

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-

stead to "examine" (p. 1) the development of the losers' position. Pursuit of this theme through 219 liberally footnoted pages produces considerable new information and a distinct improvement in the tone of discussion, but falters when it comes to establishing a satisfactory framework of terminology for clarifying issues, motives, and policy positions.

It is obvious that this study is based on intensive and careful research, and that it generally strives to move with intellectual integrity from the accumulation of data to the formulation of supportable conclusions. Disturbing exceptions are: a refrain of references to the alleged attitudes and influence of German-Americans, despite the fact that by the author's own eventual admission (pp. 223, 231-32) evidence on this point is inconclusive; the gratuitous disparagement of William Jennings Bryan by a frequently belittling treatment, when other interpretations would be at least as plausible; and the wholly unconvincing attempt in the book's "Conclusion" to absolve today's "neo-isolationists" of "isolationism." Occasional digressions from the author's area of competence produce regrettable results. An imaginative excursion into the presumed forensic strategy of Woodrow Wilson's war message prompts an incursion into theology, a blurring of Lutheran concepts of grace and of the freedom of the individual conscience, and the conclusion that Wilson was "sinning boldly" at Washington, as Martin Luther had at Worms. Both would be astonished to hear what can be deduced from a little presidential paraphrase.

On balance, however, such lapses are more than outweighed by the value of the evidence presented and a conscientious attempt to transcend what the author designates as the "behavioral" and "rhetorical" techniques his predecessors have used in dealing with the loyal opposition in this "Great Debate." Informed and judicious evaluation of source materials presented in a "Bibliographical Essay" should be of substantial help to other students of the subject. The sixteen tables and accompanying comments in the Appendix are less valuable.

A serious disappointment in a work that consistently stresses conceptualization, rather than mere description, is its failure to develop more accurate and meaningful categories for the ideas discussed; furthermore, those categories offered do not wear well when subjected to the use made of them. "Isolationism" and "internationalism" are ideological formulations of attitudes rather than specific policies. Yet, for practical purposes, each is identified with a policy position (antiintervention and intervention respectively) that enjoyed a wider span of support. Efforts to meet the resulting difficulties by establishing the motivational subclassifications of "idealists" and "nationalists" (the latter usually preceded by the pejorative prefix "ul-

tra") fail not only because the descriptions of these groups are crudely colored, but because they do not stand up when taken at face value. To offer only one example: "Idealists" whose *hybris* was so overwhelming as to make them believe that God's voice was calling to America out of a burning continent to impose a "just" settlement and build a new international order according to American specifications are not above the suspicion of having been (ultra-?) nationalists too. However, this flaw is not irreparable. Cooper recognizes the urgent need for more viable definitions than those available; with his admirable instinct for questioning stereotypes, he may find the answers.

Purdue University, Lafayette

Walter O. Forster

*Controversy in the Twenties: Fundamentalism, Modernism, and Evolution.* Edited by Willard R. Gatewood, Jr. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1969. Pp. ix, 459. Notes, note on secondary sources, index. \$10.00.)

Building on his recently published monograph of the evolution controversy in North Carolina, *Preachers, Pedagogues, and Politicians* (1966), Willard Gatewood has now gathered together a representative collection of documents illustrating the course of that controversy in the nation at large. It is a comprehensive collection of materials, and Vanderbilt University Press is to be congratulated for allowing Gatewood ample space to do his work.

The collection begins with excerpts from writings which present the essential theological positions of fundamentalists and modernists and those of critics of both positions within the church, then proceeds to outline the nature of the fundamentalist critique of science generally and the concept of evolution in particular, and some of the responses from nonfundamentalists to this attack. The remainder of the documents demonstrate the impact of the controversy on American educational institutions, on politics, and on literature. There is a brief (fortunately) section devoted to the Scopes Trial, and the collection concludes with some interesting contemporary evaluations of the significance of the evolution controversy in the broad context of American culture. Gatewood's brief introductory heading to each document and occasional editorial comments are proper examples of effective, unobtrusive editing. The book is also enhanced by a detailed forty-six page introduction written by the editor and a very helpful annotated bibliography, both of which supplement and bring up to date the work of Norman Furniss on the same topic over a decade ago.

Gatewood realizes more fully than did Furniss earlier that the fundamentalist-modernist controversy was grounded as much in theological issues and problems within the churches as in the problems of