

vate charity was preferable to public programs, reflected the period's premium on unfettered economic competition. Finally, "scientific charities" and settlement houses revealed the more recent tendency to examine environmental factors as the cause of poverty. Trattner believes that the New Deal marked the full acceptance of the right to public assistance. Poverty "was no longer regarded as a question of personal weakness" (p. 242).

It is true that relief has become a permanent federal expenditure. However, Trattner neglects ongoing opposition to welfare. His treatment of the post-New Deal era is skimpy and sparse. Trattner does reveal a general understanding of broad trends in American and seventeenth century British history and their impact on social welfare. However, he hardly mentions the development of social welfare programs in Europe in the latter nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and does not explore regional differences within the United States. His work is a valuable invitation to further research.

Trattner clearly identifies his bias in favor of public welfare; for example, an exclamation point is used in discussing Hoover's stand on direct public relief in 1930 and 1931. This book is based on the author's class lectures, and it shows it. In the preface, he denounces footnotes as impractical, an injustice to his years of reflection on the subject. This imposes a burden on readers and reviewers. It hampers future research; it demands acts of faith instead of traditional critical appraisal. Such statements as "Or, as an equally perceptive person put it . . ." (p. 220) leave the reader perplexed. The bibliographies at the end of each chapter offer some compensation. Despite these shortcomings, the book is a welcome contribution to the study of social welfare.

*University of New Haven,
West Haven, Connecticut*

Joseph B. Chepaitis

Indian-White Relations: A Persistent Paradox. Edited by Jane F. Smith and Robert M. Kvasnicka. (Washington: Howard University Press, 1976. Pp. xx, 278. Notes, illustrations, maps, appendix, index. \$15.00.)

This volume contains a collection of edited papers and commentaries presented June 15-16, 1972, at the National Archives conference on research in the history of Indian-

white relations. The tenth in a series of semiannual conferences sponsored by the National Archives and Records Service, it was designed to focus attention on the research potential of materials in the National Archives, to provide federal archivists with guidance and counsel on how best to meet the research requirements of scholars, and to foster improved communications and a continuing dialogue between archivists and the scholarly community.

The papers and commentaries focus on the topics of the major resources of the National Archives, Indian assimilation in the nineteenth century, Indian collections outside the National Archives, the role of the military, recent research on Indian reservation policy, and aspects of twentieth century federal Indian policy. In many instances an edited book presenting the views of a group of scholars does not read well and is uneven in the quality of scholarship. This is not the case in *Indian-White Relations*. All the papers are of high quality, reflecting the good scholarship of the contributors.

The reader will not always agree with the conclusions reached, especially in the commentaries. It is difficult to concur with Louis Bruce that "Indian self-determination is going to be a complete reality not too far ahead of today, and when it is, one of the incomplete chapters of American history will then have been completed" (p. 250). D'Arcy McNickle states that "John Collier was whipped in this area [policy] because one man in the Senate committee, the staff clerk, was bitterly opposed to him. Collier had refused to name this man as chief counsel of the bureau at the beginning of his administration. Collier was never forgiven" (p. 257). Unfortunately, this strong statement does not have any documentation. Lawrence Kelly contends that "most of the sparse literature on the Indian New Deal creates the impression that Congress broke with the traditional philosophy of assimilation and adopted instead a policy encouraging Indian cultural, political and economic autonomy." Actually, "the seeds of the termination movement which surfaced in the early 1950's were planted in the latter years of the Collier administration" (p. 240). This is an interesting conclusion which deserves serious consideration. W. David Baird was not satisfied with one of the papers, so two-thirds of his commentary was "an extension of Professor [Kenneth R.] Philip's paper rather than a criticism of it" (p. 216). Baird was able

to add some valuable material which contributed to Philip's presentation.

Although these scholars did not always agree, in most instances their criticism was constructive and contributed to the success of the conference. This book is an important contribution to understanding the present state of scholarship regarding the history of the native American.

Missouri Southern State College, Joplin Robert E. Smith

Sectionalism, Politics and American Diplomacy. By Edward W. Chester. (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1975. Pp. xiii, 348. Bibliography, indexes. \$12.50.)

This is a disappointing book. Purporting to be the first scholarly synthesis of primary and secondary literature bearing on the effects of sectionalism and politics on American diplomacy from the Revolutionary era to the Vietnam War, it instead is a simplistic, almost kaleidoscopic review of numerous well known events in American diplomatic history (without footnotes and other scholarly paraphernalia) which is basically textbookish in scope and quality. Edward W. Chester argues that "Perhaps the most important generalization that might be made on the basis of this data is that one-party domination of a section often leads to sustained bloc-voting on diplomatic questions in Congress" (pp. iv-v). In this sense, he says, "Southern Democratic bloc voting" appeared years before the presidency of Woodrow Wilson (p. v). Probably the most significant development since World War II, Chester claims, is the decline in "southern internationalism" (p. 230), which he attributes primarily to that section's racism and to its change to industrialism and resultant call for tariff restrictions. Chester declares that in addition to his roll call analysis, "supplementary data reveals that such factors as economics, race, ethnicity, and metropolitanism vs. ruralism have played a major role in the shaping of American foreign policy" (p. v). Unfortunately, he does not substantiate the above assertions with either convincing evidence or sound reasoning.

Primarily the author fails to analyze the importance of the events to American diplomacy. Though showing over and over that the sections split over issues, he does not explain adequately why they did so. Nor does he discuss whether their shifting stands constituted real sectional alignments