

preciates more readily than he did while teaching American government. That the task is of great importance and that few persons are working very hard at it seems also to be true. It is however encouraging to see that political scientists are beginning to tiptoe toward the political reality of Congress, to mention only one branch of the federal government, through various participant-observation projects.

One major explanation of such gaps in our knowledge may simply be lack of imagination on the part of political scientists. Last year, for example, the House battled long weeks through what veteran congressmen described as the most savage legislative struggle in Congress in over ten years, the issue of labor-management reform. It required no great political sophistication to know in January of 1959 that this issue would be coming to a head during the first session of the Eighty-sixth Congress. Some group of political scientists might well have conducted a series of confidential interviews with party leaders in the House and Senate, members of the House Education and Labor Committee, lobbyists of concerned organizations, and knowledgeable newspapermen—the difficulties in making such arrangements notwithstanding.

It is true that waiting for the smoke of battle to clear away may bring greater objectivity to an investigation. It is also true that battlefield accounts may provide evidence not easily recoverable at a later date or, to point to another hazard, evidence not so readily subject to what the *Congressional Record* knows as "extension and revision of remarks."

Perhaps Professor Hyneman's thoughtful book will stimulate the coming crop of American political scientists to a more imaginative and fruitful use of their talents.

Member of Congress
Third District, Indiana

John Brademas

The President's Cabinet: An Analysis in the Period From Wilson to Eisenhower. By Richard F. Fenno, Jr. *Harvard Political Studies.* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959. Pp. xii, 327. Notes, index. \$5.50.)

Disregarding the usual historical or legalistic method of writing about the president's cabinet, Professor Fenno declares that the cabinet is a distinct, discreet and describable political institution" (p. 3). Many, although by no means all, of the precedents that Washington initiated in dealing with his cabinet have remained to the present. Naturally new cabinet offices have kept pace with our increasingly complex technological society as well as with our evolving social conscience. Nearly all of the added cabinet departments began as insignificant administrative agencies.

Although the president is supreme in relation to the cabinet, the author contends, and logically so, that this group is always being "transformed by other influences in the American political system" (p. 50). For example, in making cabinet appointments the chief executive recog-

nizes such criteria as party, geography, personality, social-economic status, etc. Very definitely, the cabinet represents the pluralism of American culture.

Presidents have usually had extreme difficulty in establishing and maintaining group coherence among the members of the cabinet. This is understandable when one knows how deeply these advisors of the president are involved in legislative activities, in bureaucracy, in the intricate machinery of political parties, and in the tactics of numerous pressure groups. The author shows how chief executives from Wilson to Eisenhower have sought cabinet coherence and notes that their failures have far outnumbered their success.

Eisenhower has many more business executives in his cabinet than did Wilson or Franklin D. Roosevelt. A master politician like Roosevelt appointed a cabinet which reflected numerous political group opinions within his own party and at times contained recruits from the opposition. Contrary to popular belief, most presidents have difficulty in finding persons of national reputation to fill cabinet berths. By and large, cabinets have been composed of obscure personnel.

Until recently the cabinet was a group totally responsible to the president and could not exert any influence on the national scene. Fenno believes that no one has done more to make the cabinet an American political institution than Eisenhower, who named a cabinet secretary and invested him with the power to set up the agenda for each meeting. Poor cooperation from members who do not want their departmental matters discussed by others has marred, however, the results the President hoped to attain. Nevertheless, he has taken a significant step in the right direction.

With *The President's Cabinet*, the author has made a scholarly, scientific, and valuable contribution to American political literature.

University of Florida

George C. Osborn

American Research on Russia. Edited by Harold H. Fisher. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959. Pp. xiv, 240. Notes, index. \$5.00.)

This is a most useful volume for everyone interested in research and instruction in the United States on Russia. Edited by Professor Harold H. Fisher, one of the pioneers of the study of Russian affairs in this country and for many years director of the Hoover Institute (formerly the Hoover Library for War, Revolution, and Peace) at Stanford University, it was written at the suggestion of a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council. This subcommittee, in its review of research and instruction on Russia in this country, also stimulated the work which led to a companion volume, *The Study of Russia in American Education*, edited by Professor Cyril E. Black, of Princeton University, and Professor John M. Thompson, of Indiana University, published early in 1960 by the Indiana University Press. These two volumes together describe what is known and what