

Michigan Law Review

Volume 77 | Issue 3

1979

The Matrix of Professionalization: Three Recent Interpretations

Alan Creutz

University of Michigan-Dearborn

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr>



Part of the [Education Law Commons](#), and the [Law and Society Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Alan Creutz, *The Matrix of Professionalization: Three Recent Interpretations*, 77 MICH. L. REV. 641 (1979).

Available at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr/vol77/iss3/24>

This Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Michigan Law Review at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Michigan Law Review by an authorized editor of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact mlaw.repository@umich.edu.

THE MATRIX OF PROFESSIONALIZATION: THREE RECENT INTERPRETATIONS

*Alan Creutz**

THE CULTURE OF PROFESSIONALISM: THE MIDDLE CLASS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN AMERICA. By *Burton J. Bledstein*. New York: W.W. Norton. 1976. Pp. xii, 354. Cloth, \$12.95; paper, \$4.95.

THE EMERGENCE OF PROFESSIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE: THE AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION AND THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY CRISIS OF AUTHORITY. By *Thomas L. Haskell*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1977. Pp. xii, 276. \$12.00.

THE RISE OF PROFESSIONALISM: A SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS. By *Magali Sarfatti Larson*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1977. Pp. xviii, 309. \$12.95.

I

Three recent monographs on the dynamics of professionalization in American history have emphasized the role of the American university in the rise of the modern professions. Each monograph has seen the university as the critical institution which legitimized the professionals' claims to special intellectual competence and ensured the professionals' collective control over access to their ranks. Each of the three monographs considers professionalization and the rise of the university in either an economic, an intellectual, or a cultural context.

For several decades, sociologists have examined the parameters of profession and its impact on society. By the 1950s, the definition of profession as an isolated sociological type was generally accepted.¹ The next step was to examine professionalization itself, and for this task sociologists and historians turned to comparative studies of contemporary Third World countries and to historical investigation. In this latter inquiry, scholars drew on and expanded the vast historical literature on the American past.

Historians of professionalism in America agree that professions took their current form in the decades following the Civil

* Lecturer in History, University of Michigan-Dearborn. A.B. 1967, Columbia University; M.A. 1972, University of Michigan.—Ed.

1. The best brief survey of the sociological concept of profession remains Cogan, *Toward a Definition of Profession*, 23 HARV. EDUC. REV. 33-50 (1953).

War. Although new professions are constantly emerging, the type was well developed by the end of the century and was dramatically different from the professional structure of antebellum America. Professions, it seems to social historians, evolved during the Gilded Age—the era between the end of Reconstruction and the rise of Teddy Roosevelt.

Robert Wiebe's *The Search for Order, 1877-1920* (1967) developed a new synthesis for interpreting the Gilded Age. Traditional values, he argued, succumbed to new patterns of social and economic activity. "Island communities" dissolved into supra-local institutions created by urbanization, industrialization, and modernization. Small-town America became a "distended society" which was finally transformed into an integrated national society.

The new professionalism of the post-Civil War era was a feature of that restructuring of society, and these three monographs examine professionalism in that context. Combining an understanding of the sociology of profession with a sensitivity to the history of America, each has explored the dynamics of professionalization from a different viewpoint. For Magali Sarfatti Larson, professionalization is a part of the Marxist pattern of history and is a phenomenon of the worldwide shift to industrial capitalism that occurred during the late nineteenth century. Thomas L. Haskell and Burton J. Bledstein, less global in their approach, examine professionalization specifically in the American context. For Haskell, social science as a profession derived from the intellectual shift accompanying the decline of pre-industrial idealism. It was the decline of the self-reliant man as a societal norm which produced the need for special experts. Bledstein, on the other hand, sees the professional as the epitome of the self-reliant man. The cultural values of professionals, if not those of society as a whole, presumed that man controlled his own destiny. Rather than moving away from autonomy and toward existentialism, the "middle-class person," Bledstein contends, developed a new awareness of his own power during the post-Jacksonian era. Perhaps Bledstein and Haskell are irreconcilable, but perhaps their different emphases—one's on intellectual causation structures and the other's on personal value systems—demonstrate the conflict of a modernizing nation in a traditional society.

II

Magali Sarfatti Larson's *The Rise of Professionalism*, which

is based on her dissertation (University of California, Berkeley, 1974), is a broad and bold analysis of the sociology and historical evolution of Anglo-American professions. Although she has contributed no new empirical data to the field, Larson has mastered the extensive secondary literature both on the history of individual professions and on the sociology of the professions in contemporary America and England. More than her synthesis, it is the vast material she confronts that appeals to the student of professionalism.

As a synthesis Larson has created a strongly Marxist explanatory paradigm of the rise and consolidation of professions as institutions of social and economic elitism in modern society. Her work bears the strengths and weaknesses of bold comparative analysis: the level of generalization and conceptualization is high and exciting, but the risks of profound error are magnified by her uncritical reliance on secondary works of uneven quality. Although she has been selective in choosing the works she follows, she will need to update her survey constantly as new studies of individual professions and new studies of professional sociology appear.

Basically, Larson extrapolates from the ideas of Karl Polanyi, and argues that professionalization was a part of the great economic and social transformation of the nineteenth century.² Specifically, Polanyi identified a shift to a market orientation in which there is not only the economic fact of commodity exchange but also an ideological commitment to the principle that diverse commodities can be evaluated in a common exchange medium. Larson sees the professions as a mechanism for preserving social and economic elitism within this new market economy. The new professionals engaged in collective social mobility, raising the status of their occupations within the broader social milieu. The professions were created within the structure of the market economy, but were then legitimized by an appropriate ideological framework.

Although Larson agrees that professional activities demand intellectual expertise, she concludes that the modern educational system's ideology of meritocracy, intellectual stratification, and formal credentialing, rather than its transmission of formal relevant knowledge, has perpetuated elitism. This elitism, for Larson, rests not on a functional role for the professions, but on the ideological position they have created for themselves. "In capital-

2. K. POLANYI, *THE GREAT TRANSFORMATION* (1957).

ist society, the central function of ideology is to conceal the existence of class and the basic structure of exploitation" (p. 156).

The institution most effective in aiding the professionalization "project" was the university. The university legitimized a profession's monopoly by certifying the quality of the practitioners and offering a prestigious *locus* for the growth of esoteric professional knowledge. Although not inevitably implied by the concept of esoteric knowledge, in modern Western society the special knowledge of the profession involved rationality and took the form of a science. The university was the citadel of science.

Although Larson sees the university as a major factor in the professionalization process, the university "is only one development in the twentieth-century maturation of industrial capitalism" (pp. 136-37). Large units based on rationality and efficiency characterized not only education, but production and government as well. Efficiency was equally important to industrialists, reforming politicians of the turn of the century, and professionals. Bureaucracy and profession share common values, including a presumption that advancement is based on competence. Ideologically, both seem to dismiss class as a parameter in society, although both, through social selectivity and educational screening, in fact perpetuate social stratification. Rather than conflicting, the concepts of professionalism and bureaucracy are complementary, and Larson explores the current literature which places professional activity within the bureaucracy. The professional, who seems to epitomize individuality, in fact operates effectively within the bureaucracy, which ostensibly dictates individual performance in terms of specific roles rather than in terms of individual abilities.

Larson's analysis, synthetic though it is, offers few new specific insights into professionalization as an historical process or as a sociological concept. Her chief accomplishment—gathering the diverse literature into a coherent whole—ought to make her book a significant scholarly event. Unfortunately, however, her painfully dense prose is far more difficult to read than one would have liked. Her sentences are verbose, confused, and, at times, illogical. For instance:

A profession's capacity for standardizing training and research within the confines of normal science and for excluding competing paradigms is not only greatly augmented by its connection with science; it is also given the ultimate legitimation of an objective, independent, incontrovertibly more effective inquiry, which opens up the possibility of unlimited progress. [P. 35]

The student soon wearies of such compound constructions and Latinate abstractions, and in simple grammatical terms, this sentence fails. Further, its logic is circular: the connection with science of course "augments a profession's capacity for standardizing training and research within the confines of normal science." In short, while this book should stand as a definitive summary of the literature on professionalism and should be widely consulted by students and scholars, its complex style will repel readers and probably relegate the work to reserve desks in graduate libraries.

The one aspect of the book which is readily usable and should prove invaluable to students is the extensive section of endnotes, which make up an exhaustive bibliography of the relevant literature. A word of warning, however: Larson has not carefully checked all her citations. For instance, the preeminent historian of education and its ideological connection with society, Bernard Bailyn, is referred to throughout the text and endnotes as "Baylin." Nevertheless, anyone confronting professionalism, the social history of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, or American intellectual history should carefully study the endnotes and periodically the main text for suggestions as to the significance of the cited works in Larson's Marxist synthesis.

III

In contrast to Larson, Thomas L. Haskell approaches professionalization as an intellectual process rather than an economic phenomenon. His study, *The Emergence of Professional Social Science*, which is another reworking of a dissertation (Stanford, 1973), is specific rather than global. From a careful reading of the American Social Science Association proceedings and publications, the personal papers of leading social scientists of the late nineteenth century, and relevant materials from the history of higher education, Haskell has analyzed the fundamental ideological shift in the practice of social science between the Civil War and the end of the nineteenth century in the United States. At the two poles of the ideological dimension that he develops were the American Social Science Association—eclectic amateurs who combined inquiry with reform—and those social scientists working in universities—scholars who pursued their inquiry through sophisticated concepts and methodologies.

Haskell agrees with Larson, to a point, in that he sees the ideological contest between idealism, represented by the ASSA,

and positivism, represented by the university social scientists, in the context of changing social and economic conditions. The parallel conflict between formalism and anti-formalism reflected the changing nature of society and the growing need to recognize and codify the interdependence characteristic of the social universe. The rise of this more organic view of society, replacing the image of the self-reliant man creating his own life-course, is the "keystone" of Haskell's analysis. Haskell recognizes that this interdependence is, of course, but an epiphenomenon of the standard transformation of the late nineteenth century: urbanization, industrialization, and modernization. Haskell, however, is closer to the professionalization process. A profession is an intellectual vocation, and Haskell investigates the shift in intellectual gestalt that creates a new profession. The new paradigm of practicing social scientists made obsolete individual experts who conceived, advocated, and, in so far as possible, executed solutions to social problems.³ New principles of sophisticated investigation and new conflicts over alternative social policies produced new institutions and the evolution of what Haskell calls "communities of inquiry," *i.e.*, professions.

Haskell argues his thesis clearly. He first identifies the economic, social, and cultural sources of the growing sense of interdependence and relates them to the intellectual explanations of causation proposed by nineteenth-century social commentators. With the decline of Wiebe's "island communities," he suggests, there came a "recession of causation," that is, a growing sense that one's personal fate is largely controlled by remote factors hard to control, or even to perceive, locally. In those "island communities," social causation was easily comprehended in terms of obvious factors, and there was no need for sophisticated intellectual methodologies. Lawyers, doctors, ministers, and teachers, as intelligent men, could understand problems and produce solutions simply by exploring their local environment.

Following the Civil War, increasing concern for social problems led to the formation of the American Social Science Association, whose primary purpose was to encourage individual social thinkers in their quest for an execution of solutions to social problems. In a chapter on the Association's founder, Frank Sanborn,

3. Haskell is sensitive to the fact that an intellectual approach cannot qualify as a paradigm unless it meets several stringent criteria, and he uses the term in a broader, and more convenient, sense. Haskell argues that interdependence as a paradigm has failed to achieve "that very special maturity which permits true science to *progress*" (p. 20).

Haskell describes the idealism of the Association and its naive faith that to know the facts of a problem is to conceive its solution. In an accurate, if time-worn, cliché, Haskell characterizes Sanborn as "not only a link to the past, but also a bridge to the future" (p. 56). Inherently an individualist who espoused benevolent paternalism, Sanborn undertook "community-oriented, institution-building activities" (p. 56). To the anti-institutional bias of transcendentalism Sanborn added a note of caution: individual freedom should not destroy moral and intellectual authority.

Sanborn's motive in founding the ASSA was, in part, to provide a forum for solving societal problems. Equally important, however, was the creation of a formal institution to defend the authority of the problem solvers, to "institutionalize sound opinion," as Haskell phrases it (p. 63). The move to collectivities of individual, apolitical problem solvers found expression in commissions of inquiry and administrative boards as well as in the ASSA. Inquiry and reform were united in a belief that rational understanding and complete information would lead inevitably to reform when men with proper values held power. Right-thinking men would even agree uniformly on the specific program of reform; the founding members optimistically believed that the only obstacle to a social utopia was ignorance of the facts. The ASSA encompassed all areas of social ills, which it categorized largely in terms of the existing professions (law, medicine, and teaching) whose members formed the ASSA.

By recruiting members from the social elite and by attracting new men as they left college, the ASSA would be the central agency of the social science movement. Here paralleling closely the argument of Larson, Haskell describes the breakdown of authority within the classical professions and sees the formation of the ASSA "as part of a movement to defend the authority of a gentry class, whose sturdiest foundations lay in the professions." The motives, however, were not strictly economic, for profession "served purposes that transcended the interest of any particular class" (pp. 87, 89).

As early as the 1870s, Haskell argues, conflicts over proposed solutions emerged sounding the death knell of the naive assumptions of the ASSA. The remaining history of the ASSA becomes a backdrop against which the emergence of new academic social science is highlighted. Positivists assailed the naive idealism of the ASSA and found their home in the newly emerging graduate programs at the Johns Hopkins University, the Univer-

sity of Michigan, and elsewhere.

A proposal to merge the ASSA with Johns Hopkins symbolizes the crisis within social science. Daniel Coit Gilman, who was simultaneously president of Johns Hopkins and the ASSA and who was sensitive to the new positivist research espoused by graduate students returning from German universities, recognized the inconsistency of the ASSA's idealism of inquiry united with social action and the university's commitment to objective research. The university, as a home for social scientists of the German tradition, was emerging as an alternative to, not a complement of, the ASSA. Haskell rejects Mary O. Furner's idea that university social scientists were merely retreating from social action.⁴ Haskell argues rather that the two groups were conceptually distinct and based their methods on a more complex view of interdependent society.

In 1884, the young social scientists of the university began their exodus from the ASSA. The American Historical Association, founded by one of Gilman's young German-trained professors, held its first meeting in conjunction with, but clearly separate from, the ASSA. Although not initially a majority of the AHA membership, academics dominated its governance. The AHA celebrated specialized inquiry as an intellectual function distinct from social action. The new association, linked with a single discipline, thus announced its affiliation with academia rather than with the traditional professions. Within twenty years the economists, the political scientists, and the sociologists created parallel disciplinary associations, leaving the ASSA moribund.

Where one broad community of individualistic inquirers and activists had held sway, there now existed distinct, integrated communities of inquiry. With knowledge no longer obvious and competence no longer automatic, social scientists created institutions to train, recognize, and defend their profession. The universities and the disciplinary associations legitimated pure inquiry by providing, on one hand, physical support and, on the other, an intellectual affiliation.

At times Haskell's argument is somewhat forced, as when he links the ASSA to the classic professions structurally. It is obvious that three of the four departments of the ASSA (the Departments of Health, of Jurisprudence, and of Education) exactly

4. M. FURNER, *ADVOCACY AND OBJECTIVITY: A CRISIS IN THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE, 1865-1905* (1975).

paralleled existing professions. Yet clearly the ASSA was more than a merger of these three. Haskell does not fully explore the significance of the fact that the ASSA added a fourth department, known variously as "Social Economy" or "Economy, Trade and Finance."

Haskell does not measure the extent to which the ASSA and its ideology permeated society. The goals of the ASSA foreshadowed those of Lester Ward's *Dynamic Sociology* (1883) by nearly two decades, yet they seem already to have gone into decline by the 1870s. A post-Civil War reform movement, the ASSA was replaced by academic social science disciplines, but it does not appear in Haskell's analysis to be related to the reform movements of the progressive era.

The decline of the ASSA is no doubt due to the gestalt shift Haskell identifies, but that decline is also tied to the rise of a new generation. Haskell mentions that the founders of the new academic disciplines were much younger men than were the members of the ASSA, but he does not explain the significance of that fact. He emphasizes that the ASSA members were genteel and, even by the standards of the progressive period, humane. What Haskell does not consider is that, while the academics quarrelled with the ASSA on intellectual grounds, other reformers may have simply quarrelled with it on cultural or social grounds.

As a scholarly monograph, *The Emergence of Professional Social Science* flows smoothly, focussing always on its thesis. The footnotes are useful, complete, and lead the student to other pertinent secondary literature as well as fully documenting the primary sources Haskell consulted. The "bibliography" is in the innovative form of an Author-Title Index which refers the reader to footnotes in the body of the text rather than giving bibliographic data—a useful device since it immediately places the bibliographic source in the context of Haskell's argument.

IV

Burton J. Bledstein, in *The Culture of Professionalism*, has considered professionalization from a third direction. Neither an economic explanation nor an intellectual analysis, Bledstein's work, which grew from his dissertation on liberal culture and liberal education in the nineteenth century (Princeton, 1967), describes the cultural milieu which was emerging in antebellum America and the subsequent rise of professionalism and the university. The central phenomenon of this "middle-class" culture

is the career, the ordered sequence of ascending positions within a given occupation. As high-level positions became restricted to those who had climbed an occupational ladder, and as individuals dedicated their vocational lives to reaching the top of the ladder, that occupation became a profession. For Bledstein, as for Larson and Haskell, the seminal institution in this process was the university.

The career ideal, Bledstein suggests, was a vocational expression of the middle-class penchant for order, specialization, and rationality. The middle class of post-Jacksonian America was neither a social class nor an economic rank, but the embodiment of a set of values and a life-style of a growing segment of society. Success was based on accomplishments and demonstrated ability. Failure was a personal flaw, a refusal to develop fully one's potential. Self-made, "the middle-class person was competitive, active, bold, brave, and even reckless" (p. 27). An egotist, the middle-class American relied on rationality and the mathematical organization of his life and his world to provide the matrix for his success.

In a fascinating, if not clearly focussed chapter, Bledstein describes the changing uses of space and words that illustrate these new middle-class values. The tendency to organize one's vocational experience in terms of a career was expressed in a tendency to organize space and words. Citing a wide range of examples, from the creation of specialized breakfast menus to regulations over obscenity in the mails, Bledstein detects a middle-class attempt to understand and codify reality. The rise of special arenas for sporting events and clearer distinctions between public and private spaces indicated a new rationalization of human affairs.

It is not clear from Bledstein's description just how widespread this middle-class culture was. The professions, he says, were the epitome of middle-class values, "the highest form in which the middle class could pursue its primary goals." The professional was the "independent democrat, a liberated person seeking to free the power of nature within every worldly sphere, a self-governing individual exercising his trained judgment in an open society" (pp. 80, 87). To the rest of society, these professionals, who had elevated their occupations to mysterious intellectual enterprises, were virtual priests. Bledstein paints a picture of ruthless professionals capitalizing on the vulnerability and anxiety of their clients. "Perhaps no Calvinist system of thought ever

made use of the insecurities of people more effectively than did the culture of professionalism" (p. 102).

But, as Bledstein reports, as late as 1900 only 4.1% of the population was engaged in professional service. Professionalism, it appears, "bred public attitudes of submission and passivity" (p. 104) but was simultaneously the foremost expression of the spreading values of the middle class. Bledstein speaks of a middle-class "authority" based on the "article of faith that the regularly trained professional . . . was superior to the merely experienced operator." This suggests that the "expanding American audience [that] was taking for granted the advantages of the fortunate middle class" must have included fewer than one in ten Americans (pp. 125, 45).

Bledstein's description of the university most fully details his view of the culture of professionalism. The university, for Bledstein, had three distinct roles in defining middle-class values. Most important, of course, was the training and legitimization it gave to professionals in the early stages of their careers. A second role was the institutionalization of two specific professions, the faculty and the university administrator. The third role, or, more precisely, the role of the university president, was to serve as a model of the professional and his career and values. Nine presidents (Eliot of Harvard, Porter of Yale, Gilman of Johns Hopkins, White of Cornell, Barnard of Columbia, McCosh of Princeton, Angell of Michigan, Folwell of Minnesota, and Bascom of Wisconsin) molded the universities into the principal institutions of professionalization.

Bledstein spends two chapters synthesizing the attitudes of these nine presidents. He draws both on their activities and their prescriptions, contrasting them with advice and commentary from Benjamin Franklin, who acts as a spokesman for the previous American culture. The nine presidents saw character as the fundamental personality trait of a man. Bledstein argues that Franklin had a shallower view of character and was more interested in its surface features. The nine, like Franklin, advocated industriousness, moral integrity, and frugality, but the nine were more committed than he to aggressive initiative. Bledstein here relies on written prescriptions and is perhaps overly willing to deduce fundamental differences of values from what may well be only stylistic variations in rhetoric.

These nine presidents also illustrate the new career ideal of the middle class. Charles Eliot's agony in choosing his occupa-

tional path symbolizes for Bledstein the uncertainty of career patterns at mid-century. The choice of profession was becoming the conscious, and carefully weighed, decision of the young man. No longer were external forces or accidental opportunities the primary determinants of professional choices. With structured professions came expectations of formal training, claims of increasingly esoteric expertise and intellectual authority, and more restrictive avenues of access.

Another perspective on the new culture of professionalism within the university emerges from a study of student life. Bledstein's portrait of the juvenile behavior of students under the hypocritical guidance of nonintellectual professors in the antebellum college is dismal indeed. The college was "an artificial institution" that served no purpose for its middle-class students (p. 246). As students became older, more ambitious, and more self-reliant, they demanded more of college. At first these changes took the form of student clubs and activities which organized and disciplined students' lives and provided greater intellectual stimulus than did the faculty. When college became only a first step in the student's climb up the career ladder, the student expected it to provide useful training and meaningful credentials. The student demanded to be no longer merely the commodity of the college, but rather to be its focus.

The nine presidents, and others, responded sympathetically to these demands. Sound intellectual training created the academic profession, and with the evolution of that profession and the concomitant increased credibility of the college degree, a college education became a useful, indeed increasingly an obligatory, first step in many professional careers. The late nineteenth-century structure of the faculty itself imposed a career pattern with steps from student, through assistant, instructor, and the various grades of subordinate professor, to full professor. The consumer orientation of the university led to a second specialized career, that of the university administrator who could manage these uniquely career-oriented institutions.

Bledstein fails to explain the causes of the rise of middle-class values of self-reliance, rationality, and creativity, and the accompanying evolution of career. While the middle-class values he finds at mid-century are contrasted with those of the eighteenth century, he relies too heavily on Benjamin Franklin as the archetypical eighteenth-century man. It is not clear whether "middle class" and "professional" are synonyms nor how exten-

sive either of these groups, or their cultures, were in American society. The pieces of his description are not well-integrated, and he is vague as to the logical sequence of professionalization and the rise of the university. His nine presidents molded the university to their values yet merely responded to student demands. Nowhere does Bledstein consider the impact of professorial values on students, yet by the end of the century individual professors clearly had closer contact with students than did the presidents, who had become remote administrators. In describing rather than analyzing, Bledstein leaves us wondering about possible alternative processes of professionalization. For example: Why could not the apprenticeship system have been transformed into the credentialing and legitimizing institution of a career? Bledstein dismisses the apprenticeship system as ineffective, yet it was the principal source of doctors and lawyers prior to the Civil War. In modern medicine, the intern serves as an apprentice to doctors as an integral part of his career pattern. It is not obvious to the reader why the antebellum college, with its sterile environment, was any more suitable a *locus* for professionalization than the apprenticeship system.

Nevertheless, Bledstein has not only mastered the secondary literature, but has drawn heavily on the papers of numerous luminaries of the nineteenth-century middle class. Although the book lacks a bibliography, its extensive footnotes frequently provide not only citations but useful interpretive comments. Although not always well-focussed toward a coherent description, the book is entertaining, informative, and provocative. Somewhat unnecessarily, since they merely illustrate rather than define the professional type, Bledstein provides an appendix giving brief biographical sketches of the nine presidents. The index is useful, although some finer sub-topics for those personalities frequently cited would be convenient.

V

Two of the authors, Bledstein and Larson, entertain a cynical, if not hostile, attitude towards professionals. Each concludes with a prescription for contemporary America. These codified statements of bias allow the reader to interpret better these monographs as scholarship as well as enrich his final reactions to them.

Larson, the Marxist, sees in the professional ideology a mask for class exploitation. To some extent, though, she belies the

economic determinism implicit in her analysis when she calls for professionals to abandon their monopolies of competence and access and to join other workers to develop the classless society.

Bledstein is less polemical, but in his epilogue he accuses professionals of "arrogance, shallowness, and potential abuses" (p. 334) and professionalism of countenancing fraud and deceit. Without proposing a solution, he calls for some mechanism to bring the professions to public accountability.

The three books together present three views of professionalization representing three themes of social science. The economic determinism of Larson discounts the intellectual causation of Haskell as a mere ideological charade. The cultural description of Bledstein, which is, of the three, the least analytic yet the most imaginative, perhaps best suggests what professionalization meant in terms of the conscious life of the late nineteenth-century American. With its wealth of material and variety of approaches, it is clearly the most stimulating of the three. But all three works remind us that, whether an individual was a professional, a member of the middle class, or a participant in American society, the culture of professionalism was a part of his social universe.