thought for a period of special interest. Further work of this kind is needed before a broader and improved synthesis of constitutional history can be achieved. The author well deserved the Beveridge Award of the American Historical Association.

Indiana University **Maurice G. Baxter**

The American Newspaperman. By Bernard A. Weisberger. *The Chicago History of American Civilization.* Edited by Daniel J. Boorstin. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961. Pp. x, 226. Illustrations, chronology, suggested reading, index. $4.50.)

Historians often are inclined to believe that there has been a steady decline in the quality of the American newspaper since the end of the nineteenth century when Joseph Pulitzer and William Randolph Hearst created sensationalism. Newspapermen generally disagree with this interpretation, pointing to the fact that twentieth-century newspapers, for all their entertainment features, contain far more of solid news information—reported considerably more exactly and expeditiously—than those of the previous century. Assigned to write a compact volume on newspapers as a part of the University of Chicago's series on the history of American civilization, Bernard A. Weisberger balances the two points of view fairly well. The reader may find consideration of the point of view of intellectuals who regret the coming of newspaper "empires" and consideration of that of professionals who appreciate the increased objectivity of the press.

"There is no need for despair," Weisberger writes. "It would be foolhardy to insist flatly that the makers and molders of journalism will never break through the limitations of the mass-communications newspaper to answer the challenge of the age. A new American newspaperman may yet emerge, wielding some unforeseen cost-cutting mechanism, reaching for some as yet unsuspected audience, shouting, shaping, innovating, and carrying on the traditions of a calling which, all in all, has had many things to boast of" (p. 203).

Weisberger came to the field of journalism through a study written a decade ago, which was rather undistinguished, of reporters on the Union side in the Civil War. His new book has more sweep. He is by profession a cultural historian and appropriately treats the press as an aspect of the nation's cultural history. He also follows the pattern of several journalism historians in emphasizing economic currents in the stream of the American press, the fiscal and mechanical developments.

For the scholar in the field of journalism, the new book will be less satisfactory than either Frank L. Mott's volume or that of Edwin Emery and Henry L. Smith. Although both of those are written as textbooks, they are more substantial than the present book. Weisberger's book may be more useful to the conventional historian and to the lay reader. At least one insight in the new synthesis may be useful even to students of journalism history. This is the interpretation of the first half of the nineteenth century as a period of "special audience" papers. Traditionally, that era has been called the period of the "party press." Weisberger's interpretation seems a more inclusive one.

One fault of the book is a fault of scholarship in the field generally. This is an overemphasis upon the development of the press in New York and Washington. An outstanding characteristic of the American press is its provincialism—the fact that this country, unlike Britain, France, Russia, and Argentina, for example, has never developed a national journalism. As Weisberger shows, there were the beginnings of such a national press first in Washington and then in New York, but provincialism won out. The newspapers of the provincial cities like Kansas City, Louisville, Minneapolis, Atlanta, and Los Angeles have represented more truly the pattern of American journalism than those of New York and Washington, yet relatively few careful studies have been made of the press in important provincial cities and almost none at all in lesser cities. Weisberger, like others before him, has had to depend upon the literature available.

The Indianapolis News Sexson E. Humphreys

Professional Diplomacy in the United States, 1779-1939: A Study in Administrative History. By Warren Frederick Ilchman. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961. Pp. 254. Bibliographical essay, index. $6.00.)

In the past decade there has developed among historians and political scientists an interest in administrative history. Warren Ilchman offers a significant contribution to this expanding field in his study of the growth of a professional diplomatic corps within the Department of State. In this initial study the author concentrates on the gradual transformation of American representatives on the secretarial level from temporary political appointees to career officers selected on the basis of competitive examinations. A future volume will examine developments on the ministerial level, compare American and British experience, and judge what influence the movement toward professional diplomacy has had on the conduct of American foreign policy.

Ilchman's research was wide, varied, and solid. Perhaps the only materials not investigated which could have added much to a study of this type were the individual, confidential records of the secretaries which the Department of State has not, and in all probability will not, open to historians. Much of the research is condensed into statistics demonstrating the increasing tenure of the secretaries after the profession was placed on a career basis, the growing number and quality of applicants taking the examinations, and the high percentage of graduates of eastern colleges appointed to the foreign service.

The statistical approach, however, does not make for easy reading; the figures are valuable, but many of them belong in footnotes and not in the text. The book is for the specialist who will use it as a valuable reference work. The general reader, however, will find little that holds his interest in a mass of figures and chapters that increase in length from forty to sixty-seven pages; long chapters written in the weak passive voice simply do not hold a reader's attention. A more serious defect is that the author is not always clear in his explanations; a good example of this failure is with regard to the awarding of bonus points