that I was being, if not shunned, at least left alone. After three or four
days of this, one of the senior
members of a cognate discipline
came to my office and said, “Look,
nobody ever wins anything in a
HUAC hearing. Furthermore this
***** (expletive deleted) place is
full of informers. There is no point
in giving them a bunch of sitting
targets.”

Shortly thereafter, on the
morning of the day that I was to fly
to Washington for the second set
of hearings, a young priest came to
my office. The day before he had
been sent by his abbott to do
graduate work under my supervi-
sion, to determine whether or not
this priest could qualify for doc-
toral work. He studied with me
the performance of the Catholic
historians during the Frankfurt
assembly in Germany in 1848. That
day, in my office, he said, “I wish
I could come to Washington and
testify for you, but I can’t. How-
ever, I will pray for you. God-
speed.”

Considering that most of the
cases described in the Schultz
book ended calamitously for the accused,
the question must arise why the
affair at Pitt ended with my clear-
ance. First and foremost, the city
of Pittsburgh at that time had a
most unique configuration of
power and authority. In my judg-
ment, the reasons for success were:
1) the unflinching stand of the
chancellor and his advisors; 2) the
most powerful union in Pennsyl-
vania at the time, the United Steel-
workers of America, through their
representatives and lobbyists in
Harrisburg, blocked first a bill of
attainder aimed at me and sec-
ondly a resolution authorizing a
scattergun investigation of the
university; 3) powerful repre-
sentatives of the ecclesiastical
community, who in other jurisdictions
might have sided with the accu-
cers, in this case stood with me; 4)
there were two newspapers in Pitts-
burgh, and the more literate one,
the *Post-Gazette*, stood with the

chancellor and with the faculty not
only of Pitt, but of all the other
universities in the city who recog-
nized a threat to academic free-
dom; 5) finally, when the affair
had gone into its sixth month,
three of the most prestigious cor-
porate figures in the city, using
connections established during
World War II with the highest
levels of the intelligence commu-
nity in Washington, as well as the
diplomatic community, decided to
get to the bottom of the business,
to separate fact from fantasy. When
they had concluded their work, they
informed the relevant authori-
ties of what they had discovered,
and then the most eminent among
them went to the most carping of
the media and said in effect, “Back
off and shut up.”

**Retrospect and Prospect**

Questions will arise in the minds
of the readers of the Schultz
book: “Will this sort of thing happen
again?” “Was McCarthyism a one-
time aberration in the stream of
democratic life of the United States
of America?” Unfortunately, my
answer to this is yes, it will happen
again. Nixon’s plumbers and Re-
agan’s Oliver North both cast a
long shadow towards the future.
Built into the very fabric of mod-
ern society will always be ortho-
doxies with their passionate de-
defenders, and equally eager sub-
verters of orthodoxies. This in-
deed is the very pulse of history,
the source of not only scientific
creativity, but all forms of creativ-
ity growing out of the collision
and clash of conflicting ideas and
opinions. To look at the near fu-
ture, I would like to borrow from
Christopher Marlowe’s play, *The
Jew of Malta*, the following ex-
change: “Thou hast committed
fornication.” “Yea, but ’twas
in another land, and the wench is
dead.” I can see a senator from an
oversight committee confronting
an over-zealous member of one of
the police agencies or intelligence
agencies and saying, “Thou hast
committed political repression,”
and the answer, “Yea, but, ’twas
under another president, and the
victims are dead.” If we cannot
stop this sort of thing, perhaps we
can at least reduce to a minimum
the number of innocent victims. I
would like to conclude by making
a modest proposal: we must begin
to bring up our children so that
they have the capacity to recog-
nize a political charlatan or an
over-zealous bigot, and to despise
charlatanism and bigotry. To de-
velop these capacities, we must
instill in our children love and
respect for two perhaps archaic
virtues: honor and valor.

---

**Educating Men and Women Together: Coeducation in a Changing World**

Edited by Carol Lasser


IN 1836, the leaders of young
Oberlin College decided to
admit women students, mak-
ing it the first “coeducational”
college in the nation and in the
world, although the word itself
was not coined until 1874, as
Catharine Simpson points out in
her essay in the book. To celebrate
this popular innovation, historian
Carol Lasser and others at Oberlin
in 1983 assembled a series of speak-
ers on the general theme of co-
education in the United States.
The resulting 11 essays, with Las-
ser’s introduction, are relevant,
well-written, interesting and in-
formative. The general reader
should be forewarned, however,
that the volume’s title is decep-
tively broad, for only the simplest
kind of coeducation is under dis-
cussion here — namely that at
small, select liberal arts colleges.
The book omits the more com-
plex forms of internal segregation,
of why the trustees, so boldly innovative in many ways, stopped there! Was the possibility of a substantial number of women faculty ever discussed? Why did it not seem "natural" to hire women faculty as well? Certainly this is a key issue, for the entire history of coeducation would have been quite different if they had. Nor do we hear in any of these essays about those few women who were eventually hired by Oberlin—not even Mary Sinclair, long in the Mathematics Department (1907-44), and Hope Hibbard, in the Zoology Department even longer (1928-71). Why were they chosen over male competitors? Did their appointments cause controversy, and did the women faculty have any impact?

A substantial essay by Janet Z. Giele compares the alumnae of Oberlin with that of an unspecified "seven sister" woman's college. (It is unfortunate that this institution is unnamed since these colleges are not all alike, particularly in the politically sensitive area of proportion of women faculty.) Giele reaches the conclusion that there was not much measurable or significant socio-economic difference between the two sets of alumnae, and that over the decades the two groups changed in similar ways. One wonders what impact Oberlin's many music graduates might have had on these statistics, but they are mentioned nowhere.

Of the several short essays by historians Linda Kerber, Patricia Palmieri, Lori Ginzberg and Barbara Solomon, the last breaks promising new ground by listing several colleges that were heavily influenced by the Oberlin model, including some still known for their high proportion of working-class (Berea) or black (Wilberforce) students. Yet her piece is too brief to pursue this interesting suggestion. Then, John D'Emilio's essay on the sexual preferences of college students, which talks of gay and lesbian groups on campuses since the late 1960s, does not mention Oberlin at all, leaving the reader to wonder whether Oberlin contributed to the movement in any way.

Finally Margaret Wilkerson's poignant essay on the deplorable fate of blacks and other minorities currently in American higher education misses the chance to remind us of Oberlin's unique contribution to integrated coeducation. It admitted its first blacks as early as 1833, and as every schoolchild used to know, it even had a stop on the underground railroad. But Wilkerson does not even mention Oberlin's own internationally known alumna and clubwoman Mary Church Terrell! For the whole interesting tale of blacks, men and women at Oberlin, one still needs to turn to W. E. B. Du Bois's superb article, "The Oberlin College and the Negro Student, 1865-1940," Journal of Negro History 56 (1971). In fact, with the hindsight of a reviewer, one might have wished that some of the contributors had built more directly on that article, for it makes the essential point more cogently and forcefully than the several essays (except possibly Ginzberg's on the first 15 years) that though Oberlin did not always live up to its high ideals and at times experienced alumni criticism for its backsliding (especially in controversial areas of student life such as housing, eating, dancing, athletics, clubs and prizes), it audaciously attempted more complete coeducation and integration than did any other college of its time.

Oberlin's history is rich, its influence extensive, and yet this
volume honoring both it and coeducation leaves the actual story unclear.

_Margaret W. Rossiter  
Cornell University_

**Ida Tarbell: Portrait of a Muckraker**

By Kathleen Brady  

KATHLEEN Brady’s penetrating biography of Ida Minerva Tarbell portrays an enigmatic figure who lived a life of paradox. According to popular lore, Tarbell’s place in history derives from two sources: the fame she earned as a “muckraker” after her investigation into Standard Oil’s questionable business practices, published in 1902 by _McClure’s Magazine_, led to a government inquiry that resulted in the court-ordered breakup of the monopoly; and the fact that in the process of becoming a powerful and respected public figure, Tarbell challenged the gender convictions of her day. Brady’s meticulous research, however, yields a different story; Brady’s Tarbell appears as a conflicted individual, unable to reconcile her private needs with the demands of her public persona.

Born in 1857 in a northwestern Pennsylvania log cabin, Tarbell grew up in a household of unfulfilled ambitions. Franklin Tarbell, her father, was a small-time independent oil entrepreneur whose financial success was stymied by the Rockefeller family’s eventual dominance over the oil industry. Her mother, Esther Tarbell, “had grown up with the Women’s Rights movement” (page 23) and “churned with the injustice of woman’s lot” (24). Esther had taught school before marriage and apparently reveled in her short-lived independence. According to Brady, Ida’s mother never reconciled the subjugation she felt with the assumption of wifehood and motherhood. Evidently, Esther imparted these strong feelings to her oldest daughter.

A dreamy, shy young woman, Ida had a difficult time finding her niche in life. As a youngster, she was fascinated by nature and briefly contemplated a career in biology. She graduated from Allegheny College in 1880 and taught school for two years before resigning because she considered herself a failure in the classroom. Eventually, she became a writer and then assistant editor for _The Chautauquan_. A conflict with her boss, the Reverend T.L. Flood, led to Tarbell’s departure from the magazine in 1890. Once again, Tarbell considered herself a “failure and a disgrace” (47). “Haunted by Flood’s prediction that she would starve” (47), Tarbell fled to Paris, where she determined to take up a career as a free-lance writer. She flirted with poverty and the bohemian lifestyle before her stories captured the attention of editor and newspaper syndicator, Sam McClure. When she returned to the United States in 1894, Tarbell went to work for him. Her biographies of Napoleon Bonaparte and Abraham Lincoln, serialized in _McClure’s_, brought Tarbell fame and established _McClure’s_ reputation as one of the leading periodicals of the day.

According to Brady, Tarbell was never comfortable with her success, perhaps because she believed that she had paid too high a price for fame. In early twentieth century America, public achievement for women came at the expense of a traditional family life. In a series of articles begun in 1912 on the “Woman’s Question,” the single, childless Tarbell exalted the roles of wife and mother and voiced the opinion that “women lacked the vision necessary to achieve greatness” (202). In a thinly veiled attack on the teachings of her mother, Tarbell decried the “militancy of the 1870s” (201). She suggested that young girls (such as herself) had been duped into believing that marriage was a form of slavery and that a “worth-while life” (24) was attainable by seeking higher education and a profession. Thus, although Tarbell’s life experiences embodied the aspirations of the “New Woman,” she earned the wrath of leading feminists of the day such as Jane Adams, Florence Kelly and Charlotte Perkins-Gilman by publicly rejecting their ideology.

In retrospect, Tarbell’s Standard Oil series may have been the high-water mark of her career as a crusading journalist. (It is interesting to note that Tarbell remained unsure as to her claim to fame and

**Tarbell considered herself a ‘failure and a disgrace.’**

“could never decide if in fact she had been a muckraker, journalist or a historian” [175].) According to Brady’s chronicle, even as the Standard Oil story was unfolding, Tarbell’s involvement in a new venture as co-owner and co-editor of the “kinder, gentler” periodical, _The American Magazine_, seemed to signal her retreat from muckraking. The magazine, Tarbell wrote, “had little muckraking spirit. It did have a large and fighting interest in fair play; it sought to present things as they were, not as somebody thought they should be” (194).

_The American_ aimed to increase its circulation by appealing to readers interested in literary works and pieces on popular culture rather than investigative reporting. Sto-