explain this failure, Daniel observes: "Perhaps these men were convinced that the progression of successful yet inexorable court cases signified that peonage was dying out, or possibly they were traduced by the notion of American innocence that precluded slavery by definition, or more likely they were simply blinded by institutional apathy" (p. xi). In any event, those peonage cases that did go to court were frequently characterized by disappearing witnesses and acquitted employers.

The author notes that the federal Justice Department still receives numerous peonage complaints each year, few of which are actually investigated. He maintains that peonage persists for several reasons: racist traditions in the South, the apathy—and sometimes corruption—of law enforcement officers, and the impotence of various government agencies in prosecuting this particular violation of federal law.

In preparing this study, Daniel has drawn extensively on the complaints, correspondence between local federal attorneys and the attorney general, trial transcripts, clippings, briefs, and miscellaneous material in the peonage collection of the United States Department of Justice. Much information was derived from state and federal reports, annotated codes, briefs and records of Supreme Court cases involving peonage, contemporary magazine articles, and assorted manuscript collections. Utilizing such materials to the best advantage, Daniel has produced a readable and informative work which contributes to an understanding of a little known form of modern day slavery.

Illinois State University, Normal

L. Moody Simms, Jr.


The extensive list of studies dealing with American intervention in the First World War has been enhanced by Professor Gregory's small volume. Although he does not claim to present a great deal of new information, the author, who has written the book primarily for students rather than specialists, believes it is justified because it may shed light on how the United States got to its present position in world affairs and where it is headed. What makes this brief study especially worthwhile is Gregory's realization that Ameri-
can policy did not take place in a vacuum. Decisions made by Sir Edward Grey in London and Bethmann Hollweg in Berlin affected decisions made in Washington as he clearly demonstrates.

Although the United States did not enter the war until 1917, long before that time American policies had an impact upon the conflict. Gregory submits that the timing of American entrance was significant and argues that the course of the war would have been different if the United States had entered at a different time or not at all. Gregory demonstrates that commerce played a major role in gradually drawing the United States into a web from which it could not extricate itself without choosing war against Germany. Had the United States severed all economic ties with Europe it might have been able to remain neutral, but such a course would have been economically disastrous by 1916. The American desire to continue commerce with the warring nations inevitably helped the allies who controlled the seas. Gregory believes that Wilson and most Americans may have been suspicious of German militarism even before the war, but that they were willing to tolerate German brutality and "uncivilized" warfare (e.g., the burning of Louvain) as long as it did not affect American interests. Submarine warfare was the main reason for intervention, but if the United States had not traded with the allies Germany would have had no reason to use it. The problem with Americans, as Gregory points out, was that they believed that they could have trade and peace too. They did not really understand that commerce would lead to war.

Gregory disagrees with "realist" scholars like George Kennan who suggest that since the United States was destined to enter the war it should have done so earlier. The author argues correctly that Wilson, whom he treats sympathetically though judiciously, could not have accepted such an assumption and that there was insufficient popular and congressional support for an earlier entry. Gregory believes that Wilson's personality was exceptionally complex and should not be overgeneralized. Throughout, Wilson appears as a man not fully aware of the power at his disposal, struggling to avoid a dreaded war, irritated with Britain's arrogant handling of American rights, enraged by Germany's infringements on the seas and elsewhere. There is pathos in Wilson's agony as he hoes a faltering, though generally pro-ally, neutral line and carries on a tortured diplomacy searching for an honorable way out.

An interesting bibliographic essay concludes this absorbing, concise study.
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