

be shared. As Wilbur D. Jones has analyzed Aberdeen's policy between 1841 and 1846, American success in settlement of the Maine, Texas, and Oregon questions must redound to the credit of that British Foreign Secretary who patiently worked to maintain the peace of the English-speaking peoples.

The historian who can provide the American background for himself will find in these pages welcome relief from the raucous cries of the expansionists of the 1840's. Unfortunately, save for a short Foreword by Lady Pentland, and a brief concluding estimate, Aberdeen appears only as the author of numerous soothing and diplomatically circuitous notes. Professor Jones' chief concern seems to be the full documentation of his earlier controversy with Frederick Merk over the proper evaluation of Aberdeen's motivation. Merk argued that British Opposition politics significantly affected the settlement of the Oregon dispute. Jones builds a persuasive case for Aberdeen's independence, but he avoids Merk's evidence except to reject it as a slur upon Lord Aberdeen. That is not quite convincing, and few would think less of Aberdeen if he were shown to be sensitive to bipartisan pressures in a delicate diplomatic situation. Both the diplomatic history of the period and the biography of Lord Aberdeen need further development. Judging from the real merits of this volume, what Professor Jones may say upon either subject in the future will deserve weighty consideration.

The Alabama Polytechnic Institute

Robert R. Rea

The Guns at Gettysburg. By Fairfax Downey. (New York: David McKay Company, 1958. Pp. xii, 290. Illustrations, maps, appendices, notes, bibliography, index. \$5.00.)

What Gettysburg enthusiast has not felt the presence of the "Guns at Gettysburg," and with the author been conscious that they have defied a century of time? Fairfax Downey has back of his writing the enthusiasm, or perhaps it might be called inspiration, of the true Gettysburg fan.

Downey is an artillerist, and consequently tends to overstress the importance of that arm and to exaggerate somewhat its destructive power. He develops the battle by describing the employment of artillery, day by day, and ends with a brief critique. He does it well, and for the Gettysburg addict who has always felt the need of a better picture of the artillery battle, *The Guns at Gettysburg* is the answer to a prayer and a guide to the field.

As might be expected, Downey is a little at a loss in explaining the employment of masses of infantry which furnished the development pattern of the battle. For instance, Hood's Division of the First Corps opened the second day's battle, attacking by brigades in echelon. Then McLaw's Division took up the movement, and Barksdale's Brigade which cracked the salient at the Peach Orchard was the last unit committed. However, Downey jumps in right here and introduces an account of the artillery masterpiece that eased the Union line back to its original position. He is probably inaccurate on the commitment of

the Fifth Corps to the defense of Sickles' ill-formed salient. Moreover, he is unaware of the presence of Vincent's Brigade in the defense of Little Round Top and not clear on the situation into which General Warren directed "Paddy" O'Rourke at the head of the Hundred and Fortieth of New York. Throughout the volume, as well as at the above noted points, the basic description of the battle leaves a little to be desired.

This book is full of personal incidents and first-hand description. It is filled with technical information on the operation and employment of artillery. The author has no quarrel with the traditional—no yen for new theories or appraisements. Gettysburg is still the "decisive battle"; the Eastern Theatre the center of the war; the march of the western armies unheeded; Grant at Vicksburg unnoticed. For the Civil War fan and for the Gettysburg enthusiast, however, the book is a must.

DePauw University

A. W. Crandall

The Republican Era, 1869-1901: A Study in Administrative History.
By Leonard D. White. (New York: The MacMillan Company,
1958. Pp. ix, 406. Index. \$6.00.)

Leonard D. White's *The Republican Era* concludes a series of studies in administrative history which began with *The Federalists* (1948), followed by *The Jeffersonians* (1951) and *The Jacksonians* (1954). The series was not intended to be a comprehensive history of public administration in the United States. It was, rather, the intention of the author to describe the theory and practice of administration in the national government under four distinctive and formative phases of its political history. As with the volumes which precede it, *The Republican Era* is concerned with the national level of government, state and local administration receiving only passing attention.

The years 1869-1901 were not, in the main, years of progress or perfection in the art of public administration. Accomplishments such as the Pendleton Civil Service Law of 1883 were primarily a means of return to the higher standards of public service prevailing during the early years of the Republic. In this and other measures, foundations were laid (often inadvertently) for far-reaching developments to follow. But neither Republicans nor Democrats in this era favored positive public administration in the sense later to be dramatized by Woodrow Wilson and the Roosevelts. The Republicans were as "Jacksonian" in their political principles as the Democrats, but with the important omission of Andrew Jackson.

Both major parties were factionalized throughout the Republican era. But the most consistent and characteristic leadership among the Republicans was found in the United States Senate. Initiative in the chief executive was not a quality sought by these Republican leaders. They expected that Republican presidents would serve primarily as executors of their policies and wishes. They became "righteously" indignant when presidents Hayes and Roosevelt demurred and advanced policies of their own which were prejudicial to personal interests of prominent Republican senators.