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In colonial America, Pennsylvania served as a temporary residence for numerous Indians. Migrating from the Chesapeake Bay and other regions, these natives fled from European settlement in search of less-populated lands where they might resume their traditional pattern of hunting/fishing, gathering, and cultivating small plots of corn, beans, and squash. But river valleys such as the Susquehanna offered only a brief respite for Lenni Lenape, Nanticoke, Conoy and other refugees. In the eighteenth century these migrants continued their flight before the advancing frontier. Some went to Canada, others to Ohio, Wisconsin, and Indian Territory.

Until recently, historians have concentrated on this exodus, thereby suggesting that by the mid-nineteenth century, the eastern woodlands were stripped of their native resident. Today, this argument is generally considered fallacious. Before the 1970s, however, only a small number of scholars, such as Frank G. Speck, C.L. Weslager, Theodore Stern, and Brewton Berry, focused on those native groups that remained behind in secluded settlements amidst an overwhelmingly mainstream population. In *Strategies for Survival,* Frank W. Porter III, has brought together a selection of contemporary research on the native enclaves of the eastern United States.

This is a timely book. Not only does it reinforce the legitimacy of eastern Indian communities, it also serves to remind us that the mood of the 1960s continues to provide the impetus for native groups seeking to redress old injustices. The Great Society introduced by President Lyndon Baines Johnson created a climate of “rising expectations” among minority groups. Those affected included some 115,000 members of 133 Indian tribes not recognized by the federal government. Many of these groups live east of the Mississippi, and have become increasingly vocal in the last two decades. As Porter points out, the successful land case brought by the Passamaquoddy of Maine in the 1970s “shattered [the] myth of the vanished Indian in the eastern United States” (p. 35).

In the fifteen years since the Passamaquoddy caught the attention of the national media, scholars have begun to expand on the earlier research of Speck and others. Representing several disciplines—anthropology, geography, and history—they have reached some wide-ranging conclusions. In his article on the Okehocking Band of Lenape in southeastern Pennsylvania, Marshall Becker concludes that each group of eastern Indians and possibly each individual experienced “a separate pattern of culture change” (p. 69). Thus the experience of the Okehocking differed from that of the Virginia Indians, described by Helen C. Rountree, or the Long Island Poospatuck, discussed by Elice B. Gonzalez. Nonetheless, these cultural isolates also shared some common patterns of response. Quoting Calvin Beale, Porter notes that almost all eastern Indian communities lived on marginal lands: “It is difficult to locate an Indian
community that it is not associated with a swamp, a hollow, an inaccessible ridge, or the backcountry of a sandy flatwoods” (p. 17).

Moreover, residents of these enclaves view themselves in an entirely different way from how they are viewed by outsiders. Despite generations of intermarriage with whites and blacks, members of these isolates perceive their cultural heritage as Indian. Although this manifests itself in a myriad of subtle ways, one concrete dimension has been group insistence on an Indian church and an Indian school.

*Strategies for Survival* demonstrates how family and community ties have enabled these cultural enclaves to persist, and to retain a shared identity despite overwhelming odds. It should appeal to a wide range of readers, for it addresses a pivotal issue: the thread of ethnicity that is woven into our American past.

University of New Mexico

MARGARET CONNELL SZASZ


Professor Douglas Leach is the author of two excellent studies. His *Flintlock and Tomahawk* (1958) is the best and most detailed examination of King Philip's War. *Arms for Empire* (1973) is the best one-volume history of early America's recurrent warfare. Leach is a gifted and usually provocative writer.

With these attributed, *Roots of Conflict* should be a considerable achievement, a book that will make an important contribution to the study of early American history. Sadly, however, Leach's latest study is a disappointment. He continues to write well, and he has traveled far and wide to complete the research for this volume. The problem is that Leach offers little that has not been said before, principally by Fred Anderson in *A People's Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years' War* (1984), Alan Rogers in *Empire and Liberty: American Resistance to British Authority, 1755-1763* (1974), and John Shy in *Toward Lexington: The Role of the British Army in the Coming of the American Revolution* (1965).

Leach's thesis is that "Anglo-American friction caused by the presence of British regular forces prior to 1763 was indeed an important contributing factor in the coming of the American Revolution, especially in the form of intergroup attitudes and perceptions hardening into stereotypes and traditions" (p. ix). So well accepted is that notion that for some time it has been the staple of survey textbooks marketed for introductory college courses in United States history.

At the outset Leach hints at a novel approach. Perhaps, he states, the unfavorable attitudes which Americans manifested toward British regulars can be accounted for by recourse to the tools of the psychologist. Having broken with the Old World, he writes, the colonist perhaps needed to justify his immigration by identifying with his new homeland. Conversely, the English soldier who harbored an uncomplimentary image of provincials may have been impelled by a subliminal need to vindicate his continuing loyalty to the Old Country. Intriguing, but the idea goes unnourished. Having advanced this concept as "a possible psychological reason for such mutual hostility," and having pledged his "intention to devote particular attention" to this "working hypothesis," Leach never develops this theory (p. 5).
Of course, Leach demonstrates an abundance of shared ill will on both sides by 1763. The strains had their origin in the tempestuous events in Virginia, Massachusetts, and New York during the last quarter of the seventeenth century, he begins curiously. Royal governors were overthrown in each province, and in New York a second executive, who also was an officer in the British army, encountered defiance by American leaders. Although not one colonist is quoted as having drawn such a conclusion, Leach deduces that these passionate occurrences, and the British reaction to the colonial upheavals, contributed to the perception of standing armies as a repressive tool of tyranny.

Thereafter, Leach is on more sound turf. He writes of the abortive endeavors between 1709 and 1711 to subjugate Canada, as well as of the campaign against Louisbourg in 1745-1746. In addition, he scrutinizes the contemporaneous struggles on the Southern frontier, and he studies joint operations in the French and Indian War. Scholars are likely to find his treatment of the earlier conflicts and his chapter on naval warfare to be the book’s most stimulating sections.

Leach’s study is not without merit. It is a concise and excellent summary of a century of American warfare, and it goes beyond the works of Anderson and others in its documentation of myriad occurrences that provoked lingering Anglo-American bitterness. Roots of Conflict would be a splendid choice for required reading in college courses, and military history buffs will enjoy the study. Lamentably, however, specialists in early American history will find little that is new.

West Georgia College

JOHN E. FERLING


Two books couldn’t be more different in style, intent, or aspiration than Philadelphia Theatres, A–Z and Parades and Power. Their common thread is tenuous: essentially they are expressions of that amorphous discipline, popular culture. Both also exemplify an unfortunate trend in publishing: neither includes a bibliography. The two also suffer from clustered illustrations; all group in the front in Theatres or in the middle in Parades. Mr. Glazer’s book will never have to be redone. Ms. Davis’s might lead to some further study. To use an old-fashioned phrase, Philadelphia Theatre, A–Z, was “a labor of love” by a dedicated amateur, while Parades and Power is a giant step towards tenure by an academic of promise.

An accountant by profession, Mr. Glazer has provided a book that is a model of clarity and brevity. As the title implies, this is essentially an encyclopedic reference. A forty-eight page introductory essay adequately represents an overview of the evolution of theatre buildings in Philadelphia. Subsections are devoted to specialized eras: “Variety House, the Legitimate Theatre and the Birth of the Movies,” “The Inception of the Movie Palace Era,” “Present and Future Theatre Buildings,” etc. The heart of the book is an alphabetical listing of Philadelphia’s theatres which provides the reader with all the information
available about many of the theatres and select information about the more famous. For example, the Fox Theatre, a longtime landmark, is chronicled in two and a half tightly packed pages which detail the interior decoration “... old rose brocade used against a background of old convent Sienna marble with blue belge [sic] marble basing”) and ultimately inform us that when the theatre was destroyed “the chandeliers went to Columbus, Ohio for a theatre restoration there; the bronze ticket booth was shipped to Los Angeles and the numbered stained glass exit signs were purchased for $220.00 each.”

A more typical entire entry is represented by this listing:

“Montgomery Theatre, 523-525 East Girard Avenue; Capacity 650. The brick front Montgomery resembled a house with a marquee. It opened as a silent moving picture theatre in 1912 built on a lot measuring 45 by 110 feet. There were no distinguishing architectural features. The theatre closed in the 1930’s and the site became a police station.”

A map locating many of the theatres and a list of architects and their theatre buildings are additional features of value in this study which is a timeless example of the results of a hobbyist’s passion. It is a spirit we should all salute, one which provides us all with useful, if specialized, materials no other class of humankind would provide.

While Mr. Glazer’s book is in the slightly dusty, gentleman-scholar tradition, Ms. Davis’s bristles with modern techniques and buzz words. Her clarion call is that “historians have analyzed great events and social movements, but they have often ignored the nonliterate, nonelectronic communication through which movements and events are accomplished, interpreted and remembered.” The author will, of course, rectify these oversights.

“This case study of parades and ceremonies in early-nineteenth-century Philadelphia reveals how and why public events are problematic and significant for social history. The conceptual tools of folklore, social history, and communication will enable us to examine parades and ceremonies as political actions, rhetorical means by which performers attempted to accomplish practical and symbolic goals. This approach helps interpret the usual, repetitive events of urban public culture, as well as the startling and unusual ones—the July Fourth parades as well as the strike demonstrations—as kinds of communication that are part of the social forces that shape our lives. Looking at parades in their social-historical context—in this period a context of change and conflict—reveals that parades do more than reflect society. Such public enactments, in their multiplicitous and varied forms, are not only patterned by social forces—they have been part of the very building and challenging of social relations.”

Ms. Davis completes what she sets out to do in an accomplished and magnificently documented fashion. This reviewer was especially interested in her descriptions of the significances and practices of Christmas Eve celebrations. Especially that street revelers often dressed in women’s attire and that “Young men were sometimes arrested for transvestism...” Was this a forerunner of
Philadelphia's infamous twentieth-century Halloween spectacles? Perhaps a future work will link the two. This is perhaps a trivial point to note amidst the grand themes, i.e. "Class Dramas: Workers Parades" and "Patterns of Communication: Transformation of Repertoire," but it is indicative of the variety of material included within this pioneering study.

Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg

IRWIN RICHMAN


The Cavalry at Gettysburg is a well-researched, fast-paced tactical study. According to Longacre, who is an Air Force staff historian and a well-known Civil War author, this publication will "plug" one of the last "gaps in the literature of Gettysburg" (p. 9). In fact, he contends that the "horse soldiers of North and South shouldered the major burden of the campaigning" (p. 10).

Written in a style that will appeal to readers of the Civil War Times Illustrated, Longacre traces almost every cavalry clash, often down to the company level, for the fight at Brandy Station on June 9 (the largest cavalry battle in North American history) to the skirmishes five weeks later, as R.E. Lee recrossed the Potomac into Virginia.

Initially, the two antagonists and their subordinates are introduced in a critical evaluation of their careers to mid-1863. Jeb Stuart is the "Beau Sabreur" of the Confederates. The new Union commander, Alfred Pleasanton, is the "Knight of Romance" whose chief characteristic was a "determination to advance his own rank and standing by any expedient."

The battle of Brandy Station is described in a chess-like manner. Its import was that the Union cavalry was not embarrassed (it was a tactical draw) and that it was fast "coming of age" (p. 87).

Two chapters are devoted to the little-known skirmishes at Aldie and Middleburg (twice) and Upperville, Virginia, from 17 to 21 June. With the Union high command in disarray, the Union cavalry shielded Washington, and Stuart made his well-known foray to the east via Hanover, Pennsylvania, which prevented him from assisting Lee prior to the third day at Gettysburg.

Stuart's failed effort, on July 3, to get to the rear of Meade's army, Farnsworth's "doomed assault" on Lee's right, and the hit-and-run skirmishes on his retreating army are detailed in a workmanlike manner.

Longacre gives high marks to Stuart and to his commanders, except for Robertson and Jenkins, despite being on the defensive during most of the campaign. Lee had sufficient cavalry to maintain his intelligence, however, poor staff worked prevailed. On the march into Pennsylvania, Pleasanton provided Meade with "wild speculation, unfounded rumor, and garbled intelligence." Buford and David Gregg proved to be his best fighters and leaders.

Although a few maps are included, none are adequate. In addition, the most minor skirmish is detailed as if it was of some significance. Unfortunately, the notes are at end. The bibliography lists manuscripts and unpublished records. There are thirty-one photographs, most of which are of the senior generals.

Although there is little here that is new to the specialist, Longacre's blunt
analyses are often appealing. Scholars will question whether Gettysburg was as "pivotal" as Vicksburg. The general reader, however, will enjoy the book, if he/she can afford it.

California University of Pennsylvania

JOHN KENT FOLMAR


Out of the Crucible, by Dennis C. Dickerson, is an important addition to a growing body of literature devoted to the labor history of western Pennsylvania. Dickerson blends the methodology of the old and new labor history. He utilizes manuscript collections, union records, oral interviews, and census data. His work represents the most thorough study of black industrial workers in western Pennsylvania yet written.

Dickerson does not equivocate; race, and not class, largely determined the fate of the region’s black steelworkers. Jim Crow and economic deprivation drove black workers north to the mills. The racist practices of organized labor explained their failure to embrace the union cause. Racial antagonism enabled mill management to employ black labor during strikes. Consequently, the mere fact that a man was black was presumptive of being a scab in many western Pennsylvania milltowns.

Dickerson’s work focuses upon the black experience in the steel industry rather than the ghetto. On the job, nonunion blacks encountered outright hostility, and after unionization, ambiguity. Through it all, Dickerson found the status of blacks to be tenuous. Black steelworkers, always a numerical minority, were mired in dead-end jobs, with little hope of promotion. Layoffs always seemed to find them first. According to Dickerson, management and the USWA did virtually nothing to change the reality of discrimination in the mills.

The first half of the book deals with black steelworkers who labored outside the union fold. Strikes and wartime labor shortages enabled blacks to escape impoverishment in the South. According to Dickerson, blacks achieved a surprising degree of job diversity and upward mobility in the mills before the war. In 1919, blacks again crossed picket lines and even served as deputy sheriffs. Of acute interest was the employment of blacks in company-sponsored welfare schemes during the twenties. Blacks served as company recruiters, trouble shooters, housing agents, and even registered voters in some communities.

The transition from anti-unionism to USWA membership is the weakest link in Dickerson’s work. It is surprising that he did not consult the work of Paul and Linda Nyden on black miners in western Pennsylvania. The efforts of the Progressive Miners Bloc and the National Miners Union to rid the coal industry of Jim Crow may well have influenced black steelworkers, for significant numbers of them worked in the mines. The NMU, which was the sole advocate for racial equality in the industrial workplace in the late twenties and early thirties, is dismissed as a splinter group.

Dickerson argues persuasively that membership in the USWA did not much improve the status of blacks in the region’s mills. Union seniority often froze blacks in segregated mill departments. The egalitarian rhetoric of Philip
Murray and David McDonald was not matched by action on the shop floor or in racist locals. Blacks were appointed to visible positions which were largely ceremonial. They were not even appointed to the union’s civil rights department. Dickerson makes a strong case for historians who have argued that, in some important ways, unions spawned by the CIO merely carried on the practices of craft unionism on an industrial scale. Dickerson also does much to explain why the region’s great industrial unions have languished on the periphery of western Pennsylvania’s social and political life in recent decades.

*Pennsylvania State University, New Kensington Campus*

CARL I. MEYERHUBER, JR.


*Laurel Line* and *Red Arrow* are an interesting example of similarity and dissimilarity in books dealing with kindred subjects. Both are published by the same press (they are numbers 103 and 96, respectively, of that house’s “Interurbans Special” series), oversized (8½” x 11”), profusely illustrated, and have detailed rosters of equipment, time tables, and maps. They are easy to look at and a pleasure to read.

Written by two historians at East Stroudsburg University, who used the company’s extensive records and papers held at Syracuse University, *Laurel Line* (or, more correctly, the Lackawanna and Wyoming Valley Railroad) is an in-depth study of an interurban electric railway that carried passengers and freight between Scranton and Wilkes-Barre beginning in 1905. Built to main line steam railroad standards but using the third rail method of propulsion (there is a most useful essay entitled, “Why Third Rail?” by Fred W. Schneider, III) the line’s promoters overcapitalized the works. They spent too much on construction, including a one-mile tunnel under the south side of Scranton, and put in place an organization structure that was top-heavy.

When Patrick J. Murphy became vice president and general manager in 1915, the company began a slow turnaround, and survived World War I in relatively good condition. Accidents, the absence of a block signal system, and vigorous competition from buses, trucks, and other rail lines reversed this trend in the mid- and late twenties. The depression of the thirties, the gradual decline in the demand for anthracite, and a precipitous fall in passenger traffic produced endless deficits. After World War II, wage cuts, employee layoffs, and deferring needed improvements became the norm. Murphy negotiated with the bankers and trustees for more time but there was too much against him. The area’s population was declining, less and less anthracite was being shipped, and there was only limited promise of industrial development in the region. By 1948 the company was bankrupt, and four years later passenger service was abandoned. In 1960, the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad took it over.

Written by the chief operations planning officer of SEPTA, *Red Arrow* “is a revised, expanded version of a portion of *The Red Arrow*” (1972); two additional volumes are promised. Most of the excellent photographs and much
of the text are drawn from the “more than 37,000 documents and other corporate records” on deposit at the Hagley Museum and Library.

Evolving from a turnpike (1848) and a horse-car passenger railway (1859), this line took form in the early 1890s as an electric trolley line. Despite numerous legal entanglements, not the least of which were those with the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, a trolley line from 63rd Street, Philadelphia, to West Chester was opened on December 17, 1898. Beginning in 1899, A. Merritt Taylor and his namesake son were the moving forces behind the “Red Arrow.” The father bought new equipment, increased the frequency of service, found new sources of revenue, rebuilt the track, and opened an amusement park at Castle Rock, among other things. Virtually every risk that he took paid off. Extending his line to Ardmore (1902), to the edge of PRR’s main line, came at the right time to take advantage of that area’s population growth. His finest moment came when he (and his company) became actively involved in developing the 69th Street Terminal. Riders could now enjoy fast and frequent service from downtown to the western suburbs (1907).

The company paid dividends annually from 1905 to 1933. When buses threatened, they started their own bus service as an adjunct to the trolley. Their trolleys carried milk and light freight, most of the latter to-and-from West Chester. During the depression, when other electric railway lines folded, the “Red Arrow” was never in really serious financial trouble. Instead, new equipment was purchased, service was maintained, and the right-of-way was kept in good working order. Upon becoming president in 1932, Merritt H. Taylor, Jr. reduced rider fares, so that by 1937 ridership equalled that of 1931. A completely new and much more efficient 69th Street Terminal was opened in 1936; a real estate boom followed, and Upper Darby Township’s population quintupled in a decade—more riders for the line.

In the 1940s patronage doubled and then doubled again. Women were hired as “conductorettes” starting in February 1943 and, as DeGraw puts it so succinctly, “were paid about 25 percent less than the men.” More profits accrued, outstanding bonds were paid off, more new equipment was bought, and more terminal renovations were made. The “Red Arrow” was a successful suburban transportation company in 1948.

West Chester, Pennsylvania

ROBERT E. CARLSON


Prior to reading The American Family Home, I doubt if I ever gave more than a passing thought to the single family structure in terms of moral values. If I did view the house as a special environment or protected familial retreat, it was due to the influence created by the bucolic lithographs of Currier and Ives and their competitors. Professor Clark of Carleton College takes his readers behind and beyond those cheerful, fading prints and conducts them through a century and a half of slowly changing architectural and social values.

The American home becomes more than a bricks-and-mortar structure. It is perceived as a symbol of much that was admirable in American life in the opening and middle years of the nineteenth century. That perception led both to
the desire of home ownership among all American families and to the demand for domiciles that were attractive, workable, and affordable.

The principles of Christianity, for example, influenced architectural design in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, evident in the Gothic cottages of both Alexander Jackson Davis and Andrew Jackson Downing. The cruciform floor plan, for example, was advocated, and the resulting structure with its arched, stained-glass windows, parlor organ, and idiosyncratic furniture resembled more a place of worship than a home.

Almost as popular as the Gothic style was the Italian villa with its omnipresent tower, broad verandas, and hooded windows. Larger interiors in these and later Victorian single family homes led to the incorporation of both front and back or service stairs in increasingly complicated floor plans. It was possible for the proper lady of the house to “stay upstairs until the visitor’s card had been brought up,” before her descent to the front parlor or best room invariably reserved for weddings, wakes, and visiting wags.

In what is as important a sociological study of domestic lifestyles as it is an architectural survey of the single family home, Professor Clark reminds his readers that at any given period there were obvious deficiencies to any given style. Harriet Beecher Stowe, for example, complained to her husband of the drudgery in running a home smoothly (“I am sick of the smell of sour milk, and sour meat, and sour everything, and then the clothes will not dry ... and everything smells moldy”). Because houses were larger or roomier for the most part in the last century, what they lacked in efficiency they more than made up for in the degree of privacy afforded the members of the extended family which often included three generations.

With improvements in transportation, particularly during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the exodus to the suburbs became more pronounced. A house in the country was seen as a healthy, sunlit, green, spacy setting for the rearing of a family removed from the evils of the city. This trend continued and continues in the twentieth century, though today there is a strong pull back to the city, encouraged in part by the preservation movement and the energy crisis.

An abrupt change in domestic architecture occurred at the century’s turn when the stately, sprawling Victorian manse was swept aside by the unlikely, lowly bungalow with its emphasis on compactness and economy of function. Early magazine articles promoting the advantages of the new, smaller residence identified the bungalow with Southern California but, in fact, similar structures had appeared in factory towns like White Mills, Pennsylvania, as early as the 1870s. Nonetheless, the style prevailed until first the Depression and then World War II sharply curtailed housing construction for lack of materials.

After the war, the single story ranch (and its second cousin, the split level) with low-pitched roof and large expanses of glass became popular in those halcyon days of cheap energy. The 1956 Interstate Highway Act provided tens of millions in Federal dollars to the states on a matching basis for macadam ribbons that crisscrossed the nation’s countryside and opened up vast new tracts for residential development.

The twentieth century home “retains its position as the central element within the middle-class dream of security, self-determination, and independence.” It is smaller, infinitely less attractive, but has few of the maintenance problems of its
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Victorian predecessors. The American family home is no longer perceived as a symbol of moral values. Yet, be it ever so humble.

Professor Clark has done a creditable job in bringing together in this study a wealth of sociological data that the architectural historian might normally overlook or at least downplay. The American Family Home is particularly well-illustrated throughout with a judicious blend of old photographs, blueprints and floor plans, architectural drawings, and contemporary prints including magazine advertisements.

University of Scranton

JOHN QUENTIN FELLER


The author of this history of the two hundred years of the University of Pittsburgh is a professional writer, historian, and a graduate of the University. In thirty-six chapters (interestingly titled) divided into five books, he tells the story mostly through the administrations of its chancellors, presidents, and principals. The leaders in most instances were strong personalities with definite ideas on higher education. There is no other central characteristic that binds them together. Each seemed to approach his tasks in his own way. The author with his main emphasis on the administrators succeeded in developing the strong chronological narrative he wanted. If a reader who is an alumnus of the University does not find mention of a person or of an event that he thinks merits notice, the reader will discover that certainly the areas that caught local, national, and international attention have been well detailed. Such things as the building of the Cathedral of Learning, the controversies remembered by the names of the outstanding protagonists—Sutherland, Turner, Colodny, Helen Clay Frick—and the stimulating, if disturbing at times, years of Edward Litchfield are fully and honestly discussed and evaluated. The pages of this book are crowded with all sort of activities ranging from the development of the vaccine that came to bear Salk’s name to athletic achievements and disappointments. The author has not forgotten the essential national history which is the background for the growth of the University from an academy to its present status.

There are many photographs in the book, including a portfolio by—to quote a University blurb for this work—“internationally recognized award-winning photographer Lynn Johnson” who does not get a biographical note or a mention in the table of contents. This editorial ignoring of Lynn Johnson brought to mind the late Thomas M. Jarrett who was for many years the University photographer. He is not noticed either although probably many of the photos were his. He seldom got credit for his work that went out from the University. Jarrett covered the athletes, the band, important visitors to campus, the medical and dental schools, graduations, and the multitude of other University assemblies; he provided over three hundred photos for what may be the best of the books from the University of Pittsburgh Press, Edwin L. Peterson’s Penn’s Woods West. (Peterson gets superb coverage as a teacher of creative writers, but no mention of this award-winning work.) There are few pictures of faculty
members. The selection of photos follows the organizational scheme of the book: chancellors, trustees, benefactors, and controversial faculty members. Dr. Ralph Turner gets a full page opposite Chancellor John Bowman.

The lack of attention for particular faculty members or students does not mean that faculty and students are ignored in this history. They are not. The book may have been enlivened by the inclusion of stories of eccentric professors, but which? Every graduate would have a nominee. Maybe it was best that this approach was ignored. Nevertheless, the problems that faced faculties at Pitt over the years were not peculiar to them. Problems ranging from what was to be the role of the faculty in university governance to the problems of resolving tenure questions were sooner or later on every campus. Sometimes at Pitt such problems did take a slightly different slant than elsewhere for a variety of reasons. That Pitt was able to recruit and retain some very able teachers at some very difficult times may be a point to be noted. As with faculty and its problems, Pitt's students responded to their problems, for example the societal upheavals of the 1960s and 1970s, much as students on other campuses. However, the ways that the administrators and faculty at Pitt reacted had their own features and are here reviewed. There is another aspect of the Pitt student body that grabs attention. There is a fact about Pitt students that is touched upon both in the Foreword and in the collection of statistics at the back of the book. The fact is that Pitt always cites in its handouts the percentage of freshmen who are the first generation of their family to go to college. This year it is 48.5 percent. John Funari in his Foreword has an explanation for the presentation of this fact that is of interest. (The Foreword is well worth the reading. Funari was administrative assistant to Litchfield, served later at the State Department, and then was Dean of the School of Public and International Affairs.)

There is an Epilogue that is a delight to read. The bibliography and the index are complete. In the bibliography will be found listed the previous 150-year history of the University by Agnes Lynch Starrett. It is reasonable to assume that in another fifty years another president will turn to another author to write a history of the University. Perhaps now is the time for Mr. Alberts to advance his suggestions on how it might be best to prepare the research groundwork for the next volume. If anything is evident in this book, it is that a university is a very difficult institution to explain historically. Even though Alberts has done his task very well, there must have been times when he said to himself, "If only someone had..." Dr. Wesley W. Posvar, the current and very capable president of Pitt is recorded as having asked for "...a history that would be at once scholarly, readable, and useful to a wide audience." Mr. Alberts wrote such a history, and now he can, with support, give assistance to another historian whose job promises to be even more difficult than his has been.

Indiana, Pennsylvania

Clyde C. Gelbach