

to balance privacy with communal areas of human proportions in backyards and public areas providing an arena for a "grassroots democracy," and it seemed to work—for a time. Community activity in the form of clubs and study groups, enterprises like newspapers and cooperative stores, and political action as in the case of a rent strike expressed the apparent success of the ideal.

The authors successfully lead the reader through the maze of actors who carved from the rural landscape a new kind of community. But they do not conclude their work on this relatively optimistic note. The task of dismantling federal ownership in the postwar era became mired in a changed and changing view of federal housing and notions of urban culture and life. The paradigm of interdependent groups within the city could not work in the context of rising individualism in the 1950s and 1960s. The authors discover that the ideal of Greendale "became, then, what the people themselves have wanted—not a utopia, but a town where changes could be carefully planned and where the problems of the city seldom intruded. Indeed, planning was used not so much as a directive for change, but as a restraint" (pp. 100-101).

If planning is, as the authors suggest, a conservative influence, then perhaps the vision of the planners has been fulfilled. This study demonstrates the need for comprehensive examinations of all the greenbelt towns—studies which go beyond the 1950s and question the social impact, as well as the influence on town design, of these experiments in urban engineering.

CAROL JEAN BLUM is currently working on the revision of a three-volume biographical dictionary of the *Women of Ohio* with Andrea Tuttle Kornbluh.

Highlander: No Ordinary School, 1932-1962. By John M. Glen. (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1988. Pp. ix, 309. Illustrations, appendix, notes, bibliographical essay, index. \$30.00.)

A number of "folk schools" were established in the United States during the 1920s and 1930s to encourage agricultural cooperation and the maintenance of "traditional" rural values. The Highlander Folk School was not among these. Although John M. Glen of Ball State University acknowledges this in his text as well as in his subtitle, he seems uncertain about exactly what kind of school Highlander was. As he says, it was indeed "a school on the cutting edge of social change" (p. 5) and "a school actively committed to social and economic justice" (p. 223), but these descriptions do little to aid the reader.

Highlander was first of all, a group of persons—Glen is careful to talk about them as "staff" rather than "faculty"—who used the Highlander Folk School near Monteagle, Tennessee, as their base

of operations to challenge southern conservatism through support for the classic left-liberal causes that flourished in each era. In the 1930s and 1940s staff worked in support of the southern labor movement by joining picket lines, establishing strikers' relief funds, and conducting workshops on collective bargaining, and they sometimes initiated organizing campaigns when union representatives were unavailable or unwilling to do so, most notably in connection with the Textile Workers Organizing Campaign after 1937. In the 1950s and 1960s they worked in support of the southern civil rights movement in its various phases, by participating in voter registration and voter education campaigns and by conducting community development and community leadership workshops. In the 1970s and 1980s they worked in support of the southern phase of the local empowerment movement by participating in "poor people's movement" activities, including the Appalachian Self Education Program, which they initiated, and in movements for community control over local institutions, local resources, and the ecological impact of resource utilization, most notably through a series of research projects directed by John Gaventa and published in part as *Who Owns Appalachia* (1983).

Second, Highlander was a place—a safe haven for liberal ideas, liberal causes, liberal activities in a generally unsympathetic South. During the 1940s and early 1950s, Highlander provided the locus for CIO-sponsored seminars attended by leaders of local unions, where blacks and whites met together in an integrated setting. In the 1950s and 1960s Highlander was made available for discussion of school desegregation in the South, before and after *Brown v. Board of Education*, and then for planning sessions on a variety of civil rights activities, including voter registration and the impact of the "student" movement which yielded the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee. A photograph taken at one of these meetings in 1957 brought national attention to Highlander when the Georgia Commission on Education, and then the John Birch Society, distributed copies of it with the caption, "Martin Luther King at Communist Training School." This same photograph, and the civil rights activism it represented, also yielded intense attacks on Highlander by "law enforcement" agencies and the eventual revocation of its state charter, after which Highlander was reorganized as "The Highlander Research and Education Center" in Knoxville, and later in nearby New Market.

What kind of school, then, was Highlander? *No Ordinary School* is correct but insufficient. Glen provides a carefully researched institutional history enhanced by background information on the principal events and actors in the several movements that Highlander staff supported and biographical information about the staff members themselves. But no attempt is made to place Highlander in the context of the history of social reform in America, much less

to illuminate the emergence of left-liberal activism or of its special southern focus during the 1930s and 1940s. Yet *Highlander*, both as cadre and as venue, surely represents a style of reform activism and a technique of reform organization characteristic of its age. Its history thus cries out to be used to help understand such activism through an analysis of the relationship between program technique and program goals and the relationship of social and political ideology to the definition of program goals and program technique.

Such information will not come readily from the institutional records, but it should not be the reader's obligation to make the first analytical forays in these directions. And it seems unfair to this reader, at least, to tantalize with a richness of opportunity and then serve only the dry bones of fact.

HENRY D. SHAPIRO is professor of history and co-director of the Center for Neighborhood and Community Studies at the University of Cincinnati. A specialist in American intellectual and cultural history, he is the author of *Appalachia on Our Mind* (1978) and of numerous essays on regionalism and the idea of community in the United States.

Labor Leaders in America. Edited by Melvyn Dubofsky and Warren Van Tine (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987. Pp. xvi, 396. Bibliographic notes, illustrations, index. Clothbound, \$34.95; paper bound, \$14.95.)

This fine book is a collection of essays on fifteen major labor leaders whose careers are interwoven with more than a century of American labor history. Although the essays are essentially biographical in structure and content, they locate their subjects firmly in the social and cultural worlds of their times. Together they provide at once a useful reference tool and a personalized history of the development of the labor movement in America.

These well-crafted portraits reflect current interests and themes in the work of labor historians. In the essays on William Sylvis and Rose Schneiderman one sees the interplay between trade union and feminist goals; in the lives of John L. Lewis, Sidney Hillman, Philip Murray, and Walter Reuther the recognition and acceptance of the state as a central player in trade union fortunes; and in the early experiences of such different figures as Samuel Gompers, William D. "Big Bill" Haywood, and A. Philip Randolph encounters with radicalizing ideas that animated their trade union careers in varied ways.

So broad is the sweep of the volume and so diverse the material gathered that it does not permit easy generalization about either the nature of leadership or the development of the labor movement. In their introduction the editors use a fictitious dia-