ALL SEASONS AND EVERY LIGHT was the main title of a show subtitled "Nineteenth Century American Landscapes/from the collection of Elias Lyman Magoon" which Your Faithful Editor saw at the Norton Museum of Art, West Palm Beach, Florida. It was excellent documentation of a point we have made repeatedly in this column: those small and medium-sized art museums with knowledgeable, energetic and adventurous staffs frequently mount shows rich in social and cultural implication, important for people in our field—and, frequently, aesthetically wonderful, too. The Norton is certainly such a place, though the present show is not one of its own inventions. It consists of paintings acquired by an interesting mid-nineteenth century author, orator and clergyman, who, recognizing the importance of the collection he had put together out of his own modest financial resources, allowed Matthew Vassar to house it properly in what became the art gallery at Vassar College. The show opened in October of 1983 at the college in Poughkeepsie, moved to the DeCordova and Dana Museum, Lincoln, Massachusetts, from February through March, to the Norton from late May till July 1 of '84, and then to the Mary and Leigh Block Gallery at Northwestern University from mid-November until January 13th of 1985.

The Norton mounted it handsomely and spaciously. The show-book (Poughkeepsie, 1983) includes a thoughtful essay by Ella M. Foshay on Magoon as a collector and as a reflector of mid-century aesthetic ideals, and a superlative catalogue by Sally Mills which ties each artist and painting to contemporary thought. National self-consciousness in the arts, attitudes toward the landscape, the impact of tendencies in European art and aesthetics, relationships with other paintings by the same artist and by other masters as well, intelligent speculation where documentation is not available: the whole project is exemplary.

A show I missed—the directors insisted that I have a copy of the catalogue by E. Robert Hunter (West Palm Beach, 1984)—illustrates what this smaller museum can do by itself: from March 18th to April 29th of '84, the Norton showed "Masterpieces of Twentieth-Century Canadian Painting," a show its staff put together entirely on their own hook, at the cost of a tremendous expenditure of their time and resources. Apparently nothing comparable had been done in Canada; they had to define their scope, grant-write themselves blue in the face to get together the financial support (Richard Mattigan, their director, told Y. F. Ed. that the show cost a hundred thousand dollars), talk sometimes very reluctant Canadian institutions and individual collectors into lending the works, and so on. The paintings, chosen for aesthetic reasons only, cover what the Norton's staff thought were the best of those works produced from the impact of Impressionism until about 1960. Two painters in the group, at least, are well known to Americans: Ernest Lawson and Maurice Prendergast, both Canadian born, though they worked variously in New York, Kansas, Paris and Boston. If the show and the handsome catalogue by E. Robert Hunter taught us no more than that some of these Canadians do work which looks very much like the work done by contemporary Americans, it would have been worth mounting, for despite all we know about the international nature of painting from at least Washington Allston's generation, it is difficult to separate broad international tendencies from national characteristics when we look at our paintings in isolation. Several relationships seem strong; others are tenuous; some bridge media. But looking at certain pieces by David Milne, John Lyman, Tom Thomson, J.E.H. MacDonald, Lawren Harris, Lionel L. Fitzgerald or A.Y. Jackson does make you think of some aspects (or several) of Charles Demuth, John Marin, Edward Hopper, Marsden Hartley or Charles Burchfield. The viewer is reminded that European art is not the only relevant "connection." YFE's devious journeys have taught him that there are forceful national schools in this same era in countries as unexpected as Uruguay and Mexico, whose artists not only did beautiful work (virtually
unknown outside their homelands) but who can teach us about ourselves, as well. But I dare say there is more to learn than this.

George Ehrlich praises a big Yale project, THE SELECTED PAPERS OF CHARLES WILLSON PEALE AND HIS FAMILY. Volume I, Charles Willson Peale: Artist in Revolutionary America, 1735-1791. Editor, Lillian B. Miller. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983, $50.00), as follows: In this reviewer's long held estimation, Charles Willson Peale (1741-1827) is one of the most interesting people to have lived in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century in the United States. Consequently, it is satisfying to have, finally, the convenience of a substantial selection of the papers of that gentleman and his family, in book form, extensively edited and illustrated. There is an earlier, microfiche edition of the full record for those wishing to confront (once removed) the original documents. Volume One, of a projected eight, takes us from 1735 (beginning with the father) to 1791. The additional volumes will include the remainder of Peale's life, his autobiography, and succeeding generations, to 1885. To paraphrase the appraisal of the editor, Lillian Miller, the papers are valuable to those interested in the American Revolution, the history of art, science and technology in the early republic, and to those wishing to study the social history of the time not just through institutions but a large and talented family. Peale was and remains a thoroughly fascinating personality, whose life brought him into contact with George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, various members of the American Philosophical Society and a host of other personages both here and abroad. Until the publication of the papers, we had to meet him indirectly either through his paintings, or through the work of scholars such as Charles Coleman Sellers, who wrote both a biography as well as a study of Peale's extraordinary museum. Now we can meet the gentleman directly, through his correspondence and other personal papers. The editors are to be commended for their diligent work.

STATE AND CAMPUS, State Regulation of Religiously Affiliated Higher Education, by Bernard DuBois and Edward McGlynn Gaffney, Jr. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984, $19.95 paper), Lynn Taylor predicts, will be heavily relied on by administrators needing an "accurate and carefully documented" handy legal summary of "the bearing of state regulations on religiously oriented colleges," for "all fifty states aid religiously affiliated colleges or their students in some ways."

Ralph Waldo Emerson said that if we want to understand American culture, we should look in unusual and new places, and not to the forms in which Greece and Rome expressed themselves. In "Hobgoblin in Suburbia: Origins of Contemporary Place Consciousness," Landscape Architecture, 73 [November/December, 1983], 54-61, John Stilgoe looks at plastic lawn ornaments (among other things) and finds evidence of analogies to pagan place spirits. He can't prove the connections, but his explanation of the popular understanding of private place and spirit is hard to refute. His work makes a nice counterbalance to Thorstein Veblen's explanation of the function of lawns in The Theory of the Leisure Class.

John Braeman's report on a collection of papers follows: BOSTON 1700-1980: The Evolution of Urban Politics. Edited by Ronald P. Formisano and Constance Burns (Westport, Connecticut and London: Greenwood Press, 1984, $35.00). Seven of the ten articles published here are new. Overall, the aim is to present a synoptic picture of the changing structures and dynamics of Boston politics. One of the two major variables at work has been socio-economic change: the transformation of Boston from a Yankee traders' town into a manufacturing city; its twentieth-century decline as an industrial and financial center; and its resurgence as a "service and high-technology metropolis" (4). The second variable has been the ethnocultural factor. With the shift from a homogeneous Yankee Protestant population to an Irish Catholic majority, the Yankee-Irish conflict constituted from the late nineteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries "the major visible political fault line" (5). Even during this period, however, intra-Irish divisions based upon class, neighborhood and the political factionalism was probably as important a determinant of election outcomes. And since World War II, Boston politics has involved a complex interplay among different religious, ethnic, racial and economic groups. As is inevitable, the articles vary in quality. But at least four warrant attention by all students of the urban political process: Formisano's analysis of the replacement of elite rule by party politics 1800-1840; Paul Kleppner's account of late nineteenth-early twentieth century Democratic Party factionalism; Burns' "The Irony of Progressive Reform"; and Charles H. Trout's study of James M. Curley and "The Search for Irish Legitimacy."

Strange volumes come from university presses these days, some published to make money for publishers strapped by Reagan-era budgets, some because they are too odd-ball to attract commercial publishers, yet deserve an audience, and some for no reason one can discover. The latter category, alas, includes TRUMAN IN CARTOON & CARICATURE, James N. Giglio and Greg G. Thielen (Ames, Iowa: State University Press, 1984, $14.95), which is a careless job. The editors misinterpret several cartoons and fail to do their homework (e.g., read papers of the period to find out about issues) on others.

John Braeman had similar misgivings about THE MCNEIL CENTURY: The Life and Times of an Island Prison, by Paul W. Keve (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1984, $26.95). He said he was "puzzled why anyone should bother reading, much less writing, a detailed history of the prison on McNeil Island in Washington's Puget Sound. Keve strains to give a broader significance to his study by asking what factors made McNeil Island one of the nation's 'better'