reviews

architectural populism


A book we missed when it first appeared and now available in paperback (Pelican)—a shame we missed it, too, for it could have been compared to Learning From Las Vegas (reviewed XIV, 1). The two are similar in that they seek to learn to "read" kinds of architecture which have not for the most part made it into formal histories.

I suppose that I am somewhat prejudiced in favor of this book because Banham's feel for Los Angeles is closer to my own than is anything else I've read about the city; in trying to explain why it is that I like a place we're supposed to dislike, I find that I use arguments analogous to those in this book. But Banham has the advantage of knowing the history, and, unlike Venturi, Brown and Izenour in their treatment of Las Vegas, he takes the time systematically to summarize for us the somewhat surprising way the town developed. Comfortable cliches about automobiles and shapelessness turn out not to be really true.

Unlike the Las Vegas book also, this one is beautifully produced. When Banham wants us to see the influence, say, of Sullivan and Wright in buildings made of materials alien to the Chicago tradition, and in settings unthinkable in Oak Park, he presents plates which say what needs saying, so that we connect Moorish turret or cave-like door not only with the palm trees which stand in front but with the Auditorium Hotel, the Prairie Houses and the Transportation Building at the World's Columbian Exposition. I confess to having been puzzled, until seeing this book, by praise I had seen for certain Angelino architects. The Architecture of Four Ecologies makes relationships clear; it's the best thing of its sort we've ever had.

Quibbles: some are very minor. Banham buys some pop sociology and psychology notions rather naively ("territoriality," for example, in Chapter 8), though generally he thinks for himself on the basis of good evidence. He does a few bad things stylistically, producing, for instance, a couple of those embarrassing sentences in which you write "both" and then list three items. He even gazes into what the New Yorker likes to call a "clouded crystal ball" to predict that Los Angeles (which, although it does not owe its shape to the automobile, now depends thoroughly on cars) should be called "a solution for other cities to contemplate."

On a couple of occasions Banham also backs away from those interest-
ing anomalies the analysis of which often makes a good book wonderful. Having described for us how Watts came into being, how the old electric railroads shaped Los Angeles, how they served Watts well, how the freeways tend to have been shaped by railroad routes and how Watts today, paradoxically, has no freeway service, he fails to interconnect these things, to chew on them a bit. Finally, although this is not a “popsy” book, it does suffer from the author’s apparent unfamiliarity with large-scale modern cultural studies of the United States. When he says

Los Angles cradles and embodies the most potent current version of the great bourgeois vision of the good life in a tamed countryside, and that, more than anything else I can perceive, is why the bourgeois apartment houses in Damascus and the villas of Beirut begin to look the way they do.

he knows whereof he speaks. But his analysis would be immensely richer were it informed by familiarity with good American Studies works on the nature of the dream: I think of Leo Marx’s *Machine in the Garden*, Henry Nash Smith’s *Virgin Land* and especially Warren French’s *The Social Novel at the End of an Era*, which, after all, traces pastoralism to Los Angeles in the heyday of Hollywood screenwriting.

For all that Banham fails to see how useful his material could be for us, however, this is an excellent book. It would be fun to teach in conjunction with Russell Lyne’s *The Tastemakers.*

SGL


This first-rate analysis of the Democratic party in late nineteenth-century California shows that political behavior in that state does not fit the traditional interpretation of the “Gilded Age” as an empty period between Reconstruction and Progressivism. Williams demonstrates how reform-minded Democrats in California made a concentrated and at least partially successful effort to resolve the problems resulting from urbanization, industrialization, immigration and agricultural change. He also effectively refutes the widely accepted view put forth by George Mowry that the Southern Pacific Railroad dominated the state politically during the latter part of the nineteenth century. The rejection by the California Democratic reformers of the party’s traditional gospel of states’ rights, limited government and decentralization led to worsening friction with conservatives such as United States Supreme Court Justice Stephen J. Field and Grover Cleveland’s national administration. When the President disregarded their demands for patronage, increased coinage of silver and lower tariffs, California Democrats in 1896 repudiated Cleveland and rallied behind William Jennings Bryan.

There is little to criticize in this study. The major weakness is the author’s failure to apply the new quantitative techniques to California voting behavior. It is nevertheless important to the growing reassessment of the “Gilded Age” in American history. No longer can one regard the 1880s and 1890s as a dismal period in which nothing of consequence took place. In California at least, the roots of twentieth-century Progressivism lay in the late nineteenth century.

University of Alabama

Howard Jones


This is one in a series of volumes examining “the sources of history” and “the uses of historical evidence.” It is not a comprehensive bibliography of source material dealing with nineteenth-century America but instead a survey of the various types of material available and a description of their value and limitations. Brock divides his work into four parts, discussing the use of evidence in the four areas of economic, political, social and intellectual history. He concludes with a comment on the narrow perspective of American historical scholarship and proposes greater emphasis on comparative history.
In the hands of a less accomplished author, such a survey of historical sources could have proven to be another dull exercise in professional introspection. Brock, however, has avoided the pitfalls of his task and has written a highly readable work useful not only to experienced scholars but also to students first approaching the problems of historical method and research. Despite some factual errors, the volume is an informative, provocative work which discusses a mass of material with ease and intelligence.

WCJ


Since Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., published his The Age of Jackson nearly three decades ago, historians have argued over the nature of Jacksonian democracy. Were the Jacksonians the spokesmen for the urban working class, southerners and westerners moved by hostility toward the east, middle-class champions of laissez faire and free enterprise, ambitious entrepreneurs eager for cheap and easy credit, nostalgic seekers after a return to republican simplicity or simply ignorant bumpkins?

Much of the argument has centered upon the Jacksonians' attitude toward banks and banking. Shade's work is the latest, and highly provocative, contribution to this ongoing debate. Focusing upon the struggles over money, credit and banking in the five states of the Old Northwest, he finds that the division between supporters and foes of banks reflected not so much a conflict between different economic groups, but rather a conflict between rival ethno-religious subcultures. The bank issue, he argues, "served a symbolic function: to characterize, often in highly moralistic terms, group differences, not only over the evolving economic order but also over the cultural identity of the society."

On the one side, the Whig and later Republican supporters of banks were champions of "Yankee Protestant values," who wished to use governmental power simultaneously "to enforce moral behavior and supply the needs of a developing economy." On the other side, the anti-bank Democrats—a heterogeneous coalition of Southern stock and immigrants—were moved by an anti-governmental animus that linked allegiance to cultural pluralism with hostility to "commercialization" as symbolic of "cultural domination by Yankee-Protestant values and habits."

Shade, in combining the newer techniques of quantitative analysis with extensive research in more traditional sources, has produced an impressive contribution to the broader reappraisal of nineteenth-century American political history in terms of ethno-religious cultural conflict inspired by Lee Benson and Samuel P. Hays. But while this approach is a welcome corrective to an earlier simple-minded economic determinism, the question remains if political conflicts over economic policy are reducible to no more than symbolic battles. It still behooves historians to ask who gets what.


In contrast to most recent historians of Reconstruction, who have focused upon the first two years of Andrew Johnson's presidency, Mantell examines the long and complicated struggle over the interpretation and implementation of the Reconstruction Acts during the final two years of his term. Mantell sees as the key factor in the implementation of these laws in line with Republican congressional policy the cooperation and support of the army, and in particular, of its commanding general, Ulysses S. Grant. Whereas previous scholars have tended to dismiss Grant as a confused pawn manipulated by others, or at most as a late convert to the radical side, Mantell finds him to have been not merely an early backer of congressional reconstruction but skillful and successful in his duel with Johnson over control of the army and enforcement of the reconstruction legislation.

Mantell further argues that given Johnson's continuing efforts to impede implementation of the congressional program, impeachment was not simply an act of spite or emotionalism but "an essentially political act in which the major concern of Republicans was the success of the reconstruction program that they had established." Nor was the trial a Republican defeat. On the contrary, during its course, nearly all the "threats to the completion of the congressional program were eliminated." And the Republican victory in the 1868 election—with Grant as the party's standard-bearer—established beyond all question that the South would have to accept the terms for reconstruction laid down by Congress.

Mantell's lucidly written, thoroughly researched and persuasively argued study is a major contribution to the reappraisal of Reconstruction presently underway by historians.

Back in 1961, John D. Hicks suggested, in his brief but perceptive Rehearsal for Disaster: The Boom and Collapse of 1919-1920, that the “return to normalcy” was inaugurated during the last days of the Wilson administration, rather than by Warren G. Harding. But most historians have been too entranced by the moral lesson presented by the supposed contrast between Wilsonian progressivism and Republican reaction to pay much attention.

Happily, this thoroughly researched and fully documented study of the period between the end of World War I and Harding’s inauguration should remedy that situation. Noggle details how the United States in the months following the armistice moved step-by-step toward Harding-Coolidge “normalcy.” While the war experience played a major role in this shift by undermining the reform impulse, fostering intolerance and chauvinism, awakening deep-seated psychic insecurities and stimulating a backlash against the extension of governmental controls over men’s lives and activities, Noggle shows how Wilson himself—because of his failure to provide effective leadership to deal with the manifold crises facing the country—bore much of the responsibility for what lay ahead.

The major weakness of this study is Noggle’s failure to give sufficient attention to the extent to which Wilson’s post-armistice shortcomings were implicit in the limitations of his earlier progressivism. But this caveat notwithstanding, his book should force American historians to reappraise the traditional interpretation of the Wilsonian legacy.


Oddly enough, this is only the second book to attempt to offer an historical overview of American law (Lawrence Friedman’s A History of American Law, published less than two years earlier, was the first). The text of the book was originally written for—and differs only insignificantly from—an American Heritage edition published at the same time. Perhaps for that reason it tends to be oriented toward a lay, rather than a specialized audience. Thus individual actors are given more attention than the details of legal development.

Just about half of Schwartz’ text is devoted to the twentieth century, with both the Burger Court and Watergate receiving not only mention but fairly extensive discussion. By contrast, Friedman gives major space to the nineteenth century and includes a good summary treatment of colonial law. In general, Schwartz appears more interested in bringing an understanding of the background of present-day law to the general public while Friedman sought to fill a long-noted gap in the historiography of law in the United States. Just as Friedman’s volume was long needed, so the present book serves a useful purpose. A good bibliography adds to its value.


This is the first volume in a new series on the American presidency under the general editorship of Donald R. McCoy and Clifford S. Griffin of the University of Kansas and Homer Socolofsky of Kansas State University (a second volume, on the Washington administration, has also been published and others are in various stages of preparation). If the present volume is any indication of the general quality of the series, the total effort will be a massive contribution to the understanding of that most complex and most perplexing institution, the American presidency.

Coletta shows Taft as a man of honesty and integrity but with little instinct or liking for politics. His reluctance to assume the leadership which the office thrust on him causes him to be remembered mostly as a symbol of “standpattism” although in fact more measures of a progressive nature were set in motion during his administration than during Theodore Roosevelt’s. The book is carefully annotated and contains a useful “Essay on Sources.”


In this small volume (150 pages of text), the two authors give a compact but balanced overview of Kennedy’s life and achievements. There are some conclusionary statements for which a critical reader would welcome documentation but for which
there are no footnotes or other references. A brief bibliographical note lists the late President's own writings and the major books written about him. A convenient introductory volume, part of Twaney's World Leader Series.

University of Kansas

Francis H. Heller


Sprunger has provided the only English language biography of William Ames. (Douglas Horton has translated several others and published them in a collection.) Although integration of the biographical and theological material would have made the book more useful, the information and insights scattered through the several parts are valuable to scholars. Sprunger agrees with Perry Miller's assertion that Ames influenced the development of New England and provides sufficient documentation to support the thesis. His summary of theology, particularly the Technometria, is clearer than Miller's and would be a good beginning point for students of Puritan theology.


Hall present a perspective on development and works it into a thesis: between 1630 and 1640, the New England ministry developed an anti-sacerdotal and congregation polity, but when lay power began to undermine its ecclesiastical and social positions it moved toward presbyterianism, and by 1660 was back into the mainstream of English church reform. In supporting his thesis Hall places the New England clergy firmly in colonial and imperial history and suggests that Puritan ideas were used to support the clergy in historical circumstances. Thus, the radical ideas of Ames, Robinson and others were merely used to legitimize an early clerical position and were not seminal forces in the development of the New England Way. Hall's work provides a convincing argument for important clergymen like the Mathers, but it does not satisfactorily explain the divergence of others like Solomon Stoddard. Polity and formality meant liberalism in Boston, but similar forms meant something quite different in Northampton.

University of Florida

Eldon Turner


A work for scholars, this book examines many types of movements: Christian (Pentecostal, Jehovah's Witnesses, Mormon and Holiness, among others), Oriental and quasi-Oriental, Afro-American, occult and exotic. Of the several excellent articles, two (at least) may be singled out for special mention. John F. Wilson (or is it John A. Wilson? Such typographical errors and inconsistencies abound throughout) has contributed a history of the history of sects; the literature on the subject has reached a point that requires such basic bibliographical work, and Wilson's survey is excellent. John Richard Burkholder of Goshen College, Indiana, presents what is probably the best survey to date of legal definitions and limitations of religion in his article, "‘The Law Knows No Heresy’: Marginal Religious Movements and the Courts.” Most previous articles on the topic have dealt with obvious cases, such as the conflicts of the Amish, the Black Muslims and the Jehovah's Witnesses with the legal system; Burkholder considers groups that are more marginal, and much less generally known, than those in his analysis. The legal limits of religion in recent years have been tested by such groups as Scientology and the Neo-American Church, which Burkholder includes along with the more familiar cases.

The major problems with the book are two. The first, and most important, is the recurrence of errors in Zaretsky and Leone's own introductory material. The Consultation on Church Union is what is apparently meant by their reference to a “Council for the Unification of Christian Churches.” Terminology is often imprecise, as in the use of the terms “Hare Krishna” and “Meher Baba” to denote movements rather than the principal mantra and founder of a movement, respectively. Occasionally all of the religious movements are collectively called “churches,” certainly an imprecise usage. Small matters of form are also annoying, as in the case of the use of the term “Reverend Kelly”; although that form is common, it remains illiterate.

The other problem is rather more subjective. Most of the articles try to combine description and analysis of movements, but do so within an analytical framework, which means that it is difficult for the reader to understand clearly just what the
essence of the group under consideration is. Insofar as that is true, the reader longs for new works to replace such dated classics as Elmer T. Clark's *The Small Sects in America* (1949) or Charles S. Braden's *These Also Believe* (1949), both works providing basic descriptive material on a wide variety of religious movements. There are so many religious groups in America, and so many new ones appearing all the time, that we will never really have enough descriptive works to provide an adequate basis for further research; but the effort to provide them should receive much more attention than it has in recent years.

But these failings do not mean that this hefty tome is a failure. The world of sects and cults is constantly changing; it may be growing, and it is certainly moving beyond its traditional lower-class appeal into higher social strata. For our time, Zaretsky and Leone have provided an important doorway to an area of study that is enormously important to an understanding of the workings of American society today.

University of Kansas


By studying James' use of children in his fiction from the 1860's to the 1890's, the author traces the parallel between James' growing understanding of childhood and his increasing use of children as characters. The introductory chapter is a brief history of children in literature, concentrating on nineteenth-century English and American fiction; although it ranges rather widely in a few pages (it is difficult, for example, to see Daisy Miller's brother, Randolph, as a forerunner of Holden Caulfield), the chapter is useful in placing James in an historical context.

The most important influence on James, according to the author, was the growing awareness on the part of late nineteenth-century psychologists that children were quite aware of and influenced by the adult environment surrounding them. This led, by the 1890's, to the "Jamesian child," usually a girl—like Maisie in *What Maisie Knew*, Nora in *Watch and Ward* and Nanda in *The Awkward Age*—who functions as a "deeply sentient miniature adult."

The book is arranged chronologically, beginning with James' early sketches and ending with a summary of the author's conclusions.

* * *


The book is a study of ten American "novelists of manners," demonstrating each writer's concern with the influence of a specific social context upon his characters. Although ostensibly an attempt to prove that the novel of manners does indeed exist in America (despite Cooper's complaint of "the poverty of materials"), it is more accurately described as a plea that this fictional genre be accorded the critical status the author feels it deserves.

The introductory chapter is unfortunately fuzzy: terms are ill-defined, distinctions are not clearly made and the author's explanation for excluding certain authors is not entirely convincing. Of those authors who are included, some come as no surprise (Henry James and Edith Wharton), while others (John O'Hara and James Gould Cozzens) seem at first glance to be out of place. However, Tuttleton's analyses of the works of all ten writers are cogent and perceptive, and substantiate his definition: "a novel in which the manners, social customs, folkways, conventions, traditions and mores of a given social group at a given time and place play a dominant role in the lives of fictional characters. . . ." The book's most valuable contributions are its concentration on the social and cultural environment of each writer's work—Wharton's New York, Lewis' midwestern small towns, O'Hara's Pennsylvania—and its revelation of the continuing controversy about America's "manners."

Stephens College


This thoroughly researched biography presents new information about Robert L. Vann and his *Pittsburgh Courier*, a major black newspaper of the twentieth century. Vann emerges as a pragmatic journalist-politician: successful, but so opportunistic that he may have taken a bribe from the Pullman Company to stop supporting A. Philip Randolph and the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters. While telling Van's story, Buni also illuminates the black social structure of Pittsburgh and the fluctuations of national black political fortunes during the 1920s and 1930s. The books only deficiencies are a pedestrian style and an inadequate index.

San Francisco

Great tragedy normally is produced in those cultures having an inherent sense of communal self-esteem balanced by a profound awareness of the ephemeral quality of greatness and the transitory nature of individual life. Less healthy societies produce melodrama and sentimental art works. Greece in the 5th century B.C. and Elizabethan England were two such tragically aware cultures, and the dramas of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Shakespeare and Marlowe attest to the balance between pride and pessimism subtly woven in the fabrics of both societies. Dan Vogel, contrary to most commentators, argues that American novelists and playwrights since Hawthorne and Melville have produced a notable, if not necessarily great, tradition of tragic art. Vogel’s proof is somewhat slim, for he discusses only thirteen works, and his argument unfortunately is complicated by schematic categories that do not always easily fit the art works. In general, however, he has succeeded in making his point. Americans have produced good tragedies; tragedy, to some, being the highest form of art simply because it is the most truthful.

The book probably would be better if Vogel did not insist on seeing tragic figures in American literature and drama as wearing the mask of Oedipus tyrannos, the mask of Christ, the mask of Satan or various combinations of these. In eight of the thirteen works discussed, Vogel finds the tyrannos mask predominant. It is the mask of the self-made individual who, like Oedipus, rises to prominence by his goodness, shrewdness and wit only to fall ultimately as a figure of communal sacrifice. The myth of Oedipus is akin to that of Lincoln, according to Vogel. In the Lincoln myth resides the American dream of log-cabin-to-White-House but also the sacrificial figure of a tyrannos shouldering the torments and blunderings of a sinful people. Although Vogel discusses in this category works such as O’Neill’s Desire Under the Elms and Mourning Becomes Electra, Dreiser’s An American Tragedy, Anderson’s Winterset, Faulkner’s Absalom, Absalom!, Williams’ A Streetcar Named Desire and Miller’s Death of a Salesman, he is most successful in making his point only in considering the character of Willie Stark in Warren’s All the King’s Men, a man who “clambers upward from a peeling, clapboard farmhouse to a gaudy governor’s mansion, . . . takes from the rich and gives (most) to the poor” (78), and is eventually shot down at the pinnacle of his power. But Vogel’s formula does not apply as well to such figures as Lavinia Mannon, Mio Romagna, Blanche DuBois or Willy Loman. They may be authentic tragic figures, but Vogel is hard pressed to categorize them as tyrannoi.

The mask of Christ, according to Vogel, is etched on the faces of such individuals as Arthur Dimmesdale in Hawthorne’s The Scarlet Letter, Melville’s Billy Budd, and (most perceptively discussed) Hemingway’s Santiago in The Old Man and the Sea. Melville’s Ahab in Moby-Dick and Faulkner’s Joe Christmas in Light in August, in Vogel’s scheme, wear the mask of Satan. One wonders throughout why Vogel is compelled toward categories rather than more direct discussions of the works simply as tragedies. His concluding chapter seems somewhat out-of-date, for Vogel here dismisses most American art of the past twenty years as untragic and as “solipsistic rebellion against history and decency” (169). Such statements reveal the author’s unfamiliarity with such recent mythic works as the Open Theater’s The Serpent and the Living Theatre’s Paradise Now, which, though not conventionally tragic, reveal a tragic insight contemporaneous with American life as it is presently being lived. Despite its faults, however, Vogel’s work is a worthwhile and intelligent effort to perceive American tragedy in light of its cultural milieu.

University of Kansas Robert R. Findlay

four from tusas


Margaret Ayer Barnes wrote about women who lived in upper-middle-class homes, women like Edna Looser who were concerned only with their domestic duties and relationships and oblivious to politics. Barnes presented the plight of such women objectively and ironically, sympathetically without being sentimental. Her sharp characterizations and accurate descriptions remind one of the style of Henry James and Edith Wharton. Like them, she sprang from and wrote about life in America’s upper middle class during roughly the same time—from the 1890s through the 1930s. She dealt scrupulously with the shifting social scenes during those years and with how that shifting affected women, and all of her novels were best sellers during the thirties. Good reasons for reading Taylor’s solid summary and commentary.

In addition to biographical information about the prominent Sedgwick family (Catharine's father was Speaker of the House during George Washington's administration) and the New England Lake District, the information about her contemporaries—Cooper, Bryant, Irving, Hawthorne, Fuller, Channing, Emerson, Melville—makes the book all the more valuable to the critic in American Studies. The summaries of and excerpts from Sedgwick's novels present the once successful and widely-respected writer as the first American to create a fully-developed woman character, Hope in *Hope Leslie*. Foster convinces us that Sedgwick deserves a place in studies of American intellectual and literary history.


There is abundant information here for anyone interested in the author of *The Last Hurrah* and *The Edge of Sadness*. Unfortunately, the book is rather tedious. The fault is one of strategy. Rank's purpose was to illustrate that Edwin O'Connor deserves to be brought to the attention of academic critics. But this study lacks the persuasive power to win us over. Rank could convince us of O'Connor's importance if he would sustain the broad critical vision with which he sees in the Background section of the "All in the Family" chapter. Also missing are passages from O'Connor's own writing to illustrate his artistry. Instead, overly-elaborate plot summaries and exact words of critics and reviewers weigh us down.


*Fusion* is a frequent word in this interesting book. Lyn explains how Waters' characters reflect the struggle of their author to synthesize the qualities of the Indians, intuitive and passive, with those of the white civilization surrounding, rational and active. Lyn convinces us of Waters' importance, not just because he is a Western writer and should be read since the West has contributed fewer "serious" writers than other areas, but because Waters contributes some new and powerful ideas, ideas which found their genesis in the West because that is where Waters and his characters and the land that must become a participant in their existence live. Waters offers fusion, unity, hope, without portraying the Indians or the West in the idealistic or simplistic ways in which we are accustomed to seeing their value diminished.

University of Oklahoma
Norma C. Wilson