

John Quincy Adams

By Harlow Giles Unger

Da Capo Press, Boston, MA, 2012. 364 pages, \$27.50.

REVIEWED BY CHARLES S. DOSKOW

This compelling volume is a biography of a President in which the presidency of the subject is the least interesting part. John Quincy Adams (1767–1848) was one of only two Presidents of the United States whose father served as President. He lived a long and eventful life, but his term as President was less significant than some other episodes in his life. His one term (1825–1829) was sandwiched between the Virginia dynasty of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe from 1801 to 1825, and the “Jacksonian democracy” of 1829 to 1837. Its chronological placement might in any event have consigned it to historical insignificance, but in fact the politics of the day crushed his presidency before it began.

Adams’ service to his country began at age 10 in 1778. John Adams, who was then American envoy to France, took John Quincy along as his secretary. Government appointments for the younger Adams continued intermittently with few interruptions until his death at age 80. His accomplishments and service bracket his presidency.

John and Abigail Adams were loving, but demanding, parents. They expected much of their son, both in terms of accomplishments and integrity, and he met their expectations. His work abroad as minister to Holland, Prussia, and Russia made him the young republic’s most accomplished diplomat, and he later chaired the commission to end the War of 1812, which negotiated the Treaty of Ghent.

Interspersed with this experience was one term in the Senate. When not in government service, Adams practiced law, but it held few attractions for him, and he declined Madison’s offer to appoint him to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Adams’ diplomatic experience as well as his pedigree made him James Monroe’s obvious choice in 1817 to be secretary of state. His work led to

one of the greatest accomplishments in U.S. history—the Monroe Doctrine—which was made possible in part by understandings Adams had reached with British diplomats during his time abroad. Agreement with Great Britain on the northern boundary of the United States was another of Adams’ major accomplishments.

Monroe announced early during his second term that he would not seek a third, and the election of 1824 became a free-for-all. There being no party system, individual candidates jockeyed for position. Adams was one of four candidates, his opponents being Sen. Andrew Jackson, Secretary of the Treasury William Crawford, and Speaker of the House Henry Clay. The election gave Jackson a plurality but not a majority, which, under the Twelfth Amendment, threw the election into the House.

Under the Twelfth Amendment, the three candidates who received the most electoral votes participated in a runoff in the House of Representatives, with each state having one vote. Clay, having run fourth, was eliminated, but, from his position as speaker of the House, he controlled the Kentucky and Ohio delegations. Although Clay had been instructed by the Kentucky legislature to support Jackson, he threw his support to Adams. Adams, upon his election, appointed Clay secretary of state.

The appointment raised a storm of controversy. It was labeled a “corrupt bargain” and cast an irreversible pall on Adams’ presidency. Sen. John Randolph of Virginia called it “the coalition of Blifil and Black George ... the combination, unheard of till then, of the Puritan with the Blackleg.” (Blifil and Black George are characters in Henry Fielding’s novel *Tom Jones*.)

The public reaction to Adams’ appointment of Clay was immediate, intense, and unforgiving. Jackson, expressing outrage, devoted himself to the destruction of Adams’ administration. Congress cooperated by opposing virtually every proposal of the administration.

Clay and Adams had met before the House vote. Whether they made an express bargain has remained in dispute, but the public at the time never had a doubt. According to Unger, “Corrupt or not, in appointing Henry

Clay secretary of state, John Quincy had also signed his own political death warrant as President.”

Adams’ presidency was overshadowed by the controversy, and he did little to overcome it. There is irony in Adams’ presidency having been destroyed by allegations of unethical conduct, as the Adams, as a family, had always regarded themselves as models of probity.

As President, Adams was perceived as remote and hyper-intellectual. He was criticized for supporting Clay’s “American System,” which called for the federal government to implement protective tariffs, internal improvements, and a national bank, and which some viewed as an unconstitutional incursion into state power. Long interested in science, Adams attempted to legislate the construction of observatories, but this effort became the object of derision.

After his presidency, Adams came to be regarded as being out of touch with America. He never really understood that Jacksonian democracy had left the New England public service ethic behind. The result was personal depression, and few accomplishments during his term of office. The “Tariff of Abominations” in 1828 infuriated the South, and ultimately cost Adams re-election. Jackson won by a substantial margin, resulting in the birth of the Democratic Party.

But there was a long last chapter. Upon his return to Massachusetts, out of office, Adams was prevailed upon to run for the House of Representatives in 1830. He rejected any party alliance and pledged to work for the good of the entire nation.

During Adams’ 17 years in Congress, slavery, or limiting its expansion into the territories, was an overriding issue and Adams was the most conspicuous public voice opposing it. Attacks on him by Southern interests reached new levels of vituperation. He presented petitions for abolition, even though the House’s “gag rule” expressly prohibited such action, with supporters of the gag rule claiming that the First Amendment right “to petition the Government for a redress of grievances” did not require Congress to accept such petitions.

As the public face of opposition to

REVIEWS *continued on page 68*

slavery, Adams earned the enmity of the South, but he earned the approbation of the North and a level of popularity that he had never previously enjoyed. He returned to the courtroom briefly to argue successfully in the Supreme Court for the freedom of the *Amistad* slaves.

When Adams died in 1848 after having a stroke on the floor of the House, he was accorded the most extensive funeral since George Washington's and Benjamin Franklin's. Unger writes that there was "a collective outpouring of love and veneration the nation had rarely seen."

John Quincy Adams had his limitations. Albert Gallatin, the secretary of the treasury under Presidents Jefferson and Madison, found much to praise in him, but concluded that he lacked the most essential quality: "a sound and correct judgment." Andrew Jackson's biographer, Robert Remini, called Adams "a man of incredible political ineptitude." Nonetheless, Adams' diplomacy was crucial for the young republic, and, after a failed presidency, he became perhaps our greatest former President. **TFL**

Charles S. Duskow is dean emeritus and professor of law at the University of La Verne College of Law and a past president of the Inland Empire Chapter of the Federal Bar Association.

Show Trials: How Property Gets More Legal Protection than People in Our Failed Immigration System

By Peter Afrasiabi
Envelope Books, Ltd., New York, NY, 2012. 246 pages, \$20.00.

REVIEWED BY R. MARK FREY

Wanna create a commotion? Get people's blood a-boilin' to the point where they shake their clenched fists in anger, threatening to teach you a thing or two? Then proclaim to a throng of people that our immigration system is in fine form and best left alone. Mattering little if the group is comprised of those who may be of a conservative bent or left of center, you can be sure that pandemonium will break loose. Consider, for example, a comment from Justice Scalia's heated dis-

sent in *Arizona v. United States* (2012):

The Court opinion's looming specter of inutterable horror—"[i]f § 3 of the Arizona statute were valid, every State could give itself independent authority to prosecute federal registration violations," *ante*, at 10—seems to me not so horrible and even less looming. But there has come to pass, and is with us today, the specter that Arizona and the States that support it predicted: A Federal Government that does not want to enforce the immigration laws as written, and leaves the States' borders unprotected against immigrants whom those laws would exclude. So the issue is a stark one. Are the sovereign States at the mercy of the Federal Executive's refusal to enforce the Nation's immigration laws?

Why do emotions run so high when people discuss immigration? Some people, such as Justice Scalia, perceive the immigration problem as being that we give insufficient attention to securing our borders and enforcing our immigration laws, thereby failing to ensure that people not be rewarded for breaking those laws, especially in our post-Sept. 11 world. Others decry the current system's lack of humanity, as it forces many to live in the shadows, subject to various forms of exploitation or "processing" by a legal system more akin to a sausage-making factory than to one based on due process of law.

Within this swirling maelstrom, Peter Afrasiabi's *Show Trials: How Property Gets More Legal Protection than People in Our Failed Immigration System*, strives to provide some perspective. Now a lecturer at the University of California-Irvine Law School, Afrasiabi previously founded and managed an appellate law clinic at Chapman University School of Law in Orange County, Calif., where he and his students litigated many immigration cases. *Show Trials* outlines the problems of our country's immigration system and tells the stories of some of the victims of the system's inequities.

In our better moments, we Americans embrace and celebrate the diversity of our ethnicity, religion (or lack thereof), country of origin, gender, and so forth.

We recognize that we are better for being a heterogeneous nation. But, if anything tantamount to a national religion contributes to our collective identity, it is our devotion to the Constitution and its principles. Afrasiabi vigorously reminds us of that fact:

A basic premise of this book is allegiance to the principle, rooted in our Constitution, that a human's right to the protection and preservation of his or her liberty and life is at least as important as a corporation's right to the protection and preservation of its property.

If we believe in that principle, then why, Afrasiabi asks, is the immigration system so unjust? Why do "our constitutional [Article III] courts ... protect our property rights with highly developed and important legal structures," whereas our "political immigration courts ... do not afford the same basic protections to human beings who are often in life and death situations"? Afrasiabi refers to immigration court proceedings as "show trials" because they fail "to deliver justice through the promise of due process and instead often sacrifices critical human life and liberty interests in the name of efficiency or expediency to the system."

Afrasiabi writes glowingly about an immigration system in place years ago that relied on our constitutional courts to rectify the errors of immigration authorities. He cites *Yamataya v. Fisher*, 189 U.S. 80, 98-102 (1903), which involved a Japanese immigrant deemed a pauper or likely to become a public charge and ordered deported. The Supreme Court held that she could not be deprived of her liberty to live in the United States without an opportunity to be heard. Later, in *Bridges v. Wixon*, 326 U.S. 135, 152-155 (1945), Afrasiabi notes, the Supreme Court found that deportation "visits a great hardship on the individual and deprives him of the right to stay and live and work in this land of freedom. ... Meticulous care must be exercised lest the procedure by which he is deprived of that liberty not meet the essential standards of fairness."

What happened to the fundamental role of our constitutional courts and respect for due process during the intervening years? Why the erosion of these

rights? Why is the immigration system now more akin to a plunge down the rabbit hole in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* where, as Afrasiabi writes, “up is down and back is front, a world where you run in circles without ever getting to the heart of the issue, and a world where terrible sentences are imposed for trivial mistakes”?

Congress implemented harsh changes with the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA) and the Antiterrorist and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA). IIRIRA replaced a form of relief known as Suspension of Deportation with Cancellation of Removal, making it significantly harder for a noncitizen to prove hardship when fighting removal (also known as deportation or exclusion) and, even more importantly, making it virtually impossible for constitutional courts to review an immigration judge's decision by removing the right to appeal under section 106a of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

AEDPA, passed after the Oklahoma City bombing of 1995, restricted access both to constitutional court review of deportation hearings involving noncitizens convicted of aggravated felonies (as defined under federal immigration law) and to *habeas* relief.

The new reality, according to Afrasiabi, is a system where “a political appointee immigration judge is allowed to decide that a deportation is perfectly acceptable notwithstanding the grave factual circumstances that such a deportation will inflict on a person's liberty and perhaps life, and that immigration judge's decision is forever insulated from the sunlight and scrutiny of a constitutional court.”

All the more remarkable is the fate of family members of those facing removal, especially children, whether they are holders of U.S. citizenship or have no immigration status. In either case, Afrasiabi argues, the system subjects children to deportation for something in which they played no part. “Our elected officials have not passed any laws to protect either category of children from the harsh realities of the deportation that they suffer. Children in each group are either routinely deported by our government along with their parents, or lose a parent to deportation and suffer a broken family.” (Afrasiabi is referring, of course, to the DREAM

Act that has languished in Congress, although the Obama administration, in June 2012, developed a DREAM-like program that allows children brought to the United States at a tender age to come out of the shadows and both obtain work authorization and pursue an education. Curiously, this action by President Obama was subject to the scorn of Justice Scalia as an aside in his dissent found in the aforementioned *Arizona v. United States*.

Afrasiabi does not pull his punches when taking on government attorneys. He laments a winner-take-all attitude by those working in the Department of Homeland Security's Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) as well as the Department of Justice's Office of Immigration Litigation (OIL). He reminds us that, in a speech delivered to Department of Justice attorneys in April 2009, Attorney General Eric Holder emphasized that:

Your job is not to win cases. Your job is to do justice. Your job is in every case, every decision that you make, to do the right thing. Anybody who asks you to do something other than that is to be ignored. Any policy that is at tension with that is to be questioned and brought to my attention. And I mean that.

The government now appears to be adhering to this policy, as recent months have witnessed administration directives to exercise prosecutorial discretion by prioritizing removals in order to more effectively use existing resources.

And, what of the private immigration bar? Although Afrasiabi acknowledges that its members are overworked and underpaid, he blasts their incompetence for leaving their clients in the lurch with little or nothing to show for the money they paid for their legal services. In fact, according to Afrasiabi, many immigration practitioners have been disbarred or face suspension. And why is that? The clientele simply do not have the financial resources to adequately compensate their attorneys, leaving them to take on too large of a caseload with too few hours devoted to each. But, the answer is not, according to Afrasiabi, to increase the amount of *pro bono* work by attorneys. That would be simply unrealistic given the volume of cases before immi-

gration judges. He recommends instead a system providing awards of attorneys' fees that would enable attorneys to take fewer cases, devote more time to each, and commit fewer errors. An indirect result of such a system might be that the government would exercise its prosecutorial discretion more carefully in designating people for removal.

Afrasiabi presents a list of recommendations to improve the immigration system. It includes developing an immigration judiciary comprised of constitutional judges, bringing back constitutional court review of immigration judge decisions, using mediation, providing an attorney to those who cannot afford one, and allowing awards of attorneys' fees. Although immigration proceedings are civil in nature, Afrasiabi is adamant that removal is equivalent to punishment under our criminal laws. As such, similar protections must be in place.

Afrasiabi has written a good book! It confronts and engages us to grapple with these important and timely issues. Although I empathize with his frustration, I am reluctant to condemn the immigration judges, government attorneys, and private bar as the source of the problem. The problem is systemic in nature and cries out for comprehensive immigration reform. Not radical reform, just precise and focused change. We need to return to a system that allows for nuance, exercise of discretion by immigration judges, encouragement of prosecutorial discretion by government attorneys, and more fully developed federal court review.

This nation is based on the notion that immigrants are its lifeblood, providing a constant source for renewal and revitalization through the introduction of new ideas, values, and perspectives on the world. Let us hope that our nation's leaders will finally recognize that we need comprehensive immigration reform to ensure that we have a just and orderly immigration system. **TFL**

R. Mark Frey is an attorney based in St. Paul, Minn. He has practiced immigration law for almost 25 years with an emphasis on political asylum, family immigration, removal defense, and naturalization.

REVIEWS continued on page 70

America's Soul in the Balance: The Holocaust, FDR's State Department, and the Moral Disgrace of an American Aristocracy

By Gregory J. Wallace

Greenleaf Book Group, Austin, TX, 2012. 320 pages, \$26.95.

REVIEWED BY ELIZABETH KELLEY

In *America's Soul in the Balance*, Gregory J. Wallace, a partner at New York firm Kaye Scholer, tells the story of a chapter of American history that too few know. He describes the battle in 1943 between four lawyers in the Department of the Treasury and diplomats at the Department of State. The Treasury Department lawyers were outraged at the diplomats' suppression of graphic, unimpeachable reports of the Holocaust and their blocking the rescue of European Jews. None of the lawyers or diplomats involved were Jewish, although the lawyers worked under Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau Jr. (the father of former Manhattan district attorney Robert M. Morgenthau), who was Jewish. But Morgenthau, because of his loyalty to and fear of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, was reluctant to join the fight.

The State Department diplomats were members of the upper crust, East Coast elite, and Wallace spends a good deal of time describing the worlds from which they came. Particularly thorough are his examinations of elite private boarding schools—Exeter, Groton, and St. Paul's—and how these rarified environments shaped the world views of their graduates. Living in an aristocratic bubble, they were imbued with Anglo-Saxon exceptionalism and tended to be anti-Semitic, if not virulently so. The Treasury Department lawyers considered the diplomats to be effectively war criminals and accomplices of Hitler.

Central to the story is FDR, a complex man who saved this country from the ravages of the Great Depression and led it to victory in World War II, but who was as politically calculating as he was charming. The same FDR who befriended and comforted the nation during fireside chats was also the FDR who authorized the internment of 110,000

Japanese-Americans. It is unclear exactly how much FDR knew about the Nazi attempt to exterminate the Jews and when he knew it; but what is eminently clear is that State Department diplomats deliberately squashed the nightmarish news from Europe and were largely successful in their battle with the Treasury Department lawyers. Although Roosevelt approved the rescue of 70,000 Romanian Jews and a few others, he could have done far more and could have acted earlier.

Wallace takes us beyond the statistics of suffering by telling the story of Ruth—a little girl from Romania who lost her entire family and braved unspeakable horrors in order to survive. Today, she lives in Florida and is the author of *Ruth's Journey: A Survivor's Memoir*, published in 1996. Wallace alternates the story of Ruth with the chronicle of the battles in FDR's administration.

Indeed, it was the story of another little girl much like Ruth who inspired Wallace to research and write *America's Soul in the Balance*. He discovered correspondence of Otto Frank, Anne Frank's father, requesting a visa to enter the United States. That led Wallace to wonder why a seemingly benevolent country did not do more to stop the slaughter of six million Jews.

America's Soul in the Balance shows that there is no simple answer to that question. Nonetheless, in an era when genocide and crimes against humanity still persist, we must continue to ask it. **TFL**

Elizabeth Kelley is a criminal defense lawyer based in Spokane, Wash. She has a special commitment to representing individuals with mental illness and developmental or intellectual disabilities who are accused of crimes. She has served two terms on the board of the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, has served as the chair of the Mental Health and Corrections Committees, and is currently the chair of the Membership Committee. She hosts two radio shows, Celebrity Court and Celebrity Court: Author Chats. She can be contacted at ZealousAdvocacy@aol.com. Her interview with Gregory Wallace is available at tobtr.com/s/3575221.

Eisenhower: The White House Years

By Jim Newton

Doubleday, New York, NY, 2011. 451 pages, \$29.95.

REVIEWED BY JOHN C. HOLMES

Relying partly on newly discovered and declassified documents, veteran journalist Jim Newton paints a realistic but sympathetic picture of Dwight D. Eisenhower as a hard-nosed President. Newton's portrait of Eisenhower goes well beyond the common one of a friendly and benign grandfather figure who was as much interested in golf and bridge as in the presidency. Not only did Eisenhower reportedly have a temper that could cause "the varnish ... to peel off the desk," he also had a devotion to duty and a first-rate mind that have slowly led historians regularly to place him among the top 10 U.S. Presidents.

"Ike," as he was nicknamed early in life and continued to be called when he was President, was born in Texas in 1890, the third of six boys. Soon after, the family moved to Abilene, Kansas, where they lived modestly, "most of the boys sharing bedrooms in decidedly tight quarters." Ike and his brothers helped with the family vegetable garden, oversaw a small flock of chickens, milked the family cow, tended the orchard, washed dishes and clothes, and learned to cook. Eisenhower competed with his talented brothers, all of whom would be successful in their careers. He loved the outdoors as well as baseball, football, and boxing, and, as a middle child, he developed the ability "to navigate between powerful forces." He had a stubborn disposition, but he "acquired an enduring and endearing folksiness." He was bored with his studies and "gave bare indication of [his] potential in his early years."

The Military

Eisenhower came in second in the examination for West Point, and he attended school there from 1911 to 1915. As in high school, he was a modest student and played football. Infractions that he committed, such as failing to keep his barracks tidy or to show up on time for

parades or meals, earned him enough demerits to qualify him as one of the “century men” who had to spend more than 100 hours marching off penalties. He finished 66th in a class of 168.

In 1916, Lt. Eisenhower married Mamie Dowd, whose father owned a highly successful meat-packing business. Despite frequently being separated from Mamie because of his duties, Eisenhower was a devoted husband. The only major difficulty in their marriage was the well-publicized relationship that Eisenhower had with Kay Summersby, his driver during World War II. Newton goes into substantial detail about this relationship and its effect on Mamie, concluding that, “[w]hether or not the relationship between Ike and Kay was romantic, it was undeniably affectionate.”

With an honest, open, and sincere personality, as well as an ability to understand military tactics and organization, Eisenhower gained the respect of his fellow officers and rose rapidly through the ranks, serving in the 1920s and 1930s under generals such as Fox Conner, John J. Pershing, Douglas MacArthur, and George Marshall, and becoming a brigadier general himself in 1941. He was a friend and admirer of Gen. George Patton’s, but when Patton visited a hospital and egregiously slapped and threatened men who were suffering from battle fatigue, Eisenhower wrote to Patton that he, Eisenhower, could not “excuse brutality, abuse of the sick, nor exhibition of uncontrollable temper in front of subordinates.”

In 1944, Eisenhower was appointed supreme commander of the Allied Expeditionary Force. He was in charge of a secret plan that landed 160,000 Allied troops in Normandy, France, on D-Day—June 6, 1944—and, though the invasion cost many lives, it was a success. Exercising diplomacy and steadfastness to unify the often-quarreling Allied commanders, Eisenhower was also successful in overseeing Germany’s defeat and unconditional surrender.

Politics

Both the Democratic and the Republican Party sought to enlist Eisenhower as its candidate for President in 1952. Having had no political experience and a low opinion of politics, Eisenhower at first demurred, but eventually agreed to seek the Republican candidacy. Newton writes that the smart political

money favored Sen. Robert Taft (son of President and Chief Justice William Howard Taft) to be the Republican nominee, but Eisenhower bested him and chose the 39-year-old Sen. Richard M. Nixon as his running mate.

The campaign ran into trouble when the press reported that Nixon’s supporters had supplemented his government salary with a fund for political expenses. Leading Republicans insisted that Eisenhower drop Nixon from the ticket, but Eisenhower maintained his silence, forcing Nixon to fight for himself. Nixon did so with his famous Checkers television speech. Despite this distraction, Eisenhower won an easy victory over the cerebral Democratic senator from Illinois, Adlai Stevenson.

The Presidency

“Before appointing his cabinet,” Newton writes, “Eisenhower created a position that redefined the modern presidency. ...” It was “assistant to the President,” today known as “chief of staff,” but Eisenhower “avoided creating that title, for fear it would seem too military.” The job went to the austere New Hampshire governor Sherman Adams. Adams received high marks for his work, but he was pressured to resign in 1958, after a House subcommittee revealed that Adams had accepted a vicuña coat for his wife from a Boston textile manufacturer who was being investigated by the Federal Trade Commission.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, who had served Presidents from Wilson to Truman, was Eisenhower’s best-known cabinet appointee. Among his other appointees were Oveta Culp Hobby, the second female cabinet member and the first in a Republican administration, as well as Ezra Benson, an apostle of the Mormon church.

In his presidential campaign, Eisenhower had promised to lead the nation “toward prosperity without war,” and he worked to fulfill this promise. By submitting significant cuts in federal expenditures, he paved the way for the first balanced budget in a generation. And, in 1953, Eisenhower ended the Korean War, which had begun in 1950 under President Truman, even though, Newton writes, South Korean president Syngman Rhee “could never be satisfied with the partition of his country, and he continued to harangue Eisenhower to support a war for reunification.”

Eisenhower was burdened by the actions of his fellow Republican, Wisconsin Sen. Joseph McCarthy, who had made it his mission to derail the careers of federal employees, Hollywood actors, and others whom he suspected, often without evidence, of being Communists. In 1953 and 1954, the subcommittee that McCarthy chaired—the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations—held 169 hearings, at which it questioned 653 people, 83 of whom, on constitutional grounds, refused to answer questions about subversive activities. Eisenhower refused repeated calls to confront McCarthy directly, saying privately that “nothing would please him [McCarthy] more than to get the publicity that would be generated by a public repudiation by the President,” and that he, Eisenhower, did not want to “get down in the gutter with that guy.” Eisenhower’s cautiousness paid off, as the Army-McCarthy hearings in 1954 exposed McCarthy as a reckless and dishonest bully, the Senate censured him, and McCarthy’s influence was gone. Eisenhower quipped that McCarthyism was now “McCarthywasm.”

Although he appeared a model of integrity and was blessed with a smiling countenance that seemed to confirm that he was, in 1953, Eisenhower joined Winston Churchill in approving the overthrow by the CIA and the British MI5 of the democratically elected prime minister of Iran, Mohammad Mossadegh, who had nationalized Iran’s oil industry, which had been under British control. Mossadegh was replaced by the Shah of Iran, who, Newton writes, was “loyal and beholden to the United States.” Eisenhower acknowledged that defeating “Russian intentions and plans in that area” was a major factor in his approving the overthrow.

The following year, Eisenhower again resorted to covert action by having the CIA overthrow the president of Guatemala, Jacobo Arbenz Guzman, because of his Communist connections. Newton writes that “Eisenhower was not wrong to spy Communist influence in Guatemala, but he misapprehended both its extent and its relationship to Moscow.”

On the domestic front during his busy first term, Eisenhower appointed California Gov. Earl Warren, whom he considered a moderate, as Chief Justice

REVIEWS *continued on page 73*

Alain E. Boileau
Robert J. Booth II
Hon. James J. Brady
Ann Marie Brodarick
Jeffrey Brooks
Jonathan E. Buchan
Eileen Burrowes
Edward J. Callaghan
Nicholas H. Callahan
Alexander Campbell
Andrew A. Casey
Michael Cedillos
Alejandro J. Cepeda-Diaz
Dani N. Cepernich
Eric S. Charleston
Francis A. Citera
Christian Clapp
Ian M. Clark
John R. Climaco
Sarah Clouse
Bradley Coburn
Michelle N. Comeau
Christopher J. Cox
Michael R. Croteau
Landis V. Curry III
Michael P. Daly
Angela J. Davis
John S. Davis
Paul A. Del Aguila
John E. Delaney
Tony Diab
Natalia C. Diaz
Hon. Douglas D. Dodd

Ethan L. Don
Frederick J. Dorchak
Julie A. Droessler
Paul C. Dworak
Robert W. Dziech
Hon. Sherry R. Fallon
Victoria A. Ferrer-Kerber
Jonathan A. Fleischman
David H. Flint
Domon A. Frangos
Jorge Galiber
Matthew T. Gensburg
Keren E. Gesund
Maria Ligia Giraldez
MacDonald H. Goode
Seth P. Green
Alais L. Griffin
Traci Guariniello
Brian L. Guillot
Gretchen L. Gurstelle
Sandra P. Hagood
Gene A. Hamm
John K. Harms
Brian R. Harris
Douglas W. Heim
Matthew C. Hicks
Samuel G. Hill
Noah G. Hillen
Amanda C. Hines
John Hofstetter
Hon. Ellen L. Hollander
Edward C. Hopkins
Matthew Hundley

Hon. Wayne R. Iskra
Hon. Brian A. Jackson
Christopher W. James
Lon A. Jenkins
William J. Judge Jr.
J. Steven Justice
Allison O. Kahn
Dr. Athina Karamanlis Powers
Heather Karrh
Col. Charles J. Keever
David M. Keyzer
Michelle L. Kimbril-Parks
Thomas W. Kirchofer
Sherry A. Knutson
Michelle Kranz
Leanna L. Lalla
Rebecca Larson
John H. Lassetter
Charles B. Leuin
Blake A. Levine
Nicholas R. Lewis
Heather S. Lonian
David L. Luikart III
James P. Madigan
Maria L. Markakis
Lucille Marques
Gregory J. Marshall
Pamela G. Martini
Joseph O. McAfee
Jon McCormack
Scott D. McDonald
John L. McManus
Leane Capps Medford

Wesley D. Merillat
Anne-Marie Mitchell
Carlos A. Morales Cardona
Jennifer Mountcastle
Stephanie N. Murphy
Zachary J. Murry
Lt. Maya A. Nair
Keena N. Newmark
Michelle L. Nichols
Erin J. Oglesby
Brian P. O'Meara
Roberta C. Opara
Kevin J. O'Shea
Stanley J. Panikowski
Donna T. Parkinson
Steven Pollack
Dimitri Portnoi
Brett J. Preston
William D. Prince
Jacqueline Pruitt
James E. Quander Jr.
Nancy B. Rapoport
Sarah K. Rathke
Kevin P. Ray
Michael E. Reyen
Booth M. Ripke
Patrick Risch
Lori M. Ritter
Phillip R. Robinson
Susan C. Roney
Rebecca Rosenthal
Gary B. Rudolph
George L. Russell III

Caitlin F. Saladrigas
David Samuels
Daniel L. Scott
Richard A. Sharpstein
Robin Shea
William J. Sheaffer
Henry L. Shomar
Jason B. Shorter
J. Scott Slater
Barbara Q. Smith
George H. Soltero
Elizabeth A. Spurgeon
Andrew C. Storar
Heath P. Tarbert
Jason N. Thelen
Olin Thompson
Macie D. Tuiasosopo
Nicholas M. Tyler
Svetlana Uimenkova
Philip S. Van Der Weele
Amelia Vance
Manoj S. Varghese
Michael F. Walther
Charlotte Wasserstein
Sharonda R. Williams
Booth M. Ripke
Patrick Risch
Lori M. Ritter
Phillip R. Robinson
Susan C. Roney
Rebecca Rosenthal
Gary B. Rudolph
George L. Russell III

REVIEWS *continued from page 71*

upon Fred Vinson's death. In 1954, Eisenhower was unprepared for the unanimous ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education*. Raised in rural areas where blacks were nearly nonexistent and serving in a segregated military, Eisenhower had not thought much about civil rights, and he usually desired to avoid confrontation. Nevertheless, he signed the Civil Rights Act of 1957, which made it a crime to interfere with the right to vote, and he sent federal troops to Little Rock, Ark., to integrate the city's public schools.

On Sept. 24, 1955, shortly before he turned 66, Eisenhower suffered a severe heart attack that left him hospitalized for weeks and low in energy for months. Speculation arose as to his fitness and desire to serve a second term, but he successfully ran for re-election, again with Richard Nixon as his running mate and again with Adlai Stevenson as his Democratic opponent. Eisenhower had his hands full in 1956, facing not only a presidential election, but also the Soviet invasion of Hungary and the Suez crisis. Throughout his second term, Eisenhower had to deal with the mercurial and belligerent Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev. In 1958, Eisenhower stood up to Khrushchev's ultimatum to remove U.S. troops from West Berlin within six months. In 1959, Eisenhower met with Khrushchev at Camp David,

and, in 1960, the two dealt with the U-2 incident, in which the Soviets shot down an American spy plane and captured the pilot.

One of Eisenhower's accomplishments that he was most proud of was the national highway system. He also initiated an "Atoms for Peace" program, which promoted the use of nuclear power for peaceful purposes. On Jan. 17, 1961, in his farewell address as President, he warned against the dangers of the military-industrial complex.

Eisenhower was unhappy to see the next President, John F. Kennedy, brush aside his accomplishments and proclaim in his inaugural address "that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century." Thus, it was with a tinge of sadness as well as relief that Eisenhower, age 70, retired to his home in Gettysburg, Penn. On Mar. 28, 1969, weakened by another heart attack and abdominal surgery, Eisenhower said to his son, "I want to go. God take me." He died three hours later.

Conclusion

In *Eisenhower: The White House Years*, Jim Newton brings to life a genuine American hero, who has often been honored more for his military career than for his presidency. Newton shows, however, that the reputation of 1950s as staid times are exaggerated,

and that Eisenhower as President had his share of foreign and domestic crises to deal with, and he dealt with them well. Newton concludes:

He was a good man, one of integrity and decency. ... Ike's patient pursuit of progress, his faith in his subordinates, and his rejection of doctrinaire partisanship combined to produce an American triumph in the two great challenges of his epoch: black Americans secured the right to join the society that once enslaved them, and all Americans outlasted Soviet Communism without a war of annihilation to defeat it. As Ike understood better than those around him, peace gave America time. In the fullness of that time, America fulfilled the destiny its founders imagined for it. Dwight Eisenhower left his nation freer, more prosperous, and more fair. Peace was not given to him; he won it. **TFL**

John C. Holmes was an administrative law judge with the U.S. Department of Labor for more than 25 years, and he retired as Chief ALJ at the Department of Interior in 2004. He currently works part-time as an arbitrator and consultant; enjoys golf, travel, and bridge; and can be reached at jholmesalj@aol.com.