

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 year before he had been sent by his abbot to do graduate work under my supervision, to determine whether or not this priest could qualify for doctoral 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. However, I will pray for you. Godspeed."

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 clearance. First and foremost, the city of Pittsburgh at that time had a most unique configuration of power and authority. In my judgment, the reasons for success were: 1) the unflinching stand of the chancellor and his advisors; 2) the most powerful union in Pennsylvania at the time, the United Steelworkers of America, through their representatives and lobbyists in Harrisburg, blocked first a bill of attainder aimed at me and secondly a resolution authorizing a scattergun investigation of the university; 3) powerful representatives of the ecclesiastical community, who in other jurisdictions might have sided with the accusers, in this case stood with me; 4) there were two newspapers in Pittsburgh, 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 recognized a threat to academic freedom; 5) finally, when the affair had gone into its sixth month, three of the most prestigious corporate figures in the city, using connections established during World War II with the highest levels of the intelligence community 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 authorities 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 Reagan's Oliver North both cast a long shadow towards the future. Built into the very fabric of modern society will always be orthodoxies with their passionate defenders, and equally eager subverters of orthodoxies. This indeed is the very pulse of history, the source of not only scientific creativity, but all forms of creativity growing out of the collision and clash of conflicting ideas and opinions. To look at the near future, I would like to borrow from Christopher Marlowe's play, *The Jew of Malta*, the following exchange: "Thou has 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 recognize a political charlatan or an over-zealous bigot, and to despise charlatanism and bigotry. To develop 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

Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press with Oberlin College, 1987. Pp ix, 173. \$18.95

I N 1836, the leaders of young Oberlin College decided to admit women students, making 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 speakers on the general theme of coeducation in the United States. The resulting 11 essays, with Lasser's introduction, are relevant, well-written, interesting and informative. The general reader should be forewarned, however, that the volume's title is deceptively broad, for only the simplest kind of coeducation is under discussion here —namely that at small, select liberal arts colleges. The book omits the more complex forms of internal segregation,

such as the "coordinate colleges for women" at some colleges or the single-sex colleges of home economics at large, especially land grant, universities. Also omitted, beyond some tantalizing mention in the introduction, are the many formerly all-male military academies, Jesuit colleges, Ivy League universities and other institutions that went coed between 1968 and 1983, starting with Wesleyan University.

Disappointingly, the short essays here rarely push the subject beyond what was previously known. Almost all are little more than brief summaries of what the same authors had already — or subsequent to the 1983 meeting — published elsewhere. Moreover, all too frequently we lose Oberlin itself in the general discussion, when ideally the point of the volume is to highlight its significant role.

In a provocative opening essay, sociologist Alice Rossi compares Oberlin's catalog for 1982-83 with those at Amherst College and Smith College. As someone who has written her share of "status of women reports" in years past, Rossi counts the number of men and women on the faculty of each, by rank and date of appointment. She finds, interestingly, that 17 percent of the faculty members at Amherst, coeducational since 1976, were women, compared to Oberlin, proudly coed for nearly 150 years, at just 23 percent, and to Smith, a prominent woman's college since 1875, at only 40 percent. But neither she nor any of the other authors pursue the tale

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

## Why did it not seem 'natural' to hire women faculty?

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 of 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. Bigglestone's superb article, "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

\* One of the few articles to discuss the women faculty at a coordinate college for women and the consequences of the college's dissolution is Joan N. Burstyn's "Educational Experiences for Women at Carnegie-Mellon University, A Brief History," *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* 56 (April 1973), 141-53, which discussed the former Margaret Morrison Carnegie College.

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

Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1989. Pp. 255. Notes, bibliography, index. \$12.95 paper

**K**ATHLEEN 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 Addams, 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-