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MAJOR GENERAL WILLIAM J. DONOVAN
Major General William J. Donovan: a Pioneer in U.S. Intelligence

JAMES B. DONOVAN

A Columns article is usually about the collection which has been donated rather than about the collector, but the personality and accomplishments of “Wild Bill” Donovan are so striking that they rightfully claim attention first. The distinguished author of this memoir is President of the Board of Education of the City of New York; in World War II he was General Counsel, Office of Strategic Services. The historical espionage collection formed by General Donovan and presented by his widow to Columbia will not be neglected, however: Professor Richard Morris will describe it in a later issue.

EDITOR’S NOTE

THE LATE Major General William J. (“Wild Bill”) Donovan led one of the great lives of the 20th century. Only Winston Churchill and a few other men were privileged to pursue such extraordinary, many-sided careers.

General Donovan was in sequence an inter-collegiate athlete, soldier, lawyer, politician, highly placed Government official,
wartime intelligence chief for the United States, diplomat, and leader in various other fields. Most remarkable, he achieved distinction in his every role.

What was the human measure of this man, whose widow now has graciously donated to Columbia University his collection of espionage materials relating to the American Revolution? Others knew General Donovan more intimately, for a far longer period, than was my privilege. However, I shall do my best to write this brief personal memoir.

I always have been grateful to “The General” (as all who served under him during World War II will forever remember him) for permitting me to be a member of his personal staff in O. S. S. We happened to have the same surname, although unrelated. There were petty men in Congress and elsewhere who were not averse to suggesting some form of nepotism in our relationship, in an effort to embarrass the General at various times. He simply ignored the implication. I appreciated his attitude which would not have been assumed by a lesser man.

General Donovan was a dynamic yet quiet leader of men. No person who loyally served him was unrewarded. The very experience of being close to so remarkable an individual inspired thousands of men and women who found broader intellectual horizons and a deeper patriotism through their personal devotion to the leadership of “The General.”

General Donovan’s most lasting contribution to the free world undoubtedly lies in his being the founding father of the first central intelligence system possessed by the United States, at a time when our country had become the most powerful nation on earth. Before his vision and personal initiative made possible the creation of such an intelligence system, the United States was the only major world power without an organization designed to afford its Government the resources whereby all policy decisions could be informed decisions. Since this was General Donovan’s greatest contribution to his country, perhaps we should briefly
consider his then revolutionary concepts, which now have become established policy within the United States.

As General Donovan taught all in O. S. S., intelligence should be defined as the knowledge which a person, organization or nation should possess in order to make a proper decision with respect to a necessary course of action.

In international affairs, said the General, the field may be further subdivided into the three categories of strategic intelligence, tactical intelligence and counter-intelligence. "Strategic intelligence" is information pertinent to decisions affecting national policy in the broadest sense of that term; "tactical intelligence" concerns information required by a policy-maker engaged in relatively specialized or geographically localized operations; "counter-intelligence" is an internal security or police function designed to protect one's own national integrity and to lessen the effectiveness of the intelligence or sabotage operations of alien powers. The Central Intelligence Agency today has primary responsibility for "strategic intelligence" in the United States; "tactical intelligence" is the concern of units within the State Department, G-2 (Army), O.N.I. (Navy) and other military, naval and Air Force groups directly responsible to area commanders; "counter-intelligence" is the responsibility abroad of the C. I. A., and in the United States, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

While this arbitrary division is satisfactory for most purposes, the three categories of intelligence at times overlap and a specific item of information can be of interest to all. For example, knowledge on the night of December 6, 1941, that the Japanese were planning to bomb Pearl Harbor the next morning, would vitally affect all three areas. First, it would be "strategic intelligence" to the President and the Congress, since it would mean that our nation would be at war with Japan and her allies; second, it would be "tactical intelligence" to the Commanding General in Hawaii, with an immediate military duty to defend the then Territory;
and third, it would necessitate steps by our “counter-intelligence” forces to take into custody all probable enemies within our borders, in order to minimize the possibility of sabotage and to prevent vital information (e. g., the extent of human casualties and physical damage at Pearl Harbor) from falling into enemy hands.

What, General Donovan would say, is the stuff of strategic intelligence? This basically consists of all information relevant to the overall intentions and capabilities of every other nation, including its foreign policy, military strength, manpower, technological development, national economy, civilian morale, ethnic characteristics of its people, internal policies, leading personalities of its various political factions, etc. This is more than the academic assembling of such information, for the specific objective should be to ascertain not only the potential capabilities of every other nation but also its intentions toward the United States. It involves today a great deal in addition to data concerning such major adversaries as Russia and Red China. It is also necessary for the men responsible for U. S. national policy planning (whether military, economic or broadly “foreign affairs”) to be informed on the probable effect of a general election in Great Britain; to have a realistic estimate of the degree of Communist influence in Venezuela or Argentina; and to appraise the probable effects upon international relations of a war between Israel and the Arab world.

It becomes apparent, General Donovan would teach, that the fund of information relevant to all such questions would be virtually the total sum of man’s knowledge. Accordingly, in creating the collection plan of any strategic intelligence operation, both selectivity in subjects and priority of projects must be carefully weighed. Even then, great numbers of research scholars and analysts are required. It has been reliably estimated that the Central Intelligence Agency, although formally established only in 1947, today has more employees and greater total appro-
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aptions of public funds than the State Department. However astounding this fact may be to the average citizen, it is understandable when we consider the weight of the national responsibilities placed upon C.I.A. and the importance of its being able to supply officials making policy decisions with the proper information pertinent to each determination.

Understanding the type of raw information which strategic intelligence requires, the functions of an intelligence agency would be broadly classified by General Donovan as three: first, the collection of strategic information; second, its sound evaluation; and third, the dissemination of such information to the proper persons at the right time. Unless all three of these functions are completely performed, the intelligence agency cannot achieve its objectives.

Contrary to popular understanding, the overwhelming amount of the most important intelligence is not a result of secret espionage. It is obtained by overt means. Spies will always be used and at times score brilliant individual successes. But painstaking research and analysis of readily available information will continue to provide the bulk of intelligence materials.

During World War II, for example, there were numerous instances of vital data concerning the enemy which were obtained by the simple device of our regularly subscribing to and studying German newspapers sent to a neutral country. The diplomatic service of each nation, through embassies and consulates, has traditionally and unashamedly served as a primary source of information for its government.

A democracy, of course, is a most vulnerable target for overt intelligence. We may be certain that every chart produced by our Coast and Geodetic Survey, every Defense Department report to Congress on military strength, every scientific and technical publication in the United States, every stockholders' report on national defense developments, every issue of our best newspapers, is carefully collected by Soviet Russia directly or through
intermediaries. We must remember that in the Soviet tens of thousands of young people today speak, read and write English as fluently as their native language. Cadres of them serve in intelligence centres. Instances have been reported of American surgeons visiting Russia who found to their astonishment that some Russian surgeons were more familiar than their American counterparts with the latest techniques developed in the Mayo Clinic.

It is a reasonable conclusion that with due recognition of the individual brilliance of certain Soviet scientists a highly developed system of overt intelligence, more than any other factor, was responsible for Russia's launching of the first Sputnik, with the enormous international prestige thus obtained. By taking full advantage of the latest scientific developments in the United States and Europe (few of which remain truly secret for a great length of time) the Russians have taken undeservedly acclaimed strides forward. Add to such overt intelligence the network of clandestine agents with which Russia certainly attempts to blanket the free world and it is evident that while we have been the unwitting teachers, the Russians have been apt pupils.

General Donovan taught us in O.S.S. that our intelligence and counter-intelligence tasks in the United States are complicated by a variety of circumstances. First, it is obviously difficult and most unpopular for any democracy to keep large bodies of information secret from its people. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press and other civil liberties, properly regarded as sacred in a democracy, lead to constant demand that all government activity must be made public and that personal constitutional rights must not be abridged. Our way of life sharply contrasts with existence in a state such as Russia, wherein all foreigners are treated with great suspicion, every type of internal security control is rigidly enforced, and civil liberties are disregarded whenever the security of the state is deemed to be affected.

A further difficulty is that few native Americans, due to our relative isolationism until recent years, are fluent in foreign languages. General Donovan felt very deeply on this subject. Con-
Consider how seldom a college graduate of your acquaintance is truly fluent in a foreign language. Quite the contrary is true among graduates of European universities. This fact has presented problems even in overt intelligence, since we are pitifully weak in the numbers of those who can regularly translate and evaluate such publications from behind the Iron Curtain as become available to us. It also has rendered difficult the task of propaganda abroad, and of course presents tremendous obstacles to our use of native clandestine agents under cover in a foreign country. Apart from a small band of scholars, American agents on European soil during World War II largely comprised first or second generation Americans with a heritage derived from the specific land being liberated by our forces. These also were limited to those who had not neglected their mother tongue, as so many immigrants understandably but regretfully have done in order to become “more Americanized.” We now have hopeful signs that our national deficiency in foreign languages should decrease in the years to come, but, for the present, this fact remains a formidable obstacle by reason of the limitation which it imposes upon our intelligence and diplomatic forces.

Strategic intelligence, then, is obtained principally by overt, but also clandestine, means. Having obtained such information the next step in the intelligence process is proper evaluation. The importance of this function cannot be over-emphasized, for a simple fact which would be of no interest to the ordinary person can be tremendously significant to a trained expert in any specific field. Dramatic examples of this occurred in World War II. Expert study of photographic surveys obtained through aerial reconnaissance led to recognition of rocket platforms built to launch the V-1 rockets; individual deaths among commissioned German Army officers, reported in German newspapers, could be used to determine total enemy casualties and at times even the location of military units.

Accordingly, it is basic that raw intelligence data must be carefully evaluated and sifted by experts before it will serve its
proper use. This is, however, a delicate point in the intelligence process, since the evaluator must make an expert appraisal and yet do his level best not to permit personal predilections to distort the information or the prediction which he will place in the hands of those who must make the ultimate policy decisions. Improper evaluation can have catastrophic consequences. What hindsight has shown to be an unsound intelligence estimate—that the Japanese after homeland invasion would continue the war to the last ditch in Manchuria—undoubtedly led to some of the fateful decisions made at Yalta, based upon a then felt need to have Russia enter the Asiatic conflict.

The final step in the intelligence process, General Donovan taught, comes in dissemination. The best raw intelligence, properly evaluated, is quite useless unless placed at the right time in the hands of those who can use such knowledge in making decisions. A classic failure of intelligence dissemination occurred on December 7, 1941, when the most recent information concerning the imminence of Japanese attack was not received by our military commanders in Hawaii until after the event. It is to prevent a recurrence of such a disaster that bodies such as the Intelligence Advisory Committee have been created, seeking to assure by expertly advising C.I.A. that there will be a coordinated flow of strategic intelligence to the proper policy makers within our government.

In one of my last meetings with General Donovan, shortly before his death, he said: "Perhaps the greatest weakness we see in the United States today is that too few are willing to die for their country and its ideals." This may be the tragic truth. But the observation is remembered best because it was made by a man who demonstrated throughout his life that no personal sacrifice was too great if it was made on behalf of his beloved United States.
Lord Byron's Widow, 1825

CARL WOODRING

The benefactions to the Library from Virginia C. Gildersleeve, A. B. Barnard 1899 and Dean Emeritus of Barnard College, include a number of valuable items from the library of the late Professor Elizabeth Reynard, A. B. Barnard 1922. High among these treasures, along with the poem in Alexander Pope’s hand described in the November issue of the Columbia Library Columns, we can count a letter from the widow of the poet Byron. This letter, although it has apparently not been published before now, bears upon one of the most fully discussed episodes in literary history.

On May 17, 1824, the manuscript of memoirs left by Byron was burned by representatives of the parties most closely concerned. For more than a year afterward, the persons involved blamed each other for the irrecoverable loss. Because others who had read the memoirs talked about them, we know that the first part of the manuscript contained Byron’s version of his wife’s legal separation from him in 1816. The incendiaries are newly charged by angry bookmen almost every time a new work on Byron appears. In early years the public blamed Thomas Moore, to whom Byron assigned the memoirs; some have blamed John Murray, the publisher who had paid Moore £2000 for the right of publication; some blame Lady Byron, the widow, whose interests several of those involved thought they were serving; most scholars now agree with Byron’s best biographer, Leslie A. Marchand, that the greatest responsibility belongs to Byron’s friend John Cam Hobhouse, who had never read the memoirs but worked furiously to bring about their destruction. Byron’s amiable but addled half-sister, Mrs. Augusta...
Byron Leigh, was urged to accept what she called "the horrid task," and did in fact accept the responsibility.

Augusta's cousin, Robert Wilmot Horton ("W Horton" in the letter), specifically represented Augusta at the burning but thought of himself as acting for the benefit of Lady Byron. Confusion remains over whether Colonel Francis Hastings Doyle, also present, acted for Lady Byron, or whether, as he later protested, he merely happened in on the occasion and passively consented.

Such confusion was inevitable. In 1821, at Byron's suggestion, Moore had sold the memoirs to Murray. In May of the next year Murray had signed an agreement that either Byron or Moore could reclaim the memoirs at any time during Byron's life. In March of 1824, Moore declared that he and Byron wished to reclaim the manuscript, but he had taken no further steps when news of Byron's death arrived on May 14. Although it seems clear enough that the memoirs became Murray's absolute property when Byron died, such was not clear to Moore, who opposed the burning, claimed a right over the memoirs, and insisted on repaying the £2000 he had received from Murray. This amount he raised in a way kept secret from the others involved in the immolation: from another publisher, he received an advance on the promise of writing his own memoirs of Byron. Of course the relatives and friends of Byron had no intention of allowing a commoner to say that he had suffered financially from the destruction. By June of 1825, the time of our letter, the ever-changing plan was that restitution should be made to Moore by £1000 from Lady Byron and £1000 from Mrs. Leigh. But Stephen Lushington of Doctor's Commons, one of Lady Byron's closest advisers ("Dr. L." in the letter), objected to the plan. And any £1000 supplied by Augusta would have to be borrowed.

Augusta was lovable but silly, totally without foresight, in contrast with the keen and calculating Anne Isabella, or Annabella, Lady Byron. Since early 1820, when she first received
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From a miniature by Charles Hayter
Byron's offer to read the memoir and challenge its details, Annabella had maneuvered carefully to avoid any imputation in the future that she had been in the slightest way responsible for either promulgating or repressing Byron's version of the break-up of their marriage. She was not evil; it is simply that she was as much a born calculator as Augusta was a born enthusiast. Their odd friendship cooled and warmed repeatedly. Although Augusta had been displaced as godmother to the Byron child—who was nevertheless called Augusta Ada in her first months—Lady Byron consented to stand as godmother to Augusta's daughter Emily at the beginning of 1824.

The letter now at Columbia, watermarked "Ruse & Turners, 1824," was sent by Lady Byron to Mrs. Leigh on June 4, 1825. It begins and ends with references to other letters (enclosed to save postage) on the latest propositions for guarded procedures to satisfy all claims of the middle-class tradesmen—if near-gentlemen—Murray and Moore:

Ramsgate
June 4th

My dearest A—I now send you the letter for Murray, & also a copy of mine to Mr W Horton—It is perhaps as well that the proposition for placing the £1000 in the hands of him & Hobhouse is not to be carried into effect—as you differ from the latter on some points — Dr L — thinks the business may be settled more satisfactorily in another way, with a view to which the note to Murray is written—With respect to the letter to Mr W Horton, you may wonder that I harp so much upon the MSS. not being burnt by my decision—but the reason is that he has repeatedly thrown all the responsibility on me, & I apprehend, has admitted it to others — Now the fact is that I do concur now in the expediency & propriety of the destruction, but had the question been then submitted to me, they certainly would not have been consumed by my decision — It is therefore
perhaps well it was not, & of this I feel very sure, that you did what you believed consistent with my wishes, tho' of course it was not from consideration for me, but for your Brother's Memory, that you were primarily influenced — Such being the case, why am I to sanction this falsehood? — I hope that the reason I have suggested for the determination of the B— family will be agreeable to your feelings, as exonerating us from the painful necessity of stamping disgrace on the Memoirs—

You are very good to believe me incapable of inconsistency, for conscious as I am of having been consistent even <to> in the most careless expression of my sentiments as well as in more official communications, I am perfectly aware that from my deficiency of power to explain, & from the misapprehensions of others, I must have appeared at times to be actuated by contradictory opinions—Never was a poor wretch so represented & misrepresented in all the courts of this life, & want of physical energy has compelled me to submit to what only seemed to injure myself! — However, as far as you are concerned, I have had opportunities enough of returning your charitable construction, for your conduct would have been strange indeed, had it been such as it has often been described to me by persons you cannot conjecture.—

You must excuse the parcel—for I thought it the most direct way of sending the contents—I am gaining ground a little—I shall remember your direction for the Iceland Moss—which really seems a good thing—What “mysteries” can have been made to you about my complaints, I don't know—it would not do for male ears to say that I am subject to that very prevalent infirmity, & most tedious to cure, an inflammation in the ligaments of the womb—but you have probably known many such cases, in which the Patient could scarcely move, eat, or use mental exertion without re-exciting the complaint—& it is always accompanied by a morbid state of stomach,—most difficult to manage.
The sea, by giving me air & the gentlest exercise, seems to answer best, & I have therefore thought it not extravagant to hire a beautiful Yacht for the next two months—from July 1st—that I may have protection <of> from the casualties of weather, & be enabled to live more at sea— If I should land at Brighton, amongst other places on the Coast, I should like to see Emily, & wish much that I had a prospect of meeting you there, which would alone induce me to go.—Believe me, in spite of our mutual inconsistencies

Ever yours affectnly

AMB

[The signature, “AMB,” is short for Annabella Milbanke Byron. She continued in a postscript:]

The point that throws doubt upon Murray’s claim is—the money having been repaid by Moore—Murray ought to have flung it away, rather than have kept possession[.] I understood some time ago that Mr W. Horton would lend you the £1000— but pray, if you have any delicacy about accepting his offer — prefer me—

You would much oblige me by forwarding not only the enclosed to Murray—but the letter to Dr L— without delay

In saying “your conduct would have been strange indeed,” Lady Byron is not making a hidden allusion to the charge of incest against Mrs. Leigh and the poet, for she had already wrung from Mrs. Leigh—or so she certainly reported to others—a full confession of the crime. She refers most likely to one or more of the opportunities for inconsistent conduct in regard to such vexed questions as the memoirs, Byron’s will (which favored Augusta), and Lady Byron’s own character and conduct.

The “Iceland Moss” that Augusta had recommended was Cetraria islandica, commonly prescribed as a demulcent, “capable of soothing or protecting an abraded mucous membrane.”
AUGUSTA BYRON LEIGH
From the sketch by Sir George Hayter
It seems unchivalrous to publish the sentences concerning Lady Byron’s health. Yet in a period like ours, more tolerant of human weakness than most periods since Byron’s death, we perhaps ought to redress some of the injustice that stricter generations have meted out to Augusta. Ethel Coburn Mayne, in her 1929 biography of Lady Byron, quoted a portion of Augusta’s answer to our letter (dated June 6, 1825). She quotes the answer not only as a prime example of silliness, but also as an example of cruelty to the recipient in her illness, because it gave her so much absurd gush to read through. Miss Mayne represents Lady Byron as ill because the controversy over the memoirs “broke her down once for all.” It is frightening even to imagine what satiric stanzas would have resulted had Byron seen the sentence in which his widow associated her ailment with difficulty in “mental exertion.” Retaliation would have been fierce had Byron been able to read Miss Mayne’s repeated declaration that Lady Byron’s health collapsed, and remained collapsed for thirty-five years, because she tried to practice Byron’s injunction to “be kind to Augusta.” Later pages in Miss Mayne’s biography, as well as two recent books, The Late Lord Byron by Doris Langley Moore and Lord Byron’s Wife by Malcolm Elwin, give a less attractive view of the woman who followed up her calculations by preserving all the pertinent documents that she could secure. In any event, her illness hardly seems to be Augusta’s fault.

Miss Mayne’s apparent references to the Columbia letter would come from a copy retained by Lady Byron. She quotes, or misquotes, only one part of one sentence. Lady Byron, after asserting that she would not have ordered the burning if the question had been submitted to her, then wrote, as we have seen, “It is therefore perhaps well it was not,” etc. Miss Mayne gives this as, “It is therefore perhaps as well that I was not.” The copy may have been hard to read. Miss Mayne says, incidentally, that the letter was written when Lady Byron learned that Augusta had volunteered to Wilmot Horton a declaration of re-
responsibility for the burning of Byron’s memoirs, whereas our letter and passages from the answer to it show that Augusta must have received this letter before she wrote generously to Wilmot Horton in behalf of Lady Byron.

In all the confusions, recriminations, and horrors that ensued—such as the incestuous misadventures of Medora Byron, who thought herself the daughter of Byron as well as of Augusta—the epilogue contains at least one healthy chord. Ada Byron, the single legitimate issue of Byron’s marriage, used her mathematical heritage from her mother to do important work on Charles Babbage’s computer, which was refused by the British government in 1842 because the transistor, which would make similar computers economically feasible, had not yet been invented. Unlike the disunion of her parents, and of Byron’s parents, Ada’s marriage to the Earl of Lovelace was happy up to its last year, when shortly before his wife’s death the Earl found out how very unsuccessful she had been in trying to calculate odds at the race-tracks.
The title page of *The Sketch Book* (1819-1820) disguised the author’s name as “Geoffrey Crayon, Gent.,” but shortly there was no doubt about his true identity. The international world of letters recognized him as Washington Irving (1783-1859), sometime young-barrister-about-Manhattan now living and writing abroad.

The United States quickly cheered for him as our first professional writer to prove to skeptical Europeans that an American could, in Irving’s own words, succeed “with a feather in his hand instead of on his head.” And New York, his birthplace, also recalled Irving’s earlier triumph as the “Diedrich Knickerbocker” of *A History Of New York* (1809). Columbia College rose to the occasion by awarding the newly famous author an honorary Master of Arts degree in 1821. It was his first such laurel. And though Columbia had for decades been giving honorary degrees, this was the first the school had ever bestowed on a career belleletrist.

Recently Miss Louisa Kent, a direct descendant of Chancellor James Kent (1763-1847), the distinguished jurist and longtime intimate of the Irvings, generously donated to Special Collections the handsome diploma which symbolized this unique degree. It had earlier in this century been given to her own family, which was related to the Irvings through marriage, by Mr. Edwin Van Wart, himself an Irving family descendant. James Kent, holder of an honorary Columbia LLD (1797), had been a Professor of Law there and a Trustee as well.
The circumstances of the award to Washington Irving are explained in the following letter, which also was presented to Columbia by Miss Kent, and is here first published. It was written to him in England by President William Harris:

Col: Coll: New York April 12th 1821

Sir,

I have the honor to transmit to you the following Resolution of the Board of Trustees of Columbia College—

"At a meeting of the Trustees of Col: College on Monday Feb 5th 1821.—

"Resolved: that the honorary Degree of Master of Arts be conferred on Washington Irving Esqr and that the President of the College cause the Diploma to be prepared and transmitted to Mr. Irving."

Agreeably to the above resolution your Diploma for a Degree of AM has been prepared and is now in the possession of your Brother John T Irving Esqr—As he was of opinion that you would not continue in Europe during the Summer, it was thought most adviseable to leave the Diploma with him until your pleasure respecting the transmission of it should be known—

With my best wishes for your health & happiness, and for the continuance of that success which has hitherto attended your literary labours I remain your obedient & very humble Servant

Wm Harris

Washington Irving Esqr

This presidential epistle is docketed in Washington Irving's hand "Wm Harris/President Columb College/ April 12, 1821/ with Diploma M of Arts." The expatriate author chose to remain
overseas, and both official items had crossed the ocean to him. His letter of reply, from London on August 6, 1821, was first printed in full in an earlier article in *Columbia Library Columns,* and is fulsome in its gratitude—witness the sentence “I beg you will communicate to the board of Trustees my deep sense of their unexpected, and, I must say, unmerited kindness; I feel that it is far, far beyond my deserts.” Since Washington Irving had never gone to any college, his pleasure must have been increased by the knowledge that now he could join in fellow alumnus status his brother Judge John Treat Irving. The latter, who was named in President Harris’s letter, quoted above, was both a Columbia graduate, AB 1798, and a Trustee.

The actual diploma, a stately reminder of a more leisurely age, is a genuine “sheepskin,” measuring 26 x 30½ inches. Not only in size but in script will it seem strange to Space Age graduates, for it is engrossed in formal Latin. The accompanying picture reproduces the entire text, which begins with the customary academic flourishes, announcing that the “Curatores,” the Trustees, were granting this degree to Irving. There follows the description of the achievements for which he is being honored, and since this specially written section is the heart of the matter, it is here repeated, with a suggested translation.

“. . . Washington Irving / virum in Optimarum artium studio versatum; de omnibus Literarum Amatoribus, et præsertim de hac nostra Academica, bene / meritum; qui scriptis suis, egregiis ingenii monumentis, et nomen sibi, et Patria honorem / Comparavit:”

“. . . Washington Irving, a man engaged in the pursuit of belles lettres, deserving well of all lovers of literature, and especially of our academic community here, who, by his writings, rare

*“Alma Mater To Geoffrey Crayon,” Vol. IX, No. 2 (February 1960) pp. 28-31
testimonies of genius, has won fame for himself and (brought) honor on our native land...”

The diploma closes with the customary orotund phrases about the time, and place, and signatories. It is dated February 5, 1821, and bears the names, characteristically Latinized, of President Harris and six professors. These include the young Charles Anthon (1797-1867), who was just beginning his life’s work as a Columbia classicist, and who well may have helped to compose the citation.

Originally affixed to this large parchment, which is very well preserved, was the College seal. Though separate now, this elegant appendage remains intact—a red wax disc, 2½ inches across, with the figure of Alma Mater on it which is still traditional at Columbia. The seal, in a metal case, and the faded strip of ribbon which held it through the slit at the bottom of the diploma, must 144 years ago have made the whole an impressive presentation piece.

Certainly this is historic Columbiana, and also an unusual relic of America’s early profession of letters. One wonders now what has become of the LLD diploma which Columbia next awarded Washington Irving in 1829. Any clues?
The diploma reproduced above was for an honorary master's degree which Columbia College awarded to Washington Irving in 1821. The original measures 26 x 30 1/2 inches. (Louisa Kent gift)
SARAH, DUCHESS OF MARLBOROUGH
Portrait by Michael Dahl
The Duchess Speaks Her Mind

DALLAS PRATT

A collection of fifteen letters by Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, wife of Queen Anne’s great general, and ancestress of Sir Winston Churchill, has recently been given to Columbia (cf. “Our Growing Collections,” page 53). The letters have been designated “C1,” “C2,” etc., and excerpts in the following article have been similarly identified. Some of the letters are well known and have been quoted, in part, in standard biographies of the Marlboroughs; several are unpublished and are quoted here for the first time. The spelling and punctuation have been modernized.

EDITOR’S NOTE

ON APRIL 6, 1710, two women who had been friends for over thirty years faced one another in a room in Kensington Palace and, once and for all, tore that friendship to shreds. One, who stood with averted face and in muffled, trembling tones repeated over and over again the sentence: “You desired no answer, and you shall have none,” was Anne, Queen of England. The other, from whom poured a torrent of angry questions, appeals, protests and reproaches, who alternately stormed and burst into a passion of tears, was Her Majesty’s Mistress of the Robes, Groom of the Stole, and Keeper of the Privy Purse, Sarah Churchill, Duchess of Marlborough.

The events which led up to this last, searing interview centered around the Queen’s growing intimacy with Abigail Masham, a cousin of the Duchess for whom the latter had secured the post of Woman of the Bedchamber some years before. Time passed, and the Duchess had grown not a little weary of constant attendance upon a Queen whose “discourse had nothing of brightness or wit.” But, near or far, she never doubted her power over
Anne; Anne, who had even insisted that they drop the ceremonious address customary between subject and monarch. "'Morley' and 'Freeman' were the names her fancy hit upon," the Duchess tells us, "and she left me to choose by which of them I would be called. My frank, open temper naturally led me to pitch upon Freeman, and so the Princess took the other, and from this time Mrs. Morley and Mrs. Freeman began to converse as equals, made so by affection and friendship." She instructed Abigail to keep her informed of all that passed at court, but discovered, too late, that her protegée had made use of Mrs. Freeman's increasingly lengthy absences to usurp her place in the heart of "poor unfortunate faithful Morley" (as the Queen loved to style herself).

Eight years after the final interview in which she had so unsuccessfully tried to force the Queen to explain her withdrawal of favor, the Duchess wrote to her friend, Mrs. Godolphin, wife of the Provost of Eton College, and enclosed a mass of documents which, she believed, vindicated her conduct: "I can't help fearing that you will dislike many things that I have done because it is scarcely possible for you to remember as you read them how many years the Queen would not suffer me to live with her but as a friend, nor do the least thing without sending me to ask Mr. Montgomery's and Mr. Freeman's opinion, which were the two names my lord Godolphin and the Duke of Marl: went by. I believe, besides my having taken too much liberty with a queen, you will think I have been too much a Whig." (C 12).

The word "Whig" is a reminder that these royal friendships had political overtones which were of considerable significance to successive governments, to the church, and to the prosecution of the war against France. Lord Godolphin, the able Lord Treasurer, and the Duke of Marlborough, were originally Tories, adhering to the party which upheld the cause of high Anglicanism and the Divine Right of Kings. The Whigs drew their strength from the merchant classes, among whom were
many Dissenters. Abhorring Roman Catholicism, they had been responsible for the overthrow of James II, and now gave vigorous moral and financial support to the war of England and her allies against Catholic France. But Marlborough was Commander in Chief, so it was not long before he and his friend Godolphin were won over to the pro-war party. The devout Queen sided with the Tories as defenders of the Royal Prerogatives and the established Church, and great was Mrs. Morley's distress over the intransigent Whiggism of "dear Mrs. Freeman." The latter, however, goes on to explain her convictions in her letter to Mrs. Godolphin: "I can never think it a fault to be what some Whigs profess, and whatever I alter in I am persuaded that I shall never change as to the principles which I saw very good reason for as soon as I could understand anything at court. I knew that King Charles and King James were both Roman Catholics taking money of the King of France to betray their own trust and country. And the best of these kings gave a man into prison for saying that he was a Roman Catholic, who I saw go twice a day to mass and, at the same time, I saw that neither of these kings could endure a Whig, and were very fond of the Tories, which made me think with reason that the first were very valuable men. But I have learnt that there is no great difference in party, and I now have a very great abhorrence for both. It was certainly a thing invented by ambitious knaves only to give power to themselves and by the help of their followers they became tyrants over their kings and fellow subjects. And whoever will be fair and just must own that when the prince will not let the Tories govern they never fail of being against a crowned head, though it were a family that had been ever since Adam. And the Whigs that pretend to fight for the good of their country and to maintain the laws will give up both rather than good employments . . . But as to what is called the Whig notion, that I will never part with: that Parliaments should punish ill ministers and by that means oblige weak or bad princes to keep their coronation oaths." (C12)
LADY MASHAM
As the reign drew to its close, the country grew weary of the long war. The Whig ministers, whom the Marlboroughs had helped to bring to power, were forced out. Mrs. Masham, herself a Tory in alliance with Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, easily swayed the Queen back to her original predilection. Lord Godolphin—"Mr. Montgomery"—was dismissed, the Duchess lost her offices of state, and Marlborough himself was stripped of all his public employments on the last day of 1711. Disillusioned and side-tracked, he went into self-imposed exile on the Continent a year later, and there the Duchess joined him early in 1713. It was her first trip abroad, and she knew not a word of any foreign language.

At the end of October she was amusing herself reading some of Steele's papers, and particularly "Sir Walter Raleigh's advice to Prince Henry." England, she declared in a letter to her son-in-law, the new Earl of Godolphin, was a "country where there is so much corruption that I fear Mr. Steele's papers will not prevail, nor Sir Walter Raleigh's advice succeed so well as I have seen his cordial with people that were not in a more dangerous condition than our government; however, 'tis a pleasure to read so much sense and reason." (C 3).

Another of her preoccupations in this letter was the decoration of their houses. Ever since a grateful nation had voted to build a palace for the victor of Blenheim, the Duchess had lived in an atmosphere of paint and plaster dust. Although the Duke longed to see Blenheim Palace finished, the Duchess grew increasingly irritated with its pretentiousness and size (she had had to order nearly 5000 yards of material for the rooms which were ready, and there were still more to come). She fought with the architect, Vanbrugh, every inch of the way, so, when a town house was needed, she turned to his rival, the 77 year old Sir Christopher Wren. By 1713, the hall of Marlborough House in Pall Mall was ready for murals, and the French artist Louis Laguerre was commissioned to paint some of the Duke's victories, with
Sir Godfrey Kneller acting as go-between. She wrote that she had received a letter "on Mr. Laguerre's subject, from Sir G. Kneller, for money, which I have ordered, and he said the hall would be finished in a week. He writes nothing of making any likeness of the officers. Many of them are dead, and it would not be easy to those that are in the service to sit, and I believe more might be said which makes it better not to aim at anything more than representing the battles—but I believe Mr. Laguerre need not have any particular reasons given him." (C 3). Indeed it would have been embarrassing to explain to the Frenchman that some of these officers might balk at finding themselves too realistically depicted on the walls of the house of their former leader, now disgraced and in exile.

But the exile was brought abruptly to a close by a momentous event: the critical illness of Queen Anne and, in July, 1714, the news that the end was not far off. She died on August 1, the day the Marlboroughs arrived home noisily and, under the circumstance, not very tastefully escorted by grenadiers firing salutes in their honor.

At a period when a Jacobite court was continually plotting in France to extend its influence into England and, when possible, to dispatch the Pretender to reclaim the crown, the illness or death of the de facto English sovereign was inevitably the occasion for a crescendo of Jacobite activity. The relations of both John and Sarah Marlborough with the Jacobite cause were complex and, at times, tortuous. Ever since the Duke had deserted James II and had thereby paved the way for the accession of William and Mary, he had adhered to the policy of supporting the Protestant Succession. However, at the same time he carried on an ambiguous correspondence with the Jacobite court at Saint Germains. In this correspondence he offers his devotion, begs for pardon for his desertion, and hints at a willingness to offer more material help.
Prince George of Denmark (left), William III and Princess Anne (later Queen Anne), and William, Duke of Gloucester, son of the Prince and Princess. The plaque is of Queen Mary.
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Two letters in the collection relate to the Jacobite cause. The first, though undated, must have been written shortly after the death of Queen Mary in 1694. It is written to Sarah's "uncle," otherwise unidentified, and contains a reference to Sarah's sister. This was Frances Jennings, whom James II unsuccessfully tried to seduce when she was his wife's maid of honor. (He had more success with Marlborough's sister Arabella Churchill, who bore him a son, created Duke of Berwick.) The virtuous Frances's second husband was a Jacobite general, the Duke of Tyrconnel, who died in 1691, and the widowed Duchess thereupon joined the court of Saint Germains. Sarah Marlborough wrote to their uncle: "I have sent you three dozen and three pair of gloves which I desire you will try to get the gentleman (you said was going to France) to carry with him. He will find no difficulty at the Custom House here if his things are to be seen, but in France those sort of things are forbid and therefore I trouble you with them because I can't send them as one does other goods that one may have in that country for paying for. But I conclude they are not so exact but that a gentleman may carry anything of that nature and they won't dispute it. They must be given to Madame Dumene, without naming my sister at all, and if it be as easy to you I believe it will be best not to name me to the gentleman you give 'em to, who I conclude you know enough to ask such a favor from; but if he won't undertake it I desire you would be pleased to let the gloves be sent again to my porter as St. James's and I must try to find some other opportunity of sending them." (Ct).

Sir Winston Churchill\(^1\) seizes on this letter as Exhibit A to prove that the real character of the Marlboroughs' connection with Saint Germains at a time of renewed Jacobite plotting was of a domestic and family nature rather than conspiratorial. He believes that some of the documents which seem to implicate Marlborough in plots to restore James II are Jacobite forgeries.

\(^1\) In Marlborough, his Life and Times. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.
The Duchess Speaks Her Mind

As to the matter of the "three dozen and three pair of gloves"—merely "a minor intrigue showing that feminine sentiment towards Customs regulations was much the same then as now." Perhaps he is right, but thirty-nine pairs of gloves are a great many gloves! Enough to make someone at the Jacobite court feel very well disposed towards—whom? Sarah? the Duke? Perhaps even Princess Anne herself? (Certainly poor Anne's conscience in respect to her exiled father and half-brother gave her almost as many twinges as her gout.)

James II died in 1701. Anne grew increasingly sentimental about her half-brother across the water, and, in spite of the Act of Settlement which named the Electress Sophia of Hanover her successor, more and more antagonistic towards the Hanoverians. Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke, a Jacobite who was working secretly for the restoration of "James III," became First Minister a few days before Anne died, helped by his friendship with Mrs., now Lady, Masham, who had finally quarreled with Harley. But the alertness of the Hanoverian party and the brevity of the Queen's illness thwarted the Jacobite coup, and George I succeeded in the place of his mother, the Electress, who died only two months before Anne.

Marlborough had long been in correspondence with the Hanoverian family although, characteristically, he was also exchanging letters with the court of Saint Germain. No doubt he prudently arranged to keep a finger in both pies. However, neither he nor his wife had any personal inclination towards a Roman Catholic, Jacobite restoration, and he was entirely trusted by the Hanoverians. George reappointed him Captain General of the Royal forces. Thus he presided over the defense of the realm, although he was too advanced in years to take the field in person when the Rebellion in favor of the "Old Pretender" broke out in the north in 1715. Early in 1716 the Duchess wrote to her friend, Mrs. Godolphin: "I don't know whether you will have the news of this day in print, and therefore I venture some
repetition, rather than not tell you that 'tis certain the P. is landed with some few officers in Scotland. To anybody who does not know the whole design, I believe it will appear a very hopeless undertaking, but there is no doubt but he is promised to be supported by France in the spring, and I suppose is told by the Scotch that they can defend themselves from the king's troops till then—but I hope they will be disappointed in that, or England will soon be as miserable as those countries I have been in abroad.” (C6). In fact, by early February the rebellion was crushed and the Pretender was once again “over the water.”

The Duchess suffered a strange backwash from these events. In 1720 a rumor began to circulate that she had been in the plot five years before to bring in the Pretender. It was said she had remitted a great sum of money for that purpose, and that the King was aware of her complicity. Although the story was highly improbable, Sarah defended herself hotly in a letter to the King. When she merely elicited a rather dusty answer, and failed to involve His Majesty in a correspondence of vindication such as she had inflicted on his predecessor, she lost no time in joining the anti-court circle of the Prince and Princess of Wales. The sentiments, intended only for the eyes of a friend, which she expressed in the above letter to Mrs. Godolphin, are further proof that the Duchess had no sympathy with the Jacobite cause.

The letters which follow touch on a miscellany of subjects. The Duchess sends venison from Woodstock; she will pull a wire to try and return a good man to Parliament—“because I must always desire to preserve so good a fortune as the Duke of Marlborough has in England, but as to party business I have none of that warmth that you have seen in me” (C7); and she refers to the Duke's failing health—alas, that oak-like frame and splendid intellect had been shattered by a stroke in May, 1716, and Sarah's talents as a nurse and would-be physician were now pitted against the unfortunate doctors in attendance. Not all of the latter were as tactful as Sir Samuel Garth, who wrote the
THE OLD PRETENDER
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Duchess, "I wish my lord Duke's health depended on my wishes. I am almost inclined to think that everything is in your power, and I hope the greatest man upon earth will owe a long preservation to the care of the worthiest lady."

However, the Duke's death and the melodramatic scenes which accompanied it were still five years ahead when the Duchess suddenly received word that her granddaughter, the Duchess of Newcastle, was dying. This was the Lady Harriet whose marriage is referred to in two letters (C 9 and 10)—a marriage which the Duchess had arranged. A coolness had sprung up because Harriet Newcastle, in the perpetual warfare between her mother and grandmother, insisted on siding with the former. Nevertheless, this did not prevent Sarah from rushing to the stricken household, where she behaved with unwonted restraint, and abided by the urgent request of the Duke not to agitate his young wife by visiting the sickbed. She boasts of her deportment in a letter to a friend: "I am sure you have often heard of my passions and assautments (sic), but I fancy you will think that I governed them upon this occasion—if I have such things—as well as wise people do." To Mrs. Godolphin she wrote: "I can't but think there is a reason to hope she will do well if Doctor Mead does not kill her, for I know by woeful experience that he is the most obstinate and ignorant doctor that we have had a great while, though he is much followed at present. Dr. Sloane is there and Sir S. Garth was expected. One doctor I think is better than a great many if one can rely upon him—and as the practise is among them, you have really but the advice of one when you call for twenty, for they all submit to that doctor that is most cried up, either for a quiet life, or for fear of not being sent for to his patients." (C 11).

Dr. Mead was to receive the full brunt of her "passions and assautments" when the Duke lay dying in June, 1722. Frantic at the doctor's ineffectiveness, she threatened to pull off his wig, and put him to ignominious flight. Sir Winston describes the
Duke's last hours, and in a memorable phrase writes that "Sarah prowled around his couch like a she-bear guarding its slowly dying mate, tearing all, friend or foe, who approached." Particularly obnoxious to the grief-stricken woman was the sudden appearance of her daughters Henrietta and Mary, with whom she was no longer on speaking terms. They asked to be admitted to their father's room, and stayed until dawn. After their return to London, the Duchess declared they spread untrue stories about their reception at Blenheim. They also accused their mother of having written the Duke's will.

Her quarrel with her daughters, however, enlivened her mourning, and four months after the Duke's death we find her sending a "long paper" to Mrs. Godolphin, "because I am sure you cannot but have heard all the vile things that have been reported of me, which has forced me to collect a great many disagreeable things in order to vindicate myself to those that I value most... I have known people of the most calm tempers very much warmed upon account of their reputation." (C 13). Since she did not claim to have a calm temper—"passions and assaultments"!—it is not surprising that the "long paper," which is still in the Blenheim archives, runs to some hundred folio pages of reproaches and complaints.

In her latter years, quarrels became a way of life to the Duchess. To her they were "vindications" of her own point of view—as she says in a 1735 letter to the Duke of Newcastle, "'Tis some satisfaction to show that I apprehend myself still in the right, though I should have the misfortune not to prevail by being so." (C 14). The right, in this case, was that the Duke of St. Albans, son of Charles II and Nell Gwynne, Constable of Windsor Castle, should not drive through the park without the permission of the Ranger, Sarah. So he had the permission of Her Majesty, Queen Caroline? "I am sorry your G. imagined that this way of turning it softened the point, because in my poor apprehension it seems extremely to aggravate the injury." (C 14).
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If the collection ended with this letter, one might carry away the picture of a cantankerous, lonely old lady, with the largest fortune in Europe hardly compensating for an alienated family and a body racked by arthritis. But there is one more letter, dictated by the Duchess in 1742, aged eighty-one. It was addressed to the Earl of Marchmont, but was intended also for another who had become a friend of the octogenarian Duchess, Alexander Pope. “My Lord, I have this day had the pleasure of receiving your letter and Mr. Pope’s,—which gave me a great deal of pleasure, notwithstanding all your jokes upon me. You are pleased to call me the Head of the School of Philosophy, and very obligingly press me to give you opportunities of improving yourselves. I think you may very well give me that title, since I immediately found out that what you desired of me was reasonable to think would fix me stronger in my opinion that there was nothing so good for me as retirement. And if I could receive letters from you and Mr. Pope as you had leisure, I would never come to town as long as I live. In that way of conversing I should have all the pleasure that I can possibly propose, without the disappointment when Mr. Pope falls asleep, nor the dread of your taking leave because you were weary.” (C15).

Leaving the imperious moods and interminable vindications behind, the Duchess’s spirit seems in this letter to have reached a serene anchorage. The letter shows another side of her life, that of intellectual enjoyment with a few gifted friends, with whom she could escape into the sunlit realms of philosophy and forget for a time “the perpetual war in this world to defend oneself against knaves and fools.” (C8). Even here she cannot resist a few barbs, the calm death of “my dear friend Socrates” having suggested to her that “he died much easier than our physicians treat us, when they blister us, and put frying pans upon our heads after ’tis demonstration (demonstrated?) we cannot live.” (C15). Then she returns to the playful, philosophical vein: “I find you are as ignorant what the soul is as I am. But though none
of my philosophers demonstrate plainly that, I do think there must be rewards and punishments after this life. And I have read lately [in] some of my dear friends the philosophers that there was an opinion that the soul never died, that it went into some other man or beast. And that seems in my way of thinking to be on the side of the argument for the immortality of the soul. And though the philosophers prove nothing to my understanding certain, yet I have a great mind to believe that kings' and first Ministers' souls when they die go into chimney-sweepers . . . What gave me this thought of a chimney-sweeper was an accident. My servants that are very careful of me were fearful that having a fire night and day four months together in my chamber, thought I might be frightened when I could not rise out of my bed if the chimney was on fire, and persuaded me to have it swept, which I consented to. And one of the chimney-sweepers was a little boy, a most miserable creature, without shoes, stockings, breeches or shirt. When it was over I sent a servant of mine to Windsor with him to equip this poor creature with what he wanted, which cost very little, not being so well dressed as the last Privy Seal."¹ (C 15).

In the same year as this letter the printed version of her "vindication" appeared: "An account of the Conduct of the Dowager Duchess of Marlborough from her first coming to Court until the year 1710." Since most of the people mentioned in it were dead, she had the last word, as always. She was still talking and writing, ironic and incisive as ever in her eighty-fifth year, when death interrupted her. Her exit was even easier than that of her dear friend Socrates.

¹ Lord Hervey
The Frank Lloyd Wright Collection of Sullivan Drawings

ADOLF K. PLACZEK

A famous collection of drawings by Louis Henry Sullivan (1856-1924), the tragically-thwarted but decisively influential pioneer of modern architecture in America, has been acquired by Columbia University and deposited in Avery Library. These are the 122 drawings which Sullivan, on April 11, 1924, three days before his death, handed over to his friend, former draftsman and disciple Frank Lloyd Wright as a final gesture of admiration and affection. They were, in Wright's words, "the dearest treasures of his heart," the innermost expression of an artist's mind in search of new forms. Wright himself, who considered Sullivan his "Lieber Meister," the beloved master-teacher of his early years, cherished these drawings and kept them in his possession. He published thirty-eight of them in his book Genius and the Mobocracy which was issued in 1949. Thus, at least partially, Sullivan's desire that Wright publish the drawings was carried out. The book revealed publically for the first time the existence of these drawings.

It had been hoped since that time that the collection, which contained 84 as yet unpublished pieces, would eventually find its way into an institution where it could be made available to scholarship and enjoyment. Avery, with its already rich holdings of Sullivan material (including his early sketchbook, the manuscripts of his Kindergarten Chats, and seventeen drawings) seemed the proper and logical place for its ultimate repository. When word reached Columbia University that the drawings were available, an offer was made for which very generous outside support
could be enlisted. In view of Avery’s Sullivan holdings and general preeminence as an architectural library, the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation and Mrs. Wright, the great architect’s widow, decided to entrust the treasured collection to Columbia.

The collection ranges from early, rather rigid, pen drawings from Sullivan’s days at the École des Beaux Arts in Paris (1874-76) to drawings in 1907 and one sketch dated 1910. Most of the drawings, however, were executed between 1890 and 1900, when Sullivan was a partner of Dankmar Adler in the firm of Adler and Sullivan. This was the period of his great skyscrapers, the most creative and successful period of his life. It was also the period when the young Wright was his draughtsman and “right-hand-man”—truly a creative time for American architecture. The drawings of these years—all of them pencil drawings and all of them free-hand—are of rare beauty; their delicacy, precision, lightness of touch and complexity, their “rightness” are immediately apparent. There are studies for ornamentation of buildings, a corbel for the Chicago Auditorium, plaster bands for the proscenium of the rebuilt McVicker’s Theater, and a pier of the Guaranty Building in Buffalo, and an exquisite sketch on office stationery of a never-built skyscraper, the Eliel Building, which provides a fleeting glance of what took shape in Sullivan’s mind at the inception of a project. Several of the drawings are annotated by Wright, either with crop notes for his intended publication or with such historically interesting comments as “beginning of the plastic period.”

The Frank Lloyd Wright collection of Louis Henry Sullivan drawings (as it has been designated) is thus of unique value and interest on several grounds: first for the sheer beauty of the drawings themselves; secondly for their insight into Sullivan’s genius and its development; and thirdly as a document of a great American friendship between two men who together fashioned America’s break-through to architectural leadership.
Adolf K. Placzek, Avery Librarian, President Kirk, and Mrs. Frank Lloyd Wright at the ceremony on May 11, marking the transfer of the Wright collection.
A satirical portrayal of Berlioz conducting a concert in 1846. Engraving in color by Cajetan (Barzun gift)
Our Growing Collections

ROLAND BAUGHMAN

Gifts

ANTHONY GIFT. Mr. Edward Anthony of New Milford, Connecticut, has presented the corrected typed manuscripts of two of his publications, This Is Where I Came in and O Rare Don Marquis. With the typescripts Mr. Anthony included inscribed first editions of the published versions.

This Is Where I Came in is autobiographical in form, but it contains important chapters on the 1928 Presidential campaign, and sidelights on interviews with such varied personalities as John L. Sullivan, Amy Lowell, Franklin D. and Theodore Roosevelt, and General MacArthur. O Rare Don Marquis is Mr. Anthony's well-known biography of one of New York's most colorful journalist-authors. Readers of these pages will recall that a substantial collection of Don Marquis’s papers are here, presented in 1958 by his publisher, Doubleday & Company. Much of Mr. Anthony’s research was accomplished at Columbia.

Barzun gift. Dean Jacques Barzun (A.B., 1927; Ph.D., 1932) has added most substantially to his earlier gifts. To be recorded at this time are more than 150 volumes relating to the history of science, Hector Berlioz, modern literature and the arts, and the like, including important literary first editions, autograph letters, and a colored engraving by Cajetan entitled “A Satirical Concert in 1846,” showing Berlioz conducting.

Dean Barzun has also added 17 file boxes of his literary, professional, and personal papers.

Carman gift. Mrs. Harry James Carman has presented the office files of her late husband (Ph.D., 1919), former Moore Professor
of History (1939-64) and Dean of Columbia College (1943-50). The files comprise professional correspondence, lecture notes, and a bibliographical card index of American and European history. There are numerous files relating to Dean Carman's participation and membership in the New York City Board of Higher Education (1938-64), the New York State Board of Mediation (1941-55), and the Japan American Committee on Intellectual Exchange. Also present are many of the working papers for Dean Carman's *Preparation for Medical Education in the Liberal Arts College* (published 1953) and *Resurvey of Preprofessional Education in the Liberal Arts College* (published 1961).

A particularly touching item in the collection is the manuscript Civil War diary of one Richard Brown, sergeant in Company I of the 13th Regiment, New Jersey Volunteers. The 13th Regiment was under the command of Colonel Ezra Ayers Carman—and that is probably why the diary was present in the Carman Papers.

The diary represents thirty-nine days of varied action from June 16 through July 24, 1864. During that time the Regiment was involved in several engagements—Kulp's Farm (near Marietta, Georgia) on June 22, Nancy's Creek on July 18, Peach Tree Creek on July 20, and the start of the siege of Atlanta on July 22. The account ends most abruptly with the night of July 24—"our 20 lb. Parrot is throwin' Shot and Shell every 5 minutes to the City." In Samuel Toombs's *Reminiscences of the War* (1878) we read that "Richard Brown, Sergeant, Died at Marietta, Ga., July 29, 1864, of wounds received in action near Atlanta, Ga., July 27, 1864; buried in National Cemetery, Marietta, Sec. A, Grave 712."

*Class of 1923 gift.* Readers of these pages will recall the announcement (May, 1959) of the generous gift by the Columbia Class of 1923 of an extraordinary Elizabethan manuscript, Arthur Golding's rendering of Aesop's *Fables*. Now again the Class
Our Growing Collections has joined in presenting an outstanding volume. It is Francis Bacon’s *The Essayes or Counsels*, London, 1625 (STC 1147), with which is bound Owen Feltham’s *Resolves, Divine, Morall, Politicall*, London, 1628 (STC 10756/7).

This is the first complete edition of Bacon’s essays, and the last to appear in the author’s lifetime; it is the text that is most commonly reprinted today. The two works are bound together in contemporary (original?) limp vellum, and Feltham’s work is copiously annotated by an early owner.

**Connolly bequest.** The estate of the late Vera Connolly has transferred to Special Collections a large collection of her papers. The collection comprises files on juvenile delinquency, divorce, prisons, American Indians, abortion, child labor, and other social problems. Miss Connolly’s articles appeared in numerous newspapers and magazines over nearly half a century, including the *Christian Science Monitor, Colliers, Delineator, Good Housekeeping, Reader’s Digest, and Woman’s Home Companion*.

Some years back Miss Connolly was approached by Columbia with the request that she make this the depository of her “papers.” She readily agreed, and left instructions to her heirs that such was her intent. Her death occurred in the fall of 1964, and a memorial to her, in the form of her personal and professional files, has now been established.

**Cox gift.** Mr. Allyn Cox has presented some thirty letters mainly written to him by his father, the late Kenyon Cox, during 1916-1918. The present gift will be added to the main Kenyon Cox Collection, given by Allyn Cox in 1961 and 1962.

**De Lima gift.** Mrs. Agnes De Lima (A.M., 1909) has added another group of important materials by or relating to the late Randolph Bourne. Included in the present gift are: a 4-page holograph manuscript of a poem by Bourne, entitled “Sabotage”;
some pencilled notes for an autobiographical novel; and a letter from Padraic Colum to Mrs. De Lima, 22 March 1948, concerning Bourne.

Fowler gift. Mrs. Edmund Prince Fowler, Jr., has presented, in memory of her late husband (M.D., 1930; Med. Sc.D., 1935), a large and important collection of books (175) and serials (628) which Dr. Fowler had formed. The collection is mainly in the field of oto-rhino-laryngology, and as such has particular significance to the Medical Library.

Frick gift. Professor Bertha Frick (B.S., 1929; M.S., 1933) has added several items to her earlier gifts. Of special note on this occasion are three autograph letters to her from David Eugene Smith, founder and donor to Columbia of the Smith Library on the History of Mathematics.

Haas gift. Mr. Milton Haas (A.B., 1933; LL.B., 1935) has presented a collection of law reports and statutes, numbering some 300 volumes, to the Law Library.

Hallenbeck gift. Mr. Chester T. Hallenbeck has presented a score of items, including several literary gift annuals and Pennsylvania-Dutch imprints.

Halsband gift. Professor Robert Halsband (M.A., 1936) has presented a fine packet of eight letters written to him by the poet Christopher Hassall during the years from 1937 to 1953. Also included in the gift are two first editions of works by Hassall, Penthesperon (1939) and The Slow Night (1949). The latter volume bears a presentation inscription from the author to Professor Halsband.

Journal of Philosophy gift. Last year (May, 1964) we reported
the gift by the Political Science Quarterly of all its back files of correspondence. Now we can report a similar gift by the Journal of Philosophy, whose editorial headquarters are in Philosophy Hall, and whose files go back to 1904.

In this instance a selection from the files has been made, the Journal wishing to keep physical control of its past records. The selection numbers 116 letters and 3 manuscripts, all of which have been replaced in the office files by photocopy. Included in the gift are 9 letters of Nicholas Murray Butler, 7 from John Dewey, 2 from John Erskine, 14 from Josiah Royce, and 15 from George Santayana. Two of the manuscripts are by John Dewey ("The Naturalistic Theory of Perception by the Senses" and "Valuation Judgments and Immediate Quality"). The third is "Programme of Lectures to be delivered at Columbia University" by Josiah Royce.

Kranz gift. A fine gift has been received from Mr. Jonathan E. Kranz, a Columbia student of the Class of 1967. The gift comprises 51 Wartime Newsmaps that were issued weekly by the Army Orientation Course for public posting. They reveal the progress of the war from October 26, 1942, to November 15, 1943. In addition are five similar posters, out of series and undated.

The Newsmaps, which are in excellent condition, were collected as they were issued by Mr. Kranz's father. One wonders how many persons who saw the maps as they were posted had the foresight and sense of history to preserve them for the future.

Lada-Mocarski gift. Mr. and Mrs. Valerien Lada-Mocarski have continued their generous gifts to Avery Library. To be recorded here is their donation of eighteen volumes devoted to the fine arts, including splendid facsimiles of Piranesi's Magnificenza di Roma and Del Re's Ville di Delizia.

Lamont gift. Dr. Corliss Lamont (Ph.D., 1932) has presented
funds for the purchase of a fine letter from George Santayana to Hannibal Ingalls Kimball, his publisher. The letter, a 3-page holograph, is dated August 30, 1896, and discusses a newly-published edition of Santayana’s sonnets and suggests the publication of “two long dramatic poems called ‘The Hermit’s Christmas’ and ‘The Marriage of Aphrodite.’”

Longwell gifts. Mr. Daniel Longwell (1922 C) of Neosho, Missouri, has sent a number of important items for addition to the Sir Winston Churchill Collection. Among them are six “Executive Pamphlets” especially printed to be dropped behind the German lines during World War II. The titles are: “Churchill on the Reconstruction of Europe,” 1943, in French, German, Dutch, and English; “Wer ist dieser Mann,” 1942; “Churchill über Deutschlands Zukunft,” 1944; “Plus de 1,000 Bombardiers à la Fois sur l’Allemagne,” [1942]; “Winston Churchill Ami de la France,” [1942]; and “De Maand van de Groote Ommekeer,” [1942]. Mr. Longwell also presented The Windsor Magazine for the period from December 1902 to May 1903. The March issue contains on pages 453-460 a short story by Churchill, “On the Flank of the Army.”

New York County Democratic Committee gift. At a luncheon meeting in the Men’s Faculty Club, sponsored by the History Department, February 8, 1965, the New York County Democratic Committee formally presented certain documents relating to the New York Tammany Society. Included in the gift were two volumes of minutes of meetings, 1891-1915 and 1895-1916; a volume containing the charter and by-laws, ca. 1860; eleven volumes of scrapbooks containing correspondence, campaign materials, and election forms; and a substantial amount of memorabilia and miscellaneous documentary material.

Parsons gift. Professor Coleman O. Parsons (A.B., 1928) of City College has continued his generous gifts. To be recorded at this
time is his presentation of six plays by the 18th-century English dramatist, George Coleman the elder. The plays are: The Deuce is in Him (1763); The Clandestine Marriage (1766); The Man of Business (1774); and three early editions of The Jealous Wife (1763, ca. 1770, and 1790).

Pratt gift. On January 9, at a meeting of the Council of the Friends in Butler Library, an exhibition of specimens of research materials of non-standard format was placed on view. These materials ranged from cuneiform tablets to electronic tape, and included Chinese oracle bones, early Roman coins, palm-leaf manuscripts, microfilm, micro-fiche, and the like. As a gracious gesture to the occasion Dr. Dallas Pratt (M.D., 1941) presented a rare piece of early Chinese paper money, a one-kuan (one thousand “cash”) government note of the Hung Wu period (1368-1399). The note is printed on one side of a large sheet, 8¼” x 13½”, from a wood-block. The text includes information regarding the authority under which the note was issued, and the fate which counterfeiters could expect.

Dr. Pratt has also presented a remarkable collection of seventeen items, of which fifteen are letters by Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, Sir Winston Churchill's ancestress. Dr. Pratt's article in this issue of Library Columns, “The Duchess Speaks Her Mind,” explains the historical significance of these letters.

Puckette gift. Mrs. Charles McD. Puckette of Sewanee, Tennessee, has presented a collection of papers by and relating to the late Charles Leverich of New York and other members of the Leverich family. The collection numbers some 600 items.

Pullman Memorial gift. Mrs. David Pullman has placed with us a collection of books formed by her son, the late Leonard A. Pullman. Mr. Pullman had been graduated magna cum laude with
the class of 1962, and was enrolled for graduate work in the Department of English at the time of his tragic and untimely death.

**Rosenberg gift.** The celebrated artist, Mr. James N. Rosenberg (A.B., 1895; LL.B., 1898), has presented a holograph poem by George E. Woodberry. In making the presentation, Mr. Rosenberg stated that the poem had been given to him during his student days at Columbia, and that it had hung, framed, on his walls ever since. The poem is a sonnet entitled "Love's Rosary," and it is signed "Septr. 1896 G. E. Woodberry."

**Saffron gift.** Dr. Morris H. Saffron (A.B., 1925) has presented two items of great interest. One is a manuscript by a certain Aaron Thomas, entitled *Remarks & Occurrences . . . During the Encampment on Bagshot Heath*—a fair copy, bearing the date 1792. The other is a copy of Harrison D. Horblit's *One Hundred Books Famous in Science*, published by the Grolier Club, 1964.

**Spencer gift.** Mr. Frank N. Spencer, Jr., has presented a collection of eighty volumes, of which sixty-three are publications of the American Institute of Mechanical Engineers, and seventeen are in the field of economic geology.

**Tindall gift.** Professor William York Tindall (A.B., 1925; A.M., 1926) has presented a splendid collection of notes, drafts, and corrected typescripts of a number of his more important writings. Represented in the collection are his *Reader's Guide to Dylan Thomas; Reader's Guide to James Joyce; James Joyce; Joyce's Chamber Music; The Joyce Country; D. H. Lawrence and Susan His Cow; Wallace Stevens; The Literary Symbol; Forces in Modern British Literature; Samuel Beckett*; and miscellaneous essays.

**Trilling gift.** Not even in the midst of his sabbatical in England does Professor Lionel Trilling (A.B., 1925; A.M., 1926; Ph.D.,
Our Growing Collections

1938) forget us. He has sent us one piece that we in all probability could not have acquired in any other way—the Order of Service in memory of Thomas Stearns Eliot . . . Thursday, 4th February 1965 (Westminster Abbey), and with it a clipping of the account of the service as published in the London Times on 5 February 1965.

Notable Purchases

Manuscripts. Readers of these pages may recall the great “manu-
mission letter” by Henry Laurens to his son John, dated August
14, 1776, which was presented by Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Berol in
1963. Recently the opportunity to purchase an earlier Henry
Laurens letter arose, and was quickly seized. Dated November
29, 1767, and addressed to the commercial firm of Clay & Haber-
sham in Savannah, Georgia, it reveals Laurens’ earlier dealings in
the slave traffic. It reads, in part, “I was in great hopes that you
might have obtained a reasonable price for the Negroes con-
signed to you . . . but since that cannot be done it only remains
that I desire you to sell them upon the best terms your Master
will admit of . . .”

Fifteenth-Century Editions. Two incunabula have been pur-
chased recently, both being editions of classical writings for in-
clusion in the Gonzalez Lodge collection. One is Aristotle’s
Ethica ad Nicomachum rendered into Latin by an unknown
eyear scholar (Henricus Krosbein?) and printed in Paris by
André Bocard for Jean Petit, about 1496-1500. The other is
Terence’s Comoediae with the copious commentary of Guido
Juvenalís, and printed at Lyons by Jean de Vingle, 1497.

Early Science. Two very important volumes containing early
mathematical treatises have been acquired for the David Eugene
Smith Collection. One of the volumes contains three rare 16th-
century editions: Arnoldus de Lens, In geometrica elementa,
printed by Christopher Plantin at Antwerp in 1565; Gemma
Roland Baughman

Frisius, *Arithmeticae practicae*, printed for Gregorius Bontius in Antwerp, 1547; and Henricus Glareanus, *De VI arithmeticae practicae*, printed at Louvain by Stephanus Valerius, 1561. The other volume contains the first edition in English of William Oughtred's *The Key of the mathematicks new forged and filed*, printed at London by Thomas Harper, 1647. This work, says the D.N.B., “was a systematic text book on Algebra and arithmetic embodying all that was then known on the subject.” Its first appearance was a Latin version of 1631.

*Avery purchases*. High among the many purchases of important architectural works destined for Avery Library is William Thomas’s *Original designs . . . consisting of twenty-seven copper-plates . . .* London, 1783. This is one of the rarest of English architectural publications of the period. Among the plates is one of Surrey Chapel in St. George’s Road, Southwark—a building that was later used as a boxing arena, and which suffered a final indignity when it was destroyed during the bombing of 1940. Another item is a fine run of the early issues of *L’Esprit Nouveau*, an avant-garde magazine devoted to esthetics in all branches of letters and the arts, and containing articles of the first importance by various influential writers. The magazine was founded in 1920 by, among others, Le Corbusier, and it continued through 28 issues to 1925. Avery Library now possesses numbers 1–17 and 22–23.

*Modern Fine Printing*. A year ago (May, 1964) we reported the purchase of Pierre Schaeffer’s *Jeux de Trames*, published at Paris in 1962 and containing ten “trama-reliefs” by Joel Stein. Had we been up-to-date on art movements we could have referred to the trama-reliefs as examples of “op art”—which now it is clear they are. A recent Ulmann Fund purchase adds a work with “pop art” features: Robert Rauschenberg’s thirty-four lightly colored plates, illustrating Dante’s *Inferno*. It was recently issued
PLAN AND ELEVATION OF A HUNTING SEAT

(From William Thomas's Original designs in architecture ... [containing] plans, elevations, sections, ceilings [sic] and chimney pieces, for villas and town houses; designs for temples, grottos, sepulchres, bridges, etc. in the most approved taste... London, 1783.)
by Harry N. Abrams, New York. There is a fine essay on the Rauschenberg approach by Dore Ashton. As John Canaday reported in the New York Times of December 19, “Rauschenberg’s Dante wanders through a nether world filled with symbols of our 20th-century hell, and is sometimes girdled in a bath towel or capped by a space helmet.” (Dante, as depicted, is Rauschenberg himself.) Canaday concludes with the comment that the price asked for the set “is a lot of money, but on the other hand, this is a lot of Rauschenberg.”

PICTURE CREDITS

Credit for some of the illustrations in this issue is acknowledged as follows: (1) Article by Carl Woodring: The drawing of Byron is from W. Teigmouth’s D’Orsay or the Complete Dandy (N.Y., Brentano’s, 1911); The portrait of Lady Byron is from G. Wilson Knight’s Lord Byron’s Marriage . . . (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957); and the sketch of Augusta Leigh is from Ethel Colburn Mayne’s Byron (N.Y., Scribner’s Sons, 1913). (2) Article by Dallas Pratt: The portraits of the Duchess of Marlborough, of the Earl of Marlborough, of Lady Masham, and of the Old Pretender are from Winston Churchill’s Marlborough: His Life and Times, 1650–1688 (N.Y., Scribners, 1933); the portrayal of Princess Anne with family group is from Ralph Dutton’s English Court Life from Henry VII to George II (London, B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1963).
Activities of the Friends

MEETINGS

Bancroft Awards Dinner

On Thursday, May 20, approximately 300 members of our organization and their guests met for the culminating event of the academic year — the Bancroft Awards Dinner which was held in the Rotunda of Low Memorial Library. Mr. Hugh J. Kelly, Chairman of our association, presided.

During the program, President Grayson Kirk announced the winners of the prizes for the three books judged by the Bancroft Prize Jury to be the best published in 1964 in the fields of American History, American Diplomacy, and International Relations of the United States: (for diplomatic history) Bradford Perkins's Castlereagh and Adams: England and the United States, 1812-1823; (for history) William B. Wilcox's Portrait of a General: Sir Henry Clinton in the War of Independence; and (for international affairs) Dorothy Borg's The United States and the Far Eastern Crisis of 1933-1938 from the Manchurian Incident through the Initial Stage of the Undeclared Sino-Japanese War. Each of the authors received a co-equal $4,000 award.

Mr. Kelly presented certificates to Mr. David Hales of the University of California Press, to Mr. Harding Lemay of Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., and to Mr. Mark Carroll of the Harvard University Press — the publishers, respectively, of the three books.

The Bancroft Awards Dinner Committee was made up of Mrs. Francis Henry Lenygon, Chairman, Mrs. Arthur C. Holden, Professor Lewis Leary, Dr. Morris H. Saffron, and Mr. Norman H. Strouse.
THE FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA LIBRARIES

PRIVILEGES

INVITATIONS to exhibitions, lectures and other special events.
Use of books in the reading rooms of the libraries.
Opportunity to consult librarians, including those in charge of the specialized collections, about material of interest to a member. (Each Division Head has our members' names on file.)
Opportunity to purchase most Columbia University Press books at 20 per cent discount (through the Secretary-Treasurer of the Friends).
Free subscriptions to Columbia Library Columns.

* * *

CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP

Annual. Any person contributing not less than $15.00 per year.
Contributing. Any person contributing not less than $25.00 a year.
Sustaining. Any person contributing not less than $50.00 a year.
Benefactor. Any person contributing not less than $100.00 a year.
Checks should be made payable to Columbia University. All donations are deductible for income tax purposes.
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