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Recent studies of the dramatic changes that occurred in the American legal system during the 19th century have provided new and exciting insights not only into practice and procedure of criminal law, but also in understanding the development of American society in general. Professor Steinberg’s study of the *Transformation of Criminal Justice Philadelphia* is a most welcome addition to a happily growing body of work, new classics in law and history which include Stephen Skowronek’s *Building a New American State* (1982) and especially Hendrik Hartog’s *Public Property and Private Power* (1983).

These are different views of law than the more traditional case study compilation as in the almost encyclopedic Julius Goebel and Thomas Naughton’s *Law Enforcement in Colonial New York* (1944). The new literature provides conceptual, imaginative dimensions showing more clearly the relationship of law and society. Steinberg makes use of numerous tables and statistics as tools to sharpen and hone ideas though these are not always effective and so should be used with some caution.

There is one basic theme which sounds repeatedly through Hartog’s work on New York and then again in *Transformation*: the 19th century began with the city having very limited jurisdiction over private property. Maintenance of private interests was the paramount concern of government, and private prosecution in “which private citizens brought criminal cases to the attention of court officials, initiated the process of prosecution, and retained considerable control over the ultimate disposition of cases . . .” (p. 5) was the norm. At least colonial Pennsylvania, as quoted by the author, was a “happy country” because “they have no lawyers. Everyone is to tell his own case, or some friend for him.” (pp. 6, 7)

Philadelphia, at the turn of the century, was a “happy country,” where citizens took each other to court without police intervention. Even the disenfranchised poor had a stake in the legal and political system, and there existed a democratic forum for law enforcement.

The first chapters of *Transformation* offer colorful descriptions of early aldermanic and mayoralty courts where criminal justice was defended in crowded noisy rooms in front of people who saw the courts as their courts and an extension of the “theatre of the streets”—moreover, it was free popular theatre. Drunks were always funny, and prostitutes were a notable attraction, with Monday mornings usually drawing the largest crowds. On a typical day in 1848, one alderman heard “six assault and battery cases, three larceny cases, three breach of ordinance cases, one fire cracker case, one fast driving case, and one case of throwing torpedoes on the stage of the Arch Street Theatre.” (p. 17) Among other duties he conducted one marriage ceremony.
Gradually, sometimes even quickly, the Eden of Democracy even with its corruption and brutality changed as business and population expanded. In 1800 there were 67,000 people in Philadelphia, 800,000 by 1875. By that year there were factories, sweatshops, railroads, row houses and mansions which replaced a simpler more orderly community. It was a modern city beautiful and ugly, peaceful and violent, and the rules and courts changed. Consolidation in 1854 created one government of forty separate political units. Centralization, to achieve the public good, led to the gradual disempowerment of ordinary citizens, "the patrolman, the bureaucracy and crime control measures take the place of the alderman, the courthouse and dispute resolution." (p. 3)

Elitist reformers led the assault on popular culture, temperance advocates and anti-city zealots led the way in destroying Philadelphia's traditional minor judiciary in the name of public interest. In 1800, the greatest number of criminal cases were brought by private individuals, but by 1875 state prosecutions were primary with the police having broad powers of arrest. What was true in Philadelphia was also true in New York (where in a landmark decision the right of private interment was successfully challenged in the interest of the public good) and probably throughout urban America.

In a way this is a nostalgic look at the past. Professor Steinberg wonders whether the loss of popular participation in local government was worth the problems caused by the institutional state and the transformation (or bureaucratization) of criminal justice. Is not the passive citizen a serious detriment to a viable democratic process? Nonetheless, Professor Steinberg has proven a most capable guide to comprehending the emergence of present-day America.

Leo Hershkowitz, Queens College, City University of New York


Readers of Pennsylvania history will enjoy this well-informed account of a Pennsylvanian significant in transforming his state—and nation—into a developed industrial economy. Joseph Wharton's long life (1826-1909) spanned the era of such entrepreneurs as Vanderbilt, Daniel Drew and Carnegie. Neither so famous (or infamous), he played a role slightly below that of these more familiar names.

As suggested by the title, "Quaker and Industrial Pioneer," Yates's book emphasizes Quaker ties in Wharton's life and his part in developing new industries. Early chapters explain the nature of Hicksite Quakerism in Philadelphia and detail the Quaker interests of the extended Wharton family. Although Wharton first chose farming as an occupation (a highly approved vocation among Quakers), he abandoned it after a year for a career in business. Starting as an apprentice in a mercantile house where he learned bookkeeping, he soon moved to his brother's white lead business. Here he glimpsed the challenging mysteries of industrial chemistry.
In 1854 Wharton accepted the position of "Manager" of the Pennsylvania and Lehigh Zinc Company's works in Bethlehem. Allowed wide scope, he hired experts and used his own knowledge to solve production problems. At first, they made only zinc oxide, a paint pigment, but by 1859 Wharton developed the first commercially viable method of producing pure zinc metal. This achievement brought him recognition as a pioneer. Although a quarrel with the directors forced him out by 1863, through special deals Wharton had accumulated a kitty sufficient to launch a new business.

He would have preferred smelting zinc, but there was no alternative to the Lehigh Company's Saucon Valley mines. His early eminence as a business manager is suggested by the offer of two steel companies, the Bethlehem Iron Company and the Thomas Iron Company (the largest in the Lehigh Valley), to be their president. He chose instead the challenge of struggling with an intractable metal: nickel. The hardness of the ore, the high melting point of the metal (1453°C.) and its troublesome combination with other metals had until then balked American metallurgists.

Wharton bought control of the Gap Mines in Lancaster County, complex deposits which had been worked sporadically and unprofitably for about one hundred years. After several failures in smelting ore, Wharton brought in more technical help and produced a saleable nickel/copper alloy. A greater triumph came when they produced economically the first pure, malleable nickel. Wharton's American Nickel Works was the dominant supplier of nickel in America until the best veins in the Gap Mines ran out in 1893. It had been the principal basis for his fortune when he sold to the International Nickel Company in 1903.

Like many nineteenth century businessmen, Yates's research reveals that Wharton had interests in businesses other than his central one of smelting. Between 1864 and 1901 when the company was bought by Charles M. Schwab, Wharton was the principal stockholder and member of the board of the Bethlehem Iron Company. Railroads such as the Lehigh Valley Railroad attracted his investment and briefly his time as director. Ventures in Colorado gold mining, forestry and farming in the New Jersey Pinelands and a menhaden fishery drew off some of his capital and energy, but with very little return. Nonetheless, when he wrote his will in 1905 he was worth about $14,000,000.

Yates describes Wharton's considerable activity as a Republican Party supporter and lobbyist, principally as the Vice President of the American Iron and Steel Association. Though tendered the Republican nomination for the House of Representa-

tives in 1872, Wharton refused all political candidacies. On the other hand, he was extremely interested in using political power to secure a high protective tariff for the metals he sold—a cause he justified as serving a large national end. His campaign contributions, entertaining and lobbying brought him into association with politicians whom historians have not always praised for their ethical vision: Matthew Quay, Boise Penrose, Simon Cameron and James G. Blaine.

Generally, Yates prefers descriptions to judgments, but questions arise. Wharton held Pineland tracts till his death (later the Wharton State Forest), but was profit or ecology his motive? He founded the Wharton School, but cut it out of his will. Do his
modest benefactions—including his assistance to Swarthmore College—rank at all close to Carnegie's? Does Quakerism truly modify his business behavior and his life, or is he more a man of his times with his sharp business practice, lack of concern about slavery, rejection of pacifism and immoderate pursuit of wealth to the end of his life?

Robert A. Davison, Hofstra University


The American Backwoods Frontier had its beginnings in research that Terry G. Jordan believed would demonstrate that American notched-log construction had its origins among the Germans of central Europe. After examining every major log-construction region of central Europe, however, Jordan was forced by his own intellectual honesty to recognize that the thesis was not tenable. He then turned his attention to Scandinavia, where he found a carpentry similar to that of the American frontier in a Finnish region known as the Finnskog, which provided Finnish settlers to the American colony of New Sweden in the seventeenth century. At that point Jordan invited Matti Kaups, a specialist in Finnish culture, to join him in a study in which cultural ecology would constitute a prime part of their methodology.

Jordan and Kaups found practices in the Karelian culture around Lake Ladoga, beginning about the eleventh century, which were especially suited to woodland colonization. They included methods of burnbeating, or of shifting cultivations to new clearings, known as *huhta* and *kaski*, which facilitated rapid advances into virgin forestlands. *Huhta* permitted a heavy crop of rye, but for only one year, while *kaski* made possible good rye and barley yields for two or three years. Both, however, necessitated moving on to new lands after those first harvests. Livestock raising, hunting, fishing, and gathering were also aspects of the Karelian culture, but its hallmark was forest pioneering, which after about 1350 led to rapid agricultural colonization of much of interior Finland and Russian Karelia.

Karelian pioneers expanded into southern Savo Province, where they blended with a small indigenous Finnish population to produce the Savo-Karelian culture. This culture was marked by the construction of *pirtti*, a combination dwelling, sauna, and grain-drying shed; enlargement of dwellings by the addition of a second room across an open breezeway, to make a double log house; and the importance of *kirvesmiehet*, or "ax wielders." During the sixteenth century this Savo-Karelian culture expanded further, reaching central Sweden, and especially into Varmland.

Finns of Savo-Karelian background formed a substantial part of the Swedish migration to the Delaware Valley after the 1640s. They, more than pioneers of other national origins, had already pre-adapted to the forest conditions they encountered and were admirably suited by generations of experience for forestland colonization. In
addition, they drew freely from Indian practices, especially those of the Delawares. Jordan and Kaups contend that they transplanted Savo-Karelian culture to the banks of the Delaware River, which became a hearth from which their basic ideas and practices expanded across the American woodlands to the Pacific Coast.

Similarities between the Savo-Karelian culture and that planted by the Finns on the Delaware went far beyond the notched-log construction that had been the focus of Jordan's original investigation. Among the similarities were burn-beating techniques, with clear-cutting methods of removing forests but leaving tree stumps in the fields; expert use of the felling ax; "worm" or "snake" fences, as well as those of the stake and rider or straight rail type; crop selection processes; and the seemingly haphazard layout of farm buildings. In their log construction, Finns on the Delaware, like the Karelians, made use of round timbers, split-logs, and flattened logs. Moreover, they used the same chinking techniques and roofing practices found in Karelian buildings.

In the matter of log cabin construction, Jordan and Kaups specifically credit the Finns with contributions commonly attributed to the Swedes. They hold that the pre-adaptation of the Finns enabled them to come to terms with the requirements of the American woodland frontier far more readily than the English, Germans, and Scotch-Irish. They concede that the Finns may have borrowed the "worm" fence from the Lapps, who used it to direct game, and they make no claim that the Finns had exclusive responsibility for the V-notching and diamond notching of logs used in building construction.

The authors maintain that only the techniques of the Finns enabled the Americans to spread across the continent within about a hundred years after settlements left the Delaware Valley and eastern Pennsylvania. On the other hand, they recognize that Finnish methods were extremely wasteful of forests, flora and fauna, and even human energies and set an early precedent for American destructiveness of natural resources.

This work is thoroughly researched, convincingly argued, and amply buttressed by graphic illustrations. If the interpretation is in its own way deterministic and inclined to give little credit to the originality of non-Finnish pioneers on the western side of the Atlantic, it is, nevertheless, challenging and stimulating. Jordan and Kaups have stated their thesis with vigor and great detail, and those who question or reject it will need to adduce data and arguments equally or more convincing.

Otis K. Rice, West Virginia Institute of Technology


This book by a journalist and a political scientist is a joint biography of the two great commanders of the Civil War. While beginning and ending with chapters treating both, it largely uses the approach of alternate chapters focusing on each man. Chronology justifies starting the sequence with the older Lee but that pattern also seems
to reflect the authors' relative interest in their subjects. Much of the limited research in manuscripts is from Lee-related collections. The Andersons also draw upon the published letters of Grant and Lee. There is, however, very little use of The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies. Surprising for a study of two professional soldiers, there is nothing from the rich resources of the National Archives. Instead the book rests heavily upon standard biographies and memoirs. Hence scholars are unlikely to find it useful.

To the general readers who are probably its intended audience, it may be of limited value. Reasonably well written, the biography's contents are replete with human interest. In their eagerness to include such material, the authors sometimes lose their focus—as in their graphic accounts of the Confederate evacuation of Richmond and surrender parade at Appomattox (events unwitnessed by either of their subjects). Still, like the modern secondary works which they cite, they give unromanticized, realistic and generally interesting treatments of their central figures. An especially distinctive theme is the authors' stress on the influence of the tradition of the American Revolution on the leaders and people of both North and South. Their case is very strong for the parallel often cited between Lee and his fellow Virginian, George Washington, and they may well be correct in believing that Confederate physical deprivations akin to those of the rebels of the Revolutionary War contributed to a degree of Northern respect for their foes. Also interesting is the authors' suggestion that relations between Lee and his own counterpart to Washington's Martha improved as a result of wartime travail, while Grant's already great dependence on his wife helped him to overcome other personal problems.

Yet even as popular history, this book has serious weaknesses. The general background discussion of topics like the antislavery movement and the Compromise of 1850 is shallow. Even the treatment of such military topics as the Mexican War and the climactic assault on Mexico City is superficial and sometimes unclear. Some important events of the Civil War are treated with cavalier brevity—Grant at Missionary Ridge gets a sentence—and the detailed treatments of others contain doubtful interpretations. Thus the account of Gettysburg reflects the claims of enemies that James Longstreet was inordinately slow and that George Meade had been ready to withdraw the Union army until dissuaded by his aides. (Incidentally the writer of the oft-quoted description of the battle upon which the authors draw was Frank—not Fred—Haskell.) Especially unsatisfying is the relegation of the postwar period to a brief epilogue. Perhaps reflecting the authors' preoccupation with Lee, who died much sooner after the war than Grant did, it does scant justice to aspects that tied up major themes in both men's lives.

An important problem for readers not already well informed about the period is the number of confusing and erroneous statements. In the former category is the statement that just as the Americans took Mexico City in September, 1847, "members were being elected to the Thirtieth Congress which assembled in Washington in December 1847." (p. 91) Similarly confusing is the placing of Fort Henry on different rivers on successive pages (pp. 221, 222). Simply incorrect are the assertions that Franklin
Pierce was a "New Yorker" (p. 112), that "Lyman Ward Beecher" recommended "rifled Sharp muskets" (p. 131), that Union soldiers carried forty "pounds" (p. 224) (not rounds) of ammunition; and that the "cracker line" opened by Grant to feed Chattanooga ran to Knoxville (pp. 351-352).

Still, for readers willing to allow for the book's defects and anxious for a combined treatment of these two leaders, The Generals may give access to the interpretations of the contemporary scholarship upon which it is largely based. This is faint praise; that is as much as the book merits.

Frank L. Byrne, Kent State University


Sports fans born after World War II have taken as a given the racial integration—at least among players—of professional franchises and the close relationship between sport and television. They also define professional and collegiate sport as pretty much all there is by way of spectator pastime.

It wasn't always that way. Before television, sandlot teams played in almost every city in the country. Company teams filled industrial leagues, club and recreation facility teams also vied on the sandlots, and minor league baseball, though professional, all provided occasions not only to watch a game, but to come together in some sense as a community.

Blacks in this period found themselves excluded from virtually all professional sport and, excepting black colleges, from intercollegiate athletics as well. If they wanted to participate, they had to organize their own teams, a situation both confining and liberating. The confinement was obvious, but the liberation came in the sense of pleasure and achievement whole groups felt when they proved that they could indeed organize such activities and could compete quite successfully against whites. The games also gave both participants and spectators a certain escape from the grinding prejudice they encountered in their everyday lives, brought migrant and long-time resident blacks together, and in cities like Pittsburgh—where blacks lived in several geographically separate neighborhoods—acted as a unifying force for the complete black community.

Rob Ruck's Sandlot Seasons recaptures the world of amateur and professional sport in Pittsburgh from the late nineteenth century to the rise of the integrated, televised professional teams that dominated the post-1950 world. After briefly describing sport throughout the city, he focuses on the black community, which organized some of the most remarkable black teams found anywhere in the country. On a professional level, for example, the Pittsburgh Crawfords, owned by numbers king Gus Greenlee, produced a 1935 team that not only won the Negro National League championship, but boasted five players now in the Hall of Fame—Oscar Charleston, Judy Johnson, Cool Papa Bell, Josh Gibson, and Satchel Paige.
But even a team like the Crawfords had its origins on the sandlots. They had been organized eleven years earlier in the Hill District of Pittsburgh, drawing their name from the Crawford Bath House. Originally an integrated group, much like the neighborhood in which they played, they soon evolved into an all-black team, then went from neighborhood sandlot group to city-wide team, with many original members lost in the process. Though Pittsburgh and most northern cities did not ban games between black teams and white teams—indeed these contests provided a great deal of what revenue black teams took in—integrated teams were rare despite the presence of many mixed neighborhoods. Ruck never makes clear quite why this was so, though he goes to some trouble to describe one team—from Terrace Village—that did integrate. But this was already the 1950s, when the neighborhoods had become much more segregated. Ruck never addresses this paradox, but a reader cannot help wonder why more integrated neighborhoods tended to produce teams that soon became segregated while the more segregated neighborhoods of a later period produced one of the most integrated teams. One is tempted to dismiss Terrace Village as an anomaly, but then why would Ruck pay it so much attention?

Ruck divides Pittsburgh’s black sporting era into three periods. Prior to the mid-1920s, much organizational and financial support came from corporations, city government, and settlement houses. Each had their own overlapping reasons for supporting athletics, from helping immigrants (including Southern black migrants) adjust to new social and cultural realities to keeping civic and labor peace to winning votes. As the depression came, funding from these sources decreased markedly, but sporting activity was by now deeply enough ingrained that community support helped keep much of it going. Teams passed the hat at games, held socials, sold peanuts and drinks, printed programs containing ads purchased by local merchants, found sponsors such as political ward leaders, and charged a modest admission fee (although this last was not allowed within Pittsburgh limits, which placed a real limitation on the amount of money black teams could raise from their home games).

Such scrambling for money was difficult at first, but, Ruck tells us, it gave blacks relative autonomy over their own sporting activities. From sandlot team organizers to professional magnates like Cumberland Posey and Gus Greenlee, self-sufficiency was the byword. On a professional level, it meant that Greenlee drew capital from his lucrative control of the numbers racket in Pittsburgh. Though not the focus of this study, Ruck’s essay on the rise and effect of the numbers on the black community is fascinating. Ruck notes that in a city like Pittsburgh—where blacks controlled the game with the cooperation of local politicians and police—the profits were often plowed back into the community in the form of loans, handouts, and physical structures as well as professional sports teams like the Homestead Grays and the Crawfords. And though undercapitalization finally became a contributing factor to the decline of black community sport, the numbers helped keep it going further than it might otherwise have gone.
Professional or sandlot, teams organized first in neighborhoods and mostly stayed there, exceptions like the Grays and Crawfords and football's Garfield Eagles notwithstanding. But after World War II, neighborhood change began to accelerate. Increased segregation had already characterized the thirties; now the rise of the suburbs added to the trend. The almost simultaneous arrival of integrated professional sports teams and television constituted the final nails in sandlot activity as it had existed before the war. People no longer gathered together to watch a sandlot semi-pro game or even a minor league game; they stayed home and listened to the Pirates or Steelers on the radio or watched them on TV. The black community's attention focused on the blacks those teams now employed; the black major leagues were doomed. Attention on sport now focused on athletics as a way out of the ghetto, not as a community force. Though hardly opposed to the breakdown of race barriers in white professional sport, Ruck does note that something was lost in the process.

Meticulously researched, including interviews with many of the participants from both the playing and organizational level, Sandlot Seasons makes a real contribution to our understanding of local amateur, semi-pro, and professional sport and its place in defining neighborhood and ethnic identity.

Alex Holzman, The Ohio State University


The resurgence of baseball during the past decade has spawned a growing body of popular and scholarly literature devoted to the origins and evolution of the national pastime. Few comparable works exist on cricket in America. Kirsch’s study of the emergence, competition, and respective fates of these team sports in the nineteenth century redresses this imbalance. The author provides the reader a cogent and well written social history of the formative amateur era of both baseball and cricket.

Though celebrated for their pastoral qualities, modern baseball and cricket were products of an industrial and urban milieu in which traditional patterns of work and play were uprooted, giving rise to new leisure activities tailored to a growing urban population. In the wake of this first leisure revolution, baseball and cricket flourished in the city and its surrounding environs. Americans, as players and spectators, embraced team sports as an escape from industrial capitalism’s enforced work regimen and the tensions of urban life. By 1860, baseball and cricket mania had swept the country, and the preconditions for the subsequent commercialization and professionalization of both sports were already in place.

Kirsch draws upon the leading sport journals of the period, as well as club minutebooks, scorebooks, and rulebooks (much of this contained in the New York Public Library’s Albert J. Spalding Collection) to reconstruct the early sport-club era. America’s first athletic clubs functioned as private voluntary associations to provide
members with healthful recreation, spirited competition, and suitable playing grounds. As sport institutions, they evolved and codified playing rules and contributed to the rationalization and bureaucratization of modern athletics. Moreover, their sponsorship of city, regional, and national championship contests (in the case of cricket, international matches) fanned spectator interest and laid the foundation for sports as a business enterprise. Sport clubs became the key link in the transformation of informal "town ball" into a structured and formalized game packaged for mass consumption.

Beyond their recreational role, baseball and cricket clubs provided a source of social stability in an increasingly pluralistic, fragmented, and impersonal urban society. These associations fostered group loyalty and reaffirmed the identities of members who had more in common than an interest in sports. Kirsch's demographic analysis of New Jersey and Philadelphia players and clubs reveals a positive correlation in age, wealth, occupational status, and ethnicity in the formation of cricket clubs. White collar and working class organizations dominated cricket, with very few clubs having mixed membership. English immigrants comprised the bulk of cricket club membership—though in Philadelphia that city's native-born elite monopolized the sport.

Educational, religious, and familial background proved more important variables in shaping baseball club affiliation. Baseball clubs drew their members from a broader social spectrum, with mixed membership being the norm. Like cricket, baseball maintained rigid gender and racial divisions and largely excluded unskilled workers, who confined their ball playing to informal neighborhood games. Philadelphia's black baseball teams (composed of the black community's elite) often shared playing grounds with white clubs but seldom engaged in interracial contests.

Why did baseball gain greater acceptance than cricket? Baseball enjoyed several advantages over its rival: playing equipment was less expensive, and the early ball diamond required less care and maintenance than the well-manicured cricket pitch. Contemporary observers considered baseball a more exciting and efficient game. Cricket matches often ran for days, with the participants imbibing and banqueting between play. Baseball's unique blend of individualism and teamwork seemed especially suited to the American temperament.

Kirsch argues that sport clubs played a decisive role in the outcome. Cricket's hold on the nation's youth was tenuous, due in large part to the club practice of discriminating against junior members, regardless of skill level. This policy, combined with the disastrous impact of the Civil War, significantly diminished the future of cricket. Baseball clubs proved more cooperative and effective in the creation of a national governing body (the National Association of Base Ball Players in 1858) to standardize rules and administer the growth of the game. Cricket clubs, mired by petty jealousies and intense competition that transcended the playing field, could not develop a parallel organization.

Ironically, baseball's emergence as a popular spectator sport led to the demise of the amateur sports club. As fan interest grew, the sport succumbed to greater commercial encroachment and professionalization—evident in enclosed playing fields,
admission charges, and salaried players. By the late 1870s, professional contests generated far more interest and revenue than the gentleman’s game of the previous decades and thus provided the model for baseball’s future development.

Kirsch’s book is a welcome addition to the Sport and Society Series edited by Benjamin G. Rader and Randy Roberts for the University of Illinois Press. This volume is a balanced blend of social, urban, and sports history. The author has undertaken one of the most comprehensive demographic surveys of players and clubs to date, and his chapter on spectators delves into a relatively unexamined topic that is central to the evolution of modern sports. Readers might shy away from the immense amount of quantitative data that the author has packed into this study—there are far too many tables to digest—but this does not detract from a highly informative and entertaining narrative. This study illustrates that good sports history is social history, and how Americans played is equally as important as how they worked.

James P. Quigel, The Pennsylvania State University


William McMullen was the Democratic boss of Philadelphia’s Fourth Ward (the Moyamensing district) for the last half of the nineteenth century. McMullen’s careful attention to his Irish constituents’ needs ensured his election “to a political office in every election from 1856 until his death in 1901” (p. 17). His deft use of patronage, his racism, and his political amorality are the focus of this excellent, compact study.

After describing urban immigrant politics in the early 1800’s and the everyday life of the immigrant poor, the author traces McMullen’s career through three periods. From the 1840’s through 1871, the street tough McMullen used the Moyamensing Fire Company and the street gang known as “the Killers” to achieve and maintain political power. Battling other fire companies and nativists, McMullen was nicknamed “the Bull,” signifying his prowess and personal role in the often bloody confrontations characteristic of the turbulent politics of the day.

The crucial transitional event to the second period of McMullen’s career was the race-riot of October 10, 1871, in which prominent black political leader Octavius Catto was killed. As the author established in his 1977 article in this journal, McMullen or his lieutenants “orchestrated the riots, using a few drinks and a lot of demagoguery to encourage [Irish] community residents to act out their aggression on the streets” (p. 82). But the 1871 riots ushered in a new political era for McMullen, who would become known as the “Squire.” With the disbanding of the volunteer companies, political leadership shifted from the firehouse to the saloon, where success required access to government patronage. Crucial was McMullen’s role as chief lieutenant for Congressman Samuel J. Randall. A separate chapter, based on 181 McMullen letters in the Randall papers, describes the two men’s political alliance and personal friendship. This
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second period of McMullen's political life was also the era of "reform" politics, when party labels meant little. McMullen was consistent in only three things during this period: concern for constituents' welfare; friendship for Randall; and determination to preserve against "nonpartisan" reformers those government structures which made possible continued domination of the Fourth Ward.

The third period lasted from the Randall's death in 1890 to the end of McMullen's own life in 1901. Now McMullen was the "Sage of Moyamensing," noted for his balloon ascensions and acts of charity. While race remained a powerful force in ward politics, social and economic forces guided the politics of personality which McMullen still practiced. McMullen could ally himself with the black Republican boss Gilbert Ball, whose own saloon was 2-3 blocks from McMullen's. Ball was as uncomfortable with intellectual, pro-temperance well-to-do black Republican leaders as McMullen was with the intellectual, pro-temperance, wealthy "silk stocking" Democratic "reform" elements.

This is a masterful description of the career of a successful Irish local politician. That the author proves his thesis is not so clear. In Silcox's view, McMullen's career opens a window into the lives of those who constitute "the bottom" of nineteenth-century urban life. Through this window we observe those lives in personal, individual, and intimate ways which statistics and the other tools of the "new history" do not permit.

The author's conclusion is open to two challenges. One arises from the very nature of the study of leadership. Leadership is, by definition, to lead, to put oneself out front, ahead, above, those who follow; bureaucracy is to reflect, to mirror, to serve. McMullen was a leader, not a bureaucrat. Secondly, McMullen disposed of a $27,000 estate in his will. This may indicate that he did not personally profit from his long career in politics. But no benchmarks are provided to determine whether an estate of that size was typical or atypical of those who came to mourn the "Sage of Moyamensing."

The author provides in his opening chapters a good view of 1840's urban immigrant life at the outset of McMullen's career, and places him in it. But the McMullen of the 1870's or of the 1890's is not so carefully placed in his political, social, and economic environment. Nevertheless, in detailing the life and career of a Irish politician who had no aspirations to strut a stage beyond the city boundaries, Silcox has written a model study of urban political leadership in the late nineteenth century. We need more studies of this nature.

David E. Meerse, Presbytery of New York City


This is not the first collection of its kind: that distinction belongs to L.A. Windley's Runaway Slave Advertisements: A Documentary History from the 1730s to 1790 (Westport,
Conn: Greenwood, 1983, four vols). The present collection is especially welcome because it reveals the continuing presence of blacks—mostly slave, some free, a few bound by indentures—in Philadelphia, the rising commercial hub of the colonial East Coast and the early United States. Philadelphia's central location further made it and its surrounding territories a place where masters needed to advertise for runaways. Even in 1790 the majority of blacks lived in the Chesapeake region; those who wished permanently to escape their bondage had little motive to go South; their best chance for freedom was to flee by water, or by the various routes that led North and East. And of course slavery was widespread in the Delaware Valley itself, surviving as a curious remnant in the state of Delaware until 1865.

As the editors point out in their crisp, informative introduction, Benjamin Franklin and his successors on the Pennsylvania Gazette wrote marvelously informative advertisements for runaways, whatever one may think of the morality of their efforts. One will rarely find a book on early American History that makes for such lively and fascinating reading as this collection of three hundred and twenty-six ads, drawn from a total collection of 1,324. The first three hundred are, as the title indicates, descriptions of runaway blacks. The final twenty-six, however, remind us that white servitude persisted in colonial and even early national times, and that white servants also ran away, had bounties or rewards paid for their return, and suffered whippings as well as other severe punishments. White servants also appear from time to time in the ads concerning blacks, usually as accomplices.

A sample will help convey the fascination of these descriptions:

Christiana Ferry, New-Castle County, January 20, 1773
RUN AWAY, last night, from the subscriber, a lusty yellow fellow, part Indian and part Negroe, about 5 feet 11 inches high, calls himself JERRY CLARK, is a thick strong made fellow, a great liar, fond of strong liquor, and boasts much of his having been at sea. . . .

Far from being unusual, the mixing of races is evident in many of these ads. Many runaways were mulattoes, black runaways often, as already indicated, made off with fugitive whites, and occasionally had white wives. There is abundant evidence here that our colonial and revolutionary ancestors were not especially prejudiced with respect to race. The slaves described are often praised for valuable skills, knowledge, literacy, cleverness, experience and imagination. Where they are disparaged or condemned it is usually in the same vein used for white runaways: the master is aggrieved because he has sustained a loss of property. Any ferment the American Revolution might reflect with respect to the equality of all mankind was lost on these slaveholders, whether from Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, or New Jersey. In the ads one notes the War for Independence chiefly as a disruption: some blacks were running off to join the British. The growth of anti-slavery opinion in the United States, and especially Philadelphia, go all but unnoticed: two or three ads barely suggest that some white men were encouraging blacks to think of themselves as free, or that they perhaps ought to be free.

The editors supply in their notes an excellent bibliography of works that have made Pennsylvania History
use of runaway ads. They also supply an illustration, a chart, and a map, as well as three indices—one by name, a second by subject, and a third which lists by name and date all 1,324 runaways advertised in the *Gazette* before 1791. Especially useful is a glossary of words which either had different meanings in the Eighteenth Century or are no longer in ordinary use.

Robert McColley, *University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*

**By Stephen William Foster. The Past Is Another Country: Representation, Historical Consciousness, and Resistance in the Blue Ridge.**


Academic fads periodically stimulate Southern Appalachian studies of mixed value; however, this detailed and brilliant anthropological investigation will have enduring importance. The author spent time in the mid-1970's in North Carolina's most northwestern county, Ashe, when the area's people and prime farm land faced the destructive onslaught of corporate outsiders. Foster's social science methodology, though free of jargon, at times makes heavy reading, but it contributes to the work's great worth. It transcends disciplinary bounds.

The New River dispute began in 1962, when the American Electric Power Company (AEPCO) proposed the Blue Ridge Project for electrical generation. The Federal Power Commission (FPC) issued the necessary permit to proceed over the objections of the United States Department of Interior, which wanted a dam double the proposed size for pollution dilution on the downriver Great Kanawha. The dam would have flooded 42,000 acres in Virginia and North Carolina, including 8,400 in Ashe County. The Environmental Protection Agency rejected the pollution dilution scheme, but AEPCO decided that it wanted the larger dam for projected increased power demand. AEPCO revised its proposal to build instead two dams for electrical pumped storage generation. In 1966, the FPC began hearings on the revised approach as did the United States Senate Public Works Committee in 1970. With a dummy real estate company, AEPCO began property acquisitions. In June 1974, the FPC licensed the revised project pending conclusion of the State of North Carolina's opposing litigation and until Congress had studied the feasibility of designating the New River as a national wild and scenic river. Local opposition formed the "Committee for the New River" and injected the issue into the presidential campaign of 1976. In March 1976, the United States Court of Appeals upheld FPC licensing, but required a delay for removal of archaeological remains. To win the North Carolina presidential primary against Ronald Reagan, President Gerald Ford declared his opposition to the scheme. In August, the United States Congress approved a bill designating the New River as a national wild and scenic river, an enactment signed by President Ford. Now, Ashe County residents would confront the federal park service instead of AEPCO and the FPC.

What were Ash County people and their society like when the controversy began and how did the dam-fight change them? By thorough use of previous Appalachian
studies and his contemporary baseline overview of the society and its ideology, the author comprehensively answers these questions. He dissects historical and economic development, kinship, and family patterns, politics as a part of social identity, religious practices, and the community, broadly defined. The composite portrait constitutes one of the shrewdest views of a rural Appalachian county found in all literature. Foster's insightful conclusions ring true to those who know Appalachia, and provide a reliable guidepost to others. His narrative captures a dynamic people and culture in which the New River project represents a jarring discontinuity. In the end, Ashe County society changed, as the inhabitants gained but a partial victory. Scenic and wild river designation spared the inundation but residents still transferred some of their land to outsiders and the state.

The themes of this work, though familiar, have broad implications for anybody interested in the impact of the dominant urban/industrial civilization upon a rural society. This was a clash where even in victory, the local community loses. The outsiders frame the debate, devalue the local culture, and proclaim the ascendency of their society. Life in Ashe County and wherever else such conflicts occur will never be the same, as "civilization" pollutes local culture.

John E. Stealey, III, *Shepherd College*


*Allentown, 1762–1987,* as city histories go, is massive and finally outdoes the one-volume historical compilations that have honored the history of Reading and Lancaster. The two volumes run to 1247 pages, of which 895 pages deal with the twentieth century alone. The book is arranged in the form of annals, divided into relatively small stretches of time, each covered by expert historians who have used every available source from local newspapers to court records.

Three main historical themes recur throughout the book, and are dealt with in the subsections: (1) the institutional, political, and economic history of the town from its earliest roots before the Revolution; (2) the social history of the town's population, linking it to ethnic, cultural, and educational factors; and (3) the development of Pennsylvania Dutch (Pennsylvania German) self-consciousness from the eighteenth century to the present.

The city itself grew from the town lots laid out in 1761 by Judge William Allen (1704–1780), town entrepreneur much like the Hamiltons of Lancaster, for whom he named Hamilton Street. In 1762 "Northampton Town," as it was christened, had thirteen men on the tax list, with six listed in nearby townships. In 1785 there were 27 taxables, with 29 houses. In 1811 the town became the Borough of Northampton, and in the following year the county seat of the new county of Lehigh. From its place on the
Lehigh River, near the Lehigh anthracite region, and connected by road networks and eventually by rail lines to Philadelphia, New York, and Harrisburg and the West, the town grew rapidly through the nineteenth century. By 1900 the town's population numbered 35,416, and by 1940 it was almost at the 100,000 mark.

Linked as it was to Philadelphia and New York, much capital was supplied from those centers to develop Allentown in industry and commerce. Philadelphia was a particularly potent influence, with trade and educational ties. David Deshler, colonial merchant, kept up contacts with his relatives the Wisters of Germantown. Peter Rhoads, one of the first native Pennsylvania German judges, had been educated among the Quakers in Philadelphia, and took his place in the mainstream of political life, becoming President Judge of Northampton County in 1784 and serving in this capacity for several decades.

The book's chronological organization makes it difficult to trace the history of Allentown's major institutions consecutively, but the information is there. The long shadow of the Pennsylvania German ethnic leader Samuel Kistler Brobst (1824-1876), Lutheran minister and Allentown publisher, is seen in the founding both of the Philadelphia Lutheran Seminary in 1864 and Muhlenberg College as a feeder for it in 1867. The first higher educational institution in the town was, however, the product of nineteenth-century German immigration—the North American Academy of Homeopathic Healing Art, founded in 1835, which led eventually to the Hahnemann Medical College in Philadelphia.

Allentown’s ethnic components are dealt with, competently, from the major group, the Pennsylvania Germans, through the nineteenth-century emigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe, to the more recent arrivals from the Caribbean and the Far East. The editors have taken a properly synoptic view of Allentown’s ethnic history. In dealing with the Puerto Rican population and other Hispanics, the book goes into the “grumblings today about bilingual education for the Hispanics and court interpreters for them” (II, p. 551) and rightly points out that the Pennsylvania Germans went through all that much earlier with no bad effects on their or the state’s cultural development.

The use of local photography in the volumes is superb, from the frontispiece of Volume I showing Center Square in 1862 (the earliest known town photograph) to the portrait of the redoubtable Maria E. Hornbeck, postmistress of the town from 1849 to 1857. The twentieth-century photographs show pictures of the “First Defenders,” Civil War veterans picnicking with their wives; Dorney Park crowds in the decorous bathing dress of the 1920s; local people preparing for war and reacting to the First and Second World Wars; and the construction of Allentown’s great Art Deco monument, the P.P. and L. building, designed by Harvey Wiley Corbett, who later helped to design Rockefeller Center. The book ends with photos of the historic preservation and urban renewal movements in the town.

While soberly and properly historical, the book is not without humor. One of the great popular institutions of the city through the years has been the Great Allentown Fair—the “Great” is there appropriately—whose “Big Thursday” crowds brought town
and country into contact as nothing else. The book deals amusingly with the "hootchie-kootchie controversy" of 1914, when the Lehigh County Agricultural Society unanimously vetoed renting space to "hootchie-kootchie" or "oriental" shows. The dialect columnist Solwell Files suggested in protest that the fair was not just for preachers, but for hardworking common folk who enjoyed a day off and wanted entertainment. Eventually the Society relented and the shows were permitted, so that Allentown's fair could at last rank with the York Fair and other annual exhibitions of risqué plebian taste.

If the book presents the building up of local institutions, it also presents the decline of some of them. First the railroad passenger service, which connected the town to the outside world in all directions, went down the drain in the 1960s, with the terminal station now sporting a singles bar called the Gingerbread Man. The street car network was next to go. And even the local breweries took their departure in our time one by one—the Daeufer-Lieberman Co. in 1948, the Louis F. Neuweiler Co. in the 1960s, and the Horlacher Brewing Co. "died in 1978 after an existence of nearly a century, weighed down by mortgages, unpaid bills and tax liens" (II, p. 587).

Finally, it is a pleasure to award the accolade of excellent historical scholarship, creative use of pictorial evidence, painstaking research in the local newspapers, and perceptive editorial policy, to the book's editor, Mahlon H. Hellerich, and his staff of writers. The book certainly is the most detailed and best researched city history that I have seen from upstate Pennsylvania, and can serve as a model for city histories in other parts of our state and the nation.

Don Yoder, University of Pennsylvania