

BOOK REVIEWS

Philadelphia's Black Elite: Activism, Accommodation, and the Struggle for Autonomy, 1787-1848. By JULIE WINCH. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988. x, 240p. Bibliography, index. \$34.95.)

Nineteenth-century black Philadelphians have been the recent subject of intense historical scrutiny. Gary Nash's *Forging Freedom* and Roger Lane's *Roots of Violence in Black Philadelphia* view the community through a broad lens, looking at both leaders and ordinary people. In *Philadelphia's Black Elite*, Julie Winch favors depth over breadth, focusing on one slice of Philadelphia's black population. She studies the leaders of the community, not simply its social and economic elite.

Winch traces two generations of black leaders between 1787 and 1848. Although lacking power and position outside the black community, they became its spokesmen through experience gained in black churches and other community organizations. They often faced conflicting demands from the black masses and white leaders, both of whom conceded their right to speak for the black community. For several decades, they attempted to negotiate the chasm between activism and accommodation—with mixed results. On a few issues, such as colonization, they brought white reformers around to their way of thinking. On others, such as the protest against disfranchisement, they were woefully out of step with the black masses. By 1848 they had to choose where their loyalties lay.

Winch places Philadelphia's black leaders in a national context and traces their shifting fortunes. The largest and most prominent antebellum black elite, Philadelphians led the early crusade against the colonization movement, and despite occasional skirmishes with New York blacks, almost singlehandedly created and directed the black national conventions of the 1830s. But during the 1840s, this elite moved further and further from the epicenter of black activism in the North. Philadelphians played a minimal role in the revived black convention movement and were frequent targets for the criticism of other black leaders, who urged more militant strategies. By the 1850s, western blacks—like Frederick Douglass—controlled the convention movement. As colonization became less of a threat, and moral reform less of a solution, Philadelphia's hegemony over the northern black community disintegrated.

Winch's major contribution is a reevaluation of the concerns confronting these black leaders. She traces these in a series of chapters on African colonization, Caribbean and Canadian alternatives, slavery, the black national conventions of the 1830s, the American Moral Reform Society, and

suffrage and racial violence. She demonstrates that the first commitment of the black elite was not to fighting the colonizationists or to ending slavery, but to the struggle for equal rights. But the relative weight of these priorities changed over time. In the early years, one had to be a vocal opponent of colonization and slavery to enter the leadership class. This wasn't the case by the 1840s. Strategies and tactics also shifted. By 1848 most black leaders abandoned moral reform and an integrated approach for militant independence. They recognized that white prejudice, not social and economic condition, lay at the root of black problems.

This well-written and thoroughly researched volume draws on a wide variety of printed and archival sources to recreate the life and times of an antebellum black elite. Those who have had the opportunity to peruse Winch's 1982 dissertation will find this a more sophisticated and developed version. But one omission will trouble them. The earlier work included a lengthy demographic profile of the members of the elite and the networks that linked them. This book nearly jettisons that entire discussion, reducing it to a couple of paragraphs. Nevertheless, *Philadelphia's Black Elite* offers valuable insights into the complex world of early black leaders.

Florida State University

ROY E. FINKENBINE

Public Housing, Race, and Renewal: Urban Planning in Philadelphia, 1920-1974. By JOHN F. BAUMAN. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987. xvi, 278p. Maps, bibliographical note, index. \$34.95.)

At its inception in the 1930s public housing embodied the hopes and dreams of many idealistic Americans seeking a new and better way of life for their less affluent fellow citizens. Forty years later the grim government projects in big cities throughout the nation were monuments to the failure of liberal public policy and symbols of a culture of dependence and poverty. In *Public Housing, Race, and Renewal*, John F. Bauman traces the evolution of this public housing debacle in Philadelphia, emphasizing especially the interaction of housing policy with racial attitudes and interests. Arnold Hirsch's *Making the Second Ghetto* has told the story of race and housing in Chicago, and now Bauman does likewise for the City of Brotherly Love.

Bauman begins by describing the housing reform tradition of the early twentieth century. He identifies two factions of housing reformers, the "professionals" and the "communitarians." The professionals sought to improve housing conditions through passage and enforcement of tough municipal codes, whereas the communitarians advocated government construction of well-planned housing communities. Until the 1930s proponents

of code enforcement had the upper hand, but with the onset of the Great Depression demands for government aid to the building trades as well as concern over deteriorating standards of shelter resulted in the first public housing projects constructed at least partially in accord with communitarian precepts. The New Deal projects, however, faced some problems that would continue to plague public housing. Housing officials perpetuated racial segregation by refusing to upset the existing racial balance in neighborhoods. Thus projects in all-white areas received only white tenants, and public housing in black neighborhoods was open exclusively to blacks. The government housing of the 1930s was also the target of heated attacks from conservatives who labeled it "socialistic," and this verbal barrage against the ideological underpinnings of the program would continue for decades.

Despite this criticism, in postwar America public housing construction resumed, though by the 1950s an emerging disillusionment was evident. Bauman notes that many former friends of government housing were dissatisfied with the inhumane design of cost-cutting high-rise projects. Moreover, the Philadelphia Housing Authority failed in its idealistic effort to use public housing as a spearhead for racial integration. Plans for locating projects in white neighborhoods met insuperable opposition from residents antagonistic to the introduction of poor blacks into their midst. The postwar projects also were unable to answer the heavy demand for low-cost housing and could not even accommodate the thousands of families displaced by the city's urban renewal schemes. According to Bauman, by the 1960s Philadelphia's public housing became welfare centers dispensing social services as well as shelter to a predominantly black clientele that included the city's poorest and most troubled families.

Altogether Bauman offers a well-written, thorough account of the travails of public housing in Philadelphia. His undisguised liberal bias should prove popular with most academic readers, but, regardless of political predilection, any student of the recent urban past will benefit from his informative and often perceptive account. On the whole, Bauman's work is a worthy companion to Hirsch's volume on Chicago, offering a review of housing policy in America that complements and enhances the findings of the earlier study.

Purdue University

JON C. TEAFORD

Burning Down the House: MOVE and the Tragedy of Philadelphia. By JOHN ANDERSON and HILARY HEVENOR. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1987. xv, 409p. Index. \$18.95.)

The radical faction known as MOVE was the focus of the outrage of May 13, 1985, when the forces of law and order of the City of Philadelphia

carried out a day-long siege of the fortified row house in West Philadelphia. The siege ended with an unprecedented conflagration that killed eleven people, burned sixty-one houses, and left 253 people homeless. The bizarre incident can only be compared to such tragedies as the Molly Maguire hangings in the 1870s or the "Ludlow Massacre" in the Colorado coal strike of 1914. Such events underscore the fact that American government and law enforcement have never been able to deal humanely and effectively with ideological dissent of a radical nature or with civilian agitators of inflammatory and persistent energy. The book here reviewed, written by two University of Pennsylvania faculty members, is a record of the tensions and provocation leading up to the MOVE disaster and the legal and judicial inquiries set in motion by the violence. It also touches on the verdict of the public "MOVE Commission" set up to hold an investigation into the morbid affair.

The book traces the origins of the MOVE faction under the leadership of Vincent Leaphart, known as John Africa, and the early problems of the group within itself and with the police dating back to 1972. John Africa's cadre began with rambling discussions at the Community College of Philadelphia when the air was still reverberating with the slogans and rebellious spirit of the radical 1960s. In the 1970s one of the attorneys who had to cope with MOVE members in court stated that: "You couldn't get them to make sense." He was entirely accurate. Both as a tactical defense and as a result of a delirium of scrambled slogans and wispy ideas, the MOVE cadre of predominantly black foes of the existing social order were beyond rational discourse. Their creed was a jumble of ill-assorted notions of protest behavior, environmental dissent, and political agitation. The authors document this in their journalistic style, attempting to provide views of the MOVE imbroglio from various perspectives.

The account provided veers among the parties involved, including the MOVE participants, city officials, local politicians, newspaper commentators, and those who provided legal services and testimony at the ensuing trials and Commission hearings. There are about one hundred references to trial records and several dozen to newspaper editorials and reportage. The book lacks a formal citation system, footnoting, and bibliographical listing, but its good photos of MOVE in extremities of distress have considerable human-interest value.

This is not a historical study. It is a smartly captioned journalistic record. What evaluation there is wanders amid the conflicting parties and arguments. This tragedy is surveyed from such proximate perspective that the true roots, social significance, and public implications of the events are not really assayed. At the end of the book, the authors simply state that given the urban setting in which men and women of different colors and classes do

not, and seemingly cannot, meet in what William Penn called "the broad pathway of good faith and good will," it is little wonder that John Africa could assemble his tiny coalition of the alienated and dispossessed. Beyond this, the authors offer little analysis of the bureaucratic neglect that permitted MOVE to intimidate citizens and officials, little examination of the political fear and cowardice that gave the faction free rein, and scant judgment in context of the classic failure of local government that led to this episode of destruction and bitterness.

Philadelphia, PA

DENNIS CLARK

Black Coal Miners in America: Race, Class, and Community Conflict 1780-1980. By RONALD L. LEWIS. (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1987. xv, 239p. Tables, figures, photographs, primary sources, appendix, index. \$25.00.)

Between the lines on the pages written about the coal field conflicts between miners and coal operators lies another mostly unknown struggle, that of the black miner and his search for freedom and work. From small family-run mines in antebellum Virginia to the large corporate operations of post-World War I West Virginia, black miners have performed an integral role in coal production. Their experiences are far from uniform, varying regionally in accordance with labor and product market trends and simple demographics. *Black Coal Miners in America* is an attempt to provide a comprehensive chronicle of these experiences.

The author identifies three regions (and corresponding time periods) in which distinctive work experiences for black miners emerge. The first is the South in the pre- and immediate post-Civil War period where blacks were employed as miners, first as slaves then as convicts. Convict leasing proved financially expedient in states such as Alabama, and it also permitted post-Civil War legislatures to retain de facto policies of servitude for blacks. Not surprisingly, work and living conditions for black miners were atrocious. When this system was finally abolished, exploitation nevertheless continued. With blacks comprising almost half the mine labor force, racial justifications for low pay persisted and further depressed already low overall wage scales. Also, unionization efforts invariably met with failure because the racial mix of miners made public acceptance of the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) virtually impossible.

Blacks were also imported into northern areas (Ohio, Illinois, and western Pennsylvania) during the 1880s and 1890s. Their role was as strikebreakers, and their presence was designed to forestall the growing union movement

in these coal fields. White miners forcefully resisted these black imports, and after a number of bloody confrontations the operators removed the blacks and recognized the union. In this instance, Lewis contends, blacks were simultaneously seen as a threat to jobs *and* the community, hence the resolute and unwavering attempts to exclude them from both by native whites. As a result, blacks never gained a significant foothold in the northern coal fields.

Central Appalachia is the third area Lewis discusses, with an explicit focus upon the southern West Virginia coal fields at the turn of the century. Labor shortages in this area led to the influx of many blacks and immigrants. The persistence of a diverse ethnic and racial mix was an intentional policy by operators, who saw such divisions as a way of stifling the growth of occupational or class consciousness among miners. However, for reasons which are not always clear in the book, polarizations along class rather than race and ethnic lines developed and set the scene for the violent unionization struggles that characterized West Virginia in the early 1900s. Only there did black miners attain work (but never living) conditions that were comparable to their white counterparts.

The book concludes with a final section that discusses technological unemployment among miners. This affected blacks more than others because as unskilled and uneducated workers it was their jobs that were the first to go following mechanization.

Lewis is particularly good at discussing the ambiguous allegiances black miners felt. He shows that the race and class conjuncture was different in each region and that unionization merely compounded the problem of identity. In Alabama, for instance, the UMWA at the turn of the century found itself in a dilemma that typified these broader problems. It had to represent black miners but do so in a way that did not threaten the caste system that was pervasive in that state. Such efforts frequently resulted in union failure.

The book has two weaknesses. First, its coverage of the post-World War II period is sketchy and incomplete, and little attempt is made to continue the regional discussions which gave focus to the earlier periods. Second, the author does not adequately demonstrate why white miners accepted blacks in the central regions when he claimed racism was so pervasive elsewhere. While conceding racial tensions in the southern West Virginia coal fields, he nevertheless chronicles the birth of solidarity and occupational consciousness that eventually transcended race and ethnicity in this area. Why this should be is not entirely clear. And there is further confusion when, in the last section of the book, racism re-emerges and is invoked as an explanation for the general demise of the black miner following mechanization. Because

of the centrality of the race/class issue to his thesis, such a flaw is serious and mars an otherwise good, readable book.

Wake Forest University

IAN M. TAPLIN

Making Their Own Way: Southern Blacks' Migration to Pittsburgh, 1916-1930.

By PETER GOTTLIEB. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987.

xiii, 250p. Illustrations, appendixes, note on sources, index. \$26.95.)

Making Their Own Way is the latest in a series of recent urban studies that examines the Great Migration as the transformation of a rural and southern into an urban and industrial population. Gottlieb's objective is to analyze the process of migration, the formation of the black working class, and the important accompanying social changes. In doing so, he addresses certain enduring misconceptions about the performance of black industrial workers and the roles that the migrants played in their adjustment to the new world of the northern industrial cities. As the title suggests, black migrants are not treated as passive victims of the impersonal and inexorable forces of industrialization, but as decision-making agents engaged in a process of self-transformation. It is in this latter aspect of the study that Gottlieb breaks new ground in the understanding of migrant attitudes and behaviors.

He starts from the position that the key to understanding the profound historical changes accelerated by the Great Migration lies with the migrants themselves. The study is informed by and makes superb use of sixty-five oral history interviews conducted with persons who moved to Pittsburgh between 1916 and 1930. Approaching the world of the southern migrants from an anthropological and sociological perspective, Gottlieb is at his best in recognizing and analyzing underlying patterns of the southern migrants' diverse range of experiences: the function of kinship, communal networks, and information sources in channeling migration; the different patterns of movement of young men, married and single women, and older men who made the trip north; the shape of residential settlement and the avenues of information about employment; the "work culture" within the steel mills; the growing social separation between Pittsburgh's older black residents and the newcomers; and the functions of the black gatekeepers who mediated the process of long-term settlement. Generalizations about the logic of the decisions made by newcomers—persons traditionally viewed primarily from the perspective of northern observers and critics—are brought to life through quotations from the oral history interviews. This method is especially effective in his discussion of the work culture, attitudes, and behaviors of black steelworkers. The author shows that when viewed in the

context of the southern culture, society, and work experiences that black males brought north with them, the "poor" work habits that northern observers attributed to racial temperament were actually the product of logical decisions and part of the migrants' adjustment to industrial life. But the portrait he paints of class formation and the social changes that Pittsburgh's southern migrants underwent is incomplete, and its omissions appear most glaringly in the last chapter, "Making Homes." Here Gottlieb is concerned with the process of the southerners' settlement in Pittsburgh: the ways they established homes, the gatekeeping roles of the Urban League and black churches, and the tensions between Pittsburgh's older black residents and the newcomers. Though the analysis is well-constructed as far as it goes, the picture is incomplete and highly sanitized. The importance of commercial vice and politics are severely undervalued. Due to the racism of the industrial workplace and the close ties between commercial vice and local politics during the 1910s and 1920s, the world of the "bright lights" played major economic and social roles in the northern black inner-cities and must be considered in any analysis of economics, gatekeeping, and intraracial relations.

In addition, by focusing so intently on the industrial workplace, Gottlieb deals primarily with the black male experience and the male world. Frequent layoffs and the periods of high unemployment characteristic of industrial employment made domestic work a mainstay of the black economy in Pittsburgh, as in Philadelphia. Although over 90 percent of all black female wage earners were employed in some form of personal service in Pittsburgh throughout the era of the Great Migration, there is no discussion of their "work culture" in white homes or of the gatekeeping roles and influences of the white matron or family who employed them.

These omissions perpetuate certain misconceptions and biases in a study devoted to providing a more comprehensive and balanced understanding of black migrants' experiences and range of choices. They should not, however, detract attention from Gottlieb's accomplishment in moving the study of the Great Migration toward the perspectives and experiences of the migrants themselves. *Making Their Own Way* deepens our understanding of the Great Migration and rephrases the discussion of critical aspects of its history in important ways. It demonstrates well how anthropological and sociological perspectives and the insightful reading of oral history interviews can broaden our understanding and appreciation of Afro-Americans' transformation from a southern and rural into an urban and northern people.

Sandlot Seasons: Sport in Black Pittsburgh. By ROB RUCK. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987. xiii, 238p. Illustrations, index. \$21.95.)

The mammoth migration of southern blacks during the late nineteenth century through the first half of the twentieth century dramatically affected the economic, social, political, and cultural life of the nation's major urban and industrial cities. Pittsburgh's black population numbered 20,000 in 1900. Within twenty years, 1910-1930, that figure more than doubled, exceeding 50,000. Amid the influx of black migrants, blacks in the steel town, like their counterparts in Chicago, Detroit, New York, Philadelphia, and elsewhere, developed and maintained a sense of identity and worth through their churches, involvement in local politics, associations in neighborhood clubs, and various forms of cultural expression. In Pittsburgh, perhaps more than in any other city, the black community also sought and found group expression and solidarity in sports. The success and organization of a team afforded the individual players and their community a sense of self-esteem, pride, belonging, and neighborhood identity. In *Sandlot Seasons*, Rob Ruck details the centrality of sport to neighborhood development and everyday life in black Pittsburgh.

It was understandable that black Pittsburgh would look to itself for sports in the early part of the twentieth century because racial barriers kept much of professional and collegiate athletics closed to blacks until the late 1940s. Hence black Pittsburghers reached inward and gave birth to a tremendous sporting heritage that included such teams as the Monticellos and Loendi Club in basketball, the Garfield Eagles in football, and the most famous of them all, the Pittsburgh Crawfords and the Homestead Grays in baseball. The longest lasting of the teams was the 18th Ward Club, which encompassed the Beltzhoover community. This die-hard group of sandlot nines played from the 1920s into the 1950s. The Crawfords and the Grays were the hallmarks of sport in the black sections of steel town and beyond. Their rosters included players that became the greatest names in Negro League baseball; among them were Hall of Famers Josh Gibson, Cool Papa Bell, Martin Dihigo, Oscar Charleston, Judy Johnson, and Satchel Paige. A Crawfords' or Grays' game was more than an outing; it was a social event, a happening which brought together the famed Hill section with other black enclaves of Pittsburgh in a chorus of excitement as their warriors battled for supremacy on the diamonds against black and white challengers from Pennsylvania and other states.

Despite the community's great love for its teams, the support was largely vocal. Ruck tells us that the public's enthusiasm for the teams did not translate into economic support. The Great Depression especially took its toll on black Pittsburgh. Had it not been for the aid of the Works Progress

Administration, which spent considerable sums of money on community services and the development of playgrounds and recreational centers throughout the nation, black sandlot sport in Pittsburgh might have perished. But even in better times the black community as a whole failed to provide its teams with sufficient backing, allowing a few relatively prosperous individuals in the black communities to seize the times and the teams. Rube Foster, Cumberland Posey, and Gus Greenlee were the major financial backers of black baseball and the forces behind the development of the professional black baseball league. Posey and Greenlee also were black Pittsburgh's biggest numbers runners and dispensers of illegal liquor, and its most supportive sport entrepreneurs. Ruck is quite correct when he argues that the connection between black sport, the numbers racket, and other extralegal activities was not limited to Pittsburgh. The same occurred in Kansas City, Chicago, Detroit, and New York during the 1920s and 1930s.

The post-World War II era brought many changes in the world of sports and society in general. Ironically, the struggle to end segregation meant the demise of much of traditional black sport. Ruck is on solid ground in his assertions that the integration of the major leagues, beginning with Jackie Robinson in 1947, signaled the end of the Negro Leagues; that the Little League and other organized youth programs of today replaced the outlet sandlot offered to earlier youth; and that the black community now looks to mainstream professional and collegiate athletics for their heroes and role models.

The book is not without its problems. Despite the fascinating subject, the reading was tedious and frustrating at many points and the organization so muddled at times that Ruck appeared to contradict his own evidence. Ruck's thesis requires further grooming as does the structure of the book and the writing in order to make even more clear the significance of black sport.

The merits of the work, nevertheless, far outweigh the shortcomings. Traditional research is combined with oral history, including interviews with some remaining personages of Pittsburgh's early, black sport heritage (e.g., Harold Tinker, the man responsible for recruiting Josh Gibson to the Crawfords). Ruck's *Sandlot Seasons* makes a significant contribution to the history of sport and the Afro-American experience, providing us with the first comprehensive treatment of sport in black Pittsburgh, once a major center of black sporting activity.

University of Connecticut

DONALD SPIVEY

The NAACP's Legal Strategy Against Segregated Education, 1925-1950. By MARK V. TUSHNET. (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1987. xiv, 222p. Bibliography, index. Cloth, \$29.95; paper, \$9.95.)

In this slim volume, Mark V. Tushnet presents the story of the legal campaign conducted by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to end segregation in the public schools. Beginning his narrative in the mid-1920s, Tushnet analyzes how the NAACP's legal strategy developed over a quarter century and why in 1950 the legal staff decided to change its attack on segregated schools from one of circumspection to a direct assault on the principle of "separate but equal." He ends his story in 1950 when the NAACP began to pursue the cases that we know as *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954).

Much of this story has been told before, most notably in Richard Kluger's magisterial *Simple Justice* (1975). Tushnet, a law professor at Georgetown University, justifies his endeavor as a case study in public service law. Within this limited scope, he skillfully delineates the internal factors that shaped the NAACP's legal campaign. Focusing on such factors as monetary resources, legal personnel, internal politics, and organizational needs, he argues that these internal factors were more important in determining the organization's legal procedure than the general social and political environment from 1925 to 1950. Tushnet concludes that the NAACP's litigation was largely experimental and tactical in the 1930s and early 1940s and did not approach strategic proportions until after the war.

Nevertheless, as the author demonstrates, by 1930 the NAACP had drafted a long-range strategic plan to sue for the equalization of black and white elementary and secondary schools in the Deep South, where the inequality was greatest. The agency reasoned that equalization would bankrupt the South and force it to desegregate the schools. The newly established Garland Fund promised \$100,000 toward this effort, although it delivered only a fraction of that amount because of the depression. Thus, until after World War II, the NAACP's legal campaign was strapped for funds, and a handful of overworked and underpaid people, primarily the brilliant legal team of Charles Houston and Thurgood Marshall, determined the course of litigation.

Tushnet marshals considerable evidence to support his thesis that internal factors were decisive in the development of the NAACP's litigation. The assault on unequal elementary and secondary schools in the Deep South did not begin in the 1930s or even in the 1940s. Rather, litigation began in Maryland, and not for the equalization of schools but for the equalization of teachers' salaries. This was done because of the sheer convenience of

Maryland (its proximity to Washington), because Thurgood Marshall, a native of Baltimore, knew Maryland law, because Maryland teachers had tenure (which made for less vulnerable plaintiffs), and because the state was more liberal than those farther south. For similar reasons, the NAACP's next legal step was an indirect attack on segregation in graduate and professional schools in the Upper South and the border states.

Although Tushnet acknowledges that external factors had greater impact on the NAACP's legal strategy after World War II, he tends to slight such factors as the decline of white racism, the needs of Cold War liberalism, the entrenchment of equalitarianism social science in academia, and the rising militancy of blacks that issued from World War II. In a lengthy conclusion—a chapter that seems disproportionately long and speculative for the rest of the book—Tushnet expresses skepticism about how effective litigation can be against a hostile majority. He rightly stresses how difficult the legal victories of the 1930s and 1940s were and how easily they were evaded by a determined white establishment, a portent of things to come.

Unfortunately, such towering and complex figures as Houston, Marshall, and Judge J. Waties Waring never come to life in this terse book; and there is no courtroom drama. The book nonetheless essentially accomplishes its stated aims and is a welcome addition to the literature on the struggle for black equality in America.

Westminster College

DAVID W. SOUTHERN

Gunnar Myrdal and Black-White Relations: The Use and Abuse of An American Dilemma, 1944-1969. By DAVID W. SOUTHERN. (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1987. xviii, 341p. Selected bibliography, index. \$35.00.)

When *An American Dilemma* was published in 1944, it became an instant classic. The book, which ran over 1,500 pages, provided rich and detailed documentation of this nation's system of political and economic apartheid, at a time when there was little public consciousness about racial inequity. Its thesis—that there was a reprehensible gap between the nation's democratic ideals and its racial practices—established the terms of discourse for decades to come. And its author, Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish economist who was recruited by the Carnegie Commission to impart "objectivity" to the study, became a liberal spokesman on race relations until his death in 1987.

In this book David Southern approaches *An American Dilemma* from the perspective of a historian of ideas. His first two chapters provide an inside

account of "the making of the *Dilemma*," based in large measure on documents that he wrangled from the Carnegie Commission. These chapters provide useful information about the role that the Carnegie Commission, Myrdal, and other key actors played in the social production of knowledge, as represented by this study. Not all this information is flattering. There are also compromising details concerning personal conflicts and rivalries, exorbitant salaries (Myrdal was paid the equivalent of \$152,000 in current dollars, plus expenses), the use of generous research awards to curry favor and blunt criticism, demoralizing snags in the writing of the manuscript until it was finally rescued by Myrdal and Arnold Rose, and finally, attempts to engineer a favorable "press" upon publication of the book. Though it is not their purpose, these chapters help to dispel the mystique surrounding this celebrated book and its illustrious author.

The main thrust of Southern's book is to assess the influence that the *Dilemma* had on scholarship and public policy. His theoretical bias is stated in the preface: "An underlying premise of this book is that ideas have consequences, that they occasionally shake and move" (p. xv). To demonstrate who was "shaken and moved" by this study, Southern culled through government reports, court decisions, presidential speeches, scholarly books and journals, textbooks, training manuals for teachers, and other sources for citations and references to the *Dilemma*. This is sometimes carried to absurd extremes, as when Southern attempts to decipher which political leaders "knew" of the *Dilemma* (Dwight D. Eisenhower did not, but his attorney general did; Hubert Humphrey was "an enthusiastic reader"; of the two Kennedys, "Robert more likely read, or was briefed on, the *Dilemma*" [p. 252]; Lyndon Johnson probably did not read it, but Bill Moyers had read Rose's condensation as a college student). Allusions to the *Dilemma* in key Supreme Court decisions—the subject of another chapter—provide more compelling evidence of the influence of "Myrdalian thought," though in the final analysis, the full impact that the *Dilemma* had on race, politics, and thought in America does not lend itself to easy measurement.

In his concluding chapter Southern triumphantly returns to his central premise and asserts that "Myrdal's study serves as a reminder that ideas and values do play a part in the process of social change" (p. 293). That his book played a very significant role in the process of social change is indisputable. What is debatable is Southern's tendency to construe this role in simple cause-and-effect terms, as though any book could have an independent and autonomous role in shaping history. Although Southern acknowledges that "the exquisite timing of the book" helps to explain the book's success, this generality does not begin to explore the constellation of historical, social, and ideological forces that not only influenced Myrdal's ideas, but also explain why they were so appealing to the liberal establish-

ment. Myrdal's contemporary critics, like Ralph Bunche, Ralph Ellison, Herbert Aptheker, and (most notably) Oliver Cox, contended that Myrdal had presented a safe view of the Negro problem, and by failing to give adequate weight to the economic foundations of racism, presented an analysis that did not criticize basic institutions or imply a need for fundamental change. Southern's reverence for this "modern classic" unfortunately prevented him from assuming a more critical stance—one that could explain why Myrdal became an exalted figure while his astute critic, Oliver Cox, fell into obscurity.

Queens College and Graduate Center,
City University of New York

STEPHEN STEINBERG

The Canon of Benjamin Franklin, 1722-1776: New Attributions and Reconsiderations. By J.A. LEO LEMAY. (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1986. 162p. Appendix, bibliography, index. \$24.50.)

In 1967 J.A. Leo Lemay announced his concern with the canon of Benjamin Franklin, noting defects in the Yale edition of the *Autobiography* and arguing that significant essays by Franklin had been omitted from the *Papers* by the editors. In recent years Lemay's longstanding devotion to improving the accuracy of Franklin texts has been reflected in his and P.M. Zall's scholars' edition of the *Autobiography* (*The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin: A Genetic Text* [1981]) and a new readers' edition based upon the scholarly one (*Benjamin Franklin's Autobiography: An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds, Criticism* [1986]). *The Canon of Benjamin Franklin, 1722-1776* extends Lemay's examination of Franklin texts to Franklin's anonymous and pseudonymous writings for newspapers between 1722 and 1776. In this book Lemay attempts to correct the Yale *Papers* by identifying works of Franklin excluded by this now standard edition and by rejecting works which he believed the Yale editors or other scholars have incorrectly ascribed to Franklin. Lemay does a superb job of scholarly detective work; his book will be an essential supplement to the *Papers* for future scholars and critics of Franklin.

Lemay examines 98 items. Of these he rejects 21 from the canon and assigns 77 (including 39 newly ascribed ones) to Franklin. The items Lemay judges to be Franklin's range from major philosophical, political, and satirical essays to fillers written for Franklin's newspaper. The majority of the works are from Franklin's years as a printer in Philadelphia. Lemay discovers fewer, but significant, items from Franklin's youth in Boston, written for his brother James's *New England Courant*; he finds surprisingly few new

essays from Franklin's years as a colonial agent in England. Apparently, Verner W. Crane's earlier examination of the English newspapers was thorough and accurate.

In determining whether a particular item was written by Franklin, Lemay depends upon external and internal evidence. A few items are rejected on the basis of clear external evidence, but in most instances Lemay's judgment of the provenance of a work depends finally upon his analysis of the extent to which a piece reflects Franklin's characteristic subjects, attitudes, rhetorical devices, and stylistic features. Given the inevitable subjectivity of such analysis, some of Lemay's conclusions will no doubt be challenged by future scholars. Most of his attributions, however, are likely to stand. The book reflects a thorough knowledge of Franklin's life, works, and times and extensive reading in both American and British eighteenth-century literature. Its analysis of Franklin's characteristic ideas, rhetorical devices, and stylistic habits is masterful. Most scholars will be convinced.

Lemay's book is valuable for the critical light it sheds on Franklin as a thinker and writer as well as for its additions to the Franklin canon. Lemay has taken what could have been a dry scholarly discussion and, without detracting from the scholarship, has filled it with provocative comments on Franklin's views of human nature, philosophy, religion, politics, and writing. A reader who disagrees with Lemay's interpretations finds himself forced to reconsider his opinions and review his evidence as he reads this book. In short, Lemay's work adds almost as much to Franklin criticism as it does to Franklin scholarship.

For the scholar interested in Franklin as a writer, Lemay's book is one more welcome sign of Franklin's reviving literary reputation. Only the works of a major writer demand the kind of canonical scrupulosity Lemay applies to Franklin. Behind this book is the assumption that it is important to identify everything that Franklin wrote, minor works as well as major ones, and to exclude works written by other hands. Lemay's devotion to the completeness and accuracy of Franklin's texts both testifies to Franklin's stature in American literature and helps to re-establish it.

Cleveland State University

DAVID M. LARSON

The Forging of the Union, 1781-1789. By RICHARD B. MORRIS. (New York: Harper and Row, 1987. xiv, 416p. Illustrations, tables, figures, bibliography, index. \$22.95.)

The New American Nation Series, edited by Richard B. Morris and Henry Steele Commager, has long been regarded as the premier narrative

history of the United States. With this long-awaited volume the series is nearly complete. It is a tribute to the energy and capacity of the editors, rivalled only by the immense drive of the editor of the original American Nation Series, Albert Bushnell Hart. The volume under review is not only one of the very best entries in the series on its own, but amply confirms the master craftsmanship of its author. In it, Morris has synthesized almost every piece of modern scholarship on the politics, law, demography, economic development, military activity, and diplomacy of the period between the adoption of the Articles of Confederation and the inauguration of the federal government, and he has stamped his own arguments indelibly upon the face of all future accounts of the period.

Morris's approach is a mixture of narrative, vignette, and middle-gauge explanation. No overarching theories command the reader's unalloyed allegiance here. Instead, Morris blends factual materials and biographical details in sensible analysis of human motives and market forces. Throughout, the book is marked by sagacity, balance, and perspicacity. He gives due weight to the great leaders of the era—Madison, Hamilton, Jay, Jefferson, Washington, and their peers—but does not forget the Indian, the black, the woman, and the laboring poor of all demographic characteristics.

The frame of the work (corresponding to the format of the series) is a combination of chronological and topical chapters. Nevertheless, Morris is plainly more at home with political, constitutional, and diplomatic developments than with the "deep" rhythms of social history. The two chapters on economic problems, "The Military-Fiscal Complex" and "The Nation's First Depression," are the clearest and most compact descriptions of the fiscal crisis this reviewer has ever read. They straddle three chapters which are very effective special pleading on the Continental Congress and the states. Morris's conviction that a national government was created by the first Congress and maintained in the Articles (broached first in a 1974 *Columbia Law Review* article and repeated in his 1977 American Historical Association Presidential Address) receives meticulous proof in his chapter on the "Congress and the People." In it, he concludes that "the United States was created by the people in collectivity, not by the individual states" (p. 76). The Articles contained the seeds of a fully elucidated national government, though the delegates to the Congress hesitated to surrender newly won state sovereignty. Later chapters on the federalists' attempts to reform the Articles, the convention at Mt. Vernon that triumphantly resolved the Virginia-Maryland contest over the Potomac, Hamilton's clever drafting of a circular letter at the Annapolis Conference calling for a new federal government, and the creation of such a government in Philadelphia

thus become a part of the movement begun with the Declaration of Independence.

Along his march to the Constitution, Morris halts to explore the vital issues of public policy confronting reformers and localists. In addition to the financial crisis, he devotes entire chapters to the disposition of the western lands and the friction with Europe's great powers. After much maneuvering, Virginia's cession of its western claims answered Maryland's demands for the creation of a national domain, gained the small states' adherence to the Articles, and permitted the Congress to arrange for an orderly (if outrageously speculative) settlement of the trans-Appalachian wilderness. The Northwest Ordinance was a great triumph for the Congress and the principle of federalism. Morris's account is a reminder of why Virginia's political elite was regarded so highly in the formative era of our nation. The diplomatic crisis was not so easily handled. Despite the prodigious efforts of John Jay (the hero of this volume), there was little real compliance with the terms of the Paris Peace Treaty of 1783, no resolution of the border dispute with Spain, and no entry to the British markets in the Caribbean. The Barbary pirates preyed on America's ships; the British incited the Indians of the Northwest to raids on its frontier; and the French, America's erstwhile allies, diddled with American pleas for mutual trade concessions.

To the specialist in this field, much of this analysis may appear familiar, but even the specialist will be reminded of illustrative details and alternative arguments. Many of these can be used with great profit in the classroom. This reviewer will henceforth remind his students that the aftermath of Shays Rebellion included a victory for the Shaysites at the polls and thorough debt and tax relief for many in the western Massachusetts town. Certainly the crucial role of John Jay among the Framers (a role long underestimated until Morris's own superb edition of the unpublished Jay papers began appearing) can no longer be ignored.

There are a few minor caveats which must be entered against the author. His volume has a distinct middle-state bias, both in space and time devoted to their story and emphasis given to their leaders. The importance of Jay may be exaggerated (he gets as much space as Hamilton and Madison, and more than any other figure in the tale). There is more than one example of conspicuous hindsight, the author explaining events in the early 1780s (and even the 1770s) in terms of the Constitution's provisions or the legislation of the first United States Congress. While a mild version of this retrojection serves to pull together the themes of the book, and is acceptable therefore as a stylistic device, the strong version of such presentism attributes to the federalists of 1781 a vision of the Constitution they did not yet possess.

Caveats aside, Morris's volume replaces Nevins's *American States* and

Jensen's *The New Nation* as the foremost account of this critical period in our history. Perhaps even more important than this professional achievement, Morris incontrovertibly establishes the fact that John Adams was right about the new American republics. They were creations of an enlightened citizenry—framed rationally, by men primarily concerned for the public weal.

University of Georgia

PETER CHARLES HOFFER

The Republic Reborn: War and the Making of Liberal America, 1790-1820.

By STEVEN WATTS. (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987. xxiii, 378p. Index. \$29.50.)

In the last decade an urgent problem has surfaced in the historiography of the early republic. It stems from the growing realization, confirmed by virtually every scholar working in the field, that the Founding Fathers lived in a radically different world from the one we inhabit. The problem can be put in a variety of ways, but the formulation most commonly used focuses on how we are to understand the transition that occurred from the Revolutionary republicanism that dominated American culture in the last quarter of the eighteenth century to the liberal, capitalistic democracy that had clearly emerged by the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Put another way, the problem is how pre-modern America became essentially modern.

The Republic Reborn is the latest contribution to the growing body of literature on this subject. Watts does not see himself as challenging the mainstream of scholarship that already exists, but rather as supplementing it. His distinctive contribution is to emphasize the role the War of 1812 played in the process. While Watts believes that America was already moving away from its revolutionary traditions before this war, "the military ordeal gathered, focused, and sanctioned post-1790 trends away from traditional republican ideology and political economy" (p. 298). A short section of the book, "Politics and Productivity," deals with the issue of political economy on the level of explicit ideas. The principal focus of the argument, however, is on the psycho-historical import of the conflict.

According to Watts, the war forced Americans to come to terms with their emerging modernity. He uses a psychological model that emphasizes the unintegrated nature of modern man's personality, relating his internal fragmentation to the strains of modernization. Watts deploys this model through a series of biographical sketches of members of the cultural elite who he feels were instrumental in making the ideological transition to liberalism. His sketches are designed to illustrate the different psychological effects of the war. On one level, it permitted men made anxious by change

to resist fragmentation by the premium it placed on the patriotic appeals to republican virtue and unity, and on individual self-control and focused activity. On a more significant level, it facilitated the eventual but painful acceptance of fragmented identities as the cultural norm by offering "troubled liberal individuals" the opportunity to succumb "to the varied seductions of armed conflict" (p. 210). One of the more important of these seductions was the chance the war gave the sons to excel their Revolutionary fathers and in turn to establish their authority over the next generation. The war, then, provided a bridge between Revolutionary republicanism and liberalism, less in a direct, causative sense, than by giving Americans an occasion for discovering and reconciling themselves to how far they had already travelled from their revolutionary origins.

While a summary of this length can hardly do justice to the complexity of Watts's argument, I hope it shows that the text attempts more to describe than to explain the transition it addresses. There is nothing wrong with such an enterprise in principle, especially if the outline of an explanation that reveals the inner logic of the process is already in place. The problem here is that while we are still lacking such an explanation, Watts is right to assume that the War of 1812 should play an important role in it. This makes it all the more frustrating that he begins his book with an arbitrary decision which precludes him from understanding the war's public as opposed to private significance. This is the decision to exclude the Federalists from serious consideration. Watts offers a lame excuse for their exclusion which amounts to saying they were a regressive rather than a progressive force (p. xxii), but this takes place just after his celebration of Jackson Lears's dictum that hegemonists, with whom I assume Watts identifies, "need to cultivate a greater sensitivity to 'the creation of counter hegemonies'" (p. xx). Not only does it seem to me impossible to reconcile the exclusion with Lears's prescriptive statement, but it makes it impossible for Watts to explain why the war was fought and consequently why its outcome, which he discounts as objectively trivial, seemed so significant to contemporaries. Using the war as an occasion for a psychological gloss on the process of modernization is a luxury we could better afford if we first had a firmer understanding of what the conflict was all about.

While I came away from this book disappointed, my disappointment is to some extent a product of Watts's success in sharpening a reader's sense of the dimensions of the problem he addresses. That *The Republic Reborn* fails to provide a definitive piece in the solution to the puzzle of how America evolved into a liberal capitalist culture detracts in no way from its quality as an intelligent, well-written account which any reader interested in the history of the early republic should find stimulating.

In Pursuit of Reason: The Life of Thomas Jefferson. By NOBLE E. CUNNINGHAM, JR. (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1987. xvi, 414p. Illustrations, bibliographical note, index. \$24.95.)

It should not be surprising to discover that Thomas Jefferson is the third most popular subject for American biographers, after Abraham Lincoln and George Washington. When one considers the range of his interests and achievements, Dumas Malone's graceful compliment, "he never ceased to contemplate the universe," becomes prosaic reality. Accordingly, given the availability of Malone's six-volume study and Merrill Peterson's 1,000-page biography, the need for another might be questioned. But not everyone needs or wants such lengthy studies, and Noble Cunningham's biography (349 pages of text) fills a need for a competent shorter work on the famous Virginian.

Professor Cunningham is best known for his studies of the Jeffersonian Republican political party as well as the relationship between legislative, executive, and judiciary during Jefferson's presidency. The various stages of Jefferson's public life—from the House of Burgesses through his years as Secretary of State and Vice-President to the Presidency—are given in sufficient, but not overwhelming detail. Cunningham provides background information clearly, but concisely, and he never wanders far from his subject. As a study of Thomas Jefferson, public man, the work is a success. Cunningham does not blink from criticizing his subject, and his treatment of the Embargo, especially, is very even-handed.

The book, then, is very much a political biography. While other topics are covered, they are related only in the context of Jefferson's public life. For instance, Cunningham justifies not doing a separate, topical chapter on Jefferson's political thought on the ground that Jefferson achieved notice as a public figure and his thought should be presented in the context in which it took form and words. But, because Jefferson never did write a finished, formal work of political philosophy, it can be argued that it is necessary to pull his thought together from the disparate papers, reports, statutes, and letters in which it was expressed in order to give the reader a clear picture of the complex Virginian. Cunningham treats aspects of Jefferson's personal life (he deals neatly and concisely with the often repeated charge that the planter took one of his slaves, Sally Hemings, as a mistress), but while Cunningham presents the record, he does not always draw needed conclusions. For example, he quotes extensively from several letters Jefferson wrote to his daughters in which Jefferson tells them what they must do to deserve his love. While one should not be a psychoanalyst to his helpless subject, a biography is a study of both career and personality, and the

biographer owes the reader his judgment on this peculiar style of character formation.

Thus, *In Pursuit of Reason* succeeds primarily as a political biography. This is certainly a sufficient achievement to make it worth the attention of readers interested in one of the most significant figures of both the Revolutionary and early national periods of United States history.

Fordham University

ROBERT F. JONES

Embattled Courage: The Experience of Combat in the American Civil War. By GERALD F. LINDERMAN. (New York: The Free Press, 1987. x, 357p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$22.50.)

Embattled Courage by Gerald F. Linderman is an exploration into the human dimensions of combat during the Civil War. The author has written an interesting work, spiced with lively quotations from published sources.

In the first part of the book, Linderman argues that courage was the core value in soldiers' perceptions of war. As young men left their homes for military duty, they were convinced that the war was their greatest opportunity to exhibit valor in the face of the enemy, to become a war hero to the folks at home and their comrades in the service. Moreover, the side that exhibited the greater courage, which obviously was going to be its own, would win the war.

The great strength of this book lies in the second part. Here the author skillfully discusses how soldiers learned that, much to their dismay, advances in technology, particularly the rifled musket, had altered warfare dramatically. The staggering casualties that the rifled musket inflicted caught them physically and psychologically unprepared. In the face of these weapons, the audacious conduct of an individual soldier was not as important as they had previously imagined. Visions of bold performances on the battlefield that would lead to a rapid victory faded, as soldiers slowly realized that the war demanded the endurance of far more hardships and sacrifices than they had anticipated. Slowly they came to the conclusions that modern war was a brutal, dirty business and that victory in a total war required aggression toward both the enemy's army and its civilian population.

When the war ended, soldiers returned to a civilian population that did not understand the transformation these men had undergone. Private citizens still retained that prewar image of combat, and when the troops returned home, they recognized the gaps between the two groups. Nevertheless, in an effort to ease their own transition back into the civilian world, they adopted the civilian perception of the war. Only late in life did they depict

war somewhat realistically, but by then the years could not help but romanticize it, and their successors, the next generation, held an even more mythic view of the combat their fathers had experienced.

In fact, the prewar notions of courage seem more suited to officers and their perceptions of leadership than the values of the "common soldier." Over 70 percent of Linderman's *dramatis personae* were officers, ten times higher than their representation in the war, and 20 percent of his enlisted men received some higher education after the war. Because he relied almost exclusively on published sources, which are usually the writings of the brightest and most articulate, his research was slanted. The author seems to recognize this when he writes, "Some soldiers, probably those least equipped and least inclined to record their reactions, may have entered with a feeble allegiance to courage's values" (p. 265). A broad survey of unpublished manuscript material, I believe, will indicate misperceptions about the realities of war, and also a concern merely for "doing one's duty" rather than performing courageously.

Two final comments. The author apparently failed to examine any secondary works that have appeared over the past five years, a number of which would have been helpful to him. Also, I wish footnote citations included diary and letter headings and dates. The inclusion of such information would have made this reviewer's job much easier.

Overall, *Embattled Courage* is a book that few students of the Civil War can afford to miss. Gerald Linderman has provided us with a penetrating look into Civil War officers and perceptions of leadership, as well as the "hardening" process of the Civil War and the dichotomy between civilian perceptions and reality.

University of Houston

JOSEPH T. GLATTHAAR

Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865 to 1913. By GAINES M. FOSTER. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987. x, 306p. Illustrations, appendixes, selected bibliography, index. \$29.95.)

An Old Creed for the New South: Proslavery Ideology and Historiography, 1865-1918. By JOHN DAVID SMITH. (Westport and London: Greenwood Press, 1985. ix, 314p. Selected bibliography, index. \$34.00.)

Historians are only beginning to understand the psychic trauma that the Civil War visited upon the South. Just after the struggle, many southerners were swept under by depression, some finding comfort only in drugs, alcohol, or suicide. Their way of life had seemingly ended, and more than 150,000

of their comrades had died in vain. Most haunting for these honor-haunted people was the knowledge that they had surrendered. The majority, of course, passed through this crisis, and historians would probably say that they dealt with their anguish in a typical manner: through avoidance and through myth. The meaner aspects of the past were often forgotten, and in their place came the myths of the Old South and the Lost Cause.

Many volumes have been written about both of these subjects. But on the Lost Cause, none is better than Gaines Foster's new book. Foster explores the whole nature of this idea and how it manifested itself in poetry, song, sculpture, and celebration. He argues that it was not, as is often believed, a backward-looking vision and that it actually aided southerners in accepting the demands of modernity.

The idea of the Lost Cause first helped southerners confront death. In the decades after the war, memorial associations tended Confederate graves and erected monuments, usually on the grounds of cemeteries. Thus the dead might be honored; however, grieving would occur in the privacy of the cemetery and memories of the war would not intrude upon the daily affairs of the community.

But memories did intrude. "The dead, dead corpse of the Confederacy" (p. 71), as one southerner lamented, could not be so easily buried. Former Confederates were tormented by doubts about their cause, their honor, and even their masculinity. A few joined reactionary veterans' societies in Virginia. Such men, most of whom were former officers, had difficulty even believing that the South had lost the war. But most southerners harbored no desire to dwell upon the past in such a way. Instead, they enlisted by the thousands in the less elitist United Confederate Veterans (UCV), which was founded in 1889 and led by New South men. Its parades and reunions reassured old soldiers of the nobility of their service, and an offshoot of the UVC, the United Daughters of the Confederacy, left no doubt about the esteem of southern women. At the same time, the UCV worked for reconciliation with the North—but only if the North acknowledged southern valor. By the 1890s the UCV and the Grand Army of the Republic were sponsoring joint encampments and offering joint tributes to the gallantry of their former enemies. In 1905 Congress ordered that captured rebel flags be returned to the South.

As the South's slow catharsis occurred, perhaps the inevitable happened: southerners began placing their Confederate memorials on courthouse squares or in other public places. Rather than funeral tributes, these monuments sought to honor all former soldiers, but especially those still living. Such memorials were usually capped by the figure of a Confederate private atop a column—a not very threatening looking chap, plainly at ease, and hardly fearful that the Yanks were about to attack. The Lost Cause had

finally fulfilled its purpose, Foster argues, and thus in the first decade of this century interest in the idea began to wane. For many old rebels, the Civil War was at last over.

Or was it? Like Gaines Foster, John David Smith also believes in the ghosts of the Lost Cause and the Old South. After the war, he notes, southerners were usually willing to acknowledge defeat and emancipation. But they could not bring themselves to question the wisdom of slavery. Indeed, this was an idea that informed almost all southern discourse about blacks in the half century after the Civil War. Slavery, southerners believed, had been the perfect institution for the African, who was at best a child and at worst a savage. Generally paternalistic, it provided blacks with a school that tutored them in the rudiments of civilization. With freedom, the former slaves quickly retrogressed. Most grew shiftless, and some turned to rape or murder. This, at least, was how southern whites appraised the situation. It was an idea that provided a happy rationale for slavery. It also justified such postwar institutions as black codes, peonage, and lynching. This view was made all the more respectable when it issued from the pen of the South's most distinguished white historian, Ulrich B. Phillips. The plantation, Phillips wrote, "[was] probably the most efficient method ever devised for the use of stupid labor in agriculture on a large scale" (p. 250). Phillips's thinking, however, was not confined to the South. At the turn of the century, students in Herbert Baxter Adams's and James C. Ballagh's famous seminars at Johns Hopkins University regularly turned out thoroughly researched and essentially racist histories of the peculiar institution. Smith makes a convincing case that during this time black historians, although less adept in the use of primary sources, produced more enlightening accounts of slavery.

Both of these books are well-researched and skillfully argued. Smith's is clearly designed for the specialist, whereas Foster's will appeal to both the specialist and the layman. Foster's work ends in 1913, which may leave readers wondering about what followed. In 1915, for example, the UCV gained rights to the northern face of Georgia's Stone Mountain, and eight years later, Gutzon Borglum began work on the most colossal tribute to the Confederate past: the great bas-relief of Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, and Stonewall Jackson. The project was soon mired in byzantine wrangling, and it was not completed until 1970. Then, too, what of the Lost Cause today? Not only have segregationists embraced the idea, but it still appears in television docudramas, Civil War battlefield reenactments, and quarrels over the playing of "Dixie" at football games. All of these are complicated subjects. Yet no historian could write a volume about them with greater subtlety than Gaines Foster. It would be a book worth waiting for.

Sociology and Scientism: The American Quest for Objectivity, 1880-1940. By ROBERT C. BANNISTER. (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1987. viii, 301p. Bibliography, index. \$29.95.)

Of the many books in the past two decades on the evolution and professionalization of the social sciences, *Sociology and Scientism* should eventually rank among the most illuminating and most interesting. That what became the discipline of sociology yearned for "objectivity" in its research and so respectability vis-à-vis the natural sciences is hardly a revelation, and Robert Bannister's book makes no such claim of originality. What it does profess to do—and does quite well—is to provide unprecedented detail as to precisely how sociology's "second generation" tried to adopt the methodology of the natural sciences, and then to chronicle the resulting intellectual, professional, and personal conflicts within the emerging discipline.

Successors to such founding fathers of sociology as Lester Ward, Albion Small, Franklin Giddings, and William Graham Sumner—to each of whom Bannister devotes a chapter or two—included Luther Lee Bernard, William Ogburn, and F. Stuart Chapin. Although Bannister treats their associates and disciples as well, it is upon these three that the bulk of the book is concentrated. That all of the discipline's principal figures in this period were men is duly noted, lamented, but not dwelled upon.

As Bannister makes clear, what distinguishes the second generation from the first is not the "quest for objectivity" per se, for the founding fathers certainly sought it too, but rather the comparative extremism of these intellectual offspring—in both their extraordinary faith in science and their narrow, rigid notion of science (their "scientism"). Moreover, as Bannister persuasively argues, their very extremism reflected a host of non-intellectual motivations: youthful insecurities and disappointments, consequent yearnings for professional prestige and power, simultaneous fears of contemporary social disorder and cultural fragmentation, and political and financial pressures from universities and foundations. As he perceptively notes, their "scientism" links them to many other Americans of the period who, in related ways, also glorified efficiency and social control and also distrusted the average citizen's ability to determine his own best interests, much less those of his society.

Nevertheless, the specific meaning of sociological objectivity was hardly agreed upon by its foremost advocates. To be sure, all emphasized the need to confine sociology to observable external human behavior, thus ignoring internal feelings and desires; to quantify knowledge, especially through statistics; and to remain strictly neutral in ethical and policy matters. But where for Bernard and his allies a truly scientific sociology would, despite this neutrality, impose "absolute standards for social reconstruction" (p. 6),

for Ogburn and Chapin and their associates it would be more advisory and focus on means, not ends. These profound conceptual differences manifested themselves in fierce conflicts within the American Sociological Society in the 1930s that Bannister lucidly recounts, along with the long-term mixed legacy of the objectivity crusade that he summarizes. That this obsession with objectivity "masked chaotic inner lives that led Ogburn . . . to psychoanalysis and Bernard to compulsive philandering" (p. 234) is in itself revealing of the crusade's limitations.

Bannister's own methodology successfully integrates the history of ideas with the history of institutions and with intriguing biographical sketches of the figures involved. His personal stance on the prospect of objectivity is happily balanced between blind faith on the one hand and utter rejection on the other. What he does believe—and demonstrate—is that "objectivity has a history" (p. 9).

Like his fine *Social Darwinism: Science and Myth in Anglo-American Social Thought* (1979), *Sociology and Scientism* is not for the casual reader. But for serious students of the issues he addresses, the book will amply repay the close, careful reading it both demands and deserves.

University of Maine

HOWARD P. SEGAL

Hope Among Us Yet: Social Criticism and Social Solace in Depression America.

By DAVID P. PEELER. (Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 1987. xiv, 340p. Illustrations, bibliographical note, index. \$35.00.)

In his ambitious study of depression-era writers, painters, and photographers, historian David P. Peeler enriches our understanding of the process whereby widespread and compelling dreams for a more humane and creative society were cogently fashioned in this volatile decade, only to be frustrated and ultimately abandoned. Exploring the relationship between artistic creativity and social criticism among four genres of 1930s social artists—travel reporters, documentary photographers, social novelists, and painters—Peeler concludes that despite the exalted hopes these diverse artists held at the outset of the decade, "social art of the 1930s never achieved its full potential, and fell short of its creators' political and artistic intentions."

Artistically, these writers, painters, and photographers searched for new forms of realism that would allow them to better depict the hardship and suffering of depression America. They also sought to redefine the artists' relationship to society, bridging the gap between artist and audience by

making this new, universally accessible art the centerpiece of community life.

Their efforts varied widely. While numerous writers took to the road in an attempt to gauge the mood of the American people and assess the potential for radical change, others employed fiction to vivify the plight of the victims of poverty and prejudice. During this same period, many painters not only abandoned their earlier abstractionism but also rejected the literal depictions of naturalism, establishing a new communion with "the people" by painting poignant protests of oppression, hunger, and despair. These painters all participated in government arts programs—either in the Works Progress Administration/Federal Arts Project, the Treasury Department Section of Painting and Sculpture, or the Public Works of Art Project—and felt a sense of liberation at being able to replace their former bourgeois patrons with the public. The documentary photographers also abandoned their earlier pictorialism and distanced themselves from colleagues associated with the Group f/64 school in their efforts to capture photographic images of human misery. The photographers' artistic and social/political inclinations were nurtured during their work for the government in the New Deal's Resettlement Administration (later the Farm Security Administration).

Aside from the work of the photographers, Peeler finds little of enduring value in this substantial body of work. He argues that the social artists' "paralyzing humility" and rejection of all perspectives other than those of "the people," their obsession with the victimized common man to the exclusion of heroic characters capable of changing their circumstances, and their general desire to capture and record rather than to enlighten and create produced works of art that rarely transcended the moment.

Over the course of the decade, the social artists' work even lost its political sting and sharp social criticism, as their initially unflinching anticapitalism gave way to a simplistic and often delusory complacency about the prospects for a better future. Seeking an escape from the decade's suffering, they increasingly embraced an unreasoning, but emotionally satisfying, optimism that allowed them to maintain hope and solace.

Despite all the welcome insights in *Hope Among Us Yet*, the book suffers from the author's failure to locate the artists' evolving political and artistic consciousness within the broader formative social milieux, including the political debates and movements that influenced intellectual discourse during these years. Peeler, for example, describes the artists' seeming political moderation and growing sympathy toward Roosevelt after mid-decade without assessing the influence of the Popular Front. While commenting frequently on the shallow and unprogrammatic nature of the artists' politics, Peeler fails to explore the various organizations through which they most concretely expressed their views, including the John Reed Clubs, the Film

and Photo League, the League of American Writers, the American Writers Congress, the American Artists Congress, and the Artists' Union. Although providing extensive evidence that many collaborated with the Communists during these years, Peeler downplays both their commitment and radicalism, placing far too much significance in the fact that most abandoned their political radicalism before the end of the decade. Peeler compounds this error by interspersing retrospective comments, calling into question the radicalism of the artists' youth, without any indication that such commentary was not contemporaneous with the views and events being discussed. Moreover, Peeler fails to provide the systematic sociology of knowledge needed to illuminate the complex processes that shaped the politics and aesthetics of members of specific artistic communities, largely ignoring the rich intellectual cross-fertilization that occurred during these years. Thus, intent upon viewing the social artists as "confused liberals," he mistakes the impermanence of their radicalism for a lack of intensity and seriousness, and fails to draw some of the key lessons from his study.

Despite such deficiencies, *Hope Among Us Yet*, with its wealth of insights and anecdotes, significantly enriches our understanding of the hopes and frustrations of art and politics amidst the turbulence of depression America.

American University

PETER J. KUZNICK

Once A Cigar Maker: Men, Women, and Work Culture in American Cigar Factories, 1900-1919. By PATRICIA A. COOPER. (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1987. xvi, 350p. Illustrations, tables, index. \$29.95.)

The effort to gain a deeper and fuller understanding of working men and women's lives has occupied the attention of an increasing number of labor historians over the past two decades. Though the task is hardly complete, we now possess a more informed awareness of how workers came to grips with the various demands of the workplace. Patricia Cooper's *Once a Cigar Maker* is a notable addition to this expanding literature, one that deftly explores the wider cosmos of America's cigar trades in the years 1900-1919.

The volume's major arguments revolve around several interrelated themes. The nature of the cigar trade itself constitutes the first of these, as Cooper pictures an industry undergoing a series of managerial, technological, and organizational changes. In general, factory owners moved toward producing the five-cent cigar, pursued an increasing division of labor through the team system, sought the earliest possible use of machines, and implemented the hiring of women as a means of remaining competitive and

resisting union strength. These alterations upset long-established work patterns and prompted worker responses.

The predominantly male Cigar Makers International Union (CMIU) reacted ineffectively to these challenges largely because of the powerful work culture which its members had created. This system of ideas and practices grew out of a shared set of experiences, and it successfully integrated workers nationally. The traveling system played an especially important role in linking union members. Cooper convincingly shows how this work culture brought the strengths of solidarity and loyalty but also bred an exclusivity which limited the ability of unionists to bridge class, gender, and age differences and unite with other cigar workers.

Nowhere was this weakness more in evidence than in the CMIU's policies toward women. Unionists never found ways to welcome unorganized women into the ranks, and, given management's decisions, this flaw proved critical. Although women were able to fashion a work culture growing out of their own needs and experiences (and in some ways paralleling that of their male counterparts), the CMIU remained apart. Except for a brief period in the World War I era, cigar workers never presented a united front. Ultimately, a factionalized workers' movement proved unable to withstand the effects of employer intimidation, government surveillance, worker poverty, and postwar economic dislocations.

This short review cannot do justice to the sophistication of the volume's analysis. By joining the mentalities of cigar workers, as seen most clearly in their work cultures, with the wider marketplace and community realities, Cooper is able to see how class, gender, ethnic, and ideological issues exerted their respective influences. In the end, we can understand why male and female cigar workers acted both differently and the same at certain times and why they failed to join in common cause.

Readers should know that Cooper has carefully defined the parameters of her study, with each choice backed by sound reasoning. Her focus is almost exclusively on male CMIU members and nonunion female workers, especially those who worked in Detroit (mostly Polish immigrants) and southeastern Pennsylvania. She has excluded the Tampa cigar industry, which, in her view, constitutes something of a separate story. Although some cigar workers have been left out by these choices, the lives of those who appear in *Once a Cigar Maker* are more sharply etched and sensitively illuminated because of them. This is a work of real distinction, one that combines impressive research with compelling interpretation. It should serve as a model for future studies.

A Time for Giants: Politics of the American High Command in World War II.

By D. CLAYTON JAMES with ANNE SHARP WELLS. (New York: Franklin Watts, 1987. xvi, 317p. Bibliography, index. \$19.95.)

Since few officers in the highest United States command echelons during World War II had previously earned distinguished records in battle, how did they attain their preeminent wartime positions? That is the question that James, the author of a widely acclaimed three-volume biography of General Douglas MacArthur, attempts to answer by studying the careers of eighteen officers: seven Army generals (Marshall, MacArthur, Eisenhower, Stilwell, Clark, Bradley, and Patton), five admirals (King, Leahy, Nimitz, Halsey, and Spruance), four Army Air Forces generals (Arnold, Spaatz, Eaker, and Kenney), and two Marine generals (Vandegrift and Smith). Of these, all but Patton held command above the level of a numerically designated army, air force, or fleet.

The book is nicely organized. Each of the first nine chapters has three sections. The initial section explains selected aspects of the high command, such as the development of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the evolution of command relationships in different theaters as the war progressed. Molded by international, interservice, and personal rivalries, these relationships could become extraordinarily complex. None was quite as tangled as the China-Burma-India Theater, where Stilwell was simultaneously superior to *and* subordinate to British General William J. Slim and where Allied leaders maneuvered "against each other with almost as much belligerency as their forces altogether mounted against the Japanese invaders" (p. 116), but all had labyrinthine qualities. The second and third sections each describe the career of one of the eighteen officers. In a brief tenth chapter, James expounds on the themes that emerged from studying the collective career pattern.

The foremost theme is that, although final authority for appointing officers rested with President Franklin D. Roosevelt, no real "system"—no formal, consistent, orderly process—for selecting the highest ranking officers existed. A second theme is that in selecting military commanders Roosevelt often relied on the recommendations of trusted advisors, especially Marshall for the Army, King for the Navy, and, to a lesser extent, Arnold for the Army Air Forces. These service chiefs, in turn, depended to a great extent on personal knowledge of those whom they recommended. Because the armed forces between World War I and Pearl Harbor were relatively small, officers' careers in each of the services were astonishingly intertwined. Yet the selection process did not involve "politics" in the derogatory sense of the word. James uncovered little evidence of men using deceitful or conniving methods to attain high command.

Instead—and this is the book's third major theme—those who rose to the top did so on merit. "Without exception," the author asserts, "these eighteen leaders seemed to have achieved their positions of high command by being the best qualified and most experienced officers available for the jobs at the time" (p. 268). As proof that the "system" identified those who were meritorious, James notes that only one of the officers was relieved of command, and that was Stilwell whose task verged on the impossible. Overall, the officers achieved a remarkable record of longevity—an average of thirty-five months—in their highest commands.

James's conclusions are similar to those in Eric Larrabee's *Commander in Chief: Franklin Delano Roosevelt, His Lieutenants, and Their War*, also published in 1987. Although Larrabee emphasizes far more than does James that the president carefully hand-picked his lieutenants (sometimes because they specifically suited his intentions), they agree that the end result was invariably an impressive matching of the right man to each important task.

Based primarily on published biographies and autobiographies, *A Time for Giants* should be read by all scholars interested in World War II and, more generally, U.S. military affairs.

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

PETER MASLOWSKI

Ronald Reagan, *the Movie, and Other Episodes in Political Demonology*. By MICHAEL ROGIN. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987. xx, 366p. Illustrations, index. \$25.00.)

Ronald Reagan's presidential career, according to Michael Rogin, hardly differs from his earlier career in Hollywood. His present-day concerns match those of his 1940s and 1950s film personae, and even the dialogue has hardly changed in the intervening years. As we now know, the Reagan presidency has even employed a modern scriptwriter, in the person of the inventive Larry Speakes, to supply the dialogue when the Warner Brothers treasure trove comes up dry. Thus, the presidential image begins to blur with the heroic image of mass culture produced in both the world of film and television.

Yet, this oft-observed characteristic of the Reagan presidency is not Rogin's only concern in *Ronald Reagan, the Movie*. The work consists of a diverse series of essays, some concerning questions of film history—such as the role of D.W. Griffith in the creation of the modern film technique, or the images of the anti-communist films of the late 1940s and 1950s. Other chapters run the gamut from the study of political repression in the United States

to the analysis of liberal society and the Indian question, a subject Rogin has addressed in earlier writings.

Uniting this somewhat random series of essays are Rogin's studies of political demonology. Rogin notes that political demonology—the "creation of monsters as a continuing feature of American politics"—can be exemplified by the "Indian cannibal, the black rapist, the papal whore of Babylon, the monster-hydra United States Bank, the demon rum," all familiar images from American political history. Once the demons are created, Rogin argues, the countersubversive utilizes these monsters to "give shape to his anxieties" and to battle his opponents by imitating his enemies. These concepts can be used to explain Reagan's anti-Sandinista rhetoric and actions or D.W. Griffith's powerful use of imagery in the classic *Birth of a Nation*.

Although Rogin's analysis of political demonology is designed to give both order and coherence to his otherwise disparate series of essays, the concepts at times seem an afterthought, as, indeed, the various articles seem to have diverse origins. Some chapters seem directly related to the book's intended structure; others seem oblivious to it. The D.W. Griffith chapter is a case in point. Rogin surveys what to most film historians are fairly standard observations of this filmmaker's contribution to the world of cinema. Only the introduction to the book and a concluding chapter (an excellent selection on American political demonology) ultimately suggest Rogin's reason for including his essay on Griffith. Here Rogin claims that Griffith "shifted the locus of the real in America from mythicized history to image by crystallizing demonological images and placing them on film." Unfortunately, these concepts are not addressed in the article itself.

The majority of essays are of high quality (although the essays on film history seem to survey well-travelled ground), but their lack of compelling inter-relation make the parts of *Ronald Reagan, the Movie* far more interesting than the whole.

Rutgers University, Camden

ALLEN WOLL

Independence: The Creation of a National Park. By CONSTANCE M. GREIFF.
(Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987. xiv, 281p. Illustrations, index. \$24.95.)

Constance M. Greiff's *Independence: The Creation of a National Park* is the first published account of a national park's history and is important to the chronicles of the American preservation movement. The story contains all the usual elements of a preservation tale raised to the level of high drama—a neglected collection of the most historic relics of our nation's

past saved by leading citizens and preservationists who pitted themselves against a triply internecine bureaucracy of municipal, state, and federal governments. Had the scale of the success been any less grand, this narrative could easily have degenerated into a farce.

Independence, which covers the mid-1930s until 1976, is only concerned with a small slice of the history of Independence Hall and its attendant structures and collections. Greiff focuses on the politics and dynamics whereby the federal government acquired and transformed the site. She describes the determined Judge Edwin O. Lewis, who, with the Independence Hall Association, succeeded in transferring the stewardship of the buildings in State House Yard and their contents to the federal government in 1951 when Independence National Historic Park was established. In two of her chapter headings she appropriately employs the metaphor, "The Wars of Independence," because hers is, indeed, a trench account of the transformation of the congested fifth ward into an urban garden greener than Penn could have imagined.

Greiff is a noted preservationist, and the richest passages of *Independence* are her architectural descriptions. She provides a nail-by-nail description of the restoration of Independence Hall and the Bishop White House, but her descriptions of other buildings and areas of investigation other than the historic fabric are rather thin. This is unfortunate because *in toto* the preservation and interpretation history of Independence Park contains examples of nearly every category of problem and philosophical issue related to historic site management. Independence has been a field laboratory for many techniques of historic architecture, archaeology, and site management in common use today. The names of professionals in those fields who had an association with this park form an impressive roster.

The author had no lack of documentation from which to develop this book. In addition to written records, Greiff had access to transcriptions of interviews, made in 1976, with Park staff about the site and also had the opportunity to discuss the Park's history with many of its original planners. Despite this wealth of material, preservation is emphasized and interpretation—the other half of *Independence's* mandate—is less fully treated. In some respects, this bias reflects the author's rapport with her informants (who, like all mortals, hold a selective memory) and also the internal review process itself. One of the best informants was the Park's first architect, Charles E. Peterson, who deserves the attention he receives for his vision and high standards. But contrary to the book's implication, more than the administrators, historians, and architects had a decision-making role in the Park's development. For example, the curators' role in the research, acquisition, and implementation and maintenance of the Park's furnishings is underplayed. Greiff ignores projects for which a curator had sole respon-

sibility, such as City Tavern, or, as in the instance of the *Aurora* subscription offices, she miscredited them to historians. Similarly, she casts the protection, maintenance, and interpretive staffs in reactive roles that belie their initiative and autonomy.

Before the book goes to a second printing, it would benefit from a more careful reading for typographical and factual errors (Franklin died in 1790, not 1791) and from the inclusion of one clear map that would orient the reader to the first chapter's narrative tour of the Park. None of the maps and plans reproduced in the publication are intelligible without the aid of a magnifying glass.

Despite the problems in emphasis, Greiff's work, overall, is excellent. *Independence* puts into print the story of a critical period in urban preservation, and it reminds us that Independence Park is a unique national treasure that deserves the continued scrutiny of its administrators and its public.

Independence National Historic Park

DORIS DEVINE FANELLI

The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Academe. By RUSSELL JACOBY. (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1987. xiv, 290p. Index. \$18.95.)

"Insurance executives can write fine poetry; Harvard professors can toss off ringing calls for revolution," writes Russell Jacoby in this challenging book. "In general, neither do" (p. 23). With wit and erudition, he goes on to describe the "impoverishment" of American intellectual life during the past two decades. His heroes are the "public intellectuals" who flourished from the 1930s into the early 1960s, his targets those who abandoned this calling for the comforts of academe, and, more particularly, a "missing generation" who came of age during the sixties but have failed to keep alive this earlier tradition.

For Jacoby, intellectual life during this century has seen three successive generations, comprised roughly of individuals born around 1900, 1920, and 1940. The first or "classical" generation included Lewis Mumford and Edmund Wilson, while a second or "transitional" one numbered such figures as Alfred Kazin, Daniel Bell, and Irving Howe. Members of the former "never or rarely taught in universities" (p. 17); the latter typically moved in mid-careers to some institutional affiliation. In contrast, would-be spokesmen of the "missing generation"—the sociologist Richard Sennett, for example—have spent their entire careers within the universities. The result,

Jacoby argues, has been an intellectual landscape strewn with trivial monographs, bad writing, and sloppy thinking.

Jacoby's pointed judgments enliven often lengthy lists of individuals. Unlike some of the timid academics he derides, he names names, among them some of the most respected of an older generation of New York intellectuals. Thus, the Columbia literary critic Lionel Trilling was "distinguished by the cadence of his prose and his measured liberalism, not the brilliance, originality, or force of his thought" (p. 25). Although the philosopher Sidney Hook "specializes in politico-cultural stances," he has not since the 1930s "produced an original and coherent philosophical work" (p. 106). The efforts of the "missing generation" come in for even harder knocks; Jacoby describes the work of Sennett, for example, as "drab and pretentious, even sloppy" (p. 210).

Although Jacoby analyzes few works in depth, his standard often appears to be political or social, rather than intellectual or aesthetic. Jewish radicals, he tells us, are more likely than their non-Jewish counterparts to trade in "their red pasts for blue chip careers" (p. 87). His special heroes are the Edmund Wilsons and C. Wright Millses; his tarnished transitional, a Lionel Trilling, the first tenured Jew in Columbia's English department, who possessed an overdeveloped sense of accommodation and a fondness for terms like "scarcely," "modulation," and "our educated classes." Sidney Hook, likewise, labors under a cloud of his excessive anticommunist zeal. True to its central theme, *The Last Intellectuals*, here as elsewhere, is suggestive rather than scholarly: an arbitrary list of Jewish intellectuals who deserted their radical pasts "seems" shorter (p. 88) than one of their non-Jewish counterparts.

The concept of the "public intellectual," although ostensibly neutral, is also tinged with Jacoby's political convictions. In its broadest meaning, the term describes that class of individuals, whether on left or right, who sought and addressed "a general and educated audience" (p. 5) on matters of social and cultural importance—John Kenneth Galbraith or William F. Buckley, no less than Irving Howe and others on the left. But his focus is clearly on the latter, whether those who abandoned the cause or those representatives of the 1940 generation who vanished intellectually—Tom Hayden, for example, or the others whom Jack Newfield once labelled *A Prophetic Majority* (1966). Jacoby begins his study with Harold Stearns's question of 1921: "Where are our intellectuals?" But, more precisely, the book evokes the subject of another symposium of the 1920s, "Where are the Pre-War Radicals?"

However one phrases the question, Jacoby's explanations hold few surprises. Among broader social changes, the culprits are an unholy trinity of modern America: Moses (Robert), malls, and mass media. Together these

have produced a reconstruction of cities, the rise of suburbia, and the decline of a "reading public." Since the 1940s, the cultural void has been filled by the emergence of the university as the ubiquitous agency of intellectual life. Displaying again his instinct for the jugular, Jacoby views the latter development less as a result of impersonal forces than of the intellectuals' weakness for the three S's of academic life—"salaries, security, summers" (p. 14). At one point, he hints that an additional fact may well be that the Left (old or New) has little to offer: they are, to say the least, "out of step" (p. 4). But the point is not seriously explored. An apparent confusion in the author's political agenda also muddies the analysis. Does the problem lie in the fact that academe now embraces groups it earlier excluded (Jews, women, and radicals in particular)? Or in continuing threats to academic freedom? Can it be that new issues have legitimately eclipsed the old? Given the prominence and vitality of feminism and gender-related issues, for example, their virtual absence here (save a passing reference to Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*) may explain why Jacoby has read so few good books lately.

Although Jacoby would wince, the pedant in me recommends that *The Last Intellectuals* be read along with Alexander Bloom's *Prodigal Sons* (1986), Alan M. Wald's *The New York Intellectuals* (1987), and other recent studies of many of these same figures. Meanwhile (perhaps the unkindest cut) I think what a fine text it will make for my course in recent intellectual history. But Jacoby's message finally transcends courses and syllabi. Whether or not one shares his political agenda, or his distaste for highways and malls, the book clearly enriches public discourse and addresses the wide, educated audience whose demise it laments. In this sense, *The Last Intellectuals* provides its own best evidence that all is not lost after all.

Swarthmore College

ROBERT C. BANNISTER

If I Had a Hammer . . . The Death of the Old Left and the Birth of the New Left. By MAURICE ISSERMAN. (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1987. xx, 259p. Index. \$18.95.)

This is a detailed account of a transitional decade in radical history that ended in the early 1960s. Its five chapters are devoted respectively to the collapse of the Communist party, the failure of Max Shachtman to reshape American socialism in his own image, the founding of Irving Howe's journal *Dissent*, the creation of radical pacifism, and the arrival of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). The author makes abundant use of published material, document collections, especially the papers of the SDS, and his

own extensive interviews. This is a work of careful scholarship that is, at the same time, clearly written, fair-minded, never pedantic, and often incisive.

Even so, this book does not appear to fill any particular need. Isserman is both a professional historian and a disappointed veteran of the SDS. His book is, therefore, yet another in a long list of recent studies devoted to ransacking the history of the American left for a usable past, or at least for ideas that might be useful in the future. Specifically, by examining the roots of the SDS, Isserman seeks to shed new light both on its rapid rise and equally quick decline. In this, he fails. That the SDS rejected much of the self-defeating legacy of the old left—ideological hair-splitting, rigid hierarchies and discipline—is well known. So also is the failure of the SDS to appreciate the old left's strengths—patience, organizational and doctrinal coherence—which were frequently the mirror images of its defects. Isserman tends, accordingly, to restate the obvious rather more than is required.

On the other hand, parts of this book are fresh, notably the chapter on Shachtman. It is, to my knowledge, the best thing written on this enigmatic figure, who appears in most accounts as a shadowy doyen of the anti-Stalinist left. Thanks to Isserman, his significance is now easier to estimate. No other person is treated as fully, but there are sketches of such figures as Michael Harrington, Irving Howe, Dave McReynolds, and A.J. Muste. Among the organizations he surveys are the Committee for Non-Violent Action, the League for Industrial Democracy, and the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, though he omits, except for an endnote, Women Strike for Peace, which was, arguably, as influential as SANE.

Despite the merit of certain parts, *If I Had a Hammer* does not add greatly to our knowledge of radical history, and fails to overturn the conventional view of this period as one in which the left was neither very important nor particularly interesting.

Rutgers University

WILLIAM L. O'NEILL

Hopes and Ashes: The Birth of Modern Times, 1929-1939. By ALICE G. MARQUIS. (New York: The Free Press, 1986. xii, 274p. Index. \$22.50.)

This book begins and ends with the New York World's Fair in 1939. Focusing on the time capsule buried at that time, it "will exhume that time capsule and the world it enclosed" to document "the restless interface between high culture and mass culture, a battleground where during the

Thirties the last aristocracy—the peerage of art, music, literature—gave way to the democratic impulse.”

The introduction raises a number of important issues with which scholars of the 1930s have wrestled, including the rise of mass communications, the apolitical nature of the American people, the role of technology in a democracy, the contrast between the European and American experience of modernity, and the contrasting ways with which intellectuals from the two continents have looked at the American experience. The reader begins the book assuming that the author will make a critical statement about the interaction of high and low culture and document her presumption that the 1930s was the period in which modern times began. Such an analysis would be welcome. While leading scholars of the period, such as William Stott in *Documentary Expression and Thirties America*, Richard Pells in *Radical Visions and American Dreams*, and Jeffrey Meikle in *Twentieth-Century Limited*, have explored the document as work of art, the intellectual history of the period, and industrial design, no one with proper training in anthropology and the theory of mass communications has done such work. Many of us would like to know just how much impact major works of art, music, and literature had on the average product of the public schools, and to know as well what an awareness of such an audience did to major cultural innovators. Names such as Aaron Copland, Martha Graham, James Agee, John Dos Passos, and Thomas Hart Benton pop into the mind; perhaps we will get away from the endless analysis of the New York intellectuals which is currently clogging the catalogs and get into something more rewarding.

Unfortunately, none of the important issues which come up ever gets much in the way of analysis. The book is artfully written, clear, and sensible, but it is essentially circumstantial and descriptive, rarely analytical in any serious sense of the term, and never theoretical. Although it uses some archival material to fill in the corners, it is essentially a textbook narrative of the role of radio, film, journalism, and modern art. It makes no serious points about the impact of mass culture on artists or the impact of serious art on the masses. Aside from a faintly provocative comparison between the American and British experience of radio regulation, it passes over the absolutely central matter of the impact of European intellectuals on America and of America on them. It never analyzes a text, whether a novel, radio script, film, or photograph.

Any scholar knowing nothing of the media during the 1930s will find the book a pleasant place to begin; anyone needing anecdotes to fill out lectures will find a few new ones. But as with so much of popular culture, it provides nothing for the mind.

University of Texas, Austin

ROBERT M. CRUNDEN

And My Children Did Not Know Me: A History of the Polish-Americans. By JOHN J. BUKOWCZYK. (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1987. xiii, 190p. Illustrations, maps, bibliographical essay, index. Cloth, \$27.50; paper, \$8.95.)

Although they constitute five percent of the U.S. population (twice as numerous as American Jews and more than three times the number of Asian Americans) and ten to fifteen percent of the population of some states like Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Michigan, Polish Americans remain a group about which, comparatively, very little, scholarly or otherwise, has been written. One wonders why this should be so. As John Bukowczyk has so admirably shown in his *And My Children Did Not Know Me*, Polish-American history and experience has much to teach us about the form and nature of American society and of group life within that society. Moreover, as a group, Polish Americans have a uniqueness which makes them very different from other Catholic immigrant groups, such as the Irish and Italians, and other central and eastern European groups, such as the Jews. Their legacy is one of peasant serfdom, complete with its "anti-mobility work ethos" favoring family, home (owned, of course), and security over money, status, and power; their Catholicism is more traditional and devotional (especially with respect to the Virgin Mary), if not medieval (the rationalist influence of the Protestant Reformation passed it by); and their view of big power *Realpolitik* more hard-nosed and severe (communism, in their view, does remain the greatest threat to America and the Free World).

In an attempt to alleviate the shortage, Bukowczyk has contributed the best single-volume history of Polish Americans to date. His work is synthetic, relying largely on published and accessible materials rather than on original research. Nonetheless, his presentations and interpretations are insightful and thought-provoking. He recalls the convolutions of Polish history, including the Partitions and the intricacies of peasant culture, to explain the complex reasons for the great emigrations of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He traces the lives of the Polish peasants as they enter America's industrial workforce, in coal mines, steel mills, slaughterhouses, and tanneries. He shows the importance of Catholicism (parish, priest, and school) and the role of the myriad fraternal and beneficial societies in the lives of Polonia. He analyzes the intense, but unrewarded, loyalty of Polish Americans to the Democratic party and their increasing tendency to move into the Republican camp. Finally, Bukowczyk explores the evolution, erosion, and revival of Polish culture, identity, and community from one generation to the next. Indeed, the work is noteworthy because it treats, not just the Polish immigrants of 1870-1915 and their children, but the third and fourth generations as well. With great pains, the author tries to

define what it means to be a Polish American in the 1980s. For this reviewer, it is these latter chapters that are the most intriguing, even if they are more subjective—and apologetic—than those which deal with the first two generations.

Perhaps the lack of general interest in Polish Americans on the part of the larger society (and, unfortunately, of Polish Americans as well) is due to the “invisibility” of this group. While they may have a handle on Italian-, Jewish-, or Afro-American culture, Americans, as a whole, are at a loss to describe either the form or content of Polish-American culture. Polish Americans may have their sports heroes and a few political figures of national renown, but Polish names do not come rolling off the tongue like, for example, Italian or Jewish ones.

Americans’ historical familiarity with Slavs has always been more rudimentary than their general knowledge of Italy, Greece, or Israel. The study of Latin and Greek classics was carried to America and found a place in its universities and academies, while the Bible, so essential to Protestant America, made the Jews and their history available to most Americans. There were no such counterparts for the Poles or other Slavs. Polish-American invisibility, however, is due primarily to the work experience of this group in America, in the first as well as subsequent generations. Unlike the Italian or Irish experiences in construction, Poles worked in occupations, and hence in locations, which largely separated them from most Americans on a daily basis: coal mining towns or in steel mills, slaughterhouses, and tanneries, around which they planted their self-contained neighborhoods. Moreover, unlike the Jews or Italians, they counted very few professionals (other than priests) or self-employed businessmen among their numbers, further reducing their contact with other Americans. The Poles’ rural peasant culture frowned upon small business as a livelihood. (“Polonia’s entrepreneurs, unlike members of many other rising middle classes in nineteenth-century Europe, were never secular, atheistic or materialistic enough.”) They preferred to put their capital into home ownership, building magnificent churches, and sending money to family still working the farm in Poland. When they did begin the climb to the middle class, their choice of occupations failed to increase their visibility. While Jews maintained a strong representation of self-employed businessmen and moved into teaching, social work, law, and medicine, and while Italians moved from construction laborers to contractors and into entertainment and drama, Polish Americans became machinists, tool and die makers, and, finally, engineers. They may be the backbone of the nation, but how often in one’s lifetime does one need to call on the service of engineers?

Because they lacked a solid tradition of business and self-employment and because their middle-class occupational choices tended to keep them

hidden, the Polish-American image continues to be associated with that of working-class America—and not without foundation. Polish Americans were much slower than others to climb the occupational ladders. As late as the 1960s, 65 percent of Polish Americans were still in blue-collar jobs. From the beginning Poles simply defined success differently than others; theirs was an “anti-mobility work ethos” which valued steady, well-paid work. As Bukowczyk observes: “Such people yearned neither for money, status, nor power in the ‘land of opportunity.’ What they sought was contentment in the things they prized: family, faith and fatherland.” In sum, the Poles “attained little social mobility because they did not seek it.”

Into the 1980s Polish Americans are still burdened with the “Polish joke” and continue to confront anti-Polish stereotypes in television, film, and comic routines. Each year thousands, feeling the force of ethnic discrimination and the negative connotation associated with “Polish-American,” continue to change their names to more acceptable ones—further increasing the invisibility of the group. Indeed, as Bukowczyk points out, Polish-American ethnicity has increasingly become one based on negatives, on working-class stereotypes of racism and of brawn and brutality over brain. Because of these stereotypes, which “express a deep anti-working class bias in American culture,” Polish ethnic identity is seen as a liability. Polish-American group survival depends, however, not on the rejection, but the maintenance of an ethnic identity. Karol Wojtyla (Pope John Paul II) and Lech Walesa may have put a dent in the old image (or so hopes Bukowczyk), but these illustrious men are not home-grown and remain foreigners. Americans continue to make a distinction between Poles and Polish Americans. It remains to be seen if the achievement and *personae* of Wojtyla and Walesa—and of the thousands of educated emigres who have come from Poland in the 1980s—can “rub off” on Polish Americans in general and raise their image in the public mind.

University of Pennsylvania

CAROLINE GOLAB

St. Clair: A Nineteenth-Century Coal Town's Experience with a Disaster-Prone Industry. By ANTHONY F.C. WALLACE. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987. xvii, 519p. Illustrations, tables, chronology, appendix, bibliography, index. \$30.00.)

In this splendid piece of social history, University of Pennsylvania anthropologist Anthony Wallace turns his acute eye for detail to the anthracite coal region of eastern Pennsylvania. Best known among historians for his award-winning study *Rockdale*, Wallace now looks to the coal town of St.

Clair, Schuylkill County, to chart the rise of the anthracite coal industry between 1830 and 1880. In this richly textured study, Wallace contends that if anthracite (and by implication other industries) is taken as an example, the industrial revolution is more accurately presented as the triumph of tragedy. In doing so, Wallace challenges that traditional literature which generally portrayed the history of American industrialization as a monument to the ingenuity of American capitalists who, if somewhat unscrupulously, succeeded in turning the United States into the world's dominant industrial power.

St. Clair was a small town with fewer than 6,000 people in the mid-nineteenth century when numerous important actors in this industrial drama began to play their roles on its stage: the families of political economist Henry Carey and John M. Wetherill who shared ownership of the mineral rights in the area; Franklin B. Gowen, chief executive officer of the Reading Railroad Company which came to monopolize the industry in Schuylkill County; Benjamin Bannan, publisher and editor of the influential *Pottsville Miners' Journal*; John Siney, one of the most influential union leaders of his century; and the Molly Maguires, those presumed saboteurs whose trial created a national sensation. To this cast must be added the tens of thousands of poor European immigrants who converged upon the coal fields in search of a place to start life anew. Wallace provides an excellent ethnography which demonstrates how they left their impact on the coal towns of the southern district.

The central thesis of the book is that the capitalists who developed the coal fields actually created an industrial structure that was, in Wallace's phrase, "disaster-prone," one that was designed to fail, even though they were honored by peers and workers alike. Because these "industrial heroes" ignored well-established best practice in colliery design, and discounted the advice of geologists, their mines were repeatedly destroyed by nature through floods, falls, fires, and explosions. Man-made havoc took its toll as well. The industrial capacity increased as independent operators entered the field, and inevitably the markets became depressed. As prices declined, coal could be sold only at the most meager of profit margins. Heavily indebted operators were forced to increase production in order to service their debts even as prices and delivery contracts became further destabilized. Seeking to cut costs, operators shirked safety precautions. As a result, an anthracite miner could expect to be killed or crippled for life in six years, a figure that is comparable with combat fatalities in America's wars. Operators who permitted miners to work in excessively gaseous mines not only risked the lives of their employees, they also threatened the integrity and efficiency of the mines themselves. Explosions killed men, but they also destroyed the very means of production upon which operators depended for their economic

survival. Wallace convincingly demonstrates that these industrialists, far from being farsighted organizational geniuses, in fact succumbed to the illusions of themselves created by mythmakers, and to their own short-term economic interests.

These conditions still plague coal and other basic industries, a point which the author must have found difficult to restrain himself from developing considering the current "deindustrialization" of America. Wallace also lost the opportunity to explain how the anthracite industry itself managed to continue for so long when the vast majority of individual enterprises lost money and failed. These are mere musings, however, alongside the fact that *St. Clair* is a monumental work of historical reconstruction. Exhaustively researched in primary and secondary sources, and brilliantly interpreted, this book will long serve as a model for demonstrating how an intensely local study can illuminate broader social developments.

West Virginia University

RONALD L. LEWIS

"Slaves of the Depression": Workers' Letters About Life on the Job. Edited by GERALD MARKOWITZ and DAVID ROSNER. (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1987. x, 229p. Index. Cloth, \$31.50; paper, \$9.95.)

So deep is the imprint of the Great Depression on our historical consciousness as a cataclysm of mass unemployment that it is easy to forget that the jobless were in fact a minority. One of the many contributions of *"Slaves of the Depression"* is that it reminds us not only that the typical worker managed to keep his or her job during those trying years, but that for even the fortunate majority of the employed the 1930s were often a time of insecurity, fear, and degradation in the workplace.

Culled from Record Group 100 of the National Archives, *"Slaves of the Depression"* is a representative collection of workers' letters to such New Deal luminaries as Franklin D. and Eleanor Roosevelt and Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins that were eventually forwarded to the Department of Labor's Division of Labor Standards. Perkins had created the division to monitor labor conditions across the nation and provide workers with helpful information and a sympathetic ear in Washington. As such, the division received and answered the complaints, inquiries, and poignant entreaties of working Americans who turned directly to the federal government for assistance. Editors Gerald Markowitz and David Rosner have arranged the letters topically—dealing with matters of class, working conditions and health and safety, women and blacks, management's assault on

labor, and the interplay of federal policy with state and local power—and they have properly carried the story through World War II, which, for all its importance in its own right, was of a piece with the rise of the New Deal welfare state. The aggregate effect of the collection is a revealing self-portrait of working Americans of the 1930s and 1940s.

The portrait is a complex one, for by tapping popular voices the editors have also succeeded in tapping the ambiguities of popular consciousness. These ordinary Americans wrote their government in tones of outrage and injustice, unwilling to suffer exploitation and indignities, yet they were also deeply conservative in many ways. There were no calls for revolution, and in the very act of their writing was an implicit faith in the promise of reform. Evident in many letters, too, was the powerful personal appeal of prominent New Deal figures, most especially the Roosevelts, to beleaguered citizens looking for answers and succor. To a remarkable degree, FDR's public persona (which he cultivated by his artful use of the radio) made the liberal reformism of the New Deal concrete and human for many Americans. That has long been a cliché of New Deal history, and these letters bear witness to its truth. If workers were naive to write the White House expecting a personal reply, they certainly were not foolish to do so, since their letters attest to a popular understanding that the New Deal state was somehow for "the working class of people." The Youngstown steel worker who wrote FDR in 1940 may have misspelled "colectave Bargaining," but he clearly knew what the term meant.

The editors add depth to this grass-roots view of the depression by including official replies to some of the letters. In this they render a double service by rescuing a couple of interesting and important New Dealers (Clara M. Beyer and Verne A. Zimmer) from undeserved obscurity and by capturing the dynamics of reformism at the local level, where most Americans experienced it. Manifestly sympathetic to working people and organized labor, left-leaning technocrats like Beyer and Zimmer (and indeed their boss Frances Perkins) exemplified the accomplishments and limits of New Deal liberalism: compassionate and encouraging, they were also bound by the traditional constraints on central power inherent in the nation's federal structure, and by their roles as brokers and agents of social harmony. It is this "symbiotic relationship" of the New Deal and the labor movement that Markowitz and Rosner so ably document through well-chosen correspondence.

As a vivid and illuminating compilation that enables us to examine the New Deal years on several levels, *"Slaves of the Depression"* has much to offer. Together with its focus on popular perceptions and the role of the state, its attention to working conditions and the experiences of heretofore little-studied service and white-collar employees makes the collection an

innovative one that should stimulate further scholarship. Introductory essays and notes are straightforward and intelligent, and place the letters in a coherent historical framework. My only reservations, aside from one or two differences over interpretation, concern the documentary format. Since this is, in effect, a primary source, the precise citations for each letter within Record Group 100 ought to be given; by the same token, I can see no justification (unless there is a legal one of which I am unaware) for disguising the letter writers' identities with initials rather than giving the full names as they appear in the original documents. But none of that seriously detracts from the overall value of this rich and well-edited collection.

The Samuel Gompers Papers
University of Maryland, College Park

EDWIN GABLER

Reconstructing American Education. By MICHAEL B. KATZ. (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1987. viii, 212p. Index. \$22.50.)

It would be a mistake to read this book as the latest riposte in the ongoing debate over revisionist educational historiography. Readers will be tempted to do so, since here Katz has offered us the most forceful and detailed revisionist critique of his critics. He has carefully explicated the fundamental theoretical principles behind much of his own recent reviews and essays: schooling cannot relieve society of its basic problems with crime, poverty, inequality, racism, or gender biases. Reforms that focus on "affective" pedagogy, curriculum rearrangements, and organizational efficiency are band-aids. The putative "objective" authority of statistics has simply distracted Americans from the real issue. Real schooling is a product of specific organizational contexts and time-bound social structures. The central question of schooling—who controls education—must be addressed as a clash of social-class interests, that is, a no-holds-barred engagement between one group that wishes to impose its values and behavioral codes upon another at a given point in time. Since 1967 Katz has represented the most sophisticated and compelling version of "revisionism" in American educational history.

Reconstructing American Education is not simply a defense of Katz's views. He does engage with evidence and verve his critics, laying bare the limits and inadequacies of their arguments, but, most importantly, he further clarifies the implications of his own theoretical stance. Indeed, in a way one might read these essays—several of which have been published before in other forms—as a reconstruction of Katz's own intellectual hegira since 1967. Chapter 3 contains the principal historical essay, an analysis of the

emergence of an early educational bureaucracy: Boston, 1850-1880. How did formal bureaucracies arise to impose their rigid formalism upon teacher-parent relations, to minimize highly individualistic teaching and learning styles, and to mechanize schooling and impede its adaptation to local needs? Katz has now refined his earlier indictment of elite interests and conspiratorial purpose. His own carefully orchestrated evidence plus powerful contextual forces (Chapter 1) have documented multiple causal factors, and he has explicitly made "no single cause" a major theoretical corollary. Largely in response to his critics, Katz moved during the 1970s away from intimation of elitist conspiracies and deceptions, though he has kept the role of elites and social-class conflict significant in his historical interpretations. Instead, he began to explore the role of "cultural hegemony," the power of inherited ideologies that bind societies together yet also hinder them in the generation of social alternatives. It has always been, in other words, difficult to critique and transcend one's own tradition. At times people embrace values that do not advance their own legitimate interests. The rise of bureaucracy, for Katz, had become a major case in point, particularly since people have deferred to bureaucratic solutions so uncritically since the end of the nineteenth century. Self-styled reformers and professional experts continue to invest themselves in superficial changes and in flawed bureaucratic alternatives. Why?

In part, Katz argues the abandonment of history and substitution of empiricism has legitimated a false objectivity to social inquiry generally. Without the critical force of historical analysis how can the limits of an ideological hegemony ever be comprehended? Statistical patterns, for example, are treated as authoritative rather than as interpretive constructs in need of further interpretation. (Katz offers several extensive discussions of statistical applications by historians, like Maris Vinovskis; his commentary might serve as a minicourse in the perils of number-crunching.) Even more, his argument runs, invocations of objectivity and neutrality frequently mask self-interested political agendas, a point Katz makes convincingly in criticism of federal reports like *A Nation at Risk* and the anti-revisionist polemics of Diane Ravitch.

In his final essays Katz explores the university as a current, prime expression of modern bureaucracy. His talk here, as elsewhere, is no longer to register the force of capitalism itself as a major conditioner to American institutions. Rather, he grapples with the university as a product of the capitalist marketplace, yet also as a *mélange* of bureaucratic and anti-bureaucratic forces (like tenure). Here Katz reaches the cutting edge of his own pioneering inquiries. He leaves his reader asking, exactly how can the university distance itself sufficiently from its own capitalist inheritance? How can the weak reed of tenure protect or advance reformist alternatives?

If the university or tenure can so serve, how can they escape elitist assumptions of change-from-above? What evidence would document any hegemonic change and who might legitimately control such a shift in education or any other social sphere? Katz's achievement is to make these questions central to an ongoing dialogue.

New York University

PAUL H. MATTINGLY

The Grounding of Modern Feminism. By NANCY F. COTT. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1987. xiii, 372p. Index. \$29.95.)

This book might well have been entitled *The Paradox of Modern Feminism* because it tells the paradoxical history of feminism from the 1910s to the 1930s. In a well-written, richly illustrated, and deeply researched book, Nancy Cott demonstrates that as the foundation of modern American feminism was laid in those early years, so, too, did the fault lines, divisions, and contradictions manifest themselves. She begins at the point that the "woman movement" was reaching its conclusion in the accelerating suffrage effort around 1910 and carries her study into the 1930s when "feminism" seemed to have lost its steam. Indeed, the word *feminism* first came into use in the 1910s, and its appearance marked the end of the *woman movement* and laid the basis of the twentieth-century agenda for women.

The *woman movement* had emphasized the unity of the female sex and suggested that all women had one cause, one movement. Feminism demanded that women be treated as individuals, rather than be stereotyped as women (which implied inferiority). On the other hand, feminism sought to mobilize women *as* women against a collective, common grievance. Yet, feminists paradoxically "sought to end the classification *woman*" (p. 8). They sought to free women from sex-typing and to allow individual choice. "As much as feminism asserts the female individual . . . pure individualism negates feminism because it removes the basis for women's collective understanding or action" (p. 6). The unity that it needed was lost to the individual choices that it demanded.

While Cott probably did not intend it, the content of her book provides two meanings to the book's title. She argued that the foundation, the *grounding* of twentieth-century feminism, was laid down in the early twentieth century. But then she shows how feminism "went aground," as if it hit a sandbar and was stranded in shallow water in the 1920s. Much of the history of feminism in the 1920s is the story of women working at cross purposes, bashing each other, cancelling out each other. The context of the 1920s was antagonistic to the feminist ideology. Cott shows that many of

the trends in mass marketing, professionalization, science, and so forth created conditions that weakened a feminist sense of solidarity. For example, the rise of professionalism and the scientific mentality both undercut feminism as an ideology. One's loyalty was to the profession itself or to the ideals of science, not to gender loyalty. One was encouraged to think of herself as a lawyer or physician, not a woman lawyer or woman doctor. Science preached an "objective" standard, not sex-based criteria. The more that women succeeded in these areas, the more they were drawn away from feminism.

Cott gives a thorough and fair treatment of the division over the Equal Rights Amendment (indeed, ERA epitomized the divisive trends in the 1920s). One of Cott's most interesting and paradoxical chapters tells how modern psychology, science, home economics, and advertising took over the feminist concept of individual choice and put it to work to reinforce the traditional role and place of women—in the home, marriage, and motherhood. In another chapter Cott shows how women faced the question of how to have both a career and marriage, but in the course of the 1920s the debate actually weakened the argument for working married women.

Some historians have argued that feminism died in the 1920s and have pointed to the lack of carry-over from suffrage organizations and the decline of reformist groups such as the Women's Trade Union League and the National Consumers' League. This is a misreading of women's efforts and interests, and Cott argues that one must look at the multiplicity of women's organizations in the 1920s. More women's organizations than ever existed. Women did not care less; they simply marshalled their efforts in other places. Instead of joining the League of Women Voters or the National Woman's Party, they joined the PTA, YWCA, peace organizations, business and professional clubs, and new patriotic groups. These new coalitions were more diversified and differentiated in their purposes than the suffrage organizations had been.

Cott's argument and coverage are subtle and extensive. I found myself underlining and underlining, making exclamation marks and stars in the margins as I was struck by the superb quality of the work. When I finished the book, I could only say, "I wish I had written this."

Rhode Island College

J. STANLEY LEMONS

From Front Porch to Back Seat: Courtship in Twentieth-Century America. By BETH L. BAILEY. (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988. x, 181p. Illustrations, index. \$18.95.)

Having documented the conventions of gender interaction in the nineteenth century, social historians are now beginning to perform a similar task

for the twentieth century, an age of rapid technological change punctuated by the insecurities of periodic war, depression, and postwar malaise. In her engrossing study of pre-marital courtship patterns in the years from 1920 to 1960, Beth L. Bailey focuses on the conservatising impact both of social insecurity and of the new mentality of a business, consumption-oriented society.

The story of the actual changes in courtship behavior is relatively simple. In the main, the conduct of courtship moved from the interior space of the young woman's home to the public space of theater or dance hall or amusement park; from the "front porch" of that home to the "back seat" of the auto used for transportation. But the story of the causes and the meaning of those changes is complex. With the transition came, first, the intrusion of money and the business ethic of competition and of consumption into what seemed to be a private relationship. Concomitantly, there was an increasing emphasis on a conservative definition of gender roles. Those of us who came to maturity in the 1950s remember the conventions well: that dates meant the spending of money; that young men always did the inviting, opened the car doors, and paid for the entertainment; that young women enforced rigid mores regarding sexuality. What Bailey convincingly demonstrates is the extreme extent to which commodification and gender rigidity came to define adolescent heterosexual interactions. The expectation of expensive dates turned into the expectation of expensive diamond engagement rings and pre-nuptial "showers" of consumer goods. At the same time displays of female assertiveness were forbidden, except in controlling sexual expression. Males were defined in terms of sexuality, while the double standard under which women were defined as either "good" or "bad" placed heavy burdens on them in support of the patriarchal family and society.

In many ways this book is a model historical monograph. Bailey uses her reading of high school and college newspapers and yearbooks, of magazine advertisements and general media sources to elucidate significant questions regarding generational conflict, sexual attitudes, the conservative contributions of supposedly "neutral" marriage experts, and the nature of the family in recent times. But this is a brief book, and it would have profited by greater length. Oral interviews with individuals and groups still living about their experiences during this period would have provided a greater sense of how mores operated in distinct situations. More attention to standards of personal appearance would have given a more precise gauge of just how far conformity went. (Indeed, American individualism has always produced cranks and non-conformists, but such individuals are absent from this book.) Finally, some attention to anthropological literature on the subject of courtship would have even more fully highlighted the distinctive (and in many

ways bizarre) courtship practices of these mid-century years, practices to which in fact we may be returning as cultural conservatism resurfaces.

University of Southern California

LOIS W. BANNER

Wilson and His Peacemakers: American Diplomacy at the Paris Peace Conference, 1919. By ARTHUR WALWORTH. (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1986. xiii, 618p. Appendix, bibliography, index, maps. \$35.00.)

By Arthur Walworth's own account, he spent some twenty-five years gathering the material for this book. Along the way he published three other books on Wilson and/or the American role in the international arena: *Woodrow Wilson: American Prophet*; *Woodrow Wilson: World Prophet*; and *America's Moment: 1918*. The preparation shows. *Wilson and His Peacemakers* is probably as careful and thorough, as judicious and balanced, an account of the American role at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 as can be constructed.

We are all (scholars and interested general public alike) enormously in his debt, the more so as Walworth places 1919 in a much larger historical context and highlights problems which have regularly vexed American diplomacy and so often caused our performance to fall far short of our expectations. Walworth begins his work with *The Oxford English Dictionary* definition of diplomacy—namely, “the management of international relations by negotiation”—and one of his central themes is that Wilson and most of his peacemakers (Colonel House frequently excepted) had grave shortcomings in precisely this area. The author is repeatedly forced to the conclusion that Wilson and his peacemakers often did not have their priorities straight and frequently pursued policies that were neither consistent nor precise. In short, they often didn't know what they wanted and, even when they did, they had difficulty in conveying their thoughts to their European counterparts in any understandable fashion. And this problem was only exacerbated by other failings. Wilson never imposed any order or organization on the American delegation and generally held himself aloof from and inaccessible to his advisors. Moreover, all too many of the American participants saw the Peace Conference in the same manner as did Ray Stannard Baker—namely, as a moral struggle of the New World against the Old. Neither intellectually, philosophically, nor bureaucratically were the Americans prepared to conduct diplomacy in the true sense of the word.

Another and even more encompassing theme runs throughout the book. Harking back to de Tocqueville, Walworth stresses the point that “for the first time in the long history of Europe, democratic governments were to

bear the responsibility for re-establishing the Continent's international structure and of ordering its affairs" and that democracy not only made embarrassing demands on diplomacy but frequently overrode its requirements. The hatred toward the defeated enemy which prevailed among the public in all the Western democracies made a rational peace unlikely at best. And at almost every crucial juncture considerations of domestic politics tended to prevail. All of the principals, Wilson included, opted all too often for the role of politician over that of statesman. The pressure, the temptation to pander, frequently proved too great to withstand. While that is perhaps understandable in human terms, "history does not," as George Kennan once so trenchantly wrote, "forgive us our national mistakes because they are explicable in terms of our domestic politics."

The book has further virtues. For the first time the other members of the American delegation are fleshed out and brought to life (particularly interesting are the views of and the role played by Tasker Bliss), with the result that we see even more clearly that there was precious little agreement among the American delegation with respect to either objects or to requisite strategies. In addition, Walworth does a better job than most historians have done in analyzing the problems inherent in constructing a viable security organization and in pointing out the likely practical consequences of the League's constitutional peculiarities.

If the book has any major fault it is only that Walworth in straining to understand and to be fair to Wilson occasionally falls under his spell and seems to accept, if only momentarily, two of the major tenets of Wilsonian mythology—namely, that aggression can be stopped by words and that the United States really played an objective, disinterested role at the peace conference. But those are small things when we remember what a long shadow Wilson has cast over the whole American approach to the conduct of foreign policy.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign WILLIAM C. WIDENOR

Cloak and Gown: Scholars in the Secret War, 1939-1961. By ROBIN W. WINKS. (New York: William Morrow & Company, 1987. 607p. Bibliography, index. \$22.95.)

Robin W. Winks, Townsend Professor of History at Yale University and former member of the diplomatic service, has produced a rich and wide-ranging book that tells of the role—and what an intimate and vital role it was—of the Ivy League universities in the origins of the U.S. intelligence services. The primary focus is on the Office of Strategic Services (OSS),

the World War II parent of what grew into the Central Intelligence Agency, but the narrative develops certain major strands of the story down to the present day.

The contributions of Yale to the foundation and growth of the American intelligence community fascinate Winks, and understandably so. Yale men abound in these pages, from Nathan Hale (whose statue adorns the precincts of CIA headquarters at Langley, Virginia), to Lt. Col. Peter Downey, first American officer to be killed in Vietnam; a list of their names would include many of the most distinguished scholars in the world. Winks believes that, until recently, more graduates entered American intelligence services from Yale than from any other school of comparable size.

The urgencies of World War II and the emerging menace of the Cold War enabled the OSS and its successors to call on the services of the country's most distinguished historians, political scientists, economists, anthropologists, and so on. In the Pacific, for one example, U.S. Naval strategists found themselves confronted with the task of preparing defenses for islands whose names would soon achieve world fame, but about which they had at the time practically no information. They turned to the professors, mostly from the Ivy League and many from Yale, and were not disappointed. In many ways, the wartime OSS was like a university, a haven for "the idiosyncratic individual with odd curiosity, distinctive knowledge, the freewheeling thinker"; even today, the precincts of CIA headquarters are called "the campus."

Several lengthy, illuminating, and not unsympathetic portraits of outstanding American intelligence figures (most notably, perhaps, the brilliant, tragic James J. Angleton) provide insight into the foreign policies of the Truman and Eisenhower eras. But Winks also effectively studs his narrative with memorable nuggets, such as the story of how five Yale scholars, in the summer of 1951, using only open sources, prepared a description of American defense capabilities whose accuracy shocked CIA Director Walter Bedell Smith and scandalized President Truman.

Winks seeks to explain, without complete success, why the intimate bonds between the Ivy League and the intelligence community became unravelled. Perhaps the tensions generated by a democracy trying to engage in global intelligence activities in a world of apparently increasing moral ambiguities made such a denouement inevitable, but Winks suggests as well that in the post-Vietnam world, intelligence work is less attractive to talented young men who do not have to face the alternative of active military service, as many did in the exciting days of the OSS. At any rate, Winks believes that the Ivy League has lost its predominance in the intelligence services to West Point, the University of Southern California, and several Catholic institutions. And he offers the piquant observation that Ivy schools, having

"democratised" their recruitment, were no longer so clearly the strongholds of the "well-connected."

The increasing estrangement between large segments of the academic world and American intelligence has been expensive for both sides. Southeast Asian studies are "dead" in American universities, according to Winks, because federal funding for these programs was cut off in the face of bitter antagonism toward American foreign policy generated by scholars who had for years been receiving generous support from the federal government.

In summary, this engagingly written volume about a neglected but fascinating subject, full of remarkable characters, wise asides, and provocative judgments, should be intriguing reading for a wide academic audience.

St. Joseph's University

ANTHONY JAMES JOES

Tippecanoe and Trinkets Too: The Material Culture of American Presidential Campaigns, 1828-1984. By ROGER A. FISCHER. (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988. x, 322p. Illustrations, sources, index. \$34.95.)

Roger Fischer's *Tippecanoe and Trinkets Too* is both welcome and disappointing: welcome because it provides illustrations of a large corpus of presidential campaign material held by American museums and collectors, and disappointing because it does not get much beyond a descriptive recording of the pieces discussed, nor much beyond a conventional academic interpretation of the campaigns considered. Fischer's preface notes that his volume was "motivated by a desire to assist two disparate groups: the curators, antiquarians, and collectors who gather and preserve the physical relics of past American presidential campaigns and the academic historians who create the scholarly interpretations of those quadrennial contests" (p. vii). The first group, he notes, "often appear to be at best only dimly aware of the historical context . . . of the objects they treasure." "Political historians, on the other hand, have traditionally limited their scholarly inquiries to the recorded verbiage of this or that election." Fischer's aim is to aid both groups in broadening their vision in relation to this important and neglected class of materials.

Unfortunately, Fischer does not entirely succeed in his object. His account of presidential campaign memorabilia is organized by eras: 1824-40, 1840-54, 1856-72, 1876-92, 1896-1916, 1920-48, 1952-72, and 1974-84. Each chapter is profusely illustrated, usually with materials from the Division of Political History of the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of American History (a division of which I was curator in the late 1950s and

early 1960s), particularly for the early materials, or from private collections, particularly of members of the American Political Items Collectors. Citations are to a narrow range of literature, mainly collector-oriented, and very few references to the broader secondary literature in political history, to primary sources of letters scattered in archives around the country, or to the newspapers of the periods covered. Often materials referred to in the text—such as the “rather risque little metal pigs with pictures of Cleveland, Harrison, Winfield Scott Hancock, and other luminaries visible through the anus” (p. 113)—are not linked in the illustrations or footnotes to specific collections.

Pure speculation often serves in lieu of hard evidence. Examples include Fischer’s assertion that certain ribbons supporting the candidacy of John C. Frémont in 1856 “were unquestionably put to effective use in the slaveholding states and those regions of the lower North settled primarily by southerners” (p. 79). Or when Fischer concludes that “A generation riddled with doubts over the ability of this nominee or that one to provide able leadership would have provided a poor market for Garfield and Hancock cologne bottles, Cleveland and Blaine checkers sets, and Harrison high hat toothpick holders” (p. 121). Or that “Victorian relics suggest a political grass-roots untainted by cynicism or apathy” (p. 121).

Fischer appropriately “essentially ignored the vast quantities of artifacts inspired by presidential victory celebrations, inaugurations, pilgrimages, and deaths, as well as the host of postcampaign items reflecting upon winners in office or losers in exile” (pp. viii-ix), although a number of such items, which are often hard to distinguish from the campaign materials, may have slipped in.

Fischer’s conclusion is weak and defensive. He asserts that “it cannot be stated with any degree of certainty that the outcome of any American presidential election has been determined by its material culture” (p. 303). Because he focuses so exclusively on the objects and not the ideas or symbols conveyed by the objects, this is not a surprising conclusion. Nor is his constant use of the word “trinkets” (as in the title), “the art of trinketry” (p. 67), or comments that one party “continued to be generally out-trinketed” (p. 110) liable to elevate the significance of “material culture,” which he calls “a pretentious phrase born of convenience and the desire for academic respectability” (p. ix), to the level of serious scholarly attention.

In sum, Fischer has performed a useful function, but one that might better have been incorporated in a form closer to a museum catalog rather than a general survey of presidential campaign memorabilia with a text that will neither attract many academic scholars nor redirect the energies of museum curators. In sum, an opportunity has been missed.

The Good Ruler: From Herbert Hoover to Richard Nixon. By BRUCE KUKLICK.
(New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1988. xi, 202p. Illustrations, essay on sources and methods, index. \$17.95.)

The author contends that "From the Depression to Watergate, leadership succeeded with the citizenry when it evoked a positive emotional response; it failed when that response was negative" (p. 169). Hence the impressive presidents were Franklin D. Roosevelt, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy; the others were failures. Kuklick believes that scholars have wasted their time, and that of their readers, by making so-called objective appraisals. They can hardly prove that whatever their favorite presidents did, or their unfavorables, the result followed. Moreover, many of them attempt to look at what might have happened.

The author comes close to saying that everything in American politics must be drama, and if not illusion then a persistent effort to convince largely through the emotions or some sort of subjective enterprise. The leader who senses the popular need and caters to its apparent solution, Kuklick sometimes seems to be saying, acquires historic greatness. One could argue, too, that occasional judgments are unfair or at last unprovable. At one place the author says flat out that President Roosevelt had a mistress; on that issue judgment surely is premature—no one has proved it, even though one of the president's long-time woman friends was present that sad afternoon at Warm Springs when FDR suffered a massive stroke and died. The drawing of President Harry S Truman seems likewise unfair, as Truman had a way of writing down his casual thoughts as well as sober reflections. Because his private secretary, Rose A. Conway, saved everything, we now have everything. It is easy to mix half thoughts and careful conclusions. Historians, one might argue, must also have mad moments. For the most part they do not appear in print. On a more important level of analysis, rather than personalities, it does seem that Kuklick hardly gives Truman his due for a series of international moves that changed American foreign policy from abstention to participation.

But any book that in short compass and with one sharp generalization after another examines American politics from 1929 to 1974 and shows how ephemeral were the actions of presidents during the last half-century, how fragile the judgments of many historians who have written about them—such a book is nothing less than a triumph. If the author overstates a bit, this is of no moment, and even an assistance, for the reader has no problem seeing the point. The book sparkles with such remarks as "the public response did not derive from its intellectual understanding of policies but from the provocation of its feelings" (p. 171), or "politics in this period is to be preeminently understood as an on-going communal emotional

experience" (p. 177). The volume's first chapter is a fable, really a spoof, of how American political history might have gone in far different directions. It is so plausible (and American college and university undergraduates so gullible) that readers who are teachers may wish to lecture some of these pages, to see how many students take notes.

What, then, have been the guiding forces of our time? Kuklick points out that the massive enlargement of the federal government since the era of President Herbert Hoover may not have brought leadership so much as response, not so much solution as illusion. Readers will choose other forces, perhaps, as more important than politics in our lives. One might advance the enormous rise in the American standard of living, the increasing internationalization of production and consumption, the rise in armaments around the world, and—here again is Kuklick's theme—the continuing irrationality of so much that people do.

Indiana University

ROBERT H. FERRELL

Joseph Wharton: Quaker Industrial Pioneer. By W. ROSS YATES. (Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 1987. 413p. Illustrations, appendix, bibliography, index. \$49.50.)

W. Ross Yates's *Joseph Wharton* is a monumental work about a veritable titan. Wharton contributed to the nineteenth-century age of industrial entrepreneurship by major contributions in metallic technology, industrial and managerial finance, conservationism of the New Jersey woodlands, and, surprisingly, educational philanthropy and vision in providing the University of Pennsylvania with the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce and by giving major support to Swarthmore College in its difficult early years.

Wharton's influence and industrial foresight helped create the engines of industry which contributed to making the United States the industrial giant of the nineteenth century. He pioneered in new processes in the iron and steel industry, and his adaptation of the Bessemer process revolutionized the growing U.S. steel industry. Under Joseph Wharton's leadership, the Bethlehem Iron Company began to turn out Bessemer steel, and supplied thousands of tons of steel rails for the fast developing U.S. railroad system. After Wharton made a major impact on the nineteenth-century growth of the steel and railroad industries, he began to foster research in nickel, subsequently buying a nickel mine in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and almost single-handedly bringing about the coining of the "nickel." He was also the first to make pure malleable nickel on a commercial scale.

Joseph Wharton was the consummate entrepreneur during his vital middle

age, turning from his scientific talents to integrating business organizations and financial combinations, generally in conjunction with other famous financiers and industrialists, among them Andrew Carnegie, J.P. Morgan, Charles M. Schwab, A.J. Drexel, Cornelius Vanderbilt, and John D. Rockefeller. Wharton's work with iron, steel, and nickel led him to the railroad industry. He also entered the gold mining business, which entailed owning gold mines in southern Nevada and dredging operations in Idaho. He integrated all these ventures by heavy investments in the Lehigh, the Reading, the San Antonio and Arkansas Pass, and the Oregon Pacific railroads.

Aside from his financial and managerial genius, Wharton's Quaker background and the Protestant ethic which he followed made him respond to overtures for funding higher education. Wharton's Bethlehem Iron Company, which grew to be the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, was instrumental in founding an institution of "practical" higher education that came to be Lehigh University. But Wharton's two major ventures in higher education involved Swarthmore College and the University of Pennsylvania. He helped finance the Quaker Swarthmore College from its infancy (1864) to an adult stage without ever determining what should be taught or who should teach. His involvement with the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania was quite different. While his gifts to Swarthmore were as substantial as his contributions to the program at the University of Pennsylvania which was to bear his name, his attitude towards Swarthmore and Pennsylvania expressed two different sorts of dependency. Swarthmore College would have survived without Joseph Wharton, but the Wharton School would never have existed without him. He became very demanding in his attitude towards the college which was to bear his name, while his attitude to Swarthmore was more liberal and *laissez-faire*.

Wharton was dissatisfied with apprenticeship training. He insisted that students have both a knowledge of the classics and an awareness of "society," business law, advanced techniques of banking and bookkeeping, and related skills. In his proposal for the new Wharton School, he said, "There should be a dean and professors narrowly specialized in accounting, money and currency, taxation, industry, commerce, transportation and mercantile law." Wharton spelled out what a dean should do: "that professors were not to use the lecture method; that students should engage in athletics; that they should write a thesis as a requirement for graduation." His was an elitist plan—unlike his adherence to democratic curriculum planning at Swarthmore College. Wharton's plan was laid out to the University of Pennsylvania's trustees in 1880. He contributed \$100,000 in the form of securities, and throughout the remainder of his life made additional gifts. He reserved the right to revoke the gift if the school departed from the agreed scheme—

a right he threatened to invoke on several occasions. As the school matured and departed from Wharton's demands, he withdrew support, finally cancelling a \$500,000 bequest he had intended for the school.

Yates presents Wharton's life in fascinating detail. His challenging biography should find a large readership among students of industry, finance, and education.

*Wharton School,
University of Pennsylvania*

EDWARD B. SHILS

"To the Best of My Ability": The Presidency and the Constitution. By DONALD L. ROBINSON. (New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1987. xvi, 318p. Index. \$22.50.)

Donald Robinson's analysis of the presidency and the Constitution is a substantial contribution to this often controversial subject. His introductory section summarizes some of the most important innovations of executive authority in the post-World War II era and emphasizes the recurring problems confronted by Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, and Reagan who had "repeatedly stumbled" (p. xii) in dealing with twentieth-century issues. Robinson then treats these contemporary problems in the context of the Framers' creation of an executive branch in 1787. These chapters sensitively assess the books read by the Framers, examine the development of state governments from independence to the Philadelphia Convention, and analyze the debates and decisions about the creation of the presidency in Philadelphia in 1787. After tracing the evolution of the presidency, Robinson examines the nature of and the important interrelationships between the tasks and the responsibilities of the office—winning electoral office, choosing and managing an administration, enforcing the laws, and making war. Robinson concludes with specific recommendations to strengthen the presidency in the face of persistent and compelling problems.

In his proposal, Robinson retains the key elements of American constitutionalism—federalism, separation of powers, an independent judiciary, and a bill of rights—but he would modify separation of powers by allowing members of Congress to serve in the president's Cabinet. Most importantly, he provides for dissolution which would trigger new federal elections within any four-year period for president, all House members, and one half of the senators. Since a third Robinson proposal would establish four-year terms for House members and the president and eight-year terms for the senators, the concept of fixed electoral terms would have to be abandoned or Rob-

inson's proposal would create a basic constitutional contradiction. His fourth proposal, for the establishment of a national council of one hundred notables chosen for life by the president with the advice and consent of the Senate, smacks of nineteenth-century Bonapartism by providing review of certain types of legislation and power of temporary suspension of laws pending further congressional considerations. The proposed council would be empowered to elect one of its members as formal chief of state. This chief would issue calls for elections and superintend their conduct, thus contradicting the other Robinson proposal for new federal elections by a presidential proclamation or by joint congressional resolution. The main thrust of Robinson's proposals is a significant strengthening of executive power and a corresponding weakening of legislative authority.

Robinson's remedies, unfortunately, would contribute to the further intensification of the very problems he so ably identifies in the initial chapters of his book. Placing determinative power over his proposed dissolution procedure in the chief executive rather than in the legislature likely would contribute to even greater aggrandizement of power by presidents. This is not very surprising since Robinson's analysis largely ignores major comparative examples of the devastating impact of uncontrolled executive power and influence upon the nations led by charismatic and largely unrestrained executives, such as Louis Napoleon who combined charisma and ineptitude or Adolf Hitler who combined charisma, malevolence, and madness.

Robinson provides an interesting and provocative treatment of the interrelationship of important factors influencing the choice of characteristics of presidents—changes in the role of parties, the emergence of candidate-centered presidential and congressional campaigns, the increasing importance of money—but he largely ignores these factors in the formulations of his constitutional remedies. As a result, he has unwittingly contributed a potential formula for constitutional dictatorship.

University of Southern California

JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions. By WILLIAM R. HUTCHISON. (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987. xii, 227p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$24.95.)

In the past twenty years we have witnessed a resurgence of interest in what has been one of the prevailing themes of American Protestant history since 1800—foreign missionary activity. Initiated shortly after the American Revolution by independent groups of evangelical Christians and largely modeled after British examples, this foreign missionary impulse was early

absorbed into the denominations themselves and became a dominant concern of American Protestantism during the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century. It rode the crest of American nationalism and exceptionalism, and it entered into a demise with its political counterparts in the mid to late twentieth century.

The story is filled with ironies. Devout evangelical women entered the mission field and there exercised a form of ministry that would have been denied them at home, where they were not allowed to serve as ordained ministers. Dedicated missionaries, convinced of the truth of Christianity, reported back to the United States about the varying and vital religious traditions they encountered. These reports both broadened American Christian understandings of the religions of the world and simultaneously raised the question of the exclusive claim of Christian truth and revelation. Perhaps most ironically, the churches created by both Roman Catholic and Protestant missionaries during the last two centuries are now becoming the numerically dominant churches in Christianity. As the numerical strength of Christianity moves from the West to the southern hemisphere and the East, a virtual revolution will have taken place in the two-millenia history of Christianity.

William Hutchison's work is another contribution to the story of this powerful and influential movement in the history of American religion and now the world. Hutchison's theme is the dilemma which American Protestant missionaries confronted in varying degrees from the very beginning. Was the enterprise one of converting the people to the truth of Christianity, or was the enterprise also one of spreading the benefits of American civilization and culture—ambiguous though they may be—to non-Western peoples? The debate over "Christianizing" versus "civilizing" not only dominates the history of American Protestant thought about missions but also the historiography.

The great virtue of Hutchison's work is his recognition of the subtleties and difficulties confronted by the missionaries. From the perspective of the late twentieth century, it is easy to be scornful of the naiveté, if not blindness or obtuseness, of some of the Protestant missionary thinking. Yet Hutchison also demonstrates the keen sensitivity which the missionary thinkers exhibited in grappling with what were and are enduring dilemmas for American Christians confronting other religious traditions and other cultures. Hutchison recognizes that the missionaries themselves often became critical of American culture and particularly its coercive and imperialistic impulses.

When Hutchison writes of "American Protestant Thought," he is describing primarily the so-called mainstream of American religious life—Episcopalians, Congregationalists, northern Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists. This has some validity for the nineteenth century, but even there it neglects the fascinating story of black Protestant missionary activity and the

slowly rising tide of missionary activity by fundamentalist and pentecostal groups in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. By the 1930s the enterprise of American foreign missionary activity had shifted dramatically: the "mainstream" Protestant denominations had lost their dominance to other denominations, such as southern Baptists, and a majority of American Protestant missionary activity was outside any denominational control at all. Hutchison's treatment does better in describing the nineteenth-century developments than these later mutations of the twentieth century.

Both Hutchison and his wife are children of missionaries, and it is to them that this volume is dedicated. If Hutchison's treatment of American Protestant missionary thought seems both nuanced and ambivalent, it may be a tribute to his awareness of the mixed legacy that his family and their churches embodied and bequeathed to the history of Christianity. This is a sensitive and thoughtful essay that will inform the historical understanding of both American religion and society.

Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary

JOHN M. MULDER

Beyond the Laboratory: Scientists as Political Activists in 1930s America. By PETER J. KUZNICK. (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987. x, 363p. Manuscript collections, index. \$29.95.)

It is Kuznick's thesis that "a remarkable transformation occurred in the inner world of scientists" (p. 253) in the 1930s. The scientific community's socially conservative, apolitical ethic of the pre-Depression years gave way, by the end of 1937, to a politicized worldview that was characterized by social concern and an aura of radicalism. This change, Kuznick contends, was "more profound than that experienced by any other sector of the American population" (p. 253).

Kuznick fills a void by studying the ideas of an important but neglected group between the two world wars. Earlier studies have documented periods of radicalism in the engineering profession, both in the immediate post-World War I years and in the early years of the Great Depression. In his study of social scientists, Loren Baritz described the prevailing social ethos of social scientists as a willingness to be *Servants of Power*. While the scientific community, at its applied fringe, overlapped with engineers and social scientists, previous studies have hardly touched on the social outlook of laboratory scientists.

One of Kuznick's goals is "to delineate and explicate the process whereby scientists, a basically conservative group . . . underwent a profound transformation in their social and political attitudes" (p. 7). He succeeds quite

well in achieving his objective. The depression, Kuznick argues, challenged both the prestige of science and the scientists' allegiance to business values. Popular criticism of science for creating technological unemployment shook public faith in science, and cutbacks in science funding in industry, academia, and government shook the apathy of scientists. The New Deal's lack of interest in science angered and frustrated the scientific community. For some scientists, especially physiologists and medical researchers, the Soviet Union, a society seemingly committed to using science and rational planning, represented a compelling alternative to the New Deal. To others, Germany demonstrated the dangers of totalitarian governments for science. The radicalism of younger British scientists reinforced a growing social consciousness among American scientists. This change manifested itself in the election of reformers (economist Wesley Clair Mitchell in 1937 and Harvard physiologist Walter Cannon in 1938) to head the Association for the Advancement of American Science (AAAS), and in that organization's aggressive campaigns to generate public interest in science and to encourage scientists to use their methodology to solve social problems. This new mood found one outlet in the fight against fascism. Anthropologist Franz Boas took the lead in forming the scientist-dominated American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, which in 1939 spearheaded an attack on the Nazis' racial theories. An even more radical outlet was the American Association of Scientific Workers, founded in 1938, which hoped to counter problems facing scientists and to work for the reorganization of science and society.

The radicalism of scientists in the late 1930s proved short-lived. By 1940, the three organizations, which had served as the institutional vehicles for scientists' social concern, were on the defensive and declining in membership and influence. Kuznick blames red-baiting for the decline. His own evidence, however, could lead to the conclusion that following the 1939 Nazi-Soviet Pact, communists within the scientific organizations shifted from their anti-fascism of the Common Front to a peace initiative, thus making the organizations vulnerable to attack and splintering them internally. John Dewey, for one, believed this was the case.

While, on the whole, Kuznick succeeds admirably in demonstrating a growing political awareness within the scientific community in the late 1930s, his study is not entirely free of problems. He too easily incorporates social scientists into the scientific community when it suits his needs. He tells us, for example, that the American Anthropological Association and the American Psychological Association endorsed positions attacking racism, but he does not tell us anything about the professional associations of the geneticists and biologists. In fact, there is a total omission of reference to the professional associations of the laboratory scientists.

Kuznick has greater problems in achieving his ambitious stated goal of explaining "why the ultimately hegemonic culture of abundance assumed the form of contemporary consumerism, instead of realizing the liberating potential that much of the scientific community envisioned" (p. 8). In fact, Kuznick fails to show a coherent scientific ideology which offered a "liberating potential" counterposed to consumerism. Rather, the political activism tended to be reactive to Germany's interference with scientific research, to Nazi racist theories, to cutbacks in funding, to concerns about government interference in American science, and to threats to academic freedom. The activists did try to educate the public to the unique needs as well as the contributions of science. At their most progressive moments, activists like *Science* editor James McKeen Cattell and AAAS president Walter Cannon urged scientists to show greater social concern and to assume social responsibility. In the end, however, they never succeeded in offering a convincing explanation of how or to what end—except higher social status. Thus, like the earlier radicalism of engineers, the political activism of scientists was flawed by their failure to develop a vision which defined a unique political role for scientists.

These criticisms notwithstanding, the book will be a welcome addition for anyone interested in the history or philosophy of science.

Ursinus College

WILLIAM E. AKIN

The Dread Disease: Cancer and Modern American Culture. By JAMES T. PATTERSON. (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1987. xiii, 380p. Bibliographic note, index. \$25.95.)

For a full generation now, medical historians have devoted much attention to the relationship between culture and disease and the treatment of disease. Their successes have attracted numerous other historians to try their hands at this aspect of medical history. A very recent convert is political historian James T. Patterson, who has identified an important problem, the relationship of cancer to American culture, and has produced a history of the subject—in part in the absence of appropriate efforts by regular medical historians.

With substantial emphasis on media celebrities, this book appears to be designed for a general public, although there is the usual scholarly apparatus and the publisher is a university press. The work in fact is a monograph about the institutional and popular history of a type of disease, with only a small amount of exploration of cultural ramification. The author has

utilized a vast array of popular presentations, public health and medical publications, some archival collections, and many secondary historical works.

Patterson begins his story with the late nineteenth century and goes right up to the present. He traces the changing image of the disease group from a killer that menaced civilization to the focus of a general "cancerphobia" that emphasized the "insidious and indiscriminate spread of the disease" (p. 232). In recent decades, Patterson points out, changing attitudes toward aging and death, plus the rise to dominance of chronic diseases (as opposed to epidemics of infectious diseases), enhanced the importance of the cancers.

The major part of the text, however, is devoted to the development of an anti-cancer crusade, first by physicians and researchers and then by private groups and legislators, all of whom together formed by the 1940s an alliance to work for funds for research, education, screening, and other preventive work. The result was, first, the transformation of the American Cancer Society into a major money-raising institution and, second, government financing.

Along the way, Patterson points out, medical researchers and the well-informed public shifted from thinking about cancer as a primarily hereditary condition to one instigated by environmental factors. The result was that increasingly hope developed that the disease might be controlled. Moreover, over the years the media played up not only fear but unrealistic expectations every time an advance was announced. When faith in science combined with expectations, in a society increasingly willing to use government to solve problems, the 1971 war against cancer was an inevitable outcome.

Disappointed hopes and the desperation of victims meantime called into existence what Patterson calls (anachronistically) the cancer counterculture—the anti-intellectual elements who patronized and supported quacks and other persons, often dietary and other faddists who allied with propagators of alleged cures.

Historians of medicine will find few surprises in this book (see particularly Stephen P. Strickland, *Politics, Science, and Dread Disease* [1972]). Patterson's views follow closely those of scientist Michael Shimkin, who has published extensively on the history of cancer and his own place in that history. Many scholars will be offended by Patterson's presentist approach to medical science and his deference to experts. Cultural historians will be disappointed that Patterson did not take his analysis further. Was there, for example, some special connection between ideas of cancer and ideas of the self? Could a disease actually threaten civilization? But scholars will appreciate his tracing not only the alliance of experts but their opponents and the many ways in which forlorn hope twisted people's grasps on cultural and personal reality.

And the general public? Patterson has searched widely for a variety of materials about the reaction of various types of Americans to an important

disease group. In 1939, a Gallup poll showed that 76 percent of the people would "hate most to have" cancer of all diseases, and a physician commented, "Many people are afraid to even mention the name. They still endow the condition with an aura of mysticism and hopelessness" (p. 112). Half a century later, cancer, although much better publicized, still frightens people and still has not been defeated by either voluntary contributions or government programs.

Ohio State University

JOHN C. BURNHAM

BUKOWCZYK, <i>And My Children Did Not Know Me A History of the Polish Americans</i> , by Caroline Golab	133
WALLACE, <i>St Clair A Nineteenth Century Coal Town's Experience with a Disaster Prone Industry</i> , by Ronald L Lewis	135
MARKOWITZ & ROSNER, "Slaves of the Depression" <i>Workers' Letters About Life on the Job</i> , by Edwin Gabler	137
KATZ, <i>Reconstructing American Education</i> , by Paul H Mattingly	139
COTT, <i>The Grounding of Modern Feminism</i> , by J Stanley Lemons	141
BAILEY, <i>From Front Porch to Back Seat Courtship in Twentieth Century America</i> , by Lois W Banner	142
WALWORTH, <i>Wilson and His Peacemakers American Diplomacy at the Paris Peace Conference, 1919</i> , by William C Widenor	144
WINKS, <i>Cloak and Gown Scholars in the Secret War, 1939 1961</i> , by Anthony James Joos	145
FISCHER, <i>Tippecanoe and Trinkets Too The Maternal Culture of American Presidential Campaigns, 1828 1984</i> , by Wilcomb E Washburn	147
KUKLICK, <i>The Good Ruler From Herbert Hoover to Richard Nixon</i> , by Robert H Ferrell	149
YATES, <i>Joseph Wharton Quaker Industrial Pioneer</i> , by Edward B Shils	150
ROBINSON, "To the Best of My Ability" <i>The Presidency and the Constitution</i> , by John R Schmidhauser	152
HUTCHISON, <i>Errand to the World American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions</i> , by John M Mulder	153
KUZNICK, <i>Beyond the Laboratory Scientists as Political Activists in 1930s America</i> , by William E Akin	155
PATTERSON, <i>The Dread Disease Cancer and Modern American Culture</i> , by John C Burnham	157

Founded in 1824, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has long been a center of research in Pennsylvania and American history. It has accumulated an important historical collection, chiefly through contributions of family, political, and business manuscripts, as well as letters, diaries, newspapers, magazines, maps, prints, paintings, photographs, and rare books. Additional contributions of such a nature are urgently solicited for preservation by the Society where they may be consulted by scholars.

Membership. There are various classes of membership: individual, \$35.00, family/joint, \$50.00, patron, \$125, contributor, \$250, connoisseurs' circle, \$500, benefactor, \$1,000. Membership benefits include invitations to lectures and exhibit openings, receipt of the newsletter, *The Pennsylvania Correspondent*, and a subscription to *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (individual membership without publications and student memberships are also available). For additional membership information please call the Society, (215) 732-6201.

Hours. The Society is open to the public Wednesday, 1 p.m. to 9 p.m., Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. For exhibition hours please call the above number.

ABOUT BEREAN SAVINGS ASSOCIATION

5228 Chestnut Street · Philadelphia, PA 19139

Berean Savings Association became 100 years old in 1988. The founder, Matthew Anderson, Pastor of Berean Presbyterian Church, in his book *Presbyterianism—Its Relation to the Negro*, describes the events leading to its formation as follows: "One of the first things which greatly surprised us on coming to Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love (?) was the difficulty which colored people experienced in securing desirable homes. That they should occupy only certain districts...in the slums or the most uninviting of the small streets, seemed to have been agreed upon by landlords generally."

Dr. Anderson, together with a group of concerned citizens, decided that a savings organization to assist colored people purchase their homes was the only solution. Their efforts bore fruit when on February 12, 1888, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania granted a charter to the Berean Building and Loan Association. Meetings were held once a month on the fourth Thursday in the basement of Berean Church. Savings (then known as dues) were collected and accumulated until sufficient to lend to the members on mortgages. Officers and directors served without pay. At the end of the first year the total assets were \$4,800. The first mortgage granted was for \$1,000.

Berean grew over the years and helped the "great migration" of Negroes to Philadelphia in the period 1910 to 1920 solve their housing problems. It continued to operate during the Great Depression of the 1930s, and its depositors were always 100 percent secure. No one ever lost a dime at Berean.

In 1941 the association opened its first full-time office at 52nd and Arch Streets and received federal insurance of its deposits. After World War II Berean continued to grow. It offered equal opportunity in housing in the days before federal or state laws prohibited racial discrimination in mortgage lending. In 1975 its assets totaled \$5,000,000 and it needed larger quarters. That year a new office was acquired at 5228 Chestnut. Additional expansion necessitated an administrative annex two doors away in 1985.

Today Berean Savings has assets of over \$33,000,000 with all deposits federally insured to \$100,000. It remains Philadelphia's only minority-managed, federally insured financial institution.

I. Maximilian Martin
President
Berean Savings Association