Alarmed by the inefficiency of local governments and by continuing high taxes, the new citizens, led by the Milwaukee Municipal League, moved into politics and captured control of city administrations across the state. At the outset of this movement, mugwumps were mugwumps still. However, experience in dealing with traction, water, and electric utility companies soon transformed mugwumps into modern-type progressives. Before 1893, Wisconsin cities had relied on competition to guarantee fair rates and good service by public service corporations. But the depression caused bankruptcy of small companies and their consolidation into powerful monopolies in many Wisconsin cities. In dire financial straits, the new monopolies began to raise rates and reduce services. City governments struck back as best they could, but they were largely helpless because they were wards of the legislature. Hence followed, almost inevitably, the formation in 1897 of a statewide movement for home rule and relief through public ownership or stringent regulation. Interestingly, the early progressive movement in Wisconsin was a movement without Robert M. La Follette. The urban reformers decided to join forces with the La Follette faction of the Republican party in 1897 in order to create a coalition capable of capturing the state not because La Follette himself had been a leader of early progressivism.

This is the bare skeleton of *The New Citizenship*. It is a highly revisionist study. It demonstrates conclusively that the Panic of 1893 was the prime dynamic force in the emergence of a new reform movement in Wisconsin progressivism, as mugwumps changed into modern-type reformers. It reveals, equally clearly, and in contrast to the Mowry, Hays, and Wiebe models, that the Wisconsin movement drew its strength from all classes except the business élite—unionized workers as well as small business men, farmers as well as the urban and middle classes.

The main question, of course, is how far this etiology and model of Wisconsin progressivism is applicable to other states. Only new research can give us an answer. However, we may be certain that all future students of local and state progressivism will come to their work challenged and benefited by this pioneering and seminal work.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY ARTHUR S. LINK

Joseph Fels and the Single-Tax Movement. By Arthur Power Dudden. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1971. xi + 308 pp. Illustrations, notes, and index. $10.00.)

Joseph Fels accumulated a fortune from the family soap business in Philadelphia, and he spent it almost as fast as he made it trying to convince the world that Henry George's theory of land taxation was the answer to all of its social and economic ills. Fels did not become an apostle of Georgism and the single tax until nearly the last decade of his life, but well before then he was intellectu-

ally committed to sweeping land use and land tax reform. While one may agree with Arthur Power Dudden's conclusion that Fels probably achieved very little of lasting importance, the doughty "sawed-off Hebrew" tremendously enjoyed his role as patron of the single-tax movement and other related reforms.

The late Arthur Schlesinger pointed out many years ago that one of the characteristics of reform movements in the United States has been the generous support they have received from people of wealth. In some instances the motives of such persons were never completely clear, but such was not true of Fels. In his most noted and quoted statement of belief and purpose, Fels declared in 1910: "We cannot get rich under present conditions without robbing somebody. I have done it, you are doing it, and I am still doing it; but I propose to spend the damnable money to wipe out the system by which I made it."

Fels' activities and philanthropies were carried out both in the United States and Great Britain where he resided, between frequent voyages across the Atlantic, from 1905 until his death in 1914. During the depression years of the 1890s Fels lent personal encouragement and financial assistance to Hazen Pingree's program for the cultivation of empty city lots by the unemployed. He also contributed generously to the single-tax colony in Fairhope, Alabama, although his meddling in its internal affairs was not always appreciated. Fels later implemented Pingree's vacant lot theory to alleviate the condition of London's unemployed and helped underwrite the establishment of several cooperative land colonies for the same purpose, none of them conspicuously successful. A non-religious Jew, Fels worked closely for a time with Israel Zangwill in the cause of Zionism, though here his purpose was more in setting up a Jewish state based on the principle of the single tax than in founding a refuge for the oppressed. Yet he invariably could be relied on to help those in distress. As an interesting footnote to history, it was Fels who loaned £1,700 to stranded delegates attending the Fifth Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party in London in 1907, among them Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin. The loan ultimately was repaid in 1922 with Trotsky declaring: "Revolution carries out its obligations, although usually not without delay."

In all of his undertakings Fels had the support of his wife Mary, a thoroughly liberated woman of her day. Their home in England attracted many intellectuals and leftist political leaders including Peter Kropotkin, George Lansbury, and Keir Hardy, as well as an assortment of just plain spongers. Mary Fels was a woman of some cultivation, although, one also suspects, of some pretension. Beatrice Webb described Fels as a "decidedly vulgar little Jew with much push, little else on the surface. . . ."

The scholarship behind this book is thoroughly commendable. Dudden has left few if any stones unturned in his search for information on Fels. And yet this study has all of the shortcomings of an unrevised doctoral dissertation: excessive detail, too many long and sometimes pointless quotations, and just

plain trivia. It is regrettable that the editors of the Temple University Press did not resort more to the blue pencil. They could have made this a far better and more readable book.

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS, AMHERST HOWARD H. QUINT

The Passing of the Great West: Selected Papers of George Bird Grinnell. Ed. by John F. Reiger. (New York: Winchester, 1972. 182 pp. Maps, illustrations, notes, selected bibliography, and index. $8.95.)

One of the more important men in the early conservation movement was George Bird Grinnell. As editor of *Forest and Stream*, as an ardent sportsman, and as an ethnologist who knew the Blackfoot and Cheyenne tribes as few white men did, he also established himself as an authority on many facets of the Great West. John F. Reiger has located the great mass of Grinnell's papers and has edited this short volume which carries the man's life down to 1883 (he lived until 1938).

The rationale for this presentation is an unfinished manuscript autobiography. Reiger has chosen to publish these *Memoirs* with additional papers, plus connecting paragraphs and annotations supplied by the editor. We read of Grinnell's youth spent on the Audubon estate, of his experiences out West with Othniel Marsh and with Colonel Custer, of his friendship with scout "Lonesome Charley" Reynolds, and of the decisions in Grinnell's early years which charted the course of his life.

The criticism of this work lies in the paucity of its annotations and in the failure of the editor to place his subject sufficiently in the milieu of the time. Examples of the former are the absence of notes pointing out that Grinnell's descriptions of such events as the Fetterman massacre and Reno's retreat differ in many respects from the accepted versions. A good example of the editor's failure to present Grinnell in the milieu of the time is the lack of any mention of other scientists in the field. Because of the omission of any reference to such men as Cope, Parry, and the survey directors Hayden, Powell, King, and Wheeler the reader is left with the impression that Marsh and Grinnell were alone in the field of scientific exploration of the West. Moreover, Reiger's statement about "the Army's new role as the subsidizer of the more sophisticated, academic approach to Western exploration" (p. 121) is simply incorrect. In the 1870s the army was merely trying to reestablish a prerogative it had lost to civilians during the Civil War.

Nevertheless this book remains a contribution of some value. Anything new about Grinnell is welcome. The illustrations are superb. And it whets our appetites for Reiger's forthcoming biography of Grinnell. It should be a major contribution and a fascinating story, especially if the author will saturate himself with knowledge about the complex West to which Grinnell so ardently devoted his life.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY, TALLAHASSEE RICHARD A. BARTLETT