

Note from the Editor

In announcing changes in organization and subscription procedures over the past year, we hinted that more change might be coming. This spring, the Society for Historians of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era worked out an agreement for the journal to be published by Cambridge University Press starting in 2011. The reasons are the same as those that have prompted numerous society-published journals—including both the *American Historical Review* and the *Journal of American History*—to affiliate lately with university presses. The shift toward electronic publishing presents numerous opportunities for improving substance and expanding scope and visibility, including overseas. A publisher such as Cambridge has the presence and credibility, as well as the editorial, administrative, and technical ability, to put together aggregations of interrelated journals that can accomplish as a group an expansion and upgrading that is beyond the capacity of an academic society working alone. Without going into details (I will send the relevant reports to any member who asks), Cambridge addressed with noteworthy acuity and specificity the concerns that hitherto caused us to keep postponing such an arrangement.

As discussion within SHGAPE emphasized, we have faced the dilemmas of a growing small business. At a certain point, one reaches the end of one's ability to grow and improve without the infrastructure and expertise that a well-established, experienced, large organization can bring. Subscribers will have noticed the pressures upon us in a number of ways, for example the chronic two-month lateness of print issues or vexing snags in implementation of the online membership system announced in October 2009. Details will be forthcoming from Cambridge and from us over the coming months, but we are certain that subscribers will quickly perceive an upgrading of substance, management, and responsiveness. By mid-2011, the online edition will become more readily and broadly accessible, while the print edition will become more prompt and better designed and produced.

By January, the journal will thus have a new support structure, after years of remarkable continuity. As explained in the October issue, this year is the first in SHGAPE's history without institutional support from the Hayes Presidential Center. The History Cooperative is dispersing as well, although we will remain a part of the back-issue service of JSTOR. Computer graphics expert JoAnne Geigner implemented the current design in 2004 and has put together every page of every issue since then. Since 2007, we have relied on Tracy Brown, a professional editor based in Washington, for copyediting and proofreading. Western Publishing, the respected academic printing firm in Indianapolis, has handled every issue since the journal's inception in 2002 and has always given this journal sound advice and solid support. These friends brought the journal very far, and now our job is to take it farther.

The arrangement with Cambridge promises more *efficiency* in both the operational sense and the broad *social efficiency* sense that reformers advocated in the Progressive Era. In a subtle way, J. I. Little's article on the Lake Memphremagog campers illustrates how social-reform progressives such as the Barrowses and their friends arrived at that outlook. In keeping with the long American tradition of small-scale social experimentation, the Barrowses sought a retreat from the city and its degrading aspects, but only a temporary, annual one. Among friends in a wholesome setting, they could experiment with personal and social arrangements that they could carry back to the city.

Joseph Gabriel's research on early, state-level debates over drug regulation illustrates social *inefficiency*, as reformers conceived of this. Horrific experience revealed that the training and standards of pharmacists was inadequate for modern social, medical, and market conditions, as was pharmacists' professional relations with physicians, another problem-plagued occupation. Drug regulation came to appear an undeniable example of the social and political reorganization needed to ensure individual freedom. Expanded regulatory and legal mechanisms were clearly necessary to protect people from dangerous or addictive drugs. Responsible citizenship depended on individual character, but that character in turn depended on social efficiency.

In the 1890s, as Michael Taylor explains, the bicycle was a novel, modern mobility device that many Protestant denominations viewed with ambivalence. Used in the right spirit, it could make the task of winning souls more efficient, but it could also convey people to temptation and worldliness.

Finally, Jonathan Zimmerman elaborates on a Progressive Era episode in efficiency carried so far that it seemed to become its own romance or madness. When in August 1906, President Theodore Roosevelt unexpectedly attempted to put the Government Printing Office behind the cause of simplified spelling, critics lambasted the move as an example of the president's penchant for erratic, imperious activity to no useful end. In its place, efficiency was laudable enough, antisimplifiers insisted, but a society based on efficiency was a "beautiful theory" in the most negative sense. The good society needs an element of *irrationality*, a humane thought with which Little's campers assuredly agreed. Predictably, one simplified-spelling proponent was Frank Gilbreth, whom generations have encountered as the archetypal efficiency cultist through his children's 1948 memoir *Cheaper by the Dozen*. I asked my daughter why she loves that book and reads it repeatedly. Life would be "boring" had Gilbreth succeeded, she remarked, a word with particular meaning for an eleven-year-old. But within limits it would have been "interesting to be around" while he tried.