secretarial career in detail and picture him as a most successful administrator. Wallace's role in the Agricultural Adjustment Association, the retirement of marginal lands, the ever normal granary, his administrative problems, and his ability to blend New Deal ideas into a new philosophy made him an effective and also a marked man in FDR's cabinet. It was Wallace's ability to spell out the philosophy of the New Deal that encouraged Roosevelt to name him as a running mate in 1940.

This is a well researched and scholarly book. It is a genuine contribution to an era of our history. Some historians may not agree that Wallace was the nation's greatest secretary of agriculture, especially since no secretary of agriculture has been loved by the farmer since the early 1920s. The editing of the book is a bit disconcerting, especially if one wishes to check the source for a quotation. On page 23 a long quotation is given, but the number for the footnote follows at the end of an unrelated paragraph. Citations are pushed together. Chapter eleven has nearly fifty citations listed under note number 4. There is an incomplete sentence on page 136.

Kansas State University, Manhattan A. Bower Sageser

Embattled Democracy: Missouri Democratic Politics, 1919-1932. By Franklin D. Mitchell. *University of Missouri Studies,* Volume XLVII. (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1968. Pp. 219. Notes, bibliography, index. $4.75.)

Until recently twentieth century American historians tended to neglect the exciting and eventful decade of the 1920s while concentrating their efforts on the Progressive and New Deal reform eras, which were deemed more significant and relevant. Mitchell's revised doctoral dissertation dealing with Democratic politics in Missouri is one of several recent monographs which have attempted to remedy this neglect by probing the nature of politics at the state and local levels during the twenties.

The Missouri Democracy, a once dominant coalition of rural, old stock citizens and urban Irish, was first rent asunder by the fierce, intraparty battle over the League of Nations. A key element in this conflict was the bitter, personal feud between President Woodrow Wilson and the irascible, irreconcilable senator from Missouri James A. Reed. During the twenties certain divisive domestic issues such as farm relief legislation, the Ku Klux Klan, and, most important, prohibition continued to plague the party and assure its minority status.

The author emphasizes the shift of the Negro vote in Missouri after 1928 as a principal factor in the return to power of the Democratic party. This shift, he insists, began because of Republican indifference and a calculated Democratic campaign to woo black voters long before the Depression shattered the national economy. Since that time the Negro voter has been the most faithful member of the dominant Democratic organization.

It is Mitchell's contention that Missouri in the 1920s might be viewed as a microcosm of the nation. The cotton farmers of the southeast shared the economic and social outlook of the Deep South; the grain and livestock farmers of the north possessed the attitudes of the Midwest's corn-hog farm belt; the urban areas of St. Louis and Kansas City were similar to the nation's eastern industrial complexes. The author attempts to show how various factors—sectionalism, rural-urban antagonisms, ethnic differences, and charismatic leaders—influenced political patterns in Missouri, but he makes no rash judgments as to which were most significant. Thus an honest historian, unwilling to pervert his discipline to prove a thesis, points up once again the complexity of political analysis when dealing with a multitude of possible causal factors.

Mitchell's bibliography and documentation give evidence of extensive use of manuscript material and a thorough grasp of pertinent secondary literature. A serious shortcoming of the book, however, is the absence of graphs and charts which might have underlined the author's efforts to show changes in Missouri voting patterns.

Embattled Democracy is a solid but uninspired work which suffers from a repetitious style and occasionally bogs down in a morass of inconsequential details. Nonetheless, it is a significant contribution to the scant state and local history of the twenties which must be compiled before a definitive political study of the period can be written.

Indiana State University, Terre Haute Herbert J. Rissler