

tioners. Physicians initially excluded homeopaths from membership in the American Medical Association, but soon realized that by including this group in their regular ranks, they would increase their chances of securing licensing legislation. In the twentieth century, hospitals and other health care organizations had become central to the practice of medicine. These institutions, too, served as a potential menace to the sovereignty of physicians. Although doctors easily could have become employees of hospitals, they were able to maintain their sovereignty while using the hospitals to enhance their professional status. Thus, Starr, like Rosen, argues that physicians were able to shape the structure of medicine—a structure that insured professional autonomy.

In his second part, Starr examines medicine's transformation into a vast industry and studies the role of the corporation and state in that industry. Starr thoroughly explores the movement against compulsory health insurance, the structure of private medical insurance, and the rise of Medicare and Medicaid. Starr notes that even as medicine became a giant industry in the twentieth century, physicians were able to maintain their professional sovereignty. But, as Starr adds, whether physicians will be able to maintain that sovereignty in the future is uncertain.

Although Starr's work is more comprehensive than Rosen's, both books should be required reading for medical historians and social historians, as well as anyone interested in the health care industry.

*Indiana Historical Society and* Katherine Mandusic McDonell  
*Indiana Medical History Museum,*  
*Indianapolis*

*The Growth of Federal Power in American History.* Edited by Rhodri Jeffreys-Jones and Bruce Collins. (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press. 1983. Pp. xviii, 207. Table, notes, bibliographical essay, index. \$22.50.)

As the title indicates, this is a collection of essays on the general theme of the growth of federal power in American history. What makes it rather unusual is that all the authors of these articles are English or Scottish scholars who, with the exception of one or two, teach United States history in English or Scottish universities. Although this collection is not a festschrift in the usual sense of the word, all the authors are former colleagues, students, or friends of William Brock, who pioneered in the teaching of United States history at Cambridge University before moving on to the University of Glasgow. The book is dedicated to Brock, and it is a worthy tribute.

The format is twelve, twelve-page essays, each dealing with a different chronological period, sandwiched between introductory and concluding essays by editors Bruce Collins and Rhodri Jeffreys-Jones. Each author deals with some aspect of growing federal power or, nearly as frequently, with the evolution and significance of a rationale in opposition to it.

A point of view that most of the authors have in common is an implicit approval of the expansion of federal power. As editor Jeffreys-Jones observes, this perspective may well stem from an English trust in a powerful central government. Indeed, by way of an essay on Henry Carey, editor Bruce Collins finds his modern American *bête noire* in Milton Friedman, whom he accuses of misusing history in his arguments against the welfare state.

As is usually the case with such collections of essays, the value of the works varies considerably, and space does not permit an extended critique of each. It might be noted, however, that at least two essays, those on the Washington, D.C., race riots of 1919 by Adriane Cook and on the Peace Corps by Gerard T. Rice, contribute nothing to the discussion of federal power. On the other hand, particularly stimulating and sophisticated are the essays by David Turley on the abolitionists, by Anthony Badger on recent historical research on the relationship of localities and the New Deal, and by Harold Hyman on the current debate on the nature and value of federalism. All the essays indicate a familiarity with pertinent recent scholarship, and a number show evidence of considerable research in archival sources.

For the most part these essays are worthwhile reflections on a significant topic. Their audience, however, will be limited largely to professional historians and political scientists.

*Saint Mary's College and  
Holy Cross Junior College,  
Notre Dame, Ind.*

Bernard F. Donahoe

*History of the United States Army*. Enlarged edition. By Russell F. Wiegley. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984. Pp. vi, 730. Appendix, notes, index. Paperbound, \$10.95.)

Russell F. Wiegley's study, the *History of the United States Army*, updated and reprinted by Indiana University Press, is not for the casual reader. Neither is it for the reader looking for a one-volume "drum and trumpet" history of American wars. (For that, readers should refer to the *West Point Atlas of American Wars*, 1962, which will give them an extensive overview of United States wars.) It is not an attempt to show how the United States army fits into the social, economic, and political fabric of the