

little documentary history in a number of chapters and a considerable amount in the last chapter on modern religions.

Underhill is one of the best writers in anthropology as the following quotation shows: "One of my most dramatic memories is that of standing in the plaza of a Pueblo, in the dark of a January morning, to watch the Mother of Game bring in the deer. It was almost dawn when we heard the hunter's call from the hillside. Then shadowy forms came bounding down through the piñon trees. At first we could barely see the shaking horns and dappled hides. Then the sun's rays picked out men on all fours, with deerskins over their backs and painted staves in their hands to simulate forelegs. They leaped and gamboled before the people while around them pranced little boys who seemed actually to have the spirit of fawns" (p. 117).

On the whole this book is the best on its subject to date and will appeal to a wide audience. It may be classed as text, trade, reference, or all three and can be read with profit by professionals in both the behavioral sciences and the humanities, including historians.

Indiana University

Harold E. Driver

Historians against History: The Frontier Thesis and the National Covenant in American Historical Writing since 1830. By David W. Noble. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1965. Pp. 197. Notes, index. \$5.00.)

This slender volume re-examines many of the precepts by which Americans have been guided since 1830. It also raises anew many arguments which no doubt will go into perpetuity. The author has sought the central theme or tradition in historical writings dealing with an expanding America. He of necessity has had to review the conflicts between old and new world cultures and between the simple agrarianism and the rising complex industrialism. In examining the adjustments of Americans to their new-found environment, historians have come under many intellectual and physical influences ranging from that of the mythical second covenant of salvation between God and man to the philosophies of Locke, Rousseau, Jefferson, and others. Triumph of the common man, some historians have said, came in the 1830's with the elevation of Andrew Jackson to the presidency of the United States.

American historians no doubt, as Noble says, have constantly searched for answers to the question of how the country attained uniqueness and resisted alien influences. From George Bancroft to Daniel Boorstin, historians have tried either to explain this fact or to refute it in many of its parts.

Bancroft has had a vast and no doubt undue influence on American historians, even on those who have never read his history. The simple Calvinistic doctrine of predestinarianism had meaning for Americans. So did the simplicity of Puritanism. Beginning with no actual cultured heritage, as Bancroft saw America, the Republic built its cultural structure on a simple rural agrarianism. Humble leaders such as George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and Daniel Boone were

destined to bring about the fulfillment of the covenant. It was they who would lead the conquest. It was they who would help the people step out of a feudal past. To Bancroft the sprawling frontier was a "garden" not to be despoiled once again by the sordid bickerings of man, especially political man.

Beard and Turner perhaps synthesized much of the conflict between agrarian expansion and the industrial revolution and the various contradictions which arose. It was Carl Becker, however, who best revealed the changing viewpoints of the American historian with the passing years and the gaining of experience as a historian. Becker's Kansas experience tarnished some of the shine of the frontier for the eager young historian. In two perceptive essays the author traces the transition of Carl Becker from an idealistic frontiersman to a historian willing to accept the dynamics of technology and industrial revolution. In his later years Becker greatly revised his belief in the ability of the common man to achieve democracy and to make the great plan necessary for its future operation. Beard, too, viewed the revolution of the twentieth century from a sharply revised perspective—even though he was highly cynical about the capacity of the capitalist plutocracy to survive.

In his concluding chapter, the author examines the points of departure of Daniel Boorstin between the publication of *The Mysterious Science of Law* and the *Genius of American Politics*. By 1962, and in the *Images*, Noble says Boorstin reached the point at which he seemed "to deny much of the intellectual position he had constructed over the last decade. He appeared to have discovered a more fearful threat to American innocence than those which had haunted Bancroft, Turner, Parrington, and Beard. He found corruption within the 'people'" (p. 173).

This book raises many old questions and provokes many new ones. It raises no greater new one than whether or not middle twentieth-century America has fulfilled the covenant of the garden and the great dream.

Indiana University

Thomas D. Clark

Fisher Ames, Federalist and Statesman, 1758-1808. By Winfred E. A. Bernhard. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1965. Pp. xiii, 372. Notes, illustrations, note on sources, index. \$8.75.)

Among congressmen of the 1790's Fisher Ames, representative from Massachusetts, acquired a notable reputation as a hard-core Federalist and an outstanding orator. He reached the peak of his fame midway in the decade in defense of the treaty which Federalist John Jay had negotiated with England. The treaty provoked dispute throughout the country, and in the House rebellious Republicans moved to block the necessary appropriations. "A Jupiter was needed," Bernhard writes, "who could hurl thunderbolts and confound the enemy. Federalists turned to Ames" (p. 267). They were turning to a sick man. "Mr. Chairman," he began, "I entertain the hope, perhaps a rash one, that