

investment success and soon earned the title "Little Napoleon of Third Street" (p. 44). His arrogance and greed, however, led to dishonest speculation, which brought charges of embezzlement and larceny. In 1872, along with former Philadelphia treasurer Joseph Marcer, Yerkes was convicted of misuse of public monies and incarcerated in Philadelphia's Eastern State Penitentiary. Ever the survivor, Yerkes shortened his two years and nine months prison term to seven months through manipulative testimonial refutation of former affidavits, and he was soon back in business.

Within the next few years Yerkes experienced failure in a Philadelphia street-railway investment, soured on the Quaker City, divorced his wife, and moved to Chicago. By 1886 he bought the Chicago Northside (horse car) Railroad and soon thereafter also acquired the Chicago West Division Railroad as he moved closer to his new goal of creating a unified Chicago transportation network.

Business historian Franch achieves his purpose by punctuating his subject's commercial exploits with frequent personal tidbits. For example, Yerkes had fifteen lawyers on his staff, became known as a womanizer, abandoned his Quaker religion, and turned to art for meaning in his life. By 1893 he began a relationship with New York City. While still functioning in the Illinois metropolis, the financier bought a Fifth Avenue mansion and a lot in Greenwood Cemetery. He placed a bust of the Roman Emperor Nero in the entrance of that Gotham residence.

Yerkes was one of New York's most powerful men by 1899, but opposition from the press and earlier exposure by the visiting British journalist William Stead turned the streetcar magnate toward London, England. Within two years, running true to form, he formed a holding company there to control the existing but struggling underground lines of that city. Failing health brought him back to America where he died in the Waldorf Astoria Hotel of Bright's disease in 1905. This reviewer recommends the book because of the importance of its subject, the cogency of its argument, and the felicity of the author's expression. There are really no negatives.

*Eastern University*

JOHN A. BAIRD JR.

*We Are a Strong, Articulate Voice: A History of Women at Penn State.* By CAROL SONENKLAR. (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006. xiv, 232 pp. Illustrations, index. \$24.95.)

One can write a separate history of women at Penn State because for most of its history women at Penn State led an existence largely separate from the men. President James Calder introduced coeducation in 1871 when he arrived from coed Hillsdale College and brought two female students with him. Ironically,

women were less separate at the outset than they would be for many succeeding decades. All students lived in the original Old Main (a coed dorm!), and female enrollments soon rose to 30 percent. But Pennsylvania State College developed into an engineering school with limited appeal for women and female enrollment declined so that men typically outnumbered women by about four to one.

When the Ladies' Cottage was built in 1889, it facilitated both residential and social segregation. The daily routines of women students, and especially interactions with males, were tightly controlled. Following a pattern found at many eastern colleges, most male students seemed to resent the very presence of coeds and enforced campus customs that emphasized their subordinate status. The perceived need to maintain a sheltered existence for women long served to restrain enrollments, since their numbers could not exceed the availability of approved housing. Multiple restrictions and prohibitions for women students continued through the 1930s, enforced most zealously by their female administrators. However, partly due to the advocacy of these guardians, facilities and activities for women improved substantially over time. Typical of both the progress and the ongoing separateness, the Mary Beaver White Building for women's athletics, built in 1938, was off limits to all men at all times.

As late as 1960 the dean of women asked parents for written permission stating the number of times their daughters could leave a residence hall. But that decade would witness the unraveling of separate treatment—along with the whole regime of *in loco parentis*. A milestone was passed in 1971 when President Oswald announced that men and women would be admitted on an equal basis. The 1970s thus mark the beginning of full social equality between male and female students at Penn State. Professional equality for female staff and faculty would follow in the next decade with the creation (1981) and subsequent work of the Penn State Commission for Women.

As social history, the participation of women in higher education reflects the social customs and cultural values of an era, while also sometimes registering challenges to those customs and values. Studies of women at other universities have often criticized past practices from the standpoint of present values, as in Charlotte Conable's *Women at Cornell: The Myth of Equal Education* (1977) or Polly Welts Kaufman's *The Search for Equity: Women at Brown University, 1891–1991* (1991).

Carol Sonenklar's *We Are a Strong, Articulate Voice* suffers from no such animus of feminist indignation. She has chosen to write a celebration of her subjects that has nothing unkind to say of anyone. However, her account is also lacking in analysis, statistics, references, or comparison with women at any other university. Instead, she has provided a convenient, readable overview of the female experience at Penn State, replete with pictures and picturesque detail.

*Pennsylvania State University*

ROGER L. GEIGER