In this slim volume, Dorothy Rogers undertakes a commendable task, reviving the memory of seven neglected American philosophers—Susan Blow, Anna Brackett, Grace Bibb, Ellen Mitchell, Eliza Read Sunderland, Lucia Ames Mead, and Marietta Kies. Since most of these women were associated with late-nineteenth-century American idealism, Rogers also touches on topics of broader historical interest, such as the St. Louis Hegelians and the Concord School of Philosophy. Beyond that, the book contains interesting information about the limited academic and professional opportunities for women during this period in American history. Despite their intellectual abilities and aspirations, only Kies and Sunderland were able to earn doctoral degrees and only Bibb, Mitchell, and Kies held faculty positions in higher education. Although Blow held the position of "Director of the Kindergarten" in St. Louis for eleven years, she freely chose to work as a volunteer, apparently in deference to her father's wishes. Brackett served as principal of the normal school in St. Louis for almost ten years and with her domestic partner was co-founder of a highly successful private girls school in New York City. Mead worked as both a theorist and activist in the international peace movement.

I was pleasantly pleased to see that Rogers avoided common generalizations about the St. Louis Hegelians, depicting them as an intellectually diverse group who believed philosophy must have practical effects in the world. She points out that, on the whole, the St. Louis Hegelians were particularly interested in the philosophy of education and worked actively to reform public education in the United States and beyond. Rogers also notes that some of the intellectual leaders of that group—William Torrey Harris, Denton Snider, and Thomas Davidson—were more progressive about issues such as women's suffrage than some of the women she discusses.

This last point facilitates Rogers' effort to demonstrate that women intellectuals are distinct individuals who hold a variety of viewpoints about the issues they address. Although they too were particularly interested in education, Rogers classifies three of these women as "maternal feminists" and four as "liberal feminists." The former group argues for an expansion of women's social roles by insisting on their difference from men and emphasizing their superior abilities in nurturing and caretaking; the latter argues women should have equal rights by emphasizing women's similarity to men. Although, in effect, maternal feminism tended to expand opportunities for women, it did so in ways very different from liberal feminism. Maternal feminists such as Blow, Sunderland, and Kies chose not to support women's suffrage on the grounds that women could have a more positive effect on society by remaining in traditional roles. Liberal feminists such as Brackett, Bibb, Mitchell, and Mead argued that women should be allowed to advance themselves and the progress of their society in traditionally male roles if they chose to do so. Perhaps ironically from a twenty-first century viewpoint, a plausible argument can be
made that the work of maternal feminist Susan Blow in the public kindergarten movement may have had the most profound and far reaching effects on American society.

My only criticism of the book is that I would like to have seen more thorough and nuanced philosophical analysis of these women and their use of Hegel. Rogers admittedly prefers feminist critiques of Hegel, but even the sources she cites for that reading contain more nuanced accounts of Hegel than she provides. There is abundant evidence that Hegel was committed to the doctrine of two spheres; much like America's "founding fathers," he believed women should aspire to be Republican Mothers. In itself, the notion of the Republican Mother, that a women's role was to maintain a moral atmosphere in the home in order to inculcate republican virtues into her husband and children, actually elevated women above prevailing eighteenth-century perspectives on women's roles. Nonetheless, it is patently obvious that the notion of the Republican Mother falls far short of most versions of twenty-first century feminism.

In his recent biography, Terry Pinkard provides evidence that Hegel felt personally threatened by strong women, but from what I read in Rogers' book I get the impression that "America's first women philosophers" saw potential in his thought, perhaps even understanding the implications of his ideas more fully than he did himself. For example, despite allegations that Hegel glorified war, two important points of the master/slave dialectic is that the slave drives human progress while the master stagnates, and that conquest can never produce right. Moreover, many insightful readers have interpreted Hegel's historicization of abstract concepts such as "essence" and "human nature" as opening space for the redefinition of traditional social roles. As Blow and Brackett noted, for Hegel, growth requires a process of self-alienation and return, whereby the self incorporates otherness and difference into itself. These aspects of Hegel's thought can be employed in a defense of pluralistic society.

Rogers also adheres to a rather uncharitable account of Hegel's concept of civil society that should make readers wonder why he so resolutely rejected Adam Smith's laissez-faire approach to economic policy. Unlike Smith, Hegel emphasized the extent to which individual wills are mediated by social interaction in civil society and elevated the human desire for recognition above the desire for material gain.

Despite these problems, Rogers has given us a worthy introduction to the lives and philosophical work of these women. As she notes, it is travesty that these women have been almost completely ignored by students of American philosophy; her conclusion that male bias is the main reason for this seems unavoidable to me. I know I for one will draw on this book to help me include these women in future work on late-nineteenth-century American idealism. And I sincerely hope Rogers and other scholars will add to this important introduction to their thought. At this point, however, it is incumbent for scholars to move beyond memorialization to critical engagement of their thought. I have no doubt that further study of their unique perspectives will enrich our knowledge of American intellectual history and contribute to the project of advancing American philosophy through application to contemporary issues. Specifically, Rogers
makes a persuasive argument for the contemporary relevance of Mead's "practical pacifism" and provides enticing information about Kies' defense of altruism, pointing out similarities between Kies' ethical thought to contemporary feminist theories of care. There are also more riches to mine in the educational thought of these women, particularly Blow's and Brackett's application of Hegel's dialectic of self-alienation and return to practical educational issues, which provides solid ground for conceiving education as an expansion of the self, a useful corrective to the now common reduction of education to a marketable commodity. Hence I wholeheartedly recommend Roger's book to anyone interested in the history of American philosophy, as well as scholars interested in a myriad of contemporary philosophical and social issues.

Jim Good
North Harris College


What bothers me about this book is that it attempts to change public discourse on the environment using philosophy, and even science, when I see little inclination toward reason or science in our culture. But then, I serve as a science supervisor in a school district that used a sticker in texts to warn students about evolution. While there are erudite, learned people in our district, in metro-Atlanta, and the nation, it took the courts to remove the stickers, and I do not see the normative nature of U.S. citizens as particularly interested in the other "e" word—environment—or in the value of philosophy. That lack of interest is a problem for the essayists who wish to dialog in the public arena.

The book is comprised of twelve chapters, divided into three sections: 1) Political Theory and Environmental Practice; 2) Philosophical Tools for Environmental Practice; and 3) Rethinking Philosophy through Environmental Practice. The editors provide an astute and poignant introduction to the unity of the text and the issues facing environmental philosophers. In "Introduction: Environmental Ethics—Whose Philosophy? Which Practice?" the editors state their purpose:

Coming mainly from a background of pragmatism and communitarian political theory, we claim that philosophy can be expressed as a public event. It can, and perhaps should aim at changing the world, and it can do so only if it (1) takes seriously arguments that derive from real cases, from practice, and (2) applies itself to searching for novel philosophical tools that can be of use in environmental practice.

The book argues for what they call a "public reflective equilibrium" that removes philosophy from academe and places it squarely into the fray or public decision-making. It removes the idealism and anthropomorphism of nature and allows it to be discussed in an economically driven present. While obviously fraught with dangers for the essence of