tries. Since 1916 she has been in continuous contact with these women through her work in the Young Women's Christian Association and the United Nations Educational, Social, and Cultural Organization. Her first book on Moslem women appeared in 1936. The final briefing for her second book took the form of fifteen months of field work in the six countries.

Women have been so much in the background of Eastern history down through the ages that it is not surprising that this study does not include much comparative or factual data. The author does show, however, that a generation ago most Eastern women were illiterate and that their lives ran in much the same way as such women's lives had for countless preceding generations—early marriage, mothers of large families before thirty, secure economic positions in the extended family, social contacts confined to their own sex, and little movement outside the home. Suddenly they have found themselves in a world where their security and seclusion are disappearing. Now they must often earn their livelihood in competition with men, mix with them socially, and bear some responsibility for community, and even world, events. Miss Woodsmall shows that many women have already adjusted to these dramatic changes.

My only criticism of this excellent study is that it is perhaps a little too optimistic, and not realistic enough about the extent to which these new patterns have been adopted by all the women of these countries. Nor does it place enough emphasis on the tensions and frustrations that the new role of women is causing for those who play related roles. As the prestige of the wife rises, that of the husband must go down. What are his feelings of adequacy in this new age? And what has happened to the dignity of the older people now that they no longer command controlling positions, but must play relatively insignificant roles?

However, if one reads this study in the perspective of history, the changes that have taken place in the lives of many Eastern women since the "cake of custom" cracked and they began to emerge from economic, social, and psychological *purdah* are truly remarkable.

AILEEN D. ROSS
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
McGill University
Montreal

SOCIOLOGY

LOREN BARITZ. *The Servants of Power: A History of the Use of Social Science in American Industry.* Pp. xii, 273. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1960. $4.50.

Professor Baritz sets out to study "the social role of the intellectual" and "the social use of specialized knowledge." The effort is guided by this rhetorical question: Does "any intellectual who accepts and approves of his society prostitute his skills"; is he "a traitor to his heritage"? A resounding "yes!" is the message of the entire book—although the target of the indictment remains elusive to the last.

"Because of the dominance of business in the United States," Baritz decided to look at the relation of the intellectual to industry. He is not sure what "intellectual" means, so he assumes that social scientists are intellectuals and concentrates on "industrial social scientists." By "social science" he means "only psychology, sociology, occasionally anthropology, and the new field of human relations." Through a review of the trade press and carefully selected academic writings, an examination of some company records and personal correspondence, and a few conversations with selected business leaders and consultants, the author arrives at a picture of management use of "social science" since 1900.

What emerges is a caricature—of business leaders, of social scientists and their critics, of the nature and history of the social sciences. The author alternates between two extremes. First there is a fantastic exaggeraton of the power and danger of social scientists who, using the dark devices of manipulation, are said to weaken

or break unions, make workers content with their lot, increase efficiency and thereby incorporate profits. These villains have enabled management to "shove its people into line," at first with psychological testing, morale studies, and merit rating, now with "techniques of group pressure"—sociodrama, role-playing, supervisory training and executive development, communications programs, and group conferences (pp. 198, 209). At the same time, such techniques are dismissed as fraudulent and ineffective. Management, we are told, has been taken in by quacks and overzealous peddlers of shoddy "social science," whose programs "were bound to fail" (p. 190). Undecided between these possibilities, the author in the end remains haunted by the specter of "what social science *could do* in the next five, ten, or twenty years."

The method is that of the propagandist and the problem vastly oversimplified. An unfortunate looseness of phrasing and logic prevails throughout. Personnel programs in the 1920's and testing and training today are treated mainly and simply as a response to unionism, and we learn that management has "finally found" in counseling "a most devastating weapon to employ in its continual struggle for power" (p. 116). Doubtless much of personnel administration was designed to thwart unionism, and many an industrial psychologist has been hired to weed out "troublemakers" and to recruit more docile employees. But this is only a part, perhaps the smallest part, of the truth. Baritz ignores the weight of such factors as the changing requirements of technology and task; the administrative complexity of large organizations; the rationalization of rules—including those lodged in collective bargaining agreements; and the need to recruit and maintain a labor supply. Personnel management flourishes most, as Baritz reports, in prosperous firms with large pay rolls and advanced technology at times of manpower shortages—with or without unionism. The reader wonders what use of social science would be acceptable to Baritz. Somehow, industrial social science in Europe does not arouse his ire. Is it because European intellectuals do the same things as ours—but for governments, parties, and labor movements whose policies Baritz favors? Professor Baritz's general formula seems to be: Every intellectual whose research is used by a practitioner whose values I reject has sold out.

The author's polemics reflect both confusion about his object of analysis and a profound misunderstanding of the functions of ideological and technical intelligence in political and industrial life. Throughout, the discussion confuses "personnel work," "counselling," and "industrial relations." Throughout, we slide imperceptibly from one category of traitor to another—from salaried staff experts in industry to independent consultants, or to academics who write on industrial topics, or to "social scientists." Psychologists, he keeps reminding us, disagree. Does he mean to imply that any science, social or not, moves forward with one mind, unified and clear—or that social science is impossible? When he is arguing the manipulation line, social science is not only possible—it has arrived. Then the problem is that the final use of research is determined by management. Is this different from other forms of intelligence? Should Einstein be held morally culpable for Hiroshima? "Psychologists," he complains, "supplied tools and information, not policy" (p. 76). Does he mean that experts, instead of responsible officials, should make policy?

This book represents a missed opportunity. Baritz's ideological blinders led him away from the scores of serious studies of experts and intellectuals—who play the game of advice-giving in wondrously varied ways; from many disciplined discussions of science and the social order; and from the main body of work in sociology and economics on industry and economic institutions, stemming not from Mayo, but from Marx, Durkheim, Weber, Commons, and others. The problems troubling Baritz deserve study; it is a pity that as a social historian he could not have brought to his task the more dispassionate view he seems to recommend for other academic men. Perhaps he could then have seen that some social scientists—even "human relations experts"—are scholars, others are not; some are antidemocratic, others are not; some who serve big business are

relatively objective, others are not; and still others serve—with varying degrees of competence—labor, government, and even their own academic disciplines.

HAROLD L. WILENSKY
University of Michigan

WILLIAM T. HAGAN. *American Indians.* (The Chicago History of American Civilization.) Pp. viii, 190. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961. $6.00.

This book is mistitled; it deals only with the United States Indians, one fiftieth of the total of American Indians. And within the United States, it deals with Governmental-Indian relations, and not anthropologically or sociologically with Indians.

Within its limited scope, the book deals cynically with the Government, and generally with the white man, across the whole reach of time from Colonial years until nearly 1930. Surely, the Government's—and the white man's—record invites cynicism. There has been vast wickedness in that record, and vast dogmatic senselessness; and, recurrently within the record, faithful and wise intentions defeated within the event. The record invites cynicism. And, yet, does the cynical mind ever produce revealing history?

Apart from this bias of cynicism—toward the Indian as well as toward the white man—the book impresses this reviewer as being structurally deficient. It selects from thousands of events a few hundred; and the few hundred events are presented with a jostling hastiness of narrative which leaves even their dramatic values unrevealed. I illustrate through two quotations. One is concerned with Christian missionary attitudes: "A Chinaman on the banks of the Yangtze remained a more romantic and challenging figure than the sullen, syphilitic aborigine squatting in the dust of his allotment." And another deals with Indian leadership: "Captain Jack [of the Modocs] resisted all efforts to convert him before his execution. In vain he offered forty ponies to a divine, who had been assuring him of the existence of Heaven, to replace him on the scaffold which offered a short-cut to this eternal bliss." The quotations are precisely given and are, this reviewer suggests, representative of the book's style and, on the whole, of its selectiveness.

The book's terminal chapter, "The Indian New Deal and After," departs in style from its preceding five chapters. The history of White-Indian relations since 1930 is told in all its complexity, and without cynicism. Broadly, as is accurately but too briefly told in this chapter, the Government's Indian work since 1930 has moved away from forced atomization of the Indian cultures and properties toward the reenfranchisement of the Indians' spirit, life, and economic energies. In this chapter, the author departs from cynicism and permits Government-Indian events to speak for themselves. However, a pallidness of vision persists, and the vision which has moved the National Congress of American Indians in the last decade is not Mr. Hagan's vision. I quote from the last page but one of the book: "The reservation is an anachronism in modern America, but one which should not be destroyed by non-Indian action. When the Indian has been acculturated to the point that he no longer requires this refuge, it will disappear. . . . If cultural enclaves are not feasible, this does not mean that the Indian has nothing to contribute to a composite culture." Interestingly, what it is that the Indian has to contribute is not made plain in Mr. Hagan's book.

JOHN COLLIER, SR.
Professor Emeritus
City College of New York

RUTH GLASS, assisted by HAROLD POLLINS. *London's Newcomers: The West Indian Migrants.* (Centre for Urban Studies, University College, London, Report No. 1.) Pp. xiii, 278. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961. $4.00.

Using a great variety of sources of material, Ruth Glass and Harold Pollins have put together an objective and comprehensive description of the material conditions of the West Indian migrants in London and a survey of the anticolored prejudice and agitation in London and Nottingham. The characteristics of the migrants—by origin, sex, age, occupation, and geographic distribution—are set forth, followed by a description of the problems faced by the