Age philanthropists George Peabody, Johns Hopkins, and Enoch Pratt; a slave and several middle- and upper-class families; and the twentieth-century urban planner, James Rouse. Viewed as an introductory essay this methodology is a success. Bode's strong awareness of the milieu of historical development prevents the book from lapsing into elitist history or disintegrating into ill-connected episodes. Presenting Maryland's history through a continuum of individuals will make the book appealing to the general reader.

From a more critical stance, the book has several obvious problems. The author seems at times to overemphasize familiar events; ten pages on the military campaign of the War of 1812 does not fit well with the rest of the book. Bode also discusses Baltimore so fully that it is sometimes difficult to fully comprehend the development of other areas of the state. Bode believes that from the 1830s on "Baltimore was in many ways Maryland," a statement that can be easily defended but does not condone somewhat limited views of the rest of the state. And the book is so heavily indebted to the earlier histories by Donald Dozer (1976), Richard Walsh and William Lloyd Fox (1974), Matthew Page Andrews (1929), and John Thomas Scharf (1874-1882) as to say little new.

The professional historian will find at least one pleasant surprise in the book. Bode's lengthy discussion of the significant but little-known reformer and social critic Severn Teackle Wallis will bring new attention to the Marylander. Wallis was an astute observer of and participant in the state from the 1830s to his death in 1894. Wallis was, for example, largely responsible for Maryland's decision not to join the Confederacy and was a guiding force of the political reform movement in Baltimore in the 1880s and 1890s. My hope is that Bode continues to work on this intriguing nineteenth-century Marylander.

Carl Bode's *Maryland: A Bicentennial History* deserves a spot on anyone's bookshelf of Maryland studies.

*Baltimore City Archives*  
Richard J. Cox

There is growing interest in the history of cemeteries; about ten books on the subject have appeared in the past decade. The topic can be discussed from the viewpoints of ritual, thanatology, sociology, economics, local history, iconography, art history, landscape architecture, and perhaps others as well. This aptly titled book has no thesis and makes no claims to scholarship. The authors have simply enjoyed looking up the burial places of some American notables and folk heroes. They point out that “a cult of death exists” and attracts hordes of admirers to the tombs of celebrities.

The volume pictures the graves of eighty-two persons. They range in date from 1809 to 1974, in location from Maine to California. Eight graves are in Pennsylvania including those of Sarah Josepha Hale in Philadelphia, Ann Jarvis, the originator of Mother’s Day, in Bala-Cynwyd, the blues singer Bessie Smith in Sharon Hill, and Milton Hershey in Hershey.

A few of the tombs are in accord with our mental image of the occupant: Thoreau rests beneath a stark stone with the single word “Henry”; Luther Burbank is buried under a big tree in his garden; the gaudy financier and ladies’ man Jim Fisk is memorialized by an obelisk and four nude statues of voluptuous women. Most monuments could not be predicted: we are surprised to find that F. W. Woolworth of the five-and-ten lies within an imposing mausoleum in the ancient Egyptian temple style; Samuel Morse, one of the most famous Americans of his time, has only a marker with his initials “S.F.B.M.” Some burial sites are also surprises: Bat Masterson, the western gunfighter, is buried in The Bronx, and John Sutter of the California gold rush in Lititz, Pa. That sophisticated New Yorker, Cole Porter, rests in his birthplace of Peru, Ind. John O’Hara of Pottsville, Pa., lies in New Jersey but Thomas Wolfe, the son of a tombstone carver, could go home again to Asheville, N.C.

The authors had the notion to show the graves of some noted teams: Chang and Eng Bunker, the Siamese Twins, share a headstone in North Carolina; we also see the tombs of Wells and Fargo (both in Upstate New York), Currier and Ives, the bearded Smith Brothers, and Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane (Merrill and Lynch were two men despite the absence of a comma between their names).

The breezy mini-biographies facing the pictures are in the featherweight class but the handsome photographs display a nice sense of time and place. These illustrations also demonstrate that the ancient and noble art of designing and carving memorials has virtually died out. Most of the newer specimens are of remarkable banality and ugliness. This reviewer awards the booby prize to the tomb of Babe Ruth: the deceased is portrayed as a small boy who is being patted on the head by Jesus.
This album barely qualifies as a historical study but it provides some more evidence for the endless variety and total unpredictability of Americana.

City of Philadelphia

JOHN MAASS


This monograph, No. 27 in "German Studies in America," belongs in the category of useful works. In style and approach it resembles the German dissertation of an earlier epoch; full and accurate, but seldom venturing an unequivocal judgment. The plan is systematic, though the author has not made the most of it. First comes an account of European views of America other than German. Then follow six chapters which single out for discussion one novel by each of six authors. Why these particular novels were chosen is not altogether clear, though the writer offers some reasons in his introduction. His chief reason seems to be that though a sizable number of German novels of these two decades use America as background for "stories of horror, adventure, love, and the experiences of German immigrants," the six novels, "by contrast, are all directly concerned with America and the American people."

I take it these novels were also chosen for their revelation of particular aspects of anti-Americanism. Summarizing ruthlessly Mr. Hollyday's findings, I note that they develop the following particular themes: relentlessness of the denunciation of America (F. R. Eylert's Rückblicke auf Amerika, 1841); range of American scenes and characters presented (Karl Müller's Des Lebens Wandlungen, 1845–1846); "frequency with which various aspects of American life are discussed" (Therese Robinson's Die Auswanderer, 1852); the low state of culture in America (Ferdinand Kürnberger's Der Amerika-Müde, 1855); "the contrast between the evils of civilization and the idyllic life in nature" (Albert von Halfern's Der Squire, 1857); the failure of the American experiment in self-government (Adelbert von Baudissin's Zustände in Amerika, 1862).

In Chapter Eight the author is off on another tack, discussing what is said in the many novels about emigrants and emigration. In the next chapter he deals with the big city horror novel; needlessly, I think, since this genre was common also to French and American fiction. He tacks again in Chapter Ten, "Novels and Stories by Popular German Authors." The reason for the inclusion of this chapter is his discovery that the themes, characters, and attitudes developed in this popular fiction accord with those in the six selected novels. The book ends with "Summary and Con-
clusions" in which rather too many miscellaneous propositions are concluded. About everything goes in, the trivial along with the revelatory. Perhaps the most significant conclusion attempts to explain why the picture of America is so negative in almost all the novels. Mr. Hollyday gives four well-documented reasons: (1) the contrasting life of the German immigrant at home and in the New World; (2) expectations of life in America and the reality; (3) disillusionment with life as it was found; (4) the heartache experienced in adjusting to life in the strange country.

I wish Mr. Hollyday had focussed more sharply on the proportions of pro and anti-American sentiment in his novels. In a laudable effort to be faithful to their content he ferrets out the passages of praise as well as invective. But in consequence it is often difficult to make out whether a novel is, on balance, more pro than anti-American. Possibly only a computer could settle the matter, statistically, but making the decision ought not to be left up to the reader so often.

I cannot end without mentioning two excellent typographical features of the book. The format is neat, suitable, and handsome. The book is doubtless much less expensive than what an American publisher would have to ask for it. The thirty-one woodcuts, lithographs, engravings, u.s.w., drawn from newspapers, periodicals, and books, German and American, make a superb compendium of scenes from American life, tendentious though they may be.

Princeton University

Willard Thorp