THE EMPORIA STATE RESEARCH STUDIES

THE GRADUATE PUBLICATION OF THE KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE, EMPORIA

John Frampton and Thomas Nicholas Two Sixteenth-Century Propagandists For English Expansion

by

Loren E. Pennington

William H. McMaster: An Agrarian Dissenter During "Normalcy"

by

Patrick G. O'Brien

The Emporia State Research Studies

KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
EMPORIA, KANSAS 66801

John Frampton and Thomas Nicholas: Two Sixteenth-Century Propagandists For English Expansion

by

Loren E. Pennington

William H. McMaster: An Agrarian Dissenter During "Normalcy"

by

Patrick G. O'Brien

Volume XX | June, 1972 | Number 4

THE EMPORIA STATE RESEARCH STUDIES is published quarterly by The School of Graduate and Professional Studies of the Kansas State Teachers College, 1200 Commercial St., Emporia, Kansas, 66801. Entered as second-class matter September 16, 1952, at the post office at Emporia, Kansas, under the act of August 24, 1912. Postage paid at Emporia, Kansas.

KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

EMPORIA, KANSAS

JOHN E. VISSER

President of the College

●

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE
AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES

LAURENCE C. BOYLAN, *Dean*

EDITORIAL BOARD

WILLIAM H. SEILER, *Professor of Social Sciences and Chairman of Division*

CHARLES E. WALTON, *Professor of English and Head of Department*

GREEN D. WYRICK, *Professor of English*

Editor of this Issue: WILLIAM H. SEILER

Papers published in the periodical are written by faculty members of the Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia and by either undergraduate or graduate students whose studies are conducted in residence under the supervision of a faculty member of the college.

"Statement required by the Act of October, 1962; Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code, showing Ownership, Management and Circulation." **The Emporia State Research Studies** is published quarterly. Editorial Office and Publication Office at 1200 Commercial Street, Emporia, Kansas. (66801). The **Research Studies** is edited and published by the Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas.

A complete list of all publications of *The Emporia State Research Studies* is published in the fourth number of each volume.

John Frampton and Thomas Nicholas: Two Sixteenth-Century Propagandists For English Expansion

by

Loren E. Pennington

For well over a century the younger Richard Hakluyt has been recognized by historians as the foremost propagandist for English overseas expansion in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. A predecessor of Hakluyt, Richard Eden, and a successor, Samuel Purchas, have also received widespread, if lesser, acclaim. Taken together the three are regarded as a kind of triumvirate whose books and pamphlets goaded the English to the far reaches of Asia, Africa, and especially America. Yet the works of these writers are more general than specific. A particular venture often did provide the immediate occasion for a special publication, but their works seldom, except in the case of some of Hakluyt's writings, show more than a tenuous connection with the sponsors of such undertakings. Morever, the rambling travel account, often of foreign origin, that was the mainstay of all three writers cannot be considered good propaganda in any modern sense. Even so, historians have rightly never doubted that Eden, Hakluyt, and Purchas intended to (and did) influence English public opinion in favor of expansion. The three were, in short, engaged in the production of "promotional literature" in the broadest sense.

The publishing careers of Eden, Hakluyt, and Purchas span the period from the beginning of the Muscovy explorations through the downfall of the Virginia Company, but they do not overlap. Between the end of one and the onset of the next there is in each case a significant lapse of time. Eden published his first promotional translation, *A Treatyse of the Newe India,* in 1553, [1] and his last, a revised edition of his earlier *The Decades of the Newe Worlde,* was published posthumously in 1577 by his collaborator and literary executor, Richard Willes. [2] Richard Hakluyt did not publish his *Divers Voyages, Touch-*

---

[*] Dr. Pennington is a professor of history at Kansas State Teachers College.

[1] The work was printed at London by Edward Sutton. It was a translation from the Latin of Book V of Sebastian Münster's *Cosmographia universalis* (Basel, 1550), which had previously appeared in several Latin, German, and French editions beginning in 1536.

[2] The first edition of the *Decades*, translated by Eden, was published at London in 1555 by Richard Jug, Roberte Toy, Willyam Seres, and Edward Sutton. It was drawn chiefly from Peter Martyr d'Anghiera's *De Orbe novo Decades* (Basel, 1533). There had already been several Continental editions of this work beginning at Alcalá in 1516. The second and greatly expanded edition by Eden and Willes is entitled *The History of Travayle in the West and East Indies* (London, Richard Jugge, 1577).

ing the Discoverie of America until 1582,[3] although in 1580 he had sponsored a translation of the travels of Jacques Cartier.[4] Except for a few translations specially undertaken in 1609 and 1614 in behalf of the Virginia and East India Companies,[5] Hakluyt had closed his continuously active publishing career at least by 1604, when he may have been responsible for Edward Grimeston's translation of José de Acosta's *Historia natural y moral de las Indias.*[6] Samuel Purchas, in turn, did not produce his first work, *Purchas His Pilgrimage,* until 1613,[7] and his much more famous (and more promotional) *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes* did not appear until 1625.[8]

The lengthy gap between the careers of Hakluyt and Purchas in the first quarter of the seventeenth century was filled by the works of the many direct propagandists for Virginia, Newfoundland, New England, Guiana, and the East Indies. Their efforts, particularly those of the Virginia authors, have received considerable attention from historians. But the shorter period between Eden's last work in 1577 and Hakluyt's first in 1582 saw only two English writers of any importance at work on overseas subjects. These two were John Frampton and Thomas Nicholas. In that brief five-year period they published nine, and possibly eleven, works on the new discoveries. Most writers on sixteenth-century English geography and expansion have given Frampton and Nicholas at least passing attention, and four of their works have

---

[3] London, Thomas Dawson for Thomas Woodcocke.

[4] *A Shorte and Briefe Narration of the Two Navigations and Discoveries to the Northwest Parts Called Newe Fraunce,* trans. John Florio (London, H. Bynneman, 1580). The translation was made from Giambattista Ramusio's *Navigationi,* Vol. III, 1556 or later.

[5] Gentleman of Elvas, *Virginia Richly Valued, by the Description of the Maine Land of Florida, Her Next Neighbor,* trans. Richard Hakluyt (London, Felix Kyngston for Matthew Lownes, 1609; another edition, 1611); Marc Lescarbot, *Nova Francia or the Description of that Part of Newe France, which is One Continent with Virginia,* trans. Pierre Erondelle (London, Geor. Bishop, 1609); Gothard Arthus, *Dialogues in the English and Malaiane Languages,* trans. Augustine Spaulding (London, Felix Kyngston for W. Welby, 1614). The second work was undertaken at the instigation of Hakluyt, as Erondelle makes clear in his preface, while the last may well have been under his direct supervision. Hakluyt may also have had some slight connection in his later years with the publication of Gerrit de Veer, *The True and Perfect Description of Three Voyages . . . Performed . . . by the Ships of Holland and Zeland,* trans. William Philip (London, for T. Pauier, 1609) and Peter Martyr d'Anghiera, *De Novo Orbe, or the Historie of the West Indies,* trans. M. Lok (London, for Thomas Adams, 1612). See George Bruner Parks, *Richard Hakluyt and the English Voyages* (2nd edition, New York, 1961), pp. 266-267. But even if all five of these works are ascribed directly to Hakluyt, they constitute no more than an epilogue to his earlier prolific career.

[6] *The Naturall and Morall Historie of the East and West Indies* (London, Valentine Sims for Edward Blount and William Aspley, 1604). Hakluyt's connection with this work is more by inference than direct evidence (Parks, *Richard Hakluyt,* pp. 166, 211), and it may be that the end of his main publishing career should be dated as early as 1601 (*ibid.,* pp. 256-266).

[7] London, William Stansby for Henrie Fetherstone, 1613; other editions, much enlarged, 1614, 1617, 1626.

[8] 4 vols., London, Henry Fetherstone.

been reprinted in modern editions.[9] But in spite of the fact that they used the same types of materials as Eden, Hakluyt, and Purchas, and seem to have had the same purpose in mind, they have usually received only slight credit for their efforts, and little real attempt has been made to assess their works as expansionist propaganda.[10] While their publications certainly do not in this sense measure up to those of their three near contemporaries, they appear to have made a more important contribution than has generally been recognized.

An evaluation of the published works of Frampton and Nicholas may shed some light on the state of English overseas knowledge in late 1570's and early 1580's, and may give some indication of the weaknesses of English thinking in regard to expansionist propaganda. It may also, through an examination of the attitude expressed toward the Spaniard and the Indian, cast some doubt on the alleged prevalence of the Black

---

[9] Frampton's *The Most Noble and Famous Travels of Marcus Paulus* (London, Ralph Newberry, 1579) was edited by N. M. Penzer and published at London in 1929; his *Joyfull Newes out of the Newe Founde Worlde* (London, William Morton, 1577: another issue, 1578; other editions 1580, 1596) was edited by Stephen Gaselee and published in two volumes at London in 1925; Nicholas's *The Pleasant Historie of the Conquest of the Weast India* (London, 1578; another edition 1596) was issued in facsimile reprint at New York in 1940 with an introduction by H I. Priestley; his *Strange and Delectable History of the Discoverie and Conquest of the Provinces of Peru* (London, Richard Jhones, 1581) was edited by D. B. Thomas and published at London in 1933.

[10] George Bruner Parks in his *Richard Hakluyt* gives them only a paragraph (p. 71), though he discusses Eden and Purchas at some length; F. T. McCann's *The English Discovery of America to 1585* (New York, 1952), which is a history of colonial literature, also contains but a paragraph on the two (p. 159); the same is true (p. 212), of Donald Lach's *Asia in the Making of Europe*, I (Chicago, 1965), though Lach deals at length with the Continental versions of a number of works translated by Frampton and Nicholas; C. N. Robinson and John Leyland in their chapter on "The Literature of the Sea" in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, eds. A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller, IV (Cambridge, 1949) make no mention of either man; A. L. Rowse, *The Expansion of Elizabethan England* (New York, 1955) briefly discusses Frampton (pp. 67-68), but does not mention Nicholas; even E. G. R. Taylor in her classic *Tudor Geography, 1485-1583* (London, 1930) gives them but passing attention (pp. 40, 110, 112). Boies Penrose, *Travel and Discovery in the Renaissance* (Cambridge, Mass., 1952) does contain a number of brief but important observations on their works, but within the framework of a general discussion of travel literature; the same is true of John Parker's *Books to Build an Empire: A Bibliographical History of English Overseas Interests to 1620* (Amsterdam, 1965). James A. Williamson in his article "Piracy and Honest Trade," *Blackwood's Magazine*, CCXXVII (1930), pp. 546-556, discusses at some length Frampton's troubles with the Spanish Inquisition, but makes no mention of either Frampton or Nicholas in the chapter entitled "The Propagandists of the Tudor Period" in his *The Ocean in English History* (Oxford, 1941), pp. 56-85. Aside from Williamson, the only author to deal extensively with Frampton is Lawrence C. Wroth. In addition to discussing his career in Spain, Wroth does give extensive mention to the first two of Frampton's works. See his "An Elizabethan Merchant and Man of Letters," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, XVII (1953-54), pp. 299-314. At the time Wroth promised a larger work on Frampton, but it has never appeared. A few authors, as noted below, have dealt at some length with individual writings of both Frampton and Nicholas.

Legend in England during this period, at least as reflected in the English colonial movement.

The medium of Frampton and Nicholas was the translation of discovery and travel accounts drawn from works published chiefly in Spain. Though both clearly indicated in their prefaces that an important purpose behind their efforts was the promotion of English expansion, this dependence on Spanish authors resulted in rather unsatisfactory propaganda for a number of reasons. Most obvious is the fact that the type of colonization stressed in Spanish publications, with its emphasis on quick riches and extractive industries, did not prove adaptable to the English colonial situation, which eventually succeeded only through the development of agriculture and staple production. The proof of this shortcoming, however, lay in the future, and Frampton and Nicholas can scarcely be blamed for not recognizing it at so early a date.

The Spanish works did possess more immediate weaknesses as promotional literature that any good propagandist should have been able to recognize. In the first place, almost none of them had been intended as propaganda for overseas trade or settlement; rather, the writings tended to be collected works or narrative relations which, though containing considerable information and commentary about newly discovered areas, usually had as their chief object the chronicling and glorification of the deeds of the conquistadores. This was particularly true in reference to the New World. In order to make these deeds the greater, the Spanish authors stressed not the opportunities of America but its dangers and hardships – the oppressive climate, wild beasts, vicious natives – everything that Howard Mumford Jones has characterized as the "anti-image" of the New World.[11] The Spanish authors presented such a discouraging view of American prospects that many of their works could have been converted to effective propaganda for colonization only by the severest editing. With this editorial problem Frampton and Nicholas were unable or unwilling to cope, perhaps because they recognized that although it might not create a desire to travel to the New World, much less settle there, this anti-image was as fascinating to the imagination of Renaissance man as the opposite suggestion that America represented a new Garden of Eden.

The anti-image also had a corollary in the impression it left of the Spanish. Just at a time when England and Spain were drawing away from their traditional friendship and were moving toward the enmity that was to characterize their relations for the next two hundred years, there was appearing in England, in the midst of vigorous anti-Spanish

---

[11] Howard Mumford Jones, *O Strange New World* (New York, 1964) pp. 35-70. For an excellent discussion of the way reality was obscured in the travel literature of the period by literary and moralistic stereotypes, see W. T. Jewkes, "The Literature of Travel and the Mode of Romance in the Renaissance," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, LXVII (1963), pp. 219-236; reprinted in *Literature as a Mode of Travel*, ed. W. G. Rice (New York, 1963), pp. 13-30.

propaganda in other fields, this considerable body of literature in which the Spaniards and their accomplishments were pictured in the most glowing, heroic, and flattering terms.[12] The works of Frampton and Nicholas were simply not in tune with the temper of the times. To criticize them for this, however, is to criticize all the works of Richard Eden and many of those of Richard Hakluyt, both of whom, because they used the same source materials, frequently achieved the same impression. Notwithstanding these propaganda weaknesses, the works of the Spanish and other continental authors were still the only sources available to the English at a time when they lacked both the imagination and experience (except in their unsuccessful quests for a passage to Asia) to produce their own propaganda[13].

* * * * *

Most of what we know of John Frampton concerns his activities in Spain. According to depositions he later made before the High Court of Admiralty, he had sailed for Spain as a factor aboard the ship *Jesus* in 1561. He landed at Cadiz and sold his cloth for 2100 ducats

[12] One of the most persistent themes among historians of the colonial effort is the importance of the Black Legend in spurring English overseas efforts. Two sixteenth-century writings are most often cited in support of this view. The first is Richard Hakluyt's "Discourse of Western Planting." See, for example, Louis B. Wright, *Religion and Empire: The Alliance between Piety and Commerce in Elizabethan Expansion, 1558-1625* (Chapel Hill, 1943), pp. 41-46. It is too often forgotten that the "Discourse" remained in manuscript until the nineteenth century, and could have had at best a limited influence. The second writing is M. M. S. (tr.), *The Spanish Colonie, or Briefe Chronicle of the Acts and Gestes of the Spaniardes in the West Indies . . . By the Reverend Bishop Bartholomew de Las Casas* (London, Thomas Dawson for William Brome, 1583). It should be pointed out that this work, as its preface indicates, probably had its impetus in the Dutch Revolt rather than the English colonial movement. Moreover, though the writings of Las Casas were extremely popular on the Continent, and appeared in numerous sixteenth-century Latin, German, Italian, French, and Dutch translations, this was the only English edition of the work published before 1624. In fact, most writers who stress the importance of the Black Legend actually draw their examples from the period after that date. See, for example, Lewis Hanke, *Bartolomé de Las Casas: Bookman Scholar, & Propagandist* (Philadelphia, 1952), pp. 53-58. Nearly half a century ago, Sidney Lee pointed out that sixteenth-century England looked to Spain as a master and model in the field of colonization, and that English contempt and loathing for Spain was a later development. See his "The Example of Spain" in *Elizabethan and Other Essays by Sir Sidney Lee*, ed. F. S. Boas (Freeport, N.Y., 1968; originally published Oxford, 1929), pp. 199-231. If Lee was correct, it might be inferred that the Black Legend played a negligible role in English expansionist literature before 1600. The present author has in preparation an extended article which attempts to examine this idea. The most recent work on the Black Legend, William S. Maltby's *The Black Legend in England: The Development of Anti-Spanish Sentiment, 1558-1660* (Durham, N.C., 1971), appears to support the view that Nicholas's translations (those of Frampton are not discussed) are not particularly anti-Spanish (pp. 20-23).

[13] While it is difficult to gauge the impact of the Frampton-Nicholas translations on English thinking, some idea of their importance to other English literature may be gleaned from Robert R. Cawley, *The Voyagers and Elizabethan Drama* (Boston, 1938), *passim*.

in bills of exchange. He then traveled to Seville, where he lodged in the house of Hugh Tipton, who was on good terms with the Spanish authorities and later served as an agent for John Hawkins. The Inquisition examined his effects at Cadiz and became suspicious when an English version of Cato was discovered. Meanwhile Frampton proceeded to Malaga, where he was located and arrested. He was returned in chains to Seville, and endured a trial of sixteen months. He was three times put to the torture, and after confession went through the *auto da fé*. His confession probably saved him from death, but he was sentenced to loss of goods and imprisonment for a year, and thereafter to be subject to the Inquisition's pleasure. Finally released on a perpetual ticket-of-leave, he was ordered never to leave Spain and to wear the San Benito, the parti-colored coat with the St. Andrews cross, whenever he walked abroad.

By 1567 Frampton had managed to escape to England, leaving behind his San Benito, which the Spanish burned to signify his death, and all his goods were declared forfeit. His next step was to commence suit in Spain for the recovery of his property, probably with no expectation of winning, but as a necessary prelude to prove that he could obtain no redress from Spanish courts and thereby strengthen a case for securing letters of reprisal against Spanish shipping from the High Court of Admiralty. His case was still before the Spanish court in 1568 when a diplomatic rupture between England and Spain caused a suspension of all such legal actions. By the time relations were renewed between the two countries in 1573, he had commenced proceedings before the English court. The deposition of the case is unknown.[14] It may be that final action by the court was prevented by the negotiations leading up to the Treaty of Bristol of August 1574, which attempted to balance shipping loss claims on both sides and inhibit further Inquisition actions against English merchants for religious activities outside Spanish domains.[15] At any rate, Frampton drops from sight for four years.

Frampton may well have brought with him from Spain a large number of Spanish books on Asia and America. He may also have continued to receive the latest works from some peninsular source, as

[14] Information on Frampton's troubles in Spain is contained in Williamson, "Piracy and Honest Trade," *Blackwood's Magazine*, CCXXVII (1930), pp 546-556 and in Wroth, "An Elizabethan Merchant," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, XVII (1953-54), pp. 299-314. The two accounts differ somewhat in detail. Williamson used as his source H. C. A. Examinations, no. 19, Querela Johannis Frampton, 1572-73, December 21, 30; January 5-8, preserved in the Public Record Office. Wroth's article is undocumented, but probably used the same source.

[15] For a discussion of this treaty and its effects, see Albert J. Loomie, "Religion and Elizabethan Commerce," *Catholic Historical Review*, L (1964-65), pp. 27-51.

one of the books he translated was not published in Spain until 1577.[16] Thus he had at close hand considerable material for his translating efforts. He commenced his activities in 1577 with the publication of a translation of *Historia medicinal de las cosas que se traen de nuestras Indias Occidentales*, the chief work of the distinguished Spanish physician Nicolás Monardes.[17] Its main theme was a subject of great importance to all Europeans of the day: the hope that America might provide remedies for all the ills of mankind from venereal disease and cancer to the "evil breath."[18] The first issue had the rather clumsy title, *The Three Bookes Written in the Spanish Tongue.* A second issue the same year had a much more attractive title that best gives the flavor of the contents:

> *Joyfull Newes out of the Newe Founde Worlde, Wherein is Declared the Rare and Singular Vertues of Diverse and Sundrie Hearbes, Trees, Oyles, Plantes, and Stones, with Their Aplications, Aswell for the Phisicke as Chiurgerie, the Said Beyng Well Applied Bryngeth Such Present Remedie for All Deseases, as Maie Seme Altogether Incredible: Notwithstandyng by Practize Found Out, to be True.*

The "Epistle Dedicatorie" makes it clear Frampton intended the volume as a guide to the herbs daily coming into England from the West Indies via Spain.[19] His promotional objective, if it existed, was at best vague, for he makes no suggestion that the English take steps to search out the drugs for themselves. Nevertheless, the descriptions of pepper, cinnamon, and ginger, along with the medicinal herbs, especially sassafras and tobacco, might well have been a spur to those interested

---

[16] This was Berardino de Escalante's *Discurso de la navegacion que los Portugueses hazen à los reinos y provincias del Oriente* (Seville, 1577), which Frampton translated as *A Discourse of the Navigation which the Portugales Doe Make to . . . the East Partes of the World* (London, Thomas Dawson, 1579).

[17] A portion of the work was first published in Seville in 1569 and a second part in 1571. The book had a wide reputation throughout Europe, and its reputation in England preceded its translation. During the winter of 1574-75, Roger Bodenham, a frequent English traveler in Spain, had promised to send Burghley a Spanish edition in the conviction it propounded a useful remedy for Burghley's gout. Frampton may have received his Spanish copy from Bodenham. See Taylor, *Tudor Geography*, p. 112 and J. G. Underhill, *Spanish Literature in the England of the Tudors* (New York, 1899), pp. 159-160.

[18] An excellent discussion of the diseases and cures set forth in the work is contained in Louis B. Wright, *The Dream of Prosperity in Colonial America* (New York, 1965), pp. 41-49. See also Wroth, "An Elizabethan Merchant," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, XVII (1953-1954), pp. 307-308, which points out that this was the first mention of sassafras (though not of tobacco) in an English publication.

[19] The dedication to Edward Dyer may indicate an indirect connection with Richard Hakluyt, with whom Dyer was connected (*ibid.*, p. 307).

in such activities.[20] Despite the fact that *Joyfull Newes* was not directly promotional,[21] it proved to be Frampton's most popular translation. In addition to the two issues of 1577, there were two new and augmented editions in 1580 and 1596. Frampton may still have been alive in 1596 and could have personally edited the edition of that year.[22]

It was not until his second work that Frampton began to play the true propagandist for English expansion. His translation of Monardes' *Historia medicinal* was of a recent and up-to-date work, but now he reached back more than half a century to the West Indies section of Martín Fernández de Enciso's *Suma de geografia,* first published at Seville in 1519.[23] The translation, which Frampton titled *A Briefe Description of the Portes, Creekes, Bayes, and Havens, of the Weast India,*[24] is an example of the common practice of most sixteenth-century English expansionist propagandists to publish mainly to take advantage of public interest rather than create it. Most of Frampton's works were patronized by and dedicated to Edward Dyer, protégé of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. The *Briefe Description,* however, was dedicated to Sir Humphrey Gilbert, not only because Gilbert was the author of a pamphlet published in 1576 in behalf of the Frobisher venture,[25] but because "nowe you meane in proper person, and that at your owne charges to take some noble voyage and discoverie in hand, to leave behind you renowne to your family, and honour and profite to your contrie."[26] This was the Gilbert expedition that had been in preparation for several months, and which, after many delays, finally sailed in November of 1578. It returned a dismal failure the following year.

Historians are still debating whether this voyage was intended as a discovery of a northwest passage, a raid on Spanish shipping or possibly as relief for the Oxenham expendition to Panama of 1576, or a

---

[20] See especially fols. 20, 33-36, 88-89. The citations are from a copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library which has a 1577 title page, but is a later edition, probably that of 1580. The material in the last citation, above, is not actually in the first edition.

[21] Parker has pointed out that it was the only one of Frampton's translations which seems to have had no promotional purpose (*Books to Build an Empire,* p. 76).

[22] Penzer (ed.), *Travels of Marco Polo,* introduction, p. 15.

[23] Enciso was a lawyer who had been sent out to Panama to relieve the 1509 expedition of Alonso Ojedo, which had been taken over by Francisco Pizarro until Enciso arrived on the scene as governor. Enciso was deposed as incompetent by Vasco Nuñez de Balboa. But despite Enciso's alleged incompetence as an administrator, his *Suma* was the first American coast pilot, and is a landmark in navigational literature (Penrose, *Travel and Discovery,* pp. 94-95).

[24] (London, Henry Bynneman, 1578). The English geographer Roger Barlow had translated the whole of the *Suma* and added his own expansions sometime about 1540. Though he urged its publication as a promotional device, it remained in manuscript until it was published under the editorship of E. G. R. Taylor in 1932. See McCann, *English Discovery of America to 1485,* pp. 60-61; Penrose, *Travel and Discovery,* pp. 94-95, 170, 294-295.

[25] *A Discourse of a Discoverie for a New Passage to Cataia* (London, Henry Middleton for Richard Jhones, 1576).

[26] Sig. A2.

genuine colonizing expedition.[27] Like so many voyages, it may have begun with one goal in mind and then been diverted to another purpose by circumstances or delays. Frampton's statement is interesting for the light it sheds on the professed object of the expedition. He was probably not in a position to know the exact purpose, for there is no evidence of any direct link between him and Gilbert, but his expressed belief that the voyage was one of discovery may well indicate a general opinion held in London in the spring of 1578. That Frampton did not believe it was aimed at the Spanish dominions is further borne out by the suggestions which he makes for the use of the work by Gilbert and his men. As a guide to Spanish America, the work would be of direct use only

> If it fortunes our Mariners, or any other of our Nation, to be driven by winde, tempeste, currents, or by any other chaunce to any of the Ilandes, Ports, Havens, Bayes or Forelandes mencioned in this Pamphlet. . . .[28]

Still it might prove useful as a model of observations to be made in strange lands:

> [Observe] the Altitude and Latitude . . . set downe the tracte of the Islands, the natures of the soyles, and . . . note the qualitie of the ayre, the severall benefites that the soyles and rivers yield, with all the discommodities and wants the same places have. . . .[29]

Apparently Frampton saw the Gilbert voyage as at least preparation for an actual settlement some place in America.

Though the work itself is chiefly a navigational aid, it does contain some descriptions of the Indian tribes, the flora and fauna, and the riches of the New World, especially the gold and pearls of Hispaniola. Most of even this limited information is the old Spanish dream of mineral wealth combined with tales of hardships in which not only Indians and animals but the very plants threatened the lives and well-being of the settlers – a man could be blinded by sleeping under the wrong tree.[30] If Gilbert did intend a voyage of discovery or settlement in North America, he would have found little of use in the *Briefe Description*, for it deals mainly with South and Central America and the West Indies.

---

[27] For a discussion of the possibilities, see D. B. Quinn (ed.), *The Voyages and Colonizing Enterprises of Sir Humphrey Gilbert*, Hakluyt Society *Publications*, Second Series, LXXXIII (1940), pp. 35-46. Quinn holds that the principal object was a settlement somewhere in the southern part of North America.

[28] Sig. A2v. Parker suggests that these remarks may have been facetious (*Books to Build an Empire*, p. 13). As Frampton's introductions are generally very serious in tone and not given to witticisms, this seems unlikely.

[29] Sig. A2v.

[30] See, for example, pp. 7-15, 19-20.

The best Frampton could offer on more northerly areas was a short description of Labrador which did not appear until the last paragraph:

> Much fishing . . . many portes, and good: Much of the country is inhabited, and there are many Islands before it, all inhabited. They say there is in it a great quantitie of Furres, and very fine. [31]

The *Briefe Description* well illustrates the limitations of these early translations as anything more than the barest model for English objectives.

After his two works on America, Frampton turned his attention to the Far East. His first work on this area was from the most renowned travel account of all time. [32] *The Most Noble and Famous Travels of Marcus Paulus . . . into the East Partes of the World,* despite its ancient vintage, is without question Frampton's best promotional effort. [33] Published in 1579 in the wake of the collapsed Frobisher ventures, it was probably intended to renew a waning interest in a passage to Asia:

> Having lying by mee in my chamber . . . a translation of the great voiage and long travels of Paulus Venetus, . . . manye Merchauntes, Pilots, and Marriners, and others of dyvers degrees, much bent to Discoveries, resorting to me upon severall occasions, toke so great delight with the reading of my Booke, finding in the same such strange things, & such a worlde of varietie of matters, that I coulde never bee in quiet, for one or for an other, for the committing the same to printe in the Englishe tongue, perswading, that it might give great lighte to our Seamen, if ever this nation chaunced to find a passage out of the frozen Zone to the South Seas, and otherwise delight many home dwellers, furtherers of travellers. [34]

And he might have added, to encourage those "home dwellers, furtherers of travellers" to risk further their already depleted purses, for few

---

[31] p. 27.

[32] No less than 138 manuscript versions of Polo's travels still survive (Penrose, *Travel and Discovery,* p. 16).

[33] Frampton made his translation from the Castilian *Cosmographia breve* (Seville, 1503). The translation includes not only Polo, but an introductory treatise by Rodrigo Fernández de Santaella, editor of the 1503 Castilian edition, and an account of the Nicolò Conti's fifteenth-century travels in the Far East by Giovanni Francesco Poggio Bracciolini, secretary to Pope Eugenius IV. Frampton's work was apparently not the only Polo account to appear in England at this time. On December 3, 1578, The Stationers Company licensed another book on Polo, now lost. See Penzer (ed.), *Travels of Marco Polo,* introduction, pp. 15-16.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 1. Frampton also made it clear that he did not produce the translation for scholars – they could refer to the Latin, Spanish, or Italian editions – but for those who "have but the English tongue." (*Ibid.*)

sixteenth-century English accounts of the newly discovered lands promised such rich bounty to those willing to seize the main chance. As a merchant, Marco Polo was most interested in describing the riches and possible trading commodities of the lands he had visited, and his account of sugar, spices, gold, silver, jewels, pearls, silk, cloth of gold, and the numerous other types of wealth to be found in the Far East ought to have been an inspiration to Englishmen in their renewed search for a passage.[35] Polo's account should have been doubly effective from a promotional viewpoint: its emphasis on commodities and trading practices rather than merely lands and people (though it was not without its tales of giants and people with no heads) made it possible for Frampton to avoid the anti-image that was an outgrowth of the geographical and anthropological orientation of so much of sixteenth-century travel literature.[36] But in spite of these advantages, this work, the most optimistic of travel accounts to appear in England in this early period, had only one edition. One suspects the English reading public preferred the anti-image.[37]

After the Polo translation, Frampton continued to concentrate on the Far East as a means of promoting the discovery of a northern sea passage. In 1579 he published *A Discourse of the Navigation which the Portugales Doe Make to the Realmes and Provinces of the East Partes of the Worlde,* a translation from the Spanish of Bernardino de Escalante's *Discurso de la navegacion que los Portugueses hazen à los reinos y provincias del Oriente y de la notica q̃ se tiene de las grandezas del Reino de la China.*[38] Frampton says he was requested to make it "especially by diverse most excellent Pilottes, Maisters, and towardly young Marriners" in order to push the discovery of a passage, and he regarded it as confirmation of the information contained in his Polo translation.[39] Moreover, though the Escalante work was "a

---

[35] Examples abound, but in the Penzer edition, see especially pp. 93, 101, 102, 112-113 (sugar and spices); 41, 77, 80-83, 99, 102, 106 (gold, silver, jewels, and pearls); 27-30, 34-35, 74, 76 (silk and cloth of gold).

[36] The account of Conti, included at the end (Penzer edition, pp. 124-149), does contain a few hints of the anti-image (pp. 131, 133), but there is little to offset the impression of riches and civilization left by the Polo work.

[37] Parker has noted that the nature of the publishing trade at this time was such that publishers had to depend on the cheap and sensational in order to stay in business, and that it was only through a patron that such things as the Polo translation could be published. Indeed, most travel and exploration literature was simply ahead of the public interest. (*Books to Build an Empire,* p. 96.) It has also been pointed out that there is little evidence that the Polo account was widely read in England, and that its matter-of-fact presentation may well have repelled those Englishmen who read for pleasure and relaxation (McCann, *English Discovery of America,* p. 39).

[38] Seville, 1577. Though published in Spain, the work was compiled from Portuguese sources as an inspiration to Spanish efforts, and therefore may be regarded as one of the few examples of truly promotional literature by Spanish authors. (Penrose, *Travel and Discovery,* p. 285; Lach, *Asia in the Making of Europe,* I, p. 743.)

[39] Fol. 2.

curious mixture of hearsay, fact, and conjecture,"[40] it dealt with the East Indies, China, and the Philippines, the very regions Englishmen were trying to reach via the northern passages.[41] In this sense, it may have been even more valuable than Frampton's edition of Polo.[42]

The next year, 1580, Frampton published *A Discoverie of the Countries of Tartaria, Scithia, & Cataya by the North-East,*[43] taken from a portion of a book of travels gathered together by Francisco Támara and published at Antwerp in 1556.[44] *A Discoverie* was dedicated to the Muscovy Company, and may have been subsidized by them,[45] probably to promote the Pet-Jackman voyage to the northeast that same year. It also accompanied in manuscript that expendition, apparently as a guide to Tartary, Scithia, China, or the East Indies should the voyage reach any of those areas.[46]

Frampton concluded his translating career in 1581 with the publication of *The Arte of Navigation,*[47] taken from Pedro de Medina's *Arte de navigar,* which had first been published at Valladolid in 1545.[48] According to D. W. Waters, it is naive in its discussion of compass variation and its descriptions of instruments are relatively poor, but its tables of declination and rules for finding latitude by celestial observation are at least adequate.[49] Designed for experts in the field of navigation, it seems to have had no real promotional intent.

* * * * *

Frampton's fellow translator was Thomas Nicholas, whose career and background were strikingly similar to Frampton's own. Nicholas had

---

[40] Penrose, *Travel and Discovery,* p. 285.

[41] Though Escalante had never visited China, his book was the first effort on the part of a European to synthesize the various available accounts on China and put them into some sort of narrative form (Lach, *Asia in the Making of Europe,* I, p. 743).

[42] Parker, *Books to Build an Empire,* pp. 90-91.

[43] London, Thomas Dawson, 1580.

[44] The Antwerp edition title was *El Libro de las costumbres de todas las gentes del mundo, y de las Indias.* It was taken from an earlier work by Joannes Boemus, *Omnium gentium mores,* which appeared in a number of editions at various places between 1520 and 1610.

[45] Parker, *Books to Build an Empire,* p. 106.

[46] Taylor, *Tudor Geography,* p. 187.

[47] London, Thomas Dawson, 1581; another edition 1595.

[48] The original work had been part of a bitter dispute between Medina and Alonso de Chaves, Cosmographer Major of Spain, on the one hand and Sebastian Cabot, Pilot Major, and Diego Gutierrez, a licensed cosmographer, on the other, in which Medina and Chaves won a notable victory for a scientific approach to navigational problems. See Ursula Lamb, "Science by Litigation: A Cosmographic Feud," *Terrae Incognita,* I (1969), pp. 40-57.

[49] D. W. Waters, *The Art of Navigation in England in Elizabethan and Early Stuart Times* (New Haven, 1958), p. 163. Waters points out that the work was not particularly popular in England, and was reprinted only once at London in 1595. It appeared in at least eleven editions in French, Italian, and Dutch between 1554 and 1598 (*ibid.,* n. 3).

been a factor for several years in the Canary Islands when he was thrown into prison in 1560 by the Inquisition. Released through the efforts of the English ambassador to Philip, Sir Thomas Chamberlain, his liberty was shortlived, for he was again imprisoned on religious grounds when a business enemy bore witness against him. Finally, through the direct intercession of Elizabeth and after seven months in chains, he was brought to Seville in 1564, where he was tried and acquitted, though he was commanded never to leave the city. Nonetheless he either disobeyed the command or his complete release was obtained, for he soon returned to England, where he was residing at the time of the Frobisher voyages. [50]

His first work, *The Strange and Marveilous Newes Lately Come from the Great Kingdom of Chyna, which Adjoyneth to the East Indya,* is a translation of a report of a Spanish merchant in Mexico City to a friend in Andalusia describing an Augustinian mission to China in 1575. [51] The more than twenty sheets of the original were condensed by Nicholas to six, and probably garbled in the process, for the pamphlet presents a confusing picture of Turks attacking the coast of China and makes continual reference to Indians. [52] It is more in the nature of a news item than a book, and was doubtless intended to capitalize on and encourage general interest in the Frobisher voyages and the northwest passage. Though of little account as compared to the lengthier overseas reports of the day, it may well have achieved this purpose, for it contains reports of Chinese silk and pepper, and claims that the Spanish were planning the conquest of China in the expectation of discovering the gold of another Peru or Mexico. [53]

Nicholas published a much more substantial piece in that same year of 1578. It was an edition of the second part of Francisco López de Gómara's *La Istoria de las Indias y conquista de Mexico,*[54] a work already partially familiar to English readers through the publications of Richard Eden. The immediate motive for publication again was undoubtedly the Frobisher voyages, for it appeared sometime before Frobisher's return from his third expedition. [55] Written by the man who

---

[50] L. de Albert and A. B. Wallis Chapman (eds.), *English Merchants and the Spanish Inquisition in the Canaries,* Camden Society *Publications,* XXIII (London, 1912), introduction, pp. xiv-xv; Underhill, *Spanish Literature in the England of the Tudors,* p. 162.

[51] London, Thomas Dawson, 1578? The work was reprinted by S. E. Bridges in *Censura Literaria,* VI (London, 1808), pp. 126-132.

[52] Parker, *Books to Build an Empire,* pp. 75-76.

[53] Sig. A6^{v}-A7. The work is said to have led to a request by the Spanish governor of the Philippines for a military attack on China, a request which Philip II refused (Lach, *Asia in the Making of Europe,* I, p. 746 and n. 63).

[54] Saragossa, 1554. For an account of Gómara and his works, see Henry R. Wagner, "Francisco López de Gómara and His Work," American Antiquarian Society *Proceedings,* new series, LVIII (1948), pp. 263-282.

[55] In the introduction, Nicholas argues that the Frobisher expeditions had proved the erroneousness of the popular belief that gold was to be found only in tropical regions (sig. Aii^{v}).

had been chaplain to Cortez after his return to Spain, it had as its principal object the glorification of the conquistador,[56] and though the translation is very free in other requests – Nicholas omitted 101 of its 252 chapters – nothing detracts from the virtues of the hero, or indeed from other Spaniards, except those who mutinied against him.[57] In spite of the fact that such things as the Spanish slaughter of the natives might have provided Nicholas with an excuse for a rousing anti-Spanish diatribe,[58] nothing of the sort is forthcoming.

Nicholas's attitude is surprising, considering the treatment he had personally received at the hands of the Spanish. It is well-expressed in the title he gave the work: *The Pleasant Historie of the Conquest of the Weast India, Nowe Called New Spayne, Atchieved by that Worthy Prince, Hernando Cortes . . . Most Delectable to Read.* In the dedication to Sir Francis Walsingham, who may have sponsored the publication, Nicholas makes clear what he thinks to be the lessons of the book:

> A Mirrour and an excellent president, for all such as shall take in hande to governe newe Discoveries: for here they shall beholde, howe Glorie, Renowne, and perfite Felicitie, is not gotten but with greate pains, travaille, perill, and daunger of life: here shall they see the wisdome, curtesie, valour and pollicie of worthy Captaynes, yea and faithful hartes which they ought to beare unto their Princes service: here also is described, how to use and correct the stubborn & mutinous persons, & in what order to exalt the good, stoute and virtuous Souldiers, and chiefly, how to preserve and keepe that Beautifull Dame Lady Victorie when she is obtayned.[59]

Nothing better sums up the admiration of Spain that is so often evident in these sixteenth-century translations. It was not to hatred of

---

[56] It is sometimes argued that the first edition was suppressed by the Spanish Crown in 1553 because it was too favorable to Cortez. Wagner claims that the original work does not overly eulogize Cortez and actually criticizes him on several occasions. He contends further that the 1553 suppression was to remove unfavorable references to the mother of Cortez and a concluding sketch of the conquistador which may have offended his son. The work, which was now even more favorable to Cortez, was reissued by the same Saragossa publisher in 1564 (Wagner, "Francisco López de Gómara and His Work," American Antiquarian Society *Proceedings*, new series, LVIII [1948], pp. 274-275, 281).

[57] Nicholas (trans.), *Pleasant Historie*, pp. 24-25, 67-71, 101-104, 132-136, 152-158, 286-291. The chapters Nicholas omitted were those containing Cortez's defeats. See Leslie Bird Simpson (trans. and ed.), *Cortez: The Life of the Conqueror by His Secretary, Francisco López de Gómara* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1964), introduction, p. xvii.

[58] See especially the account of the final assault on Mexico City, Nicholas (trans.), *Pleasant Historie*, pp. 320-351. The opportunity for an anti-Spanish polemic is made more manifest by the fact that one of the chief Spanish proponents of the 1553 suppression was Las Casas. See Simpson (ed.) *Cortez*, introduction, pp. xvi-xvii.

[59] Sig. A2.

Spain that the early English propagandists for expansion sought to move their audiences, but to emulation.[60] Moreover, the theme of the *Pleasant Historie* is the same as in most similar translations: great wealth achieved only through valor and in the face of terrible hardship, Indian treachery and savagery, and continual disaster.[61] Exciting it certainly is, and it probably had a certain appeal to the adventurous, but to the more wary, the ordinary citizen, the riches must have seemed scarcely worth the cost.

In his introduction to the *Pleasant Historie,* Nicholas tells of a conversation with an old gentleman whom he allegedly had met on the road while traveling in Spain. The old gentleman was planning to go out to Brazil to make a settlement, and asked Nicholas his opinion of the scheme. The latter answered to the effect that a man of his age who made such a proposal was more suited to an asylum than a colony. But the old man replied in words that had meaning for an England that was thinking of its economic problems in terms of overpopulation, not only of the lower classes, but of the nobility and gentry as well:

> I say unto you . . . I seek for no quiet in this transitorie life, . . . Every true Christian is borne, not for his own private wealth and pleasure, but rather to help and succoure others his poor breethern [sic]. Likewise doe I consider the great number of Gentlemen, younger brethern and other valiant persons, who through want of living, do fall in to many disorders. Wherefore to accomplish my dutie toward God and my Prince, and to releeve such poore Gentlemen, do I now attempte this journey. . . .[62]

The old gentleman was Augustín de Zárate, who for several years had served as Treasurer-General of Peru, and who had written an outstanding history of Pizarro's conquest, *Historia del descubrimiento y conquista del Peru.*[63]

---

[60] Louis B. Wright claims in his *Religion and Empire,* pp. 127-128, that Samuel Purchas "was one of the first to hold up the examples of the Roman and Spanish empires for English imitation." It seems clear that the use of Spanish activities as a model antedated the writings of Purchas by at least thirty years.

[61] See especially pp. 12-15, 43-46, 110, 149, 152-154, 156-165, 274-279.

[62] Nicholas (trans.), *Pleasant Historie,* sig. A3^{v}.

[63] Antwerp, 1555. Zárate had gone to Peru in 1543 in the entourage of Blasoo Nuñez Vela to take charge of the disordered financial affairs of the colony. He was captured in the ensuing civil wars by Gonzalo Pizarro and forced at gunpoint to appoint Pizarro governor. He was naturally not very partial to the Pizarrists, and his announced plan to write a history of Peru met with a threat of death from one of their number. This may be the reason why he hesitated to put his work in print for seven years after his return to Spain, and then had it published in the low countries rather than in Spain itself. It did not appear in Spain until 1577 (Penrose, *Travel and Discovery,* p. 297). The work was cleaned up considerably in the Spanish edition. See Justin Winsor (ed.), *Narrative and Critical History of America,* II (New York, 1967), pp. 567-568.

In 1581, Nicholas published a translation of the first four books of the *Historia* under the title, *The Strange and Delectable History of the Discoverie and Conquest of the Provinces of Peru, in the South Sea. And of the Notable Things which There are Found: And Also of the Bloudie Civill Warres which There Happened . . . And Also of the Ritche Mines of Potosi.* Having published an account of the conquest of Mexico, it might seem only natural that Nicholas should undertake a companion volume on Peru. It was probably more than coincidence, however, that he chose to publish it in February, 1581, only a few months after Sir Francis Drake had returned from his circumnavigation, during which his most famous exploit had been the raiding of Peruvian treasure ships. In his dedication to Thomas Wilson, one of the Queen's secretaries, Nicholas praises Drake for raising the glories of England to those of Spain and Portugal through his wonderful three-year voyage.[64] The *Strange History* may be regarded as a kind of commendatory volume for Drake, and may indicate that the common argument that such works were prohibited by censorship has little basis.[65] Be that as it may, it seems apparent that once again the event had inspired the propagandist, rather than vice versa.

The first of the four books in the *Strange History* describes Peru at the time of the Spanish arrival, the second is the history of the conquest, and the third and fourth tell of the mutinies and civil wars among the Spaniards. The first two would seem to be of most interest to Englishmen considering ventures to the New World, for it is in these parts, as well as in the appendix on the mine of Potosi, that one finds the accounts of the country's wealth. And here, for once, the agricultural possibilities of America receive some attention, though they still occupy a role secondary to the mineral.[66]

It was the last two books, however, that seemed most important to Nicholas, for above all else he loved a moral, and it is in these books that the "dutie and royall service, of the Subject to his Prince, and how Mutynies are justly punished" are emphasized.[67] Even had Nicholas translated only the first two books, the theme would be little different; it is still the bravery of the Spanish in the face of the savagery and brutality of the Indians.[68] Some advocates of English expansion in the sixteenth century and a good many in the seventeenth century used the possibility of Indian conversion as the philosophical basis for

---

[64] Sigs. A4^{v}-q1.

[65] Parker, *Books to Build an Empire,* pp 107-108. In the opinion of the present author, the extent of Elizabethan press censorship, at least in regard to the literature of colonization, has been considerably exaggerated.

[66] Sigs. C4, D2; fol. 13 (the work is numbered by folio pages beginning with folio 13).

[67] "To the Reader," sig q4^{v}. Parker argues, incorrectly I believe, that the passage refers to Drake rather than Pizarro (*Books to Build an Empire,* pp. 107-108).

[68] See, for example, fols. 16, 30, 42^{v}-43.

colonization, but in the *Strange History* the natives often appear completely unwilling to accept Christianity. Instead, their "recompense of the great liberalitie which the Governor had extended to them" is to make human sacrifice of captured Spaniards.[69] As enemies they are intractable, and as friends and allies treacherous, and in battle useful only for despoiling the dead and wounded, which they do without reference to friend or foe.[70] In contrast, the Spaniards persevere to victory in spite of all, and fall into atrocity and mutiny in the lower ranks only when their leaders are not present to discipline them.[71] The chief propaganda beneficiary of the *Strange History*, as well as most other sixteenth-century English translations from the Spanish, was not so much English overseas enterprise as the legend of Spanish invincibility.

Two other works require brief mention in this discussion of the promotional translations of the late 1570's and early 1580's, because both have been ascribed to Nicholas by various authorities. The first of these was a translation of Book I of *Historia do descobrimento e conquista da India pelos Portuguezas* by the famous Portuguese chronicler Fernão Lopez de Castenheda.[72] The English translation is signed "Nicholas Lichefield," and as no such person has ever been positively identified, it has been assumed that this was a pen name for Thomas Nicholas.[73] Perhaps the best evidence for this contention is that in 1578 Nicholas wrote Sir Francis Walsingham that he intended to translate a work "of the East Indies which is now enjoyed by the King of Portugal."[74] The effort may have been frustrated by the appearance of Frampton's translation of Escalante the same year. But the assumption that Nicholas was the translator of the *Historia* seems un-

---

[69] Fol. 26v.

[70] Fol. 88.

[71] Fols. 34v-36, 45 ff.

[72] In its original, the work is one of the great monuments of exploration literature. Castenheda had been education in the classics, and had entered the Dominican order. He later left the order and went out to India with his father at the age of 28 in 1528. He spent ten years in Asia and may have journeyed as far as the Moluccas. He gathered many of his materials while on his travels. He returned to Portugal in 1538, settling at Coimbra, where he took up the work of archivist and librarian at the University. The first volume was published at Coimbra in 1551. A new edition was undertaken in 1552 and published in eight volumes in 1561, two years after Castenheda's death. A ninth book remained in manuscript, and a tenth existed but has never come to light (Lach, *Asia in the Making of Europe*, I, pp. 187-188). The work proved extremely popular, and the English translation was only one of several to appear outside Portugal (*ibid.*, pp. 187-191; Penrose, *Travel and Discovery*, pp. 277-278). The English translation was probably made from a French or Spanish version rather than from the Portuguese. Henry Thomas suggests that it was made from an anonymous Spanish edition printed at Antwerp in 1554. See his "English Translations of Portuguese Books before 1640," *Library*, fourth series, VII (1926-27), p. 5.

[73] See, for example, Penrose, *Travel and Discovery*, pp. 279, 316.

[74] Lach, *Asia in the Making of Europe*, I, p. 211; *Taylor, Tudor Geography*, p. 186.

likely, for he had shown no desire for anonymity in publishing three previous translations under his own name.

Entitled *The First Booke of the Historie of the Discoverie and Conquest of the East Indias, Enterprised by the Portingales,* the Castenheda translation was licensed for publication at London in 1581.[75] The occasion of its publication was probably the proposed expedition of Captain Edward Fenton to the East Indies, which was then fitting out.[76] The work is a monument to Portuguese imperialism in Africa and Asia to 1525. As such it is primarily a history, and gives only a modest amount of attention to the opportunities for trade and settlement. Once again the European is the hero and the native the villain, except the respective roles are now played by the Portuguese and the Moors, particularly those of Calicut.[77] Lichefield promised that if the first book was well received, a second and third would follow. They never did.

Two years after the appearance of *The Discoverie and Conquest of the East Indias,* there was published in London a little tract on the Canary Islands, *A Pleasant Description of the Fortunate Ilandes.*[78] The author is nowhere identified in the original pamphlet,[79] but when Richard Hakluyt reprinted the tract in his *Principal Navigations,* he identified the author as "Thomas Nicols, who remained there [in the Canary Islands] the space of seven years."[80] Perhaps because of Hakluyt, it has been assumed that the author was Thomas Nicholas, especially as the author says he was a victim of the Inquisition and was detained five years in the Canaries.[81] But it may tentatively be suggested that while Thomas Nicholas was neither Nicholas Lichefield nor Thomas Nicols, the latter two may have been one and the same, for both *The Discoverie and Conquest of the East Indias* and *A Pleasant Description of the Fortunate Ilandes* came from the same press, that of

---

[75] London, Thomas East, 1582. For the license, see Edward Arber (ed.), *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1660 A.D.,* II (New York, 1950), p. 404.

[76] Fenton began his preparations in April 1581, and sailed in April 1582, ostensibly in an attempt to discover the northwest passage, but actually for the East Indies via the Cape of Good Hope. See E. G. R. Taylor (ed.), *The Troublesome Voyage of Captain Edward Fenton,* Hakluyt Society *Publications,* second series, CXIII (London, 1959).

[77] See, for example, fols. 16-20, 42-48, 86-88, 105-107, 147-149.

[78] London, Thomas East, 1583. The intent of the work was to correct certain errors in the writings of the French cosmographer André Thevet.

[79] The author styles himself only a "poore Pilgrime."

[80] Richard Hakluyt (ed.), *The Principal Navigations, Voiages, Traffiques, and Discoveries of the English Nation,* VI (MacLehose edition, Glasgow, 1904), pp. 125-136. Nicols is identified as the author in a marginal note, p. 125.

[81] For a suggestion that the author was Nicholas, see Taylor, *Tudor Geography,* p. 40.

Thomas East.[82] Moreover, these were the only two geographical works printed by East during this period, save for a new edition of the travels of John Mandeville.[83] In any case, the Canary Island pamphlet has little connection with the new discoveries, except as it may be considered part of the general overseas literature of the day.

* * * * *

Viewed in retrospect, the translations of Frampton and Nicholas do not appear to be very effective vehicles for encouraging Englishmen to undertake overseas discovery, trade, and colonization, particularly in America. Many of them deal with the Far East, and consider the new World as only of several possible routes to Eastern riches. Of those that do make America their principal theme, none gives any significant consideration to those areas of North America which might conceivably offer fields of opportunity for Englishmen, nor do they offer more than the most general suggestions for applying the Spanish and Portugese experience to the English situation. Nearly all are pro-European and anti-native. In the former instance they tend to glorify England's rivals, and in the latter to maximize the difficulty of English penetration into the new discoveries of the East and West Indies. Finally, the translations, though their general promotional intent is obvious, were more often the result than the cause of overseas undertakings. Frampton and Nicholas (and Lichefield, whoever he was) were as much concerned with capitalizing on public interest as inspiring it. But all of these criticisms can be made of Richard Eden and indeed, though to a lesser extent, of Richard Hakluyt. And in that important period just after the failure of the Frobisher expeditions when neither of these giants of overseas promotional literature was in the field, Frampton and Nicholas helped to keep the theme of overseas expansion before the public, and thereby contributed to a state of knowledge and information in which Hakluyt and the propagandists who followed him were able to function.

---

[82] The month after *The Discoverie and Conquest of the East Indias* was entered at Stationers Hall in December 1581, East published another "Lichefield" translation from the Spanish, *"A Compendius Treatise Entituled, De Re Militari, Containing Principall Orders to Be Observed in Martiall Affairs.* It seems possible that Nicols may have published these first two works under the "Lichefield" pseudonym, and then used the "poore Pilgrime" for his pamphlet on the Canaries. In 1899, J. G. Underhill contended that Lichefield was an Englishman of gentle birth who spent a number of years in military service in foreign lands. Underhill apparently believed that Lichefield was neither Nicholas nor Nicols, but that all three were separate persons (*Spanish Literature in the England of the Tudors*, pp. 162, 167, 275.

[83] *The Voyages and Travailes of Sir John Maundeville, Knight* (London, Thomas East, 1583).

William H. McMaster: An Agrarian Dissenter During "Normalcy"

by

Patrick G. O'Brien *

Historians have substantially modified the caricatures once attached to "normalcy." This has been forcibly demonstrated on the obtuse topic of progressivism which has received massive and thoughtful reassessment. Yet, there is wide divergency among historians on the practitioners of progressivism. This is apparent in the inequitable status assigned to progressive and insurgent Republicans in the United States Senate during "normalcy," where some have been virtually deified and others have received only casual attention. A previous issue of *The Emporia State Research Studies* resurrected a neglected insurgent and progressive, Senator Robert B. Howell of Nebraska.[1] This article has a similar objective. It is to establish the inclusion of William Henry McMaster in the circle of independent reformers who inhabited the United States Senate from 1921 to 1933. The analysis of individual politicians will both contribute to a progressive-insurgent configuration and clarify reform themes in a disruptive era.

William H. McMaster was born at Ticonic, Iowa, on May 10, 1877. After attending public schools in Sioux City, Iowa, he was graduated A.B. in 1899 from Beloit College, where he had acquired stature as an intercollegiate debater. Thereafter, he established a banking chain in South Dakota and gravitated into politics. He was elected on the Republican ticket to successively higher state offices. After four years in the South Dakota State Legislature (1912-1916), first as a member of the House and then the Senate, he served two terms as Lieutenant Governor (1917-1921), and was twice elected Governor (1921-1925). McMaster was affiliated with the progressive faction of the party, and as Governor worked for increased efficiency in government, assistance for agriculture, and protection of the citizens against unscrupulous monopolies. His tenure as Governor as tempestuous, with widespread criticism of state programs, acrimony between the progressive and conservative wings of the Republican party, and conflict between the executive and "selfish" business interests. National attention focused on McMaster when he denounced high gasoline prices as "highway robbery" and had the state sell gasoline to the public to force down

---

* Dr. O'Brien is an associate professor of history at Kansas State Teachers College.

[1] Patrick G. O'Brien, "Senator Robert B. Howell: A Midwestern Progressive and Insurgent During 'Normalcy,'" *The Emporia State Research Studies*, XIX, No. 2 (December, 1970).

oil company prices. In 1924, he defeated incumbent Thomas Sterling in the primary election to receive the Republican nomination for the United States Senate. He was subsequently elected to the seat over his major opponent, Democrat L. S. Cherry.[2]

The insurgent-progressives where seldom viewed with clinical detachment. To their defenders, they were men of vision and integrity who believed in genuine democracy and subscribed to progressive positions without regard for the political consequences. Their detractors had another impression. After the 1924 Republican senatorial primary campaign, Peter Norbeck, then still the junior Senator from South Dakota, wrote McMaster that some senators and future colleagues regarded him as "one of the wild-eyed radicals that [sic] are utterly impractical and would destroy the Government, just because you do not know the consequences of your own acts."[3] Both characterizations are spurious.

McMaster was a consummate realist without utopian delusions. He was a professional politician with acute political instincts and without hazy misconceptions about democracy. An examination of his correspondence with Norbeck reveals a practical politician vitally concerned with mundane matters of patronage, political strategy, personal political gossip, complaints about unreliable friends and treacherous enemies, and his public "image." His letters are largely devoid of progressive hyperbole and truisms about democracy; these were confined to his public rhetoric. It is often forgotten that the progressives and insurgents were politicians foremost, and fully capable of duplicity, rationalization, and demagoguery, as well as high ideals.

McMaster presented himself to the electorate as an apostle of progressivism with a tenuous party affiliation. This description often evokes the mental image of a solitary crusader against the invincible forces of party regularity and conservatism, but the impression does not correspond to actual politics in South Dakota during "normalcy." To expound independence and progressivism, especially with an agrarian coloration, was often expedient and effective politics in a state which regarded itself as an exploited province, vociferously demanded economic relief and equality with industry, and elected politicians to mirror its resentment and volatility. "Progressivism" inundated South Dakota, and to oppose it was to invite political extinction, a conclusion affirmed from the defeat of many party regulars and conservatives. The

---

[2] There is no major biographical work on McMaster. *The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, C (New York: James T. White and Company, 1930), 39-40, has some personal data. Albert Shaw, "Nine Governors of the Middle West," *Review of Reviews*, LXVII, No. 3 (March, 1923), 282-3, has a brief analysis of his program as Governor. The dispute over gasoline prices in South Dakota is summarized in "Cheap-'Gas'-Costly," *Literary Digest*, LXXVIII, No. 8 (August 25, 1923), 8-9.

[3] Norbeck to McMaster, April 19, 1924 Peter Norbeck Papers University of South Dakota Library, Vermillion, South Dakota.

conservatives were often the politically dispossessed: It usually required more courage to be a conservative than a progressive in South Dakota. McMaster was fully conscious and attuned to the state political syndrome.

Because party regularity implied servility to the eastern establishment, professed independence of party was a political advantage in South Dakota. McMaster appreciated this. When it was rumored that the national administration might oppose him in the 1924 senatorial election, his response was, "I would simply make capital out of that and of course it would make me many votes in the end." [4] Sectional economic welfare was inextricably related to political independence. It did not require unprecedented courage, therefore, to tell his constituents that while the economic crisis persisted in agriculture, "I am not going to vote 'regular' in Washington." [5] Independence was also politically opportunistic in Washington, for he was informed that "the more independence you show here the more likely they are to take you seriously." [6] Insurgency was effective politics.

It has yet to be ascertained if McMaster actually practiced the independence he professed to his constituents. There are well-defined obligations of party membership, and the faithfulness with which the politician fulfills them is the basis for classification as a party regular or irregular. To be defined as a regular Republican, McMaster would be expected to: (1) endorse the party presidential candidate; (2) vote for the party candidate for Senate president *pro tempore* and approve committee chairmanships and committee assignments; (3) vote for the partisan appointments proposed by Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover; and (4) ordinarily vote with the party majority. When these criteria of party loyalty are applied to McMaster, the conclusion is that he was highly independent but not a categorical insurgent.

Partisan politicians are expected to suspend personal and ideological conflicts to unite behind the party presidential candidate. The South Dakotan overcame qualms to endorse and campaign for Herbert Hoover in the 1928 election. His first choice for the Republican nomination, "based wholly upon exigency," was Frank O. Lowden. [7] Although McMaster discouraged his progressive colleagues in the United States Senate from political activity in South Dakota because it would threaten the Lowden cause, there is little evidence that McMaster made substantial contributions to the Lowden campaign. [8] When the Lowden

---

[4] McMaster to Norbeck, April 30, 1924, *Ibid.*

[5] Manuscript prepared for a speech over radio station WNAX, Yankton, South Dakota, on May 4, 1930, William H. McMaster Papers, University of South Dakota Library, Vermillion, South Dakota.

[6] Norbeck to McMaster, April 19, 1924, Peter Norbeck Papers.

[7] McMaster to Norbeck, November 19, 1927, *Ibid.*

[8] McMaster to Norbeck, November 4, 1927, *Ibid.*

crusade dissipated, Hoover was left without a major obstacle to the nomination.

The South Dakotan was disappointed with the party candidate and expressed resentment that he was forced to choose between Alfred E. Smith and Hoover, but there was solace in that the latter had committed himself "unreservedly and unqualifiedly to the farm problem." McMaster philosophically concluded that "from a Presidential candidate standpoint, we have to take the best that is offered to us. I think Hoover is better than Smith from an agricultural standpoint." [9] It was less than euphoric endorsement of Hoover.

The disposition of the South Dakota Senators toward Hoover was crucial because the state was thought to be equally divided between Smith and Hoover. [10] A *New York Times* editorial expressed encouragement that "Norbeck . . . a 'Roosevelt Republican'" and "McMaster . . . perhaps even further away from Republicanism as Mr. Hoover understands it" were "Both dragged into the Republican reservation this year." [11] As Norbeck and McMaster became more active in the Hoover campaign, the political prognosis brightened for the Republican party. [12] Personal influence in an election is often an imponderable, but McMaster's campaign involvement certainly contributed to Hoover's victory in South Dakota. It was not unrestrained approval of the candidate nor uncritical compliance with party obligations that led to his support of Hoover. It was a practical and unenthusiastic involvement which stemmed from his perception of western agricultural welfare.

McMaster almost always voted for the party choices for Senate president *pro tempore* and committee chairmen. The only exception was his vote against the party majority when it deposed Edwin F. Ladd (N.D.) from his chairmanship because of his defection to Robert M. La Follette (Wisc.) in the 1924 presidential election. [13] Actually, the vote was on enforcement of party loyalty, and it indicated that McMaster was permissive toward violators of party obligations. The South Dakotan protested that the composition of committees in the Senate militated against the Northwest. He joined transient Republicans in the 71st Congress in demanding an increase of western representation on the powerful committees, especially the Senate Finance Committee, to ensure equitable legislation for agriculture. [14] The party leadership responded with the appointment of Robert M. LaFollette, Jr. (Wisc.) and John Thomas (Idaho) to the Finance Committee. The appointments failed to placate the dissidents who insisted that McMaster be

---

[9] McMaster to Norbeck, August 15, 1928, *Ibid.*

[10] *New York Times*, October 8, 1928, p. 4.

[11] *Ibid.*, October 26, 1928, p. 24.

[12] *Ibid.*, November 4, 1928, III, p. 2.

[13] U.S., *Congressional Record*, 69th Cong., Special Sess., 1925, LXVII, Pt. 1, 63. Hereafter, cited as *Cong. Record.*

[14] *Ibid.*, 71st Cong., 1st Sess., 1929, LXXI, Pt. 4, 4319.

appointed to the Interstate Commerce Committee. When he failed to receive the appointment, Robert B. Howell (Neb.) made a futile objection to his exclusion on the floor of the Senate. [15]

McMaster was especially unreliable upon administration appointments. During his tenure in office, he voted or was paired upon 37 prospective appointees to fill positions on the federal courts, the presidential cabinet, and federal boards, commissions, and agencies. He voted to confirm only five minor nominees and opposed the rest, including Charles B. Warren as Attorney-General; Roy O. West for Secretary of the Interior; Irvine L. Lenroot, Associate Justice of the Court of Customs and Patents Appeals; John J. Parker, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; and Charles Evans Hughes as Chief Justice of the United States. Acute pressure was applied on senators to approve these five nominees, and the administration equated opposition on most of them with party disloyalty. The South Dakotan's willingness to offend the administration through chronic objections to major appointments is a salient gauge of his independence. Few Republicans equalled his tenacious and nearly categorical opposition to the administration on this criterion of party regularity. It should not be forgotten that his obstruction was approved in South Dakota. John Hirning, a scrutinizer of state politics, wrote Norbeck after the struggle over the Charles B. Warren nomination, "I presume you and Mac voted right on . . . Warren." He added, "it will appeal . . . to the rank and file of the voters." [16]

It was in his voting behavior that McMaster was perhaps the least responsive to party authority. He voted with the Republican majority on only 50 per cent of the roll-call votes from the 69th through the 71st Congress (1925-1931). [17] There were 84 Republican senators in these three Congresses who voted enough times for valid tabulation, and only seven voted less often with the party majority than McMaster. The South Dakotan's voting independence is even more graphic on party votes, when a majority in each party vote against each other. When this situation existed, he voted with the Republican majority on a mere 36 per cent of the roll-call votes. Only six Republican senators were less responsive than McMaster to party influence on party votes. When party lines were drawn and the forces to conform were most intense, McMaster was the most incorrigible. An examination of the issues upon which McMaster diverged most from the Republican majority were those which delineated progressives from conservatives and when the east and Northwest were in conflict.

Insurgency encompasses a broad range of political behavior from intermittent and tepid obstruction to unremitting dogmatic intractability.

---

[15] *Ibid.*, 2nd Sess., 1930, LXXII, Pt. 2, 1421-23.

[16] Hirning to Norbeck, March 11, 1925, Peter Norbeck Papers.

[17] The statistics in this paragraph are based upon an analysis of nearly 900 votes in the *Congressional Record* and the *Journal of the Executive Proceedings of the Senate* for these Congresses.

McMaster was between the two extremes on the party irregularity continuum. He was markedly more independent than Arthur Capper (Ks.), Charles L. McNary (Ore.), James Couzens (Mich.) and Norbeck, who are often identified as insurgents, but less automonous than John J. Blaine (Wisc.), Robert M. LaFollette, Jr. (Wisc.), and Smith W. Brookhart (Iowa). The South Dakotan merits the independent label more than many Republicans who have been eulogized for their refusal to supinely follow party.

The irregular senators had strongly divergent attitudes toward the Republican party and the virtues of party organizations in the American political system. Some insurgents were virtually Republican in name only and actually thought political parties were a baneful impediment to popular government. Others thought of themselves as loyal Republicans, and their independence was either an article of political faith and/or the result of practical political influences. McMaster was among the latter: he had an attachment to the Republican party without servility to party fiat. His independence stopped at the edge of the Republican party. If fundamental Republicanism includes deprecation of the Democracy, McMaster clearly expressed it when he wrote during the depression, "I am certain the Democratic party can neither wreck nor save the country as the country is to [sic] big and strong and we will ultimately work out as we always have in the past." [18]

McMaster was in a dilemma over party loyalty. Norbeck wrote Republican leader Senator George H. Moses (N.H.) that "he [McMaster] is a republican, and always has been, and wants to work with his party." [19] The South Dakotan, however, was confronted with two political realities that he could disregard only at great personal peril. The first reality was the decline of party loyalty within the state. Norbeck informed him that "No party loyalty exists. Doublecrossing and dissatisfaction are the order of the day." [20] The other reality was that "The State is getting more radical, notwithstanding the contrary claims of the reactionaries." [21] To appeal to an increasingly independent and disaffected constituency and yet remain within the party was the problem for McMaster, which he resolved through independent Republicanism. McMaster would be a faithful mirror of those who elected him at the expense of party loyalty, practicing Republicanism only when it was propitious. As Norbeck had indicated to Moses, McMaster's Republicanism notwithstanding, "he must, first of all, have an eye to the welfare of the only industry we have, — that of agriculture." [22] His insurgency cannot be detached from his sectional and agrarian perspective.

---

[18] McMaster to Norbeck, March 30, 1935, Peter Norbeck Papers.
[19] Norbeck to Moses, October 1, 1924, *Ibid.*
[20] Norbeck to McMaster, December 15, 1925, *Ibid.*
[21] Norbeck to McMaster, December 10, 1925, *Ibid.*
[22] Norbeck to Moses, October 1, 1925, *Ibid.*

Progressivism was an attribute that could be manipulated to advantage in South Dakota politics, just as insurgency. Few politicians deliberately inflict defeat upon themselves with appeals which they know the electorate will repudiate. It was as a political realist that McMaster identified himself with the progressives in the U.S. Senate: "part and parcel with that group, thoroughly aligned with that group." [23] Other progressives confirmed his affiliation with the group and testified that he had "a record of consistent and courageous adherence to Progessive principles and of loyalty to the interests of his constituents." [24] In the 1930 campaign McMaster's strategy was to identify his opposition as standpat or reactionary while he usurped the progressive exclusively for himself. He insisted that "The whole issue in this campaign is whether or not the work of the Progressive Republican group shall be upheld." [25] To vote for him, therefore, was to endorse progressivism and independence; whereas to vote for his opponent was to approve conservatism and party regularity, and this to McMaster was "impossible to conceive" as having "great appeal in South Dakota." [26]

Progressivism had a powerful attraction to Northwest voters, because it enveloped sectional and agrarian self-interest. McMaster's own philosophy was a synthesis of ruralism and traditional progressivism. As with other progressives who have received high marks for unsullied idealism, he was primarily a defender of the Northwest. Surprised at being described as a radical, he responded, "If asking the fighting for a square deal for the people of the Northwest is radicalism, then of course I must plead guilty to the charge." [27] Defense of sectional welfare may be a component of progressivism, but it is not the equivalent of progressivism. Agitation by McMaster and other progressives for relief and reform programs often stemmed from the same selfish motives for which the eastern conservative senators were censured.

McMaster equated progressivism with representative democracy and constituent interests. The progressives "have steadfastly stood by the farmers, small business men and the laboring men of the Northwest." [28] To have done otherwise "would be untrue to their trust, would betray their constituents . . . whom they have the honor to represent." [29] The litmus test of his progressivism was: "When I was elected to the . . . Senate, . . . I pledged to the people . . . that I would vote and support only such measures . . . in the interests of the State South Dakota.

---

[23] Manuscript prepared for a speech over radio station WNAX, Yankton, South Dakota, on April 28, 1930, William H. McMaster Papers.

[24] Undated letter of endorsement from Robert M. La Follette, Jr., for use by McMaster in the 1930 senatorial election, *Ibid.*

[25] Manuscript prepared for a speech over WNAX on May 5, 1930, *Ibid.*

[26] McMaster to Norbeck, April 5, 1930, Peter Norbeck Papers.

[27] McMaster to Norbeck, April 30, 1924, *Ibid.*

[28] Manuscript prepared for a radio speech over WNAX on May 5, 1930, William H. McMaster Papers.

[29] Manuscript prepared for a radio speech over WNAX on April 28, 1930, *Ibid.*

. . . That pledge has been redeemed." [30] The test for representative democracy is not perforce the same for progressivism.

The Senator also subscribed to traditional progressive principles and ideals. These he often expressed in the context of sectional self-interest. He, for example, sided with the progressives against the Mellon tax proposals. Until legislation was adopted to raise the income of farmers, who were both laborers and business men, he would oppose tax relief for other groups. When this was done, he would willingly consider tax revision along the Mellon lines. [31] When progressivism was not expressly related to programs for his constituents, he used it to symbolize obstruction of the "industrial crowd in the East . . . ." [32] Progressivism could not be improved upon either to rationalize constituent interest or opposition to the establishment, and McMaster adeptly exploited it.

Although McMaster and some other northwesterners invoked representative government in the name of progressivism, they actually opposed majoritarian democracy. The South Dakotan was acutely conscious of the demographic currents which threatened to perpetually subordinate the West to the densely populated industrial East. [33] Agriculture, however, could compensate for decreased numerical forces with discipline and the will to manipulate the political power equilibrium. He insisted that an "organized and a unified agriculture" held "the balance of power in the United States." When the farmers are "organized and the voice of agriculture . . . , speaks out, economic justice will follow." [34] The new numerical reality would require new perspectives, including an appreciation that only in the Senate could agriculture find protection from industrial depredation. Members of the House of Representatives would increasingly reflect the industrial philosophy, and the President thus would become more responsive to the numerical majority. This was the reason McMaster disapproved an increase in executive discretion. It was only in the Senate where the "vote of a senator from South Dakota is equal to the vote of a senator from New York" that agrarians could obstruct the East and defend the farmer's welfare. [35]

The Senator obviously overlooked the institutional and constitutional arrangements and misjudged the future political currents whereby the power of farmers would often increase while their numbers declined. His proposal that agriculture behave as a self-conscious interest group

---

[30] Manuscript prepared for a radio speech over WNAX on October 13, 1930, *Ibid.*

[31] *Cong. Record*, 69th Cong., 1st Sess., 1926, LXVII, Pt. 4, 3860.

[32] Manuscript prepared for a radio speech over WNAX on April 28, 1930, William H. McMaster Papers.

[33] *Cong. Record*, 70th Cong., 1st Sess., 1928, LXIX, Pt. 2, 1169.

[34] Undated manuscript prepared for presentation to members of the Farmer's Union in 1930, William H. McMaster Papers.

[35] Letter from McMaster to the Lead *Call* published on November 5, 1929, *Ibid.*

exemplified the paradox in the progressive position, and distracted from the alleged altruism of their protest. While the progressives expounded platitudes about democracy and majority rule, they were actively constructing defenses for minority power in violation of these very principles.

McMaster described the progressives as "fighting . . . to restore conditions whereby agriculture may come into its own." [36] He professed there was an epic struggle within American society between the "industrial philosophy" and the "philosophy of agriculture, which holds that agriculture is the basic industry of the country, and that . . . agriculture is the determining factor of industrial prosperity." [37] History demonstrated the economic debilitation of societies neglectful of agriculture, which "ought to be an object lesson to America of the results of the . . . industrial philosophy." [38] He asserted, therefore, "the argument for farm relief is not based upon sectional interests, but is based upon the broad policy of national interests." [39] Simple logic determined that "industries can not remain prosperous and labor can not remain well-paid . . . without a prosperous agriculture." [40]

Agricultural relief, moreover, would "insure the future stability of our social and our political institutions." [41] This was because the farmer "believes in our form of government. He believes in property rights. He constitutes a great conserving power and influence in national life. [42] The Senator's bucolic conclusion was that "The farmer draws his philosophy from the sunshine of the fields. His philosophy is an honest philosophy. It is a sane philosophy. It is a wholesome philosophy." [43] With the equation of agrarian interest with the national welfare, McMaster had actually defined a rationale for class and sectional legislation for the farmer.

Farmers, according to McMaster, were threatened with extinction, for "since 1883 the wholesale price of grains have been less than the cost of production." [44] Low prices, as farmers were forced to compete in the world market, and high production costs, the result of expensive labor, large business profits, and high taxes, "reflected in the salaries of school teachers," helped to explain the farmer's economic peril. The Senator described the farmer as "caught between two millstones. The lower millstone is that of the high cost of production, and the upper millstone is the low price obtained on the world's market, and for a

---

[36] Manuscript prepared for a radio speech over WNAX on May 5, 1930, *Ibid.*
[37] *Cong. Record,* 69th Cong., 1st Sess., 1926, LXVII, Pt. 10, 10796.
[38] *Ibid.*
[39] *Ibid.*
[40] *Ibid.*
[41] *Ibid.*
[42] *Ibid.*
[43] *Ibid.*
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 10798.

quarter of a century those millstones have been gradually grinding him to dust." [45]

McMaster introduced a substantial number of measures to extricate the farmer from the millstones. Several were distinctive, including his advocacy of the export of agricultural products, both to improve international relations and deplete the farm surplus. His proposal that the Federal Farm Board purchase $25,000,000 of wheat and flour for Chinese relief combined charity with practicality. It "would create a friendly feeling toward this nation in every section of the globe, for generosity and kindness does more to disarm hostile sentiment than anything eles [sic] . . . . I know of no greater instrumentality of promoting international good-will and peace than by sharing with those unfortunate people some of the surplus produced in this nation." [46] For his constituents without a "philanthropic spirit," he emphasized the "tremendous economic effect" of removing $25,000,000 of farm produce from the market whereby "we not only would carry blessings to other sections of the world but we would carry great benefits to the distressed condition of agriculture in this country." [47] McMaster concluded with an appeal to "all generous-minded people" to "take up the battle cry" to make his proposal "an annual national policy." [48]

The South Dakotan firmly defended the better known and more prosaic relief measures for agriculture. He announced, after the first veto of McNary-Haugen, that "No one claims that the Farm Bill would have cured all the ills and evils of agriculture, but it . . . was a step in the right direction." [49] If allowed to become law, it would have acknowledged that government "stood ready to treat with agriculture on the same basis as it treated with the railroads, the banking system and the industries, as well as labor. That of itself would have been a great victory for agriculture . . . ." [50] The veto failed to quell his zeal. His implacable refusal to compromise on McNary-Haugen offended some agrarian colleagues, and even the President was unable to mollify him. [51] In the 70th Congress, he would again vote for the McNary-Haugen bill and to override the executive veto.

The 71st Congress gave major attention to relief programs for agriculture. McMaster expectedly voted for the programs, including the abortive attempt to attach the export debenture plan to the tariff bill. Although it failed, the Senator prophesized that the "fight for the debenture is going to be continued in the future; and . . . changes in

---

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 10798-99.

[46] Undated manuscript prepared for a radio speech over WNAX in 1930, William H. McMaster Papers.

[47] *Ibid.*

[48] *Ibid.*

[49] Letter from McMaster published in the *Arlington Sun* on March 17, 1927, *Ibid.*

[50] *Ibid.*

[51] *New York Times*, July 8, 1927, p. 17.

the membership will be such that the debenture will have a clear majority in both Houses." [52] He explained to his constituents that "The Wild Jackasses of the Senate are insisting that retribution be made to agriculture along these lines . . . ." because the idea of the debenture is to make the tariff on wheat about 50 per cent effective. We calculate that it will raise the price of wheat by about 19 cents a bushel." [53] The debenture was only justice for agriculture because "we are simply returning to the farmer . . . that 10¢ a bushel which the . . . railroads have taken from you in increased transportation rates. . . ." [54]

The debenture struggle was not the first time that McMaster thought he perceived the exact relationship between the tariff and agrarian welfare. He had earlier concluded that agricultural relief was dependent upon tariff revision. In an analysis of tariff practices, he asserted that the "system is fair and just when applied impartially and fairly to all classes alike, but it is a vicious and reprehensible policy and indefensible policy when its benefits are reserved for only a favored few." [55] The existing tariff enabled the industries to exploit the farmer because he "not only pays a duty upon the necessities of life which are not used in farming, but we find that he pays a duty upon practically all the articles used in farming excepting farm implements, and when the farmer buys farm implements he is gouged by a giant Machine Trust." [56] During his tenure, McMaster followed a dual policy on the tariff, which was to reduce duties for industry and make agriculture the recipient of effective tariff protection.

He introduced S. Res. 52 in the 70th Congress for the downward revision of tariff duties on manufactured items. The purpose was to narrow the gulf between the "outrageous schedules afforded industries and the pitiable amounts of duty . . . afforded agricultural products." [57] S. Res. 52 provoked heated debate and acrimony between the agrarians and industrialists, including the threat from McMaster "that the farmers . . . are going to wage this fight to a finish; and if the industrial group invites it to a final conclusion it may smash your tariff system, but out of the ruins will arise a new tariff system . . . which will give economic justice not only to the farmer but to the industrial classes as well." [58] The resolution was adopted, but there was no real prospect for tariff revision in the 70th Congress. It had simply allowed the agrarians to express their frustration and previewed the tariff dispute in the next Congress.

---

[52] *Cong. Record*, 71st Cong., 2nd Sess., 1930, LXXII, Pt. 6, 6014.
[53] Undated manuscript prepared for a radio speech over WNAX in 1930.
[54] *Ibid.*
[55] *Cong. Record*, 70th Cong., 1st Sess., 1928, LXIX, Pt. 9, 9204.
[56] *Ibid.*, Pt. 2, p. 1166.
[57] *Ibid.*
[58] *Ibid.*, p. 1169.

Early in the tariff struggle in the 71st Congress, McMaster focused his criticism upon the Tariff Commission. Its procedures to collect and disclose data was "simply an ingenious system that has been built up for the purpose of befuddling the minds of the public and of ascertaining the information in secret so that the public will be in the dark as to what the actual investigations revealed." [59] Secrecy was inimical to the public welfare; special business interests could receive favoritism from the Comission without exposure. McMaster, therefore, introduced S. Res. 113 to require the Senate Finance Committee, upon request of a senator, to obtain full information from the Tariff Commission on subject matter in the tariff bill. With several modifications, the resolution was adopted as an amendment to the tariff bill. [60]

When the Senate began to vote on rates, McMaster was a determined opponent of increased duties for industry. He led the fight against higher rates on plate glass and battled to keep cement on the free list. Statistics from the plate glass industry itself were used by the South Dakotan to demonstrate that it had little need for increased protection. Although his amendment on plate glass failed, a compromise amendment to reduce duties from the level originally proposed was passed. [61] He had less success with cement. The Senate first voted in the Committee of the Whole to keep cement on the free list and then voted not to concur in the McMaster amendment. [62]

The Senator had long subscribed to the thesis that agriculture was economically depressed largely because it had insufficient tariff protection. He insisted duties for agriculture should be high enough to cover the cost of production and ensure a substantial profit. The 1922 tariff had been ineffectual only because "the farmers did not get what they had asked for," but McMaster warned his colleagues that in the future "they are going to ask for more and they expect to get the protection for which they will ask; they expect . . . much – lot more than they have ever asked for in the past." [63] Their next opportunity to ask for more was in the 71st Congress. When McMaster was convinced that the tariff bill failed to provide agriculture the protection it needed, he voted along with only four other Republicans against passage. The South Dakota farmer and the agricultural interests had a consistent and forceful protagonist of their cause.

The Senator was not wholly absorbed with sectional and agricultural issues. His foreign policy and Indian affairs positions were exceptional enough to merit fuller investigation. McMaster had a repugnance of war, militarism, and belligerent foreign policy. "There is a yearning

---

[59] *Ibid.*, 71st Cong., 1st Sess., 1929, LXXI, Pt. 4, 4565.
[60] *Ibid.*, Pt. 4, p. 4570.
[61] *Ibid.*, 71st Cong., 2nd Sess., 1930, LXXII, Pt. 5, 5790.
[62] *Ibid.*, p. 4916.
[63] *Ibid.*, 70th Cong., 1st Sess., 1928, LXIX, Pt. 2, 1167.

desire . . . in mankind throughout the civilized world that . . . understanding between nations may be arrived at, which will abolish war. The world is weary and sick of war." [64] More than many senators, he was willing to accept internationalism to improve foreign relations and achieve peace. The World Court and the London Naval Treaty were to him "forward steps in the movement for an ultimate world peace" which gave men "a new hopefulness that the nations of the earth have come to their senses in reference to the folly of war." [65]

Although the South Dakotan voted for the World Court, London Naval Treaty, and the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and against the cruiser bill and the use of marines in Latin America, none of these could assure peace. Peace was possible only if those responsible for war were made to fight in them. The ruling classes "built armaments in the name of peace . . . and with what result? Wars, greater wars, and still greater wars . . . due to the world ambition for trade of the ruling classes of the world." [66] Youth, "inexpressibly fine . . . noble and generous, courageous and heroic," was forced to sacrifice itself in war to the economic lust of the elite. [67]

McMaster's amendment to the cruiser bill in the 70th Congress stipulated that the American ruling class (Congressmen, corporate executives, large stockholders, and other opulent citizens) was to be drafted into the military to serve in combat zones upon the declaration of war. [68] He readily admitted the amendment was punitive toward the rich, but it was only to impress upon "them a keen responsibility of what war means. There would be driven home to them the fact that war means not only hell to the masses but to them as well." [69] In his defense of the amendment he stated, "If . . . the conscription of property would postpone war for many a day, then the conscription of life would effectually prevent war. It is a certainty that when the bodies of the ruling classes feel the withering touch of the flame of war . . . then sanity and common sense and honesty will be translated into the diplomacy of the world." [70] His emotional exposition notwithstanding, the Senate refused to impose conscription on itself. McMaster exemplified the idealism and myopia which are often intertwined on foreign policy.

The attitudes of progressives toward racial and ethnic minorities usually ranged from crude bigotry to genuine paternalism. A few progressives demonstrated authentic concern for the American Indian, which often contrasted with their disregard or contempt of other minor-

---

[64] Manuscript prepared for a radio speech over WNAX on October 13, 1930, William H. McMaster Papers.

[65] *Ibid.*

[66] *Cong. Record*, 70th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1929, LXX, Pt. 3, 2755.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 2754.

[68] *Ibid.*, 1928, pp. 2407-08.

[69] *Ibid.*, 1929, p. 2755.

[70] *Ibid.*

ities, especially the Afro-American. McMaster was among the progressives most actively involved in Indian affairs. Aside from humanitarianism, a germ of Indian militancy and political consciousness made it politically prudent. South Dakota had the third largest Indian population in the United States and, according to Peter Norbeck, it held "the balance of power between the political parties." [71] Indians, therefore, were to be diligently placated.

South Dakota Indians had a legacy of white exploitation, were subject to government callousness, and lived a squalid existence on reservations. Master worked to: (1) provide relief for Indians; (2) increase government responsibility toward them; and (3) rectify the historical injustices inflicted on the tribes. When the Indians on the Cheyenne River Reservation and the Pine Ridge Sioux experienced crop failures, McMaster introduced legislation to save them from total economic destitution through payments from the public treasury. [72] Remedial legislation of this type received McMaster's consistent support.

A more valuable contribution was his vehement protest against government neglect and niggardly treatment of Indians. He fiercely objected to a reduction in the food and clothing allowance for Indian children in reservation schools on the grounds it would imperil their health. [73] When it was proposed that an old school be converted into a tuberculosis sanatorium, the South Dakotan criticized the "policy of treating Indians in this manner. It seems that . . . wherever there has been an old military fort or post, we have gone and taken the stables and old buildings and converted them into hospitals and schools for Indians." [74] He insisted that "they ought to have the best modern-equipped institution that can be given to them. The only way to cure a tubercular trouble is through sunshine and fresh air. These buildings ought to be constructed with that idea in mind." To put Indian children in old buildings "is simply condemning them to death . . . ." [75] Thereupon, McMaster proposed a $300,000 appropriation to begin a "real" tubercular institution in Rapid City, South Dakota. He incessantly implored the government to expand its commitment to Indians.

Finally, McMaster wanted to rectify past injustices against the Indians and prevent their repetition in the future. When the Comptroller General declared Sioux benefits (the treaty obligation to give equipment, livestock, and cash to the head of a family or single person over 18) illegal in 1927, he introduced legislation for their restoration. [76] A bill to maintain Sioux benefits was enacted into law. An example of his

---

[71] *New York Times*, June 21, 1927, p. 71.

[72] *Cong. Record*, 69th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1927, LXVIII, Pt. 3, 3111; and *Ibid.*, 70th Cong., 1st Sess., 1928, LXIX, pt. 7, 7242.

[73] *Ibid.*, 71st Cong., 2nd Sess., 1930, LXXII, Pt. 5, 5605.

[74] *Ibid.*, 70th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1928, LXX, Pt. 1, 926-27.

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 926.

[76] *Ibid.*, 70th Cong., 1st Sess., 1928, LXIX, Pt. 7, 7242.

determination to amend for past transgressions was his proposal to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and settle Sioux claims against the United States. His bill corresponded with a suit brought by 35 Indian tribes against the government, including 45 complaints from the Sioux nation against the United States for fraud and treaty violations.[77] When the Senate procrastinated on appropriations for the Court of Claims judgment against the government, McMaster became vexed and habitually proposed legislation to settle the claim.[78]

McMaster persistently defended South Dakota Indians and represented their interests. He both agitated for their cause and proposed measures to alleviate Indian suffering, expand their opportunities and compensate for historical injustice. As a member of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, he was constantly absorbed in Indian problems and worked for their settlement to the Indians' advantage. South Dakota Indians responded to his concern with their votes in the 1930 election. Peter Norbeck reflected to a political associate: "I notice that the Indian vote came in good for McMaster. He was their friend and it ought to come in good."[79]

It has been demonstrated that McMaster viewed progressivism from an essentially sectional and agrarian perspective and that he was progressive within that context, but progressivism encompassed more than agricultural relief. There were senators who voted for assistance to farmers who could not otherwise be construed as progressives. Although McMaster did not neglect other progressive issues, they were peripheral to his major concern with agriculture. To be determined is whether McMaster was sufficiently progressive on a variety of issues to merit the sobriquet "Son of the Wild Jackass." A comprehensive and valuable analysis of roll-call votes in the U.S. Senate between 1921 and 1933 to identify progressives and measure their level of progressivism has many references to the South Dakotan's votes on progressive issues and concludes that he was a "hard-core" progressive in the three Congresses in which he served.[80] This conclusion was reinforced when McMaster's position on 75 votes, encompassing the broad spectrum of issues which contemporary political analysts and newspapers described as progressive, was ascertained. He voted progressive 87 per cent of the time, which affirms his progressivism was pervasive and intense. Graduated taxation, regulation of business, government development of Muscle Shoals, abolition of secret Senate executive sessions, and opposition to excessive campaign expenditures were among the progressive measures he supported. Only seven Republican senators between 1921 and 1933

[77] *New York Times*, August 2, 1926, p. 29.

[78] *Cong. Record*, 70th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1929, LXX, Pt. 5, 4694.

[79] Norbeck to C. N. Leedom, November 11, 1930, Peter Norbeck Papers.

[80] Charles Mason Dollar, *The Senate Progressive Movement, 1921-1933: A Roll-Call Analysis* (Lexington: University of Kentucky History Department, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, 1966), 184, 232, 281.

had higher progressive percentages than McMaster. William E. Borah (Idaho), Norbeck, Couzens, Capper, and Hiram W. Johnson (Calif.), often identified as progressives, had lesser percentages. Although the South Dakotan's progressive percentage was less than George W. Norris (Neb.) or Robert M. La Follette, Sr. (Wisc.), he was a persistent and assiduous progressive. The progressives have been criticized for their radicalism at home and their timidity in Washington; a criticism inapplicable to McMaster.

The 1930 election is an epilogue to his political career. Progressivism and independence of party were the main themes in his campaign for reelection. Although he defeated George Danforth in the Republican primary, Democrat William J. Bulow won the general election. Norbeck commiserated with McMaster: "I can well appreciate how humiliating it is to go back to Washington and admit the farmers did not stay with us in the fight against an unfair tariff, nor in the fight for a fair price for agricultural products."[81] This would seem to belie a fundamental conclusion in this analysis, except that elections are seldom won or lost simply upon the "issues." McMaster was defeated for virtually every reason except his insurgency and progressivism, including limited campaign funds, lingering disaffection over his policies as governor, resentment over patronage, poor campaign organization and strategy, and Bulow's effectiveness as a campaigner. Most newspapers concluded that his defeat was not a repudiation of his principles, and old politico Peter Norbeck confided to a friend that the standpatters could accept no credit for his colleague's demise.[82]

The paradox was that McMaster was defeated at a time when farmers were becoming increasingly radical, but their truculence made no allowance for incumbents, including those sympathetic with agriculture. Smith W. Brookhart (Iowa), probably more progressive than McMaster, would be defeated in the 1932 election by radicalized farmers. The imponderable is how much the South Dakotan contributed to his own defeat from encouraging agrarian disaffection and constituent disregard of party lines.

McMaster ceased active participation in politics after 1930 and lived in relative obscurity until his death in Dixon, Illinois, in 1968. A eulogy on the U. S. Senate floor validly portrayed him as a public figure who always worked for the best interests of "his people."

---

[81] Norbeck to McMaster, November 12, 1930, Peter Norbeck Papers.
[82] Norbeck to C. N. Leedom, November 20, 1930, Peter Norbeck Papers.

The Emporia State Research Studies

Vol. I, No. 1. 1952: Willis Ratzlaff, *The Limnology of Some Roadside Ditches in Chase and Lyon Counties, Kansas.* No. 2,* 1952: C. Stewart Boertman, *Apportionment in the Kansas House of Representatives.* No. 3,* 1953: John Breukelman and Ted F. Andrews, *Offerings and Enrollments in Secondary School Sciences in Kansas in 1951-1952.* No. 4, 1953: George S. Blair, *The Office of County Coroner in Kansas.*

Vol. II, No. 1,* 1953: Green D. Wyrick, *The World of Ernest Hemingway.* No. 2,* 1953: Ira Everett Welch, *The Comparison of Column Method Versus the Context Method in the Teaching of Spelling.* No. 3, 1954: Jerry P. Leibman, *Press Freedom and Libel as Defined by Kansas Case Law.* No. 4, 1954: Harold Crimmins, *A History of The Kansas Central Railway, 1871-1935.*

Vol. III, No. 1, 1954: Fred W. Grabhorn, *Status of Teachers of Business Subjects in the Secondary Schools of Kansas, 1953-1954;* Billy Lee Fowler, *Turnover of Business Teachers in the Secondary Schools in Kansas, 1952-1953;* Eleanor Patrick Evans, *List of Free Teaching Aids for Typewriting, Bookkeeping, and Shorthand.* No. 2, 1954: Garrett R. Carpenter, *Silkville: A Kansas Attempt in the History of Fourierist Utopias, 1869-1892.* No. 3, 1955: John C. Scafe, *Foreign Language Teaching in Kansas High Schools, 1953-1954.* No. 4, 1955: Richard A. Valyer, *A Proposed Course of Study for Driver Education.*

Vol. IV, No. 1,* 1955: Jesse Louise Losev, *A Selected, Annotated List of One-Act Plays for Festival Use.* No. 2, 1955: George E. Thornton, *The Social and Moral Philosophy of Thomas Dekker.* No. 3, 1956: John Breukelman and Ted F. Andrews, *Offerings and Enrollments in Secondary School Sciences in Kansas in 1954-1955.* No. 4, 1956: S. Hull Sisson and Harry Walthall, *An Annotated Bibliography of Theses Accepted for the Master of Science Degree, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, 1945 Through 1954.*

Vol. V, No. 1,* 1956: Walt Butcher, *Presidential Election Returns for Kansas, 1864-1952.* No. 2,* 1956: Alex A. Daughtry, *A Report on the Post-Graduation Activities of the 1955 Kansas High School Graduates.* No. 3, 1957: Carl W. Prophet, *Seasonal Variations and Abundance of Cladocera and Copepoda and Some Physical-Chemical Conditions of the Fall and Verdigris Rivers in Wilson and Montgomery Counties, Kansas;* Claire L. Schelske, *An Ecological Study of the Fishes of the Fall and Verdigris Rivers in Wilson and Montgomery Counties, Kansas.* No. 4, 1957: William C. Tremmel, *The Social Concepts of George Herbert Mead.*

Vol. VI. No. 1,* 1957: John M. Matthews, *Sang De Boeuf: Its Chinese Historical References and Local Reduction Experiments in Electric Firing Kilns.* No. 2, 1957: Weldon N. Baker and Merle E. Brooks, *Background and Academic Preparation of the Teachers of Science in the High Schools of Kansas 1955-1956.* No. 3,* 1958: Harold V. Sare, *Nehru and the Rise of the Modern State of India.* No. 4,* 1958: Robert M. Taylor, *Accoustics for the Singer.*

Vol. VII, No. 1, 1958: Robert F. Clarke, *An Ecological Study of Reptiles and Amphibians in Osage County, Kansas.* No. 2, 1958: Harold V. Sare and Wallace Browning, *Background and Academic Preparation of the Social Science Teachers in the High Schools of Kansas 1956-1957.* No. 3, 1959: John M. Burger, *Background and Academic Preparation of the Mathematics Teachers in the Public High Schools of Kansas 1957-1958.* No. 4, 1959: Johnny L. Kloefkorn, *A Critical Study of the Work of H. L. Mencken as Literary Editor and Critic on the American Mercury.*

Vol. VIII, No. 1, 1959: Herman H. Harris, Jr., *The History and Calculation of Pi.* No. 2, 1959: Willard O. Stibal, *The Historical Development of Student Personnel Records in Colleges and Universities.* No. 3, 1960: Donald E. Zimmerman, *The Nature of Man: John Donne's Songs and Holy Sonnets.* No. 4, 1960: Emily L. Hartman, *The F. B. and Rena G. Ross Natural History Reservation.*

Vol. IX, No. 1, 1960: Charles E. Walton, *To Make in Myrthe: Spenser's Theatrical Practices in The Faerie Queene.* No. 2, 1960: Paul G. Jantzen, *The Ecology of a Boggy Marsh in Stafford County, Kansas.* No. 3,* 1961: R. Alton Lee, *Pasquale Paoli: Fighter for Freedom.* No. 4, 1961: Eugene Donald Decker, *A Selected Annotated Bibliography of Sources in the Kansas State Historical Society Pertaining to Kansas in the Civil War.*

---

*This issue is no longer available.

Vol. X, No. 1, 1961: John Breukelman and Ralph P. Frazier, *Offerings and Enrollments in the Secondary School Sciences in Kansas in 1960-1961.* No. 2, 1961: Marvin Ewy, *Charles Curtis of Kansas: Vice President of the United States, 1929-1933.* No. 3, 1962: J. J. Weigand, *A Comparison of the Effectiveness of Two Methods of Teaching General Music in the Junior High School.* No. 4, 1962: Roma Ball and Others, *Four Studies in Elizabethan Drama.*

Vol. XI, No. 1, 1962: Robert L. Dorsch and Dorothy D. Greer, *Faulkner—Three Studies,* Part I. No. 2,* 1962: Sherland N. Dirksen, *Faulkner—Three Studies,* Part II. No. 3, 1963: George M. Rundell and Minnie M. Miller, *Foreign Languages in Kansas Secondary Schools, 1961-1962.* No. 4, 1963: James S. Wilson, *Flowering Plants of the Ross Nautral History Reservation, Lyon and Chase Counties, Kansas.*

Vol. XII, No. 1, 1963: Eldon E. Snyder, *Offerings and Enrollments in the Secondary School Social Sciences in Kansas in 1961-1962.* No. 2,* 1963: John Breukelman and Ralph P. Frazier, *Offerings and Enrollments In Junior High School Science in Kansas In 1962-1963.* No. 3, 1964: D. Stanley Eitzen, *David J. Brewer, 1837-1910: A Kansan on the United States Supreme Court.* No. 4, 1964: Franklin L. Jensen, *Mark Twain's Comments On Books and Authors.*

Vol. XIII, No. 1, 1964: Craig, Smith, Walton, James, *Shakespeare and the Renaissance.* No. 2, 1964: R. C. Anderson, *Secondary School Geography and Its Status in the North Central Region: 1962-1963.* No. 3, 1965: Charles L. Bell, *Industrial Arts in the Public Secondary Schools of Kansas in 1962-1963.* No. 4, 1965: Robert F. Clarke, *An Ethological Study of the Iguanid Lizard Genera Callisaurus, Cophosaurus, and Holbrookia.*

Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1965: Lattin, McClure, Daniel, *Three Studies in Middle English Literature.* No. 2, 1965: Saada Ishang and Constance Denniston, *The American Novel: Two Studies.* No. 3, 1966: Loren E. Pennington, *Hakluytus Posthumus: Samuel Purchas and the Promotion of English Overseas Expansion.* No. 4, 1966: John Breukelman, *Offerings and Enrollments in the Secondary School Sciences in Kansas in 1965-1966.*

Vol. XV, No. 1, 1966: Walton, Morgan, Myers, Bergman, Wheelen, *Studies in Renaissance Drama.* No. 2, 1966: Carl W. Prophet, *Limnology of John Redmond Reservoir, Kansas.* No. 3, 1967: James S. Wilson and Robert J. Boles, *Common Aquatic Weeds of Kansas Ponds and Lakes.* No. 4, 1967: Dicks and Clark, *Medieval Renaissance Studies.*

Vol. XVI, No. 1, 1967: Graig M. Goad, *Daylight and Darkness, Dream and Delusion: The Works of Truman Capote.* No. 2, 1967: Dale M. Garvey, *Simulation, Role-Playing, and Sociodrama in the Social Studies,* with *An Annotated Bibliography by Sancha K. Garvey.* No. 3, 1968: Richard A. Overfield, *Science in the Virginia Gazette, 1736-1780.* No. 4, 1968: Carey Wilds Kaltenbach, *Evidence for a Quem Quaeritis Easter Matins Trope in the Divine Office at Poitiers, Annorum Circiter 800?*

Vol. XVII, No. 1, 1968: William R. Elkins, *The Dream World and The Dream Vision: Meaning and Structure in Poe's Art.* No. 2, 1968: Robert J. Bicker, *Granville Hicks: An Annotated Bibliography, February, 1927 to June 1967 with a Supplement to June, 1968.* No. 3, 1969: Ruby Brandley Kirk, *An Inquiry into the Elements of Time and Space in Spenser's The Faerie Queene.* No. 4, 1969: H. Michael LeFever, *Studies on Laboratory Populations of Drosophila americana americana and Drosophila americana texana.*

Vol. XVIII, No. 1, 1969: Joy E. Prather and Carl W. Prophet, *Zooplankton Species Diversity in John Redmond, Marion, and Council Grove Reservoirs, Kansas, Summer 1968.* No. 2, 1969: Doris Morton, *Ralph Waldo Emerson and The Dial: A Study in Literary Criticism.* No. 3, 1970: James D. Kemmerling, *A History of the Whitley Opera House in Emporia, Kansas, 1881-1913.* No. 4, 1970: Carl W. Prophet, Joy E. Prather, and N. Leon Edwards, *Comparison of Summer Water Quality in Three Grand River Reservoirs, Kansas.*

Vol. XIX, No. 1, 1970: John Studer and Sharon S. Geddes, *Two Studies in Middle English Literature.* No. 2, 1970: Patrick G. O'Brien, *Senator Robert B. Howell: Progressive and Insurgent During "Normalcy."* No. 3, 1971: Mary Ellen Goad, *The Image and the Woman in the Life and Writings of Mark Twain.* No. 4, 1971: Carter M. Cramer, *The World of Nathanael West: A Critical Interpretation.*

Vol. XX, No. 1, 1971: Paul T. Graham, *The Mystical and Musical Realism of Richard Crashaw.* No. 2, 1971: Richard F. Raugewitz, *The Horse Disease in Kansas, 1912-1913.* No. 3, 1972: Paul Schnitzel, *The Role of Euro-Dollars in Financing United States Exports.* No. 4, 1972: Loren E. Pennington, *John Frampton and Thomas Nicholas: Two Sixteenth-Century Propagandists for English Expansion;* Patrick G. O'Brien, *William H. McMaster: An Agrarian Dissenter During "Normalcy."*