

tion of the Pacific region of the far west. It will be welcomed by readers interested in the history and geography of the Pacific coast region of the United States.

Department of Social Science
Missouri Southern State College
Joplin, Missouri

ROBERT E. SMITH

Settlement Houses and the Great Depression. By JUDITH ANN TROLANDER. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975. Pp. 216. Preface, introduction, appendix, notes, bibliography, index. \$12.95.)

Settlement houses were founded in the late nineteenth century as agencies of reform. Middle and upper class settlement workers started kindergartens and vocational training programs to supplement inadequate public schooling. English language classes helped Americanize recent immigrants. The houses initiated public recreation programs in poor neighborhoods and encouraged the passage of housing laws. Labor issues such as child labor, working conditions for women, and the right to unionize drew the support of settlements. In most cities, settlement workers actively supported government reform. In summary, according to Judith Trolander, settlements "emerged from the Progressive Era with a strong heritage of social reform" (p. 13).

Something happened to this reform orientation between the Progressive Era and the New Deal, however. By the 1930s, settlement houses were established institutions, providing recreation and some relief for their neighbors, but their response to the Depression was essentially "hollow and irrelevant" (p. 16). Most settlements either opposed or refused to support New Deal programs involving unemployment, relief, and labor relations.

What brought about this dramatic change in social outlook and action? Trolander discusses various explanations that have been offered by other scholars — from the professionalization of social workers to the influence of psychology — but finds that the determining factor was the changing source of settlement house funds. From the 1880s to World War I, the innovativeness and enthusiasm of settlements made them attractive to wealthy philanthropists. By the 1920s, however, budgets had increased tremendously and donations had be-

come hard to find. Most settlements joined with other groups in their cities in Community Chest fund drives. The purpose, of course, was to have one large charity drive, rather than many small ones. The result, however, was to put settlement funding under the control of city-wide welfare federations, usually led by businessmen. This financial control by conservatives is what caused settlement houses to forego reform action in the 1930s.

Trolander's research is impressive; she consulted all the manuscript collections of settlement houses except one. And her argument is persuasive. Only two major cities — New York and Chicago — had settlement houses that maintained independent financing instead of participating in Community Chests; they were also the only settlement houses which continued an activist-reform tradition into the thirties. Boston, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Minneapolis-St. Paul all received their support from the Chest, and all limited themselves to recreational and educational activities during the Depression.

There are some real problems with the study, however. The writing is repetitious. Trolander tends to make her points by giving an example or two, and by assertion rather than by analysis. At various points Trolander suggests some seemingly contradictory interpretations that are resolved only in the preface and introduction, where she makes her own perspective clear. The result of these organizational and literary weaknesses is that the argument of the book is robbed of much of its force and coherence.

The most serious fault, however, is Trolander's failure to put her study into the context of the recent literature on the twentieth-century reform tradition in America. The sources she uses for the history of the Progressive Era and the New Deal are almost exclusively the standard liberal-consensus histories of the 1950s. She seems unaware of the debate about the conservatism of American reform or of questions about the intentions and effects of both Progressives and New Dealers. This would be troubling, but perhaps not fatal, if Trolander were simply writing a history of settlement houses. The subject of the present study, however, is the question of the liberalism or conservatism of settlement houses at various times in American history, judged by their response to liberal reform movements. With such a topic, ignoring the debate is crucial.

The most useful parts of the book are the detailed accounts of settlement house response to specific New Deal programs and the research aids provided in the appendix and bibliography. Trolander in-

cludes a complete listing of all settlement houses in the United States in the 1930s and information on all settlement house manuscript collections.

American Studies Program
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio

LINDA K. KIRBY

School for Soldiers: West Point and the Profession of Arms. By JOSEPH ELLIS and ROBERT MOORE. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974. Pp. ix, 291. Bibliography, index. \$9.95.)

"How does what I am doing impact on the goal of producing people who know how to make guys fight wars?" (p.146). This is the type of question that instructors at West Point are advised to ask themselves as they go about their academic duties. Their task is to produce soldiers not scholars. The United States Military Academy is not an academic institution in the true sense of the word, it is first and foremost a mold of army officers.

Joseph Ellis, assistant professor of history, Mount Holyoke College, and Robert Moore, assistant professor of English, University of Maryland, have written an in-depth study of one of the United States's national institutions. The aim of their book is to show in detail the philosophy and operation of the United States Military Academy today.

This is a book that is thoughtful, scrupulously objective, excellently written and, in places, startling. The authors, both former West Point faculty members, very carefully allow West Point to speak for itself; they interviewed officers and cadets, they studied official academy publications and quote extensively from all. The result is a picture of an aggressively self-confident institution convinced that its system possesses the answers for a contemporary world. The system was developed in the early nineteenth century by Sylvanus Thayer (little known in educational circles outside West Point) and has been but little touched by the monumental changes in American higher education since. The academy, in fact, sees any pressure for change, whether from the public, from Congress, from educators, or from cadets, as outside interference. Over and over again, West Pointers answer critics by saying something like: "I hate to give up on a