

ment in economic conditions by groups. This understanding is well documented in the impressive accomplishments of the Greeks, Jews, and Japanese of Chicago. The essays by Andrew T. Kopan, Irving Cutler, and Masako M. Osako, respectively, discuss this phenomenon. Of special interest is the latter study, which includes Osako's reflections on the success of Chinese, as well as Japanese, in adapting to the urban environment. The pattern of movement from city to suburb is evident in the Kopan and Cutler contributions and the study of Italians in the suburb of Chicago Heights by Dominic Candeloro.

Ethnic Chicago helps dispel the myth of monolithic ethnicity. Diversity, tension, and even discord are major features described in the essays by Funchion on the Irish and by Myron Kuropas on the Ukrainians. In a revisionist analysis of the impact of World War I on German culture, Melvin Holli considers the "de-ethnization" of the city's German community, which he interprets as a result of the interplay of external events and conflict within the group itself.

As these essays make clear, ethnic history considers such processes as adjustment, identity, and assimilation. Holli and Jones use a passage from Israel Zangwill to describe the melting pot as "an all-around give-and-take by which the final type may be enriched or impoverished" (p. 6). This reviewer's disappointment with the absence of a chapter on Scandinavian-Americans is simply a quibble; this book makes a significant contribution to an understanding of urban life in the Midwest and the nation.

Indiana State University Evansville

Robert L. Reid

The Earnest Men: Republicans of the Civil War Senate. By Allan G. Bogue. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981. Pp. 369. Notes, illustrations, tables, figures, appendixes, index. \$28.50.)

In subject, methods, and conclusions *The Earnest Men* is an important addition to a substantial and sophisticated literature on the Civil War and Reconstruction. Somewhat distinctive in its focus on the Civil War Senate, this volume is an artful blend of traditional and quantitative forms of analysis. While consistently sensitive to idiosyncracies, Bogue carefully illuminates the broader patterns of Republican factionalism and legislative behavior.

Beginning with a brief, stylish description of each senator, a prosopographical analysis, and a thoughtful consideration of

Senate structure and procedures, Bogue moves to the difficult task of classifying all Republican senators in this era as radical or moderate. Although nonspecialists may initially cringe at the appearance of indices of disagreement, cluster bloc matrices, and Guttman scales, this reaction should soon be dispelled by the clear explanations and by the judicious and fruitful handling of these statistics. In studying the Thirty-seventh Senate Bogue first identifies eighty-seven roll calls that related to southern issues, presumably the heart of any radical/moderate division. Through clustering and scaling techniques he confirms the existence of these groups and identifies their members. Senators in subsequent sessions are classified in like manner. The analysis reveals that although less important than party conflict, this radical-moderate split was significant (and more so than sectional differences). Second, despite considerable continuity, factional composition did change over time. Third, neither institutional context nor personal background explain much about factional membership.

In Part II of the volume Bogue describes the substance of disagreement—the debates over 168 roll calls that exceeded a minimum level of disagreement. Somewhat predictably, considerable conflict arose over slavery, emancipation, and civil rights, while reconstruction issues sparked passionate but surprisingly brief debate. Also interesting is the factional conflict over subjects rarely considered in this context—courts, loyalty, and Senate self-governance.

Bogue compensates for over-burdening the reader with descriptions of minor matters (three fourths of all roll calls are reported) with an excellent summary. Radicals, he argues, were somewhat “punitive” (p. 297) toward even loyal southerners, while moderates were “more deeply” racist (p. 299). Radicals emphasized more the federal government and Congress, while moderates esteemed precedent and appealed to the Constitution with an arresting passion. Such attitudes and values, Bogue suggests, fit within a modernization framework, an approach which helps to explain why this division also appeared over nonsouthern issues. This broader context and the excellent model of legislative analysis make this a valuable work not only for period specialists but for a wider audience as well.