

Good Schools: The Seattle Public School System, 1901-1930, by Bryce E. Nelson. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1989. xi, 187 pp. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$20.00 cloth.

REVIEWED BY CARROLL ENGELHARDT, CONCORDIA COLLEGE, MOORHEAD, MINNESOTA

This attractively illustrated and printed volume began as a University of Washington doctoral dissertation. As a solidly researched case study of an urban school system during the Progressive Era and after, it is germane to students of United States public education and is of interest to Iowa historians as well. Superintendent Frank Cooper, who presided over the expansion of the Seattle system from 1901 until his forced retirement in 1922, began his administrative career in LeMars in 1883 and later served in Des Moines until 1899.

Nelson sees Seattle as an outstanding example of a progressive school system. It differed from other cities in that the upper middle-class professionals and businessmen who governed did not use schooling as social control. One wishes for a more extended discussion of why this was the case. Apparently it is because the board concerned itself with economic matters and allowed Cooper to run the schools. Relying on the typology provided by David Tyack in *The One Best System* and (with Elisabeth Hansot) *Managers of Virtue*, Nelson sees Cooper as a "pedagogical progressive" and as a transitional figure between the nineteenth-century superintendents who formed an "aristocracy of character" and the twentieth-century superintendents who were "managers of virtue." Nelson does explain—in terms sensitive to issues of gender and ethnicity—how the elite maintained control through voting requirements and the system of school elections. Yet it is not entirely clear from Nelson's account why a business-minded board accepted Cooper's progressive pedagogy. He states only that their commitment to good schools overrode their concern for higher costs. Therefore they accepted small, attractively designed neighborhood elementary schools and progressive reforms of the curriculum which were similarly desired by socialists, unionists, and feminists. Under Cooper's leadership the course of study became more diverse by including manual training and domestic science, while night schools were established for adults, foreigners, and working youths. In this regard, photographs are well selected to document Nelson's analysis. He might have elaborated more fully on what some pictures suggest about assumed gender roles, however.

Nelson's informative middle chapters on the teaching profession, administration, paternalism, and health contain evidence that contradicts his earlier assertion that Seattle schools were unconcerned about

social control. The female teachers (usually unmarried) in the elementary schools, for example, were tightly regulated. Moreover, schools were paternalistic in their rules about dancing, athletics, attendance, and health. To be sure, these controls were idealistic and egalitarian in their intention to benefit *all* children. They were a form of social control nevertheless.

World War I represents a watershed in Seattle education, according to Nelson. It fostered a breakdown of progressive educational consensus and a shift toward the more conservative 1920s when educators focused on economic and ideological issues. Conservatives learned during the war that schools were vulnerable to pressures from special interest groups. Cooper's courageous attempt to resist patriotic indoctrination alienated him from the board and led to his retirement in 1922. In this shift to conservatism, Nelson correctly identifies a progressive component. Superintendent Thomas Cole, Cooper's replacement, was an "administrative progressive" who promoted efficiency through bureaucratic controls, testing, tracking, guidance counseling, vocational education, junior highs, and larger schools. Unfortunately, Nelson's characterization of this change as pouring the "new wine of efficiency into Cooper's old bottles" (172) obscures more than it clarifies. A more detailed discussion of the degree of change during the 1920s would be helpful. This caveat, however, should not detract from an otherwise useful case study of a Progressive urban system under the leadership of the former Iowa schoolman Frank Cooper.

Taking the University to the People: Seventy-five Years of Cooperative Extension, by Wayne D. Rasmussen. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1989. ix, 300 pp. Illustrations, appendixes, bibliography, index. \$24.95 cloth.

REVIEWED BY KATHERINE JELLISON, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Wayne Rasmussen, former historian for the United States Department of Agriculture, reviews the history of the Cooperative Extension System and briefly outlines its potential role in the twenty-first century. Rasmussen's study of the Extension System relies on a variety of secondary sources to examine the origins, growth, and future of Extension services in rural America.

A product of Progressive Era politics, the Cooperative Extension System was established by the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. Congressman Asbury F. Lever of South Carolina and Senator Hoke Smith of Georgia sought to create a system through which the American peo-

Copyright of Annals of Iowa is the property of State of Iowa, by & through the State Historical Society of Iowa and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.