

**COMPARATIVE BOOK REVIEW:** Read a nonfiction book about a topic in U.S. History from 1865 to the present and compare it to the class textbook. The book must be at least two hundred (200) pages in length. Books must be chosen from the booklist in the course's CONTENT section, content.Books.label, or alternate selections approved by the instructor. Selections must be submitted via email by March 30. Alternate selections must be approved by the instructor. The principle limitation for such selections is that their content must be included in the textbook, also. Otherwise, there is no basis by which the authors' versions of history can be compared. Reviews are due by 11:30 PM, April 25.

Reviews should be double-spaced with one-inch margins. They should be typed in number twelve (12) Times New Roman font with no gaps between paragraphs. The entire review should be double-spaced and three to five pages in length. Information at the top left corner of the first page should include the student's name, the title and author of the book under review, the name of this course and the date the review is submitted.

**Book review format:** 1. Use MLA style. Provide proper citation for the book at the end of the review. 2. Compare at least five(5) issues discussed in both the book under review and the textbook. Discuss the similarities and/or differences in the authors' works concerning significant issues (not trivia, such as differences in dates or names). Refer to authors. Be specific. Tell, directly, whether the authors agree or not and to what extent. Provide evidence to prove their agreement/disagreement. Evidence should be paraphrased descriptions of the authors' works. Avoid direct quotes. Use all the authors' full names upon first reference to them. Thereafter, last names are sufficient. In subsequent references multiple authors are referred to by the first author's last name and *et al.* (*and others*), as in Goldfield, et al.

*Example:* David Goldfield, Carl Abbott, Virginia DeJohn Anderson, Jo Ann Argersinger, Peter H. Argersinger, William L Barney, and Robert M Weir, the authors of The American Journey, report that President Johnson denounced the Fourteenth Amendment and took his message of sectional reconciliation on a tour of northern states during the congressional election of 1866. The authors say that the tone and manner of Johnson's criticism of the Republican Congress offended many people and Republicans won greater than two-thirds majorities in the House and Senate. Amanda Evans, the author of *America's Reconstruction*, agrees. She maintains that the President traded insults with hecklers and embarrassed supporters by comparing himself to Christ and opponents to Judas. She also agrees that Republicans won a three-to-one majority in the next Congress and adds that as a result Southern Democrats soon faced more stringent terms for readmission to the Union..

*Example:* Goldfield, et al., identify weaknesses in the U.S. economy as the principle cause of the Great Depression, and they cite the unequal distribution of wealth as the most damaging of those weaknesses. The authors report that by 1929 the richest .01 percent of American families received as much income as the 42 percent of families at the bottom of the income scale. That more than half of Americans lived at or below the subsistence level made the economy unsustainable. Most people were simply not able to buy what industry produced. Simpson agrees that maldistribution of wealth was responsible for the economy's failure to recover from the 1929 stock market crash and instead remain depressed for more than a decade. He describes consumer-oriented industries as the most dynamic elements of the economy and insists that they could have enabled business to recover quickly from the

crash had they been stronger. Such strength for industries such as cars, household appliances, processed and packaged foods and recreation required putting more of the national income into the hands of average Americans.

*Example:* Goldfield, et al., say that in the face of the U.S. naval blockade of Cuba during the 1962 Missile Crisis the Soviet leader, Nikita Krushchev, offered to remove the missiles in return for a pledge that the U.S. would not invade Cuba. They maintain that President Kennedy's response included such a pledge and a secret promise to remove obsolete Jupiter missiles from Turkey. Krushchev's acceptance of Kennedy's commitments ended the crisis.

McPherson agrees that Krushchev ended the tense standoff created by Kennedy's naval blockade of Cuba when he ordered the Soviet missiles on the island to be dismantled. He also concurs that Kennedy pledged to remove American missiles from Turkey. However, the author contends that the missiles had been ordered out of Turkey previously, and the President's actual promise was to complete the process.

McPherson adds that researchers later learned that the situation had been more dangerous than the Americans had realized in 1962. Access to Soviet archives in the mid-1990's revealed that tactical nuclear weapons had already been placed in Cuba before the U.S detected the construction of launch sites and the crisis ensued.