

possibilities. Thus they attack the Radicals for not seeking "pragmatic accommodations" with liberal Republicans or Democrats, and hold this responsible for their downfall (p. 233). At the same time, they clearly show that liberal Republicans met their doom precisely because they naively accommodated their enemies. Perhaps Radical efforts to keep many Democrats disenfranchised should not be looked upon with unqualified favor, but it certainly was the single factor which kept Republicans in office after 1865.

This same attitude toward Radical Republicanism and its disenfranchisement efforts can be seen in some of the state studies. As William Parrish puts it for Missouri, Republicans' vindictiveness "overshadowed their positive program and ultimately split and destroyed their party" (p. 2). It seems more reasonable to this reviewer that voting proscription was in fact necessary to the implementation of Republican programs. The Radicals were overthrown not because they flouted democracy, but because their platform, no matter how conservative and racist it seems to twentieth century scholars, was a wild eyed anathema to Democrats and many liberal Republicans.

Such criticism does not negate the contribution of *Radicalism, Racism, and Party Realignment*. Curry and his colleagues have broadened the view of Reconstruction and have produced a welcome introduction to border states' affairs during that turbulent era.

University of California, Berkeley

Robert H. Abzug

Politics and Patronage in the Gilded Age: The Correspondence of James A. Garfield and Charles E. Henry. Edited by James D. Norris and Arthur H. Shaffer. (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1970. Pp. xxix, 304. Notes, illustrations, index. \$7.95.)

Charles E. Henry and James A. Garfield first met when the former was a student at the Western Reserve Eclectic Institute, and the latter was its principal. They both served in the Forty-second Ohio Volunteers, and after the war Henry watched over Garfield's congressional district in northeastern Ohio. Henry was a loyal lieutenant, eager to promote his close friend's fortunes. He managed Garfield's campaigns for the United States House of Representatives and for the Senate in 1880 and worked in the presidential campaign of that year.

Garfield secured appointments for Henry first as an ordinary mail clerk, then as a postal investigator. Henry was a fervent Republican but worked to improve mail service and vigilantly guarded

against malfeasance among postal employees under his jurisdiction. The astute, candid Henry quickly became an effective "two-way conductor of information between Garfield and his constituents" (p. xx). This was a difficult task, given Ohio's turbulent electorate. Both by necessity and temperament, Garfield was a moderate Republican and relied on Henry to report on voter attitudes. Henry travelled regularly and believed that "light is better than darkness in politics as well as other things" (p. 20). He tirelessly explained Garfield's stands on the currency, tariff protection, and other controversial issues, and tried to harmonize local factions. Both men paid close attention to appointments and veterans' benefits, but their letters reveal no corruption. Corrupt or inefficient officeholders were politically disastrous in small communities where neighbors knew each other's business and regularly debated public questions. As Henry said: "I am well aware of the importance of selecting only men of judgement in that dangerous thing politics" (p. 78). Garfield's occasional errors of selection reflected poor information, not indifference or favoritism.

The correspondence reveals popular interest in politics and shows how much time and energy were necessary to persuade and control a diverse electorate. The editors wisely allow the documents to speak for themselves, and the editorial apparatus does not distract the reader. The footnotes are especially useful for identifying a wide range of people, and the index is comprehensive. This handsome book shows how effectively local materials can help the student of larger questions, and is an important source for the development of American political parties.

University of Texas, Austin

H. Wayne Morgan

The Vanity of Power: American Isolationism and the First World War, 1914-1917. By John Milton Cooper, Jr. *Contributions in American History*, No. 3. Edited by Stanley I. Kutler. (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishing Corporation, 1969. Pp. xii, 271. Notes, appendix, tables, bibliographical essay, index. \$11.50.)

One of the proverbial spoils of war is the victor's advantage in writing its history. The same might be said of the political battles preceding entry of the United States into World War I. The passing of a half century seems to have fixed rather than dispelled this kind of bias even in some purportedly scholarly literature dealing with the views and arguments of the noninterventionists of that day. In *The Vanity of Power* Cooper repudiates "still-prevalent morality-play" (p. 218) accounts of struggles about foreign policy and undertakes in-