

We pass over Mr. Fieldhouse's treatment of the growth of the British and other empires after 1815 and move on to the final chapters, which are the best in the book. Under the heading (borrowed from the French historian Brunschwig) 'Myths and Realities of the Modern Colonial Empires', he deals faithfully with Hobson, Lenin and other modern critics of imperialism and 'colonialism', and by a careful examination of the facts demolishes the myth that modern empires 'were great machines deliberately constructed by Europe to exploit dependent peoples by extracting economic and fiscal profit from them'. The argument is impressive and readers whose interests are contemporary rather than historical might well find this chapter and the epilogue on decolonization worthwhile, even if they have no time to tackle the whole book.

A comprehensive survey of this kind can hardly hope to escape minor errors, though some might have been eliminated by more careful proof-reading — e.g. 'Khalif' for Khalifa (p. 224), 'Edward' for Edwin Montagu (p. 235), 'Opulu' and 'Sawaii' for Upolo and Savaii (p. 365). Kitchener arrived at Fashoda with a gun-boat flotilla, two Sudanese battalions and a hundred Highlanders — hardly 'a large army' (p. 224); and I can find no authority for the statement on p. 231 that 'the Russians occupied northern Korea'. Their influence was dominant for a time in Korea and a partition appears to have been mooted; but it was never carried out. These points, admittedly, are only on the fringe of the subject.

A further point concerns the publisher rather than the author. There are sixty-two illustrations, well selected and on the whole, considering their small scale, well reproduced. But the grouping of these illustrations, covering as they do a period of four centuries, in a continuous series between pages 210 and 211 has a kaleidoscope effect which is hardly an aid to historical understanding. If the grouping was necessary, it would have been desirable at least to have references to the plates on the appropriate pages of the text. But it would have been preferable to distribute them, like the maps, throughout the book. This *caveat* made, the publishers must be congratulated on a notable piece of book production, as must the author on the large measure of success with which he has carried out the task the publishers assigned to him.

W. P. MORRELL

University of Otago

The Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933-1942. By John A. Salmond. Durham, North Carolina, Duke University Press, 1967. 240 pp. U.S. price: \$6.50.

ALTHOUGH European observers such as Alexis de Toqueville, James Bryce, and Gunnar Myrdal have produced some of the most penetrating analyses of American society and government, the study of American history has been generally neglected by non-Americans until recent years. While American historians have made important contributions to the historiography of many other countries, it is hard to think of more than a handful of significant books on the history of the United States written by outsiders.

During the past decade, however, there has been a tremendous expansion of American studies all over the world. In Australian and New Zealand universities, most history departments now employ an American specialist who more often than not is engaged in original research in the subject. Dr. John Salmond, a New Zealander now at La Trobe University in Australia, typifies this new generation of non-American scholars studying American history, and his book on the Civilian Conservation Corps well represents the kind of specialized monograph that it is producing.

The C.C.C. was a federal agency established in the early days of the New Deal to attack two problems: the unemployment of men and the wastage of natural resources. Its specific task was to put young unemployed men to work on such jobs as soil conservation, re-afforestation, and the protection of wild-life. During the nine years of its existence the Corps provided work for millions of young men (up to 500,000 at any one time), operated thousands of camps all over America, and carried out a vast amount of valuable work in such fields as forest improvement and erosion control.

Dr. Salmond's interest in the C.C.C. lies in its administrative and political history rather than in trees, soil or birds. Although he devotes a chapter to describing the field work of the Corps, he is mainly concerned with such questions as the reasons for its remarkable popularity, how it was organized, and why it failed to survive World War II. It is not easy to write the history of a complex administrative agency such as this (no fewer than four government departments had a hand in running the C.C.C.!) without becoming bogged down in a mass of detail, but on the whole the author manages to avoid this trap. Very sensibly he has chosen to keep the length of his book down to modest proportions and to concentrate on a few major themes.

Despite its popularity, it appears that the C.C.C. was subject to many of the same pressures and internal conflicts of other better-known New Deal agencies such as the N.R.A. and the T.V.A. The tension between the President's drive for economy and Congressmen's determination to save camps in their districts, for instance, sounds a familiar note. The clash between the office of Education, which wished to use the Corps as an instrument of educational reform, and the army, which preferred to keep the boys away from dangerous long-haired educationalists, reminds one of similar clashes between reformers and 'pragmatists' in the A.A.A. and elsewhere. Salmond's excellent chapter on the Negro in the C.C.C. bears out once more the point that often the least privileged groups in American society benefited only marginally from New Deal programmes.

Salmond's explanation of the C.C.C.'s demise in 1942 is to me his most interesting point. 'The Corps was never able to outgrow its emergency status', he says. It 'was a relief agency and . . . never successfully sold itself as anything else'. Was this not in part true of the New Deal as a whole, one wonders? Occasionally while reading this book, I felt that Salmond could have explored points like this more fully and made a more deliberate attempt to relate them to the New Deal as a whole. But perhaps he was right to simply tell his story and let the facts speak for themselves. This they do admirably.

JAMES HOLT

University of Auckland