

Lincoln's Gadfly, Adam Gurowski. By Leroy H. Fischer. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964. Pp. xvii, 301. Notes, illustrations, bibliography, index. \$6.95.)

Every student of the Civil War must, at some time, have puzzled over and through the diary of Adam Gurowski. Its outspoken and vitriolic statements on the issues and conduct of the war, its damaging and near-libelous comments on the quality of the nation's leadership, and its high conceit and self-righteous tone clearly have marked it as the production of an unusual and even sensational individual. That such was indeed the case has now been demonstrated. In a study that originated at the University of Illinois under the late James G. Randall, Professor Fischer, of Oklahoma State University, has "recounted for the first time the Civil War actions and opinions of Count Adam Gurowski" (p. vii). The author's purpose "is to understand the Count as he revealed himself during the war years and to make pattern of the multitude of opinions on men and issues found in the jungle of his writings" (p. viii). This proved to be no small task, for Gurowski was a prolific writer—not only as a diarist, but as a letter writer and an author of books. There seems to be little if anything on which Gurowski did not have an opinion. This study is based, then, to a very high degree on Gurowski's own statements. Their "pattern" appears in a series of topical chapters, detailing Gurowski's opinions on and attitudes toward Radical Republicanism, Lincoln, Lincoln's cabinet, northern military leadership, international relations, and slavery. Two chapters deal with a libel suit brought against Gurowski for statements made in his published diary.

Count Adam Gurowski (for he was a Polish nobleman) was every bit as bizarre and eccentric as his diary indicates. His penchant for causes, to which he attached himself with a whole-hearted devotion, resulted in an erratic and frequently contradictory career. He was rude, crude, and unmindful of the feelings of others; he was quick to take offense and, always armed, brandished his pistol at the slightest provocation. On one occasion, he described himself, rather aptly, as a savage animal by nature. Early in his life, Gurowski dedicated himself to the cause of freeing his native Poland from the Russian yoke, only to abandon the Polish freedom movement in favor of a Russian-led Pan Slavism. Disenchanted with the Russians, he fled to Prussia and eventually to the United States, which he came to regard as the incarnation of liberty. In the 1850's, he took up the cause of the abolitionists and soon became identified with the Radical Republicans.

The author claims much for Gurowski as a Radical Republican. No man, he maintains, saw the demarcation between Conservative and Radical Republicanism more clearly than Gurowski. His views on the Radical movement "were unusually clear" (p. 91) and there was much wisdom in his opinions. His diary was, and remains, "the Jacobin bible" (p. 196). An "objective" abolitionist, he tempered his zeal with an intellectual and scholarly approach (p. 226). Yet, precisely what influence did Gurowski exercise? The answer is not clear. If he did play a constructive role in Civil War Republican politics, or even in the

formulation of Radical policies, it is not delineated here. That Lincoln was impressed with Gurowski (after a fashion) is evident, for he feared that the Pole might assassinate him. Beyond this, it is not certain that Lincoln even read some of the many letters Gurowski addressed to him. The conclusion is inescapable that Gurowski was, above all, a colossal nuisance; whatever value his actions might have had was a nuisance value. As a self-appointed theoretician and spokesman for the Radical cause, he broke with other Radical leaders who could not accept uncritically his views or abide his obnoxious character (Sumner and Chase, for example). Gurowski seems to have been his own worst enemy, depriving himself of whatever constructive influence he might have had by his unrestrained outbursts of invective and by his erratic behavior. Even the author concedes at one point that "no man was less intelligible" (p. 257). As a gadfly, Gurowski's sting was harmless; indeed, even his nuisance value might be questioned.

Professor Fischer deserves our credit, however, for carefully summarizing the thought and career of this unusual personality. This book, in manuscript, was awarded in 1963 the \$5,000 Literary Award of the War Library and Museum and the Pennsylvania Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion.

University of Illinois

Robert W. Johannsen

Varieties of Reform Thought. By Daniel Levine. (Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1964. Pp. xiii, 149. Notes, bibliography, index. \$3.00.)

Variety, complexity, and diversity have been keynotes in the lexicon of recent studies of the progressive era, and this slender volume is no exception. Other historians have pointed out that businessmen were of mixed views on reform issues, and that lower class urbanites shared in some of the supposedly middle class progressive values; we now learn that reform thinking displayed no monolithic ideology, but rather a "tremendous variety" (p. 109). Evidence to support this view consists of brief and interesting studies of five individuals and one organization: Jane Addams, Samuel Gompers, Albert J. Beveridge, Edgar Gardner Murphy, Robert M. La Follette and the Civic Federation of Chicago. All enjoyed national prominence save Murphy, who fought for child labor regulation and improved race relations in Alabama. From this sampling the author concludes that reformers had widely divergent views on the nature of man and society, on the desirability of social change, on the issue of liberty versus equality, and on the proper functions of government.

Levine is troubled by the inaccuracy and general abuse of the word progressive, so he has chosen to describe his subjects as "non-Populist" reformers. This diversionary tactic is unsatisfactory, for it replaces an admittedly imprecise label with a catchall which is even vaguer. His reluctance to identify Gompers as a progressive is understandable, but there are equally strong grounds for denying that the labor leader was even a reformer. Perhaps some day historians will shrug their shoulders