Because of these limitations, I would caution against assigning this book to undergraduates, unless they have a strong background in labour and political history. Even graduate students will need a brief introduction before they jump in. Despite these limitations, Lause once again does a great job of showing the depth of political currents during this period. He demonstrates the link between antebellum land reform ideals and the rise of post-bellum radicalism, and carries the political history of period beyond the constraints of sectional strife.

*Jane Flaherty—Texas A&M University*


In *Reinventing “The People”* Stromquist offers an elegant synthesis of recent work on the Progressive movement and a nuanced analysis of the importance of class for understanding reform. Integrating scholarship in political, urban, women’s, and labour history with insightful archival investigations, Stromquist captures key tensions at the heart of progressivism. Most reformers responded to the dislocations and unrest generated by industrial capitalism with proposals to renew democracy and promote social harmony while minimizing the importance of class. Radical, labour-oriented reformers, however, struggled to maintain a focus on economic inequalities against a middle-class core of activists. The latter worked to empower “the people” even as they excluded recent immigrants and African Americans from full citizenship. Ultimately, violent clashes between labour and capital from 1909 through 1914 and during the immediate postwar period shook Progressives’ faith in prospects for cross-class harmony. Yet Stromquist argues that progressivism left a fundamental legacy to twentieth-century liberalism: a denial that structural class inequalities matter in American society.

Stromquist defines the Progressive movement primarily in terms of ideology and networks. Drawing significantly on republican ideology, early twentieth-century reformers hoped to redefine ‘the people’ in order to exclude corrupting influences such as party bosses and corporate monopolists. A new language of reform, shaped especially by muckraking journalists, stressed social harmony and the need to transcend class differences. Progressives also created networks across diverse communities, which Stromquist perceptively reconstructs. Linking settlement houses, social work conferences, the National Consumers League, the National Child Labour Committee, Women’s Trade Union League, and the Progressive Party of 1912, Stromquist connects reformers who advanced a common vision of civic harmony. Middle-class activists dominated these largely nonpartisan reform networks. At times, women organized along lines of shared feminine identities to bridge class divisions. But Stromquist is also sensitive to assertions of defiance by working-class women, as during the ‘uprising of the 20,000’.
Such popular challenges periodically shifted the context for reform and threatened the authority of middle-class Progressives to define the interests of ‘the people’. Among the strengths of Stromquist’s work is his attention to urban politics as crucial sites for asserting radical reforms animated explicitly by class concerns. In cities like Detroit, Cleveland, Milwaukee, and San Francisco, independent labour or socialist parties often drove reform campaigns for public ownership of utilities. Middle-class Progressives, by contrast, tended to embrace nonpartisan, ‘good government’ reforms that effectively reduced working-class political participation. While Stromquist deserves praise for his insightful comparison of urban campaigns, more work is needed to uncover the extent of local, working-class politics and labour responses to both corporate manipulation of government and bureaucratic, non-partisan Progressive reform.

Compared to organized members of the working class, other social groups lacked a voice within the core Progressive movement. New immigrants and African Americans migrating northward appeared as easy prey for corrupt party bosses in the eyes of many white, middle-class reformers. Consequently, these Progressives tended to circumscribe the boundaries of ‘the people’ along ethnic and racial lines. Some even demonstrated support for immigration restriction and eugenic campaigns in order to reengineer the civic community. Though settlement activists largely opposed restriction, they nonetheless remained suspicious of ethnic employment agents and fraternal organizations.

In his examination of the founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Stromquist does not shrink from identifying the racial limits of Progressives’ commitment to democracy. Cooperation with black leaders like W.E.B. Du Bois proved short-lived as white reformers retreated from addressing the pressing problems of black inequality during the Progressive Party campaign of 1912. White reformers tended to marginalize efforts at interracial cooperation. Stromquist contends that this left to liberal heirs of progressivism the boundary of race as the “new class problem” (164).

More immediately though, reformers confronted a surge in labour conflict. Responding to strikes by steelworkers, garment and textile workers, and miners, Progressives pressed for a federal investigation of class unrest. Here Stromquist considers the competing Progressive agendas which animated reformers on the US Commission on Industrial Relations (USCIR). Chairman Frank Walsh articulated the hopes of radical reformers. He used the commission’s authority to lay bare the autocratic despotism of employers like John D. Rockefeller and to question the integrity of reformers dependent upon corporate philanthropy. In one of the commission’s final reports, Walsh insisted that structural class divisions remained the central problem for America that only the political mobilization of labour and a redistribution of power could remedy. Dissenting from Walsh’s vision, labour economist John Commons refused to concede that class inequalities were endemic. Reconciliation could instead result from scientific inquiry into eco-
nomic conditions, remedial labour legislation, and proper machinery to administer it.

Stromquist insightfully observes that the USCIR was a watershed in the Progressive movement. Though Walsh attempted to keep his vision of class-based progressivism alive through his work on the National War Labour Board, it was Commons’ vision that prevailed in the 1920s. It was thus not just the implications of militarism and expanded state power that divided Progressives during World War I. The postwar strike wave continued to challenge Progressive hopes of transcending class conflict. Worker hopes to define industrial democracy in favourable terms founedered as most reformers embraced the Commons ideal of rationalized labour-management relations. Progressives bequeathed to twentieth-century liberalism a retreat from the structural inequalities of American capitalism.

Reinventing “The People” is a remarkable analysis of the complexities of the Progressive movement through the lens of class. Stromquist ultimately offers a hopeful vision of class-based reform that might have been.

R. Todd Lungen—Metropolitan State College of Denver


In 1954, pioneering African-American historian Rayford Logan dubbed the years around the turn of the twentieth century the ‘nadir’ of African-American history. Abandoned by their European-American former allies in the North, black Southerners suffered the twin defeats of disfranchisement and segregation. Logan, however, was by no means the first African-American intellectual to view these years as a time of acquiescence and accommodation: during the 1920s, Alain Locke and others associated with the Harlem Renaissance proclaimed the emergence of a ‘New Negro’, more assertive than his predecessors in challenging white supremacy. The first historians of the Civil Rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s similarly proceeded upon the assumption that the struggles they chronicled represented a new determination to overthrow Jim Crow.

Logan’s work, which stressed the abandonment of African Americans to white racism, and hence the complicity of the federal government in creation of the South’s totalitarian system, was intended to challenge the then prevailing historiography, which emphasized the wrong headedness of Reconstruction and the virtues of North-South reconciliation. By focusing on white oppression, however, Logan and others left the implication that African Americans should be viewed primarily as victims. Such a portrait has become the target of attack by a recent