



critic of the government in the infamous Dreyfus Affair. (Dreyfus, a Jewish army officer, had been wrongly convicted of treason.) Blum became the leader of the Socialist Party shortly after its break with the Communist Party in 1920. He shaped his party's policy of "nonparticipation"—no cooperation with parties unwilling to back a socialist program. However, argues Lacouture, a former reporter for *Le Monde*, Blum was not inflexible. The threat of fascism in 1936 prompted him to form a coalition government, the Popular Front, with the middle-class Radicals. Serving as Premier for less than a year, he still managed to extend obligatory schooling, nationalize the arms industry, and introduce collective bargaining and the 40-hour work week. Despite his pacifist principles, he followed Charles de Gaulle's advice to strengthen the French military. It was too little and too late. During the World War II German occupation, the Vichy government imprisoned Blum, then sent him to Buchenwald—not the first or last time that he suffered from anti-Semitism. Blum returned to politics after the war, serving twice briefly as Premier. Critics on the left attacked Blum as a timid "legalist." But Lacouture praises Blum for his commitment to the welfare of the common man and for his refusal to abandon political persuasion as the only legitimate means to achieve his dream.

**THE ROOTS OF
AMERICAN
BUREAUCRACY:**

1830-1900

by William E. Nelson
Harvard, 1982
208 pp. \$22.50

During much of the 19th century, reform-minded Americans struggled to create a healthy balance between majority rule and individual rights. Their failure, argues Nelson, an NYU law professor, resulted in a less-than-ideal compromise: a powerful central bureaucracy. In the 1830s and '40s, antislavery advocates such as John Quincy Adams championed blacks' rights to freedom in a political culture (Jacksonian Democracy) dominated by party rule. But after the Civil War, reformers realized that their use of U.S. courts to advance blacks' civil rights jeopardized the rights of the states; maintaining a

balance between state and central governments was one of the reformers' larger goals. Recognizing the dilemma, high-minded idealists of the 1880s and '90s (e.g., George Pullman and Henry Adams) preached civic-mindedness and social responsibility. But moral crusading went largely unheeded in a society of competing interest groups—including Big Business, organized labor, and the political parties themselves. So President Rutherford Hayes's Interior Secretary Carl Schurz and other reformers challenged the strongest interest, partisan politics (and its spoils system), by applying "scientific morality" to the existing bureaucracy. Policy decisions, they believed, were best made by "experts," not by cronies and hacks. Thanks to the reformers, party influence was increasingly tempered by civil service reforms and by regulatory agencies. The judiciary became professionalized, more mindful of precedent than of current politics. The reformers *were* staunch defenders of democratic pluralism, concludes Nelson. But they could accomplish their goal of advancing individual rights only by creating a strong, professional elite to administer the laws of the land.

MEMOIRS

by Petro G. Grigorenko
trans. by Thomas P.
Whitney
Norton, 1982
462 pp. \$19.95

While chronicles of the Devout Communist's fall from faith could now stock a small library, these memoirs by the Soviet Union's first exiled general earn a special place. Born in 1907 on a Ukrainian farm, Grigorenko witnessed the bloody struggles between the Bolsheviks and the Whites, enlisted in the Communist Party in 1927 (despite its brutal "collectivization" of agriculture), joined the Red Army four years later. A skilled engineer during the prewar years, he proved to be an able combat leader during World War II. After early doubts, Grigorenko became convinced that Stalin was a "brilliant military commander." But the Stalinist state soon seemed a vile corruption of Marxist-Leninist principles. Under Nikita Khrushchev's relatively liberal regime, he began publicly criticizing the Soviet leadership and its violations of civil rights. Such boldness led to the first of