

theory regarding the southern states. Belz calls it "Reconstruction as Territorialization." As developed by James M. Ashley, chairman of the House Committee on Territories, the theory maintained that the seceded states had "reverted to the status of territories and must be governed by Congress" (p. 40). Charles Sumner added his state suicide theory; Congressman John Gurley, his confiscation and antislavery ideas; and Senator Ira Harris, his more moderate bill for a genuine interim government which would maintain peace and order until the citizens of the rebellious states could "reorganize" loyal governments.

The point is that Congress was developing theories and policies for reconstruction at the very time that President Lincoln was himself organizing military governments in states where victory made it possible. What came out of it, as Belz shows, was a growing struggle between Congress and the executive, but with a drift towards the elimination of slavery on both sides.

The struggle between the two developed by stages and climaxed in Lincoln's determined effort to admit Louisiana with his low 10 per cent loyalty requirement and in the passage by Congress of the so-called Wade-Davis bill. Lincoln's death prevented a final showdown, but Belz believes that with Lincoln's growing effort to include abolition of slavery in his demands that a compromise would soon have been worked out. That, of course, lays the major responsibility for the final outcome squarely on the shoulders of Andrew Johnson.

This is a valuable and important book. It gives us for the first time a full account of the congressional side of Reconstruction to be placed against the well known Lincoln part in that phase of American history. The assumption that theory produced the policies in reconstruction, however, is open to question. It ignores, to a large degree the matter of personalities, the great new economic and political forces of an emerging new age, and the part which military victory and defeat played; which is only suggesting that developments sometimes shaped the theories as well as the policies adopted.

The University of Chicago, Chicago

Avery Craven

The University of Illinois, 1867-1894: An Intellectual and Cultural History.

By Winton U. Solberg. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968. Pp. x, 494. Notes, illustrations, bibliography, index. \$12.50.)

In this book Winton U. Solberg, professor of history at the University of Illinois, has produced a penetrating analysis of a quarter of a century of the development of higher education in that state. The University of Illinois entered its formative stages in one of the most important eras of American higher education. This was the era when universities everywhere struggled to depart from the stultifying traditions of the past. The university had been founded and organized under the terms of the Morrill Land Grant Act; friends of the university acted no differently from those people who helped

to organize Cornell, Michigan State, Purdue, or Kentucky. All of them had their "great periods of conflict." Nevertheless John Milton Gregory and his staff had the opportunity to make some fresh and imaginative beginnings in the field of public university education. They, however, were shackled by their own philosophies, by the deeply ingrained American educational tradition, and by the confused desires of a people who demanded they be served within the context of a strong "Jacksonian" folk need for advanced training.

The author treats in four erudite chapters the tradition of university curricula and struggles, the dreams and campaigning which looked to the future, and the sources of conflict which arose out of practical politics and everyday life. Throughout this book there is a consciousness that the projection of the central philosophy read into the Morrill Act was disruptive of the flow from the past, and in many ways it clogged the approach to the future by its placement of emphases. Elements of conflict in the application of this concept of educational needs were polarized about the maintenance of the ancient liberal arts curriculum and the development of a curriculum for the new applied sciences and vocational subjects. This conflict revealed itself in attitudes of presidents, professors, board members, the public press, and most important of all, the people of Illinois.

Professor Solberg unfolds the story of the founding of the University of Illinois, petal by petal. Basically there were the presidential administrations of John Milton Gregory, Selim Hobart Peabody, and Thomas J. Burrill, interim president. Each of these men left a personal impress on the institution. Burrill was, in many respects, the most impressive of the three. Associated with these men were professors of widely varying capacities and accomplishments. The same thing can be said about students. The latter fell under a smothering pall of paternalism, and there was a constant tugging at this curtain of control to give the students a breath of freedom and independence as human beings with maturing minds. In an epilogue the author viewed the board of trustees with genuine skepticism. This body gave Illinois little aggressive or progressive leadership. In fact more often than not it was a public brake on the maturing of higher education in the state.

This is a highly competent study which views the state university in the context of a people's culture. The author has used generously the great mass of university records to present a dependable account of a quarter of a century of an American public university against a universal background of folk education. This age of public universities, not Solberg's book, had both a tone of dullness and more than a coloration of excitement about it. All across America there was almost a childish expectation that higher education would hasten realization of the great American dream. The people of Illinois were no exception.