

French and British periods. Once the narrative reaches the transfer of Detroit to the United States, the treatment shifts to topical chapters on cultural, philanthropic, political, social, and economic matters within the chronological skeleton. At the midpoint of the book there is a nostalgic look at Detroit during the last decade of the nineteenth century. By that time population standards qualified Detroit as a city, and its cultural variety created an appealing charm which unfortunately diminished during the next fifty years. Throughout the book the relationship of regional and national events to Detroit's history are noted.

Most readers of *All Our Yesterdays* will welcome the extensive chronological table at the back of the book, and, although the maps and photographs are typical of biographies of cities, they do capture some of the character of Detroit. Professional historians will regret the scanty bibliography and the absence of reference notes.

All Our Yesterdays is both too long and too short as a study of one of America's major cities. If much of the inside information, meaningful only to natives and residents, and the antiquarianism had been eliminated, the book would have been shorter and tighter in composition. If more analysis and greater insight into the nature of Detroit and its special qualities had been provided, it would have been longer and more satisfactory. As it is, the book fairly compactly chronicles the major events in Detroit's past from initial settlement down to the riot of late July, 1967. Any rigorous and thorough study of such a large and complex city must be more extensive and must furnish the reader with a better understanding of Detroit's character and the driving forces behind what appears on the surface.

Drake University, Des Moines

Walter R. Houf

Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War. By Eric Foner. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970. Pp. xii, 353. Notes, selected bibliography, index. \$8.50.)

Although hardly the "significant re-evaluation of the causes of the Civil War" that the dust jacket advertises, this study nevertheless will command scholarly attention. It presents detailed kaleidoscopic views of the complicated Republican ideological scene, shifting deftly to adjust for change in time, geography, and attitude. Taking Radical spokesmen pretty much at their word, Foner concludes that Republican ideology did indeed rest upon the demand for "Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men," just as the campaign banners said. All the various factions within the party are represented in the study, but a

space emphasis goes to the Radicals, particularly to Salmon P. Chase, Charles Sumner, Joshua R. Giddings, George W. Julian, Carl Schurz, Preston King, and Benjamin F. Butler. Representatives of Republican business interests get considerably less exposure. The index lists, for example, only seven references to Thurlow Weed, six to David Davis, five to Thomas Corwin, five to Thomas Ewing, three to Edward Bates, and two each to William M. Evarts and Caleb Blood Smith. As a result the party is made to seem less Whiggish than it was.

Foner argues, not too convincingly, that "ideology represents much more than the convenient rationalization of material interests" (p. 5). Using the phraseology of the once fashionable *Gestalt* psychologists, he asserts rather mystically that the Republican ideology was "more than merely the sum of its component parts" (p. 10). He criticizes "revisionists" for "denying altogether the urgency of the moral issue," but he admits that "to explain Republicans' actions on simple moral grounds is to miss the full richness of their ideology," which he characterizes as a "profoundly successful fusion of value and interests" (pp. 5, 10).

Foner is quick to defend Republican motivations. He claims it is "too simple" for Clifford S. Griffin to say that "Republican leaders speedily deserted temperance and anti-foreignism as soon as they realized that anti-slavery was even more popular" (p. 259). He complains that Leon Litwack, Eugene Berwanger, and Robert F. Durden "have carried a good point too far" in taking "the Republicans to task for racial prejudice within their ranks" (p. 333). His evidence in at least one instance is flimsy. He cites a hectic vote during the last days of the Peace Conference in February, 1861, to indicate that "a majority of the Republican party stood by the citizenship of the Negro on the eve of the Civil War" (p. 293). An examination of the circumstances reveals that the amendment in question was a parliamentary tactic designed to make the initial proposal so objectionable that it would be defeated.

Although not afraid to generalize, Foner sometimes generalizes unfairly. For example, he claims that "few historians would go as far as William Best Hesseltine" in concluding that "the Republicans" were "little more than an enlarged Whig party disguised in a new vocabulary" (p. 149). Yet Hesseltine carefully qualifies this statement in context, specifically excepting Massachusetts and indicating that this was the case in those states "where industry and commerce were supreme and where the financial centers of the land were located" (*Lincoln and the War Governors*, 1948, p. 18).

Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men provides a lively, well docu-

mented digest of what pre-Civil War politicians said. Foner's next book should put Republican words to the test of Republican deeds.

Indiana University, Bloomington

Robert G. Gunderson

The Slave Power Conspiracy and the Paranoid Style. By David Brion Davis. *The Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1969. Pp. ix, 97. Notes. \$4.00.)

The 1969 Fleming lecturer at Louisiana State University applies to the slavery controversy Richard Hofstadter's concept of a "paranoid style" in American politics. David Brion Davis points out that the polemics of antislavery and antiabolition had some striking similarities to the propaganda directed in the first half of the nineteenth century against Freemasonry, Roman Catholicism, and Mr. Biddle's Bank. All identified a vast conspiratorial movement that was seen as threatening the fundamental values of American society.

Drawing upon sociological concepts developed in Erving Goffman's *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959), Davis suggests that the fluidity of status and role in this period made Americans singularly sensitive to the poses unconsciously assumed by the members of various classes and professions. In assuming the manners and style of a status or role, a man joins the "conspiracy" of his "team" to project a certain definition of themselves and the social situation. At a time when so many men were new to their roles, they were more conscious of this kind of conspiracy in themselves and in others. Hence, Davis suggests, the pronounced "paranoid" tendency to interpret conflicts in conspiratorial terms.

Within this conceptual framework Davis has some fresh and perceptive things to say about the slavery controversy. But his analysis reveals more about the social conditions encouraging a "paranoid" view of conflict than about the slavery conflict itself. He cautiously ducks the question of how much justification the antagonists had for viewing each other as conspiratorial and subversive. Nor does he attempt to measure the causal force of the paranoid disposition.

Davis is cautious, too, about the conservative implications of this kind of analysis. Perhaps, he concludes, "the image of the Slave Power was a necessary means for arousing the fears and galvanizing the will of the North to face a genuine moral and political challenge" (p. 85).

This conclusion raises some doubts about the whole concept of a "paranoid style." The parties to a conflict usually exaggerate each others' malignancy and conspiratorial potency. At what point does this normal human tendency become a "paranoid style"? And the