should be rewarding to American Studies scholars, especially the first, Jerome Rodnitzky's "Popular Music as a Radical Influence, 1945-1970." John Garraty's "Radicalism in the Great Depression" places American reactions in world perspective, and the remaining two, "Harry S. Truman and His Critics: the 1948 Progressives and the Origins of the Cold War," by Frank Ross Peterson, and "John Collier and the American Indian, 1920-1945," by Kenneth Philp, are contributions on topics of current concern. These varied writings, including LBJ's introduction, suggest not only that "radicalism" is a relative term, but that "radical" activities may be a prerequisite to a healthy society.

MJS


Although the author professes to be writing primarily biography, this is a distinguished critical study and the most comprehensive ever written on Eugene O'Neill, embracing all the unproduced and even unpublished early plays that are extant. Of particular interest is his discussion of the experimental plays written between 1921 and 1926, which include The Hairy Ape, Desire Under the Elms, The Great God Brown and Strange Interlude. In 1929 O'Neill renounced the Art Theater principles which prompted such experimentation and, as Bogard effectively demonstrates, moved steadily toward his last and greatest plays, The Iceman Cometh and Long Day's Journey Into Night.

University of Oklahoma
Bruce Granger


Cassell's thoroughly researched biography of Samuel Smith, Baltimore merchant prince, Revolutionary War hero, and maverick Jeffersonian who during his forty consecutive years in Congress championed mercantile interests, military preparedness, a national bank and federally financed internal improvements underlines the shortcomings of simplistic approaches—such as the Beardian agrarian versus commercial dichotomy—to early American political alignments.

JB


The thesis of this highly competent study is that "Minnesota progressivism was no more successful than its national counterpart in overcoming inner tensions or developing a sure sense of direction." (viii)

RWS


No two people in our field seem to agree about the worth of the American Quarterly bibliographies. Some dislike the categories ("American Studies is supposed to break through categories, not reenforce them"); "How can we inventory all the disciplines which deal with the United States?"); some bemoan the omission and exclusions (this often means, "They missed three out of four of my articles"). Perhaps it's fair to say that AQ's lists have their limitations, but that, given the structural peculiarities of our field, AQ's "principal editorial criterion for listing" would have to be something as arbitrary as "the extent to which . . . [an article] manifests a relationship between two or more aspects of American Civilization." That's the old interdisciplinary test, ambiguous, unsatisfactory and tough to apply with fairness. Moreover, the really interdisciplinary article is hard to categorize, and often eludes the American Quarterly cross reference listings. The individual bibliographers, working under Donald Koster, obviously influenced the selections according to their interests and their conceptions of American Studies; that's neither a virtue nor a failing. My impulse is to repeat the judgments of friends, some of whom, coming to this resource for guidance, praise it and lament its decreased scope (starting next year, AQ will cut the brief comments which accompany the items), while others grouse about its perhaps inevitable limitations. The collected edition has indices, which should be useful.

SGL


While Cox's argument that Harper shifted from a relatively moderate and non-