Henry A. Wallace was a complex man of inflexible attitudes and incurable optimism, a rich admixture of personality traits which contributed to the formulation of his basic beliefs of foreign policy. Imbued with an Iowa-bred, agrarian progressivism and bedrock religious convictions, Wallace viewed the turbulent twentieth century as a spawning ground for a “century of the common man” where world peace, prosperity, and personal freedom could, and would, be achieved if cooperation and mutual trust were stimulated and nurtured by all nations.

Wallace’s international idealism of the post-World War II period sharply contrasted his earlier views. Wallace supported isolationism during the 1920s, hardly a novel position, but gradually embraced an “international path” during the 1930s. A bizarre encounter with mystic Nicholas Roerich enlarged Wallace’s perception of an international brotherhood, while the horrors of World War II convinced him that colonialism, unilateralism, and power politics were obsolete remnants of a bygone era.

Unfortunately for Wallace, his commendable concern for a world order stimulated his proclivity for the Soviet Union; many Americans believed Wallace himself to be a Communist. Wallace inadvertently became an apologist for the Soviet Communists, and found himself in the uncomfortable position of defending the Soviet Union, regardless of how outrageous the action, and unwittingly planted the seeds of his devastating loss in the 1948 presidential election.

Wallace was truly a remarkable, multi-faceted man, and his eclecticism contributed to his rabid adherence to the promise of a rational world order free from want or hunger. Wallace was convinced that domestic prosperity, improved diplomatic relations, and not a little personal sacrifice would create a new world order based upon hope, reason, and common goals. Wallace’s dedication to those beliefs blinded him to opposing, though equally legitimate, points of view, however, while his increasingly shrill denunciations of American “fascists,” notably the military and big business, destroyed his support at home. By 1948, the Cold War was full-blown and Wallace’s third party bid was annihilated, but his visionary idealism remained.

Inter-war uncertainties were eventually supplanted by the bone chilling nuclear fears of the post-war period which Wallace had labored
unsuccessfully to prevent. Dr. Walker has done a fine job of capturing the essence of Wallace's foreign policy ideals, and has enlarged on material covered by the Schapsmeier brothers. Unfortunately, Dr. Walker's admiration for Wallace has rendered him a Wallace apologist in several instances, most noticeably regarding Wallace's indefensible polarization due to his intransigent defense of the Soviet Union throughout 1947-1948. An appreciable analysis of Wallace's foreign policy is relegated to a few brief, but extremely insightful, pages near the book's end. Nevertheless, Dr. Walker has performed a credible job of "de-dissertationizing" his doctoral dissertation, and has provided new and valuable insights into a fascinating man.

—Ronald Rayman
Western Illinois University


Samuel B. Griffith's *In Defense of the Public Liberty* is a very readable, enjoyable account of the events of 1760 to 1781. The book provides some valuable insights into the Revolutionary War period. This history is a successful and sensible account of the most important military, political, and diplomatic events of the period. It provides more detailed information concerning those events than is usually to be found in such a general history. This information includes excerpts from the private diaries and correspondence of the major American, British, and French military and political participants as well as contemporary newspaper accounts and government records. In combination with extensive background material relating to the Anglo-American and Anglo-French relationships prior to 1760, these sources serve to clarify the issues at hand and the positions of each faction.

Mr. Griffith's analysis of the Anglo-American conflict is traditional. He emphasizes the importance of the initially covert, then following the Franco-American alliance of 1778, overt, French aid to the American cause. His analysis of the military proceedings of the war itself, while very accomplished and well reasoned, presents little new material or ideas. The real value of *In Defense of the Public Liberty* lies in its exceptionally lucid treatment. It is a history made accessible to lay readers, without having sacrificed scholarship.

—Dennis J. Pogue
Iowa City