

man wrote: "Pile on the Black Man's Burden / His wail with laughter drown" (p. 184). By 1900 such views encouraged a sizeable minority of blacks to forsake the Republican banner and cast their vote for William Jennings Bryan. Over the next two years the black troop experience in the Philippines proved a bitter involvement for Negro Americans. With such experience as the final proof most blacks came to realize that colonialism had only helped consolidate the shift domestically toward discriminatory racial politics and explicit white supremacist ideas.

This study is an excellent example of the use of neglected source materials to enrich a period of history. Gatewood examines the views of black journalists and editors in Negro weeklies and magazines and concludes that their positions were far more varied than previously realized. Combined with extensive reliance on manuscript materials, army records, and autobiographies, Gatewood's presentation of black editorial opinions represents a solid basis for a subject that he consistently treats with careful organization and graceful prose.

Georgetown University,
Washington, D. C.

Ronald M. Johnson

John Hay: The Gentleman as Diplomat. By Kenton J. Clymer. (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1975. Pp. ix, 314. Frontispiece, notes, essay on sources, bibliography, index. \$15.00.)

Since Tyler Dennett published his magisterial biography of John Hay in 1933 (*John Hay: From Poetry to Politics*), no one has attempted to match him until now. In the meantime Hay's reputation as secretary of state has somewhat declined. Beginning in the mid-1950s, Howard K. Beale, Raymond Esthus, and others have rehabilitated Theodore Roosevelt as a maker of foreign policy, and biographers such as Margaret Leech and H. Wayne Morgan have rediscovered William McKinley. It is altogether appropriate that some one should reexamine the career of John Hay in this new milieu, making use of source materials and secondary accounts not available to Dennett. Kenton J. Clymer has done a reasonable job of the reappraisal, coming to some different

conclusions from those of Dennett. His biography supplements but does not supersede the older work; future historians probably should read them both.

As they do so, they may have the unhappy feeling that Hay does not deserve all that effort on their part. A secretary and daily intimate of Abraham Lincoln, a successful businessman, an admired author, a wealthy socialite, a brilliant wit in a circle of intellectuals, and, at the end, a secretary of state during a transition period in United States history, he was a man to whom many things came easily. Dennett admits that Hay was both lazy and lucky but insists that he was one of America's great secretaries of state. Clymer, having studied the refurbished careers of McKinley and Roosevelt, is not so sure. He also sees, more clearly than Dennett, Hay's intense, even vindictive, anti-Democratic partisanship, his snobbishness, and his double dealing ways with even his closest friends. (Some of them, especially Henry Adams, were just as catty as he.)

Clymer makes an important contribution in his sharper awareness of Hay's social and political thought (to which he devotes two out of nine chapters), emphasizing the rightward drift of his ideas during the 1870s and 1880s. The two biographers' accounts of Hay's anonymous antiunion novel, *The Bread-winners*, are revealingly different. Dennett sees the book as "less a social study than a study of society in the higher altitudes" (Dennett, *John Hay*, p. 107), while to Clymer it represents an "open repudiation of the social democracy found in his early works . . . an explicit denunciation of Jacksonian Democracy" (p. 40). Concerning Hay's diplomacy, Clymer frankly admits the secretary of state's Anglophilia, while Dennett either denies it or tries to explain it away. Dennett's account of diplomatic questions is usually fuller, while Clymer's naturally benefits from up to date scholarship at several points.

Even in style the books are unlike, Dennett's being somewhat prolix and flowery, and Clymer's occasionally gauche, with a sprinkling of typographical errors and other misspelled words. The modern reader will sometimes feel that Dennett has told him more than he wants to know and Clymer not enough.