When the founding mothers won the early struggle against the rebellious daughters to make CLUW a loyal "insider organization," their victory put CLUW on a path of incremental change rather than radical challenge. Even some of the rebellious daughters who are no longer active because they now hold significant leadership positions in their own unions credit CLUW with pulling and pushing male union leaders to address issues like pay equity and plant-wide seniority. In retrospect, perhaps the founding mothers were right: CLUW could never have played the role it did from outside the labor movement, though it perhaps would have played another role, formed a different kind of bridge. The triumph of CLUW is that it navigated that contradiction and survived.

But the attempt to reconcile two very different organizational cultures and structures may explain CLUW's limitations. Roth argues that the lack of top leadership turnover, the divide between local chapters and the national leadership, the lack of a path for local members to achieve top leadership positions, and CLUW's hesitation to play an aggressive role in organizing unorganized women have been weaknesses. Because she chose to interview top leaders, past and present, her focus is on the costs paid in activism and vitality to a structure that values stability, loyalty, and incumbency. If she had chosen to focus on local CLUW chapters around the country, run by rank-and-file activists, Roth might have gotten a much livelier picture of the successful bridging function of an organization like CLUW.

Female unionists have made significant gains since CLUW's founding. In 1974 the chances of a Latina becoming one of the three top officers of the AFL-CIO seemed remote. The participation and leadership in CLUW of women of color is a success story for labor. But tremendous challenges remain. CLUW seems to operate mainly as a support network for *current* female leaders who head CLUW. Roth's research indicates that most local CLUW members feel the organization should play a more activist role. Given the crisis in the labor movement, the need for CLUW to expand past the support network role and into a more activist agenda is critical, but is made harder by the organization's static, top-down structure and insider status.

Readers interested in the relationship between the women's movement and the labor movement will appreciate this book, provided they can tolerate its numerous flaws in copy editing, citation, and proofreading (blemishes that should be laid at Praeger's door). For students of social movement theory, labor history, and women's history, *Building Movement Bridges* raises crucial questions about the costs of "insider status" by focusing on issues of organizational development, change management, and advocacy politics. The book is especially helpful for younger readers and scholars who did not live through these movements. It is an interesting treatment of two movements at the center of America's current public discourse on social justice, women's rights, and democracy.

Sally M. Alvarez

Senior Extension Associate
New York State School of
Industrial and Labor Relations
Cornell University

Triangle: The Fire That Changed America. By David Von Drehle. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2003. 340 pp. ISBN 0-87113-874-3, $25.00 (cloth).

The fire that took the lives of 146 workers on March 25, 1911 in Manhattan's Washington Square neighborhood may well be the best known tragedy in U.S. labor history. It appears in every history of garment workers in early twentieth-century New York; it figures significantly in all studies of political and social reform in Progressive era New York; it was highlighted in a documentary film produced by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; a website created at Cornell's Kheel Center includes graphic illustrations of the fire and its victims as well as numerous documents; a network television company produced a three-hour docu-drama about the event; and Leon Stein, the long-time editor and publicist for the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union (ILGWU), wrote his own book-length study of the fire (published originally in 1962, and republished only three years ago by Cornell University Press with a new introduction by William Greider). What motivated David Von Drehle to write a new history of the fire, and for whom did he write his book?

The first part of that question is by far easier to answer. Von Drehle, a journalist by trade, clearly knows a good story when he sees it. The site of the tragedy, the identity of the victims (most of whom were young immigrant female workers), the employers, who

seemed to embody the most heinous aspects of capitalism, the unexpected heroism of several actors in the fire, the association of such important figures as Al Smith, Robert Wagner, Charles F. "Boss" Murphy, and Frances Perkins with the tragedy and its aftermath, and the drama of the fire all create a gripping story. Von Drehle's ability to tell a tale that carries the reader along and that elicits empathy for the fire's young victims explains why his book ranks at 1,216 on Amazon.com's sales-list compared to 55,611 for Leon Stein's fuller, better researched, and more perceptive history of the same event.

The question of audience is more problematic. Von Drehle offers little for those knowledgeable about modern U.S. history, New York City history, labor history, or the garment trades. For those unfamiliar with the Triangle fire and its iconic place in history, the central chapters that describe the fire and the ensuing charges of criminal negligence against the employers may well come as a revelation. I fear, however, that readers drawn to the book by the author's way with words may acquire a distorted understanding of the past alongside their new knowledge about the graphic details of a human tragedy.

The thesis expressed by the book's subtitle, "The Fire That Changed America," reappears in the author's opening pages when the author writes that "the Triangle fire … was the crucial moment in a potent chain of events … that forced fundamental reforms [in] New York, [and] the whole nation" (p. 3). Yet no solid evidence establishes that the fire and its aftermath caused fundamental change in New York or elsewhere. The reform legislation that resulted from the work of the New York State Factory Investigating Committee, a body created in reaction to the fire, was already on the agenda of most industrial states or enacted prior to the fire. Important as was the work of the State Committee, it pales beside the investigations undertaken by the U.S. Commission on Industrial Relations (1913–15) in response to a union-engineered dynamiting of the *Los Angeles Times* building (which also occurred in 1911) and a myriad other violent industrial conflicts. Moreover, whereas the chair of the New York committee, Al Smith, became a relatively conservative Catholic and an outspoken opponent of the New Deal, Frank P. Walsh, the chair of the CIR, was radical for his time, and the sponsor of a final report that actually presaged the New Deal's labor reforms.

Other errors and distortions abound. Immigrant Jews were not political refugees as contrasted to Italian "birds of passage" who emigrated solely for economic reasons (pp. 60–61). J. P. Morgan controlled U.S. Steel, not the steel industry (p. 71). "Big Bill" Haywood was not the notorious leader of the Western miners or an advocate of violence in 1909 (pp. 84–85). When Democrats took control of the state legislature and the governor's mansion in the election of 1910, state government did not fall into the hands of the enemies of reform (p. 189). By 1910, Tammany Hall, the dominant political organization in New York (Manhattan and the Bronx; Brooklyn had a separate Democratic "machine") was already an advocate for working people, trade unionists, and social reforms, the advance guard of progressivism in New York rather than its adversary. Moreover, "the Hall" was no longer as dominant in city politics nor as graft-ridden as Von Drehle suggests. Between 1909 and 1917 the mayoral office was held first by a reform Democrat from Brooklyn and then by a Fusion, anti-Tammany mayor. The Triangle fire may have accelerated Tammany Boss Charles Murphy's drift toward urban liberalism and social reform; it did not precipitate it. Anyone knowledgeable about Fiorello LaGuardia knows that he was never a socialist, a garment union organizer, or a 100 percent New Yorker (p. 268). Nor did urban liberalism, which Von Drehle credits with setting the political agenda for the nation in the twentieth century and becoming the dominant politics of the left, arise from the ashes of the Triangle fire.

Von Drehle's narrative of the Triangle fire is to the history of early twentieth-century New York what Martin Scorsese's "The Gangs of New York" is to the history of mid-nineteenth-century New York. Both create dramatic tableaus and humanize distant historical actors who left behind few personal records—Von Drehle, for example, writes that at the moment of the fire "Jennie Rosenberg's look suggested she knew something funny. Jennie Stern … had a direct and sultry gaze … Pauline Levine a worldly, skeptical look … Rebecca Feibisch far-away eyes" (p. 88)—yet twist and distort history.

Melvyn Dubofsky

Bartle Distinguished Professor
of History
Binghamton University, SUNY