

that the author does not use material from every state does not detract from the interest or accuracy of the book. He is describing elements of a phenomenon that transpired on a national level, and he does not neglect any section of the country. The reader having an interest in or knowledge of the development of public health, medical education, regulation of the practice of medicine, or medical economics will find this volume enormously interesting.

Indianapolis

Charles A. Bonsett, M.D.

Six Who Protested: Radical Opposition to the First World War.
By Frederick C. Giffin. (Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1977. Pp. 158. Notes, bibliography, index. \$9.95.)

In recent years several studies have focused on American opposition to war in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Such studies include books by David S. Patterson, Thomas W. Ryley, Charles DeBenedetti, and Charles Chatfield. One of the most recent additions to this literature is Frederick C. Giffin's *Six Who Protested*, which discusses the antiwar views and activities of a half-dozen nonconformists during World War I—Eugene V. Debs, Morris Hillquit, Max Eastman, John Reed, Emma Goldman, and William D. Haywood. Giffin has provided a useful introduction to antiwar sentiment during 1917 and 1918. Although Ray Ginger's *Bending Cross* (1949) remains perhaps the most absorbing treatment of Debs' wartime activities, *Six Who Protested* offers a more detailed account of the response to the Great War by these individuals than is found in Merle Curti's *Peace or War* (1936), H. C. Peterson and Gilbert C. Fite's *Opponents of War* (1957), or William Preston, Jr.'s *Aliens and Dissenters* (1963). And while Giffin is obviously sympathetic to the individuals he treats, he is by no means blind to their shortcomings.

Each of the dissenters discussed in Giffin's book experienced varying degrees of repression. Hillquit was prevented by Secretary of State Robert Lansing from attending an international socialist conference in Stockholm, Sweden, although there is no indication in this study that he was ever indicted, convicted, or imprisoned for his views. Eastman was tried twice for violating the Espionage Act but was never convicted as both trials ended in hung juries. Reed was indicted, together with the editors of the *Masses*, under the Espionage Act but not convicted, even though, Giffin notes, he may have perjured himself at the second *Masses* trial. Reed was also charged with

sedition in New York and Philadelphia. One case was dropped before coming to trial, and in the other the jury failed to convict. Goldman was convicted of obstructing the selective service and was given a two-year sentence. She served twenty months of that term and then, shortly after release, was deported under the Alien Act of October, 1918, because of association with anarchism. "Big Bill" Haywood received the severest sentence, twenty years of imprisonment and a \$10,000 fine. He was released on \$30,000 bail pending a decision on a new trial but jumped bail in early 1921 and fled to the Soviet Union where he died in 1928. Debs, who Giffin contends taunted the government into placing himself—and the war—on trial and who admitted obstructing the war effort, served thirty-two months of a ten-year sentence before being pardoned by President Warren G. Harding.

The major shortcoming of this study is that its focus is too narrow. While the work's introductory pages do trace opposition to war throughout American history, a larger sense of the context in which these individuals operated is lacking. The author might have made a greater effort to compare the fate of these American dissenters with the treatment dealt their counterparts in the other belligerent countries. Giffin does make some effort in this direction, arguing that the treatment of Debs was far harsher than that given to "prominent dissenters in England, most notably philosopher Bertrand Russell" (p. 46). Aside from the Russell case, however, the author does not provide convincing evidence that war opponents were treated more severely in the United States than in England. Knowledge of how civil liberties fared during these years in England, as well as in France and Germany, is fragmentary, and any comparison with the United States needs to be carefully qualified. While Giffin is correct in maintaining that civil liberties were severely—and one might add at times viciously—repressed during 1917 and 1918, his study also might have made a clearer distinction between repression initiated at the federal level and that at the state and local levels. Granted, no good, detailed account of the Wilson administration and civil liberties exists, but repression at the state and local level apparently was more severe.

*Indiana University,
Bloomington*

Stephen Vaughn