

A Summer to Be: A Memoir by the Daughter of Hamlin Garland, by Isabel Garland Lord, edited by Keith Newlin. Bison Books. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010. 424 pp. Illustrations, notes, index. \$23.95 paper.

Reviewer Marcia Noe is professor of English and director of women's studies at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. She is a senior editor of *The Dictionary of Midwestern Literature* (2001).

Hamlin Garland, Pulitzer Prize-winning author and Wisconsin native, wrote eight volumes of autobiography, in addition to works of realist midwestern fiction, such as *Main-Traveled Roads*, which draws on his childhood on a farm near Osage, Iowa. His elder daughter's memoir complements his own writings and enlarges our understanding of this prolific author, lecturer, and crusader for social justice by illuminating his roles as an overprotective and controlling yet loving and generous husband and father in middle and old age. Isabel writes engagingly of the idyllic childhood and teen years she and her sister experienced as the pampered daughters of a best-selling novelist, but focuses mainly on her early stage career and romantic relationships with and marriages to Hardesty Johnson and Mindret Lord.

Scholars of midwestern history, literature, and culture will value her anecdotes about Chicago Renaissance figures such as her uncle, sculptor Lorado Taft, and novelist Henry Blake Fuller; they will also appreciate her tales of the family's summer sojourns in England, where they socialized with Conrad, Shaw, Galsworthy, and their contemporary cultural luminaries, as an index of Garland's importance in his own time. Keith Newlin's superb introduction and notes contextualize the memoir and make it a valuable addition to Garland scholarship.

Good, Reliable, White Men: Railroad Brotherhoods, 1877–1917, by Paul Michel Taillon. The Working Class in American History Series. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2009. xi, 266 pp. Illustrations, notes, index. \$75.00 cloth, \$25.00 paper.

Reviewer John Williams-Searle is director of the Center for Citizenship, Race, and Ethnicity Studies at the College of St. Rose. He is the author of "Courting Risk: Disability, Masculinity, and Liability on Iowa's Railroads, 1868–1900" (*Annals of Iowa*, 1999).

Most labor historians characterize the Big Four railroad brotherhoods — the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers (BLE), the Order of Railway Conductors (ORC), the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen (BLF), and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen (BRT) — as conservative "bread-and-butter" business unions. Paul Taillon, however, argues that the Big Four played an important role in reorienting the relationship

between labor, capital, and the state at the beginning of the twentieth century, moving workers from an era of labor-management relations governed by the courts to a system of free collective bargaining regulated by federal legislation.

The railroad brotherhoods began in the 1860s as fraternal organizations devoted to advancing the interests of highly skilled white male railroaders. They saw themselves as equal to anyone, particularly the nation's railroad managers. Accused of being "aristocrats of labor," they rejected government interference in the labor-capital relationship and relied on the courts for relief. Labor historians have thus concluded that the Big Four lacked a transformative class consciousness and sacrificed broad worker solidarity across craft lines for an insular vision of middle-class fraternalism. Taillon's work, however, demands that we reexamine the Big Four.

After they experienced the full power of the federal injunction during the 1888 Burlington Strike, the Big Four drastically changed their perspective regarding the federal government's role in the labor-capital relationship. When courts used the Sherman Antitrust Act to rein in labor and left the power of the railroad corporations unchecked, railroaders realized that they could not bargain as equals with railroad managers. Thus, the Big Four demanded a federal system that would protect the rights of workers and acknowledge their importance as independent citizens within the republic. Taillon demonstrates that the Erdman Act (1898) was the brotherhoods' first successful leverage of their political power to force federal intervention on behalf of railway workers.

Taillon's examination of the Big Four's political engagement reveals that railroad brotherhoods were both class conscious and increasingly militant. By 1900, the brotherhoods abandoned their fraternal origins, becoming more politically savvy and increasing their relevance. Brotherhood members maintained that their relationship to capital should be based on working-class activism mediated by the state, rather than collective bargaining based on their status as individual men. This class-conscious new liberalism and the political lobbying that it occasioned led to the passage of important new federal legislation, such as the Newlands Act (1913) and the Adamson Act (1916). The latter established an eight-hour day for railroaders and was characterized as labor's Magna Charta, freeing railway workers from their "railroad lords" (202). Railway workers thus stood at the vanguard of defending workers' rights. Taillon concludes that the Big Four's shift from fraternal unionism to political engagement played a significant, and heretofore unrecognized, role in modern labor-capital-state relations.

Taillon notes that when railroaders pressured the state, the outcome was not always progressive. The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, for example, used state power to help them expel African American brakemen from their ranks through an amendment to the 1934 Railway Labor Act that undermined black union representation (206). Moreover, the Big Four did act for themselves first; changing labor's playing field vis-à-vis the state was not the primary reason that they developed an effective legislative presence. Taillon, however, shows that unintended results can still be critically important.

His main argument is skillfully demonstrated and a significant achievement, but his deft handling of gender in the earlier chapters is not sustained in later chapters. The first third of the book offers important insights about gender and work culture, suggesting that women played an important role in transforming railroaders' ideas about themselves as men. His connection of the domestic world with the shop floor is an exciting development in a historiography relatively devoid of gendered analysis. However, Taillon drops this promising analysis midway through the book, transitioning into a standard narrative institutional history. Taillon suggests that the Big Four's turn to politics necessitated the devaluing of the fraternal manly ideals that had helped to launch the railroad brotherhoods, but I'm not convinced that railroaders suddenly stopped debating the meanings of railroad manhood in 1898 and even less convinced that their wives had nothing to say.

That caveat aside, Taillon has written an impressive and useful history that sweeps aside a long-standing misreading of the origins of twentieth-century unionism. He has produced a book that is indispensable not just for historians of railroad labor, but for labor historians as well as historians of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era and the development of the twentieth-century state.

Making Capitalism Safe: Work Safety and Health Regulation in America, 1880–1940, by Donald W. Rogers. The Working Class in American History Series. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2009. viii, 275 pp. Illustrations, tables, notes, bibliography, index. \$55.00 cloth.

Reviewer James D. Schmidt is professor of history at Northern Illinois University. He is the author of *Free to Work: Labor Law, Emancipation, and Reconstruction, 1815–1880* (1998) and *Industrial Violence and the Legal Origins of Child Labor* (2010).

A growing literature in U.S. history addresses the accident crisis of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, an era when the violence