

Book Reviews:

By Michael Zuckerman. *Almost Chosen People: Oblique Biographies in the American Grain*.

(Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993. Pp, x, 315. \$30.00.)

Anyone who writes history knows that the historian's personality and experience have an enormous, if sometimes unconscious, influence on the subjects they choose to write on and how they write. Yet the relation between the historian's persona and his or her scholarship remains an elusive subject. Historians run the gamut from the ivory tower intellectual who claims to know more about the 17th century than his own, to engaged scholars who write history quite deliberately to change the world.¹ This has of course long been true. What is different today is the increasing openness among historians about their personal agendas in doing history—and, in the case under review, the author's willingness to delineate the wellsprings of his commitment to certain subjects and modes of inquiry.

The essays which comprise *Almost Chosen People* offer a meaty sampling of the preoccupations of one of the most interesting minds writing history today. Since publishing his important and controversial study of colonial New England towns, *Peaceable Kingdoms*, in 1970, Michael Zuckerman has concentrated most of his scholarly energies on shorter pieces—essays, articles, and papers, not to mention his extraordinary labors as a colleague, teacher, mentor, and constructive critic of peers' work.² Though best known as a colonialist, Zuckerman's focus as a cultural historian (he sees himself as a historical anthropologist) encompasses a much wider swath of American turf. The essays in this book, for example, open with a consideration of community and polity among the Puritans, and close with a meditation on citizenship in the late twentieth century, covering virtually the entire chronology of American experience in between.

In his autobiographical introduction to *Almost Chosen People* Zuckerman describes his family and his experiences as a youth, and how they affected his life's decision to pursue history, and specifically, to probe beneath the surface of American life and values. Despite the apparent success and tranquility in Zuckerman's family, "things were not what they seemed" (p. 12); and over the course of his higher education and personal odyssey on the open road, he discovered that neither were they what they "seemed" to be in the course of American history.

The notion that we need to be skeptical of conventional wisdom and surface truths informs many of the essays collected in this stimulating and provocative book. Several examples stand out. Consider Zuckerman's ingenious exploration of William Byrd's family life, a long essay which takes what appears to be inexplicable behavior on the part of one of colonial Virginia's notables and makes sense of it. As Byrd's son lay dying, the elder Byrd was out visiting friends, carousing, doing chores, disciplining workhands—everything, it seemed, but ministering to his son. Was Byrd a monster? Not really. He was acting as a man of his times, not ours. His "family" embraced not merely his wife and his children, but other relatives, friends, friendly acquaintances, employees, and even his slaves. Byrd's Virginia residence was constantly busy, filled with guests and relatives who were staying over for a day or two, weeks, and in some cases, months. Some guests would come and make themselves at home while Byrd was away! This was alright

with Byrd, who expected and enjoyed reciprocal privileges at the homes of his peers.

Zuckerman seeks not to excuse or forgive William Byrd for not being more emotionally engaged with his son or more of a doting husband. Rather, he wants to help readers understand that Byrd's family orientation was more public than private. Byrd's family "existed in a rush of social roles and relations and not in a hush of intimacy and autonomy. Its members learned to live in it by participating in its actual practices and not by mastering its abstract preachments or manipulating the tangled triads of the narrow nuclear family." In this context one can better appreciate why Byrd would minister so diligently to his dying friend Benjamin Harrison, and go out of his "ordinary course" (p. 130) for many other neighbors and acquaintances. In no other essay does the historical anthropologist nomenclature seem more relevant to what Zuckerman is up to. In his sensitivity to the nuance and pattern woven through 18th century Virginia culture his essay meets a standard set by the likes of Rhys Isaac and Timothy Breen.³

In his respective essays on P. T. Barnum, Horatio Alger, Lewis Mumford, and Dr. Benjamin Spock, Zuckerman likewise cuts through conventional wisdom to explore aspects of American community and discover lighter or darker shadings of reality. Barnum emerges in these pages not as the huckster of popular culture, but rather as an engaged and enlightened citizen, legislator, and philanthropist. Like Benjamin Franklin, with whom Zuckerman brackets Barnum, the famed impresario had not merely a capacity to promote himself or his causes, but a real empathy and commitment to empowering ordinary people as they "had never been empowered before" (p. 147).

Zuckerman's treatment of Mumford's last great writing project, *The Myth of the Machine*, dissents from the common critical view that Mumford was essentially repeating himself in his final works, albeit from a confoundingly pessimistic outlook. Rereading Mumford, in the context of his long career, Zuckerman makes the interesting (if not necessarily conclusive) case that Mumford was more zestful and optimistic than critics would have readers believe. Mumford had always been ambivalent about the human adventure. His last work, with its "vigor and venom" and "ironic bemusement" was in fact an eloquent plea to human beings not to cede their autonomy to machines and to find truths in their inner selves that will abide them through trial and adversity.

If the essay on Mumford is dense and hermetic, Zuckerman's dissection of Benjamin Spock's classic *Baby and Child Care* is, by contrast, a virtuoso exercise in textual analysis and an important contribution to American Studies. Best known as the avatar of "permissiveness" in child reading, Spock has been repeatedly vilified (and occasionally praised) for his alleged impact on baby boomers who challenged and so effectively vexed the establishment in the 1960s. Yet if one reads Spock closely, as Zuckerman does here, one can find contradictions and incoherences in Spock's notion of parents' role in disciplining and socializing their children. More important, one can find astonishing evidence in *Baby and Child Care* of obeisance to new cultural norms—most notably, the culture of conformism, of adapting to the economic exigencies of one's time.

Zuckerman depicts Benjamin Spock as a secret (or unwitting) agent for corporate America, as a kind of pediatric tailor, fitting children early on into the grey flannel suit they would eventually adopt as standard apparel. Spock's emphasis on the benevolence of nature and the naturalness of good fellowship counteracted the anxiety people felt in the white collar world. Whereas advice books earlier in the century continued to espouse rugged individualism and competitiveness, Spock was operating in a different environment, one where social skills were more appropriate than sharp elbows. "The post industrial order," Zuckerman observes, "does not need the exaggerated autonomy and aggressiveness that an older mercantile milieu honored. It prefers men and women more mutually supportive, more genial and mild, more benign and bland. And Spock's advice serves its preferences superbly" (p. 276).

Given Zuckerman's acute grasp of the context of the times (he grew up in the fifties and sixties), it is disappointing to this reader at least that the essay on Spock should limit itself to textual analysis. Even granted that assessing Spock's influence on baby boomers is as easy as nailing jello to a wall, it seems somehow a cheat that Zuckerman stops where he does. Could he not have suggested how it was that young people who were raised on Spock's bromides would so loudly reject the values of upper middle class America and defy the establishment's dictum that the United States had an obligation to prevent the spread of communism in a distant part of the world? That Benjamin Spock himself was a vocal opponent of the Vietnam War seems somehow incongruous with the argument presented here. Provocative as Zuckerman's argument is, one wishes it did not stop where it did.

As the Spock essay suggests, a second major thread running through *Almost Chosen People* is Zuckerman's contention that there is less to vaunted American individualism than meets the eye. Visionary cooperative endeavor has also run through American history, from the Puritans to the utopian experiments of the nineteenth century and on up to various counter-cultural and social change movements of the past generation. In "The Fabrication of Identity in Early America," Zuckerman reminds readers that we cannot understand the "emergence of American individuality" (p. 24) unless we familiarize ourselves with the pre-modern context for American settlement. The sense of collective endeavor animated the establishment of towns and villages throughout New England, and the process of self government.

For example, in "The Social Context of Democracy in Massachusetts," a companion piece to Zuckerman's book *Peaceable Kingdoms*, he shows that the debate over "democracy" in eighteenth century New England went off course because scholars forgot that democracy was only "incidental" (at best) to the major purposes of provincial society. Majority rule was not what the new immigrants had come to New England to establish; neither was direct democracy, nor choice between interests, ideals, or office seekers. The irony, for Zuckerman, is that the way men practiced government in New England proved conducive to democracy. But we err to think that that was a conscious aim or value of New England provincials.

Two final essays merit brief attention. In "The Power of Blackness: Thomas Jefferson and the Revolution in St. Domingo," Zuckerman examines the Jeffersonians' "abandonment" of the principles which had sustained them during the Revolution and its aftermath. Jefferson in partic-

ular, he argues, had a choice to make in the early 1790s. He could support the rebels in San Domingo led by Toussaint L'Ouverture or side with aristocracy and reaction. What should have been an easy decision for Jefferson to sustain those who shared his principles became a seminal decision to put "negrophobia" above principle. For Zuckerman, Jefferson's action was startling, sad, and one suspects from the tone of the essay, outrageous. Jefferson's decision to throw his weight against the black rebels in Haiti was the "moment of truth" for "the foremost racist of his era." He never says in quite so many words that he is angry with Jefferson, but that is the implication.

While Zuckerman's analysis of Jefferson's race consciousness seems apt, I am not convinced that the 1790s was such a defining moment for him. In 1975 David Brion Davis described Jefferson as fatally trapped between his commitment to justice and his instinct for self preservation, with instinct proving stronger than abstract ideas.⁴ Also in 1975 Edmund Morgan depicted a Jefferson for whom democracy was possible only if blacks in this country remained enslaved.⁵ It would have been illogical and surprising, if one accepts the premises of Davis and Morgan, respectively, for Jefferson to have acted differently than he did in the 1790s. As recent scholarship has made amply clear, Jefferson's brilliant achievement will forever be tarnished by his racial views and behavior as a loyal member of the planter class.⁶ But that is how we must take him, and it is a little odd that a historian of Zuckerman's bent and savvy should be "shocked, shocked," that Jefferson would choose to repudiate Toussaint L'Ouverture rather than succor him.

If Zuckerman's explication of Jefferson and San Domingue borders on polemic, the final essay in this provocative collection crosses the line. "Reagan, Beard, and the Constitution," originally published in 1987, is an acidulous attack on the imperial presidency and in particular the antidemocratic style of governance inaugurated by John F. Kennedy and carried to ominous extremes by Ronald Reagan's handlers. Secrecy and contempt for the public became the norm rather than the exception among American presidents, Zuckerman argues. The public has been complicit in this alarming trend by its own disengagement from public affairs and by the increasingly common assumption that good citizenship means showing up to vote. For Zuckerman, "the Enlightenment vision of a virtuous, self determining people intelligently enacting the public business daily dissipates" (p. 309).

To this and much else in "Reagan, Beard, and the Constitution," one is inclined to respond, "lighten up, Michael, things are not quite so bad." In fact, while it is not difficult to point to various pathologies in American public culture today, there are also many healthy signs, not least of which include the proliferation through cable outlets of opportunities for interaction between average citizens and their elected representatives and the public's refusal in 1992 to let the salacious or titillating aspects of campaign coverage outweigh its concern for pocketbook issues and (dare one say it) concern for the country's future. Equally important, the pendulum seems to be swinging sharply toward an ethic of empathy and service rather than simple self aggrandizement or some public relations version of Mandeville's Fable of the Bees. Surely, for one of our fore-

most analysts of the cooperative strain running through American culture, an essay focusing on the current stress on service rather than one lamenting the supposed death of democracy would have provided a more compelling and more symmetrical conclusion to what is a generation's quarry of rich and often seminal insights into what makes Americans tick.

Michael J. Birkner, *Gettysburg College*

Notes

1. For a historian who claims to know more about the 17th century than his own time, see J. H. Hexter, "The Historian and His Day," in *Reappraisals in History* (Evanston, Ill., 1961), esp. 6-9. For a notable example of the historian injecting his work into contemporary controversy, consider C. Vann Woodward and the circumstances surrounding his lecture series at the University of Virginia, which became *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*. "Since the historian lives in the present," Woodward observed many years later, "he has obligations to the present as well as to the past he studies. The present always proceeds, consciously or unconsciously, on some theory about history, very often a false one. . . ." *Thinking Back: The Perils of Writing History* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1986), p. 98. For context, see *ibid.*, chapter 5; John Herbert Roper, *C. Vann Woodward: Southerner* (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 1987), chapter 7; and Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: 'The Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988), pp. 353-354.

2. Michael Zuckerman, *Peaceable Kingdoms: New England Towns in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970).

3. Rhys Issac, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982); and Timothy Breen, *Tobacco Culture* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985).

4. David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of the Revolution, 1770-1823* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1975), esp. pp. 171-184.

5. Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1975).

6. On Jefferson and slavery, two recent trenchant discussions are Paul Finkelman, "Jefferson and Slavery: 'Treason Against the Hopes of the World,'" in Peter S. Onuf, ed., *Jeffersonian Legacies* (Charlottesville, Va.: University Press of Virginia, 1993), pp. 181-221, and Scot A. French and Edward L. Ayers, "The Strange Career of Thomas Jefferson: Race and Slavery in American Memory, 1943-1993," in *ibid.*, pp. 418-456.

By Oliver Zunz. *Making America Corporate, 1870.1920.*

(Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1990. Pp. 267, \$24.95 cloth, \$12.95 paper.)

By Burton W. Folsom, Jr. *The Myth of the Robber Barons: A New Look at the Rise of Big Business in America.*

(Herndon, Virginia: Young America's Foundation, 1991. Pp. 170. \$21.95 cloth, \$11.95 paper.)

By James Howard Bridge. *The Inside History of the Carnegie Steel Company: A Romance of Millions.* With Introduction by John N. Ingham.

(Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1991. Pp. 380, \$34.95 cloth, \$16.96 paper.)

The history of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries has long been dominated by the most notable and, to some, notorious figures of the period. Entrepreneurs like Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller have symbolized the stunning industrial growth of an era noted for its conspicuous consumption and the growing gap between rich and poor in America. Not surprisingly, they have been harshly criticized through much of this century, most memorably in Matthew Josephson's characterization of them and other businessmen as "robber barons."

Each of these books goes beyond this stereotypical view, and therein lies their contribution. While Burton Folsom offers a generally positive assessment of the era's entrepreneurs, Olivier Zunz views them as interchangeable parts in an organizational juggernaut. In 1903, when he published his *Inside History*, James Howard Bridge anticipated Zunz's analysis: "The Carnegie Steel Company, as will be seen from this narrative, is not the creation of any man, nor indeed of any set of men. It is a natural evolution, and the conditions of its growth are of the same general character as those of the 'flower in the crannied wall'" (p. xxxiii). These three books not only cause us to reassess any preoccupation we may still have with the "robber barons," but go beyond them to address the beginnings of modern bureaucratic organizations in America, their impact on individuals, and the role individuals can play in them.

Olivier Zunz sees himself answering the challenge posed by Alfred D. Chandler, Jr. in his book *The Visible Hand* (1977). Chandler urged social historians to "move beyond their focus on the proletariat and open their studies to other causes and consequences of large-scale economic change" (p. 7). Zunz describes Chandler's work largely as explicating "the creation of middle-level managers, the nature of their responsibilities, the new techniques of accounting and statistical reporting, and the 'professionalisms' of their loyalties" (p. 6). According to Zunz, Chandler attributes growth not to the control of financiers, but to the decisions made by managers. "Thus 'the American railroad enterprise,' he [Chandler] suggests, 'might more properly be considered a variation of managerial capitalism than an unalloyed expression of financial capitalism'" (p. 6): The top executives, however, were subjected to the scrutiny of boards of directors, while middle-level executives, dealing with the daily control of management matters too mundane to

interest the boards of directors, actually had more autonomy. "Chandler's work on management has, in effect, opened the door for social historians to examine the role of middle-management in the rise of corporate America" (p. 7). It is this role, through the study of many individual lives, called prosopography, which Zunz examines.

In *Making America Corporate, 1870-1920*, Zunz recalls that prosopographical studies have moved from a focus on the economic elite toward a concentration on the radical fringe groups, but have largely neglected mainstream America. The middle class was an important and powerful entity in its own right, not a pawn at the mercy of the corporation as C. Wright Mills argued in *White Collar* (1957). Zunz sees the middle class corporate executive as the driving power of business and society, determining standards and practices and creating the American work ethic.

Zunz first deals with the loss of individual business autonomy as small businesses were increasingly drawn into the corporate web. Concentrating on the E. I. DuPont de Nemours Powder Company as a representative case, he describes how business was first carried on by a plethora of general retailers who served as independent agents for the company. As the railroads, DuPont's largest clients, started to buy directly from the company, these independent agents found themselves squeezed out and replaced by company representatives in consolidated districts. The company expanded to handle its own marketing as it became more vertically integrated, creating a great demand for salesmen, bookkeepers, and clerks to handle the accounts.

A chapter on the first executives traces the growth of upper and middle management in the railroad industry, especially the history of the Chicago, Burlington, and Quincy. Here Zunz describes the aggressive corporate mentality of these company men. At a time when only eight percent of the American population had a high school education most of the middle management executives had graduated from high school, and some had been recruited from the relatively small pool of college graduates and were given positions where they penetrated local elite social circles. These men, whether through education or experience, showed great flexibility, creativity, and determination in solving difficulties that slowed corporate growth. Their work ethic was so corporate-centered that their loyalty was unshakable. Their antagonism toward strikers, whom they viewed as the destroyers of opportunity and a lesser breed of men according to the precepts of social Darwinism, exceeded that of the company owners.

Zunz also posits three different styles of corporate organization. He labels the innovative DuPont Company's approach, which he had treated in detail in chapter one, as "theorizing." Frederick W. Taylor notwithstanding, DuPont, he argues, practically invented the concept of "scientific management" in its application of departmental organization, and best embodies the principles of big business as they are commonly understood. By contrast, the Ford Motor Company was built on a basis of "tinkering," a more haphazard, experimental approach to production, distribution, and marketing developed by relatively uneducated mechanics who had a genius for machinery and applied mechanical principles to the less tangible aspects of organization. Most interesting is his characterization of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company as

embodying the principles of Zunz's third organizational style: "reforming." This corporation's business became the improvement of the health of its clients. Organizing in the same social movement that resulted in the founding of settlement houses, the well-educated and humanitarian executive of Metropolitan Life launched mass education programs on public and personal health. These programs increased the life expectancy of Metropolitan Life's clients, and thus the profits of the corporation. In the process they compiled extensive statistical data. The executives also employed relatively uneducated foreign-born agents who possessed a personal knowledge of several languages which they used to collect the insurance fees and interact with a variety of ethnic groups. While launching a sophisticated, multiple-phased program of health improvement in cooperation with governmental and humanitarian organizations, Metropolitan Life eventually discarded its profit-making shareholder system and transformed itself into a mutual association.

The skyscraper tower is so much a symbol of corporate America that Zunz devotes an entire chapter to it. He starts with the vision of the Greek temple masonry building, with its large solid scale and horizontal lines, built with an interior court and skylight. Despite the complaints of the advocates of the City Beautiful movement and the general population, the style then evolved toward the vertical as in the Gothic cathedral of the Woolworth Building and the campanile tower design of Metropolitan Life. The move to the skyscraper implied more than the erection of an impressive monument; it reflected the new hierarchical organization of functions within the building and an attendant change in the social structure, including an increasing proportion of women in clerical positions.

The collar line, as Zunz calls it, drew a distinction between the blue collar designation of assembly-line workers, manual laborers, and machinists, and the white collar occupations of salespeople, accountants, clerks, teachers, managers, supervisors, and executives. Considerable overlap in status and salary existed from the higher blue collar levels of "tinkerers" and craftsmen to the lower white collar levels of shopgirl or clerk, but the white collar designation certainly carried more prestige. One young man complained about the drop in his income when he was raised to supervisory status because he now received a straight salary instead of the hourly-wage-plus-overtime he earned as a laborer. But the white collar position eventually opened the door to promotion and his financial reverses, due to his perseverance, proved to be only temporary.

The vastly enlarged demand for white collar office workers was increasingly filled by the children of white collar parents who had received a specialized education either in a high school commercial course or at a business college. Higher level skilled blue collar parents also directed their children to these positions where extremely restrictive codes of dress, behavior, propriety, and thrift were imposed.

Although a rising proportion of these white collar clerking, typing, and accounting jobs were held by women, generally men oversaw such office work which was viewed as an interim phase before marriage. At this point women were expected to resign, invariably leaving the higher management positions to the men. Companies took seriously their responsibility to provide respectable conditions for these young women and took a paternal interest in promoting

the good health and moral values of all their employees. Ford especially took his educating responsibilities to heart and instituted a "sociology department" to investigate the private lives and living conditions of his employees.

Corporations moved into the rural hinterland well in advance of, and with far more success than, government extension programs and Grange-type organizations in promoting scientific agriculture and an up-scale farm life. Zunz's chapter "On the Farm" describes the work of the McCormick Company and International Harvester, still separate and competing companies as they sought to tap the rural market through district representatives. The corporations viewed farmers not as "hicks," but as aspiring businessmen in their own right, open to technological advancement and the amenities of modern life. Salesmen for McCormick and International Harvester stressed the appearance of the machines they sold, their brilliant finish and functional designs. Much credit goes to the company representatives for successfully assaying local needs and wants and insightfully appraising the corporation of rural expectations in terms of product lines.

Zunz's final chapter focuses on salesmen, whose roles and lifestyle changed radically with the rise of corporations and the institution of territories, quotas, commissions, and expense accounts. Zunz points out that given the rigors of life on the road, the need to live frugally and the lack of job-security and benefits, salesmen showed extraordinary initiative and enthusiasm. He cites the large number of articles written by salesmen for company magazines and their dynamic presentations at sales conventions as evidence of a zeal that went far beyond monetary compensation.

In his conclusion, Zunz pinpoints this time before World War I as being unique in the history of corporations for the amount of success available to the ambitious individual, unprecedented and unequalled in any other period. This epoch created a corporate mentality and homeogeneity in America as companies became increasingly hierarchical and national in scope.

Making America Corporate, 1870-1920 is beautifully crafted. The text flows smoothly, incorporating skillfully drawn pictures of individual lives through extensive research. These representational sketches are further fleshed out by references to the literature of the period. Willa Cather's *My Antonia* and Theodore Dreiser's *Sister Carrie* accurately reflect life of the common working people, blue collar and white collar. He matches these points of view with the thoughts of philosophers and sociologists of the period such as Thorstein Veblen as well as employees themselves such as DuPont salesman E. T. Wolf. From this array of source material, Zunz builds a well-developed view of an emerging corporate mindset.

Burton Folsom turns conventional wisdom upside down with his book *The Myth of the Robber Barons: A New Look at the Rise of Big Business in America*. Rather than lumping the great industrial entrepreneurs of the late 19th and early 20th century together as the pleasure-seeking villains of American history, living off of the labors of the poor and driving the small, independent businessman out, Folsom has rewritten the play. He divides these builders of industry into two very different and opposing camps—those who sought political subsidies, spent them wastefully, and stifled creative growth—and those men of genius who built indepen-

dently and gradually on the cutting edge of technology to compete successfully against seemingly insurmountable odds. His heroes are Cornelius Vanderbilt, James J. Hill, the Scrantons, Charles Schwab, John D. Rockefeller, and Andrew Mellon. With the exception of Andrew Mellon, these men all came up the hard way from humble beginnings and built their corporations with planning, care, and thrift, taking on impossible challenges when they foresaw the "big break." Thus, the Scrantons, cursed with a location that furnished them neither cheap transportation nor plentiful high-quality raw materials, agreed to supply the New York and Erie Railroad with 12,000 tons of T-rails in two years when all they were producing at the time were inferior-grade nails. After losing his place in U.S. Steel to new management policies that stifled creativity and individual incentives, and after losing his company and fortune to his gambling addiction, Charles Schwab started over with Bethlehem Steel, importing ore from Cuba, investing in the necessary equipment to cast one-piece structural beams, and beating U.S. Steel at its own game. John D. Rockefeller entered on the ground floor of the oil industry and, brought the price of kerosene down from 58¢ per gallon to 5¢ by buying timberland and making his own barrels. Each of these men, rather than being despoilers, built on efficiency and the development of potential use. If their lifestyles were lavish, so too was their generosity. They rewarded hard work and ingenuity. Folsom claims that they did not "rob" society of its wealth; they created it. In the process, they raised the opportunities for millions who found employment directly in their companies or in expanded farm production and in an increased number of city services dependent on the corporation and servicing its needs. In a most appealing plea, Folsom builds a strong case for reducing federal regulation and business subsidies, claiming that whenever the federal government has stepped in, it has encouraged waste, discouraged efficiency and initiative, and cost the taxpayers money.

As Secretary of the Treasury under Presidents Harding and Coolidge, Andrew Mellon worked to lower the personal income tax at all levels in his attempts to bring in more government revenue. In what appeared to be circuitous logic to most government politicians who favored taxing the highest income levels the highest, Folsom says that Mellon had the vision to see the situation as it actually was. Imposing high taxes on the rich actually eroded the tax base since the rich were investing their money in tax-sheltered municipal bonds where it was being used to build parks and stadiums but contributed nothing to economic growth. When taxes were lowered, these moneys were once again invested in business, creating growth, and raising even more revenue for the government. Mellon's revolutionary plan actually raised revenue from the highest income brackets and reduced the burden on the poor and middle-class. Yet, all that he had labored to do, against stiff opposition, was speedily undone under the Roosevelt administration. This not only returned to the old taxing structure, but funded New Deal programs through excise taxes on such diverse items as bank checks, movie tickets, phone calls, gasoline, tires, cars, electricity, lubricating oils, and grape concentrates which hurt the poor more than the rich.

All this certainly contradicts the conventional interpretation that most historians have ventured concerning these men. According to Folsom, history has to be rewritten to tell the whole truth and wipe out the blanket condemnation of great industrialists as "robber barons," as Matthew Josephson called them sixty years ago. For at least twenty years, organizational historians, Zunz among them, have advanced the theory that the rise of the corporate structure, not the individual entrepreneurs, determined the business growth of America. With the rise of corporate structure, the whole matter is taken out of the moral sphere and the course of history is predetermined. The development of giant corporations is no longer seen as the result of the strivings of individuals. The "organizational view" claims that such entrepreneurs would have come to the top even if Hill, Schwab, Rockefeller, Vanderbilt, and the like had never existed. The race would have gone to the second place winner if the first place winner were not there to compete. Folsom disputes not only Josephson's negative portrait, he also disputes this point of view as presented by Bridge and Zunz. He credits Rockefeller and his cohort with genius in creating the organizational forms of American business strength. They formed the corporate structure and if they had not existed or been given the chance, the void would not necessarily have been filled.

In the new introduction to *The Inside History of the Carnegie Steel Company*, John N. Ingham speaks of the author's bias and the possible distortions in the presentation in the book. The author, James Howard Bridge, served as Andrew Carnegie's literary secretary; Carnegie collaborated with him in writing *Triumphant Democract*. In the introduction to this reprint of *The Inside History of the Carnegie Steel Company*, originally published in 1903, Ingham explains that the book was sponsored by Henry Phipps and Henry Clay Frick, who by the time of the writing had become Carnegie's opponents. According to Ingham, Phipps and Frick "are consistently treated with gentleness and deep respect" while Bridge's purposes "oftentimes seem to be to denigrate Andrew Carnegie's contributions to the firm's growth and success, while elevating the contributions of others" (p. xii). Bridge consistently referred to Carnegie's self-aggrandizing *Autobiography* as inaccurate and distorted. He portrayed Carnegie not as a man of innovation and courage, but as a conservative businessman, afraid of risks, who had to be convinced by others to make the moves that kept Carnegie Steel on the technological cutting edge. Bridge referred to Carnegie's statement of his later years, "pioneering don't pay," and applied it to Carnegie's entire business career to depict him as resistant to change. Even Carnegie's decision to build his massive Bessemer plant was credited to the efforts of William Coleman, backed by Thomas Carnegie.

Bridge also held Carnegie accountable for what he considered ethical misconduct in securing companies and markets. He described in detail how Thomas Miller, because of his position with the Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne, and Chicago Railroad (then the Ohio and Pennsylvania) which purchased rails from the Kloman Brothers iron works, enlisted his friend Henry Phipps to represent him in a partnership with the Klomans. When difficulties arose with the Klomans, Miller and Phipps sought the aid of a mutual friend, Andrew Carnegie, to help mediate. Through subterfuge, he maneuvered Anton Kloman and eventually Miller himself out of the firm and his brother in. Then he and Miller bought a nearby property, started their own rival mill, and eventually

merged this new Cyclops Iron Company with Kloman's Union Iron Mills.

Bridge also cited examples where Carnegie, in his autobiography or public statements, deliberately bent the chronology of events to exculpate himself from charges of financial manipulation. Bridge may be correct in assuming that these "confusions" of time sequence are deliberately contrived to give the appearance that Carnegie did not create the conditions that forced businesses to sell out to him. Or these errors may have been legitimate misconceptions by a man too egotistical to check the record. Considering the number of business and financial records of Carnegie's dealings that were purposefully or inadvertently destroyed, Bridge may have a case for some of his claims, even if he did belabor the point.

Bridge's account is an object lesson in disillusioning the reader of any false preconceptions concerning these larger-than-life characters of America's industrial age. Americans, fed on myths of poor men who achieved by diligence, perseverance, and the nerve to take unprecedented risks in the mold of the Horatio Alger heroes, it strains credulity to see these men reduced to petty, scheming manipulators, ruthless in their pursuit of power and wealth. One would rather accept them, or at least some of them, as Professor Folsom sees them, as men of daring, rather than as cutthroats.

Folsom decries the modern organizational approach to the industrial age where the rise of the corporate structure becomes the guiding force, not the individuals that developed that structure. The corporation takes on a life and direction of its own, divorced from the morals of business ethics on the part of the industrialists who in this view are replaceable pawns. This is the very philosophy that Bridge expounds upon at the conclusion of his preface, written nearly a hundred years ago:

Andrew Carnegie has somewhere said, in effect: Take away all our money, our great works, ore mines, and coke-ovens, but leave our organization, and in four years I shall have re-established myself. He might have gone a step further and eliminated himself and his organization; and in less than four years the steel industry would have recovered from the loss. This is not the popular conception of industrial evolution, which demands captains, corporals, and other heroes; but it accords with evolutionary conceptions in general (pp. xxxiii-xxxiv).

Far from being a new concept, the theory of the role of corporate rise over individual initiative was espoused in deep philosophical moments even by those early entrepreneurs. As Henry Clay Frick himself stated, "the demands of modern life called for such works as ours; and if we had not met the demands others would have done so. Even without us the steel industry of the country would have been just as great as it is, though men would have used other names in speaking of its leaders" (p. xxxiv). The three authors reviewed here—Zunz, Folsom, and Bridge—have all presented the rise of the corporate world with a particular emphasis. Zunz traces the growing class of managers and sees them as the true power that shaped the corporate world. Folsom takes a closer look at particular entrepreneurs and sees in them the driving force that reshaped the industrial world. Bridge presents Frick's view that the rise of industry and the corporate world was predetermined by the demand, and the outcome was never dependent ulti-

mately on any of the players, even the greatest of them having, in the end, feet of clay. But wherever the source of power and direction resided, the rise of the corporate structure reshaped America, forming a new national culture and lifestyle.

Joseph F. Rishel, *Duquesne University*

By David E. Narrett. *Inheritance and Family Life in Colonial New York City.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992. Pp. 248. \$41.50.)

Through an exhaustive study of probate records in colonial New York, David Narrett has uncovered a complex story of social change and assimilation among the heterogeneous population of this mid-Atlantic colony. Focusing on inheritance patterns, the original Dutch settlers emerge as active players in the slow but steady domination of English law and custom. The Dutch maintained their cultural integrity and accommodated selectively to the new English legal system. Narrett sees legal change as influencing but not dictating social custom.

Among the many examples of Dutch family and inheritance patterns discussed is the intriguing, distinctly non-English custom of joint will-writing. The Dutch husband and wife both wrote the will that divided up the family's estate. The surviving spouse be it husband or wife was the primary heir of the familial assets. This was in contrast to the English system that did not allow married women to write wills and guaranteed in most colonies simply a dowry right for a wife on the death of her husband. The author goes beyond description and uses such evidence to probe the inner workings of the Dutch family. For example, Narrett argues that joint will-writing spoke to the status of women within marriage. A woman was "a partner rather than a servant within marriage" (p. 43). I suspect, given the other evidence he offers, that Dutch women were partners in marriage; however, I feel the converse may not be as accurate—English women were servants in marriage. As Narrett himself states, the connection between statute and behavior is complex. Law did not always reflect the way people conducted their intimate lives.

In addition, as Narrett demonstrates in his appendix, will-writers were not average people. They tended to be wealthier than intestate individuals. Those who did not write wills outnumbered those who did. Much of the analysis in this study is based on probate sources. Although this approach has its limitations Narrett makes good use of the material at hand.

What is particularly strong in this analysis is the discussion of women and their legal circumstance within the context of the family. Rather than presenting women as victims of an increasingly patriarchal legal system he discusses family strategies that worked around the edges of the legal system. We don't just have men versus women here, but rather a complex form of familial decision-making.

Narrett's dissertation was a must for researchers working on inheritance and women in early America. This book improves on that study and presents difficult material in a well-organized format.

Lisa Wilson, *Connecticut College*

By Glenna Matthews. *The Rules of Public Woman: Woman's Power and Woman's Place in the United States, 1630-1970.*

(New York: Oxford University Press, 1992. Pp. 297. \$25.00.)

This is an ambitious book covering over three hundred years of American history. It begins in the seventeenth century and ends as women celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of suffrage with a Strike for Equality on August 26, 1970. Its organizing theme involves women's increasing access to public roles over time, the form those roles took, and the opposition women met with each time they ventured into male-dominated arenas. The book focuses on women who were pioneers in the public sphere, concentrating primarily on already well-known female leaders rather than rank-and-file unknowns. Within a chronological framework, Matthews explores four dimensions of "public womanhood" (legal, political, spatial and cultural).

Beginning with two distinct religious groups in the seventeenth century, Puritans and Quakers, Matthews contrasts the intolerance for public women in New England (using Anne Hutchinson as her example) with the Pennsylvania Quakers' more egalitarian female roles within the family and the religious community. Matthews then examines eighteenth-century development which led to increased female autonomy in the American colonies prior to the Revolution. Post-war progress included the beginnings of free black women's activities in the Public sphere, as well as republicanism's promise of new authority for women within the family. A chapter on the emergence of the novel in the early nineteenth century details the development of women's cultural activities. Women used the novel to legitimate public roles which, by the Civil War era, meant that a domestically-based politics was firmly established.

Matthews regards the late nineteenth century, the Gilded Age, as a watershed in public roles for women. This era witnessed a substantial number of women employed outside the home, and a "growing number of women who earned enough to live outside the confines of a family" (p. 10). Women's politics could now be predicated on something other than domesticity. The Gilded Age was also the era in which working class, immigrant, women (such as Emma Goldman and Mother Jones) became public figures. The final chapter is devoted to transformations in the twentieth century including the struggle for the ERA, unionization, black women's contribution to the civil rights movement, and the rebirth of feminism.

Because Matthews chooses to focus on well-known women who are representative of the development of public roles over time, there is much that the book cannot cover. With the exception of Phyllis Wheatley, it is white, middle class women who are the focus of the book prior to the late 19th century. Matthews does, however, briefly mention the activities of Chicana, Native American and Amerasian public women in the twentieth century.

The book relies primarily on secondary literature, occasionally supplemented with Matthews' original research. As such, it is a comprehensive survey of the recent historiography on women in America, organized around the theme of women's public roles. Matthews' footnotes are a useful source from which to begin further reading on a given era or topic. And the book can serve as an entryway to further exploration of less well-known public women, and to women's collective activities over the last three hundred years.

Susan Branson, *Southern Methodist University*

By Jon Pahl. *Paradox Lost: Free Will and Political Liberty in American Culture, 1630-1760*.

(Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992, Pp. 233, \$35.00.)

The title of Jon Pahl's engaging and provocative book suggests its major problem. The lost paradox is the tension between free will and determinism, a tension Puritan theology kept tenuously balanced so God's grace would be required to save men who nevertheless had the option to perform good works which would preserve the social order. Despite Pahl's title, however, he does not show how we lose this paradox. Instead, in an extremely suggestive but all too brief final chapter, he shows how the running colonial debate between free will and determination spilled over into the causes of the American Revolution and the dispute over the nature of the new republic. Thus, the paradox was not lost; it was transformed into arguments over colonial liberty vs. British regulation, and state vs. national power. Alas, instead of developing these themes in depth, which the short length of this book would easily have allowed, Pahl drops a few tantalizing hints and leaves us with a problem to ponder.

Brevity is usually a scholarly virtue, and Pahl is to be commended for clearly distilling a dozen colonial debates over free will and determination into about 180 pages of text. Students of Pennsylvania will be especially interested in his treatment of Benjamin Franklin's wrestling with this problem, beginning as an eighteen-year-old determinist with his "A Dissertation on Liberty and Necessity, Pleasure and Pain," and ending with his mature endorsement of human freedom (pp. 70-82). The rehabilitation of Franklin as a serious philosophical thinker is much to be applauded, for behind his facile writing style and wit lay a profound concern and understanding of the great dilemmas which have plagued humankind. Most of the book, as might be expected, deals with New England, a good part of that with the Great Awakening and Jonathan Edwards's struggle to retain the traditional Puritan balance in the face of born again determinists and free will Anglicans. There are interesting snippets, however, on Philadelphia Anglican priest Archibald Cummings's defense of free will and the writings of two obscure New Jersey Quakers—John Hepburn and Thomas Lowry—who in 1714 linked slavery of the will with the physical slavery of blacks as moral abominations.

Despite its virtues of conciseness, clarity, and thought-provoking ideas, Pahl ultimately fails to satisfy. Many of the chapters are only a few pages long; controversies which engaged Perry Miller in gigantic tomes are tossed off in essays which simply breeze past. The author goes out of his way to pick quarrels with most of the extant major interpreters relating ideas to the American Revolution without presenting much of his own case that the theological debates he discussed were indeed a major influence. These flaws, notwithstanding, *Paradox Lost* is a fine, short introduction to the major colonial arguments over whether the cosmos could consistently embrace both human freedom and Divine Will, and how a mediating orthodoxy was maintained which insisted that it could.

William Pencak, *Penn State/Ogontz Campus*

By Tyler Anbinder, *Nativism & Slavery: The Northern Know Nothings & the Politics of the 1850s*.

(New York: Oxford University Press, 1992, Pp. 330, \$39.95.)

It is truly remarkable that despite the vast literature on the political crisis of the 1850s we still have not had a complete, scholarly monograph on the enigmatic Know Nothing movement. A voluminous and highly informative periodical literature of local and state studies has provided an excellent base for research, but until the 1970s, historians continued to view this nativist organization as a chapter in the history of Protestant intolerance, a case study in the politics of prejudice and hate. The conceptual breakthroughs of the "new" political history (with its emphasis on social science methods and its interest in ethnoreligious impulses in politics) have radically altered and broadened this picture to account for the movement's critical role in the sectional quarrel of the 1850s. A number of historians began to recognize the Know Nothings' unmistakable presence at the deathbed of the old Whig party—the great prelude to the rise of the antislavery Republicans.

It is with this latter problem—the antislavery or nativist credentials of the Whigs' successors—that Anbinder is primarily concerned. His seminal study offers the first comprehensive examination of the northern Know Nothing electorate and traces the rapid rise and decline of the nativist movement. Anbinder almost completely overturns the prevailing view that Know Nothings were the Hell's Angels of the 1850s—a youthful, violent, and fanatical organization. Anbinder's Know Nothings were not narrowly nativist and were instead a generally respectable party raising issues of deep and continuing concern. Their opposition to partyism, slavery, rum, Catholics, and foreigners reflected mainstream northern political culture, just as the party's demographic profile mirrored the average age, socioeconomic background, and sectional orientation of the northern population at large.

Given this broad base, it was hardly surprising to find that once the Whig party retreated from its nativist, cold-water, and antislavery constituencies in 1852, voters flooded out of it and into the new and thriving Know Nothing lodges. In an odd twist on an old tale, Anbinder argues that the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 sparked the rise not of the Republicans, but of the Know Nothings, to whom the Act was the perfect mixture of proslavery and immigrant elements long fostered by the Democratic party. "Slavery, not nativism," Anbinder says, "played the decisive role in the destruction of the second party system" (p. 100).

In careful and detailed chapters on the party's electoral career in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, New York, and Massachusetts, Anbinder dispels the Know Nothings' single-issue image and reveals a complex collection of motives, leaders, issues, and ideas at work. In a dramatic revision of the conventional wisdom about Know Nothings, Anbinder argues that the party's demise came not from its narrow focus on a single issue, but from its factious heterogeneity, which defied the imposition of a coherent platform, especially on slavery. Antislavery Know Nothings defected early to the Republicans; nativists and conservatives came later, lured by the party's moderation on slavery and support for protectionism.

Anbinder's focus on northern realignment defines southern Know Nothings out of the study, including highly important Know Nothing activity (much of it violent) in the border states. And ancillary questions—the order's role in the political socialization of new voters, the unique nature of its pyramidal organization—are generally left alone. The portrait that emerges is of an embryonic Republican party, for if Anbinder is correct, the only practical difference between Know Nothings and Republicans were the name and the relative emphasis given to pieces of a common agenda. Republicans were just more willing than the Know Nothings to localize some issues, like nativism and temperance, while they accepted the fact that an antislavery party was by definition a sectional party.

This is an excellent, superbly researched, and provocative book about a subject long overdue for extensive treatment. Perhaps it will pave the way for a capstone volume on Know Nothingism as a national, and not just a northern, phenomenon.

Peter Knupfer, *Kansas State University*

By Gerald Eggert, *Harrisburg Industrializes: The Coming of Factories to an American Community.*

(University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993. Pp. 432, \$ 35.00.)

A modern lyricist has observed: "Sometimes you don't know what you've got till it's gone." So it is with Harrisburg industry. A very late industrial revolution generated hundreds of jobs that have long since disappeared. These jobs, so readily denigrated by leftist scholars, would today constitute an extraordinary asset to the city. In this community study of Harrisburg, Eggert demonstrates a profound understanding of the nexus between the coming of the factory system and prosperity.

Harrisburg Industrializes has been inspired by Stephan Thernstrom's seminal work of thirty years ago. There is, however, a fascinating twist to the way that Eggert has organized and presented his material. In Part I of the book the reader is offered a chronological account or *history* of Harrisburg industrailization focusing on the rise and demise of factories between the 1840s and the 1890s. In Part II the reader is offered chapters that focus topically on Entrepreneurial Elites, Persistence of Workers, Ethnic Minorities, Craft Workers, etc.—essentially *social science*. This reviewer recognizes that not every scholar sees a meaningful distinction between history and social science, and that Professor Eggert may not have intended any such distinction. Intended or not, it is an effective way to organize the study.

Harrisburg Industrializes is essentially the story of a quiet second stage industrial revolution. It is suggested that John Harris's town was emulating Lancaster, and the Red Rose city did not get started much before the mid 1840s. By 1849 Harrisburg enjoyed all the preconditions for industrialization including: a transportation revolution, the rise of banking, and well-heeled merchants willing to invest. Eggert says at one point that he is not sure what triggered the rise of

factories, but then goes on to discuss the influence of New England mill doctor and promoter Charles Tillinghast James who inspired the Harrisburg Cotton Manufacturing Company in 1849. In so doing, Professor Eggert answered his own question.

Beyond the Harrisburg Cotton Manufacturing Company there were the McCormick and Baily iron properties, the Pennsylvania Railroad's machine and car shops, the Harrisburg Car Manufacturing Company, and the Hickok Eagle Works—all established between 1849 and 1855. This late developing industrial activity enjoyed considerable support from outside investors, particularly Philadelphians. Dun and Bradstreet reports reveal serious damage stemming from the Panic of 1857 and the depression of the 1890's. Labor relations were generally calm. This was due, in part, to the common practice of shutting down in the face of strikes and thereby not antagonizing workers by bringing in strike breakers.

Considerable attention is paid to the impact of the factory system on local craftsmen. Eggert argues that industrialization posed little threat as Harrisburg factories (unlike Lancaster, for example) did not produce anything that competed with hand technology. So it was that artisans could continue to grow in number even as factories did.

Harrisburg enjoyed a robust industrial economy for about fifty years, after which limited capital seemed to preclude plant modernization and thus competitiveness. At the same time, the business of politics continued to grow. Alas, today the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania employs more people in Harrisburg than the six largest industries in the Harrisburg metropolitan area.

In hindsight, industrialization may be seen as an interlude in the history of the community, an interlude carefully chronicled by Professor Eggert. *Harrisburg Industrializes* represents many years of research and the compilation of extensive data that guarantee this work's importance to current and future scholars interested in the history of south central Pennsylvania. It logically follows that no collection of historical works relating to the Commonwealth should be without this book.

Thomas R. Winpenny, *Elizabethtown College*

By Stuart McConnell. *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900.*

(Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina, 1992. Pp. 332, \$32.50.)

At the close of the American Civil War, northern troops gathered in Washington for a final "Grand Review" before returning to civilian life. Despite proud rhetoric about finely honed military discipline, the Union troops were a pretty disorderly bunch, especially those war weary westerners who had marched through the South with Sherman. This tension between clearly delineated ideals and unruly truths lies at the center of Stuart McConnell's fine history of the Grand Army of the Republic.

McConnell traces the veterans group from its postwar formation as a highly political organization formed around a complex system of grades; to its emphasis on fraternalism following the

1876 Centennial; to its years as a spirited lobbying group, peaking with the passage of the 1890 Dependent Pension Act. As the war retreated in memory, the GAR fought for control of the nation's recollections. Their war, the veterans insisted, had been a millennial crusade to preserve the Union, and they took care to pass this message on to future generations. But as the century neared a close, the volunteers who fought in the Spanish American War discovered that the patriotic ideals from their youth had little relevance to their own military experiences.

Although largely an institutional study, McConnell offers the GAR's history as a "microcosm of a nation trying to hold fast to an older image of itself in the face of massive social change" (xv). But it is perhaps more accurate to describe this as the story of a distinct subgroup of Civil War America struggling to maintain its place during three decades of rapid change. In a particularly interesting discussion, McConnell dissects the membership of three selected posts: Philadelphia's elite-dominated post number 2; the Brockton, Massachusetts post, composed largely of shoe workers; and the more rural Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin post. The different class makeups of the three posts, and the concomitant diversity of business activities behind their doors, reveals much about the local variation within the GAR. But in a larger sense the veterans group was never an accurate "microcosm" of the nation. Immigrants, workers, blacks and women were systematically excluded or underrepresented, with occasionally stormy results. Confederate veterans and young men from the next generation faced similar barriers. As McConnell explains, the GAR's relationship with outsiders was "at base an effort to freeze the social relations of 1865 and hold them against all comers" (219).

This, then, is a history of how these Union veterans defined and defended their past. The GAR's evolving rituals reveal the development of an idealized memory of military life recreated in fraternal "camps" stressing sentimentalism and self-discipline, running counter to the grim realism that would later mark the fiction of veterans like Ambrose Bierce. In presenting themselves to the nation, the veterans struggled with the implications of pension legislation. On the one hand, the nation owed its saviors financial relief. But they feared that excessive aid would defeat self-reliance and sap their "manliness." The solution of the 1880s was to defend pension legislation as the appropriate payment of a national debt which would in fact preserve the veterans' independent manhood.

McConnell has made an important contribution to our understanding of how the Civil War continued to mold the nation's consciousness for decades after Appomattox.

J. Matthew Gallman, *Loyola College, Maryland*

By Sharon Hartman Strom. *Beyond the Typewriter: Gender, Class, and the Origins of Modern American Office Work, 1900-1930.*

(Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992. Pp. 427, \$42.50.)

This book reflects a number of recent developments in labor history. Moving away from traditional concerns with blue collar workers and unions, it lengthens the list of works that dis-

cuss the rapidly expanding white collar, clerical, and unorganized workforce. Strom, in tune with recent work, offers a gender analysis of workers and workplaces. She examines not only discrimination against women, but also how jobs came to be tagged “feminine” or “masculine.” Finally, like recent studies of workers, Strom’s book notes that conditions outside workplaces as well as within them shaped workers’ aspirations and opportunities. Strom brings technology, management systems, education, social movements, and workers’ ethnic, racial, and class backgrounds into the story of the expansion of office work in the early decades of the twentieth century.

Beyond the Typewriter is not a book driven by a strong thesis. Rather, it examines the growing number of office workers and the increasing specialization of their tasks from several perspectives, including those of management theorists, businessmen, educators, and middle and working-class women and men. The book opens with a discussion of scientific management. By shifting decision-making from the factory floor to newly-created layers of middle management, Taylorism helped create the need for a throng of office workers, who in turn were targets of Taylor’s principles. Some feminists had hoped that scientific management’s fixation on “rational” decision-making would open management positions to qualified women. Yet “rationality” was not so rational after all: soon most levels of management were deemed “male” and prestigious business schools were closed to women; personnel positions appeared to mix femininity with college training, so women got those jobs; and some technical assignments seemed suited for both sexes. Lower-level jobs were also sorted by sex. Men as well as women poured into office work in the early twentieth century, helped by free training offered by public schools. The management ideal included stringent sex segregation, both to guard against sexual disorder in offices and to reassure male workers that office work remained a path to respectability. By the 1920s, many office jobs became routinized and dead ends for low paid women. Still, office workers were not an undifferentiated female mass. Some men and women still performed essentially the same work, albeit for unequal pay; and women workers were divided by job classification, age, and class.

Strom engages a number of debates among historians and sociologists. Against those who suggest that clerical work was all of an unskilled, routine piece, Strom points to labor segmentation. Women who stayed in office work past their twenties probably reached the top of their climb as supervisors over other women, but there they came into conflict with younger workers. Labor segmentation made organizing office workers difficult. Strom also sensibly joins the debate about whether women wanted different things from work than men. She argues that no blanket characterization of women workers is possible: women entered office work for myriad reasons and with a range of expectations, and those expectations changed over the course of their careers.

Beyond the Typewriter is clearly written, but the topical organization makes it repetitive. It is strongest on technology, management ideas, and office professionals; the material on workers and work culture is thin by comparison. But it is a good introduction to a growing literature, and perhaps instructive to anyone who has worked in an office.

Paula Baker, *University of Pittsburgh*

Edited by Ava Baron. *Work Engendered: Toward a New History of American Labor*.

(Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Pp. 385, 1992. Cloth \$42.50, paper \$14.95.)

This book brings together a remarkable collection of essays which peer through the lens of gender at U.S. working-class and labor history. The essays seek to illuminate ways that socially constructed definitions of "masculine" and "feminine" shape the lives of both working women and working men. Collectively the research in these essays reveals that workers only selectively embrace such socially imposed identities; indeed, the shape and strength of workers' resistance is in part a consequence of men's and women's abilities to overcome—or creatively use—such ideologies of gender.

The thirteen essays (plus an introduction by Ava Baron) encompass a mosaic of approaches. Several writers subject employers' gender ideas and practices to intense scrutiny, making it clear that it will no longer suffice to assume that employers act merely according to economic considerations. As Delores Janiewski concludes in her study of southern manufacturers, employers "never recruited or managed workers as if they were colorless or sexless" (p. 90). Other essayists focus on male-dominated unions. Eileen Boris lays bare the origins of the much vaunted "manliness" of AFL craft unions when she describes the lukewarm support Samuel Gompers' cigarmakers union (CMIU) gave domestic tenement house cigarmakers in New York. This essay is followed by Nancy Hewitt's disturbing—but perhaps not surprising—account of the CMIU's opposition to the Latin-based and gender integrated cigar-makers union in Tampa. Here the CMIU's sexism and racism combine to undermine a vital and rich labor union movement.

A number of essays posit a distinct union culture as a result of women's participation in working-class organizing, a culture that is often at odds with male constructions of union organizations. Women in Tampa cigarmakers' union in 1900, for example, produced a movement with "community-wide support, non-violent militancy, decentralized leadership, and an ethos of mutuality" (p. 151). Elizabeth Faue finds the same community-based unionism in Minnesota thirty years later, only to watch women's participation become marginalized as the clothing and textile unions become more centralized and bureaucratic. Finally, some essays describe the struggle of women to break down job segregation, revealing what author Dorothy Sue Coble calls "the complicated nature of working-class feminism." Like their middle-class counterparts, working women "proclaimed their desire to be treated the same as their male co-workers," but also "accepted and defended a separate female sphere" (p. 251).

As the above example suggests, and as Baron's introduction emphasizes, this collection does not pretend to resolve some of the theoretical tensions posed by the prospect of incorporating gender into labor history. The collection also raises a question of style. As happens inevitably when a new theoretical approach is being developed, some essays become tangled in sociological jargon. As abstract concepts like "gender constructions" become historical actors, the human drama risks becoming eclipsed. I enjoyed most those essays which adopted a theo-

retical perspective yet retained a dramatic narrative thread. For example, in Mary Blewett's poignant description of male and female textile workers in Fall River, the reader is alternately enraged by the way working-class masculinity was defined by the middle-class so as to degrade the male mule-spinners, and inspired by the (only partially successful) creative efforts of men and women to overcome differences in style so as to forge a united resistance.

Encompassing a variety of approaches and grounded in fresh research, this collection maps out a broad new terrain; it is hard to imagine any future investigation of labor history ignoring the impact of gender.

Janet Irons, *Lock Haven University*

By Douglas B. Craig. *After Wilson: The Struggle for the Democratic Party, 1920-1934.*

(Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992. Pp. 400, \$45.00.)

Liberals and conservatives rejoice! Here is an old-fashioned, rock 'em, sock 'em chronicle of political intrigue and partisanship. Douglas Craig's socioeconomic interpretation returns ideology to the center of political history. Discounting the prevailing ethnocultural interpretation, which explains the Democratic Party's weaknesses during the 1920s in terms of divisions between "wets" and "drys," Catholics versus Protestants, and city against country, Craig turns our attention back to the conservative-liberal cleavage which paralleled the more visible cultural conflict of these years.

After Wilson is a persuasive revisionist monograph that portrays the postwar Democracy as a party without money, direction, or organization, but not without hope. Craig deftly shows how the negative statist principles of Grover Cleveland, repackaged by the followers of Al Smith, John J. Raskob, and Jouett Shouse, enabled the party's northeastern conservatives to block the decade-long presidential aspirations of Wilson's self-anointed heir apparent, William Gibbs McAdoo. Seeking to redefine their party's ideological direction, Democratic conservatives fought against the expansion of federal jurisdiction in such critical areas as public power development, prohibition and business regulation.

Rather than a "beacon of liberalism" symbolizing the first Catholic presidential candidate's courageous struggle against religious bigotry, Governor Smith's 1928 "Brown Derby" campaign must also be viewed as the repudiation of Wilsonian policies and an acceptance of business control of the national economy. Craig rejects the earlier view of Smith as an embattled progressive championing the interests of the urban ethnic, working class. The struggle of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment should be interpreted, he suggests, not merely as a sign of cultural division within the nation, but primarily as the effort of conservative Democrats to redefine their party's ideological direction.

In denouncing Prohibition and by providing a "whiff of national liberalism," northeastern conservatives sought to attract the support of immigrant, industrial, rank-and-file voters away

from the perceived radicalism of the party's progressive wing. When the Great Depression savaged the nation during the early 1930s, Democratic conservatives hoped that repealing Prohibition, relegalizing the liquor trade, and initiating new excise taxes would create thousands of jobs, hasten recovery, and slow demands for increased federal involvement in the economy.

The conservative coalition's success produced a paradoxical consequence. Rather than reuniting Democrats around a new policy agenda, their visibility provided the party's liberal wing (led by McAdoo and Franklin Roosevelt) with a clearly identifiable enemy. Pushing his thesis forward beyond the 1932 election, in which parenthetically, one Democratic party poster portrayed its nominees—FDR and John Nance Garner—flanking a full-headed beer mug—Craig argues that the creation of the American Liberty League enabled New Dealers to portray themselves as moderate progressives battling the age-old forces of economic royalism.

After Wilson successfully documents the emergence of a conservative alliance that bridged the years from 1920 through 1940. Although the repeal of national Prohibition represented the high point of the conservative crusade, it was also its death knell because a new era of federal interventionism overwhelmed the Liberty Leaguers under a tidal wave of centralization, planning, and bureaucratic growth.

This is a must-read book for any serious student of early twentieth-century American politics.

Eugene M. Tobin, *Hamilton College*

By Kenneth J. Heineman, *Campus War: The Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era*.

(New York: New York University Press, 1993. Pp. 348, \$40.)

By Sigmund Diamond, *Compromised Campus: The Collaboration of Universities with the Intelligence Community, 1945-1955*.

(New York: Oxford University Press, 1993. Pp. 371, \$27.95.)

The books under review reveal a great deal about the cooperation between academe and the government during the Cold War. Institutions of higher learning received federal grants for defense-related research as well as for the expansion of the universities physical plant. Government grants were made available because there was a need for highly-educated engineers and scientists—especially after Sputnik—and foreign area specialists for the purpose of producing new weapons and developing counter-insurgency scenarios in order to advance national security.

Kenneth Heineman's study of the anti-Vietnam student protest movement at Penn State, Kent State, Michigan State and the State University at Buffalo, focuses on the involvement of these institutions with the Department of Defense and other government agencies. This cooper-

ation made it inevitable that University administrators would develop a vested interest in supporting the Vietnam War and quelling student protest against it. Sigmund Diamond's book discusses the cooperation of both Harvard and Yale with government agencies and congressional committees from the outset of the Cold War to 1955. Together, the books present the picture of compromised campuses that, as in the case of the Penn State University administration, "denounced and covertly spied upon campus activists opposed to university-military research and the Vietnam War," or, as at Yale, where the administration gave privileged faculty and student information to the FBI.

In his analysis of the peace movement during the Vietnam era, Heineman's primary focus, however, is in dispelling the myth that student opposition to the war during the 1960s and early 1970s received its direction from elite state and private universities such as Berkeley, Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Michigan, and Wisconsin. Heineman argues that student and faculty opposition to the war "germinated throughout America's less prestigious state universities" and using schools such as Berkeley and Columbia as paradigms does not add to our understanding of the campus anti-war movement. The author contends that many journalists, activists turned memoir-writers, and contemporary scholars were generally trained at prestigious institutions and thus regarded the protest of the affluent children of the establishment as more important than the anti-war activists of working and lower middle-class students. Misperception about the peace movement was enhanced by the fact that aside from Kent State, many of the more sensational protests, such as those at Columbia and Berkeley, took place at elite schools which have become our dominant cultural image of the 1960s.

Heineman attributes the longevity of this myth to the fact that violent protest was strongest at the elite schools where administrators, fearful of alienating wealthy liberal alumni, refused to confront the excesses of their radical students. Students at state universities, who tended to follow the lead of elite university radicals, generally came from upper-middle class and "red diaper" backgrounds whereas less affluent and generally Catholic and "low status" Protestant student activists championed educational forums and non-violent protests.

By profiling the peace movement along the lines of class and religion, Heineman calls our attention to the disproportionate number of Jewish students who were active among the radicals at both the elite and state universities. But the author also shows that Jewish radical students were opposed by campus Zionists organizations, Hillel, Orthodox Jewish student groups, and Jews in the Young Americans for Freedom, all of whom opposed the violent tactics of the radicals. Nevertheless the image persists of identifying Jewish students with the more violent extremes of the anti-war movement.

Heineman tells us much about how administrators at representative state universities attempted to crush the protest movement during the Vietnam War. Diamond's book examines the more subtle cooperation of administrators at Harvard and Yale with the government. Much of Diamond's information comes from previously classified data he received under the Freedom of Information Act. What he has gleaned from these sources is surprising. For example, Dia-

mond discloses that both Henry Kissinger at Harvard and William F. Buckley, Jr. as a student at Yale were FBI informants. He shows that the Russian Research Center at Harvard regularly advised the state department and engaged in covert activities for the government as when it brought émigrés with Nazi pasts to Harvard to work for the Center. Faculty, such as Talcott Parsons, and administrators, such as George Fischer, had no moral scruples about using former Nazis against the new enemy:

He [Fischer] was disturbed because the hopes and plans of the Center . . . to bring some of the emigrés to the United States might run afoul of recent legislation barring emigration of those who had been accomplices of the Nazi regime. Fischer found the anti-Soviet potential of such emigrés more important than their Nazi past.

Diamond documents Yale's cooperation with the FBI in investigations of faculty and students and in providing privileged information to Congressional investigating committees. He rejects the argument, made by liberal political and educational leaders, that the failure to cooperate in the war against Communism was to invite even more rabid witch-hunting. Diamond shows that the FBI pressured university officials to fire, harass, and refuse positions to suspected Communist and "fellow-traveller" faculty. This meant denying Abe Fortas a professorship at Yale. At both Yale and Harvard, the FBI created a network of university informants through a form of blackmail in which vulnerable faculty gave information and in exchange were protected from being fired.

All of this was done in secrecy. For Yale, secrecy meant immunity from embarrassing disclosures that might alert the public that Yale had departed from the norms of academic autonomy. Thus, Yale failed to protect its own faculty and students from government inquisitions, but protected its own liaisons through secret arrangements with federal agencies that used the stamp of classified information to protect this collaboration.

Diamond presents a damning picture of both Harvard and Yale during the Cold War. But the author fails to present the other side of the controversy. Liberal anti-Communists were zealous in protecting the university from attacks on heretical ideas but they drew the line at conspiracy! Academics, in general, did not object to the presence of Communists on a faculty as long as they openly admitted to their ideological preference. The problem, however, was that most Communists hid their affiliations from colleagues and students thus presenting themselves as something other than what they were. For scholars such as Sidney Hook, the Communists used the university to promote the party line and further the interests of Moscow. For the anti-Communist liberal, in cooperating with government agencies to ferret out Communist faculty, university administrators were not engaged in an attack on academic freedom or in support of witch-hunts but rather engaged in protecting the University from those who would subvert their institutions as sanctuaries for the free exchange of ideas.

One need not agree with this view of the universities' response to the Cold War between 1945-1955 to realize that it was a position held by many thoughtful scholars and administrators. Diamond fails to present their side of the argument and that is the book's primary weakness.

Jack Fischel, *Millersville University*

By Robert R. Bell. *The Philadelphia Lawyer: A History, 1735-1945.*

(Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 1992. Pp. 328. \$49.50.)

This study, written by a retired professor of sociology at Temple University, has laudable objectives. Bell proposes to explore the evolution of the legal profession in Philadelphia from the colonial era to World War II, paying special attention to changing professional values, patterns of recruitment and training, and alterations in the conditions of practice. His central thesis is that a group of old Philadelphia families—a wealthy and socially prominent upper class—has exerted a predominant influence on the city's legal establishment during most of the period he examines. To substantiate this claim, he analyzes major demographic and professional trends in twelve historical periods, and follows each chapter with a biographical profile of a representative bar leader of the time.

Much of the story Bell outlines will be familiar to readers of such general works as Lawrence M. Friedman's *A History of American Law* (2d ed., 1985) and Kermit L. Hall's *The Magic Mirror* (1989). After encountering Quaker hostility and popular mistrust in the seventeenth century, a well trained bar emerged by the mid-eighteenth century to serve the commercial needs of a rapidly developing society. Philadelphia lawyer-statesmen proved their worth during the crisis of the American Revolution; but, in the early nineteenth century the city's upper-class attorneys increasingly abandoned democratic politics to devote their full energies to private practice. Securely entrenched in prestigious law offices and firms, practitioners from old-family backgrounds managed, Bell argues, to maintain their professional dominance well into the twentieth century, despite massive social and technological changes. They controlled such important nineteenth-century bar organizations as the Law Association of Philadelphia and the Law Academy of Philadelphia, and in later years their sons enjoyed unrivaled access to the nation's leading colleges and law schools.

To enliven his argument, Bell incorporates much anecdotal material that will interest all students of Philadelphia history. Readers will learn, for example, where most lawyers lived during various stages of the city's growth; how law students reacted to the training they received in the homes of elite practitioners; what the separation of home and law office meant in terms of professional relationships; and why service in Battery A of the First Pennsylvania Artillery during the Civil War proved so beneficial for upper-class attorneys. Unfortunately, such useful information is embedded in a text that is riddled with typographical mistakes, factual errors, and grammatical lapses. In fact, it is difficult to believe that anyone ever proofread this manuscript. A wildly erroneous name or date on one page reappears correctly several pages later; chronology is often ignored, despite the book's purported periodization; and dubious unsupported generalizations abound.

On a more substantive level, Bell fails to sustain his upper-class thesis, except in superficial terms. The old families, it turns out, were ever ready to welcome new blood, and several of Bell's representative lawyers, including James Wilson and John Graver Johnson, came from nonelite backgrounds. Did they nonetheless support an upper-class legal agenda? And what did that

agenda amount to? Bell seems to suggest that the old families were a unified group, but he never explores the nature of their alleged influence on the law, apart from their willingness to sanction matrimonial alliances with talented attorneys.

Maxwell Bloomfield, *The Catholic University of America*

By John W. Jackson. *Valley Forge: Pinnacle of Courage.*

(Gettysburg: Thomas Publications, 1992. Pp. 331. \$24.95 hard, \$16.95 paperback.)

In his detailed study of the Valley Forge encampment of 1777-1778, John Jackson provides very little in the way of new insights or interpretations. The work deals with standard views of the military affairs and Continental Army's privations during that period. However, Jackson thoroughly and exhaustively discusses most aspects concerning that encampment. His study adds depth to the documentation and clarification of existing interpretations.

The author covers a wide range of topics concerning the Valley Forge encampment. He begins with the retreat of the army after the Brandywine campaign, and Washington's overall strategy for the army. The author emphasizes that Washington was quite combative, but was frustrated in his planning by the poor overall condition of his army. Washington finally agreed that an encampment was necessary, and from that point Jackson follows Washington's personal involvement in making preparations for the winter encampment.

The author delves into camp layout, hut construction, supplying the army, medicine, doctors, hospitals, defense of the camp, and protection of the outlying regions. The role of Baron Frederick William Ludolph Gerhard Augustin Steuben is covered in some depth; the importance of Steuben to the American cause is quite apparent. On more esoteric matters, Jackson explains the significance of the French alliance and the disruption of the Conway Cabal. Throughout, General Washington emerges as the one man who held all together in spite of the frequent lack of support from the Continental Congress. If I have any criticism of the book, it would be its almost encyclopedic coverage of the material.

One of the most interesting chapters was simply entitled "Camp Medley." A wide array of topics was presented: courts-martial, women, indians, masons, music, theater, recreation, and the Continental lottery. It is an enlightening section on social history and sheds insight into the daily life of the soldier. Jackson does not become mawkish about the hardships of the American Army, and provides a balanced account of hardship and fellowship.

The book is solidly researched. One of the quaint aspects of the study is its combination of empirical data, legend, local tradition and story telling. This mixture in no way detracts from the book's scholarship, it merely enhances the telling of the story. In addition to local tradition, Jackson neatly blends in local geography. It is reminiscent of the studies conducted by the Army War College of several of the Civil War battle sites. Jackson used local landmarks, and contemporary names to help us understand troop movement. For example, "the British marched down

Main Street (Germantown Avenue) to Abington Road (Washington Lane) where they filed to the left and passed over to York Road" (p. 8).

Valley Forge: Pinnacle of Courage is a comprehensive study of the Continental Army's winter encampment. This work adds luster to George Washington's impressive stature, and provides documented insights into that most trying time. It is a useful resource for understanding Valley Forge's place in the larger story of the American Revolutionary War.

David L. Valuska, *Kutztown University*

By Bruce Bomberger and William Sisson. *Made in Pennsylvania: An Overview of the Major Historical Industries of the Commonwealth.*

(Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1991. Pp. 57.)

Since the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania quite possibly contains more industrial sites of national significance than any other state, it is appropriate and timely that the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission take on the enormous task of surveying, documenting and, whenever possible, preserving those sites. Bruce Bomberger and William Sisson have taken the first important step in this direction by setting forth, in forty-five lavishly illustrated pages, a summary account of the state's industrial history. The authors begin by identifying five major stages of industrial growth and decline followed by brief discussions of the Commonwealth's five largest industries and a series of secondary industries.

The pamphlet contains no surprises or new discoveries. Nor is it intended to. It states simply such facts that iron and steel, coal mining, textiles, the foundry and machine shop trade and transportation were, in that order, the largest and therefore the most important industries in Pennsylvania history. Bomberger and Sisson do not fail, however, to point out the important role of other key industries including oil, glass, and railroad car building and repair.

Succinct, brief discussions of these leading industries identifying both their magnitude and temporal parameters is precisely what is needed as the first step of a state wide survey. A growing body of experience in the discipline of industrial sites surveying has shown the absolute necessity of determining, in advance of the field work, the number and types of sites that will probably be encountered. Not only do surveys guided by such advanced research save time and money, they are more capable of finding the important sites and placing them in their proper context. It should be required that all surveys be preceded by a work similar to Bomberger's and Sisson's, but geared to the specific region or locality to be surveyed.

Despite its value, the work suffers from a shortcoming that derives primarily from the type of source material consulted by the authors. Based primarily on census data, it places too little emphasis on the technological distinctions that occurred within various industries and within various regions. Stating correctly for instance that tremendous growth occurred within the iron and steel industry between 1861 and 1919, and that both eastern and western Pennsylvania played key roles, Bomberger and Sisson fail to identify the features which set the two parts of the

state apart. They do not mention Pittsburgh's leadership in the development of large, hard-driven, coke blast furnaces that provided the quantities of pig iron that high-volume steel furnaces needed and that anthracite furnaces could not provide. Pittsburgh's large coke blast furnaces were largely an American innovation made possible not only by coke made from Old Basin coal from the Connellsville region, but also by a mechanical tradition that developed in the unique industrial setting of western Pennsylvania. This setting was different in important ways from eastern Pennsylvania. Both the census enumerators and the authors have missed this distinction. It is a distinction that should be made because, as surveyors of industrial sites will find, it is strongly reflected in the material remains of the two regions.

Jack R. Bergstresser, Sr., *Birmingham, Alabama*