

Testimonies relating the horrors of the war are piercing. A young platoon leader attests that the bayoneting of "a living human being" was a standard of training in his command and that massacres of suspect civilians were "routine." American pilots are executed in defiance of international law; Koreans provide both "forced labor" and "comfort women" for the Japanese war machine. A Japanese army doctor describes ghoulish experiments in human vivisection. Okinawan villagers engage in mass suicide to avoid capture by Americans intent, they have been told, on violating them.

The Japanese people do not escape the agony and pathos. Those who experienced the Tokyo fire bombings and the atomic attack on Hiroshima share the ghastly trauma of the moment. Fourth graders harvesting the fields scurry to avoid strafing from American planes. Women widowed by the war lay plans to have their ashes scattered in the Pacific where their pilot-husbands were lost half a century ago. Octogenarian mothers mourn sons who never returned, lighting candles and burning incense before Buddhist altars. Despite the pervasive suffering the acceptance of the surrender was met by disbelief and anger by many who had given so much of themselves and their families for what they considered to be a glorious and just cause.

The commentaries of the authors are succinct, syndetic, and probing. Their salient message: The war for the Japanese was "lost" amidst the facile political and economic transformation of the post-war era and remains, therefore, "unresolved," lacking even a definitive title, and neglected in textbooks and public discourse. They urge that the nagging residue—including "war responsibility"—be "faced and examined in public" in both Japan and the United States.

For secondary social studies in America, *Japan at War* offers a rich and fascinating supplement to the Pacific War presented in American textbooks, from Manchuria to Hiroshima, in a few laconic paragraphs. It is also a lesson in historiography for high school students who can learn how much history is contained in the lives of the people around them.

Kean College of New Jersey

William W. Goetz

David Steigerwald. *The Sixties and the End of Modern America*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995. Pp. vii, 328. Cloth, \$35.00; ISBN 0-312-12303-5. Paper, \$14.50; ISBN 0-312-09007-2.

David Steigerwald is assistant professor of history at The Ohio State University at Marion. He has written a number of articles for scholarly journals and has a forthcoming monograph, *Wilsonian Liberals and the Passing of the Universal Ideal*.

The basic theme of this book is that the sixties marked the passing of U.S. society from the modern to the postmodern age. The author dates the modern era as beginning at the turn of the twentieth century and reflecting the nature of modern industrial capitalism. The mass production in heavy industry and in consumer goods fed on labor from the great cities. Out of these changes come what the author refers to as the administrative state that liberals used to promote social reform at home and to oppose colonialism in foreign affairs.

In the postmodern era technology allowed manufacturers to move plants, automate work, and "deindustrialize." City cores deteriorated as urbanization moved into suburbanization. Modernist artists and intellectuals dissolved old ideals of politics, philosophy, and taste and abolished all traditions. Steigerwald sees the one real "winner" of the sixties as consumer culture. It was adaptable enough to turn many of the sixties' challenges into marketing opportunities. The author acknowledges a political purpose in his hope that "interpreting the decade as neither heavenly nor diabolical can help us break the current social and political stalemate." That's a pretty lofty hope that an academic work will bring reason to extremists in American society, but it makes for interesting reading.

After stating his theme and hopes for the work, Steigerwald then gives us ten chapters analyzing the various aspects of this tumultuous decade. There are two chapters on the Vietnam War and chapters dealing with the civil rights movement, student radicalism, the urban crisis, and crisis of authority, among others. He spends little time on the flower children and rock and roll. The civil rights movement was an "unambiguous" development for good and the Vietnam War appalling to the author.

In politics Steigerwald sees the 1968 defeat of Hubert H. Humphrey marking the end of the New Deal coalition based on the party machines, organized labor, the white working class, and southern conservatives. What emerged is the New Politics of left-leaning civil rights advocates, mainstream women's organizations, academic remnants of the university revolts, and by 1972 gay liberation and environmentalists. The New Deal groups could not relate to the New Politics and the result was demonstrated in McGovern's historic defeat when he captured only Massachusetts and the District of Columbia.

The chapters are nice summaries and analyses of the various movements of the sixties. These chapters could be a good source of lectures on a particular aspect of the decade. There is also a large annotated bibliography organized for each chapter. The paperback version would be worthwhile considering for supplemental reading for a more advanced course.

Southwest State University
(Marshall, MN), Emeritus

David L. Nass

Stephen Skowronek. *The Politics Presidents Make: Leadership from John Adams to George Bush*. Cambridge & London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1993. Pp. ix, 526. Cloth, \$29.95. ISBN 0-674-68935-6.

Skowronek, a Yale political science professor, has conceived a new framework for examining the leadership of United States presidents in the past. He contends that there have been four different modes of governmental operations in which presidents have had to work. (1) The Patrician mode of 1789-1832 was one in which the characteristic presidential resource was his personal reputation among notables and his typical strategy was to stand as national tribune above faction and interest. (2) In the Partisan mode from 1832 to 1900, party organization and executive patronage constituted the characteristic presidential resource, and the typical strategy was to act as a broker for the national coalition by distributing patronage to party factions and local machines. (3) The Pluralist mode from 1900 to 1972 was a period when the characteristic presidential resource was the expanding executive establishment needed to attend to newly nationalized interests and America's rise to world power; the typical strategy was to bargain with leaders of all institutions and organized interests as the main steward of national policy making. (4) In the Plebiscitary mode, from 1972 to the present, Skowronek maintains that the main resource the president had was his independent political apparatus and mass communication technologies, while the typical strategy was to appeal for political support over the heads of Washington elites directly to the people at large.

It is the author's thesis that it is these changing modes of governmental operations that account for what he sees as recurring patterns in leadership characteristics throughout the history of the presidency. Consequently, he examines in considerable detail the leadership of Presidents Jefferson, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Jackson, Polk, Pierce, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Hoover, Franklin Roosevelt, Lyndon Johnson, and Jimmy Carter, and winds up with a brief look at Reagan, Bush, and Clinton. His argument is that the presidents that we have seen as important leaders have been Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, FDR, and Reagan, who reconstructed the new modes. Skowronek calls Monroe, Polk, Theodore Roosevelt, LBJ, and, in a way, Bush, "faithful sons," or "articulators," of the new mode. Finally, he argues that presidents who have been seen as poor leaders had the misfortune of presiding at the point of disjunction for the old modes. In this category he discusses the leadership of John Quincy Adams, Franklin Pierce, Herbert Hoover, and Jimmy Carter. In the process of doing this the author comes up with many original insights. Most of them will have to be taken into account by political scientists and historians who study the matter of presidential leadership.

Although his book is not easy to read, once the reader gains an understanding of Skowronek's framework and his thesis, reading is not at all a chore for anyone who has a good knowledge of United States political history. Skowronek knows his history and his broad generalizations about presidential leadership in different eras rest on his mastery of a mass of historical facts. If students or other readers