In positing his notion that workers need to depend less upon “bureaucratic coercion,” Green underestimates the historic significance of the favorable New Deal political climate and resulting supportive legal environment in the creation of America’s modern labor movement. This sympathetic federal political and legal environment in turn encouraged militant CIO unions to channel their energies into forming aggressive but tractable bureaucratic entities that could best confront their corresponding corporate bureaucracies to gain workplace and economic benefits for their members. As scholars such as Christopher Tomlins have argued, the gains that workers made in industrial communities such as Austin in the mid-twentieth century would not have been possible without this supportive environment. Of course, in coming under the protective hand of the federal government, unions sacrificed a good deal of their independence. Then, once the federal government became less supportive of organized labor, particularly during the Reagan years, unions saw a tremendous erosion of their earlier gains. If nothing else, the Hormel strike of 1985–1986 truly illustrates the profound contradictions that have emerged from the “devil’s bargain” that organized labor struck in the New Deal period.

Although Hardy Green’s book on the Hormel strike certainly captures the spirit of the workers who participated in the event, his analysis of the meaning of these events for the rest of America’s labor movement is less compelling. Exhortations for workers to rely upon “selfless mutual support” (300) cannot by themselves overcome the divisions that exist among workers or the decline of federal government support for an organized labor movement.


REVIEWED BY TIMOTHY WALCH, HOOVER PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY

It is a truism to say that readers should neither judge books by their covers, nor assume that titles describe contents. *History and Public Policy* proves the truth of those maxims. Although the title is broad and expansive, the contents are tightly focused. The contrast between the two leads to confusion over the purpose of the book. This is not to say that this eclectic collection of essays, reviews, and articles is mistitled. In fact, all of the contributions in this volume do discuss the history of specific public policy issues, the value of historical analysis in the development of current public policy, the literature of public history,
or the historical methodology used in writing public history. Yet History and Public Policy is a collection of contributions that is less than the sum of its parts. To be sure, all of the essays and articles are worthy of publication, and each one is valuable in and of itself. But the contributions were prepared over the past fifteen years for different purposes and delivered to different audiences. Several were first published in other forms. Bound together, these essays and articles have no common purpose or thesis other than the broad outlines noted in the title.

Several of the individual contributions deserve special mention. Of particular value are the memoir by Edward D. Berkowitz on his service as a historian for a presidential commission, the review essay by W. Andrew Achenbaum on the literature of the public history movement, and the analysis by Otis Graham on the uses and misuses of history in the debate over immigration reform. These contributions will stimulate readers to think seriously about the relationship between historians and policy makers. On a less positive note, it is not clear why the editor included the contributions by Edward Berkowitz and Daniel M. Fox, David B. Mock, and Irvin D. Solomon. They focus narrowly on the history of specific public policy decisions, but do not discuss how historians were involved in the evolution of those decisions. More important, these articles stand out as distinctively different from the other contributions in the book.

It is not damning with faint praise to say that History and Public Policy is an imperfect work with a noble intention. David B. Mock and his colleagues—as well as their publisher—are engaged in an admirable effort to bring to public attention the important role that historians can play in our daily lives. "Collectively," as Mock notes, "these authors ... suggest that policy makers and their advisors can use the skills of historians to gain important insights into the various issues they face." On that point, all students of history can agree, but how do we get the policy makers to add a historical dimension to their point of view? History and Public Policy doesn't offer much in the way of an answer to that question. Iowans interested in that topic would do better to consult Public History: An Introduction, edited by Barbara J. Howe and Emory Kemp (Krieger, 1986), or Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers, by Richard E. Neustadt and Ernest R. May (Free Press, 1986). Those works are not definitive, but they are always thoughtful and at times provocative. Although it contains several useful essays, History and Public Policy should be placed farther down the reading list than either of those works.

The public history movement is still in its formative stages across the nation. Archivists, historic preservationists, and historically
minded citizens in Iowa and other states have made great progress in preserving our heritage. Now the challenge before us is to get a wide range of citizens—students and policy makers, in particular—to use what we have preserved. The answers to that challenge will not be found in books like this one, but in a concerted effort to raise public consciousness about the value of the past. It is time for us to put down the books and get to work.


REVIEWED BY THOMAS VENNUM, JR., SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

After forty years of fieldwork and numerous publications on the music and dance of Plains Indian peoples, William K. Powers is an established authority on the subject. His most recent book, War Dance, however, is a major disappointment. Instead of synthesizing his vast experience with the material to provide fresh insights and make a major contribution to the ethnomusicological literature, he has opted instead to string together in fairly disjointed fashion a miscellany of his previous essays, some of them more than two decades old.

The book is divided into two parts. An anecdotal, autobiographical introduction to Powers’s early career leads into part one, “Plains Indian Music and Dance,” whose seven chapters make up the essence of the book. In them he defines “powwow” and “War dance,” contrasts musical-cultural traits of the northern (Dakotan) and southern (Oklahoman) plains, and considers matters of diffusion. His main contribution to War Dance, the excellent and previously unpublished chapter, “Pan-Indianism Reconsidered,” unfortunately has little to do with the purported topic of the book. The four final chapters (part two, “Plains Music in Review”) represent little more than an appendix, consisting of slightly reworked Ethnomusicology reviews of recordings, many of them out of print and some containing song genres (peyote music, Christian hymnody) having nothing to do with Powers’s central theme.

War Dance is richly illustrated with twenty historical and contemporary photographs. However, their subject matter, layout, and the general lack of commentary on them suggest that they are mere fillers. Nowhere are they referred to in the text, nor are they used to illustrate the discussion. For example, the photograph of an informal Rabbit dance from about 1930 on the Pine Ridge Reservation appears on page 31, while Powers describes the dance on page 79. Similarly, the