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 conservativism, 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-

ple could receive "useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics." The Smith-Lever Act provided for a unique system in which the Department of Agriculture and the nation's agricultural colleges would work together to disseminate research-based information to the nation's farm families and thus improve the efficiency of American agricultural production. Extension work was to be carried out largely on the county level and financed jointly by federal, state, and county appropriations. The execution and financing of Extension work, therefore, was truly "cooperative." For the next seventy-five years, through two world wars, depression, and cold war, this cooperative system remained in place, producing volumes of instructional materials and supporting the work of county agents, home demonstrators, and 4-H clubs.

Rasmussen's study provides useful information on the development and adaptation of Extension System programs through the institution's seventy-five-year history. Those interested in the history of Extension work, from agricultural historians to farmers who participate in Extension programs, will find Rasmussen's highly accessible book filled with important facts about events ranging from the congressional debate on the Smith-Lever Bill to the establishment of rural development programs in the 1980s. Rasmussen does a good job of tracking the development of significant Extension projects implemented in individual states as well as the establishment of those programs that were adopted throughout the nation. He also provides valuable appendixes that include the entire text of the original Smith-Lever Act and information on Extension Service administrators and funding sources.

If one is looking for a critical history of the Cooperative Extension System, however, one should look elsewhere. Rasmussen intends his work as a factual account, not an interpretive history, of the first seventy-five years of Cooperative Extension work. For example, Rasmussen merely mentions in passing some of the more controversial aspects of the Extension System's history, such as the American Farm Bureau's influence on Extension policies or the claim that Extension programs primarily benefited relatively prosperous, farmowning families rather than those who existed farther down the rural socioeconomic scale. Although Rasmussen acknowledges the segregated nature of Extension work during its early decades, he does not critically examine the implications of this "separate but equal" policy for the nation's black agricultural colleges and Extension agents and the clients they served. Rasmussen also devotes relatively little attention to the experiences of female agents and farm women in a system that employed and served hundreds of thousands of women. For example, he does not mention Secretary of Agriculture David F. Houston's 1913 survey of farm women, which was instrumental in determining early Extension System policies and establishing priorities that affected farm women and men for at least the next two decades.

As a handy reference book, however, Rasmussen's study remains useful. Read in conjunction with a more interpretive history of the results of rural Progressivism, such as David Danbom's *The Resisted Revolution* (1979), Rasmussen's study could provide the reader with a well-rounded understanding of the Smith-Lever Act's legacy. Read alone, this study provides the reader with the major facts of the Extension System story.

Breadlines Knee-Deep in Wheat: Food Assistance in the Great Depression, by Janet Poppendieck. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1986. xvii, 306 pp. Notes, bibliography, index. \$35.00 cloth.

REVIEWED BY DAVID E. HAMILTON, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

Two of the most vivid images of the Great Depression are often coupled in the popular and the academic mind. One is that of the long, grim lines of the unemployed suffering the indignity of mass charity as they awaited a bowl of soup and a piece of bread. The other is the distress and destitution of hundreds of thousands of farmers and their families suffering from miserably low prices. These images are coupled, of course, because of the irony of the unemployed wanting food and needing clothes while farmers struggled with price-depressing surpluses of wheat and cotton. During the 1930s the notion of a "paradox of want amid plenty" (xi) became a popular idea. For some it confirmed the irrationality of American capitalism. But according to Janet Poppendieck, it also focused public attention on finding ways of resolving the unseemly contradiction of surpluses and hunger. The subject of her book is an analysis of one result of that heightened public attention: the federal government's food-relief programs of the 1930s.

Poppendieck begins her study with two chapters reviewing the farmers' plight on the eve of the depression and the difficulties confronting relief agencies and social workers in the depression's early stages. These are followed by a discussion of the food relief issue under Hoover. It arose when the failure of the Federal Farm Board stabilization program left the board holding massive stocks of wheat and cotton. After nearly two years of debate, Congress approved legislation donating seventy million bushels of wheat and eight hundred

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 listsery without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.