MIRROR FOR BUSINESSMEN: BRONSON HOWARD'S MELODRAMAS, 1870–1890

MAXWELL BLOOMFIELD

Every nation has its master theme, Bronson Howard observed around 1886. "In France, this perennial topic is marital infelicity; in England it is caste; in the United States it is business."[1] The remark may seem trite today, when business ideals have permeated all corners of American society, when businessmen-novelists are celebrating the virtues of the "great American game" and when business-oriented historians are demanding that we scrap the term "robber barons" in referring to the founders of our industrial fortunes.[2] The businessman has become the dominant symbol of our age, but in 1886 his status and popular appeal remained uncertain. While success literature of all kinds flooded the markets of the day, the emphasis was on character training and morality; next to nothing was said about actual conditions in the business world.[3] William Dean Howells is generally regarded as the first great American writer to deal with the businessman as a human being. His fine case study of a self-made man, The Rise of Silas Lapham, appeared in 1885. Seven years earlier, Bronson Howard had produced the first of four successful melodramas in which he explored the business theme. By 1886 he was polishing up the last, and greatest, of them all.

Both Howard and his plays are forgotten today, but at the turn of the century he was hailed as the dean of American dramatists. A journalist by training, he was a keen and sympathetic observer of the rapidly changing world in which he lived. Unlike most of his contemporaries, he had strong ideas about the drama as an art form. He insisted that American plays must be true to American life. At a time when French and English adaptations dominated the New York stage, Howard cried out for realism and a return to native themes. His uncompromising attitude helps to explain why so many of his early plays ended in the waste basket. Most producers simply did not dare to gamble on an "American" plot. The prevailing climate of opinion is well illustrated by an anecdote from Howard's apprenticeship years in the sixties: he had written a short play called Drum Taps which dealt with the Civil War, and submitted it to Lester Wallack, one of the great producers of the day. Wallack was favorably impressed until he realized that the action took place in America. "Couldn't you make it the Crimea?" he pleaded, but Howard stood his ground. The play was never produced.[4]

A vigorous Americanism characterized all of Howard's best work. It was likewise noteworthy for what President Theodore Roosevelt called its "clean and healthy character."[5] A Howard play was invariably moral, for Howard believed there was a vital relation between the stage and popular standards of conduct:

> Many modern plays [he observed] have a great influence over the emotional side of human nature. A nation may stand pre-eminent for the products of intellectual endeavor, and at the same time its civilization, from an emotional standpoint, may not be above that of the American Indian. Rome, for instance, excelled in architecture and law, yet its citizens could enjoy the sight of human beings butchering each other and the butchering of wild beasts in a public arena. Plays in which the noble side of manhood and womanhood are exalted, while meanness, cowardice, and all the degrading traits of humanity are held up to public contempt, --such plays must necessarily have an ennobling influence. Where playgoing is so prevalent as in this country, plays that laud virtue and denounce vice contribute largely to the evolution of proper emotion. It would be difficult to estimate how much cruelty and barbarism have been eradicated from the world at large through the appeal of the drama to the better side of human nature.[6]

Fortunately, Howard did not always practice what he preached. He was too much of an artist to remain satisfied with conventional stereotypes of good and evil. His finest creations, such as old Nicholas Vanalstyne, the "master of Wall Street," in The Henrietta, do not fall into any neat moral categories. Howard knew his businessmen and their associates too well to suppose that they were either monsters or saints. When he attacked them it was not, as a rule, because they were "city slickers," in the established melodramatic tradition. Most of Howard's businessmen are simple, hard-working types, whose very success in the pursuit of wealth threatens to destroy them as human beings.

The dehumanizing power of money haunted Howard throughout his life. Although he seldom touched upon the theme of class conflict in his plays, he was profoundly disturbed by the growing cleavage between rich and poor in America. At the outset of his career as a professional dramatist, he traveled to England, where Charles Wyndham was adapting his first success, Saratoga, for the London stage. There, in the streets of London, the young playwright encountered scores of the homeless poor--men and boys with sullen faces who held out match boxes for sale and touched their hats to him as he went by. The sight made a lasting impression on his imagination. This "fearful inequality in the distribution of wealth," he wrote to his father,

was "a fact thrust upon my attention at every turn." It suggested a "serious thought" to him: "If we can discover the reason of it, the more attention we give it in America the better. It is possible, if not probable, that timely forethought, while our own nation is still young, may save us from a similar condition as a people."[7] Within two years Howard was at work on the first of his business melodramas which, after several revisions, emerged in 1878 as The Banker's Daughter.

This sentimental love story explores the consequences of a marriage arranged for business reasons. The "banker" of the title, Lawrence Westbrook, is a respected New York stockbroker whose firm faces bankruptcy as a result of unwise speculation in foreign securities. In this crisis Westbrook's first concern is the protection of his daughter and the countless small investors who have entrusted their savings to him:

> It is not only ourselves, it is hundreds, thousands, will find their ruin in mine! Who will heap upon your father's head the curses of the poor, the wail of the widow, and the tears of the orphan. I cannot survive it.[8]

To avert the catastrophe Westbrook induces his daughter Lilian to marry wealthy John Strebelow, whom she does not love. This maneuver rescues the firm but threatens to destroy the marriage when, years later, Strebelow discovers the truth. By that time, however, Lilian has grown to love him in earnest and their mutual devotion to their daughter Natalie reunites them at last. All ends happily, as Westbrook and his partner retire from business with a handsome profit, vowing to "speculate no more in human hearts."[9]

The sentimental stockbrokers of this early play are stereotypes, not well developed character studies. Yet they do exhibit certain general traits which Howard observed among the older business leaders of the seventies, men who had established themselves prior to the Civil War and its get-rich-quick opportunism. Fundamentally, Westbrook is a cautious operator who takes his calling seriously. To him business is not a game but a stern task, to be carried out in conformity with moral law. The Puritan ethic still dominates both his public and private life. When he violates conventional moral standards, as in his matrimonial dealings with Strebelow, he experiences a sense of guilt which can not be explained away by reference to any higher law of business necessity. For men of Westbrook's generation, then, no business code could compete effectively with the Decalogue.

There was less attachment to the old value system on the part of the emerging business elite of the post-Appomattox era, however. Howard feared that the younger businessmen of the 1870's were losing their sense of perspective. For them business was becoming, not an adjunct of the good life, but the whole of life itself. It was developing its own set of values, a rival creed of dog-eat-dog geared to the demands of a purely material success. Howard would explore the darker implications of this dual-

ism -- the supplanting of the Puritan by the Economic Man -- in his later work. But in The Banker's Daughter he essayed merely a robust caricature of the "new businessman" in the person of G. Washington Phipps.

Phipps is a minor character who appears for the first time around the middle of the play and steals the show from then on. He represents the brash, go-getting opportunist of the Gilded Age, bent upon making a private fortune regardless of the cost to society. Phipps has a time-table mentality and begrudges every minute away from his work. Howard plays upon this business-mindedness to good effect as he pictures his subject touring Europe in a matter of hours, inquiring "What's your line?" to every stranger he meets, and even proposing marriage to his prospective bride with a stop-watch in his hands.[10]

Audiences recognized this bustle and feverish activity as something distinctly American. It is significant that Phipps was the only character who could not be Anglicized when The Banker's Daughter was adapted for the London stage. "Mr. Albery and I tried to make him an Irishman, or a Scotchman, or some kind of an Englishman, but we could not," Howard recalled some years later. "He remained an American in England in 1886, as he was in Chicago in 1873. He declined to change either his citizenship or his name."[11]

Howard's next play, Baron Rudolph, was produced in 1881. It dealt with the theme of class conflict, the one and only time that the playwright attempted to treat this problem. The issue was timely, for the American nation in 1881 stood on the brink of a four year depression period, which was to place a new strain upon the relations between capital and labor. Contemporaries called this industrial depression a "rich man's panic," and it culminated in the Haymarket Riot of 1886, which had tragic consequences for the cause of the workingman in America.[12]

Howard's attitude toward organized labor, as expressed in his play, was conservative. While he sympathized with the depressed condition of the working class, he feared the prospect of class war and distrusted the motives of labor agitators. Allen, the labor union boss in Baron Rudolph, is an ex-jailbird who uses his influential position for personal ends. When his employer refuses to come to terms, Allen abandons the labor cause and strikes out for himself. "I'm a committee of one for myself after this," he remarks. "I intend to raise my own wages."[13] This he attempts to do by robbing his employer's safe, an art in which he has had plenty of practice.

But if Howard deals harshly with organized labor, what of the employer classes? They are represented in the character of Whitworth Lawrence, a wealthy industrialist. As the play opens, we learn that Lawrence has already fleeced his old school chum, Rudolph, out of a considerable fortune. Rudy, a German immigrant, is forced to become a common laborer in Lawrence's iron works, in order to survive. Thereafter Lawrence steals Rudy's wife as well as his money, piling villainy upon villainy until at last

his misdeeds are discovered. He is arrested for fradulent business operations and commits suicide on the way to prison, while Rudolph recovers his fortune and his repentant ex-wife.

As the representative of capital in Baron Rudolph, Lawrence displays no redeeming traits. He even forecloses mortgages in his spare moments, presumably as a form of amusement. It would be stretching things to suggest that Howard even intended a realistic portrait here. Lawrence is too close to the conventional "city slicker" of popular melodrama. At the same time his very lack of human traits stamps him as one of Howard's new business types. Lawrence is G. Washington Phipps in reverse. He is the economic man as viewed by his victims rather than his friends. And his standards are the standards of the industrial elite of the eighties.

Howard drives this point home quite early in the play, when Judge Merrybone relates the parallel case of another business tycoon, the president of the Blackhart Coal Company, who committed suicide in his cell while awaiting trial for forgery. The moralistic Merrybone, who believes in stretching the law only for the little man, reflects Howard's own feelings toward the crimes of big business:

> I don't mind telling you, now, Lawrence, I intended to charge the jury straight against him on every point. When the president of a great corporation defrauds his stockholders and brings ruin upon hundreds of innocent families -- I'll sentence him every chance I get to as many years hard labor as the law allows me -- and damn any governor of the State, and I'm to be the next -- that will let such a man out before his full time![14]

Howard's answer, then, to the power of big business was not the intervention of an opposing labor force, but the effective application of legal restraints to business officials. The captains of industry must be forced by law to recognize their social responsibilities. Thus class warfare might be averted without the threat of a powerful, and potentially corrupt, labor organization. While such ideals were foreign to the legal temper of the age, more recent experience indicates that they were far from visionary. The role of the courts as regulators of business practices in the twentieth century has been anything but negligible. Howard, of course, was not elaborating any well reasoned philosophy of social control in a play like Baron Rudolph. His appeal to the courts through Judge Merrybone was less a prophecy of the future than the reaction of a thoughtful conservative to the mounting tensions of his time.

With Young Mrs. Winthrop (1882) Howard undertook a study of the new businessman in his broader social role as husband and father. The working day, he recognized, did not always end at five o'clock (or six or seven in those days). Increasingly business attitudes and aspirations were penetrating beyond the office, to affect even the most intimate relations of a man's

private life. This expansion of the business spirit into nonbusiness areas has proved a fertile theme for American novelists in the twentieth century.[15] Howard's early treatment of the problem has much to recommend it. He saw clearly what many modern students of business enterprise have failed to grasp -- that the businessman is, above all else, a man, and cannot be studied effectively apart from the society in which he lives and works.[16]

Douglas Winthrop, the young hero of Howard's play, is a second-generation businessman who has inherited a sizeable fortune from his pioneer father. He is, of necessity, a manager rather than an entrepreneur. Since the business already exists, it is his job to see that it pays. He works ever harder to achieve this goal, until he begins to neglect his wife Constance in favor of the office and the club. In retaliation, Constance seeks refuge with a fast but fashionable social clique dominated by the semi-respectable grass widow, Mrs. Hepworth Dunbar. Douglas's mother, foreseeing tragedy, warns him to mend his ways.

"You never return to your home in the daytime," she observes.

To which Douglas replies, "Business men never do that. We lunch downtown, of course."

But his mother will not be put off so easily. In the familiar Howard fashion she contrasts her son's behavior with that of her deceased husband, who built up the business from scratch:

> Your father was a business man, Douglas! A successful one, too. He left you a large fortune, but he made me a very happy wife. He never forgot that his wife and child were more to him than all the triumphs of his business life. . . . Believe me, there are as many men to-day as then, rich and successful men, who do not neglect their families for the sake of making "money" -- who do not sacrifice their wives and children and all their holiest affections . . . .

To the audience she further confides:

> Douglas and Constance see less and less of each other every day. I am very anxious for them. "Business" and "the club" and the "duties of society," are changing them into mere acquaintances. . . . It is terrible -- terrible![17]

The climax occurs on Christmas Eve, when four-year-old Rosie, the Winthrops' only child, dies of a sudden illness while both her parents are away from home, pursuing their separate pleasures. This tragedy at first promises to reunite the bereaved couple, until Constance learns that Douglas spent Christmas Eve at the home of Mrs. Dunbar. Mistakenly concluding that they were having an affair, she sues for divorce. A last minute reconciliation is effected through the agency of Buxton Scott, a kindly old lawyer and intimate family friend, who reveals to Constance that Douglas

saw Mrs. Hepworth only for "business" reasons: to save Constance's brother Clarence from a jail term and public exposure as an embezzler. Thus business both divides and reunites the lovers in this play, and it is clear by the last act that Douglas has learned his lesson. In the future, love of money will not prevail over love of his wife, at least after business hours.

The theme of husbandly neglect has its purely comic aspects, of course, and Howard does not neglect them. A subplot poses the question: Would G. Washington Phipps and his bride have lived happily ever after? In answer Howard details the stormy relations between Mrs. Dick Chetwyn and her Phippslike businessman husband, who drift apart to the point of divorce, then remarry after getting acquainted all over again. ("I congratulate you both," quips one character on hearing of the divorce. "Now you and Dick will see something of each other.")[18]

Young Mrs. Winthrop marks Howard's first real success in portraying the American businessman as a human being. Douglas Winthrop, despite his occasional stuffiness, is a believable creation. He is a forerunner of the more vigorous character types developed in Howard's last business play, that brilliant study of the men and motives of Wall Street which he called The Henrietta.

First produced in September, 1887, The Henrietta became one of the most popular hits of its day. So great was its renown that, over twenty years later, it inspired a feeble imitation, The New Henrietta, which succeeded in reaching Broadway largely on the strength of its title.[19]

"I worked on 'The Henrietta' as I had never worked before in the whole course of my life," Howard later declared.[20] And in the Wall Street titan, Nicholas Vanalstyne, he has left an unforgettable portrait of a true "robber baron." Vanalstyne, known to his contemporaries as "Old Nick in the Street," is a composite of old and new attitudes. A ruthless financier to whom business is a kind of game, he enjoys winning for its own sake; even money becomes a secondary consideration when compared to the skill and shrewdness required to carry through big business operations. While he does not hesitate to use underhanded tactics to gain his ends, he retains some sense of moral responsibility and can be generous to a defeated rival:

> Ha-ha-ha-ha! Bill Jarvis lost his entire fortune in our twist on the Street last Friday. Ha-ha-ha! Bill Jarvis is my dearest old schoolmate. Ha-ha-ha-ha! We must give the old boy a chance to start again. Write to him that my bank account is at his service, Nick. Ah! He'll make another fortune in a year, and-ha-ha-ha!-I'll get that, too![21]

Vanalstyne's obsession with the "game" carries over to his private life as well. He even tries to cheat his own daughter Mary, advising her to buy certain stock which he can sell to her at an unconscionable profit. But

Mary smells a rat and ultimately turns the tables on the old man. Vanalstyne, acknowledging her triumph, recalls how his deceased wife sometimes stole a march on him by picking his pockets for inside information while he was asleep.

Contrasted with Old Nick's vigor and crude sense of humor is the character of his elder son, Nicholas Jr. Nick Jr. is a second-generation businessman to whom money means everything. Grasping and mean, his one great ambition is to ruin his own father, so that he in turn may become the "Master of the Street." His furtive nature is complemented by ill health: he has a serious heart condition. When his plot against his father backfires, he succumbs to a heart attack in the office. In an effective scene the ticker tape machine, symbol of his inhuman greed, grinds on relentlessly in the deserted room, while Nick Jr. lies dead in his chair.[22]

Howard again points out that business in America is not limited to facts and figures. It is, as one character puts it, "health, religion, friendship, love -- everything." The impact of the business spirit on religion is reflected in the person of the Reverend Dr. Murray Hilton. Hilton is a liberal-minded clergyman who has seen the light and allied himself with the dominant business interests of the time. He is, in effect, subsidized by Old Nick. While Hilton preaches moving Sunday sermons on the joys of poverty, he visits Vanalstyne during the week for inside tips on the stock market. The dying Nick Jr. savagely denounces his shallow materialism: "Show me the way to heaven! Ha-ha-ha-ha! You teach a man how to die! Have you ever shown me how to live? You have robbed me of my hope."[23]

Ironically, the most successful businessman in the play turns out to be completely devoid of the business spirit, Quixotic Bertie Vanalstyne, Old Nick's second son, becomes known, almost in spite of himself, as "the young Napoleon of Wall Street." Bertie detests the business world; he does not even know the name of the stock he owns; and he makes all crucial decisions by tossing a coin. When his father learns of his methods, he exclaims, "Let me congratulate you, young man. You have discovered the system on which the leading financiers of this great country conduct their business interests."[24] Thus the irrationality of the Wall Street struggle is celebrated in classic form.

A play like The Henrietta carries one far toward understanding how the American public reacted to its business leaders in the Gilded Age. Howard's audiences found his play very amusing; it was hailed by contemporary critics as a great American comedy.[25] To the modern reader this verdict comes as something of a shock. What about the scathing criticism, one wonders, and the savage attacks on the character of the "big rich"? Did these go unheeded? Or was this play merely another piece of "escape" literature, catering to the tastes of the very classes it purported to condemn?

In answer to these questions, it must be remembered that the modern critic does not have the advantage of seeing the play performed. There is

a vast difference between reading about a character in cold print and seeing him come to life on the stage. In Howard's case this distinction is of particular relevance, because he tailored his plays to fit the needs of the great actors and actresses of his day. Thus, The Henrietta was written for the well-known acting team of Robson and Crane. William H. Crane was seen in the role of Old Nick, while Stuart Robson appeared as Bertie. Who can tell what warmth these men brought to the somewhat forbidding creations of Howard's satire? Lewis C. Strang, in his volume on the plays and players of the period, has published a photograph of Robson in the role of Bertie. With his crumpled hat, timid expression, and white spats, he is already a far cry from Howard's stiff little hero.[26]

There is, of course, a more fundamental explanation for the public's refusal to take Howard seriously. A distinguished student of business institutions has called attention to a "cultural paradox" of the times. Speaking in terms of a particular industry, he observes:

> At the same time that Americans were saving at a high rate for development purposes and investing in railroad securities, they had a distrust of the railroad operator and were inclined to make the railroads a scapegoat for many of their ills. In other words, there was a kind of national Manicheaen heresy, whereby people were willing to sell themselves to the devil, to worship evil, as it were, but at the same time were not ready to forget that it was really the devil and not good that they were supporting.[27]

The ambiguity of this popular attitude was shared by Howard himself, and is reflected in his treatment of old Nicholas Vanalstyne. As a moralist, Howard could not condone the overbearing methods of the great financiers. Time and again he lunges out at Old Nick's rapacity, the lust for power that drives him to impose his will on everyone about him. Throughout the play the old man's faults are laid bare, one after another. Yet when the final curtain falls, one carries away the impression that maybe he isn't so bad after all. In the very boldness of his ambition there is something that captivates the imagination. Vanalstyne never pretends to be better than he is: he knows he is ruthless, he knows he is strong, and in that combination of honesty and strength Howard found something that approached the heroic. This quality, it should be noted, is conspicuously absent in the businessman of the second generation. Nick Jr. is the real villain of The Henrietta, and his cowardly intrigues are punished by death.

The difference between father and son, then, is primarily one of motivation and character. It was easy for Howard and his public to forgive the sins of the robber barons because they persisted in treating the "Old Nicks" of their day as individuals rather than as social forces. In The Henrietta the one type of unethical business activity which receives scant attention is

the most important of all, from the standpoint of the public: the corrupt alliance between business and politics. While Howard sharply reproves the private vices of the businessman, he pays little heed to the impact of big business upon American society at large, through monopolistic price-fixing, protective tariffs, and the control of courts and legislatures. The Henrietta thus remains a vigorous morality play, and nothing more; the day of the "social drama," of reform-minded protest against the social consequences of business methods, was yet to come.

And how could it have been otherwise? The decade of the eighties was a pre-muckraking period, when public attention centered on the dynamics of industrial growth and looked no further. Bigness in itself appeared romantic and the titan of finance or industry slipped easily into the role of a Byronic hero. A more critical attitude on the part of either playwrights or their audiences was slow in developing. It was not until the early twentieth century, when Ida Tarbell, Lincoln Steffens, and other muckraking journalists launched their well-documented attacks against big business practices in the cheap monthly magazines, that the public temper became aroused. Then a new group of business dramatists appeared, pledged to make the American stage (like the novel and the magazine article) an instrument of social reform. Charles Klein's immensely successful play, The Lion and the Mouse (1905), inaugurated an era of muckraking drama, in which themes, incidents, and personalities were lifted bodily from newspaper and magazine headlines and transferred to the stage. The "play of protest" came into its own at last, as dramatists focussed upon the "facts" that linked respectable businessmen to the party boss, the underworld hoodlum, and the venal legislator.[28]

Howard, past his prime and in failing health, took no part in this new movement. But his earlier melodramas captured the human side of the businessman far better than did any of the muckraking efforts. While he failed to grasp the mechanics of business "deals" or to appreciate the social cost of "rugged individualism," he did chronicle the changing mores of the American business community in a lively and definitive style. For this reason his works afford a unique introduction to the Golden Age of Big Business.

Ohio State University

Footnotes:

[1] Hamilton W. Mabie, "American Plays Old and New," The Outlook, CII (December 28, 1912), 945.

[2] Kenneth S. Lynn, "Authors in Search of the Businessman," Harvard Business Review, XXXIV (September-October, 1956), 116-124; Hal Bridges, "The Robber Baron Concept in American History," Business History Review,

XXXII (Spring, 1958), 1-13. See also the interesting debate between Allan Nevins and Matthew Josephson, "Should American History Be Rewritten?" Saturday Review of Literature, XXXVII (February 6, 1954), 7.

[3] Irvin G. Wyllie, The Self-Made Man in America (New Brunswick, 1954), 34-54.

[4] Portions of it were subsequently incorporated in Howard's Civil War romance, Shenandoah (1888). See Brander Matthews, "Bronson Howard," North American Review, CLXXXVIII (October, 1908), 513.

[5] Joseph I. C. Clarke, "Introductory Address," In Memoriam: Bronson Howard, Addresses Delivered at the Memorial Meeting Sunday, October 18, 1908, at the Lyceum Theatre, New York (New York, 1910), 11.

[6] Harry P. Mawson, "A Brief Biography," In Memoriam: Bronson Howard, 60-61.

[7] Ibid., 71.

[8] Bronson Howard, The Banker's Daughter, reprinted in Allan G. Halline (ed.), The Banker's Daughter and Other Plays by Bronson Howard (Princeton, 1941), Act I, 95.

[9] Ibid., Act V, 137.

[10] Ibid., Act III, 111-112; Act V, 133-134.

[11] Bronson Howard, "Autobiography of a Play," In Memoriam: Bronson Howard, 113-114.

[12] Samuel Rezneck, "Patterns of Thought and Action in an American Depression, 1882-1886," American Historical Review, LXI (January, 1956), 284-307.

[13] Bronson Howard, Baron Rudolph, reprinted in Halline, The Banker's Daughter, Act III, 169.

[14] Ibid., Act I, 148.

[15] Lynn, "Authors in Search of the Businessman," Harvard Business Review, XXXIV (September-October, 1956), 116-124.

[16] W. Woodruff, "History and the Businessman," Business History Review, XXX (September, 1956), 241-259.

[17] Bronson Howard, Young Mrs. Winthrop (New York, n.d.), Act II, 23, 24; Act I, 4.

[18] Ibid., Act III, 33.

[19] Arthur Hobson Quinn, A History of the American Drama from the Civil War to the Present Day (New York, 1936), 57.

[20] Lewis C. Strang, Players and Plays of the Last Quarter Century, 2 vols. (Boston, 1903), II, 152-153.

[21] Bronson Howard, The Henrietta, reprinted in Allan Gates Halline (ed.), American Plays (New York, 1935), Act I, 417.

[22] Ibid., Act III, sc. 2, 445.

[23] Ibid., Act III, sc. 1, 445.

[24] Ibid., Act IV, 453.

[25] Strang, Players and Plays, II, 152.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Thomas C. Cochran, "The Legend of the Robber Barons," Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, LXXIV (July, 1950), 315-316.

[28] For the connection between muckraking and the drama, see: Harold de Wolf Fuller, "The Realism of the American Stage: the Drama of Exposure and the Reforming Spirit," Nation, CII (March 16, 1916), 307-310. See also the specific examples discussed in Caspar H. Nannes, Politics in the American Drama (Washington, D. C., 1960), 28-33, 45-55.