

methods. Their efforts gave rise to the same question often faced today when people in the executive branch of government—some in very high places—despite their rhetoric about the joys of executive-legislative “partnership” in foreign affairs, do not really believe that Congress should be significantly involved in the shaping of foreign policy. Although the Constitution assigns to the president chief responsibility for the conduct of foreign policy, there are, in this reviewer’s opinion, three major roles appropriate to Congress in this field. First, Congress can establish—through law or in other ways—or give sanction to, certain principles that govern the nation’s foreign affairs. Second, Congress can oversee the implementation of these principles by the executive branch. Clearly, Congress cannot—nor should it—run foreign policy on a day to day basis. But, equally clearly, Congress has the right, indeed the obligation, to monitor the executive branch in its direction of international affairs. Third, under the Constitution, it is Congress that has power to appropriate the money essential to the carrying out of policy abroad as well as at home.

Recent events have demonstrated the importance to the national interest of an active Congress vigorously exercising its responsibilities in foreign policymaking. Professor Ryley’s book is a case study which illumines this crucial though still unresolved issue.

*Member of Congress,  
Third District, Indiana*

John Brademas

*The New Deal.* Volume I, *The National Level*; volume II, *The State and Local Levels.* Edited by John Braeman, Robert H. Bremner, and David Brody. (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1975. Pp. xv, 341; xiv, 434. Notes, tables, figures, indexes. Set, \$30.00.)

One of the finest historical series currently being published by a major university press is Ohio State’s *Modern America*. Begun in 1964 and edited by John Braeman (University of Nebraska), Robert Bremner (Ohio State), and David Brody (University of California—Davis), the books deal with important themes in twentieth century American history and represent significant monographic contributions

to the historiography of progressivism, the 1920s, foreign policy, and now—in these two volumes—the New Deal. The editors have gathered twenty-four articles which discuss a variety of interesting themes. Many constitute first rate analytical interpretations of previously unexamined questions; few do not succeed in either provoking critical thinking or causing modifications in the assessments presently held about particular politicians and programs or the broad contours of the New Deal. If historians are ever to move beyond the dreary debates about the New Deal as “revolutionary” or “conservative,” or as an effective fusion or reconciliation of “change and continuity,” it will be necessary to evaluate discrete aspects of ideas which are increasingly being taken for granted. The 1930s have been particularly vulnerable to the audacious generalization unrooted in primary research. Too often the historians’ understanding of this era has been affected by people Samuel Eliot Morison once described as “so superior in intellect that they can give you the essence of an era without the labor of reading the sources.” In these volumes, however, the emphasis is upon thorough immersion in the manuscript sources and secondary literature of the period and the formulation of less sweeping but more satisfying conclusions about the New Deal.

Volume I is devoted exclusively to the national dimension of New Deal affairs and contains articles which break new ground or help to solidify a formerly impressionistic judgment with firm documentary exposition and rigorous analysis. There are valuable essays such as Richard Polenberg’s recreation of the atrophy of domestic reform, Jerald Auerbach’s investigation of the sociological origins of the legal profession and the rise of a new professional elite, Albert Romasco’s identification of the liberal and conservative historians who represented Herbert Hoover and Franklin D. Roosevelt as antithetical polarities in American history, Ellis Hawley’s contention that the New Deal shift was “not from laissez-faire to a managed economy but rather from one attempt at management, that through informal federal-government cooperation to another more formal and coercive attempt” (p. 157), and David Brody’s demonstration of how World War II revealed the ideological and intellectual limitations of the New Deal. Richard Kirkendall provides a stimulating investigation of the intimate and obscure patterns of

agricultural politics, and Milton Derber conveniently summarizes New Deal labor relations.

In Volume II the focus is shifted from Washington to the states and localities, and a very interesting combination of essays unravels complicated aspects of administrative and political history. These essays undermine the myth that the New Deal unilaterally dictated policies and procedures to timid and complacent states. David Maurer shows the intense opposition to federal relief in Ohio; Robert Hunter examines a similar ethos against the federal government in Virginia; John Moore illuminates the treacherous machinations of the Huey P. Long forces in Louisiana; and Keith Bryant describes the marginal impact of the New Deal upon Oklahoma. F. Alan Coombs' account of Colorado, Michael Malone's of Montana, and James Wickens' of Colorado each indicate that the New Deal neither transformed the political attitudes of the various states nor rendered them satellites of the federal government. William Pickens, however, discovers a more far reaching impact upon New Mexico. Harold Gorvine's interpretation of Massachusetts politics shows the lack of cooperation between national and state Democrats, and Richard Keller traces the achievements of Pennsylvania's Little New Deal. Bruce Stave's depiction of Pittsburgh's relationship with the New Deal and Llyle Dorsett's account of how Kansas City's works program influenced the national New Deal are both excellent papers.

While it is difficult to characterize twenty-four separate papers on the basis of their shared conclusions, judgments, or intrinsic quality, it can be said that these two volumes will serve historians well and become indispensable guides to the historiography of the New Deal.

*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor*      Frank Annunziata