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INTRODUCTION

Plays based on native themes were no novelty to the patrons of early American drama. The performance of masques, dramatic odes and dialogues at the colleges and the establishment of a permanent and professional acting company in the 1750's early encouraged American writers to turn their hands to the construction of native plays. So popular was this trend that by 1860 approximately 200 plays bearing a national background were placed on the boards.

In their search for native dramatic material it was only natural for the playwrights to turn to war. Where else could they find at their beck and call excellent stories containing the basic elements of good drama -- action and great emotion -- than in the tales of the American Revolution and the War of 1812? Because American successes in the War of 1812 were primarily through naval battles, a condition difficult to simulate on the stage, the Revolution was the

preferred source of native themes. In the words of Brander Matthews:

the technical possibilities of any art at any moment must more or less limit, not only how the artist shall express what he has to say, but also what he shall attempt to express.

Not the least popular Revolutionary material for dramatic presentation was the much high-lighted John André story.

Little is the popularity of the André theme to be wondered at when we realize what a profound effect the execution of "the beloved spy" had on his contemporaries -- friend and foe alike. Nor did this tale of the "colorful" Major André ever lose its appeal to the subsequent playwrights of the American stage.

Tragedy cannot pass from the American stage, or any other stage, as long as we have human beings caught in a chain of events beyond their control, as long as chance and accident and unpredictable circumstance cry halt to an individual who cannot stop. Not as long as we have creative artists.

In the light of the fine character of André, his death

on the gibbet as a spy is a profound tragedy, and American playwrights, keenly aware of "the pity of it all", will not let the story rest. The writer has unearthed records of twelve dramatic attempts centering in the John André story made by American writers from post Revolutionary days to the present. Shocking to relate, each of these twelve plays has been a dramatic failure.

The failure of so many plays by so many authors is thought-provoking, at least to the writer. Questions arise that demand an answer. Did the plays fail because all these playwrights were inept jugglers of dramatic technique? Or is there an inherent weakness in the theme which, apart from the dramatic abilities or inabilities of the writers, causes the material when dramatized to fail? Moreover, just what constitutes this weakness, if such a weakness does exist? The purpose of this thesis is to find an answer to the above questions.

In an attempt to answer these questions the writer will follow a definite method of investigation.
First of all, she will analyze each play individually in order to become keenly aware of its merits and demerits. She will then weigh the fault of each play against its good points in an effort to decide whether the play is a good or a bad play from the technical and aesthetic point of view. Should she be fortunate enough to find "good" plays among the André group, whether they are good enough to have merited success. Should a few of the André plays reveal the keenly burning spark of inspiration, then and only then will she feel justified in adopting the attitude that the failure of the André theme in dramatic representation was not necessarily due to the dramatic inabilities of the playwrights who attempted it but was in truth due to some innate weakness of the theme itself. Her final step will then be to discover by an analysis of the plays as a group just what this blighting weakness is.

The writer is using chronological order in the arrangement of her material because she feels that this arrangement is the most effective one for this material. The plays that will be treated in this work
are in the order of their appearance:

(1) The Spy (1780) by Philip Freneau.
(2) André (1797-1798) by William Dunlap.
(3) The Glory of Columbia: Her Yeomanry (1803) by William Dunlap.
(4) West Point; or A Tale Of Tresson (1840) by Joseph Breck.
(5) The Highland Treason (1852) by Elihu Goodwin Holland.
(6) Arnold (1854) by Jason Rockwood Orton.
(7) André (1856) by William Wilberforce Lord.
(8) Arnold and André (1864) by George Henry Calvert.
(9) Major John André (1876) by P. Leo Haid.
(10) Major André (1903) by Clyde Fitch.

The writer has tried in vain to secure copies of The Death of Major André which was written by Mrs. Marriott around 1795 and West Point Preserved, a patriotic play by William Hill Brown which was put on the stage of the Haymarket Theatre in Boston April 17, 1797, and had a successful run of eight nights.

The writer will devote one entire section of this thesis to a complete historical account of the John André
story. Unfortunately the historians, swayed by patriotic emotions, have been too often at variance with each other in presenting the facts of the André story. Quibbles arose whether Peggy Shippen Arnold was an injured saint or an injurious sinner in the matter of the West Point treason, whether the captors of André were thieves or patriots, whether André was a man of great selflessness or selfishness, and whether Washington was conscienceless or conscientious in ordering the death of André. The writer will not take any particular side in these quarrels but will accept any fact upheld by evidence from source material.

The writer's purpose in presenting an historical account of the André story is to acquaint all readers of this thesis with the story as we know it, so that they may understand the appeal of the story to so many playwrights and may appreciate the art or lack of art with which the material is handled in drama. The writer, herself, realizing that

the real aim of the dramatist is not to copy nature but to transform her, not to obey her but to use her for imaginative ends

4. C. E. Vaughan, Types of Tragic Drama, p. 7.
will accept the plots of the plays as presented and will complain only when patriotic emotions or lack of technique instigate a flagrant and useless belying of historic truth. The writer, moreover, feels that the presentation of the story will permit the reader to see for himself whether the writer's conclusion is justifiable.
PART I.

THE JOHN ANDRÉ STORY IN AMERICAN HISTORY.
PART I.

THE JOH N ANDRÉ ST ORY IN AMERICAN HIST ORY

John André was probably born in 1751 in Warnford Court, London. Little is known of his early years beyond the fact that he studied at the Universities of Geneva and Göttingen. There he apparently made a deep impression because on November 30, 1780, two months after his death, Georg Christoph Lichtenberg, a noted German professor, philosopher, and physicist, wrote of him in a letter to a friend:

Is that not sad? You were touched already before you knew the man; however when you knew what an excellent mind he was, you could not think of him without extreme grief. He and Sir Francis Clarke have certainly been (I don't say so because both are dead) the most distinguished Englishmen whom we have had here during the last sixteen years and André was the most sympathetic and engaging. He spoke equally perfect English, German, and French and painted excellently.'

Upon John's return from his studies, his father

attempted to interest the lad in his importing business; but, although John dutifully worked in the office, his romantic nature was forever depressed by what to him were the deadening details of business life. He longed to join the army but was prevailed upon to desist from this plan by parental opposition and, upon the death of his father in 1769, by the necessity of supporting his mother, brother, and sisters. To combat the despondency occasioned by the death of the father, John took the entire family on a tour of the wells of Buxton and Matlock and there began his fateful friendship with Anna Seward and Honora Sneyd.

André fell deeply in love with the charming Honora, who, in turn, was doubtlessly flattered by the deep passion she had inspired in the handsome young merchant. In a short time the question of a formal engagement arose. The youth of the lovers, the impending threat of tuberculosis encompassing Honora and financial considerations caused Mrs. André and Mr. Sneyd to prohibit the betrothal. Utilizing his friend Anna Seward as a go-between, André attempted by frequent and copious letters and a few visits to keep the lovelight burning in the eyes of his beloved Honora.
However, Honora's love for the young and handsome André was merely the passing fancy of a young girl. That she scarcely answered his messages to her can be gleaned from the hope he expressed to Anna Seward that

Dr. Darwin's skill and your [Anna's] tender care, will remove the sad pain in her [Honora's] side, which makes writing troublesome and injurious to her; which robs her poor Cher Jean of those precious pages with which he flatters himself she would otherwise have indulged him.

She accepted the addresses of wealthier suitors -- Mr. Thomas Day, author of the History of Sanford and Merton, and Richard Lovell Edgeworth, father of the novelist, Maria Edgeworth, and author of several books including Practical Education which was written in collaboration with Maria. It was Mr. Edgeworth, her future husband, who declared that Honora experienced feelings of great relief when the saddened André eventually realized that he was deluding himself with the hope of obtaining the prize and terminated his correspondence and visits. At any rate, Honora married Edgeworth in July, 1773, a few months after the death of his first

wife and his inheritance from his father of a prosperous estate, and she lived a short but useful and happy married life. That no thoughts of André marred her happiness can be seen in the letter she wrote on her deathbed.

I have every blessing, and I am happy. The conversation of my beloved husband, when my breath will let me have it, is my greatest delight; he procures me every comfort; and, as he always said he thought he should, contrives for me everything that can ease and assist my weakness;—

'Like a kind angel, whispers peace, And smooths the bed of death.'

Just how long André's passion for Honora continued is a matter of conjecture. That he was still deeply enamoured of her when he was captured by the Americans on October 18, 1775, is shown by his writing:

I have been taken prisoner by the Americans, and stript of every thing except the picture of Honora, which I concealed in my mouth. Preserving that, I yet think myself fortunate.

Yet during his period of social triumph in Philadelphia in 1777 and 1778 André's name was linked with many a

prominent maiden -- including Peggy Shippen (the future Mrs. Arnold) and Peggy Chew. Indeed, the refusal of Miss Chew to marry until seven years after André's death has strengthened the belief that she and André were engaged. On the other hand, it is said that André's friends often talked about his "untouched heart that escaped so many shafts."  

In fact, William Sargent further states that

In the balls, the theatricals, the picturesque Mischianza, he bore a leading hand; but his affections, meanwhile, appear to have remained where they were earliest and last bestowed.

As soon as John, who had remained a merchant to secure the wealth necessary for the winning of Honora, perceived that Honora no longer favored him, he entered the army. His commission was purchased March 4, 1771.

Of very moderate fortunes and utterly destitute of influential connections, he knew that his education better qualified him for the useful fulfilment of military duties than perhaps any man of his years in the service of the king. Once embarked in the profession of arms, he had nothing to rely upon but his own address to secure patronage and promotion, -- nothing but his own merits to justify the countenance that his ingenuity should win. Without undue

5. Sargent, loc. cit., p. 723.
6. Ibid.
vanity it is tolerably safe to say now that he was authorized by the existing state of things to confidently predict his own success on these estimates.  

Love of fame sublimated his love for Honora. Little did André realize then that

Fame is the spur that the clear spirit doth raise,
(That last infirmity of noble mind)
To scorn delights, and live laborious days;

In the summer of 1774 André embarked for America. As an officer in the British Army stationed in America, his days were not at first overly laborious nor did he scorn delights. It is true that he was at times involved in actual warfare — in the massacre of Paoli, in the battles at Brandywine, Germantown and Monmouth, in the plundering of New Bedford and Martha's Vineyard, in the night attack at Herringtown on the Hackensack, and in the fighting at Stony Point and Verplanck's Ferry. André approved of gay life and during his stay in Philadelphia in 1777-1778 and in New York his social graces and handsome appearance made him the petted darling of society. His interest in the arts led him

to help in the production of plays -- but only in the rôle, Seilhamer insists, of a scenic artist. Yet André did scorn for himself those delights that extended beyond the bounds of propriety. Sargent says of him:

Nor, while foremost in the brilliant pleasures that distinguished the British camp and made Philadelphia a Capua to Howe, was he ever known to descend to the vulgar sports of his fellows.

Alexander Hamilton has furnished us with excellent observations on the character of André, observations drawn from his association with John during the trying days of his trial and from information gleaned from those who knew him. Hamilton says of André:

To an excellent understanding, well improved by education and travel, he united a peculiar elegance of mind and manners, and the advantage of a pleasing person. It is said, he possessed a pretty taste for the fine arts, and had himself attained some proficiency in poetry, music, and painting. His knowledge appeared without ostentation, and embellished by a diffidence that rarely accompanies so many talents and accomplishments which left you to suppose more than appeared.

His sentiments were elevated, and inspired esteem; -- they had a softness that conciliated
affection. His elocution was handsome; his address easy, polite, and insinuating. By his merit, he had acquired the unlimited confidence of his General, and was making a rapid progress in military rank and reputation."

André rose rapidly through his own merit from his commission as lieutenant purchased on March 4, 1771, to the rank of adjutant general to the British Army in America in 1779. But fame beckoned him to higher heights, and he entered into fatal negotiations with the dissatisfied Benedict Arnold.

Benedict Arnold, bitterly resentful of the questioning of his public accounts, of the mishandling of his promotion, and of the criticizing of his ways of command by the civil authorities of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania and of Congress, embittered by the insults and malice of his many enemies, and greedy for money to supplement his reduced income and to enable him to continue to live in lavish style, opened secret negotiations with the British early in 1779. These early negotiations carried on between "Monk" (Arnold) and John André through the help of Joseph Stansbury are important only in that they mark the beginning of

10. Alexander Hamilton, The Fate of Major André, p. 18.
the great treason. Many letters passed between "John Anderson" (André) and "Gustavus" or "J. Moore" (Arnold) in 1780, and Arnold soon understood that only by delivering tangible goods to the British could he secure a fortune in betrayal money. Accordingly, Arnold, both openly and through Robert Livingston and General Schuyler, asked for the command of West Point. Upon receipt of this command on August 3, 1780, Arnold moved to his post. On August 30 he wrote a "commercial" letter to "John Anderson" suggesting that they both meet to discuss business. This meeting, which was urgently desired by Clinton, who wished to ascertain beyond a doubt the identity of "Gustavus" and to polish up the proposed treasonous plans, was attempted but, because of the firing of British gunboats on Arnold's barge, was not consummated. Plans for another meeting were arranged, and on the night of September 21, 1780, Joshua Hett Smith was sent by Arnold to the British gunboat, the Vulture, to bring André ashore under a flag of truce. There on the banks of the Hudson the conspirators talked until dawn. Then when the boatmen refused to row André back to his ship, they adjourned their meeting to the house of Smith. André was not fated to enjoy
his breakfast that morning because shots from an American four-pounder at Gallows Point forced the Vulture to drop downstream, thereby cutting off his escape by water. The details for the surrender of West Point having been settled, treasonous papers were hid by André in his boots in direct contradiction of Clinton's orders. André again disobeyed Clinton when on the advice of Arnold he changed his red coat for an old one of Smith. General Joshua King to whom the captured André was brought has left us a description of André as he appeared during his mission.

He looked somewhat like a reduced gentleman. His small clothes were nanken with long white top boots, in part, his undress military suit; his coat purple, with gold lace, worn somewhat threadbare, with a small-brimmed tarnished beaver on his head. He wore his hair in a quiff with long, black band, and his clothes somewhat dirty.

In the same letter written at Ridgefield and dated June 17, 1817, King gives us an account of André's capture as it was told to him by the "beloved spy" himself:

he was furnished, ... , with a Continental horse

and General Arnold's pass, and was to take a route by Peekskill, Crumpound, Pinesbridge, Sing Sing, Tarrytown, etc., to New York.

Nothing occurred to disturb him on his route until he arrived at the last place, except at Crumpound. He told me his hair stood erect and his heart was in his mouth on meeting Colonel Samuel B. Webb of our army plump in the face. An acquaintance of his said that Colonel Stoddert knew him, and he thought that he was gone, but they kept moving along and soon passed each other, he then thought himself past all danger, and while ruminating on his good luck and hairbreadth escapes, he was assailed by three bushmen near Tarrytown, who ordered him to stand. He said to them 'I hope, gentlemen, you belong to the lower party.' 'We do,' says one. 'So do I,' says he, 'and by the token of this ring and key you will let me pass. I am a British officer on business of importance, and must not be detained.' One of them took his watch from him and then ordered him to dismount. The moment that was done, he said he found he was mistaken; he must shift his tone. He says, 'I am happy, gentlemen, to find I am mistaken -- you belong to the upper party and so do I, and to convince you of it here is 'General Arnold's pass,' handing it to them. 'Damn Arnold's pass,' said they. 'You said you were a British officer; where is your money?' 'Gentlemen, I have none about me,' he replied. 'You a British officer with a gold watch and no money! Let us search him.' They did so, but found none. Says one, 'He has got his money in his boots; let's have them off and see.' They took off his boots, and there they found his papers, but no money. Then they examined his saddle, but found none. He said that he saw that they had such a thirst for money, he would put them in the way to get it, if they would be directed by him. He asked them to name their sum to deliver him at Kingsbridge. They answered him in this way, 'If we deliver you at Kingsbridge, we shall be sent to the sugar-house, and you will save your money.' He says, 'If you will not trust my honor; two of you may stay with me, and one shall go with the letter I will write; name your sum.' The sum was agreed upon, but I cannot recollect whether it was five
hundred or one thousand guineas, but the latter, I think, was the sum. They held a consultation a considerable time, and finally they told him if he wrote a party would be sent out and take them, and then they should all be prisoners. They said they had concluded to take him to the commanding officer on the lines. They did so, and retained the watch until General Washington sent for them to Tappan, when the watch was restored to Major André. 4

This imputation by André of thievishness on the part of the captors, John Paulding, David Williams and Isaac Van Wert, it has been said, 13 was advanced by André in order to protect himself from the embarrassment of admitting that a man of his intelligence had been so rattled by the Hessian coat of his captor that he blurted out the truth. At any rate the patriotism and characters of the captors have been often and vigorously defended, in flowery terms and in factual terms. But their best defense was Washington's letter dated October 7, 1780, and sent to the President of Congress. It reads:

I have now the pleasure to communicate the names of three persons who captured Major André, and who refused to release him, notwithstanding the most earnest importunities and assurances of a liberal reward on his part. Their conduct merits our warmest esteem; and I beg leave to add, that

12. Ibid., pp. 233-235.
I think the public will do well to make them a handsome gratuity. They have prevented in all probability our suffering one of the severest strokes that could have been meditated against us."

André, although he could not save himself from capture, could and did save Arnold by prevailing upon Lieutenant Colonel Jameson, to whom he was brought by the captors, to permit him to write of his detention to Arnold. Upon receipt of André's letter Arnold fled to the Vulture.

André was brought to Tappan and tried before a board of General Officers on September 29, 1780. Treated with great politeness by the board, André retaliated by frankly confessing all the facts of the case with the exception of those that would implicate others. Despite their admiration for the prisoner, the board was forced by this declaration to consider André a spy and to recommend that "agreeable to the law and usages of nations, it is their opinion he ought to suffer death."²⁵ La Fayette, indeed, said in later years:

That it was a painful duty, in consideration of the gallantry and accomplishments of that

officer, but the court was impelled, not only by the rules of war, but by the example of the British army itself, in the execution of Captain Hale on Long Island, for a similar offence, to pass a like judgment.  

The camp orderly book dated Oct. 1, 1780, sets the time of execution for that afternoon at five o'clock. In the evening orders, however, we find this statement:

Major André is to be executed tomorrow, at twelve o'clock precisely. A battalion of eighty files from each wing to attend the execution.

The postponement of the execution even after the curious crowds had assembled occurred to give a British delegation sent by Clinton to present facts to save André a chance to speak -- and speak they did but to no avail.

André requested that he be permitted to die a soldier's and not a felon's death. This request was refused by Washington as being inconsistent with the findings of the court, but to spare André the refusal was not reported to him.

At twelve o'clock on October 2, 1780, John André,

17. Ibid., p. 385.
Adjutant General of the British forces in America, was hanged as a spy. Hamilton has left us a succinct but complete account of the execution. He wrote in a letter to John Laurens:

In going to the place of execution, he [André] bowed familiarly as he went along, to all those [with] whom he had been acquainted in his confinement. A smile of complacency expressed the serene fortitude of his mind. Upon being told the final moment was at hand, and asked if he had anything to say, he answered, "nothing, but to request you will witness to the world, that I die like a brave man." 11

It has been pointed out that André's death was a boon to him rather than a misfortune. Having tasted to the full the best years of his life, he died at the peak of his career in a manner that immortalized him. Buried at first at Tappan, his bones were disinterred in 1821 and reburied in a cenotaph erected for him amidst the graves of England's illustrious dead in Westminster Abbey.

André's fine and gentle character made all who knew him love him and made his death a source of sorrow to the world. Tallmadge, his guard, testifies that for the few days of intimate intercourse I had

with him which was from the time of his being brought back to our headquarters to the day of his execution, I became so deeply attached to Major André, that I can remember no instance where my affections were so fully absorbed in any man. When I saw him swinging under the gibbet, it seemed for a time as if I could not support it. All the spectators seemed to be overwhelmed by the affecting spectacle, and many were suffused in tears. There did not appear to be one hardened or indifferent spectator in all the multitude.  

André died believing he had done no wrong. He said:

I foresee my fate, and though I pretend not to play the hero, or to be indifferent about life, yet I am reconciled to whatever may happen, conscious that misfortune, not guilt, has brought it upon me.  

In another letter he writes "that he could not think any attempt to put an end to a civil war, and to stop the effusion of human blood, a crime."  

Those who knew André could not understand how anyone of his nature could undertake such a mission. Hamilton, who admired him, admitted that his mission was not one for a man of honor to fulfill. No matter how we sympathize and like André we must agree with

General Howard who growled, "He was nothing but a damned spy." 22

"Never, perhaps," said Hamilton, "did any man suffer death with more justice, or deserve it less." 23

22. Ibid., p. 64.
PART II.

THE JOHN ANDRÉ STORY IN AMERICAN DRAMA.
SECTION I.

THE JOHN ANDRÉ STORY IN AMERICAN DRAMA OF THE LAST TWO DECADES OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.
CHAPTER I.

THE SPY

by

PHILIP FRENEAU

The first writer to see dramatic value in the John André story was "the poet of the American Revolution," Philip Freneau. It was in the autumn of 1780, Pattee declares, that Freneau wrote a fragment of a drama highlighting the André theme. Since John André was captured on September 23, 1780, tried on September 29, 1780, and executed on October 2, 1780, Freneau wrote the drama entitled The Spy only a few weeks after the events occurred.

The dramatization of a story shortly after its occurrence is not in itself usually worth noting when we consider the history of the stage in the eighteenth century. Plays held the boards for only a few nights at a time, and long runs were unheard of. Therefore, rapidly written and often unpolished dramatizations of

current events were the order of the day.

Yet the dramatization of the André story at this early date is truly remarkable because feeling among the British and "rebel" factions ran high because of this incident. Moreover, the participants in the story were men prominent among the Americans and the British, and representing them in drama was not child's play. It took a brave man to attempt the André story -- and who in that age was braver than the future critic of Washington and Hamilton, "That rascal Freneau"? Yet, having written a goodly portion of his drama, Freneau abruptly ceased, and we cannot help wishing that we knew why. Freneau, who often revised and reworked his writings, never did bother to finish this drama, and until Fred L. Pattee published it in his edition of Freneau's poems, it existed only in a fragmentary and greatly revised autographed manuscript.

The Spy consists of three acts containing eight scenes. In the opening scene two servants of Arnold at work in his garden at West Point discuss such evidences in Arnold of disloyalty to his cause as his friendship with Tories and his sneering at American officers. Mention is made of a secret plan of Arnold to end the
war. Jeffery, one of the servants, concludes that Arnold is loyal and is merely posing in an effort to get news of the enemy. In the second scene of Act I André in New York proposes to Sir Henry Clinton the corruption of Arnold and for the sake of his country and of Clinton agrees to be an active participant in the plot. In the first scene of Act II Arnold, after refusing Washington's offer of 3000 more men to guard West Point, in soliloquy wavers between loyalty and disloyalty. He realizes he is doing wrong, he decides to imprison André when he arrives, then changes his mind and declares that Britain has a right to America. In Act II, Scene ii, André pays a farewell visit to his beloved, Lucinda, who warns him that she has experienced a dream prophesying his death. André reveals his mission to her. After singing to please André a song concerning an English soldier's loyalty to his King, she sings to please herself a foreboding song. Clinton arrives to urge André "on an eagle's wings to Arnold haste" and to suggest that he arrange also for the capture of Washington at West Point. In the first scene of the third act the expectant Arnold meets André and discusses plans for the surrender of

2. Ibid., p. 57.
West Point and the apprehension of Washington. André then hides the incriminating papers in his boots. In Scene ii of the same act subordinate officers of the American Army, sent to seize traders selling supplies to the British and to arm peasants for purposes of patrol, discuss the baseness of those who sell their country for gold. When one expresses his fear that their cause is lost, another expresses confidence in future American successes and declares that he who despairs is not worthy of enjoying free American life when it is gained. In the next scene the peasants, while awaiting orders in an outhouse, beguile the time by singing of the hardships of a soldier's life. In the final scene of the drama Jeffery, Arnold's servant, announces to an Aide Arnold's treacherous plot. As can readily be seen by this synopsis of the plot even this fragment of the play has rambling sections and is not perfectly unified.

Although the fragment ends abruptly, Freneau wrote enough of The Spy to give us a clear idea of its value. The Spy we find is a typical Freneau document in that it is a combination of very good writing and very poor writing.
That Freneau exercised a great deal of care in thinking out his drama is seen by his alternation of blank verse with prose throughout the entire work. The minor scenes -- the discussion of the servants, the visit with Lucinda, the meeting of the conspirators and the conversation of the peasants -- are all in prose with an occasional excursion into poetic heights when lofty thoughts are expressed. The more important scenes -- the plotting of Clinton and André, the soliloquizing of the wavering Arnold, the patriotic conversation of the officers and the revelation of Arnold's treachery -- are expressed in poetry, at times lyrical and hauntingly beautiful and at times raucous and forced.

Another evidence of careful planning can be seen in Freneau's listing of characters. Freneau made an evident effort to omit from his drama many of the prominent men of his age who were deeply involved in the affair. Washington was conspicuous by his absence from the list of characters. The only well-known figures used or proposed for use were, besides André, Sir Henry Clinton, Arnold, General Green, Knyphausen and General Robertson.
On the other hand, the list of characters was thoughtlessly composed because several of the characters that appeared in the fragment were not listed. For instance, the three American officers, Vincent, Ambrose and Asmith, who so poetically expressed their patriotic sentiments in an entire scene, were not placed on the character list. In addition, several of the aides were totally ignored.

The dialogue also is at times lyrical, at times weak in typical Freneau style. Freneau, in a feeble imitation of King Lear, makes Arnold look at the heavens and cry:

Storm on, ye wind, the tempest that ye make
In the broad regions of the troubled ether
Is quiet to the tumult of my soul!

Departing honour,—take thy last adieu,
'Tis this night's deed that stamps me for a villain.

When Arnold turns over the plans of West Point to André, Freneau does not even recognize that here is the opportunity for the poet to sound his notes. Instead, he ends the scene with a very dull, ordinary,

3. Ibid., p. 60.
unsatisfying prose conversation between the conspirators.

Maj. André. I have an expedient. I can carry them [the plans] in the foot of my boot. Do you see how snug they lie?

(Putting them on

Arnold. Aye; faith, that was well thought of; but do not put the passport in your boot.

Maj. André. No, no. That goes into my pocket.

END OF SCENE

Yet the same André in another scene bursts forth with these fine words:

O Britain, Britain,
That one descended from thy true-born sons
Should plot against the soil that gave him birth,
And for the value of a little gold Betray its dearest rights. But traitors are the growth of every country And Arnold is our own!

In his characterizations we again see Freneau’s tendency to be both a good and a poor dramatist.

Freneau’s characterization of Arnold is a very fine piece of work from the psychological viewpoint. By

4. Ibid., p. 64.
5. Ibid., p. 43.
means of a soliloquy Freneau shows us a man who at first is painfully aware of the full extent of the crime he contemplates and who calls to mind all the suffering he has endured to gain his fame in the vain hope that these recollections will restrain him. Arnold exclaims to himself:

Arnold (solus). This is the time for dark and dangerous action; This is the time that thieves and murderers choose To execute their desperate designs. But art thou, Arnold, less than murderer, Who thus prepare to stab thy bleeding country? And can I then descend to be a traitor? By honest toils a name have I acquired, Great and unequalled in the rolls of fame; And shall that name to infamy be doomed By one base act that mars and cankers all? For this have I in winter's joyless reign Explored the naked wilds of northern clime, When mid the snows and frosts and chilling winds Cold earth has been my bed.  

Freneau portrays an Arnold, bitterly desirous of remaining loyal, yet unhappily aware of his inability

6. Ibid., p. 49-50.
to withstand temptation, who cries out in hopeless agony,

Ambition, rise
And fire my soul to nobler purposes.

Yet once having made his decision to be a traitor, in a true to life manner all feeling of inner conflict melts away and the man is no longer cognizant of the heinousness of his crime. He says:

What I do is from principle, from the consciousness of a rectitude of heart and love to my country.7

He has gained the refuge of rationalization for he declares:

****For now I do imagine
They have no rights, no claims to independence.
Born were we all, subjected to a king,
And that subjection must return again.
The people are not dull republicans,
By nature they incline to monarchy.
How glorious should I be to have a share
In bringing back my country to allegiance.

7. Ibid., p. 50.
8. Ibid., p. 64.
Can France uphold them in their proud demand,
That race of puny, base, perfidious dogs?
Sooner shall all the house of Bourbon sink
Their Rochambault, C'Estang and La Fayette,
And Spain confederate cease to be a nation,
And all allies dwindle into atoms,
Ere Britain will withdraw her righteous claim
Or yield a jot of her dominion here
To any people living. Then,
Andre, come,
The sooner Britain gains this fort the better.

In a psychologically sound manner Freneau makes Arnold violently abuse other nations in an instinctive attempt by noise and violence to outshout the facts and reasons that swarm about constantly trying to penetrate the clouding, comforting film of rationalization.

Freneau uses fine artistry in driving home the main characteristic of Arnold, his baseness. Freneau shows this characteristic of Arnold directly by having Arnold say that he will sell West Point and that he has given up all notion of arresting Andre because

9. Ibid., p. 50-51.
that would be ungenerous --
more than that,
Ten thousand guineas are the
offered price
Of my desertion -- more than
that, perhaps
I shall henceforward be
caress'd by kings
And bear a generalship that
may reduce
These states revolted back
to Britain's sway."

and by showing his immediate agreement to the plan of
trapping Washington and by having Arnold plot to keep
his treachery secret because, as he says,

if we can make this pass, I shall become a
prisoner of war to you in appearance, be
exchanged after a little time, and so be in a
capacity to serve you again."

Freneau again uses a direct approach in his attempt to
reveal Arnold's baseness when he has André analyze
Arnold's character:

From some connection I have
had with him,
I found the leading feature
of his soul
Was avarice. He could feign
and counterfeit,
Persuade you black was white
or white was black,
And swear, as interest
prompted, false or true.

10. Ibid., p. 50.
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This known, I reasoned thus:
If his base soul
Can toil and fret and browbeat
death itself,
Endure the summer suns and
winter snows
In tedious route through
hyperborean wilds,
And sordid wealth alone incites
him to it,
Why may not British gold have
some effect
On such a slavish soul?¹²

Yet, realizing that the use of direct pointing constantly
is not in conformity with the best practices, Freneau
also drives home his point indirectly by having
Ambrose say of those who dicker with the British:

Gods! Can they be so base, --
but there are they
Who sell their country for a
mess of pottage, --
A servile, scheming race
whose god is gain,
Who for a little gold would
stab their fathers
And plunder life from her
who gave them life.
These are not true Americans.
They are
A spurious race -- scum, dregs,
and bastards all.
They are not true Americans,
I say.¹³

Yet the poet who could so gloriously characterize
Arnold failed dismally in his characterizations of the

¹² Ibid., p. 46.
¹³ Ibid., p. 65.
other characters.

Lucinda is merely a stick figure introduced to enliven the play by the songs she sings and to foreshadow in a very obvious way the proposed ending of the play.

Freneau's characterization of André was inconsistent. Having drawn for us a picture of André as a noble youth who for the sake of his King, his country and his patron sacrifices his feelings of niceness and becomes a spy; having pictured André as the person

Whose scheming head doth hurt our country [America] more
Than all their [the British] host beside?";

and having portrayed him as a clever diplomat who understands perfectly what type of bait suits Arnold for he promises:

You will become the greatest man in the world.
Britain will kiss the very ground you tread upon, besides lavishing wealth upon you by millions;¹⁵

Freneau turns completely around and presents an André unhampered by honor who declares:

１４. Ibid., p. 50.
¹⁵. Ibid., p. 63.
but if worst come to worst, I can tell them I have deserted from the British. Then I shall be caressed among them till such times as I can find an opportunity to escape and join my countrymen."

and an André so stupid that he immediately reveals this most dangerous plan to his lady love, Lucinda.

Another example of inconsistent characterization is the portrayal of Clinton as so selfish a commander that he says to André:

But, friend, I charge you, if this scheme succeed,
Take not the merit of it to yourself;
But let the world imagine it was Clinton
Who schemed, who plotted, and seduced the villain,

and at the same time as so unselfish that he can praise his foe for being endowed "with hearts of adamant," one can say of Washington

He is the soul, The great upholder of this long contention.
I dread his prudence and his courage more Than all the armies that the Congress raise,

16. Ibid., p. 53.
17. Ibid., p. 47.
18. Ibid., p. 42.
Than all the troops or all the ships of France."

And in even higher praise says:

And often have I sent to sound some chiefs
Whose qualities and influence are great
In yonder hostile camp, but their stern souls
Are so well armed with more than Spartan virtue
That there corruption seems to have no power,
And all my schemes and plans are come to nothing.

The great patriotism of Freneau not only impaired Freneau's characterizations but also helped destroy the unity of his work. The scene between the American officers in general contributed little to the play but was merely inserted to push to the fore some patriotic propaganda. Likewise, the peasant scene was unnecessary and slowed up the movement of the play, but Freneau retained it in order to have the peasants beguile the listeners with patriotic songs. It is, therefore, partly the fault of Freneau's great patriotism that this fragment of a drama has fallen into the oblivion reserved for unsuccessful writings.

19. Ibid., p. 56.
20. Ibid., p. 43.
The weak spots of The Spy so overshadowed its purple patches that it deserved to be the failure it is.
CHAPTER II.

ANDRÉ

by

WILLIAM DUNLAP

ANDRÉ was brought into the world with a great deal of travail by its author, William Dunlap. On November 25, 1797, while visiting Boston Dunlap noted in his diary that, after a visit to the post office and after writing letters to his wife and M. Judah, he settled down to "Write on 'Andre'." From that date until January 21, 1798, this simple entry recurs frequently. On March 13, 1798, Dunlap wrote his preface to ANDRÉ which gives a much earlier date than November 25 for the conception and beginning of his play.

More than nine years ago the author made choice of the death of Major ANDRÉ as the subject of a Tragedy, and part of what is now offered to the public was written at that time. Many circumstances discouraged him from finishing his play and among them must be reckoned a prevailing opinion that recent events are unfit subjects for tragedy. 2

On January 21, 1798, Dunlap noted that "Having finished 'André' I am to read it to Dr. Dwight tomorrow." Under the same date he further states, "Write on André, copying and correcting." Thereafter for a month Dunlap was busy reading André to his friends and copying and correcting the play. On March 12, 1798, we learn that Dunlap paid $57 for 12 reams of paper to be used in printing André. From then on the entries keep us informed of his work as a proofreader and on April 12, 1798, tell us that he sent the copies of André to booksellers "for which if they sell I offer to take books."

Dunlap began at an early date to prepare for the production of his play and his troubles bubbled merrily on. On February 21, 1798, he showed the part of Bland to Cooper who preferred to play M'Donald, and on March 1st he left the part of M'Donald with Chalmers who refused the part because he felt there was not enough time left to study it. By March 3rd the play was cast in this manner:

4. Ibid., p. 208.
5. Ibid., p. 231.
The general, Mr. Hallam; André, Hodgkinson; Bland, Cooper; M'Donald, Tyler; Melville, Williamson; Seward, Martin; British Officer, Hogg; American Officer, Miller; Mrs. Bland, Mrs. Malmoth; Honora, Mrs. Johnson; Children, Miss Hogg, and Master Stockwell. 7

Cooper promptly decided he wanted the part of André which had been given to Hodgkinson. Dunlap wrote, "I said I should not dare ask Hodgkinson to exchange. He said Hodgkinson had said André was the worst part of the three." 8 On March 27 the temperamental Cooper wrote a letter requesting that the production of André be put off. The harrassed Dunlap noted in his diary:

I call'd on and told him I would rather see it imperfectly represented than put it off, for I know of nothing else to enable me to pay Salaries on Saturday. 9

Dunlap must have uttered a sigh of relief when the play was finally performed on March 30, 1798, at the Park Theatre, New York, and drew a receipt of $817. But his troubles were not over because at the première Hodgkinson ordered the curtain rung up before Ciceri, the excellent painter and stage mechanician, had readied the stage, and Ciceri after a fight with Hodgkinson resigned.

8. Dunlap, Diary, op. cit., p. 228.
9. Ibid., p. 204.
Moreover, two incidents occurred at the first performance which did not serve to tranquilize the ruffled feeling of the harassed Dunlap. Dunlap writes the following account of one of these mishaps:

Our friend Cooper was at this time rather in the habit of neglecting such parts as were not first or exactly to his mind. Young Bland was not the hero of the piece, and very little of the author's blank verse came unamended from the mouth of the tragedian. In what was intended as the most pathetic scene of the play, between Cooper and Hodgkinson, the first, as Bland, after repeating, 'Oh, Sophonisba,' approached the unfortunate Andre, who in vain waited for his cue, and, falling in a burst of sorrow on his neck, cried, loud enough to be heard at the side-scene, 'Oh, Andre! What's next, Hodgkinson? and sunk in unutterable sorrow on the breast of his overwhelmed friend, upon whose more practiced stage cleverness he relied for support in the trying scene, -- trying to the author as well as actor and audience.'

The other more serious incident was also reported by Dunlap in his A History of the American Theater:

The play was received with warm applause, until Mr. Cooper, in the character of a young American officer, who had been treated as a brother by Andre when a prisoner with the British, in his zeal and gratitude, having pleaded for the life of the spy in vain, tears the American cockade from his casque and throws it from him. This was not, perhaps could not be, understood by a mixed assembly; they thought the country and its defenders insulted, and a hiss ensued -- it was

soon quieted, and the play ended with applause. But the feeling excited by the incident was propagated out-of-doors. Cooper's friends wished the play withdrawn on his account, fearing for his popularity."

Dunlap, feeling that a withdrawal of the play would be interpreted as an acknowledgement of guilt, decided to repeat the drama despite the fact that he was told on April 2, 1798, "that the people are so offended at the Cocade business as to threaten to hiss off the play tonight." The play that night was received with great applause, but receipts were only $271. Dunlap before the next scheduled performance inserted twenty-nine new lines in Act V in which he had Bland replace the cockade and vow that he would wear it from then on with pride.

The cockade has been described by McMaster:

The decoration was of ribbon, folded nearly circular, was four full inches in diameter, and, on a cocked hat, was fastened under the loop. On a round hat the cockade was worn on the left-hand side well up toward the crown.

The wearing of a black cockade was suggested by Peter Porcupine on May 4, 1798, "till the haughty and insolent foe is brought to reason" and was immediately adopted as

11. Ibid., pp. 222-223.
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an emblem of the Federalist party. Since few were the patriots that did not adopt this symbol, it is no wonder that Bland's action aroused so much indignation.

Dunlap portrayed André as a virtuous character, faithful to his country and beloved by all who knew him. Indeed, in his Preface he said:

he has made him his Hero; to do which, he was under the necessity of making him condemn his own conduct, in the one dreadfully unfortunate action of his life. To shew the effect which Major André's excellent qualities had upon the minds of men, the Author has drawn a generous and amiable youth so blinded by his love for the accomplished Briton, as to consider his country, and the great commander of her armies, as in the commission of such horrid injustice, that he, in the anguish of his soul, disclaims the service. 15

Yet despite the attitude of the people aroused by the cockade incident, Dunlap did balance his favorable portrayal of André with an expression of his sentiments as presented thru M'Donald, the chorus of this play. M'Donald pointed to the baseness of André's deed and to the foolishness of looking upon the crime merely from an emotional standpoint. He said to Bland:

He say'd thy life, yet strove
to damn thy country;

Doom'd millions to the haughty Briton's yoke;
The best and foremost in the cause of virtue
To death, by sword, by prison, or the halter;
His sacrifice now stands the only bar
Between the wanton cruelties of war
And our much-suffering soldiers; yet when weigh'd
With gratitude, for that he save'd thy life,
These things prove gossamer, and balance air; —
Perversion monstrous of man's moral sense!

M'Donald also presented high praises of Washington:

Both good and great thou art;
first among men;
By nature, or by early habit, grac'd
With that blest quality which gives due force
To every faculty, and keeps the mind
In healthful equipoise, ready for action;
Invaluable temperance -- by all To be acquired, yet scarcely known to any.  

and he summed up the then current patriotic American sentiment in regard to the André episode:

17. Ibid., p. 91a.
O, may the children of Columbia still
Be taught by every teacher of mankind,
Each circumstance of calculative gain,
Or wounded pride, which prompted our oppressors;
May every child be taught to lisp the tale;
And may, in times to come, no foreign force,
No European influence, tempt to misstate,
Or awe the tongue of eloquence to silence.
Still may our children's children deep abhor
The motives, doubly deep detest the actors;
Ever remembering that the race who plann'd
Who acquess'd or did the deed abhor'd,
Has pass'd from off the earth.

In this effort to be fair to England and at the same time to give due credit to American patriots Dunlap in André adheres to the point of view of the Federalists in 1798.

This play to which the author had given so much time and care was performed only three times during Dunlap's lifetime. The third performance of the play, which took place on April 7, 1798 for the author's benefit, drew only $329. On January 22, 1917, the prison scene

18. Ibid., p. 108b.
in the last act of André was performed at the Republic Theatre, New York, by the American Drama League, and the rendition of the title role by Mr. Henry Stanford was much liked. A clipping from the New York Herald Tribune of June 23, 1940, advertised the revival of André on August 1, 1940, by the Shakespeare Fellowship at the Saddle River Little Theatre. One has only to look at this record of five productions to count André as a failure, and the question now arises whether it deserved to fail.

This play has the best structure of any of the plays written on the André theme with the possible exception of Major André by Clyde Fitch. In the first act we are told of Arnold's treason and escape and of André's capture and expected execution. Captain Bland, an American officer who was befriended by André while a British prisoner, resolves out of his gratitude to save André. In Act II André alone in prison bemoans his disgrace. Bland visits him and declares that his friend shall not die. André merely asks that he be shot rather than hung. Bland's mother, who is expecting the return of her husband from a British prison, receives a letter informing her that her husband will be hung in retaliation for André. In Act III young
Bland, unaware of his father's peril, eloquently but unsuccessfully pleads with the General [Washington] for the life of André. In anger at his lack of success he tears the cockade from his hat and throws it away. Mrs. Bland arrives at camp and pleads for André's life to save that of her husband. Washington tells the British that André must die and is upheld in his decision by the older Bland. André tells young Bland that he will save his father. In Act IV Bland in his agony insults M'Donald who forgives him. Honora comes to André to save him. In Act V Bland apologizes for his insubordination to M'Donald. Honora pleads unsuccessfully with Washington for André's life. Insane with grief she visits Andre, regains her senses as she sees the guard lead him away, and is led away herself by Mrs. Bland. Word is received that the older Bland has been released. André bravely goes to his death.

As can be seen from the plot, the play has remarkable unity. The interest of the entire drama centered in André alone. At no time did Arnold appear, and his wrongs were barely mentioned. Moreover, all the preliminary events had taken place before the play opened and are shortly disposed of in Act II in twenty-four lines:
Bland. It was thy duty so to serve thy country.

André. Nay, nay; be cautious ever to admit
That duty can beget dissimulation.
On ground, unoccupied by either part,
Neutral, esteem'd, I landed, and was met.
But ere my conference was with Arnold clos'd,
The day began to dawn;
I then was told
That till the night I must my safety seek
In close concealment.
Within your posts convey'd
I found myself involved in unthought dangers,
Night came. I sought the vessel which had borne
Me to the fatal spot; but she was gone.
Retreat that way cut off,
again I sought
Concealment with the traitors of your army.
Arnold now granted passes,
and I doff'd
My martial garb, and put on curs'd disguise.
Thus in a peasant's form I pass'd your posts;
And when, as I conceiv'd my danger o'er,
Was stop't and seiz'd by some returning scouts.
So did ambition lead me, step by step,
To treat with traitors, and encourage treason;
And then, bewilder'd in the guilty scene,
To quit my martial designating badges,
Deny my name and sink into
the spy."

The action of the entire play revolved around three attempts made to save André and Washington's conflict between the dictates of duty and those of humanity. The first attempt to save the spy was made by young Bland who in reality represented all the Americans who sympathized with André. The second attempt was made by Mrs. Bland who is instigated by the desire to save her husband. The third attempt was made by Honora. In all of these portrayed attempts we see Washington suffering yet firm in his decision. Because each attempt carries with it a chance for success, the suspense of the play is retained until the very last moment. Then the play, having reached its end, closed gracefully with a sort of epilogue pronounced by M'Donald, who is not really a character but is a chorus inserted to present the author's views.

The characterization in the play is not its main charm. The characters are unfortunately not drawn as fully as they might have been. They are saved from being bad characters, however, by carrying within themselves a spark of life. Young Bland is vigorously drawn and is alive in the sincerity of his love for
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André and in his desire to save him. In a natural manner consistent with the rules of debating although urged by Washington to be brief, he piles up all that he deserves at the hands of his country in the hope that this compilation of services will balance and make possible his request. When Washington refuses his desire his hot anger and frustration suffocates him, and he bursts out in an uncontrollable manner:

Bland. (With contemptuous irony.)
Pardon me, sir, I never shall deserve it.
(With increasing heat.)
The country that forgets to reverence virtue;
That makes no difference 'twixt the sordid wretch
Who, for reward, risks treason's penalty,
And him unfortunate, whose duteous service
Is, by mere accident, so chang'd in form
As to assume guilt's semblance,
I serve not:
Scorn to serve, I have a soldier's honor,
But 'tis in union with a freeman's judgment,
And when I act, both prompt.

Dunlap in a masterly manner reveals the depths of Bland's frustration by means of two gestures, his tossing away of the cockade and his insulting of M'Donald in the hope

20. Ibid., pp. 96b-97a.
of finding a vent for his feelings. Both of these actions are very lifelike.

The character of the General [Washington] was handled in a masterly way. Since Washington was still alive at the time of the performance of this play and since everyone knew who the "General" represented, it took great courage to attempt this first theatrical portrayal of the man. In his deportment and his language the General of this play shows the great dignity and restraint that was characteristic of the real Washington. He never loses for a moment his calm, even when sorely provoked. In answer to a threatening letter from the British he calmly states to the messenger:

'Tis well, sir; bear this message in return.  
Sir Henry Clinton knows the laws of arms:  
He is a soldier, and I think a brave one.  
The prisoners he retains he must account for.  
Perhaps the reckoning's near. I likewise am  
A soldier; entrusted by my country.  
What I shall judge most for that country's good  
That shall I do. When doubtful, I consult  
My country's friends; never her enemies.
In André's case there are
no doubts; 'tis clear:
Sir Henry Clinton knows it.21

This play managed to accomplish what many of the
André plays could not do. It made its characters and
its action consistent. Dunlap presented an André of
great dignity and courage. In order to present an
André of fine character and at the same time a
patriotic condemnation of his crime, Dunlap belied
history and had André himself condemn his action.

André. Oft in the generous heat
of glowing youth,
Oft have I said how fully
I despised
All bribery base, all
treacheryous tricks in war;
Rather my blood should
bathe these hostile shores,
And have it said, "He died
a gallant soldier,"
Than with my country's
gold encourage treason,
And thereby purchase gratitude
and fame

Bland. Still may'st thou say it,
for thy heart's the same ...

André. Still is my heart the same.
But there has past
A day, an hour, which ne'er
can be recall'd,
Unhappy man! Tho' all thy
life pass pure,
Mark'd by benevolence thy
every deed;
The out-spread map, which
shows the way thou'rt trod,

Without one devious track
or doubtful line,
It all avails thee naught,
if in one hour,
One hapless hour, thy feet
are led astray;--
Thy happy deeds all blotted
from remembrance;
Cancell'd the record of thy
former good,
Is it not hard, my friend?
Is't not unjust?

Bland. Not every record cancel'd. O,
there are hearts
Where Virtue's image, when
'tis once engrav'd
Can never know erasure. 22

This clever manipulation of historical truth permitted
the audience to sympathize with André and at the same
time reconciled them to his fate.

Dunlap's blank verse has been called "the best
blank verse before Bryant." 23 In a day when dialogue
was pompous and elegant, Dunlap produced a dialogue
using blank verse that was very natural and free-flowing.
The best example of the smooth, lifelike dialogue used
by the "Father of the American Theatre" can be found
in the natural vocabulary that he gave to the "Father of
his Country":

22. Ibid., p. 92a.
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Sergeant: Express from Colonel Bland.
(delivers it and exit.)
General: With your permission. (Opens it.)
British Officer: Your pleasure, sir. It may my mission further.
M'Donald: O Bland, my countryman, surely I know thee!
General: 'Tis short; I will put form aside, and read it.
(Reads) 'Excuse me, my Commander, for having a moment doubted your virtue; but you love me. If you waver, let this confirm you. My wife and children, to you and my country. Do your duty.' Report this to your General. 24

Andre by Dunlap was not a flawlessly written play. The story of Honora is a bit too melodramatic for our tastes, and the incidents are carried forward by conversation rather than action, in part because of the fact that the hero is incarcerated. At times M'Donald, the chorus, is a little too moralizing in keeping with Dunlap's avowed intention "to impress, through the medium of a pleasing stage exhibition, the sublime lessons of Truth and Justice upon the minds of his countrymen." 25 Often sentimentality supercedes pathos, and Dunlap, as he has warned us in his preface, does not hesitate to belie history. Yet, when one realizes that the drama of the time was strongly influenced by the techniques of the Kotzebue school and of the

25. W. Dunlap, as quoted in Moses, op. cit., p. 510.
English heroic dramas, Dunlap's failures seem small indeed in comparison to the pitfalls he sidestepped, and his accomplishments are truly remarkable.

*André* by Dunlap was a failure, but it did not merit its lack of success. With few exceptions critics agree that it can be called one of the best plays of its time. Indeed, Pattee insists that it "must be ranked as the best play made in America in the 18th century -- no great praise, but worth mention," and Matthews goes even further and states that

Of all the plays on the subject of Arnold's treason ad André's sad fate, the 'André' of William Dunlap is easily the best, both as literature and as a successful acting drama.27

SECTION II.

THE JOHN ANDRÉ STORY IN AMERICAN DRAMA
OF THE FIRST HALF OF THE NINETEENTH
CENTURY.
CHAPTER I.

THE GLORY OF COLUMBIA: HER YEOMANRY

by

WILLIAM DUNLAP

The Glory of Columbia: Her Yeomanry was written by William Dunlap in 1803 and was first performed at the Park Theatre in New York on July 4, 1803. On its first night it earned for the house $1287. The repeat performance given on the very next night gained for the benefit of the author $444. From then on this "holiday drama" was "occasionally murdered for the amusement of holy day fools,"² It was produced on May 12, 1804, to celebrate the cession of Louisiana to the United States and on July 4 in Philadelphia at the old South Street Theatre. It is ironical to note that at this Philadelphia performance a set of scenery painted by André himself was used as the background for the scene portraying his capture. A description of this scenery is reported by Mr. James Rees who, in turn, quoted Mr. Charles Durang:

2. Ibid.
One scene from the brush of André deserves record. It was a landscape, presenting a distant champagne country and a winding rivulet extending from the front of the picture to the extreme distance. In the foreground and center was a gentle cascade, the water exquisitely executed, overshadowed by a group of majestic forest trees. The perspective was excellently preserved, the foliage, verdure, and general coloring artistically toned and glazed. The subject of this scene and its treatment was eminently indicative of the bland tone of the ill-fated major's mind -- ever running in a calm and harmonious mood.

It was a drop scene, and hung about the middle of the third entrance, as called in stage directions. The name of André was inscribed in large black letters on the back of it -- thus put, no doubt, by his own hand on its completion, as is sometimes the custom with scenic artists. It was burnt, with the rest of the scenery, at the destruction of the theater in 1821. It would have been a precious relic at the present day for its very interesting associations.

Poor André little thought, while he was painting that scene, that in a few short years afterwards it would be used in a national play written on the subject of his capture and death. It was so used in the summer of 1807 -- on the 4th of July -- at the old South Street Theater, as representing the pass on the banks of the Hudson River where he was taken by the three militiamen. It was the only suitable scene in the house which would answer for the locality without painting one expressly for it. 3

The Glory of Columbia was presented on July 1, 1812 under a new and timely sub-title, What We Have Done, We Can Do; on July 5, 1813; on August 31, 1814 under the motto, 'Let the Rallying Word be Liberty or Death' -- Bunker Hill; on July 4, 1820; and on January 25, 1823. Indeed,

The Glory of Columbia -- Her Yeomanry was performed at least twenty-four times until 1847, and it was published in 1817. In view of the fact that it is not at all a good play its popularity is surprising.

The Glory of Columbia -- Her Yeomanry was a hastily and carelessly written affair thrown together by Dunlap in the hope of gaining a few extra dollars. It is merely a poor outgrowth of Dunlap's much superior but much less popular André. In fact, by means of a word by word comparison the writer has found that nine of the nineteen scenes in The Glory of Columbia were lifted almost bodily from André with a few additions.

The third and fourth Acts of The Glory of Columbia, because they were lifted from the carefully written André, are the best acts of the play and are concerned with the André story. However, their effect is somewhat reduced here because they are arranged in a haphazard manner. In fact, the play as a whole is a haphazard affair greatly lacking in unity. Dunlap in the first act made David Williams a servant of Arnold who, suspecting Arnold's disloyalty, requests permission to leave. We also see the meeting and plotting of Arnold
and André. The rest of the act, however, does not even remotely touch upon the Arnold-André theme. Instead we are abruptly and for no reason at all introduced to Mrs. Bland who is awaiting her husband's release by the British and to Sally Williams who comes to visit her brother in order to see the camp but is taken back home by him. We also watch Sally and her brother, unarmed, best three armed British soldiers who attack them. In Act II we return to the André theme for a moment to witness André's capture. From then on Dunlap was too busy admiring the Americans and their leader and telling of Sally's lack of success in disguising herself as a soldier to remember his topic. With the material from André Dunlap managed to return to his theme in Acts III and IV. In Act IV he introduced an Irish deserter whose escapades added humor to the play but who did not even remotely fit into the story. Having disposed of André in Act IV, Dunlap was able to devote Act V to a glorification of the Americans and of Washington.

As is quite evident from the above synopsis of the plot, this hodge-podge play was written as a sop to the patriotic demands of the audience. The actual hero of the play was the American common people, and many lines about them were inserted obviously to get applause. For
instance, David Williams tells André:

An American soldier wears an uniform, to show that he serves his country and never will wear a livery or serve a master. 4

and insists that we are

All chosen men! "chosen," as our chaplain told us last Sunday, "to establish an empire of freemen, as an example to the world, and a blessing to our latest posterity." 5

Dunlap had André reply:

Tis well: you have taught me to reverence an American farmer. You have given me a convincing proof, that it is not high attainments, or distinguished rank, which ensure virtue, but rather early habits, and moderate desires. You have not only captured — you have conquered me.

Dunlap seized upon every opportunity to praise Washington. In one of the plays ten songs we hear:

To him [God] all praise be given!
And under heaven,
To great Columbia's son,
Blest WASHINGTON!
Who o'er the fight like fate presides. 7

Oral Coad, remarking upon this use of patriotism, explained:

5. Ibid., p. 41.
6. Ibid., p. 55.
7. Ibid., p. 56.
When the subject was America, the playgoers demanded not art, but the screaming of the eagle.

This play did not hesitate to use music and song to advance its patriotic motif. A typical song is sung by Williams to the tune of "Yankee Doodle":

A Yankee boy is trim and tall,
And never over fat, Sir,
At dance or frolic, hop and ball,
He's nimble as a gnat, Sir,
Yankee Doodle! fire away!
What Yankee boy's afraid, Sir?
Yankee Doodle was the tune
At Lexington was played, Sir.

2.

He's always out on training day,
Commencement or election!
At trick and trade he knows the way
Of driving to perfection.
Yankee, etc.

3.

His door is always open found,
His cider of the best, Sir,
His board with pumpkin pie is crown'd
And welcome ev'ry guest, Sir.
Yankee, etc.

4.

Though rough and little is his farm,
That little is his own, Sir;
His head is strong, his heart is warm,
'Tis truth and honour's there, Sir.
Yankee, etc.

5.

His country is his pride and boast,
He'll ever prove true blue, Sir,
When called upon to give his toast,
'Tis Yankee Doodle do, Sir,
Yankee, etc.

It is interesting to note here that through his use of songs in *The Glory of Columbia* and in other plays Dunlap became an important forerunner of the ballad-opera.

In keeping with his evident purpose of pleasing an audience, Dunlap created the comic role of Dennis O'Bogg, an Irishman who deserts from the British army because

First, by mere accident I found
I had two wives in the garrison.
Will. Two wives! You needn't say no more.
Paulding. How did that happen?
O'Bogg. Without the least intention on my part --
I had but just got married, t'other day,
when my widow came from Letterkenny to seek me.
V. Vert. Your widow! how your widow?
O'Bogg. Fait, hadn't she lost her husband? and doesn't that make a widow any time?

and who hesitates to help the Americans take Yorktown because his two wives live there and "then I shall have

10. Ibid., p. 40.
two batteries open'd upon poor Dennis alone, that the devil himself couldn't silence." When Williams encourages Dennis with the remark, "Take courage, man, you've a good chance of being kill'd in the action," Dennis replies, "Oh, sure enough, ther's some comfort in that." The insertion of Dennis must have been pleasing to the audience for his humor is still amusing. Yet, beyond providing comic relief, Dennis has no connection whatsoever with the play as a whole.

Dunlap again catered to popular taste by providing spectacular scenery. The New York Evening Post of July 3, 1803 carried this advertisement of the battle scene:

A VIEW OF YORK TOWN

With the British lines, and the lines of the besiegers. Nearer the audience are the advanced batteries of the besieged. Cannonading commences from the Americans upon the town, which is returned. Shells thrown into the town. Explosion of a powder magazine. The French troops advance towards the most distant of the batteries; the battery begins to cannonade, but is carried at the bayonets point. (This is done by artificial figures in perspective). While this is yet doing, the nearest battery begins to cannonade, and the American Infantry rushing to the charge, they attack and carry it with fixed bayonets. (This is done by boys completely equip'd and of a size to correspond in perspective with the Machinery and the scenery.)

11. Ibid., p. 54.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
The British are seen asking quarter, which is given.

Dunlap had set out for financial reasons to provide a spectacle for his audience. As a spectacle The Glory of Columbia was a success. To call it a play, however, would be to insult the art of drama. The main characters, Paulding, Van Vert and Williams, are mere country bumpkins, and Dennis O'Bogg is a painfully created stage Irishman. Only the scenes lifted from André are worth mentioning, and they are of too superior a tone for the rest of the spectacle. Mr. Charles Durang, as quoted by Mr. James Rees in his Life of Edwin Forrest, summed up the value of The Glory of Columbia when he said:

The piece had no merit as a drama, and was only concocted for holiday occasions. It was a sort of hybrid affair -- fulsome, in dialogue and pantomime, full of Yankee notions and patriotic clap-trap; but incessant laughter and applause of a crowded house, I well remember, rewarded the company's efforts.

When we realize that the public at that time would attend the theatre only if provided with tears and thrills and that Dunlap was trying to save his theatre from ruin, we find it in our hearts to forgive Dunlap for so prostituting his dramatic talents as to write this piece.

15. p. 59.
CHAPTER II.

WEST POINT; or A TALE OF TREASON

by

JOSEPH BRECK

West Point; or A Tale of Treason was

Entered according to the act of Congress, in the year 1840, by Joseph Breck, in the office of the Clerk of the District Court of the District of Maryland.

In a note printed on the reverse side of the title page the reader is told that the play was not original but was a dramatic adaptation of a "well written tale" from Ingraham's Arnold: the British Spy. Beneath this note a statement is appended:

This note is only added to counteract the personal malevolence of one or two contemptible individuals, whose insignificance is hardly worthy of even this attention.

Just who are these "insignificant" creatures whose existence was so significant to the author that he

1. Joseph Breck, West Point; or A Tale Of Treason, back of title page.
2. Ibid.
could not refrain from referring to them? Examination
of the Prologue to the play written by John H. Hewitt
and of the Epilogue written by Horace Pratt reveals two
long references to reporters:

I see reporters in the lobbies there,
I know them by their shrewd
and knowing air;
Their quills are nibb'd -- the
author's gazing at 'em,
They've written down his
hurried sketch verbatim;
Faith to the press it goes -- too
prosy -- dull --
The wild effusion of a madman's
skull;
Too national -- too full of
clap-trap speeches,
Wreath him a crown made up of
thorny switches;
I prithee gentlemen, not quite
so fast,
Hear the defence before the
sentence's past;
Reporters alone do not decide
the question,

and

And thank ye, patrons, for
your kind applause;
First, men of silence -- I mean
the Theban few --
Who not much say -- but very
much may do,
To raise an author -- give a
play "a name,"
And place them high upon the
scroll of Fame;

3. Ibid., p. 4.
Or otherwise, should they seem meet and fit,
To "write him down an --!" he must submit.
One thing's certain -- of course needs no debate --
You'll not doom him to share his Hero's fate! [4]

These two references lead one to suspect that the "two contemptible individuals" were reporters whose barbed articles had stung the author and from whom he wished to protect himself. Since reporters only appear "in the lobby" at the performance of a play, this play, therefore, might very possibly have been acted.

The dramatist's purpose is stated in the Epilogue.

He hopes

that in his "Treason"
you may find,
A Moral -- Sentiment -- and Truth combin'd;
For whilst each breast with manly honor burns,
And the vile name of "traitor!" proudly spurns,
Meek-eyed Pity, ever hovering near,
O'er André's fate, may freely drop a tear!

4. Ibid., p. 22.
5. Ibid.
Whether the author has accomplished his purpose is questionable. The principal moral of the play is not very clear. Perhaps the moral is "An honorable man should never undertake a dishonorable mission". Perhaps the moral lies in the inexorableness of fate because André remarked "I must abide my destiny." Most likely of all the moral of the story must center in the necessity for patriotism, because this play is definitely written in a patriotic vein. "We want not your gold, sir," said Paulding, "but we do want, aye, and will have, sir, the LIBERTY and INDEPENDENCE of AMERICA."

The author has drawn his character Smithson with an eye to obtaining the applause of his patriotic audience. Smithson, the American, fearlessly confronts entire troops of British soldiers, twits them on their incompetence and then easily eludes them. Before escaping from Clinton's guards, he says to the first British soldier

But as for you, you damned skulking scoundrel, know that neither bars, bolts, nor red coats can detain a true American soldier against his will, even at the headquarters of General Clinton himself.

6. Ibid., p. 20.
7. Ibid., p. 15.
8. Ibid., p. 9.
Smithson is in actuality the prototype of the free American. That he is a living character can be seen in the following dialogue:

**André.** Ah! Smithson, you are in time. Lose not a moment in conveying me on board the Vulture.

**Smithson.** There are two parties to that bargain.

**André.** What, fellow.

**Smithson.** Fellow not me. I am at no man's beck and bidding. I have my reasons for serving the Gen'ral, but am not every man's servant, you may depend. If you want to get back to your ship, you have arms and can pull an oar I reckon, as well's any other body.

(André appears irritated, but after a moment's reflection offers gold.)

**André.** Smithson, my good fellow, take this gold and conduct me to your boat.

**Smithson.** Mr. John Anderson, what Jack Smithson won't do for favor he won't do for gold.

The Epilogue had stated that the author wished to arouse the feeling of pity for André. Breck throughout his play was sympathetic with André, but only on two occasions does the shortness of the play permit his character to betray enough of real life to arouse our sympathies. We see the pity of it all when the noble soldier must, to avoid suspicion, so degrade himself that he tells Smithson in a mincing voice and manner that he is but a dandy who wears the British uniform in the hopes of catching the eye of a pretty maid. We also feel for André when he refuses all hope of escape because he

---

9. Ibid., p. 12.
feels that he is fated to die.

That the writer of the Epilogue knew nothing of the historical facts of the André story is seen in his expression of hope that the reader will find "Truth" in this play. Breck does permit the true facts of the tale to creep in here and there in scenes like the capture of André. But, a great deal of the plot is pure fiction. The murder of Smithson by Arnold, the kidnapping of Adélaide and her rescue, the plot hatched by Mrs. Arnold to save André and his refusal to escape are perfect examples of the license or licentiousness with which some dramatists belie history.

The only merit of this prose play lies in its few outbursts of genuine humor. In the first scene of the first act Smithson confronts a British patrol with these remarks:

Softly, good sir Corporal! you've wasted powder enough already. I did but try to see how well you kept the barrier, and what mettle your men are made of. The story goes that a pretty wench or a jug of whiskey can cross your post in broad noon and the sentinel is never the wiser. It's "who goes there?" "Man with a jug of whiskey." You answer, "Stand man, advance jug o' whiskey and give us a taste;" or, "who goes there?" "Husband and wife." "Stand husband, advance wife and give
us a kiss!" ha! ha! This is your system down in York, they say up above. Ho, ha, ha!

Corporal. You should then come in a wench's shape to test us, fellow." 

Another less obvious bit of humor is found in Sambo's method of recognizing a place in the dark.

Major André. We must be near the spot now. Sambo. Open the whites of your eyes and look about you.

Sambo. 'Tis so goramity dark, massa Jack, nigger no see one debbil bit. Dis look werry like de place, nebberdeless. Chow! hear dat bullfrog close here, massa Jack? I hearn him here when we lef. Ki! 'tis jis de place, for sartain sure." 

That this play is an utter failure cannot possibly be doubted. The chief reason for its failure lies in the attempt of the author to put too much material into too little space. For instance, in Act I, Scene i, Smithson shows his passport at the barrier and enters New York. In Scene ii of the same act Adelaide, a loyal American, notes the strange behavior of her uncle and aunt, General Arnold and Mrs. Arnold. In the third scene of Act I Clinton reveals that he has been carrying on a secret correspondence with an unknown American general. Smithson gains access to

10. Ibid., p. 5.
11. Ibid., p. 9.
Clinton after a scuffle with Clinton's guards, and he hands over to the British commander letters from Arnold which definitely confirm Clinton's suspicion of the identity of his correspondent. The letter reveals Arnold's desire for money and proposes that Arnold and André meet. The British think the proposal feasible. In the fourth scene of Act I Smithson in a British prison scuffles with the guard and escapes.

In Act II, Scene i, André accompanied by Sambo meets Arnold who proposes that they go to Smithson's house. In Scene ii of the same act André is very angry when they pass into the American lines. The Vulture is fired on and drops downstream. Arnold fears that they are discovered, but André calms him. Arnold says he is a traitor because he was injured too much by Americans. Arnold names his price, then enumerates in detail all the papers he will give André. André is pleased by the completeness of the plans, agrees to pay the price asked and reveals the British plans of attack. André makes out a check for Arnold while Arnold writes out his passport. Arnold leaves to complete all arrangements for André's departure. In the third scene of the same act Smithson refuses to
row André to the Vulture despite the fact that André offers him money and threatens him with a pistol. Smithson says there is less danger in traveling by land than by water. André, upon finding that Arnold has issued two passports, agrees and asks for the loan of Smithson's coat to cover his uniform. Smithson is suspicious. In the fourth scene of Act II the captors are playing cards, and their conversation reveals Van Wert's liking for purses. They waylay André who tells that he is a British officer and who shows his passport. André's eagerness to go on arouses their suspicion. After a search they find papers in André's boots. André offers money to Williams for his release, but Paulding and Van Wert prefer to be patriotic. In Act II, Scene v, Lieutenant Langtree, a British naval officer, arranges for abduction of Adelaide. In the final scene of Act II Arnold, while at a ball, receives a letter announcing the capture of André. He coolly bids the company farewell and reveals the entire situation to his wife. As he leaves, she faints.

In Act III, Scene i, Adelaide reveals Arnold's treachery to Smithson. To prevent Smithson from raising the alarm, Arnold kills him and with a distinct effort refrains from slaying Adelaide who lies in a
faint. The kidnappers appear and carry away both Smithson and Adelaide. In the second scene of Act III Hamilton and Tallmadge learn of Arnold's absence. Hearing Adelaide's cries for help, they rescue her from the kidnappers. In the third scene of the same act André reveals his identity to Tallmadge, strives to justify his action and asks permission to write to Clinton. Mrs. Arnold tells André of her plans for his escape. André refuses to run away. In Act III, Scene iv, the newlyweds, Tallmadge and Adelaide, discuss André and then hear the signal of André's death. In the final scene of the play André, ready for death, is upset by the sight of the gallows. He praises Washington, wants his bravery in dying to be noted, and hopes that his death will adjust the difficulties between America and England.

Not only is the plot too detailed for a play of twenty-one pages, but its very length indicates that there is a lack of unity of action and of cohesion in this play. The kidnapping of Adelaide, the love affair between Adelaide and Tallmadge, the murder of Smithson by Arnold and the plot of Mrs. Arnold are extraneous matter, the removal of which would have helped improve the quality of the play.
The list of characters also reveals lack of selection. Seventeen characters for a twenty-one page drama is the height of ridiculousness. The omission of Sir George Rodney, General Knyphausen, Lieutenant Langtree, Sambo, Wilson Broaders and Adelaide at the very least would have made the play more dramatic.

It is only natural that the dialogue and the characters of this play be stilted for no time can be wasted in talking and in revealing oneself. The characters are forced to speak with great succinctness because they must pack a world of information into a few sentences. Arnold, therefore, bids his wife good-bye in this manner:

We have been united, Mary, but eighteen months, we must now part forever. I have been, unknown to you, engaged in a treasonable correspondence with Sir Henry Clinton. The note I have just received tells me of the arrest of his messenger to me, with papers on his person, either of which would produce my death warrant. Nothing remains for me but instant flight to the enemy. My barge is at the landing. I can reach the Vulture by noon. Escape now will be easy. No one here is yet aware of my criminality. An hour hence it will be too late. Though Jamieson is too dull to suspect me, others may ere this have seen the papers, and be on their way to arrest me. Instantly burn all my papers. Now, farewell, dearest. God bless you. The heaviest blow this inflicts will reach me through you. Now, God Bless you -- bless you."
The writer is extremely surprised to note that Breck was tormented by the malevolence of only one or two individuals. She does not understand why everyone who was exposed to this dramatic failure did not develop feelings of deep dislike for its author.
SECTION III.

THE JOHN ANDRE STORY IN AMERICAN DRAMA
OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE
NINETEENTH CENTURY.
CHAPTER I.

FIVE PLAYS ON THE ANDRÉ THEME

In the second half of the nineteenth century five plays were written utilizing the André theme. They are The Highland Treason which was written by Elihu Goodwin Holland in 1852, Arnold which was written by Jason Rockwood Orton in 1854, André which was written by William Wilberforce Lord in 1856, Arnold and André which was written by George Henry Calvert in 1864 with one scene written in 1840, and Major John André which was written by P. Leo Haid in 1876. All these plays had one important point in common — they all failed and they all merited failure.

The plays by Holland, Lord and Orton were so inadequate dramatically-speaking that they are called closet-drama. Haid actually produced his play and, upon hearing of this, Brander Matthews vehemently declared:
That this turgid trash should ever have been acted, even by amateurs, is almost incomprehensible to any one unacquainted with the patient long-suffering of the American "play-goer."

Whether Calvert's play ever reached the stage is unknown.

Of these five plays Lord's was the only one that had even a bit of unified action. It begins with the treason scene at West Point and ends with the announcement to Arnold of André's death, and it concerns itself primarily with the treason and its consequence. Calvert tells the entire story of Arnold and thus destroys the unity of his plot, while Orton's play concentrated to its detriment on a study of Arnold's character development that involves many additional scenes from the earliest part of Arnold's career.

Orton and Lord alone do adequate characterizations. Orton's characters are very lifelike for he concentrates on them. His best character is Arnold whose bravery, impatience, love for luxuries, and bitterness over his punishments are gradually built up to show to the world Arnold's slow walk to treason. Brave Arnold in his play exclaims:

I've fought these boasting
Britains three to one
Before to-day. A little odds
is nothing,
The more there are, the
thicker are the marks
For our sure balls.²

Arnold's impatience and his chafing against inactivity
are seen as he awaits the messenger:

Where lags the sluggard
courier? When he comes
I'll stir his blood:
another droning week
Will rust me to nothingness,
or make
Of me a parlor general,
like Gates.³

Arnold's patriotism is seen when he cries:

I'll help with all my heart --
strike one more blow
For my beloved, but most
ungrateful country.⁴

The public reprimand from Washington is portrayed as
the straw that broke the camel's back because then
alone does Arnold say, "Now, there is nothing left me
but revenge!"⁵

³. Ibid., p. 9.
⁴. Ibid., p. 11.
⁵. Ibid., p. 41.
Lord portrays Arnold as a strong yet weak man who is very much concerned with this world. Arnold will not wait for vindication by future generations:

'Tis not my ambition  
To be a worshipped mummy, but a man  
Respected amongst men.⁶

He cannot stand pity or failure and is willing to give himself up to Americans in exchange for André because

I shall not seem a wolf  
With broken fangs, clutched by the throat and strangled,  
But as a lion that stalks freely in,  
And dares the amphitheatre.

Lord’s Arnold declares that

Once know my wrongs, and you know me; for I  
Am all made up of them, they are my senses,  
Through which I feel, and hear, and see all objects.⁷

but Lord very cleverly has Mrs. Arnold point out that it was not mere resentment of wrongs that had caused Arnold to forsake the Americans:

7. Ibid., p. 106.  
8. Ibid., p. 27.
'Tis not return to allegiance, but the mode
Of your return, the bargain, and the sale,
The cheapened perfidy, the double acting --
All that a man of honor breaking off
As you do, from his party, would avoid --
These are the things that make it infamous.

An evaluation of the dialogue of these plays had best be ignored lest the writer wax too vehement. The blank verse of *The Highland Treason* can only be called *wierd*. The very best dialogue of all five plays is seen in *André* by Lord. *André* explains his fall in very strong lines:

They came, they crowded round me, the illusive,
The treacherous visions -- they allured me on,
The blooming spectres! garlands waved around,
And music stirred my pulses. Silently
They pointed to the future; yet methought
I read a glorious promise in their eyes.
But suddenly they change; each wears a shroud,
And scowls on me with looks of death; they crowd,

They press upon me from behind,
they urge,
They thrust me on; and there,
before me, stands --
O God! I cannot speak it, cannot
name
To my own ears, the thing which
threatens me
with more than pain of dying;
and beneath it
I see a felon's coffin; and
beyond,
A lonely, naked, and dishonored
grave.¹⁰

Arnold also speaks at times from the heart

If I resist,
It is but as a swimmer in the stream,
Who strikes and gasps for life,
and does not think
How strong he is, but only in
what danger.¹¹

It is small wonder in view of the other plays of that
period that Matthews calls André by Lord "an
honorable failure."¹²

In the main the only remarkable thing about the
André plays of the second half of the nineteenth
century is the creative ingenuity displayed by the
writers. Holland introduces a Sorceress into his play

10. Ibid., pp. 91-92.
11. Ibid., p. 31.
in the vain hope of rendering it more solemn and awesome.

Orton introduces the ghost of Arnold's father who naturally appeared during a terrible thunderstorm in order to cry out "Beware!" Lord again shows his superiority to his contemporaries in drama by ignoring the supernatural. He highlights Arnold's duplicity by showing the shattering effect of his crime on the character of the young soldier that worshipped him.

Franks tells Arnold:

It is not that;
I said it was not that; although
the blow
Now seems as vile as once I held it light,
Nay, almost honorable!
But it is,
That you deceived me -- made me
the blind tool
Of your designs, your dupe,
your trumpeter;
Beguiled me, with the fable of your wrongs,
To hate just men, whom you had wronged, and boast
And swagger in your cause,
and make myself
A fool or villain in the eyes of others.
Nor is it only that you cheated me
Of admiration, service, and affection,
But you have robbed me of my trust in manhood.
Undoubtedly I leaned upon your honor --
With my whole soul. It broke, and wounded me,
And I shall halt even to my grave,
and find
No second man that I can lean upon.

Calvert and Lord both show some knowledge of dramatic technique. Calvert alone of all the André dramatists who had Mrs. Arnold use her baby as a plea to Arnold to forget his treachery, brings the baby forth as a concrete object by having its cradle appear on the stage during the touching farewell scene between Arnold and his wife. Calvert with great artistry ends his play not with André going to the gallows but with Washington signing the death warrant. Lord also ends his play effectively, for he had Franks, Arnold's most faithful friend, break the sword of Arnold, who already had been insulted by the British and who indicates his willingness to die, while exclaiming:

You stand there firm,
undaunted,
There is no shrinking in your mien; your eye
Is powerful and calm: no one can doubt
Your courage, or the unconquerable force
Of a great mind, that ever on itself
Built for attainment of its end; and yet,
A life passed in great deeds,
now shows but one

Poor, common virtue -- that
you dare to die!
'Twere no fit vengeance for the
death of André,
That you should fall, self-sentenced,
on the sword.
Grasped by a soldier and a man
of honor;
But in my country's name, and
in the right
Of my untainted honor, as a
hireling,
A renegade, and traitor --
I degrade you.\footnote{Ibid., p. 137.}

In all the André plays of the second half of the
nineteenth century the writer could find only these
few good points. She refrains from discussing the
inadequacies of these plays because in these plays are
found every dramatic fault that could possibly occur.
The writer does not regret that these plays have
earned oblivion. Instead she regrets that they ever were
penned.
SECTION IV.

THE JOHN ANDRÉ STORY IN AMERICAN DRAMA OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.
CHAPTER I.

MAJOR ANDRE
by

CLYDE FITCH

Major André was written by Clyde Fitch in 1903. It opened at the Savoy Theatre in New York on November 11, 1903, and ran for only two weeks. Withdrawn from the boards, it fell into an oblivion so deep that today it exists only in the form of a typewritten pencil-corrected prompt book in the theatrical collection of the New York Public Library. Despite the verdict of the New York playgoers of 1903, the writer feels that Major André was the best of the André plays and that it was by itself a very fine play.

Major André is a four act play, and the last act is divided into three scenes. Like all Fitch's plays it has an abundance of details and a lengthy plot. In the first act Treherne visits André and through conversation with Withers, hears that there is a
scheme afoot to end the war and that André loves a "rebel" named Sally. When André arrives, Treherne is told of the plans of the treason. Nancy, Polly and Sally, chaperoned by Mrs. Van Kort, arrive to plan a Mischianza with André. André succeeds in getting Sally away from the others and proposes to her. Sally tells André that she doesn't know whether she loves him or her fiance, Nathan Goodrich. A prisoner arrives at André's quarters and turns out to be Nathan. André frees his rival. In Act II Polly discloses her intentions of marrying Treherne, and Sally decides she loves Nathan best. Sally defies her father who insists that she marry André. Nancy twits Withers for sending her an acrostic written by André for another girl and refuses his offer of marriage. At the rehearsal of the Mischianza Treherne greatly embarrassed asks for Polly's hand in marriage and is accepted.

Robinson urges the reluctant André to meet Arnold, but André refuses because he dispaises Arnold and because he will not fight secretly against his future wife's people. To force André to go, Robinson urges Sally's father to forbid the match between her and André. Sally's father, instead, announces their betrothal, and Sally pleads with André to release her.
André releases her from her promise and in his bitterness agrees to plot with Arnold. In Act III André is riding toward the British lines with the neurotic Smith who, suspecting André's business, uses his imaginary illnesses as a pretext for parting with the spy. André is captured but manages to elude his captor. Trying to escape he finds himself surrounded by Americans and climbs a tree. Realizing the futility of escaping, he surrenders to Nathan Goodrich who recognizes him but accepts his self-identification as Mr. John Anderson. In the first scene of Act IV André's friends, Nathan and Paulding, discuss his trial. Sally's aunt visits André and tells him that Sally wishes to come. André paints his portrait for Sally. The decision of the court arrives, and André asks Nathan to procure for him a soldier's death. Ignoring his weeping servant, André then places Sally's picture on a chair to look at during his last hours on earth. In the second scene André, asleep, dreams that Sally in the picture is talking to him and is telling him that she will be with him to the end. As she leaves André cries out to her and awakes. In the last scene André is led away to his execution comforted by the feeling that Sally is with him.
The vast amount of details in this play do not retard the action because the action rushes along through the medium of very quick, very witty, very natural and very modern conversation.

_André._ ... And I will say this for Poppy, he can keep a secret.
_Withers._ (Pleased) Lord! Johnny that's demned good of ye!
_André._ He's used to keeping them -- he's done so many demned silly things he'd be ashamed to have known.

Where the other _André_ plays hint at the treasonous plans with a great deal of pomposity, Fitch tells of the plan in a very light manner. He has _Withers_ say to _Treherne_:

_Me boy, keep patient! There's a scheme afoot which may be _André'll_ tell ye, by which _we'll_ settle this whole silly quarrel over night, and in the morning old Johnny Bull will take each one of these damned little thirteen states and paddywhack the devil out of him._

The conversation is delightful in its use of wit and humor. When Nancy refuses _Withers_ he consoles himself with the remark, "If my two older brothers die and I become Lord Hazlehurst, she'll be sorry for this." _André_, angry at _Withers_ for telling _Treherne_ of the plans afoot, says:

2. Ibid., p. I-5.
André. (Looking sharply at Withers)
Have you been prattlin?
Withers. No, 'pon my honor!
André. 'Pon your what?
Withers. 'Pon my honor!
André. Swear by your legs or arms, Poppy; by your honor is asking too much of our imagination.4

Fitch, to enliven his play is not above using a bit of malapropism for he has the colored page say;

Beg pardon sah! The ladies am below, and is for asking if the Gemini am ready for to deceive 'em.5

It must be admitted, however, that Fitch in his eagerness to please does descend at times to any device that will draw a laugh. He has Mrs. Van Kort ask for a chair, and then this scene ensues:

The Three Men. Chairs!! Chairs!! Beg pardon!
(ALL THREE bring chairs for the three girls, who sit smilingly and say "thank you.")

Mrs. Van Kort. (With no chair)
Ahem!

André.
O madam! a thousand pardons.
(Goes for chair)

Mrs. Van Kort. Oh! marriage, marriage, it is a "back seat" you present to us women.

Fitch, however, can be quite eloquent at times. Nathan, feeling that he is losing Sally, exclaims to André:

I love her so and I know you well by reputation -- How can I hope to win her back from you? I cannot sing to her, nor rhyme her verses, nor paint her picture. I can only love her, and tell her so in homely language and fight for her country and die for her Liberty if needs be, -- but that won't hold a woman's heart."

That Fitch is also able to create a potent scene without the use of much dialogue is seen in his last scene:

(ANDRÉ is exalted, almost as if in a trance. He shows no emotion on his face, instead a sort of visionary, beatific expression... Far off is heard -- supposed to be heard by André only -- a woman's voice singing sweetly: --"Of all the girls that are so smart, there's none so sweet as Sally."

(She stops)

ANDRÉ. (Lifts his head to listen turning his gaze from the picture smiles; to Paulding)

Did you hear?

Paulding. Hear what?

(ANDRÉ looks at him puzzled)

ANDRÉ. (Turning to Nathan)

Did you not hear?

Nathan. Nothing

(ANDRÉ'S face changes to an expression of disappointment. A loud roll of muffled drums, the door C. opens, the CAPTAIN comes in, salutes -- Double lines of Continental soldiers are seen forming outside the window. He stands by door a little away from it -- two SENTINELS who follow him standing one on each side of the doorway. NATHAN and PAULDING have saluted and then

turn to André. NATHAN puts his arm around André's right shoulder; bell tolls.
MICHAEL who is breathing loud, almost suffocated by his grief, throws himself on the floor by his couch, his arms on it and his face buried in his arms,
PAULDING goes to take André's left arm, but just as he is about to take it, the woman's voice is again heard, distant, sweet, singing the last verse of:
"Sally." Again, supposed to be heard by ANDRE only.)

"My country calls and I must say Good-bye
Good-bye to darling Sally,
But far away I'm still her slave
As he who rows a galley,
And should a soldier's death be mine
And I ne'er marry Sally,
God Grant that we may meet some day
Though not in our alley."

(As he hears the first line, the disappointed look goes from André's face, very gently and kindly he takes Paulding's hand and gently leads him back to his right side with NATHAN, turns his face fixing his eyes on the place where Sally's eyes would be if she stood beside him, and reaches out his hand till he touches her spirit hand which he claps: and holding it tight with his eyes fixed on her spirit ones, he is led gently and slowly from the room through door R. U. by NATHAN and PAULDING, both with quivering lips and wet eyes)

(As the last line of the verse is being sung the CURTAIN SLOWLY BEGINS TO DESCEND, and falls just as ANDRE is going through the doorway)

THE END*

* * *

8. Ibid., pp. IV-20-21.
Fitch manages to produce varying contrasting atmospheres in this play. In the first act, by having the young men joke and call each other by their nicknames, he creates an atmosphere of happiness and easy-going informality. In the second act he shifts the moods back and forth between the happy preparations for a Mischianza and joy over Sally's good luck in captivating André and intense scenes where Sally refuses to marry her lover. The very happiness and calmness of the first part of the play makes its tragic ending still more tragic. Yet Fitch in a most clever manner makes the blow less sharp for the audience and dulls their feeling of sorrow by making André so busy walking with Sally in his imagination that he, himself, scarcely realizes that he is going to his death.

Fitch shows a keen observation of character and can characterize his subject with one line. All Sally's truthfulness and independence can be seen at a glance when she interrupts André, who is introducing her as "the Lady Sally," with the remark:

Not at all Captain Treherne, plain Miss Perkins at your service.9

Fitch knows women for he has them express their feelings that if their Mischianza is not to be a grander affair than that of the Philadelphia ladies, they do not want to have it at all. He also shows Nancy's cattish delight over the fact that Miss Peggy Rogers has the measles in the following humorous manner:

Nancy. (Laughing) And she is so devoted to her complexion! of course I'll be mighty sorry if there are any little spots left.
Polly. How spiteful of you, Nancy.
Sally. Nancy you're jealous because her hair was dressed higher than yours at the last assembly.
Mrs. Van Kort. Girls! Girls! what will these officers think of you? (To the Men) Don't notice them gentlemen, please, they're all Miss Peggy Rogers' dearest friends!
André. O that we could tell at once!

Moreover, although she has told André that she had a first love, Sally in a typically feminine manner cannot bear to hear that André, too, had loved, yet wants to know all about André's first love.

André. I had a first love too.
Sally. What? (Almost crying) You had? (Disappointed) O, what was her name?

André. Honora Sneyd, but I was only a boy —
Sally. (Jealously)
   Yes, but what was she like?
   (Almost crying)
André. Not so sweet as you
Sally. But light or dark?
      (Still half tearful)
André. The former, — I think; or else — the latter
Sally. And pretty?
André. Yes, and good.
Sally. And did she refuse you?]

Fitch portrays André in the first act as he really was — a gay, vivacious, socially adept, cultivated, and charming youth who was as Wither's here says "as fatal to one age [of ladies] as another!" We also see his serious business mood when he finds that the letters have not been delivered to him immediately. Yet there are flaws in the characterization of André for he is portrayed as being very jealous and sarcastic. He does not like it when Treherne compliments Sally and he hastily says to Smith who is complaining that he expects a chill, "I hope you won't be disappointed." When Van Wert undresses him in the search, André says:

"You'd make a good valet, young man, especially since you can't read handwriting. Really a treasure of a servant. Perhaps some time I'll engage you — You take off a coat as if to the manner born."

11. Ibid., p. I-34.
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The real André did not have these character traits. Since these traits are shown here for but a moment and never recur, Fitch had no reason to show them at all.

Fitch in a brilliant manner utilizes Sally and her song to unify the large mass of material in this drama. Long before Sally arrives we know that André loves her. It is because of her refusal to marry him that he sets out on his dangerous mission in this play. While on his mission we are reminded of André's love for Sally by seeing him take out her rose from his bosom. In his last hours he is comforted by dreams of Sally, and he goes to his death lulled by the thought that she is with him. Fitch makes the audience feel her presence in André's mind by having her actually appear in the dream scene as a talking portrait and by having her voice, singing the same song that she sang during the proposal scene in the first act, flow out into the darkness of the death scene. Yet Sally was in reality a figment of Fitch's imagination, and her presence in a historical drama is, therefore, open to criticism. The writer hopes that the critics, before they condemn Fitch for belying history, ponder over these words of G. J. Nathan:
One does not go to the theatre to see life and nature; one goes to see the particular way in which life and nature happen to look to a cultivated, imaginative and entertaining man and who happens, in turn, to be a playwright.  

The writer does not pretend that Fitch's *Major André* is a flawlessly written play. There are several very apparent weak spots in it. Much time is wasted for no purpose in Act I in the making of the punch. It is, moreover, unfortunate that Fitch was chary of scenes. André's escape from his captors is not historically true and is too melodramatic. Last, but certainly not least, the characterization is very poor at times.

*Major André* has defects, but its good points far outweigh its faults. It merited great success, yet it sank undeservedly into deep oblivion.

PART III.

CONCLUSION.
CONCLUSION

That the Arnold-André theme has been used more often by dramatists than any other event of the Revolutionary War is unfortunately true. Brander Matthews has pointed out that there was much in this story to attract the unwary playwright. In the first place, the action of the story evolved historically at a very rapid rate. The major André episodes took place between September 21, 1780, and October 2, 1780. With very little effort on his part, an intelligent dramatist could pack all the action into the time limit of a few days.

Another attractive element was the contrasted individualities of the two main characters, Arnold and André. Arnold was a greedy, gold-loving, capable, brooding man embittered by the constant wounding of his pride; André was a gay, vivacious, light-hearted youth of great talent and charm. Both were good characters for dramatic representation.

Indeed, the very fine character of André himself was a great factor in the popularity of his story. So
fine was his character that even today the story is enveloped by a sentimental interest that can be used to advantage by the dramatist working with this material.

The story also contained two background characters that could easily be worked up into figures of great dramatic interest. The figure of Washington, fascinating in its own solemn self, in this story had the added lustre of being almost that of a controlling fate. The figure of Peggy Shippen Arnold, the dainty and pretty young bride-mother whose life was completely affected by the episode, had great possibilities for the imaginative dramatist.

But the most important element that made this story attractive to playwrights lay in the momentous consequences involved in the outcome of the conspiracy.

Most of the plays on the André theme are poor plays written by poor dramatists. They failed because they did not merit success. The oblivion that overtook them is no cause for regret.
Two very "good" plays, however, were written on the André theme. They are André written by William Dunlap in 1798 and Major André by Clyde Fitch in 1903. Both of these plays, when viewed from the point of view of the tenets of the time they were written in, are well-made dramas. Both of the playwrights were long associated with the stage and were well versed in stagecraft. Yet André by William Dunlap is known only to students of American drama, and they only know it because it is representative of the dramatic technique of its author. Major André by Clyde Fitch, a delightful airy play, has suffered a worse fate. So deep is the oblivion into which it has sunk that it exists merely in the form of a typewritten prompt book in the theatrical collection of the New York Public Library.

André by William Dunlap and Major André by Clyde Fitch failed, and they did not merit failure. Since the failure of these dramas cannot be blamed on the dramatic ineptness of the playwrights, the writer contends that the blame for the failure of these plays and even, in part, of the poorly written plays must be laid at the doorstep of the André story itself. There are fatal weaknesses in the André story that make it unsuitable for dramatic representation.
Several of these weaknesses have been noted by Brander Matthews.

One fault of the André story lies in the fact that it is complicated by having two heroes, Arnold and André. If one hero is good, two heroes are not necessarily twice as good. In fact, the presence of two heroes is destructive since it divides the emotions and interest of the audience between two people rather than concentrates them on one.

Another defect lies in the fact that both of the main characters were base, if not in character at least in action. Great tragedy requires great personages. In the André story we find no great characters. Instead we have for heroes Arnold the traitor and André the spy. As Brander Matthews says:

The mainspring of the plot is ignoble; it is the vulgar treachery of a spendthrift selling his country for money to pay his debts. Arnold was a man of small motives, chief among which were envy and petty pique; he was a coward who fled when his plot was discovered, leaving his accomplice in the lurch and descending to the incredible meanness of surrendering to the British the men who rowed the boat in which he

escaped. It is difficult, not to say impossible, to give to a character like this the dignity and the largeness and the broad sweep of emotion which tragedy demands.

The character of Major André also destroys the dramatic value of the André story. The André story gained its sympathetic interest from the fact that John André was a good man who had to pay the supreme penalty for the one sin he had committed. The justice of his fate in view of his deed set up against the injustice of his fate in view of his character has upset the world for many years. Just as the world cannot reconcile itself to the death of André, the man, likewise an audience that has felt André's staged charm cannot reconcile itself to his death as a portrayed character. Yet the dramatist cannot save his tale by portraying André as a villain or by having him saved from the gallows without belying history in a most unacceptable manner.

The André story in true life and in dramatic form can never satisfy because it does not show poetic justice. Arnold, the villain, although despised for

2. Ibid., p. viii.
his treachery, gained revenge by serving against his country, secured enough money to live comfortably throughout his life, and died of natural causes in England on June 14, 1801. Again, the dramatist cannot satisfy the audience by hanging Arnold without belying history to an inexcusable degree.

Another fatal defect of the André story lies in the fact that there is a dearth of feminine characters. Women undoubtedly add spice to life, and their presence increases and often creates dramatic interest in a play. The only woman actually involved in the André story was Mrs. Arnold -- and her share in the plot was thought by most people to be indirect. Many of the dramatists tried their best to satisfy the need for women characters with Mrs. Arnold alone. Dunlap, partially falsified history by utilizing André's first love, Honora Sneyd, as a character. Fitch and others completely belied history by creating a fictitious love life for André. All of the dramatists suffered keenly from the dearth of love interest on the part of André.

The chief irremediable fault of the André theme lies in its lack of action. Had the two major
characters, Arnold and André, met at any time after André's capture, the dramatists would have had material for marvelous scenes. As it is, the dramatist is forced to rely upon conversation rather than action to arouse his audience, and the perils of his undertaking are immensely increased.

Enticed by the glitter of the André story many dramatists essayed the task, never realizing that the story itself made failure almost inevitable. Had success in the dramatization of this theme been possible, André by William Dunlap and especially Major André by Clyde Fitch would have been startling successes in their day.
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On a fateful day in 1779 John André, Adjutant General of the British Army in America, entered into a secret correspondence with the dissatisfied General Benedict Arnold of the Continental Army. Plans for one of the greatest treasons in the world were hatched by the pair, and André, in order to forward the proposed plot, arranged to meet Arnold. After an unsuccessful first attempt to plot in person, the conspirators did meet on the night of September 21, 1780. On the banks of the Hudson they planned until dawn the surrender of West Point to the British. André then entered the American lines from which he was fated never to emerge. The firing by Americans at the British gunboat that brought him to his rendezvous caused that boat to drop downstream and ruined André's plan of escaping by water. In direct contradiction of his orders André then assumed a disguise, hid treasonous papers in his boots, and utilizing a pass issued by General Arnold, attempted to make his way to the British forces. Near the end of his journey on
September 23, 1780, he was caught by three young Americans and turned over to the American authorities. Tried on September 29, 1790, by a board of General Officers, André was declared a spy and sentenced to be hung. André died on the gibbet on October 2, 1780. The traitor, Benedict Arnold, having been informed by André of his capture, escaped to the British among whom he lived until the end of his dishonored life.

The case of Major André fanned to a flame the patriotic sentiments of both the British and Americans. The exceptionally fine character of André made his death a source of regret to both sides. It is only to be expected that so high lighted an incident would fire the imagination of a dramatist.

There was much in the story to intrigue the playwright. The action of the story evolved rapidly, the two main characters were colorful and contrasting individuals, many prominent figures hovered in the background, much sentimental interest was attached to the figure of André, and the conspiracy that formed the basis of the entire incident involved momentous consequences.
Lured by these attractive elements in the story, twelve dramatists attempted the André theme, and all failed. The writer has examined the plays of ten of these dramatists to determine if she can, the factors leading to the failure of so many plays. Eight of the plays that were examined were poorly written works. The Spy by Philip Freneau was an undramatic fragment that exemplified Freneau's tendency to be both a very good writer and a very poor writer in the same piece. Its only claim to fame lies in the fact that it was written but a few weeks after the events it chronicles. The Glory of Columbia: Her Yeomanry was but a patriotic spectacle written by William Dunlap in 1803 to gain a few extra dollars. The only good pieces of writing it contains are the scenes that were lifted bodily out of Dunlap's superior play, André. West Point; or A Tale Of Treason, which was written by Joseph Breck in 1840, was an attempt to squeeze a very melodramatic and patriotic version of the André story into a few lines. The compressing of the story so destroyed its dramatic value that even the humor in the story could not redeem it from oblivion. The remaining five "poor" plays were written during the second half of the nineteenth century: Elihu Goodwin
Holland wrote *The Highland Treason* in 1852, Jason Rockwood Orton wrote *Arnold* in 1854, William Wilberforce Lord wrote *André* in the main in 1864 and P. Leo Haid wrote *Major John André* in 1876. All five of these plays were inartistic products of inept pens.

Two dramatizations of the André theme did not merit the fate that overcame them. They are *André* which was written by William Dunlap in 1797-1798 and *Major André* which was penned by Clyde Fitch in 1903.

*André* by William Dunlap had a hectic birth and life. It took nine years to write, and its parts did not satisfy the actors. At its première the stage mechanic left in a huff, Cooper forgot his lines, and the cockade incident was hissed. In all, it played only five times. It is a well-written play whose main defect is the lack of depth in its characterizations in general, although the character of Washington is masterfully handled. It is beautifully unified because all its action centers in the vain attempts made by Bland, Mrs. Bland and Honora to save André; and its blank verse is used in very natural, smooth-flowing dialogue.
Major André by Clyde Fitch lasted only two weeks on the stage and exists today only in the form of a typewritten prompt book. Yet it is a delightful, airy piece replete with good-humored joking and wit. The dialogue is short and snappy and rushes the action along. The action of the play is unified by the love motif that runs through it. This love story between André and Sally is a figment of Fitch's imagination, but is so well done that we do not mind the fact that it belies history. The characterization of the women characters is excellent, and Fitch shows great stagecraft in his pitting of a gay, light-hearted beginning atmosphere against a sombre death atmosphere at the end and in his toning down of the misery of death.

There are faults in both André by William Dunlap and Major André by Clyde Fitch, but the good points of these plays far outweigh their faults. Taken in the light of the eras they were written in, they are very fine dramatic pieces from the technical viewpoint. Their failure has led the author to believe that there are inherent weaknesses in the André theme itself that make failure inevitable. Analysis of all the plays has revealed six main defects of the André theme. The
story unfortunately has two "heroes." Both of these heroes are actually base. André's death, which was deserved when we remember his deed and which was undeserved when we remember his character, is very hard to accept. The story does not show poetic justice because André dies and Arnold lives. The story lacks women characters, and it contains very little real action and interplay of characters.

Since these faults cannot be remedied without belying history, dramatizations of the André story seem to be doomed to fail.