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ment of Hoover's program and of his approach to issues in the pre-presidential period.

For the presidential years themselves, the most serious failing of the book is that it centers on that which Hoover proposed, and not on what he opposed. Thus, Hoover's own program is examined in depth and the sources of opposition are described. But a large part of Hoover's image problem then and later centered not on the failure on his proposals, but on his opposition to the proposals of others. Surely any study of Hoover's presidency—even a sympathetic one—must be as attentive to the positions he took in opposition as it is to his own program. What is more, some might find in this book an excessive attempt to elevate Hoover by denigrating his opposition. Thus, the Hoover program is described sympathetically, while those opposed to it are identified as obstructionists without any real effort made to understand the reasons for their opposition or the alternatives that they proposed.

In short, Professors Robinson and Bornet have produced a book of great value in understanding the Hoover program during his presidential years, but it does not adequately illuminate other aspects of his presidency and is not, therefore, a comprehensive study of the Hoover presidency. The definitive work on Hoover's presidential years remains to be written.

—Gary Dean Best
University of Hawaii at Hilo


Paul A. Kurzman, a social worker, administrator and teacher, has written an admiring, somewhat superficial study of the public relief career of Iowan Harry L. Hopkins from 1931-1938, when the latter directed the major governmental relief activities for Governor, and later President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. The author concedes that this is not the definitive work on the pride of Grinnell College, Class of 1912. Indeed, Kurzman's short thematic chapters lack a substantive, detailed analysis of Hopkins' feelings. Kurzman is an unabashed admirer of Hopkins who hopes to rescue his hero from the limbo of historical obscur-
ity. Hopkins emerges from this study as a dedicated humanitarian reformer who provided much of the innovative genius which made the New Deal a revolutionary response to an unprecedented crisis in our nation's history. However it is the author's unwillingness to examine more critically the historical Hopkins which constitutes the main flaw in this work.

During the 1920s and 1930s, Hopkins appeared in the vanguard of changes in the fields of social welfare and public administration. The two chapters in the book which deal with this are the most original and enduring pieces in the entire work. Happily, the author has also succeeded in revising some of Robert E. Sherwood's caricatures of Hopkins as the dutiful servant and docile student of FDR. Although he never replaced Louis Howe as the president's political mentor, Hopkins did enjoy the president's confidence and wielded considerable power in his own right while deservedly receiving much of the credit (and blame) for the vast relief undertakings of the New Deal. Unfortunately, the author also accepted the opinions of Raymond Moley and Samuel Rosenman who claimed that neither the president nor Hopkins himself took the latter's presidential ambitions and chances very seriously. Hopkins never shelved his political ambitions completely until after he suffered a near fatal relapse in his chronically poor health early in 1939. Only then did he become the singleminded, selfless public servant who spent his dwindling physical resources combatting the nation's foreign enemies.

Perhaps some of the author's misconceptions might have been avoided had he relied less on Hopkins' ghostwritten articles and depended more on his correspondence which provided a clearer picture of Hopkins' motives and activities. Rather than dwell so much on Hopkins' words, Kurzman should have also paid attention to his feet. Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. remarked that Hopkins reached out wherever power lay in the 1930s, including the White House, the Army and the wealthy class of businessmen and industrialists. (The Politics of Upheaval, p. 356) Aubrey Williams, Hopkins' closest advisor, noticed by 1937 that his boss was devoting less time to the everyday tasks of work relief and more time in the pursuit of his own personal ambitions. (Williams Ms.) If one fails to appreciate the ambitious politician-administrator side of
Hopkins, an important dimension of a talented and versatile New Dealer will be lost. Hopkins did court politicians, business tycoons and generals while he practiced the craft of the “administrative breed,” gracefully exchanging agencies and causes in an effort to serve both the public welfare and his own personal goals. Hopkins carefully balanced the requirements of the social worker and the politician, the reformer and the administrator; he was a professional altruist, an idealist working on matter and an ambitious functionary who appears in disguise throughout Kurzman’s hagiographic study.

——Frank J. Rader
Empire State College
Saratoga Springs, N.Y.


The social cohesion and artistic achievements of the Kwakiutl, Bella Coola, Nootka, Coast Salish, Haida, Tlingit, and Tsim Shia peoples—what author H. R. Hays styles the “Children of the Raven”—have attracted the attention of several generations of scholars. But, complains Hays, the specialists have failed to communicate the message to the masses—hence the need for a popular account of the Northwest Coast Indians for the celebrated plumber in Cleveland with a bona fide interest in Indian history and culture, but with no systematic training on the subject. More important, perhaps, is the author’s contention that these Native Americans have “yet to be appreciated and properly integrated into the heritage of North America,” and the implication that what follows the Introduction accomplishes precisely that.

The first complaint involves the frustrations of leisure-time Americans and their technologically-prompted illiteracy—as such, subjects beyond the scope of this review. The second is more to the point, for its assertion requires the utilization of a reasoned strategy for integrating Native American history into the larger and more complex framework of the North American “heritage.”