

ing history of policing in which sexual politics drives the narrative.

The first policewomen came armed, not with guns, but with maternal affection. They believed that having women police would better "protect women, adolescent females, and children from moral dangers" and help promote the "prevention model" of criminal justice. In the 1910s and 1920s, they created semiautonomous institutions such as the City Mother's Bureau and the Juvenile Department in Los Angeles where policewomen could offer counseling and social services rather than punishment. They rejected policemen's uniforms and mores, offering a female-gendered policy alternative. Although police administrators and public officials never welcomed these female interlopers, certain territory was ceded to them. The problems of women, girls, and boys under eight, particularly those affecting domestic relations and sexual morality, became women's domain. Nevertheless, women's effectiveness was undercut by their lack of authority: in most cities, for example, women police lacked full arrest powers over adult men and adolescent boys until the 1960s and 1970s.

In the 1920s and 1930s, the work of policewomen as well as men changed dramatically. By the end of the 1930s, policewomen wore uniforms, packed guns in their purses, and in general were expected to act like male police. The female-gendered "social work" model gave way to a "male-gendered model of crime control and crime-fighting." This masculinization of police work cannot be understood as merely the neutral modernization of police work or the inevitable evolution toward a more efficient system, Appier argues. Rather, it was a highly gendered process, and one that, ironically enough, was abetted unintentionally by the pioneer policewomen themselves. Appier suggests that the sexual division of police work fostered by women reformers in the Progressive Era ultimately made it easier for policemen to deny responsibility for the welfare tasks associated with women and fueled their desire to disassociate themselves from anything smacking of social work. Here Appier could have paid more attention to the ways in which class as well as gender structured police work by the 1930s. Working-class men (the police) came to specialize in fighting

crime; middle-class professional men (sociologists, psychiatrists, government administrators) claimed the counseling and preventive functions. Indeed, neither the preventive nor the control model of criminal justice disappears; they simply reside in different institutional class settings.

Appier's book would work well in American history courses as well as interdisciplinary courses in criminal justice, women's studies, and sociology. It is convincingly researched and compellingly written. It also raises provocative questions about the legacy of maternalism, the dynamics of sex segregation and work force feminization, and the legitimacy of our current theories of criminal justice.

Dorothy Sue Cobble

Rutgers University

New Brunswick, New Jersey

Sisters in Law: Women Lawyers in Modern American History. By Virginia G. Drachman. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998. xvi, 334 pp. \$35.00, ISBN 0-674-80991-2.)

In *Sisters in Law*, Professor Virginia G. Drachman continues to unravel the story of women entering the legal profession. Her earlier, highly praised book, *Women Lawyers and the Origins of Professional Identity in America*, published in 1993, focused on the small coterie of pioneering women who entered the legal profession during the years after the Civil War. *Sisters in Law* expands on the preceding work, bringing the tale forward to the era of the Great Depression.

Drachman continues her exploration of several important themes in this latest work—the pursuit of professional growth through gender integration or separation, the use of equality and difference theories of gender by women lawyers, and the tension between professional identity and gender. The women of the Equity Club, the focus of her earlier book, tended to work through these issues by entering the profession with the help of husbands or relatives, staying single unless they could practice with their mates, and performing office rather than courtroom work. Despite the apparent submission of many early women lawyers to a domestic, nonpublic vision of

professional life, the tight links between entry to legal practice and government operations required these pioneering women directly to challenge a series of judicially and legislatively imposed limitations on their cultural roles. Drachman uses this observation as the starting point for *Sisters in Law*, noting how early women practitioners, while pursuing a largely "domestic" vision of legal practice, were tightly connected to the suffrage movement and well schooled in equality theory. How, Drachman wonders, did such tensions work out in later decades?

Weaving together materials from letters and manuscripts, studies of the profession, institutional archives, and fiction, she artfully tells the stories of the second generation of women lawyers. The professional world was becoming quite different from that of the first generation of sisters in law. The tradition of "reading" law with a practitioner as a precondition for entry into the bar was giving way to formal legal education. Elite law firms, designed to handle a growing volume of commercial and industrial demands, developed and sought students from well-known universities. The profession's hierarchy became much more clear-cut, with large firms at the top and small firms or solo practitioners without degrees at the bottom. As the barriers to entry to the legal profession changed, the challenges confronting women desiring to practice law became more complicated.

Despite the changes in the professional world, the tensions facing women remained much the same. Drachman recounts the trials and tribulations of the first law schools for women, the important role played by the few university law schools willing to accept women, and the optimistic hopes of the hundreds of women who became lawyers early in the twentieth century. Though the number of women lawyers grew to the thousands by the 1930s, Drachman concludes that

the optimism about the possibilities for women in the law [felt by women early in the twentieth century] was tempered by a growing pessimism about the realities of women lawyers' professional achievements. . . . Women lawyers continued to face the burden of double consciousness—the tension between their gender and professional

identity which the Equity Club members identified in the 1880s.

This is a fine study that fills major voids in both the history of the legal profession and the history of women professionals.

Richard Chused
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C.

Roscoe Pound and Karl Llewellyn: Searching for an American Jurisprudence. By N. E. H. Hull. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997. xii, 354 pp. \$34.95, ISBN 0-226-36043-1.)

This a book with the intriguing premise that one might "search" for an "American jurisprudence" by examining the lives and works of two legal academics—Roscoe Pound, the father of "sociological jurisprudence," and Karl Llewellyn, the self-appointed spokesman for "American legal realism." The idea has a certain attractiveness. The two were friends of a sort, who engaged in the famous "realist controversy," three articles that for many writers since have defined legal realism.

N. E. H. Hull focuses her story on the attempt of each man to produce a distinctive American jurisprudence as seen through a careful examination of their respective lives. What was important for understanding the attempt of each, she suggests, is, first, the public and private academic and intellectual networks that formed, dissolved, and reformed in the process of the search; and, second, the way that network members drew in part on the work of others, as would the Levi-Straussian "bricoleur." Thus, that neither man produced a systematic jurisprudence is unimportant; the important thing was the searching.

In focusing her story and thus her prodigious and productive archival research on both the public and private academic lives of these two law professors, Hull makes a sensible choice. The resulting book is lively reading. The story of Llewellyn's FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) file is alone worth the price of the admission. Equally sensible is her choice to focus not just on the two men's interactions with each other but also on the relations of each with other scholars, on their networks of personal and academic friendships.