The Big Sleep (which the critics unanimously dislike or dismiss as inferior to the Bogart original) implies that Hollywood's interest in Chandler's works may have come to the end of a road that took approximately forty years to travel. Strongly recommended.

University of Kansas
Harold Orel


Garfield's term as President was cut short by an assassin's bullet so soon after his inauguration that he is customarily omitted in any recital of the achievements of former presidents. Arthur normally does not get much more space than Garfield: he is usually given credit only for not having been as bad as he was expected to be. Doenecke is not a revisionist, but his careful account of the years from 1881 to 1885 leads to the conclusion that the presidency was not in total eclipse. Although he acknowledges that Garfield's term was too brief to permit a conclusive judgment, he notes that "long before Woodrow Wilson made his remark, James Abram Garfield was "the scholar in politics." Arthur, "one of the nation's great political surprises, . . . conducted the office with dignity and restraint." Doenecke particularly stresses the active foreign policy of the United States during this period. In this respect, as in others, this volume is a useful reminder that the nation's growth and development did not—as we have often been led to believe—come to a halt while Garfield and Arthur occupied the White House.

University of Kansas
Francis H. Heller


This book is both imposing and important. Leffler addresses the period's most complex issues (intergovernmental debts, tariffs, central bank cooperation, foreign loans, disarmament, French security, German rehabilitation and currency stabilization), and he provides a perceptive synthesis of the nation's foreign policies during Republican ascendancy. Leffler argues convincingly that Republican policymakers sought a politically and economically stable Europe, but ultimately their proposed international initiatives fell victim to such domestic imperatives as tax reduction, fear of inflation, legislative-executive struggles and the popularity of non-entanglement in European politics. Cogent if less original are his analyses of Hoover's internationalism during the interregnum and Roosevelt's uncertain but eventual commitment to economic nationalism in 1933. However impressive his research in American archival materials, use of the transcripts of Coolidge's press conferences would have strengthened Leffler's treatment of Franco-American divisions.

Iowa State University
Richard N. Kottman


A good book, of concern to us because Rader tries to tie sports to society. It is true that he makes errors; he does not, for example, understand Puritan beliefs, and his model of U.S. social patterns is not sophisticated. But such matters amount, perhaps, to 1/100th of the volume; most of the rest is very good, and presented thoughtfully. The reader can draw his own connections between sports and society. Rader tries to cover sports of all sorts, at least naming those he must omit in given periods, and selecting those which he feels typify major tendencies. His section titles represent his major thesis: The Age of Folk Games (1607-1850); The Age of the Player (1850-1920); The Age of the Spectator (1920 to present). The dates nicely match watersheds in Modernization Theory, don't they? Readers sensitive to other approaches to our national experience will also find useful evidence here.

SGL