

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

is being taught—or, alas, not known and not taught—about Russia, and also make a number of pointed suggestions concerning what should be done in the years ahead.

The essays in *American Research on Russia* are not bibliographical articles, but critical reviews of American scholarship in particular disciplines—history, economics, political science, philosophy and religion, social relations, science, geography, literature, linguistics, music, and architecture and minor arts—with emphasis on the quality of the published work and, above all, on the kinds of subjects neglected thus far. The essays naturally vary in quality, and one receives the impression that they often follow the tradition of American book reviews in being too cautious and tender in comments upon the books and articles that have been published.

For this reviewer, among the most interesting and stimulating essays were Philip Mosely's fine survey of "The Growth of Russian Studies" in this country since 1900 and the essays on some of the disciplines in which little effective research has yet been done, especially the one on social relations by Arthur S. Barron, that on science by John Turkevich, and that on music by Robert M. Slusser. These latter essays are particularly clear in suggesting guidelines for future research.

If American scholars and administrators read this volume with care, the funds which will certainly be invested in research on Russia will be wisely spent. The disciplines in which little research has been done will remain weak unless those with most responsibility in our training programs direct more funds and energy into these neglected fields. Errors in the next few years will lead to an unfortunate lack of balance in Russian studies, a weakness which is already apparent and which will become of especial significance as more and more attention is devoted to Russia at all levels of our educational system.

Indiana University

Robert F. Byrnes

From Wilderness to Empire: A History of California. Combined and revised edition. By Robert Glass Cleland. Edited and brought down to date by Glenn S. Dumke. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959. Pp. xii, 445, xvi. Maps, illustrations, bibliography, index. \$6.95.)

In 1944 Robert Glass Cleland produced *From Wilderness to Empire: A History of California, 1542-1900*; three years later appeared his *California in Our Time, 1900-1940*. These two volumes have now been revised, edited, and material for the past two decades added by Glenn S. Dumke. The new version is published as a single volume with the title indicated at the heading of this review. Dr. Dumke was a student and ardent admirer of the late Dr. Cleland, and the present volume shows evidence of skill and devoted care in retouching the master's original work. Dumke states that except for occasional passages, the first two chapters, the concluding chapter, and the bibliography the writing is that of Dr. Cleland. The editor's major job has been, therefore, to reduce the two original volumes to one.