Fremont was best as the daring and resourceful leader of these expeditions—when he ventured into politics and business matters, he suffered.

Chaffin also gives the reader a superb look at the antebellum westward movement and its consequences. One of the questions that appears regarding Fremont is whether he helped accentuate Indian Removal—whether he should be blamed for some of the worse aspects of empire or imperialism. As Chaffin writes, “While traditionalists venerate Fremont as a hero carrying liberty’s light into the west, revisionists dismiss him as an advance scout for imperialistic and anti-Indian genocide policies.”

This book fills a gap that is often missing in antebellum history. We do have monographs on the westward movement. But we have too few works that connect these westward scientific missions with Manifest Destiny. Chaffin’s book helps to fill in that gap.

Concordia University, St. Paul

David E. Woodard


It is difficult to capture the complex nature of a large-scale conflict, such as World War I, in the classroom. Sophisticated instruction requires an examination of the conflict’s battles, leaders, and weapons, but issues of nationalism, commerce, manufacturing, and labor are important as well. Students in the best classes investigate some of the more troubling elements of the conflict, including its true purpose, race relations, and political manipulation. In addition, war involves opponents and allies who have stories of their own to discuss that students need to consider. The Great War of 1914–1918 is an excellent example of this complexity, and few individual books have captured its total experience in a format usable in the classroom. However, it is possible to successfully describe this conflict from a specific national, regional, or topical perspective, which is the approach of Robert H. Zieger in *America’s Great War*.

Focusing on the American perspective, Zieger builds his manuscript around four major themes: this nation’s connection to Europe, the relationship between the war and the Progressive era, the rise of the national security state, and the presidency of Woodrow Wilson. In chapters organized chronologically, Zieger takes the reader from the European war, through America’s entry, to the disastrous peace negotiations of 1918–1920. Inserted in this narrative are chapters on mobilization and the issues surrounding class, race, and gender. He concludes his manuscript with a discussion of the postwar United States and poses some questions he believes are central to placing this conflict within the broader scope of American history.

*America’s Great War* is a work of synthesis, and Zieger consults a wide-array of secondary works on this conflict to support his manuscript. As a Distinguished
Professor of History at the University of Florida and prolific scholar concentrating on labor history, Zieger does not rely on standard military history views of the war, but constructs his own arrangement of the events. His narrative is not, therefore, one that will please xenophobic patriots as he describes America’s unpreparedness, reliance on French military equipment, the breakdown of its supply system, and mistreatment of African-Americans who were ready to fight for their country. Into his story he further weaves the social, economic, and psychological costs of the war such as the fight for the League of Nations, the struggles of labor, and the retaliation of the government against those who opposed the conflict.

Those who wish a more detailed study of purely military aspects of World War I will be disappointed and should continue to consult sources such as Edward M. Coffman’s *The War to End All Wars*. However as the standard text for use in undergraduate history courses, Zieger’s book is the right choice. It can be used too as a reference for lecture preparation or as a common text for use by students who are preparing more detailed examinations of other aspects of the conflict. It is a great read and should become a standard text for future classroom examinations of the United States in the Great War.

California State University, Northridge

Stephen A. Bourque


Immediately after September 11, 2001, many compared that event with Pearl Harbor and its aftermath, when all persons of Japanese ancestry living on the West Coast of the United States were imprisoned. Did national security require such action and, is it necessary, in the current situation, to take similar measures against persons with connections to a perceived enemy? A recent publication argues that the imprisonment of Japanese Americans in 1942 was justified and that similar measures should be taken today in defense of the country. (See Michelle Malkin, in *Defense of Internment: The Case for “Racial Profiling” in World War II and the War on Terror*, 2004.)

That such a notion could be considered seriously constitutes a failure of historical memory that this present volume seeks to address. In the view of the editor, the experience of Japanese Americans in that time “may well be the most documented and least known miscarriage of justice in our history,” and yet there are those who neglect the historical record and are vulnerable to the sway of myths about that experience and time.

Erica Harth asks the reader to remember that the internment of Japanese Americans affected and continues to affect all Americans and that “the story of the internment will not be over until we take full responsibility not only for the injustice but