

knew well the historian he had hired. Robert F. Durden had previously published three books on the Duke family enterprises and philanthropic endeavors (*The Dukes of Durham, 1865–1929*, 1975; *The Launching of Duke University, 1924–1949*, 1993; and *Lasting Legacy to the Carolinas: The Duke Endowment, 1924–1994*, 1998).

The narrative is chronological, often enough interesting (for example, the discussion of the visions and actions of some of the founders) but sometimes tedious, especially as the author approaches more recent times (for example, lists of awards given to the company). If there is a thesis, it can be found in the author's claim that Duke Power was a distinctive electric utility for five reasons, some better supported than others. First, its founders envisioned a regional supply system, with interconnected hydroelectric and steam facilities, both serving and hoping to develop a relatively backward part of the nation. The founders certainly had vision, but Duke Power was not the only company to seek to build regional networks. Second, Duke Power managed to remain independent during the holding company movement that gripped the nation during the 1920s. Utility holding company stocks were among the highest of the high-fliers during the stock market boom, and they crashed hard after 1929. Duke Power remained above the fray because of its truly unique link to the Duke Endowment. Third, by developing an in-house construction expertise, Duke Power cultivated what business historians call organizational capabilities. The company did build plants cheaper and better than most other utilities did. Fourth, Duke Power recognized the uses of multipurpose dams, which generated hydroelectricity but also provided flood control, soil and water conservation, and outlets for recreation. While all of those uses are beneficial, there is now much more awareness of the deleterious effects of dams, a subject not treated in the book. Finally, Duke Power has been a technological leader, both in the construction and operation of conventional plants and in its enthusiastic embrace of nuclear power, rather obviously a controversial position that the author does not fully illuminate.

In sum, the factual narrative of the Duke Power story could provide historians studying the industry or region with a footnote or two, but the book primarily will be of interest to its intended audience.

William J. Hausman
College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia

Crippled Justice: The History of Modern Disability Policy in the Workplace. By Ruth O'Brien. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001. xiv, 288 pp. Cloth, \$50.00, ISBN 0-226-61659-2. Paper, \$19.00, ISBN 0-226-61660-6.)

American policy toward the disabled changed radically in the last quarter of the twentieth century—from warehousing and medical treatment to civil rights. Ruth O'Brien asks a question that could arise only after a considerable period of implementation of the various rights-based policies. To wit: how and why have courts gutted the job protections that Congress and the disability rights movement fought so hard to inscribe into law?

Judges, O'Brien argues, have interpreted the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) through the lens of an early-twentieth-century culture established by the rehabilitation profession. That culture sees individual psychological problems as the primary cause of disabled people's exclusions and incapacities. O'Brien shows how that theory was incorporated into federal disability policy in the 1940s and 1950s, especially in the Social and Rehabilitation Services agency run by Mary E. Switzer. In a fascinating chapter, O'Brien reveals how Switzer expanded her ideas to a vision of antipoverty policy, claiming the poor and long-term unemployed needed the same kind of psychological rehabilitation as the disabled. Three chapters then examine how the civil rights idea has been articulated, legislatively defined, and adjudicated.

As many scholars have noted, the Supreme Court's interpretation of employment rights under the ADA puts claimants in a series of catch-22's. To qualify for protection, they have to be so severely disabled that they cannot perform some major life activity, yet they

cannot be so severely disabled that they are not "otherwise qualified" to perform the job they seek to hold. They have to be severely disabled, but, if they are able to mitigate their disabilities with medicine or assistive devices, then they are not deemed disabled enough to qualify. "What accounts for this type of reasoning," O'Brien argues, "is that the vestiges of the psychological rehabilitation model remain in the minds of the lower federal court judges and a majority of the Supreme Court justices." This seems to me a pinched and unconvincing explanation of judicial behavior, but half the book (the three chapters on the rehabilitation establishment) is designed to set up that argument.

Meanwhile, O'Brien offers a stunning insight that provides a much more convincing explanation: Employment rights for the disabled challenge established power hierarchies of the workplace. By allowing workers to ask for "reasonable accommodation," those rights give individual workers—not unions—the power to negotiate about the scope and definition of jobs and about schedules and working conditions. Judges have interpreted the ADA, O'Brien suggests, in ways that protect the fundamental structure of labor law. *Crippled Justice* thus has two arguments running through it. Both are intriguing. It would have made a better book to have organized the material to do as much justice to the second as to the first.

O'Brien writes from the perspective of the disability rights movement, which perhaps does not allow her to consider still another explanation. The movement's core principle—that disability is a matter of social barriers, not individual capacities—challenges the entire conceptual structure of individualism on which American political thought is based. If there is no such thing as individual ability unmediated by social forces, what happens to meritocracy and markets? No wonder judges are quaking about the ADA. All in all, though, this is a terrific addition to the history of disability policy.

Deborah Stone
Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

Finland and the United States, 1917-1919: Early Years of Mutual Relations. By Jaroław Suchoples. (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2000. 221 pp. Paper, FIM 160, ISBN 951-746-178-X.)

In this published dissertation, Jaroław Suchoples, a Polish scholar, presents what he calls "the facts connected with the beginning of Finnish-American political relations" that took shape in the waning years of World War I. His volume offers few original insights into that relationship, but it does provide a detailed account of the emergence of the Finnish-American relationship at the time, a subject that has often been neglected by historians. He describes a Finland focused on preserving its newly won independence from Russia and on gaining formal recognition from the United States. In response to those efforts, President Woodrow Wilson's administration assumed a passive and at times hostile posture since Finland's postindependence actions were not always consistent with America's wartime national interests.

The troubled beginnings of the relationship emerged as Finland, taking advantage of the internal turmoil in Russia unleashed by the Bolshevik revolution, declared its independence in December 1917. The new government approached the United States for formal recognition and for desperately needed grain shipments to ease famine conditions. But a civil war, led by Bolshevik insurgents, complicated potential relations in early 1918. Intent on ensuring its survival, Finland reached a rapprochement with Germany and even contemplated a monarchy with a German duke on the throne. Germany's defeat in October ultimately ended such plans.

Regardless of any sympathy for Finland's plight, wartime considerations took precedence in determining U.S. policy. In 1917, even though Washington distrusted the Bolsheviks, it wanted to keep its Russian ally in the war, so it hesitated to recognize Finland for fear it might precipitate Russia's political disintegration. Suchoples accuses the Wilson administration of sacrificing such principles as the right of self-determination of all peoples for the sake of the immediate exigencies of the war. Furthermore, the United States blocked