BOOK REVIEWS

A People’s Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years’ War.
By Fred Anderson. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984. xvi, 274p. Appendices, index. $25.00.)

Was the Seven Years’ War a factor in provoking the American Revolution? Fred Anderson believes it was, and his is a convincing argument.

Anderson looks into the experience of Massachusetts during that war. He finds that 176 towns in the province sent men to soldier after 1755. Hurled together from every corner of the colony, these men discovered that they shared a common outlook. They also learned that in significant ways they differed from their English brethren who served in the British army. The first discovery, Anderson concludes, taught them a powerful lesson about themselves. What they learned of the British soldiery was equally significant, though not until after 1763. After that date, when the ministry sought to implement its new colonial policies, the Massachusetts veterans of the Seven Years’ War found their way of life threatened by Englishmen “whom they personally knew to be capable of behaving in disturbing, threatening ways” (p. 223).

The beauty of Anderson’s study, however, is that it transcends the question of the causation of the Revolution. This monograph also is excellent social and military history. Anderson, for instance, finds that those who served in this war mirrored Massachusetts society. The average provincial soldier, he concludes, was a young man (about twenty-five years of age) who earned his livelihood as a laborer or skilled artisan. Roughly forty percent of the soldiery in 1756 were craftsmen; only one in five soldiers during that campaign was a landowner. The majority of those who bore arms had been engaged in manual farm labor before the conflict erupted. He found that no significant occupational differences distinguished those in the corps of officers from the enlisted men.

Anderson’s work also looks at service in an eighteenth-century provincial army. From the mustering of the army to its march to the front, from the training of the men to the nature of camp life, he provides a tapestry of rich detail. Perhaps his best work comes in the two chapters in which he chronicles discipline in these armies and the experience of combat. The barbarism of martial punishments in the British army of that age is well known. Its impact on the colonials, however, has not been fully appreciated, and it is Anderson’s judgment that the provincials departed service after a year or so convinced that the cruelty meted out to the redcoats occurred because the English officers were “morally deficient” and “bad men” (p. 141). Equally important, he adds, was that such a conclusion also led the
colonists to feel that they were morally superior to the men of the parent state. Anderson's chapter concerning battle experience seems a bit misplaced in this volume, but it is valuable for he clearly demonstrates how a soldier's role in an engagement shaped his view of the encounter.

Unfortunately, Anderson overlooks too much to make his work the last word on the subject of Massachusetts society and its armed forces in the Seven Years' War. Health problems and medical care within the provincial military units are barely treated. Society's view of its soldiery receives even less attention. While he richly details the soldiery's view of the British army, and he notes the outlook of British officers toward their provincial compatriots, he says next to nothing of the attitude of colonial warriors toward military service or about their own army. Nor does he adequately chronicle the American officers' judgment of their men. Most disappointing, however, is his failure to provide a detailed evaluation of the changing demographics that must have occurred within the several armies raised by Massachusetts after 1755. Finally, the volume suffers from the lack of a bibliography.

These omissions notwithstanding, Anderson has authored an important study that should be read by every specialist in early American history.

West Georgia College

JOHN E. FERLING


Sean Wilentz's "new" labor history study of New York City during the first half of the nineteenth century invites comparisons with Bruce Laurie's Working People of Philadelphia, 1800-1850, a 1980 publication familiar to readers of this journal. In Working People, Laurie provided three interrelated stories. He began with an overview of economic change in Philadelphia, emphasizing the unevenness of industrial development and the resulting diversity of work environments. Separate portraits of three cultural groups within the city's working class, distinguished from each other by lifestyle, religious orientation and political sensibility, then followed. A fairly straightforward account of trade union development and labor political activity in the city formed the final third of the monograph. Varied work experiences, ethnic and cultural divisions, and the moderating effect of the producer or republican ideology articulated by labor activists, Laurie generally argued, combined to prevent the formation during the antebellum period of a sustained oppositional, anticapitalist political movement on behalf of and by Philadelphia's working population.
Sean Wilentz's study of New York City during the same time frame differs from Laurie's in organization and emphasis—Wilentz's presentation is better integrated and less schematic and greater attention is devoted to ideology than to culture—yet the story related in *Chants Democratic* is remarkably similar to Laurie's chronicle of Philadelphia. Wilentz, for example, makes unevenness of industrial development a central theme of his work (although he points to important qualitative differences between New York and Philadelphia; New York by 1850 had a less well established factory sector and an even more complicated network of home, garret, contracting, and artisan shops). Wilentz also stresses the saliency of ethnic divisions within the antebellum working class, particularly during the 1840s, and notes limiting aspects of republican ideology. His narrative of trade union and labor political efforts, moreover, is almost identical to Laurie's. He takes the reader through the formation of journeymen's unions in the early part of the century, the establishment of a Workingmen's Party in the late 1820s, the explosion of activity accompanying the creation of a General Trades Union Council in the 1830s, and the demise of the movement with the Panic of 1837. Wilentz recounts the submergence of activism amidst ethnic and political divisions in the 1840s, the revival of radicalism in the late 1840s especially with the arrival of highly politicized German craft workers, and—in a vein similar to Laurie—the extraordinary labor upheavals that occurred in 1851. Because of internal discord, the latter conflicts came to naught in terms of sustained oppositional politics. New York City and Philadelphia provide for all intents and purposes the same history and the same lessons.

Wilentz's study does differ, however, in his lengthy, profound, and to date, unsurpassed treatment of republican ideology; his work is as much an intellectual as a social history of the American working class. Wilentz charts the genesis of republican sentiments in craft traditions and the experience of the Revolution; he further shows how republicanism fueled informed labor activism, and how, with the expansion and hardening of the wage labor system, working class advocates began to fix the ideology with a definite class perspective. In the most provocative section of the book, Wilentz argues that by the 1830s masters and journeymen who previously shared ideals and interests began to part company in their views and visions of the future. While articulate employers developed a variant of republicanism accentuating the values of individualism, growth, opportunity, and the necessary and beneficent workings of the market economy, their counterparts in the labor movement forged a separate understanding stressing notions of equality, fraternity, cooperativism, and the labor theory of value. Wilentz is quick to note that "workers republicanism" was hardly a revolutionary ideology, or a perspective either effectively distinct from appeals
of Democratic Party politicians or sensitive to the needs and interests of black, women and most immigrant workers; yet the disparity and articulation of different positions is a key development for him.

As a piece of historical research and writing Chant’s Democratic is truly impressive. But the definite and notable accomplishments of this study fail to still various doubts and questions. As with Laurie’s study, it is difficult, perhaps even more so here, to place the facts, stories and arguments of this book into perspective. Wilentz’s lending of great meaning and importance to the Workingmen’s Party effort of 1829 and the upheavals of 1851 as well as his argument that labor activists had developed a clear class analysis by the 1830s, seem overblown, especially without reference to other events or circumstances transpiring in society at the time. A sense of proportion is missing here, a problem common to historical works fixed on ideas and their role. Bruce Laurie did attempt to provide, successfully or not, a history of daily life, of workers at home, at work and in their communities, thereby pointing to the range of experiences and values that influenced working people’s lives. The meaning and force of ideology cannot be weighed without attention to the actualities and conditions of everyday existence, and on this score Wilentz’s work falls short.

Wilentz’s study also raises questions about the meaning of republican ideology, not just its assumed hold and sway on working people. The author emphasizes the mobilizing and radical aspects of republicanism, not its possible moderating or conservative role. A reckoning and evaluation of this now commonly-employed notion is presently in order.

Finally, Wilentz has found serious divisions within the so-called liberal consensus. But perhaps if Richard Hofstadter were alive today and able to read Chants Democratic, and the ghost of Hofstadter looms over this book, he might be more impressed (and probably depressed) by the extent and strength of shared liberal notions across class divides rather than with the emergence of some clearly oppositional perspective. And this is especially striking in the face of the growing inequalities in political, social, and economic power accompanying capitalist development that both Wilentz (and Bruce Laurie) so ably document for the early industrial period.

University of Pennsylvania

WALTER LICHT


Mormons are wedded to history, for as Richard Bushman says on the concluding page of this book, Mormons believe that “the Book of Mormon
was true history" and so are all the events (natural and supernatural) in the life of Joseph Smith. "The staying power of the Latter-day Saints from 1830 to the present," Bushman notes, rests "on the belief in the reality of those events." Mormons are "unable to take much interest in formal theology," Bushman writes, because "The core of Mormon belief was a conviction of actual events" (p. 188). Consequently the Mormons have dedicated themselves to analyzing every scrap of historical evidence they can discover about Joseph Smith, his family, his neighbors, and his environment. The first chapter of this book is devoted to an exhaustive account of the ancestors of Joseph Smith and their lives from 1732 to 1816. Though tedious to the non-Mormon, the account is necessary to show that there was nothing extraordinary in the background or family of Joseph Smith which can account for his sudden emergence as a charismatic prophet, chosen of God (except, perhaps, the inability of his immediate family to find any Christian denomination that seemed valid). Bushman is at pains to point out that "We can understand Mormonism better if it is seen as an independent creation, drawing from its environment but also struggling against American culture in an effort to realize itself" (p. 8). For him there is ultimately no way to account for the emergence of Mormonism except in terms of its supernatural origin (p. 153).

The ardent believer of any particular religion is at once the best and the worse expositor of that faith. He will bring the sympathy and insight of his own experience to his exposition, but for proof he must, in the end, rely upon faith and not historical evidence. Richard Bushman is both a devout Mormon and a first-rate historian. This book is a statement of his faith and will convince no non-Mormon of the authenticity of that faith. Bushman realizes that, and his effort is simply to try to set the historical background of the events surrounding the emergence of Mormonism in the most accurate possible perspective. The book devotes chapters to Joseph Smith's early supernatural encounters with God and the angel Moroni in the 1820s, to Smith's translation of the golden plates written in "reformed Egyptian" which Moroni revealed to him, to the debate over the authenticity of the Book of Mormon, and to the early days of the Church. Even to devout Mormons the events of Joseph Smith's life from 1820 to 1830 are complex, and Bushman performs a valuable service in providing a clear and careful dating of each of them almost month by month. However, the truth of these events, as the participants saw them (especially Lucy Smith, Joseph's heroically portrayed mother), is often documented by materials they wrote years afterward. We must accept Bushman's faith that the Smith family were not self-deceived or self-serving in these later accounts. Bushman also documents critical aspects of the content and accuracy of the Book of Mormon in terms of scholarship produced by Mormon scholars in Mormon
journals. This does not invalidate the possibility, for example, that the characters of the golden plates "closely resemble characters from Egyptian sources" [p. 88], it simply makes the reader wonder why Bushman does not find non-Mormon Egyptologists to confirm this. Smith's translation of the golden plates by the Urim and Thummin (and later by a dark gray seerstone) is documented by the scribes who wrote it down. So also for the story of the return of the golden plates to heaven.

Bushman accepts the fact that Joseph and his father did dig for hidden treasure and did use a seerstone to find lost objects prior to acquiring the golden plates, but this is considered simply part of the prevalent folk culture of the times among simple folk. It has no connection, in his opinion, with the supernatural revelations to Joseph which made him the prophet of a reformed Christian faith.

The book is at its best in examining the various explanations offered then and since for the origin of the Book of Mormon. He dismisses, rightly I think, the view that it was plagiarized from the work of Solomon Spaulding. He dismisses, rather too easily I think, the charges that much of it derives from the cultural environment of the times. It is almost irrelevant to him that many Americans then argued over the Jewish origin of the Indians, were worried over conflicting sectarianism, searched for true primitive Christianity, and eagerly awaited the millennium. For Bushman, "the Book of Mormon portrays another world in many ways alien to our own" (p. 133). Joseph Smith simply translated the lost history of those wandering Jews who came to America in 600 B.C. and to whom the future birth and resurrection of Christ was revealed at that time. In so doing, "Smith nearly obliterated the line between New and Old Testaments" and "was to receive ordinations from Moses and Elijah" (p. 185); he thus restored Christianity to its true origin and through him apostolic order was reinstated.

This volume will be of great value to Mormons for its careful summary of the evidence and scholarship on the background and early years of their prophet. For non-Mormons it will be a benchmark in contemporary scholarship between secular and religious history. Followers of William James could accept Joseph Smith's transition from a sick soul to a healthy one through a religious experience which was real for him and constructive for his followers, but Bushman eschews psycho-history. Non-Mormons will respect the author's commitment to revealed truth, but his book will not break the deadlock between believers and skeptics. It will only deepen the schism.

Brown University  

William G. McLoughlin

This study of the histories of two cities, according to the authors, held them “hostage for fifteen years.” They sum their method up as follows: “To the materials associated with the new social history and the framework of a comparative perspective we soon added some minimal techniques of quantification and, eventually, the computer’s ability to digest and aggregate large bodies of data.” What does “the computer’s ability to digest and aggregate large bodies of data” mean? Very little, I should imagine. And the fairly large body of data in this book is relatively meaningless. Comparative history is not just a history of two cities in the same book, which includes hardly a comparative or analytical line. The authors’ comparative method consists of treating a whole series of topics such as economics, crime, education, class, family, church and so forth by writing a paragraph or two on each topic in Boston, followed by a paragraph or two on Charleston. All facts are equally valuable, nor does one set of facts follow logically from another set; even sentences in the same paragraph seem to have little relationship to one another. In a paragraph on page 131, for example, the authors refer to the famous burning of the Ursuline Convent in Charlestown in 1834 in a sentence or two and then proceed to mention the “notable” “riot at St. Mary’s, whose parishioners were divided over whether temperance was a church issue.” The reader is told a line or two about the burning of the convent, but not enough to have any understanding of this important event. The riot at St. Mary’s is mentioned without even telling the reader where the church was located or its importance in the diocese. Facts, yes, but context, no. Twenty-three pages later (pp. 154-55) the Ursuline Convent burning is discussed in a little more detail but hardly adequately and certainly not comparatively with any of Charleston’s Catholic history. Another example of dangling of acts: Several (seven) times “the Affair of Denmark Vesey” in Charleston is referred to but there is no discussion of what the “affair” was all about anywhere in the book.

Perhaps most important of all, the authors make no attempt to select strategic areas for comparison. They find, for example, that one of the main differences between the cities was the fact that Bostonians tended to be exclusive while Charlstonians were inclusive. Now, one would imagine that a strategic difference in this connection would be the fact that Charleston had one of the oldest Sephardic Jewish communities in colonial America, while Boston had no colonial Jewish community at all, in spite of the philo-
Hebraism of Puritanism. Instead of making use of this important and revealing difference, there is only one brief paragraph on Jews in the whole book which mentions a “split within the (Charleston) Jewish congregation” in the 1820s and 1830s which could hardly be placed in context in an eleven-line paragraph. There is no mention of Boston Jews at all.

“The minimal techniques of quantification,” as the authors put it, were reserved for two appendices at the end of the book. Appendix B nicely repeats their every-other-paragraph-or-so method used in the text. There are, for example, eighteen tables in this appendix exploring the “Property Distribution and Changes in Property Ownership” in the two cities. No table includes data on both Boston and Charleston; the first nine tables (B-1 through C-9) include data on Charleston. It is not easy for me to make any conclusive comparisons from all this data. Perhaps a computer could do better.

University of Pennsylvania

E. Digby Baltzell


After far too many years of neglect, Martin Van Buren has been returned to center stage in the drama of Jacksonian America. In quick succession two modern, professionally researched biographies have appeared along with an equally interesting analysis of his presidency. Van Buren’s role in American politics was obviously a subject whose time has come. In Martin Van Buren and the American Political System, Donald B. Cole, the author of an earlier study of Jacksonian Democracy in New Hampshire, argues that Van Buren was not only “the quintessential party man” and creator of the modern conception of party politics, but also “the representative man of the age”—a “white upwardly mobile Northerner who began life on a farm and then turned to the new world of business.”

The title reveals the author’s primary focus. Cole traces Van Buren’s familiar career from his early involvement in New York politics where as the architect of the Albany Regency he gained the sobriquet, the “Little Magician.” (Interestingly, Cole does not use the term “Red Fox” and argues in contrast to John Niven and other biographers that Van Buren’s hair was blond rather than red.) In the 1820s Van Buren moved into the national arena as a senator. Cole follows his movement into the Jackson camp and his rise to power shaping the administration of the Old Hero and forging the nature of Jacksonian Democracy by combining traditional Jeffersonian ideals with a realistic response to “the demands of a new society.”
Such flexibility led to his election in 1836, but seemed to leave the “Little Magician” in the prolonged fight over the independent treasury that split the Democracy without providing any response to the depression. “By 1840 the magic was gone” and Van Buren went down to defeat at the hands of a nationally organized Whig party that had perfected political techniques “that he more than anyone else had developed.” The denouement of Van Buren’s political career came in the 1840s when he shifted from his long held pro-Southern stance to “new principles” and opposed the annexation of Texas. This led to his defeat in the Democratic convention of 1844 and his subsequent campaign as the candidate of the Free Soil party in 1848.

While most of this is familiar, the book is thoroughly researched, quite readable, and remarkably evenhanded. Cole continues the argument that Van Buren was a fairly consistent republican throughout his career. To the charges that he was a “trimmer,” Cole responds that “temporizing and compromising [were] part of the American way of life.” Cole’s most distinctive arguments are that Van Buren acted to moderate Jackson’s nationalism with a concern for states’ rights and strict construction and to create not only a party but also principles designed to “adjust to the social and economic revolution of the 1830s.” To a greater degree that some recent scholars, Cole admits that this entailed a willingness to accept a pro-Southern stand on the slavery issue.

Unfortunately, on his major points Cole has a tendency to assert his position rather than prove it. The structure of the modern Democratic party is never examined. Van Buren’s creative response to new economic problems is asserted when he is politically triumphant; defeat is blamed on a lack of such adjustment. The degree to which any of his proposals met new social and economic problems is not explored. Finally, for a book that represents wide research in the Van Buren materials there are some curious omissions. For example, Cole overemphasizes antislavery feeling in the North in 1840 and fails to even mention the effect on the election of pro-slavery sentiment in the South. Similarly, in discussing the events of 1843 and 1844 the key role of Robert John Walker is entirely ignored.

All in all, however, this is generally a good biography of an important figure. It is beautifully produced, but outrageously expensive.

Lehigh University  William G. Shade


Luscious illustrations in a “coffee-table” volume often mask a superficial treatment of subject matter. Not so this volume. Rather, this lavishly-
illustrated volume illuminates, through a kaleidoscope of collective biographies, a fascinating aspect of Americans’ redefining of their economy and their taste at the close of the Revolution.

This catalogue has much to tell us—and it is well-told—not only about the China trade, but also about the maturing of the scholarship of “material culture.” Long the purview of antiquarians rather than “serious” historians, the evidence of “material culture” has gained respectability only within the last generation. This “respectability,” coupled with the scholarly expertise now available, as a result of the shortage of university positions, to museums and other cultural institutions, has brought an ever-increasing sophistication to exhibition catalogs. This volume shows that development. The collaborative input of several of Philadelphia’s cultural institutions, ably coordinated by Jean Gordon Lee’s clear perspective and focus—and her palpable enthusiasm—have resulted in a volume that not only delights the eye but also stimulates the intellect on questions of taste and economics, politics, technology, and geography.

The flip-side of the whetting of our appetites for discussion of the social history of these pieces is, however, perhaps the disappointment of this volume. Though Jonathan Goldstein’s and Margaret Christman’s works on the social history of the China trade are cited in the bibliography, a look at the index and a perusal of the text suggests that the social history context received only cursory attention.

But no one book can do everything, and what Lee has done she has done well. The reader, who might wish for fuller information on the cost of some of these items in relationship to other consumer costs, may well be mollified by the sensitive and crisp discussion of the overriding influence of Quaker taste in defining “Philadelphia” taste. And even as we wish for fuller exploration of the technology of production, we can appreciate Lee’s deep and rich grasp of changing styles. The alphabetical biography format, chronicling more than three dozen of the families who pioneered the post-Revolutionary Chinese Market, makes it easier for social historians, who are often ill-at-ease with “material” evidence, to find this medium more accessible. Similarly, a glossary of archaic terms helps to make this catalog “user-friendly.”

Lee’s succinct introduction to this volume does provide some new insights into the heretofore inadequately-chronicled relationship between Philadelphia and the Chinese aspect of international trade. A companion essay, written by Philip Smith of the Philadelphia Maritime Museum further expands on considerations of geography and trade negotiations as they relate to the China trade. And both Smith and Lee give candid, if cursory, nods to the importance of opium in the success of that trade.

Woven into the biographical sketches and the meticulous curatorial detail,
research of style, and provenance, Lee's fine appreciation of and competence in her subject, is boldly evident. Her readers will be treated to a stimulating perspective on the development of exotic taste among post-Revolutionary Philadelphia trend-setters.

Temple University

EMMA J. LAPSANSKY


In the 183-year history of the Du Pont Company, its metamorphosis from a family-run gunpowder business to an international chemical conglomerate began in the middle of the nineteenth century under the influence of the founder's grandson, Lammot du Pont. Born in 1831, he received a B.A. degree from the University of Pennsylvania and joined the family enterprise in 1849. The poor health of his father, Alfred, the company's senior partner, discouraged Lammot's joining the Gold Rush, though an appetite for adventure had beckoned him westward. He turned his considerable energy toward chemical experimentation instead, receiving a patent for an improved gunpowder in 1857. In addition to acting as supervisor of refinery and laboratory operations under his Uncle Henry, who had succeeded Alfred as senior partner, Lammot was also placed in charge of all facilities outside the firm's enclave on the Brandywine.

The first of these acquisitions was a powder mill at Wapwallopen, twenty miles south of Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, which Du Pont purchased in 1857. During the next decade the company purchased a coal mining firm and the Wilmington and Reading Railroad. Ownership of these enterprises led Du Pont into battle to protect its interests from the competitive assaults of the Pennsylvania and Reading Railroad, skirmishes that proved Lammot's skills as a captain of industry. Under Lammot's guidance Du Pont pursued aggressive tactics of its own to consolidate the powder business and to buy out (or force out) rival firms, and it was largely as a result of Lammot's diplomacy and resolve that the Gunpowder Trade Association was organized in 1872 to set prices and establish sales territories for the industry as a whole. His leadership in the black powder field had long been acknowledged. As early as 1861 he was sent to England by Secretary of State Seward as a confidential purchasing agent to secure saltpeter for the Union. The following year he was selected by the nation's major black powder companies as their congressional lobbyist.

Ever the pioneer, Lammot developed a patented hexagonal powder for large-caliber guns, sponsored an expedition to the West that located sodium
nitrate beds and led to his partnership in the Wyoming Soda Company, and made steady improvements in the efficiency and productivity of the Delaware powder plant while acquiring powder companies in Canada that prefigured Du Pont's international scope.

Unlike his Uncle Henry, Lammot was convinced early on that dynamite would make serious inroads on the explosives industry. He not only invested in dynamite companies but decided in 1879 to sever his connections with Du Pont and set up a dynamite plant of his own, the Repauno Chemical Company, near Gibbstown, New Jersey, in which the Du Pont Co. arranged one-third ownership to maintain the semblance of family harmony. Lammot broke the Du Pont mold by placing non-family members in important management roles; he also established a workmen's club house and the first exclusively experimental laboratory facility for an American chemical company. The devoted father of ten, he was killed in an explosion at Repauno caused by workers' negligence in 1884.

Wilkinson's well-written biography, based on family papers, convincingly portrays Lammot as the man who "opened the door onto a new vista of opportunity" for Du Pont. Though already known, the point deserves re-emphasis. In many ways this is a study of a business through one of its principals, yet as such the book is rather superficial. While the author's main contributions to business history are details provided about Lammot's consolidation efforts and the formation of the G.T.A., there is little that is really new here. In this admirable biography of a businessman, the explosives industry itself is little more than a backdrop.

Philadelphia  

ERNEST H. SCHELL


LeRoy Ashby's examination of Progressive Era child savers, Saving the Waifs, invites us to consider the reasons for the plight of wayward youth. Some historians have seen the issue in symbolic terms—the need to create a kind of moral order amidst an increasingly chaotic urban landscape; others have measured the growing rates of dependent children and enumerated the various types of institutions which took them in—from farm schools to reformatories. Ashby looks at both the ideology and the effects of reform efforts, admitting that social control was an aim, but pointing out that boys' republics and children's homes were preferable to the reformatory or the street. He is adept at describing the complex motives which guided reformers, and at conveying the zeal of individual child savers.
Five case studies comprise the bulk of the book. Ashby surveys the work of Edward P. Savage, founder of the Children's Home Society of Minnesota who traversed the state to raise funds and visit the children he had placed in private families. He then analyzes the efforts of the women of the National Benevolent Association of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) who created orphanages in several states. In their crusade he finds elements of both traditional feminism as well as an attempt by the church to define its mission and expand its flock. Ashby quotes one church member who admitted that "Training the dependent child is the cheapest and most effective kind of evangelism" (p. 46). The third study is John Gunckel's Toledo Newsboys' Association, a self-governing association of child laborers or child entreprenuers, depending on the views of various reformers. Gunckel's efforts tapped a deep well of popular support amongst those who believed the discipline of work built character, but leading reformers were repelled by the notion that selling newspapers offered anything more than hard labor in a bad environment and an inducement to truancy. The Ford Republic, a farm home and junior republic outside Detroit, also adopted the self-government model. Ashby notes that it succeeded when its population was composed largely of dependent boys, but as the number of delinquent and emotionally disturbed residents grew, the institution became largely custodial. The final study is of Reverend George W. Hinckley, who created the Good Will Farm in Maine, run on the cottage system and emphasizing both agricultural and domestic training as well as good schooling.

Ashby concludes by reiterating the tensions within and without the child-saving movement, and in so doing helps to set an agenda for further research. The differing methods and goals of amateur and professional welfare workers need further exploration and the darker, more personally self-serving motives of reformers need to be probed. Ashby's focus on private, voluntary organizations severely limits his analysis. These groups operated in tandem with public agencies. Definitions of dependency and delinquency were muddy, at best, leaving children prey to the vagaries of the system, and enabling voluntary institutions to cull the best clients, leaving the hard-core cases to the state. The private agencies thus manufactured their success by limiting the kinds of children they served, a point which Ashby fails to convey adequately. A statistical portrait of children in institutional care would help to illustrate this fact, and would explain, to some degree, the popular support given reformers. Another critical issue is the shifting level of competition and cooperation between religious groups, particularly urban Catholic and Protestant organizations. To what degree did the ethic of reform and concern for social order modify the natural antagonism between religious organizations working to save the bodies and the souls of children? Child welfare
reform is a complex and compelling subject for analysis. Ashby has given us some important insights and has laid the groundwork for further study.

Francis C. Wood Institute for the History of Medicine  JANET GOLDEN


In 1975, Candace Falk accidentally discovered in a Chicago guitar shop a shoebox full of steamy love-letters written by Emma Goldman to Ben Reitman, the one-time "hobo king" of Chicago's outcasts. Falk at first resolved to "keep Emma's secret" (p.xv.); her later change of mind inspired this biography, which has as its central theme the ten-year Goldman-Reitman love affair. Goldman, the most notorious radical in the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, appears in this biography as a personification of the emotional afflictions that often seemed the fate of the non-conforming women who were insisting openly on enjoying the pleasures of non-marital heterosexual love. Quoting relentlessly from Goldman's erotically explicit letters to Reitman, Falk portrays her as a woman both exasperated and overwhelmed by her dependence on a man who satisfied her sexually, yet whose vulgarity, boorishness, and constant infidelity could reduce her to petulance, whining, and attempts at emotional blackmail. Others who have studied the lives of anarchist women will realize that Goldman's situation was not entirely unique. Voltairine de Cleyre, the Philadelphia anarchist who was Goldman's occasional ally and frequent rival, had a tormented love affair, describing herself as a "slave" to her passion. And lesser known women in the movement, Helena Born and Miriam Daniell for example, also led complex erotic lives. None of them, however, left such particularized evidence about their sex lives as did Goldman, whose letters detail her actual sexual practices as well as the fantasies that she and Reitman shared.

The significance of Falk's book depends chiefly on the love letters, which for their startling frankness should be of major interest to historians of sexuality. Ever since Carl Degler discovered the Mosher survey, historians have been speculating on the extent to which women during this period expressed their sexual needs or fantasies. Recently, Peter Gay has provided historians with a detailed account of the erotic life of Mabel Loomis Todd, an Amherst matron and illicit lover of Emily Dickinson's brother Austin. This biography of Goldman now offers further evidence of the complex nature of female sexuality during this era. Regardless of whether, collectively, these studies of the sexual lives of an anarchist free-lover, a middle-
class Victorian-era wife, and the college graduates surveyed by Mosher can offer enough evidence to prompt a reinterpretation of late nineteenth-and early twentieth-century sexual behavior, Falk's analysis is of genuine importance.

*Love, Anarchy and Emma Goldman* is rich in details about Goldman's relationships with other lovers, and with male and female friends. Falk's choice of a style that conveys intimacy rather than one of scholarly detachment (Goldman is Emma, Alexander Berkman is usually Sasha, Reitman is Ben) underscores the biographer's apparent belief in the pre-eminence of the intimate over the public life. This may account for what is a principal shortcoming in Falk's analysis: she too often takes Goldman's letters at face-value, accepting that Goldman's love for Reitman had overmastered her and weakened her dedication to the anarchist cause, arguing that Goldman's "commitment to the political work that had become the core of her existence was now shaken by this worthless hobo" (p. 77). That such a reading is too facile and uncritical Falk seems at times to recognize, in one case alluding to Goldman's role as provider for the *Mother Earth* staff and noting that "no matter what else she might long for, she had chosen this life for herself" (p. 147). After all, Goldman's own style was always melodramatic, in her published works as well as in her correspondence; it is significant that some of these extravagantly emotional love letters ended with a crisp discussion of business matters, Reitman being her manager as well as her lover. Furthermore, during her years with Reitman she spent, by her own choice, substantial periods of time away from him.

Falk's exhaustive research has brought to historians important and hitherto neglected sources, and her work enlarges our understanding of the conflicts between Goldman's private needs and her public commitments. Nevertheless, the genuine pain as well as the ecstasy of her erotic life should not blind us to the fact that in the final analysis her political commitments came first. When Goldman was ultimately forced to choose, she consciously chose her political work and her sexual autonomy, accepting whatever pain accompanied her decisions. In evaluating the significance of these detailed revelations about Goldman's intimate life, we must not lose sight of the meaning of her lasting choices.

Stockton State College

MARGARET MARSH


Harvey Klehr's *The Heyday of American Communism: The Depression Decade* traces the role of the Communist Party in American politics and society
from 1930 to 1940. Beginning with the Party’s “Third Period” policies of the early 1930s and ending with the Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939, Klehr contends that the Communist Party followed the dictates of the Comintern in the Soviet Union and was never a truly independent American political entity. By building its political platform on a policy set in Moscow and linked to the Soviet Union’s needs, Klehr argues, the American Communist Party could never exercise a sustained, coherent political influence on American life. This lack of American “roots” became the germ of the Party’s disappearance as a force in American politics.

Klehr uses virtually every detail of Party activity to outline the effects of Comintern policy on the American Communist Party. He discusses Earl Browder, Philadelphians William Z. Foster and Sam Darcy, and others involved in internal Party conflicts. He draws upon interviews, primary sources, newspaper accounts, secondary literature, and the Theodore Draper papers to describe how the Communist Party formulated its position on unions, racism, youth, the unemployed, and other important problems of the decade. Klehr relates how the Party decided at first to become a separate and complete political apparatus. Building its own organization was no easy task, however, because that meant maintaining a certain “purity” (as enunciated by the Comintern) from other leftist organizations and therefore remaining on the fringe of American life.

The scenario that Klehr draws is one of the Communist Party cut off from mainstream political currents—from reformers, liberals, progressives—in the interests of building a separate identity. The Party considered socialists particularly vile because these “social-fascists” paraded as leftists while giving in to the capitalists and thus deceiving people about their real intentions. The Communists unmercifully attacked such liberal leaders as Franklin Roosevelt and United Mine Workers Union President John L. Lewis for being thus deceptive.

By the mid-1930s, however, the Comintern began to worry about the threat of the growing Nazi and Fascist regimes in Europe, explains Klehr. Deciding that a policy of collective security would best benefit the Soviet Union, the Comintern declared a “Democratic Front”: the “line” on building a separate entity for the American Communist Party abruptly changed and the Communists dutifully began to join liberal political organizations and work from within these organizations to achieve harmony with the elements in society that were supporting collective security. Overnight, Roosevelt, Lewis, and other former enemies became heroes. Those communists who disagreed with this new line found that they either had to change their thoughts or see the end of their influence within the Party.

Klehr argues that by the end of the 1930s the American Communist Party had become almost a conservative force in American political life,
vehemently opposing any and all who opposed Roosevelt. Party membership increased, and its influence within unions and reform organizations grew. Communists were invited into the fledgling Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) to help do basic organizational work and rose to power within a number of unions in the CIO. Politicians sought the support and advice of the Communists. Because of their incredible energy, drive, and motivation, the Communists achieved an influence in American reformist politics far in excess of their numbers.

When the Nazi-Soviet Pact was signed and World War II began, the Comintern made it clear that the new line would be to keep America out of the “imperialist war.” Immediately, Roosevelt and many other “heroes” reverted to their old status as enemies, and the Communist Party made an abrupt turn against its policies of the previous four years. As a result, Klehr says, the Communist Party lost membership and power. Although after 1941 the Party returned to the policy of a Democratic Front, it never again achieved the power and influence it once had.

Professor Klehr has conducted a comprehensive study, but he brings perhaps an eye for too much detail to bear on his work. Instead of sorting out and synthesizing the wealth of material, he presents an overwhelming mass of names, dates, and places; the reader is then left to try to understand it all. As a result, one has little sense of the history of the period. Events seem to emerge from previous events with little or no cultural or historical analysis to help the reader gain perspective. Moreover, by concentrating on the Party’s institutional work and policy decisions, Klehr largely ignores the personalities that made up the drama of being a member of the at once reviled and idealized American Communist Party in the 1930s. In addition, Klehr is somewhat hostile to the Party, which suggests that perhaps his own “objectivity” on this highly emotional subject is not so “pure.” Still, Klehr’s study is a useful compendium of the Party’s activities during the complex Depression decade and fills a void in scholarship about the scope of the Party’s activities during this time.

Temple University

DAVID M. JACOBS


Although this widely reviewed book by David Wyman has all the trappings of serious scholarship, I think that the author is as concerned about the souls of people today as he is about the uncovering of historical truth of America and the Holocaust, 1941-1945. Wyman has written previously
about this subject; in this latest book he continues his story into the period of the actual destruction of European Jewry. His conclusions are expressed succinctly in his title: *The Abandonment of the Jews*.

Wyman's book is a *cri de conscience* about what men did not do for their fellow human beings. Wyman, a man with a strong sense of man's duties and obligations to one's fellow man, has looked at the activity of Americans, both Jewish and non-Jewish, during the Second World War and has found great deficiencies. Leaning heavily on official government documents and on available archival material, the author finds very few heroes, but neither does he relate numerous tales of individual malevolence. In a matter-of-fact scholarly style, the author lays out extensive evidence to tell a tale of anti-Semitism in the State Department, of nativism in the State Department and in Congress, of political timidity by Roosevelt and by some Jewish leaders, and above all of a lack of compassion by policymakers and by bureaucrats at all levels of government. It is a story of hard-heartedness and cruelty, but it is also a tale of "the banality of evil," of little men carrying out acts of tremendous consequence. These attitudes and actions were reinforced by an almost total lack of attention by the major American newspapers to the tragedy of European Jewry. In every case Wyman marshals massive documentary evidence to make his points. He does not need to draw the moral of the tale; readers may make inferences about the actors in the drama from Roosevelt through government officials down to Jewish leaders and the editorial boards of the leading American newspapers. Their actions speak loudly enough without Wyman pointing his finger in sermon-like chastisement.

From 1941 to 1945 some people tried to rescue the Jews of Europe. Some Europeans smuggled out the secret of the Nazi exterminations, and some Jewish leaders in America turned everywhere to get the American government to act. Wyman relates in great detail many of these activities, and he underlines the total lack of interest by the American press in this issue. Many of the actors in this story are well known, like Stephen S. Wise and Abba Hillel Silver (both leaders in the American Jewish community). On the other hand, other actors did not play leadership roles but were significant individuals in the story, like Breckenridge Long in the State Department and the unnamed American consuls in Europe who connived at denying visas for unfilled immigration quotas to desperate Jews.

One question that has haunted American Jews for decades is why the Americans did not bomb Auschwitz in 1943 to 1944 to wipe out the killing factory. Wyman earlier published an article posing this same question, and he again comes up with the same puzzle of unwillingness by Roosevelt and the American military to carry out a relatively simple detour on one of the many bombing runs over Central Europe in 1944.
Why the apathy about the fate of the Jews? Why the unwillingness to admit the desperate? Why the reluctance to support refugee camps in Europe and North Africa? Why the refusal to bomb Auschwitz? The answers to all these questions seem to lie in the attitudes of Americans in the 1930s and early 1940s. Nativism in general and anti-Semitism in particular were respectable enough to silence politicians; people of conscience were not to be heard or were not heeded. In a broader sense, the refugees could find no place to go, either in America or in Europe. No one wanted them because they were perceived to be a threat to the stability of the societies asked to accept them. One criticism of the book lies in the weight assigned by Wyman to his various topics. Large and small issues all receive scrutiny, and the reader is sometimes misled into thinking that a particular description is leading up to a major rescue tale, only to find that only a few hundred people could ever have been involved. In most situations, actions to save a few hundred would be heralded far and wide; the enormity of this tragedy gives different proportions to the story.

Wyman would be pleased if it could be shown that American society were more humane today than it was in the 1940s. In that light, it is particularly striking that the plight of Ethiopian Jews appeared as front-page news in American newspapers recently, a situation that would never have occurred a few decades ago. Moreover, the presence of tens of thousands of southeast Asians, Cubans, and Haitians in the United States, regardless of the tensions that this presence causes, suggests that the American sense of public duty is different from an era when no one (American or European) wanted refugees, no matter what their plight.

Temple University

LAWRENCE SCHOFER


This work is the third and concluding volume of Professor Fine’s bibliography of Frank Murphy. The first volume dealt with Murphy’s years in Detroit and the second covered the five years of Murphy’s role as High Commissioner of the Philippines, his service as Governor of Michigan and his unexpected reelection defeat in 1938. The present volume carries his story through his one-year tenure as Attorney-General to his death in 1949. As is true of its predecessors, this is a very large volume chock-full of detailed discussion of Murphy’s activities as Attorney-General and Supreme Court Justice. A good deal of the often overwhelming detail in this massive biography results from the approach Professor Fine has taken to his subject.
As he puts it in his Preface "I was as much concerned with the issues that confronted Murphy in his several public offices as with the man himself." Thus, especially in dealing with the Court, Murphy per se will sometimes disappear as relationships between say Black and Frankfurter are analyzed. Nevertheless, one emerges from a reading of this volume with a real feeling for the fabric of our highest court. And, if one reads carefully, there is contained within the general narrative discussion many keen insights and judgments on men and events. One such is the observation that Frankfurter, despite his belief "that he did not permit personal conviction to affect his judgment as a justice," had a "criterion for judging fairness" that was "inherently a subjective one that had natural law overtones and yielded a 'variable result' from case to case" (p. 289).

Perhaps more importantly, Professor Fine give us a picture of a man "driven by self-love and a never relaxing ambition, but one whose dedication to tolerance, freedom and concern for the needy and oppressed seldom wavered in his long and distinguished career." Fine sees clearly that Murphy's narcissistic nature and basic insecurity made dissent a natural posture for him. (In the case of Prince v. Massachusetts, Murphy was afraid Rutledge would join him in dissent and thereby prevent him from being "the lone dissenter." ) But Fine notes that this psychological predisposition did not determine the nature of his dissents which invariably followed his belief that the unpopular, the minorities and victims of discrimination should be protected.

Murphy had been brought back to the United States from the Philippines in 1936 to run for Governor of Michigan. As was the case throughout his life, his two years as Governor were filled with strife and historic events. His defeat in 1938 left him the New Deal's most distinguished lame-duck and led to his appointment as Attorney-General. This was a somewhat ironic turn since it had been Murphy's early desire to have just that position. By 1939, however, his desire to be at the center of things made the Department of War his goal. In the usual Rooseveltian way, Roosevelt led Murphy to believe that his tenure as Attorney-General would be brief and would be followed by his appointment as Secretary of War. His tenure was, true enough, brief, but it was to the Supreme court that Murphy went rather than to the War Department.

Murphy had serious misgivings about going on to the Supreme Court and stalled his appointment as long as possible. Bowing finally to presidential pressure and the promise again that his tenure would be a short one. Murphy joined the Court in 1940 where he remained until his death in 1949. Murphy never felt truly at home on the bench and attempted many times to return to a more active political life. There can be no doubt that he was not the equal of Frankfurter in the mastery of legal knowledge and argu-
mentation and, in fact, Frankfurter thought him inadequate to the job. Both during his tenure as a Justice and after his death, Murphy has been classified as a "weak sister" on the Court. Fine's study, however, balances this opinion by carefully examining Murphy's opinions and pointing out how often Murphy's dissents later became majority opinions. Murphy's lack of "lawyerly skills" has been made too much of and his defense of "preferred freedoms" anticipated much of our later history. Probably the best epitaph for Murphy was the comment in the Detroit News "that the world was a better place for his having been there" (p. 596).

Lehigh University

JOSEPH A. DOWLING


Bensel leaves us in no doubt as to his thesis. "The existence of sectionally based political conflict constitutes the most massive and complex fact in American politics and history" (p. 5). Other elements have been of "secondary, transient importance" (p. 411). The reason for that since 1880 is clear. The "salient domestic issue in American politics between the end of the Civil War and the Great Depression was the issue of economic colonialism" (p. 372). As a result, "the American party system . . . was firmly rooted in economic competition between the metropolitan-industrial North and the rural-agrarian South" (p. 368). This core versus periphery conflict declined only during the New Deal era with the emergence of a "bipolar" Democratic coalition of Southerners and Northern urban workers within the Democratic party. But this exception, in turn, has weakened since 1964, promising a return to the norm of sectional polarization in the future.

Bensel bases his argument on the roll-call record of the House of Representatives, closely examined at the mid-point of each decade since 1880. In these votes, sectionalism was "the most fundamental influence" (p. 411). At each end of the voting scale, a sectional core of different trade areas centered around major urban market centers, clustered. Bensel has also read widely in the conventional sources and provides extensive descriptions of the nature of the American political economy, and close analysis of specific policy disputes. All of this is strongly argued in a fully textured presentation which has little patience with alternative explanations of the dynamics of American politics.

Fair enough. Bensel, a political scientist with both a respect for historical evidence and a social scientist's flair for generalizing, deserves high marks for his illuminating attempt to reorient us to basics and his sweeping and
careful examination of a century of congressional behavior. Historians will benefit from this penetrating analysis of crucial policy processes and his close examination of congressional adjustments to political-economic realities. But, while applauding his energetic spelling out of a particular vision, qualms will remain about his sharply etched revisionist stance. Despite his methodological rigor and care to note exceptions and meet potential objections to his large-scale assertions, his case is incomplete, not as complex as it might be, and flawed by problems of evidence and the way connections are made. As often happens, his methods, while carefully controlled, lead him to make choices that may limit the reach of his conclusions more than he admits. For example, his use of only certain roll calls at specific time points has the potential to distort. At the same time, the principles of selection he uses, concentrating on the roll calls that demonstrate high sectional polarization, seem to favor his thesis, no matter how carefully handled. Finally, the only roll calls that can be used in determining his sectional polarization index are the closely competitive ones in which the winning margin does not exceed 55% of the total vote. This, too, suggests possible simplifying, an incomplete view of the whole and the need for further probing.

The concept of sectionalism is an honored one among historians—honored recently in its breach, Bensel might argue. But it needs careful handling. Certainly, the idea of specific trade areas (as many as sixty-five of them) is a conceptual refinement. But it is also one that may submerge the larger perspective as a useful organizing concept. Furthermore, the relationship between party and section is a more complicated one than suggested by the imperatives of political economy, dependency relationships and rational choice. Parties consist of specific economic interest groups. They also have elements in them rooted in historical memories, prejudices, and traditions. While people became Democrats or Republicans for reasons of location and sectionally rooted notions of economic needs, other matters, equally important to them, also shaped their commitments. These certainly dominated popular voting behavior and party choice in the first half of the period considered here. Nor is it clear which came first, specific sectional commitments to a particular party, or choices made after a complex of economic relationships built around core-periphery conflict showed the way. Finally, no matter how artfully confronted and explained, a perspective which does not hold for half of the period under review, raises real questions about its power as the “primordial” element in American politics. All of which suggests the need for continued probing along the fault lines Bensel has so thoroughly laid out.

Cornell University

JOEL H. SILBEY
This study of the urban area located at the very heart of the DuPont Chemical empire is a very good one. Not only does the book fill a rather large gap in the literature by supplying the history of a one-industry town over-shadowed by the towering figures of the DuPont family, but it also traces through the twentieth century a number of important urban issues. The book begins with an overview of Wilmington's history before 1900 and then settles down to an impressive discussion of public policy in an essentially urban biography form. The power structure argument is imaginatively handled. So too are mass transit, automobiles and highways, education, the tumultuous relationship between city and suburbs, race, neighborhood, ethnicity, spatial relationships and the physical evolution of the city, and the disappointing and mysterious federal-urban partnership. Together these subjects cover a great expanse of intellectual territory, much of it treacherous; but Professor Hoffecker traverses most of it without accident. The discussions of race, politics, and power are especially mature, fair-minded, and free from cant. More than anything else, the book is a critique of the idea of national urban policy or planning. Although the author did not set out to write such a book, that theme is nonetheless dominant. Hoffecker examines the policies of revenue sharing and the Federal Housing Administration, the liberal approaches of the Great Society, and the "mixed" initiatives of the era of urban renewal, and finds them all inadequate. However, unlike some urbanists who continue to believe that the modern state can "solve" the problems of the modern city, if only it is given another chance, Hoffecker resists that conclusion. As the author notes, many, if not most, federal urban initiatives are born of "current" crises of race, center-city commercial decline, general depression, unemployment, housing, or whatever. "Since one of the hallmarks of modern American society is rapid change, it has been impossible for even the best intentioned legislators or bureaucrats to imagine policy goals that will outlive a single decade" (p. 261).

True to her own conclusion, Hoffecker, with one exception, resists the temptation to sketch out yet another grand solution to the urban dilemma. The author does believe that the lessons of our urban past justify a faith that the further integration of city and suburb will more fully guarantee the good health of our urban future, but refuses to go beyond that conclusion. As Hoffecker recognizes, tomorrow will be as treacherous, unpredictable, and humorous as yesterday; and simplistic panaceas will not be any more suitable for the next set of events than they were for the last.
On the way to this conclusion, Hoffecker uncovers some decidedly incongruous situations: blacks hesitant about or opposed to school integration or city-county consolidation that might water down black power; white initiation of school integration even when it involved busing; supposedly all-powerful DuPont interests being balked (at least on some issues) by middle-income professionals; and white ethnic politicians consigning their own neighborhoods to the urban highway-man’s wrecking ball.

The only major flaw in this impressive performance is Hoffecker’s seeming unfamiliarity with much of the urban history literature relevant to this inquiry. The works of Jon Teaford, Mark Rose, and Roy Lubove were integrated into this study, but the works of many others on the auto, mass transit, race, city politics, and other topics are missing. This oversight does not necessarily invalidate the conclusions of this very good book, but it does make the author overly dependent on the insights of social scientists and others who look at human affairs from a short-range perspective and upon the materials of one single urban area. A broader approach would have enriched this impressive study by more fully integrating it with the literature of others who look at the experience of urban man over time.

University of North Carolina

ROGER W. LOTCHIN


In American history, the relative war powers of Congress and the president have traced so uncertain and shifting a course that it might have made little difference if the Constitution had been all together silent on the subject. The recurring themes—presidential action taken without Congressional approval, or the respective powers of the two branches in foreign affairs—have been debated with the same intensity and as inconclusively a century and a half ago as today.

Henry Cox’s study proceeds from the Jackson era to the death of McKinley. Cox has impressive credentials as both a legal scholar and as a historian, and he has brought his dual erudition to bear on a huge volume of nineteenth-century source material. These included State Department records and correspondence, debates from the Congressional Record, presidential papers, American and British newspapers, statutes and treaties, opinions of the Attorney General, and private diaries. The scope of the book goes beyond military actions and the war power to embrace diplomatic relations generally, the appointment of foreign missions, treaty negotiations, and the control of information by the executive branch. These are, of course,
often the necessary prelude to the exercise of the war powers. Accordingly, the breadth of the work and the mass of documentation made this history an undertaking of massive proportions. Cox, however, has succeeded in drawing his subject together into a singularly readable text which can be appreciated equally by legal scholars, by practical politicians, or by students of law and government.

In the continuing debate over the exercise of the war powers, Cox has delineated significant trends of this constitutional conflict. One is the continuing growth of the presidential power. We are somewhat surprised to learn how assertive President Tyler was in this respect. We might expect strong action from a Jackson or a Polk, but Tyler, Buchanan and Benjamin Harrison are revealed as remarkably assertive leaders.

Another aspect is that the constitutional conflict comes into sharp relief in the lesser incidents of foreign relations—in border skirmishes, naval incidents, and like minor incursions. In times of actual war or great national emergency the president's discretion is far less likely to be questioned by Congress. By example, Congress was far more upset by an "improvident resolution" which gave President Buchanan "unlimited power" to use force against Paraguay, than by Lincoln's suspension of the writ of habeas corpus only a few years later.

Finally, Cox perceives that, in the final analysis, politics rather than constitutional law has prevailed in the disputes between president and Congress. Indeed, the role of the court in this arena has been remarkably minor, and particularly so in the last century. It is Cox's grasp of these realities that gives this study its special value. We perceive that the constitution is intended as a framework for action, a sign post rather than a directive, and the practicalities of exercise of powers have had to be disputed and negotiated again and again between the president and Congress. The Constitution, then, has been more an invitation to a struggle between the branches than a means of resolution.

Our recollections of nineteenth-century America of course emphasize the larger domestic issues—the Civil War, the industrial revolution and the westward expansion. The lesser foreign policy issues of the day are obscured by the passage of these greater events. It is with some surprise that we are reminded that American involvement in Central America today raises the same constitutional issues posed in the nineteenth century in that same part of the world. In 1831, the President characterized Argentina's actions in the Falklands as "piratical"; in 1853 we were concerned with countering unfriendly foreign presence in Cuba; in 1857 the President urged Congress to grant him discretion to make an armed intervention into Nicaragua; and in 1882 the United States asserted a role as guarantor of Korean inde-
pendence. How remarkable that all these scenarios have been revived in present times!

Countering this array of familiar names, we find an equal number of burning issues of the last century which today could not achieve recognition even in a game of Trivial Pursuit. There was our naval action against Austria in 1853; the Canadian Revolution in 1837; our invasion of Sumatra in 1832; and our intervention in Brazil in 1894. Can it be remembered that a draft bill—universal military service for every male between the age 20 and 45—was brought before Congress in 1840 to meet a threat of war with Britain?

Cox has made a vital contribution to this little-understood area of political history and constitutional development: the power to bring the nation to war. At a time of present uncertainty, this work will be of large value both to students and practical politicians. For any reader, it opens a window to the tangled foreign relations of the growing republic.
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