

and other professional groups in modern macroeconomic management, created for accountants their modern functional identity, and finally brought them an elusive unity.

GUY ALCHON
University of Delaware

DEBORAH FITZGERALD. *The Business of Breeding: Hybrid Corn in Illinois, 1890–1940*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1990. Pp. xi, 247. \$29.95.

Deborah Fitzgerald is guided, she says, by two questions: how pure science becomes applied science, and how science at land-grant universities differs from science in private agribusiness. The story of hybrid corn is her vehicle for pursuing these questions. She discovers that the traditional differentiation between pure science in universities and applied science in companies was by no means so definite.

Before the business of breeding, farmers practiced selection, the folk method of seed saving and improvement. Even as conscious efforts at corn breeding got underway, they were fairly simple. "Anybody can cross corn," Henry A. Wallace said. Neither did Mendelian genetics magically transform corn breeding, for even within the federal Bureau of Plant Industry, C. P. Hartley remained committed to selection and to homely extension work with boys' clubs—this despite Donald F. Jones's breakthrough in hybridization, the double cross method.

Scientific corn breeding and hybridization proved potent, however, because they benefited from "a peculiar juncture of pure and applied science" (p. 42). College botanists took up corn breeding in order to work out Mendelian principles, while private breeders labored for profit. This juncture was uneasy. Funk Brothers, a major seed company, developed cozy relations with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), while in the field agricultural colleges and seed companies vied for control of "the machine" of corn breeding and for the "attention and respect" of farmers. As Fitzgerald weighs the matter, the seed houses won: "No longer just seed houses, they became dispensers of scientific knowledge" (p. 214).

Fitzgerald's book is a splendid contribution, splendid for its sound research, its clear exposition, and particularly for its conception. Its conclusions cannot be gainsaid; it will endure as a standard work.

The book may not be quite so pathbreaking as the author claims, however. She asserts that "agricultural historians have neglected the relationship between science, technology, and agriculture" (p. 1) and that historians of science and technology likewise have neglected agriculture. This is hardly the case. Agricultural historians, in fact, often seem obsessed with science and technology, to the exclusion of matters cultural. Most early work along these lines—much like early corn breeding—was unsophisticated (A. C.

True comes to mind), and generally USDA-whiggish, but today it is easy to assemble a bibliography of historians including such names as Earl Hayter, Margaret W. Rossiter, Ronald Tobey, Pete Daniel, Alan Marcus, and Doug Hurt (for a casual beginning), documenting sustained attention to agricultural science and technology.

Finally, it may be helpful to add that in the business of corn breeding, as in agricultural science broadly defined, there is one powerful agent not accounted for by Fitzgerald. She does an excellent job defining the roles of public agencies, agribusiness, and farmers (at least as represented by farm organizations), but this leaves unanswered questions such as why hybrid corn should be developed and promoted at a time when farmers were piling up grain surpluses. The missing agent here is the public interest, or the perception of the public interest, the force behind much of American agricultural policy from the Progressive era through most of this century.

THOMAS D. ISERN
Emporia State University

ROGER DANIELS. *Asian America: Chinese and Japanese in the United States since 1850*. Seattle: University of Washington Press. 1988. Pp. xviii, 384. \$24.95.

Roger Daniels, well-known for his definitive studies of Japanese in America, has written what he calls a "synthesis" that covers the spectrum of the Chinese and Japanese experience in the United States. It is at once both a textbook and an interpretive history. One of Daniels's main arguments is that the Chinese and Japanese immigrants were not unique but rather shared many characteristics with other immigrants. Some important similarities are that the vast majority of immigrants were sojourners who came to the United States for economic betterment, Europeans working in industry on the east coast and Asians working in mining and agriculture on the west coast; most entered unskilled occupations with low pay and status or worked in the service industry within their ethnic community; the squalor of Chinatowns was no worse than some immigrant neighborhoods of large east coast cities; the birth rate of Japanese was at or below the rates of several groups of European immigrants; and most second-generation Asian immigrants came to share the same dream that infused second-generation Europeans in America.

There are also differences: Asian-American history has been largely viewed in an indirect fashion (Daniels uses the term "negative"), focusing more on what has been done to them rather than what they have accomplished; most Asians did return to their country of origin (unlike Europeans); immigration from Asia tended to involve the United States in diplomatic imbroglios; the unfair treatment of Asians tended to discredit American democracy; and Asian immigration rates were minuscule, with more Italians enter-