that public financing of religious education would contravene constitutional principles.

This episode is merely the beginning of a complex story that culminates with several battles running from 1869 to 1876 over the "School Question." To be sure, Green shows how anti-Catholicism played a significant role in these battles, but Green also shows that numerous other factors led to the intertwined evolutions of nonsectarianism and an anti-funding principle. The strength of Green's book lies in the complexity of his nineteenth-century story. An overemphasis on anti-Catholicism skirts too much of the history. For instance, the first judicial case that Green discusses arose in Maine in 1853. A parent of a Catholic-school child argued for stronger separation of church and state; the parent maintained that the nonsectarian public school was, in truth, Protestant. The Maine courts rejected this argument by reasoning that the cultivation of universal Christian values was not equivalent to teaching Protestantism. In this instance, then, Protestants were not the ones advocating for stronger separation of church and state so as to preclude public funding of Catholic schools; rather, a Catholic parent sought to invigorate separation.

Green's argument is weakest when he attempts, in his final chapter, to tie the nineteenth-century developments directly to several seminal Supreme Court establishment-clause decisions from the post–World War II era. Unquestionably, Green demonstrates that many factors contributed to the evolution of public attitudes toward church-state relations in the nineteenth century. And without a doubt, this evolution influenced twentieth-century thinking about the separation of church and state. Yet, Green's evidence showing that the nineteenth-century events significantly influenced later Supreme Court deliberations is flimsy, especially when compared with his richly detailed description of the 1800s. Regardless, Green makes a significant contribution to constitutional scholarship. He not only enlightens the reader regarding the development of church-state relations but also indirectly clarifies constitutional interpretation in general. Although Green never discusses the originalist argument that history can provide an interpretive approach to the Constitution and definitively resolve constitutional issues, his argument undermines this currently popular theory. Green's book illustrates that the reading of history is rarely simple and is unlikely to reveal authoritative and conclusive resolutions.

Stephen M. Feldman
University of Wyoming College of Law

Tracy L. Steffes. *School, Society, and State: A New Education to Govern Modern America, 1890–1940.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 2012. Pp. xi, 284. $40.00.

This important new work provides a sweeping overview of the reasons for implementation of reforms associated with the Progressive-era "new education" and the significance of those reforms for both society and state. Tracy L. Steffes takes various aspects of educational history that have been well covered by other historians and knits them into a cohesive whole by considering their relation to state-building. The end result effectively challenges some long held assumptions about reformers' methods and aims while also making a convincing case for public education as a key component of the American welfare state.

Late nineteenth-century Americans faced with social disruption and conflict were concerned with how to adjust the individual to the new conditions of large-scale industrial capitalism. Rather than socialize risk through the creation of comprehensive social welfare programs (the European model), most preferred to socialize opportunity through universal elementary education and expanded access to high schools. This choice gained considerable public support because it fit well with American individualism, but as the author argues, one of its central flaws was its failure to confront deeper structural sources of inequality. No doubt many youth were able to reap considerable benefits from greater educational opportunities, but they still faced limitations imposed by social and economic forms of discrimination.

Because teachers and counselors were reluctant to encourage career ambitions in female and black students who did not conform to socially acceptable concepts of their economic roles, the introduction of vocational education and guidance counseling at least partly failed to fulfill the goal of making schools more democratic. Similarly, reformers regarded IQ testing as a tool that would allow them to shape instruction to meet students' individual needs, but the tendency to interpret test results as proof of innate potential reinforced existing cultural biases. Educational innovators like John Dewey were also disappointed when schools continued to encourage economic individualism rather than modeling and inculcating in students the qualities essential for a cooperative democratic community.

One of the strengths of the author's focus on state-building is that it reveals that the promotion and implementation of reforms was a multifaceted and dynamic process. This perspective serves as a much needed corrective to studies that focus on reform as an exercise in social control and bureaucratic centralization. Despite the absence of a strong federal role, national standards emerged due to the cooperative efforts of state officials, philanthropic groups such as the General Education Board, and professionals engaged in the development of education as a science. State courts also played a crucial part by issuing rulings that gave state governments primary authority in public education and placed schools within the realm of state police power. The latter shifted power from parents and communities to the state, thereby enabling state and local officials to enforce compulsory education and school consolidation, but this did not mean that reform exclusively—or even primarily—came from above.

Steffes rightfully cites rural schools as an example of how reform also emerged from the grassroots and involved a complex process of negotiation. Rural reformers, whether volunteers or officials, adopted a democratic approach because they needed the cooperation of the local population to implement reforms and knew that only community acceptance would render change permanent. State-level officials generally agreed and preferred to offer incentives, rather than use coercion, to enact reform. In urban areas as well, the authority of business interests, professional educators, and middle-class reformers was at least partially counterbalanced by grassroots initiatives and the need for community cooperation.

The author consistently provides examples from each region of the country and includes all groups with a stake in reform, although occasionally the finer differences within and among reform movements are unclear. The discussion of grassroots rural reform perhaps underestimates its pervasiveness. Moreover, Steffes depicts southern white reformers as uniformly in support of black disfranchisement as a deliberate strategy to assuage white supremacist opposition, when in fact many movement leaders avoided discussion of racial issues exactly because it usually worked against them, and some openly opposed disfranchisement laws. Such omissions are the exception, however, and understandable in a study with such broad parameters. By creating a larger framework in which to consider the significance of educational reform, Steffes has opened the door for a reevaluation of local and community studies. Her careful analysis of why and how Americans placed unrealistic expectations on schools is just as important for public policymakers today as it is for historians.

Rebecca S. Montgomery
Texas State University-San Marcos

Brian M. Ingrassia. *The Rise of Gridiron University: Higher Education's Uneasy Alliance with Big-Time Football*. (CultureAmerica.) Lawrence: University Press of Kansas. 2012. Pp. xiii, 322. $34.95.

Part intellectual history, part social history, and part sport history, Brian M. Ingrassia's book is a smart, well-written study of football's complex relationship with higher education and the general public during the Progressive era. According to Ingrassia, "intercollegiate football was maintained and reformed in the early 1900s because many university professors and administrators, as well as writers and politicians, saw it as a cultural ritual that, besides training young men in the strenuous ways of modern life, would publicize universities and disseminate prevailing ideas about the body and social order" (pp. 3–4).

Reaching as far back as the early nineteenth century, Ingrassia introduces key antebellum experts, educators, and administrators who were the earliest champions of physical culture, and he connects their ideas directly to the clear consensus that had emerged by the 1890s. Early chapters then "explore the intellectual basis of Progressive Era football reforms," particularly within the disciplines of psychology and social science, while subsequent chapters chart "the coaches and athletic directors who turned sport into an autonomous university department tied to commercial culture" and the many stadiums built on campuses by the 1920s, which "confirmed college sport's place as a permanent university activity that exploited consumerist desires, not pedagogical needs." Finally, Ingrassia concludes with an excellent analysis of the academic critique of sport that grew after World War I, "especially intellectuals who had second thoughts about college football and the progressive-pragmatist universities created at the turn of the century" (p. 12).

Readers will undoubtedly be familiar with many of the figures explored in this book, particularly those who called for America's elite young men to engage in rough play and organized sport—ranging from politicians (such as Theodore Roosevelt) and professors (including the influential psychologist G. Stanley Hall) to administrators (for example, the University of Chicago's William Rainey Harper) and coaches (such as Yale University's Walter Camp). Yet Ingrassia also introduces numerous, lesser-known voices who were nevertheless key supporters of intercollegiate athletics and who helped establish the progressive consensus supporting big-time football. *The Rise of Gridiron University* follows in the footsteps of diverse scholarly approaches to the topic, ranging from Gail Bederman's *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880–1917* (1996) and Robin Lester's *Stagg's University: The Rise, Decline, and Fall of Big-Time Football at Chicago* (1995) to John Sayle Watterson's *College Football: History, Spectacle, Controversy* (2000) and Murray Sperber's *Beer and Circus: How Big-Time College Sports Is Crippling Undergraduate Education* (2000). However, no one has written a better, more in-depth analysis of college football's origins on the broad, national scale than Ingrassia provides.

The Rise of Gridiron University draws on excellent, intriguing sources gathered from numerous institutional archives and period publications, with analysis grounded in an impressive range of scholarly literature spanning sport history, Progressive-era social and intellectual history, and education history. Beyond being the best history of early college football, perhaps the book's biggest contribution is the way it overturns the popular assumption that many academicians during the sport's pivotal early years conceived of sport as, at best, a peripheral activity unrelated to higher education's core mission.

Moreover, Ingrassia fundamentally re-periodizes college football history and helps us better understand contemporary debates surrounding the role of intercollegiate athletics in American society. Most tend to identify the rise of "big-time" football with more recent, twentieth-century developments such as the growth in college attendance after World War II, the advent of radio and television broadcasts, the scheduling of more