

Hicken has extensively examined the personal papers of Illinois General John A. McClernand and considers the Battle of Arkansas Post as both a turning point and high mark of his career. Grant's biographers have stressed McClernand's faults, but Hicken believes that "few have attempted to understand the nature of the man they are so quick to label a political general" (p. 153). Hicken's portrait of McClernand reveals "an impulsive, overly ambitious, and genuinely patriotic man who was frustrated at every turn by men who knew the ritual of the military profession better than himself" (p. 153). In the final analysis the author agrees with Robert R. McCormick that "it is plain that faith was not kept with him [McClernand] and that his indignation was just" (p. 153).

Hicken ascribes the rapid increase in desertions from Illinois regiments following the winter of 1862-63 to the emancipation and arming of Negroes and the military reverses of 1862. By April, 1863, desertion was so widespread that the *Illinois State Journal* reported that "Democratic Boys . . . are coming home every day" (p. 139). Desertions from Illinois totaled 13,046 for the entire war. (Ella Lonn, in her study of this problem, gives the figure as 16,083). In his analysis of Copperhead influence on desertions, Hicken tends to minimize the particularly violent nature of many of the Copperhead activities, such as a mob attack at Du Quoin in July, 1863, when some four hundred men attacked a deputy provost marshal and seized the deserters that were being guarded.

The most serious fault in this study is the nebulous and often confusing method of footnoting. Two sources are frequently cited without making clear from which one a particular quotation or interpretation came. In many cases the citations are clearly not relevant to the discussion but serve only as a supplemental guide to further study. For example, on page 355 Hicken discusses General John H. Winder, the commander of Union prisoners in Georgia, and lists twenty-seven pages from Hesseltine's book *Civil War Prisons* and thirteen pages from *This Was Andersonville* as the sources. References such as these should have been inserted in the bibliography. On page 87, Hicken refers to McClernand's ambitions to obtain an independent command and cites Wood Gray's study of Copperheads (p. 216), which is a description of opposition to the draft in Pennsylvania and New York. There are numerous other examples of careless and inaccurate craftsmanship throughout the book which seriously restricts its value for the Civil War scholar. The book will, however, have appeal for those who are interested in a popular account of the everyday life of the men in blue from the Prairie State.

Indiana University

Richard Thomas

*History of the Chicago Urban League.* By Arvarh E. Strickland. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1966. Pp. 286. Notes, bibliography, index. \$7.50.)

Strickland deals with a subject of significance, and he sees his subject whole. The Chicago Urban League's half-century of trial

and stress is recounted in a manner that bears witness to the larger struggles of the American Negro, and that is a theme of such exceptional importance to contemporary national existence that any part of the story that contributes to an understanding of the whole deserves commendation. If Strickland fails at all in this endeavor, it is only at the highest level where all aspects of the American experience are harmonized. But that is a characteristic failing of monographic studies, particularly of those that begin as doctoral dissertations.

An agonizing and enormously important question haunts the pages of this history, imparting unity and purpose to the book: to what extent was the league compromised by its system of patronage? The author makes it abundantly clear that from the outset a few wealthy patrons had the league by the throat and that these patrons were not loathe to lay down terms for their continued support. So it was that the league came to be "considered the 'citadel' of 'accepted' leadership" (p. 110), but at a price that kept its well-intentioned executives in a continual state of tension as they strove to satisfy both their patrons and the urgent needs of their clients. Here is the source of the discontent with the league latterly voiced by younger Negro militants; and indeed what finally gave it some freedom of action was precisely the civil rights explosion generated by the militants. Still, Strickland concludes, "without the 'old' Urban League, there could have been no 'new' Urban League" (p. 264).

Stokely Carmichael and Julian Bond might not agree. They might argue that the new posture of the Urban League is qualitatively different from that of the old, and they might very well point to the evidence arrayed by the author himself as proof of that contention. What makes this argument of more than marginal interest to American historians is just that it is a refined version of the argument over the continuity of American reform, so that the author's data concerning the particular history of a particular aspect of American reform is finally applicable to a wider realm of events. It would have been helpful to the author in his search for the meaning of the league experience in Chicago if he had seen these broader implications of his study. Perhaps then he would have been able to conclude that the withdrawal of Rosenwald funds during the late twenties was more than a product of personal eccentricity, but more meaningfully an expression of a general retreat from reform that characterized those years. Strickland might also have seen some connection with Progressivism in the league's origins, as he might have noted the substantially different orientation toward the league in the New Deal era.

But let these final reservations merely stand as an indication of the usefulness of this excellent study. That usefulness is considerably enhanced by a judicious application to the sources, by clear writing and good organization. Strickland's work will certainly appear in the citations of other writers.

*Indiana University, Indianapolis*

Bernard Friedman