the Paulists, is particularly good because it connects Hecker's individual history and psychological makeup with his subsequent beliefs, theories, and actions. Unfortunately, Fellman's repeated attempts to prove his thesis detract from his scholarship. In a comparison of Albert Brisbane, the chief American disciple of Charles Fourier, and Josiah Warren, the founder of individual anarchism in this country, Fellman writes: "Both men assumed that a pattern of close personal relations would be at the root of self-fulfillment" (p. 11). Warren's philosophy, however, revolved around the belief that all interests between individuals had to be disconnected if society were to run smoothly. No doubt Warren would have been quite annoyed at the notion that he advocated "close personal relations."

The Unbounded Frame is a good source for understanding some of the more interesting minds of the nineteenth century. However, the common thread of utopianism quickly becomes tangled, and Fellman's thesis, perhaps because it was not valid to begin with, gets lost in that tangle.

St. Louis, Mo. Lori Breslow

Mr. Polk's War: American Opposition and Dissent, 1846-1848. By John H. Schroeder. (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1973. Pp. xvi, 184. Notes, illustrations, essay on sources, index. $12.50.)

One suspects that some who pick up this book, seeing just *Mr. Polk's War* on its spine, will have no idea whatsoever of its contents. They must look to the subtitle, *American Opposition and Dissent, 1846-1848,* for enlightenment. The volume is a scholarly examination of the protest movement(s) against the Mexican War, or, as it is known below the Rio Grande, the North American Invasion. Its structure is basically chronological, cued particularly to the wartime sessions of Congress, with coverage of dissent in the different sections of the nation as it developed from political, religious, racial, economic, philosophical, and other causes as well as chiefly from admixtures of varying, even contradictory, motives. The book's main title, however, is appropriate to the outcome of the story: opposition and dissent had almost no perceptible effect on the campaigns and results of America's first "foreign" war as conducted by President James K. Polk.

Americans have had good reason to be conscious of the problem of dissent in the last few years. Several forces and conditions in the history of the United States have brought dissent to the forefront in connection with the Korean intervention and, even more notably, during the recent conflict in Vietnam. Such books as the present one are a natural, healthy, and useful result of the contemporary historians' searching of the past in order to understand the present better and to lift a corner of the curtain, possibly, for a hint about the future. The book has much to its credit. It is a result of careful and extensive research; it is based on a practical plan to which the author adheres without fanciful asides or unjustified extrapolations; and it is for the most part clearly and concisely set forth. There are worthwhile footnotes, page by page, as well as a good essay on sources, a helpful index, and a few reproductions of editorial cartoons to break up a little of the visual monotony of pages of text.

With all that said, however, this reviewer puts Schroeder's book down without any great urge to thrust it upon friends and without an expectation of seeing it cited in the future except on very specialized reading lists. It is a thoroughly commendable but modest first book, making no secret of its origin as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Virginia. It was in need of closer editorial attention than it received. In several passages, for instance, the reader cannot tell whether Schroeder is paraphrasing his sources or showing his own bias, rendering his own judgment.

More basically, this book leaves the reader with the feeling of having examined only one side of the coin, perhaps only the flawed and less significant side. The author recognizes but gives little emphasis (pp. 162-63) to the fact that most Americans favored and supported, or certainly did not oppose, the war. That it was in fact fought by volunteers and nondrafted regulars, including thousands from New England where opposition and dissent were strongest, is a matter of concern to the author only as a source of frustration to dissenters. A general or full dimensioned study of public opinion on the Mexican War and related issues would be very interesting and more significant than the present volume. The author of this proposed book should use Schroeder's research techniques but try harder to submerge his own bias.

The National Archives John Porter Bloom
Washington, D. C.