

passions that a La Follette evoked. The selections by historians are uniformly judicious, cautious, and dull.

This volume will serve its pedagogical purposes well, but it, of course, does not fill the need for a definitive biography or a published collection of his writings. La Follette, selected as one of the five greatest senators in American history by a senate committee headed by John F. Kennedy, deserves more from the historical profession than has been done.

University of South Dakota, Vermillion

Thomas H. Buckley

Reconstruction: An Anthology of Revisionist Writings. Edited by Kenneth M. Stampp and Leon F. Litwack. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1969. Pp. xii, 531. Notes. \$12.00.)

The compilers of this anthology introduce their volume with the first chapter of Stampp's *The Era of Reconstruction* (1965) and group their twenty-two selections from revisionist literature under five headings: "Lincoln, Johnson, and Reconstruction," "The Radical Republicans," "The Freedmen," "Radical Reconstruction in the South," and "The Collapse of Reconstruction."

In the introductory chapter, "The Tragic Legend of Reconstruction," Stampp sets the historiographical stage with a synopsis of the traditional interpretations of the post-Civil War era, an explanation of the origin and acceptance of that interpretation, and an assessment of its principal weaknesses. Stampp's essay contains incisive and valid criticisms of earlier historians of Reconstruction, but this reviewer cannot agree that the interpretation of Claude Bowers "is only a slight exaggeration" of the views presented by William A. Dunning and his followers (p. 5). The studies of the latter, for all their shortcomings, are decidedly more temperate, accurate, sophisticated, and scholarly than the Bowers version.

The selections in this volume are articles and excerpts by such leading scholars as LaWanda and John H. Cox, Richard N. Current, David Donald, W. E. B. DuBois, Eric McKittrick, Vernon Lane Wharton, and C. Vann Woodward. Taken together, these writings challenge earlier works, not by discounting political and economic motives, not by denying that there was greed and corruption, but by acknowledging the importance of humanitarianism, ideals, and ideology, by pointing out the period's constructive achievements, and by identifying civil and political rights of Negroes as either a central or the central issue of Reconstruction. The interpretation that emerges deflates the reputations of the Abraham Lincoln and Andrew Johnson plans for speedy reunion; discredits the contention that the Radical Republicans were simply vindictive, power hungry villains bent upon humiliating and torturing the South; reevaluates and upgrades the attitudes, behavior, and contributions of the black population, scalawags, and carpetbag governments; and offers fresh explanations for the collapse of Radical Reconstruction. Perhaps the most disturbing but nonetheless important contribution of this

revisionist literature is its exposure of the dominant influence, throughout the period, of pervasive white racism.

This volume will doubtless be useful to students of Reconstruction, but it would be much more attractive if it contained a bibliography and index, and carried a more reasonable price tag.

Michigan State University, East Lansing

Frederick D. Williams

The New Deal and the States: Federalism in Transition. By James T. Patterson. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969. Pp. viii, 226. Notes, bibliographical essay, index. \$6.50.)

Although American historians are often prone to focus too much attention on the activities of the federal government to the detriment of state affairs, this distortion is particularly evident in studies of the New Deal years. To date there have been but few published works and a scattering of doctoral dissertations dealing with the impact of Franklin D. Roosevelt's policies on the state level despite the mountain of source material which certainly exists. This situation may well cause many scholars to conclude that James T. Patterson's attempts to analyze the relationship between the New Deal and the states are premature and based upon insufficient sampling, especially since the sheer magnitude of the task prevents him from singling out more than a few of the myriad of New Deal programs for consideration. The author candidly acknowledges the difficulties involved and contends that a perusal of the current literature, coupled with his own original research, does enable him to discern the general patterns of response without losing sight of individual variations. Not everyone will agree that he has done so, but no one can deny that he has made a scrupulously honest attempt.

In the main, the author's findings indicate that most New Deal programs suffered from a lack of centralization, rather than an excess. The efforts of the various states to cope with the depression before the advent of the Roosevelt administration were confusing and ineffectual, with very few exceptions. Attempts to implement such relief projects as the Federal Employees Relief Administration, Works Progress Administration, and unemployment compensation at the state level often led to factionalism, interparty squabbling, and bitterness between federal and state officials, with the unemployed and the indigent the unfortunate victims. Efforts to coordinate other New Deal programs through such agencies as the National Emergency Council generally resulted in failure, and very few states made a concerted effort to emulate national policy by launching their own little New Deals. Far from being a dictatorial blueprint to which each state must slavishly adhere, Patterson argues, the New Deal was rather like an "over-used piece of carbon paper whose imprint on the states was often faint and indistinct" (p. 126).