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to all students of Alaskan history, the history of the West and specialists on the New Deal period. All who read these pages will not only ponder the impact of the wilderness on human development, but will wonder at the persistent desire of mankind to pay the high cost of civilization and progress. Perhaps Alaskans might yet choose to preserve their natural heritage as a reminder that an alternative set of social values can persist into the third century of American independence. So long as we can cling to the Adirondacks, the Ozarks, the Cascades and Alaska, mankind can drink from nature’s fount and enjoy the regenerative effects it has on the human spirit.

—Frank J. Rader
Empire State College


In analyzing recent United States history attention must be given to the political career of Hubert Horatio Humphrey of Waverly, Minnesota. Complementing recent memoirs from Lyndon B. Johnson and Clinton P. Anderson, this autobiography makes a significant contribution to the study of twentieth century America. Humphrey inherited his liberal Democratic biases from his father, a druggist in small-town South Dakota, and seeming Republican indifference to the plight of South Dakotan farmers during the depression of the twenties and early thirties made him a youthful advocate of an activist and compassionate government. By the time he had graduated from the University of Minnesota and Louisiana State University he had become an ardent New Dealer.

In the early forties Humphrey returned to Minnesota with a wife and family to take a position in the Works Progress Administration. He also became active in Minneapolis and Hennepin County politics and developed strong ties to labor and academic communities. He was the primary force in the fusion of the weak Democratic organization with the militant Farmer Laborites, making the DFL the most potent progressive force in postwar Minnesota politics. In following decades DFL leadership was distinguished by the careers of Orville Freeman, Walter Mondale, Eugene McCarthy, and Wendell Anderson, all of whom became prominent in state and national politics.

In 1945 Humphrey became the popular and innovative Mayor of Minneapolis. Three years later he appeared on the national political scene by successfully pushing through a militant civil rights platform in the Democratic National Convention. Although the Dixiecrats walked out of the convention, Humphrey’s state-wide popularity remained undiminished, which enabled him to become the first Democrat in Minnesota history to become a United States Senator.
These years in the Senate were clearly the happiest of Humphrey's career. Following an inauspicious debut and his ungentlemanly attack on Harry F. Byrd, he reached the nadir of his political influence. Carefully assessing Senate traditions and rules, he slowly insinuated himself into the good graces of the Senate's Inner Club. Lacking the ideological purity of such liberals as Paul H. Douglas of Illinois, Humphrey's pragmatic, anti-Communist liberalism, symbolized by his role and leadership in the Americans for Democratic Action, was deeply influenced by his agrarian background. His liberalism was no political abstraction. It was a moral and humane ethic seeking justice and fair play for those citizens in society oppressed by economic and social forces beyond their control. His sense of accommodating to political realities led to one of the more fertile legislative records in United States history, including such historic legislation as the Food for Peace program, Peace Corps, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Humphrey's participation in the major postwar legislative battles and his observations of such personalities as Robert Taft, Richard Nixon, Everett Dirksen, Adlai Stevenson, Orville Freeman, John and Robert Kennedy, and Lyndon Johnson make fascinating reading. Dominating the latter half of the book is the Johnson-Humphrey friendship, certainly one of the more curious relationships in American political history. Humphrey's rise in the Senate as well as his term in the vice presidency was accomplished under the tutelage of this larger-than-life Texan. Johnson was the dominant partner in this relationship. His manner of selecting Humphrey to be his vice president, his goading of Humphrey to kill two bucks on his Texas ranch to prove himself the equal of Bobby Kennedy, and his demands that Humphrey wear an oversized cowboy outfit for a photo opportunity session reveal as much about Humphrey's personality as that of Johnson's.

Humphrey's inability to become his own man in the vice presidency was a personal and national tragedy. His grudging private acquiescence, and subsequent enthusiastic public endorsement, of American military policy in Vietnam destroyed his credibility among the youth and minorities, formerly his natural constituency. The role of Bob Kennedy and Eugene McCarthy in the 1968 presidential primaries, the turmoil surrounding the national convention, and the Vietnam conflict became insurmountable barriers to the presidency. His final, desperate attempt to break away from Johnson in the Salt Lake City speech came too late to rescue his presidential ambitions, and the office fell into the hands of much lesser men.

There is much that is admirable in this book. More than a simple telling of a public career, it exposes the hidden pain, humiliations, and sacrifices incurred in the drive for political power. Family and personal needs are subordinated to the exigencies of public life. The slowly emerging role of Muriel Humphrey, wife and mother, from the background into a first-class campaigner is told with admiring affection. This fine, well-written autobiography, shrewdly edited by Norman Sherman, is a reaffirmation of the
American political system. Humphrey's fundamental decency and his understanding of the rules of political life contrast sharply with the spate of memoirs emerging from the Nixon period.

—Stephen Sayles
The University of New Mexico


The Dunning School of Reconstruction History has been subjected to many criticisms running the gamut from racism to a failure to employ the comparative approach in the straight political history with which they were concerned. While the former charge is tenuous, there is some justification for accepting the latter. Dunning and his pupils did fail to employ the comparative approach. They did not contrast corrupt political behavior in the South during Reconstruction with like behavior before and after 1865-1876. Moreover, there is an absence of any mention of corruption in Northern politics during the same period. Rather, they examined corruption as if it were a phenomenon peculiar only to Radical Republican Southern politics. In an attempt to remedy these faults, recent historians, including the authors of this work, have felt inclined to take a harder look at the Northern states during Reconstruction. The result is a correction of the imbalance that in part was the consequence of Southerners writing too much about Reconstruction and Northerners too little.

The subject of this well edited and equally well written work is Radical Republican politics in nine Northern states: Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Iowa. In addition, there is an excellent historiographical note and summary of source materials.

In the examination of these states representing New England, the central section of the United States, and three significant north-central plains states, the editor mentions toward the end of the introduction that all of the essays were written specifically for this volume with a single exception—David Montgomery's piece on the erratic behavior of Republicans in Pennsylvania. The editor might have added that the basic themes of all the pieces are based on Montgomery's pioneer work. These themes include inner party struggles, the question of racial relations, and the impact of economic development on politics.

It is always difficult to review a work that includes a number of essays written by different authors. Always some of the articles are of more value than others, and one cannot make an essay by essay evaluation in the space allotted for a review. Consequently, this reviewer will suggest that the chapters on Connecticut (John Niven), New York (James C. Mohr), Ohio (Felice A. Bonadio), Illinois (Phillip D. Swenson), Michigan (George M.