

Book Reviews

Edited by Samuel P. Hays. *City at the Point: Essays on the Social History of Pittsburgh.*

(Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1989. Pp. xvi + 473.)

The purpose of this collection is to provide an overview of scholarly research, both published and unpublished, on the history of a city that has often served as a case study for measuring social change. The volume consists of thirteen commissioned essays, most of them by scholars who have already published extensively on the history of Pittsburgh. Eleven topical essays cover an enormous range: immigrants, women, blacks, the working class, the social history of politics, metropolis and region, urban infrastructure, elites, social welfare, religion, and community-building. Concluding essays by Samuel Hays and Herrick Chapman place the city's history in a national or international perspective by comparing Pittsburgh with other American cities or with industrial centers in Europe.

Although it is difficult to generalize about such a variety of topics, several themes recur. Two of these are indicated by Hays: on the one hand, the impact of economic and political centralization on the city's history; on the other, the concomitant development of inequality and division along lines of class, ethnicity, race, and gender. The theme of centralization during the period of massive industrialization (1870-1920) helps to tie together essays on such diverse subjects as the working class (Richard Oestreicher), urban infrastructure (Joel Tarr) and the social basis of the city's politics (Paul Kleppner).

A third recurring theme is the uniqueness of Pittsburgh. Although the city's history has much in common with that of other metropolises, some important aspects set it apart. Oestreicher emphasizes the enduring significance of early dominance by centralized heavy industry, which he believes led to the "relatively greater salience of class" in Pittsburgh's history; from another perspective, Maurine Weiner Greenwald sees the same economic dominance by iron and steel undercutting women's opportunities for factory jobs in Pittsburgh, reinforcing female job discrimination that already existed along class, ethnic and racial lines. The unique topography of Pittsburgh, with its hilly terrain, also played a role in shaping working class life, strengthening ethnic communities at the same time that it complicated and increased the cost of developing an infrastructure. In his valuable essay on the black experience in Pittsburgh, Laurence Glasco stresses the negative effects of this topography, which by dividing the black community into half a dozen neighborhoods, undermined the group's organizational and political development.

While giving some attention to the antebellum period, most contributors focus on the period between the Civil War and the 1930s, the time when Pittsburgh gained its reputation as a quintessential industrial metropolis. The paucity of Ph.D. dissertations dealing with the post-World War II era points out the very great need in American social history to study the transition from industrial to post-industrial society.

With few exceptions, the essays in this volume are of exceptionally high quality. Several contributions deserve special mention, however. The essays by Greenwald, Oestreicher, Glasco,



Tarr, and Roy Lubove not only survey the literature of their respective subjects but raise important theoretical questions as well. Linda K. Pritchard's study of religion in Pittsburgh, which relies much more on primary sources than the other essays, assesses a topic that is too often ignored in urban history. Finally, Chapman's concluding piece provides a superb model for historians interested in the comparative history of industrial society. *City at the Point* is a valuable sourcebook for scholars studying the history of Pittsburgh; it is also, however, an important contribution to urban and social history in a broader sense. The influence of Samuel Hays' own work is obvious on every page.

Kenneth L. Kusmer, *Temple University*

By Robert M. Bliss. *Revolution and Empire: English Politics and the American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*.

(Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990. Pp. xi, 300.)

Revolution and Empire is part of a "Studies in Imperialism" series published by the Manchester University Press. The book, as the subtitle makes clear, focuses on the relationship between political developments in seventeenth century England and the growth of the country's transatlantic empire. The author, Robert M. Bliss, uses an introductory chapter to highlight the importance of his subject. "This study," he writes, "rests . . . on the proposition that England's empire was shaped by the course of English politics, not by the post-1660 navigation system nor by the century's mercantilist consensus nor by military men and ideas. The debate over the sources of English 'imperial policy' must," Bliss concludes, "be supplanted by an understanding of the 'politics of empire' " (p. 3, 4).

Bliss develops his argument by taking the reader through most of the 1600s in an essentially narrative fashion. There's a single chapter on "the ordered empire of Charles I," two on the Puritan revolution and interregnum, two more on the restoration, one on the years 1667-1679, and a concluding chapter on "The English empire at the end of the seventeenth century." The only significant break in this narrative treatment comes in a chapter entitled "Routines of state and visions of the promised land: English politicians and America, 1660-1683."

In several ways, *Revolution and Empire* makes a useful contribution to the constantly growing body of literature on the seventeenth century. The central theme of the book—the importance of English politics in shaping the empire—provides a well-timed antidote to the exaggerated claims of military domination made by Stephen Saunders Webb a decade ago in his *The Governors-General: The English Army and the Definition of Empire, 1569-1681* (Chapel Hill, 1979). Bliss describes how the reward system within the royal household influenced imperial appointments, a phenomena not previously discussed in any detail. He includes a wide range of new anecdotal and personal material on policy makers like Clarendon, Danby, Shaftsbury, and the various English monarchs. He effectively links decisions involving governance in the British West Indies to those affecting the mainland colonies.

In other ways, however, *Revolution and Empire* disappoints. Some of its problems are literary. Bliss assumes too much of his readers. Far too often he concentrates on making sophisticated observations about an event or subject he's never adequately introduced. Fellow

specialists in seventeenth century English politics may find him easy to follow, but I didn't and I'm a professional colonialist. Bliss, moreover, makes things additionally difficult by employing a meandering, elliptical, and at times almost conversational style of discourse. He writes around subjects, backing and filling so much the point he's supposedly arguing gets obscured. *Revolution and Empire*, in short, is not an easy read.

Unpredictability in coverage also weakens the monograph. Pennsylvania history buffs will search in vain for any discussion of the colony's political origins; the Carolinas, which in 1700 has together roughly the same population as Pennsylvania, get lots of coverage. Bliss seems to have decided that if someone else has written both recently and effectively about anything having to do with his broad subject, he's off the hook. Thus he spends very little time on the climax of his story, the tumultuous imperial confrontations involving James II, the Dominion of New England, and the Glorious Revolution of 1688. Bliss explains himself by noting simply that "Historians have given these developments in English and American politics much attention in recent years, creating a body of work which renders the task of his last chapter in some respects perfunctory" (p. 220). The statement makes clear what I had begun to suspect before I read it. Bliss has not attempted to write an integrated monograph on "English Politics and the American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century"; he's written a book filling in the gaps he sees in the existing professional literature.

A final criticism. Bliss, at least in his formal thematic statements, is guilty of overkill. No sensible historian will argue against the important role English politics played in shaping the nation's overseas empire—we understand that role better now because of *Revolution and Empire*—but explanation need not be singular. The post 1660 navigation system, mercantile consensus, military men and ideas, and English politics all affected development of the empire. The proposition that only the last of these counted serves as an excellent example of the kind of hyperbole historians should avoid.

Jere Daniell, *Dartmouth College*

By Jeffery A. Smith. *Franklin and Bache: Envisioning the Enlightened Republic*.

(New York: Oxford University Press, 1990. Pp. 222. \$28.00)

Benjamin Franklin's grandson, Benjamin Franklin Bache, founded and edited the Philadelphia *Aurora*, arguably the most influential newspaper in the United States during the last years of the eighteenth century. With the failure of Philip Freneau's *National Gazette* in 1793, Bache's paper became the primary organ of the emerging Jeffersonian Republican party, and the focus for a decade-long political war culminating in the election of Thomas Jefferson. Though well known to historians of Early National politics and journalism, in the world at large Bache's name faded into obscurity soon after his early death in Philadelphia's yellow fever epidemic of 1798. Even for political historians, Bache and his press colleagues mainly serve as rich sources of quotations and information for chronicles of political campaigns and party ideologies. When depicted personally at all, journalists of the Early Republic tend to be treated as mere conduits for the ideas and policies of more famous officeholders, or else, as in the case of Bache and his

sometime employee James Thomson Callender, disdained as dangerous cranks, low-minded hacks, or worse. Though journalists did most of the public “campaigning” that went on in this period, only rarely have historians granted them an important place as political actors and thinkers in their own right.

By writing an historiographically up-to-date biography of Bache and accepting the editor on his own terms, Jeffery Smith begins to rectify this situation. He establishes Bache as a worthy heir to Franklin in much more than a legal sense and places the two men’s ideas in the broad context of Enlightenment thought. Arguing that “Americans were both more opportunistic and more hopeful of overall human advancement than” is suggested by a “focus on the suspicions and self-discipline, free trade, political equality and benign, popular government” (p. 8). His first tarianism, their optimism about the capacities of the common man, and their belief in both education and the educational powers of journalism. According to Smith, Franklin and Bache were “harbingers” of a Jeffersonian ideology “that espoused the combined Enlightenment ideals of self-discipline, free trade, political equality and benign, popular government” (p. 8). His first chapter pursues this theme. Summarizing much of the recent historical literature on Jeffersonian thought, Smith puts Franklin and Bache nearer the “Lockean” capitalist position championed by Joyce Appleby, while also ascribing to them the fear of “large-scale manufacturing” discussed by Drew R. McCoy (p. 21).

After a brief sketch of Franklin’s career, highlighting his good civic works and cautious, conciliatory style of journalism and politics, Part One narrates the relationship between the young Bache and his famous grandfather. Though Franklin was representing the colonies in London when “Benny” Bache was born, the diplomat’s wife and partly estranged daughter Sally endeared him to the child with tales of Franklin’s intelligence, rectitude, and reverence for the family patriarch. Upon his return, Franklin took a keen interest in Bache’s upbringing and education, eventually taking the boy with him on his mission to France. “Blessed” by Voltaire, educated at elite academies in Paris and Geneva, taught printing by French masters, Bache formed a deep attachment to French culture in general and the French Enlightenment in particular. As Smith portrays it, Franklin used his grandsons’ education as an opportunity to “realize his [Franklin’s] ideals for the new world,” specifically his Paineite dream of an egalitarian nation of independent commercial farmers and independent small capitalists, in microcosm (pp. 76-77). Thus he tried to turn Bache’s cousin Temple Franklin into a farmer and, despite a strictly-administered elite education, “determin’d to give [Bache] a Trade that he . . . not be oblig’d to ask Favours or Offices of anybody” (pp. 81-82).

Part Two traces Bache’s career as a Jeffersonian journalist, and provides one of the best narratives available of political life in the national capital during the 1790s. Though devoted to his grandfather and his grandfather’s principles, Bache the editor quickly abandoned Franklin’s cautious, entertainment-oriented philosophy of journalism, adopting a two-fisted editorial partisanship in defense of France, Jefferson and (in the young editor’s mind) the democratic and egalitarian society for which Franklin stood. This eventually cost Bache his money, his social position, and arguably even his life, for, unlike most prominent Philadelphians, he refused to leave the city during the yellow fever epidemic of 1798. According to Smith Bache died before

he could be prosecuted under the Sedition Act that was aimed largely at the *Aurora* editor. Though Bache was in frequent contact and received some aid from Jefferson and other Republican leaders, Smith argues strongly for the independence and sincerity of his convictions: "The expectation of patronage and the praise of prominent men" was some enticement to party journalists, "but it was indoctrination and experience that were crucial to their commitment" (p. 169).

This book will be of more interest to students of Early National political culture than those of ideology *per se*. Though Smith argues convincingly for the importance of "common frustrations and aspirations" over doctrine in understanding "past mentalities" (p. 6), the book dwells often on the more formal ideas of Franklin and Bache, which together emerge here as a rather miscellaneous creed. Smith's greatest achievement is the casting of some welcome light on echelons of political life below the topmost. It is perhaps unfortunate that he chose to bury the neglected Bache within a book on the editor's often-studied grandfather.

Jeffrey L. Pasley, *Harvard University*

By George W. Franz. *Paxton: A Study of Community Structure and Mobility in the Colonial Pennsylvania Backcountry*.

(New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1989. Pp. 354. \$55.00.)

The increased availability of this reworked Rutgers dissertation will be welcomed by professional historians concerned with the Pennsylvania frontier, the study of community life in the eighteenth century, and by those interested in the famous Paxton Riots, 1763-1764. The author argues that earlier historians have centered their attention on the impact of those riots in Philadelphia and on the provincial government. He, however, is concerned with Paxton, itself, and he undertakes an analysis of that community in order to explain the actions of the Paxton settlers.

Community studies of Pennsylvania towns and of those elsewhere have provided important insights into life in colonial America. Methods of land settlement, governmental structures, geographic mobility of population, religious and ethnic diversity and economic systems & all affected the society which emerged on the Pennsylvania frontier. Central data sources for this study are found in the town tax lists (8 years) and assessment lists (4 years) within the period, 1750-1782. Land warrant and land patent records, deed transfers, and probate records also contribute to this work.

Paxton, like all towns in Pennsylvania, possessed almost no local government structures. When provincial and county governments failed to provide solutions for local problems the settlers developed unofficial structures which took unauthorized actions to deal with these situations on an ad hoc basis. Paxton people often simply took up land illegally in an "individualistic" style of land development.

Town tax lists indicate a population mobility so great that half the population might change in the course of a year. Such extraordinary mobility resulted in a decided lack of societal continuity. In addition, the township had no central village focus. Ethnically diverse, it divided about equally between settlers from the British Isles and Pennsylvania Dutch. An active Presbyterian church had been deeply fractured by the Great Awakening.

Franz's economic analysis of Paxton does not find the orderly progression from frontier to subsistence and then to commercial farming suggested by J. T. Main. The majority of citizens were farmers, but the town did not progress through Main's clearly defined stages. This diversity of developmental stages resulted in little economic homeogeneity. In examining the distribution of wealth within Paxton over time, Franz compares his work with that of other historians. While aware of certain weaknesses in his data base, he raises important questions concerning the increased stratification of society and its increasing inequity. Paxton saw a growing concentration of wealth, but Franz raises the issue of the impact of geographic mobility on these figures. If up to half the population changed in some years, do studies of wealth distribution have any relevance? Newcomers for instance all tended to be in the lowest strata while those who remained in Paxton over the whole period improved in status. One's level of wealth proved more a reflection of where you lived than what you possessed. Dividing Paxton into percentile groups created "statistical illusions," he concluded. The impact of geographic mobility is, then, a major consideration in examining changes in the distribution of wealth during the colonial era.

Throughout, Franz refers to Paxton as an ad hoc community—one with little sense of integration or homogeneity. He characterizes it as transitory, individualistic, informal, and fractionalized. When provincial government failed to answer the needs of the settlers, 1754-1763, the great danger brought short lived unity via town meetings which assumed extra legal powers to organize defenses. In the 1760s the township reacted against the Indians and against the provincial government. Following patterns which had precedents in the period before 1763, the Paxton Crisis occurred. Franz hints that such actions were justified (p. 270). In fact, he even suggests that the "peaceful" Indians killed had probably been helping the hostiles (p. 81).

Essentially then, Franz employs the societal development of Paxton as the background against which the actions of the Paxton Boys become understandable. Their actions were not expressions of frontier democracy demanding rights, rather they sought to force the central government to answer their needs. The ad hoc approach of the Paxton Boys "became the basis for organizing revolutionary society in Pennsylvania" (p. 275). It is pertinent, perhaps to note that this dissertation which seems to sympathize with the idea of the vox populi as it emerged in Paxton, was written at a time during the Vietnam War when many saw the United States government as failing to respond to a popular mandate. It has not been updated.

James G. Lydon, *Pittsburgh, Pa.*

By Rodger C. Henderson. *Community Development and the Revolutionary Transition in Eighteenth-Century Lancaster County, Pennsylvania.*

(New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1990. Pp. xxi, 482. \$66.00.)

This book, a volume in the *Garland Studies in Historical Demography*, began as a PhD dissertation at SUNY-Binghamton. For those scholars working in the field of Colonial Pennsylvania, Henderson's work will be familiar since he has presented some of his findings at various professional meetings, seminars and in articles in several journals dealing with Pennsylvania history.

Because of its 20 figures, 125 tables, 135 pages of notes, along with its 270 pages of text it is

a difficult book to read. However, it is an indispensable reference for anyone working in the field of the demography of Colonial America, for anyone who is interested in the social and economic history of Colonial Pennsylvania, particularly the frontier and backcountry regions and for anyone interested in the topic of community development. The author consistently compares his findings with similar studies dealing with other groups or locations in Colonial Pennsylvania, New England, and the Chesapeake region.

Henderson's basic methodology is family reconstitution of three generations of eighteenth-century Lancaster County inhabitants (1,378 families) through the analysis of marital patterns, fertility indices, and mortality rates across three sequential cohorts (marriages before 1740, marriages between 1741 and 1770 and marriages between 1771 and 1800). Crucial to his analysis, and impacting on these families, are such things as economic conditions, availability of land, the disease environment, and the transitions which occurred during the Revolutionary generation. Additional areas studied include such things as marital relations, family sizes, life expectancy and ethnic and religious differences. In addition, he includes an appendix that specifically analyzes, as a separate group, the First Reformed Church of Lancaster.

It is impossible to summarize the wealth of material presented in this study. However, a recitation of some of the specific areas analyzed will give the reader some idea of the depth of material (in almost all instances, these are topics covered for each cohort under review): bride and groom's age at first marriage; age distribution of residents; size and distribution of landholdings based on land warrants as well as deeds; distribution of wealth based on assessed valuation of estates; distribution of ages at death of husbands and wives; remarriage rates; distribution of family sizes; births per first marriage; intervals between marriage and birth of first child; age-specific fertility rates; mortality rates for infants; comparison of infant and child mortality rates; number of children surviving to ages ten and twenty; mortality rates for children dying before age twenty; average age at death of children surviving to given ages; life tables; and the list goes on.

There is so much detail that the reader begins to lose sight of the important generalization and trends being set. In particular, Henderson attempts to modify the individualistic and competitive picture of eighteenth-century Pennsylvania presented by James T. Lemon, and supported by Gary Nash, Stephanie Wolf and Jerome Wood. While acknowledging part of this view, Henderson is not prepared to accept the contradictory interpretation of a society much more communalistic and familialistic. He suggests that the community was "in transition" and that, "Pennsylvania was probably much more communalistic and familialistic than the Lemon interpretation suggested, at least in areas where Quakers dominated" (p. 5). Further, he concludes that "... in some ways at least Pennsylvania was more religious, familialistic and communalistic than was Puritan New England in comparable time periods" (p. 244).

Henderson suggests several purposes for his study: "One is simply to fill in some gaps in the knowledge of demographic patterns and family life in Lancaster County. Another is comparison of present findings with the New England experience and Southern demographic patterns. He also re-examines some current notions which have apparently become models of the colonial experience. Measuring the extent of change in demographic patterns and family behavior in

eighteenth-century Lancaster County during three phases of settlement, growth, and expansion, and the Revolution forms the final purpose. In addition, the author assesses the norms of behavior associated with marriage, family size, and the mortality experience of these eighteenth-century Pennsylvanians (p. 14). In all of these purposes, the author has been successful. His work is meticulous and careful and, one might add, daunting. His construction of life tables for Lancaster County provides some of the best available demographic information for the entire colonial period.

Of course, it is the role of the reviewer to quibble, and I am no exception. I would have preferred more analysis of ethnic and religious variations on marriage age, fertility and mortality. Also, my preference would have been for a completely different organization of the study. Rather than deal with each subject within each cohort, I would have preferred an analysis of each subject across cohorts. This would have provided a clearer description of change (or continuity) over time and would have allowed for less redundancy in explanation.

These concerns aside—this is an important work that belongs on the shelf of anyone working on eighteenth century Pennsylvania history. It is a mine of information.

George W. Franz, *Penn State Delaware County Campus*

By Robert D. Ilisevich. *David Mead: Pennsylvania's Last Frontiersman.*

(Meadville, Pennsylvania: Crawford County Historical Society, 1988. Pp. v, 93. \$20.00.)

The title of this book is somewhat misleading for it is less a biography of David Mead than a study of his public record. Mead is not an inconsequential character in the history of northwest Pennsylvania. He certainly deserves a full investigation; still, after we have put this book down we still know very little of the man and his motives other than what we can be deduced from his behavior in certain situations. Missing are those intimate glimpses into his life that might serve to reveal whether his true feelings always coincided with his public actions.

Mead's career is picked up from his move to the Wyoming Valley from Hudson, NY sometime in the late 1760s. This territory was then in dispute between Connecticut and Pennsylvania, since it had been granted to both by the British Crown a century before. Both colonies made land grants in the area which lead to confusion and even armed conflict. Unable to get clear title to his land, Mead soon switched to the Pennsylvania side in the conflict, but to no avail. His appointment as a magistrate in the dispute further complicated matters. Not only was he regarded as treacherous by the Connecticut claimants, but he now earned the scorn of Pennsylvanians for trying to enforce the law which they did not choose to obey. Faced with the prospect of physical harm, in 1788 Mead moved his family to Cussewago in what was then Allegheny County.

The settlement which Mead and others founded would eventually grow into a prosperous community named after him. But it was not easy. Mead soon learned that he had merely exchanged the land problems of the Wyoming Valley for more of the same in the French Creek Valley. It was not long before the settlers began to divide themselves politically on the issue.

Once again Mead was in the cross-fire, but this time managed to escape with his land holdings and reputation essentially intact. While unsuccessful in his attempts to win public office, Mead's leadership in other areas was instrumental in achieving security and stability for the fledgling community. This was particularly evident during the War of 1812 when he served as major general of the Sixteenth Division of the state militia. Although his exploits cannot compare to those of Perry, his success in putting together a defensive land force for the region cannot be overlooked. And upon his death in 1816 he could take deep pride in the existence of Allegheny College and the Northwestern Bank of Pennsylvania, two institutions he had done much to establish.

The author is careful to point out that he was often frustrated in his research by the lack of personal papers. But even the public record is at times annoyingly fuzzy. Statements about the early period of Mead's life in the Wyoming Valley are often qualified by words that can only dismay the reader—words such as “not known,” “apparently,” “maybe,” “then again” (p. 5). Some of the unknowns might have been avoided if more sources outside of Pennsylvania had been consulted, among them Henry Egle's *Documents Relating to the Connecticut Settlement in the Wyoming Valley* (1890). The treatment of the subject following the move to Cussewago is more satisfactory since here the author is able to draw upon Mead's business papers and the extensive collection of correspondence of his contemporaries in the Crawford County Historical Society. Ilisevich was for many years librarian of this institution and has a good grasp of the material. Researchers seeking further information from two other manuscript depositories might be a bit put off, however, since they are mis-named Pennsylvania Historical Society and Erie Historical Society.

For all that Mead had done for his fellow citizens, he was strangely unappreciated at the time. His obituary simply described him as “useful.” While Ilisevich has done much to upgrade that estimation, Mead never emerges as the stuff of which frontier legends are made. The question of whether the vision was really there awaits further study.

John R. Claridge, *Erie County Historical Society*

By Donald R. Hickey. *The War of 1812: A Forgotten Conflict.*

(Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1989. Pp. xiii, 457. \$32.50.)

Imagine the United States becoming involved in a conflict in which the nation's motives for waging war were unclear. A war that some contemporaries claimed was fought to silence domestic political opposition, some claimed was fought to secure economic independence, and others said was fought to preserve national honor. Imagine the United States fighting a war whose “causes are shrouded in mystery” (p. 1) even after a scholarly inquiry of almost two centuries. Donald R. Hickey, in a carefully researched, convincingly argued, and well written presentation, proposes that the War of 1812 was just such a conflict.

On one level, Hickey merely resurveys ground that other early national scholars have adequately staked out in recent decades. He offers no fresh interpretations or compelling new material when assessing the causes of the war. Instead, he concurs with Reginald Horsman and

others that maritime matters, rather than western issues, provided the primary justification for hostilities. Like those who went before him, the author convincingly supports his thesis by carefully delineating events and negotiations between the United States and Great Britain during the fifteen years that preceded the conflict.

Where Hickey departs from much of the recent scholarship is in his assessment of the underlying political motives for the war. Rather than an effort to preserve the young republic, as Roger Brown and others contend, Hickey proposes that the war was a product of political self-interest. The conflict provided Republicans with a way to shore up their institutions, consolidate support and avoid imminent political embarrassment. As such, the author questions whether hostilities were, in fact, necessary. Hickey further contends that the Republican leadership ultimately used the conflict to control and eliminate Federalist opposition. While there are some flaws in this premise, the author, nevertheless, persuasively argues his case. The product is an intriguing reinterpretation of the political maneuvering that accompanied the war.

Among the primary targets of the author's criticism are James Madison and army leadership. At best, Hickey's Madison was a president caught between political philosophy and political reality. The author agrees with Robert Rutland that Madison was surrounded by both inept administrators and avaricious politicians who quickly yanked the reins of government from the chief executive. Hickey, however, is not as kind as Rutland when assessing Madison's abilities to lead. Likewise, the army was commanded by officers that are described as "superannuated and incompetent" (p. 76). On the other hand, Hickey praises naval leadership and crews, claiming they were second to none in terms of experience and abilities. The author's assessment of the military leaves no doubt why the army lost and the navy won.

Critical of Republican motives and methods, the author generally applauds Federalist efforts to avoid and, later, to end the war. Hickey contends that the conflict "generated more intense opposition than any other war in the nation's history, including the war in Vietnam" (p. 255), and it was Federalists who championed the protest. Federalists justifiably labeled the U.S. offensive into Canada an invasion. They conscientiously warned that the nation was unprepared militarily and fiscally; and, they lamented the single-minded approach of Republican leadership. According to the author, the Hartford Convention was simply a Federalist attempt to spare the nation from impending defeat while, at the same time, guaranteeing sectional balance.

While Hickey's reassessment of the war is well presented, it is not without some defects. The most obvious shortcoming is an overzealous attack on the Jefferson administration. In essence, Hickey blames the war largely on failed policies during Jefferson's second term. Among the more perplexing issues Hickey raises is his assessment of Federalist support for naval actions. The author does not convincingly explain why Federalist merchants would back expanded naval hostilities against their primary trading partners at a time when, according to the author, Federalists were aggressively trying to end hostilities, presumably, in an effort to restore trade relations. One other shortcoming of the work is the absence of information beyond the political/military realm. While the author occasionally weaves the thinnest threads of social history into his analysis, he neglects most opportunities to describe how the war affected the general population. The result is a too narrowly focused work.

Despite some minor flaws, this book is a fine piece of scholarship. It significantly contributes to our understanding of the early national period in general and the War of 1812 in particular. The author has thoroughly researched his subject and is in full command of the available material. He presents a fresh new interpretation which many will question but none can neglect. Hickey's work should be considered one of the two or three required readings for anyone attempting to understand the War of 1812.

Paul E. Doutrich, *York College of Pennsylvania*

By Ann Marie Dykstra. *Region, Economy, and Party: The Roots of Policy Formation in Pennsylvania, 1820-1860.*

(New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1989. PP. xiii, 398. \$70.00.)

Although state legislatures in the nineteenth century were the most important governmental bodies affecting the lives of Americans, they remain *terra incognita* for most students of the history of American political development. Pennsylvania, however, has been exceedingly well served for the period between the Revolution and the Civil War by one of the classic "Commonwealth" studies, Louis Hartz's, *Economic Policy and Democratic Thought* and the articles by Douglas Bowers, Edward Davies, Owen Ireland, and Robert Harrison. A synthetic and methodologically sophisticated study is desperately needed to pull together this work on Pennsylvania and the excellent studies of historians examining other states during the nineteenth century; meanwhile the publication of dissertations such as this promises to deepen our understanding of governance during a crucial period in the state's history.

After pointing out that previous studies have focused upon either the effect of parties on legislation or the role of legislatures as institutions, Ann Marie Dykstra proposes to show "the relationship between political change and economic development" in antebellum Pennsylvania by analyzing legislative decision-making. Her main sources are public documents, most importantly the federal census, that she uses to define seven regions, each with a unique economy, and to place each county on two related "Economic-Commercial Continua" reflecting "its level of economic development and the degree to which it was integrated into larger commercial and financial networks" (p. 85). The latter are made up of aggregate scores based upon per capita production, tax assessments, bank loans, and volume of mail. Using roll calls from the Pennsylvania House of Representatives for the sessions of 1828-29, 1838-39, 1849 and 1859, the author then correlates economic policy outputs with the economic positions of the counties by measuring cohesion of legislators from each region and commercial-economic group.

Dykstra devotes two chapters, about one third of the text, to internal improvements and banking and business corporations. On the former, area legislators voted rather consistently the same way through the four sessions either favoring or opposing expansion; but on the latter, support shifted reflecting the role of economic development. In contrast to earlier historians, she finds the regional effects less important than the "level of economic development and the degree of commercial involvement of Pennsylvania's counties" (p. 347). The less developed areas while favoring both internal improvements and banks in the 1820s "had soured on the

very concept of the corporation" in the 1840s while the most developed areas increasingly accepted "lenient banking and corporation measures" (p. 349).

These differences were reflected in the behavior of the parties. During the era of the Second party system, Pennsylvania's most economically developed and commercially active districts usually sent Whigs to Harrisburg. "Democrats, on the other hand, tended to come from the less developed areas of the state." In line with this Dykstra argues that the Democrats from the more developed areas were more likely to vote with the Whigs and had a greater problem aligning their behavior with Democratic party policy than did those from less developed areas. Eventually these areas shifted to the Republicans in the 1850s.

All of this is well and good. Most of Dykstra's claims are in line with conventional wisdom especially since she tends to use imprecise language. For example, in every session the majority of Democrats in the House came from the two most developed areas. Her ascription of human motives to various scale scores of counties will infuriate most historians although her points might be restated in a more palpable form. Her presentation and use of data will frustrate even the most conscientious readers. Anyone who has ever done a study like this knows how mind-numbing such work can be and how easy it is to drift on a sea of numbers. The text is truly littered with illustrations—sixty two tables and twenty figures. Yet sometimes the relevant data is not given. When it is presented, there are sometimes serious problems of interpretation and the tables too often contradict each other. It is quite possible that all of these problems could have been worked out and a thorough editing might clarify the often obscure prose, but in this form *Region, Economy and Party* is a disappointment. Had it been Divinely inspired, however, the price would still be outrageous.

William G. Shade, *Lehigh University*

Joseph F. Rishel. *Founding Families of Pittsburgh: The Evolution of a Regional Elite, 1760-1910.*

(Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1990. Pp. xii, 241. \$34.95.)

Historians and others interested in quantitative history will enjoy reading this book. In recent years this kind of writing has become more popular, a fact scoffed at by pure traditionalists who feel that not all things of the past should be geometrically measured. What faces the scholar who chooses quantitative analysis is the burdensome task of presenting statistics both in a meaningful and interesting way. Joseph Rishel has to be commended for his painstaking efforts and endurance. While the amount of statistical data is overwhelming (more than fifty tables and charts), the result is a well organized and clearly written account of one aspect of Pittsburgh's early history.

Employing the techniques of prosopography, Rishel examines the lives of numerous individuals and then draws a general profile of the group. Though the title refers to the founding families of Pittsburgh, the twenty family names he selects at random are actually from both Pittsburgh and Allegheny County. His purpose is to describe the group's composition, the degree of

cohesiveness, and the extent to which members were able to maintain their status over time. For the sake of comparison, he divides the time frame into three periods: 1820, 1860, and 1900. Of the three the 1820 period is the longest.

The founders came from different economic and cultural backgrounds—a “Microcosm of the general population” (p. 184)—and all became part of a functional elite. Some of the names selected include George Anshutz, Benajmin Bakewell, Felix Brunot, Ebenezer Denny, John and William Herron, Alexander Negley, John Ormsby, and the Sturgeon brothers. What put these men at the top were their driving ambition and their ability to seize economic opportunity. Rishel is at his best when he focuses upon the group’s continuity and tells why an accumulation of advantages enjoyed by offspring proved important in preventing over the long run a downward social mobility. The founding families were successful in giving their children all the prerequisites they needed—education, wealth, social status, the right organizations, and even the ideal match for marriage—to remain part of the elite upper class.

Using a random method of selection raises a number of questions, the most obvious being, “Why these twenty?” Rishel’s sample of twenty family names is from an original list of 129 genealogies compiled by Frank W. Powelson in his *Founding Families of Allegheny County* (1963). Rishel reduced the list to thirty-nine possibilities from which he made his selection. Although there is little reason to suspect that his final choices are not representative of the area’s first elite, there still is the temptation to ask if any special preference was given to these names over the remaining nineteen.

Political party affiliation was one of the twenty-five categories used, but apparently data in this category was insufficient for Rishel gives scant attention to politics as a factor in determining status. Political division did play a big part in determining where one stood socially, at least in the early years. Hostility between Federalists and Jeffersonians was such that interaction between them was virtually nil; social functions were often restricted to families of the same party stripe. While they are not among the founding families used by the author, political figures James Ross, William Wilkins and Henry Baldwin, just to mention a few, were certainly included in Pittsburgh’s earliest elite. They stood at the top of their legal profession and went on to serve in high public office. They wielded great influence and enjoyed respect from both the business and professional communities. Some of them also speculated in land, an activity that receives no attention in the study. Yet, the ownership of thousands of acres or hundreds of city lots in the 1820 period was probably as much a status symbol then as belonging to a prestigious country club two generations later. Combining this factor with that of party affiliation would broaden the representative sample and give recognition to political families.

Rishel relies principally on a variety of biographical encyclopedias and family genealogies. Admitting that such sketches often contain laudatory and exaggerated statements he insists that his strategy was to collect from these sources only material of a basic nature—place and date of birth, religion, etc. He also uses city directories, regional histories, and the public record. Unfortunately, missing are letters and diaries that would have given a more personal view of these founding families and a glimpse at those factors which tended to impede the group’s cohesiveness. The edited letters of Tarleton Bates, for example, provide an excellent look at the

divisive politics and restrictive nature of Pittsburgh's elite at the turn of the nineteenth century. Observations by contemporaries are obviously not quantifiable and perhaps for this reason they were not used. Yet what Rishel has used he has used thoughtfully and with impressive results.
Robert D. Ilisevich, *Mercyhurst College*

By Ken Fones-Wolf. *Trade Union Gospel: Christianity and Labor in Industrial Philadelphia, 1865-1915*.

(Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989. Pp. xx, 266. \$34.95.)

Although some of us might like to believe that religion is the opiate of the masses, Ken Fones-Wolf clearly challenges this appraisal in his book *Trade Union Gospel*. Using Philadelphia as a case study, Fones-Wolf links the rise of the Knights of Labor to its espousal of a millenarian rhetoric, examines the influence of trade unionism on the development of the Protestant Social Gospel, and analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of the Labor Forward Movement, an evangelical organizing effort that mobilized craft unionists in the early years of the 20th century. In the process he demonstrates that Christianity proved to be a dynamic but ambiguous social force that animated proponents of social justice at the same time that it bolstered more individualistic self-help strategies.

In what is perhaps the book's strongest section, Fones-Wolf carefully analyzes the changing contours of industrial society and illustrates the complex sources of working-class culture in a city whose wage-earners divided along ethnic, craft, political and gender lines. Most important, he also demonstrates how the timing and scope of industrialization also shaped class relations, making it far easier for some workers to cooperate with middle-class reformers than others. At the same time, Fones-Wolf is careful to delineate differences among employers (who, like trade unionists and social reformers, could be liberal or conservative) and he makes it clear that religion—and the Social Gospel in particular—remained a contested terrain on all social levels throughout this period.

But while Fones-Wolf surely succeeds in capturing the complexity of labor's struggle for social power in this rapidly changing industrial city, it seems to me that he might have provided a little more detail on the religious campaigns themselves. I found myself wondering how clergymen crafted their message to trade unionists and what role their delegates to the Central Labor Union played in the organization. Likewise the notion of trade-union revival meetings fascinated me, but I still have no clear idea of how they operated and what kind of speeches were made. I also wondered how Social Gospel activists and trade unionists got together in the first place, how their networks operated, and how their evangelical message filtered down to union members themselves.

Although some of Fones-Wolf's characterizations and generalizations can be questioned (particularly where craft versus industrial strategies are concerned), his work makes it clear that the history of trade unionism is far more complex—and more interesting—than the secondary literature would lead us to believe.

Grace Palladino, *The Samuel Gompers Papers, University of Maryland, College Park*

Produced by Steffi Domike; edited by Dave Sez. *Out of This Furnace: A Walking Tour of Thomas Bell's Novel* (video).

(Distributed by the University of Pittsburgh Press, 1990. \$24.95.)

During the past decade, historians have rediscovered Thomas Bell's novel of immigrant life in the steel industry in and around Pittsburgh. Written in 1941, *Out of This Furnace* depicts, perhaps better than any historical monograph, the ethnic tensions, immigrant aspirations, occupational hazards, and familial means of surviving the harsh factory regime. It is the story of the Kracha and Dobrecjak families over three generations, largely in the steel town of Braddock. Through these two Slovak immigrant families, Bell is able to weave together many stories—of ethnic communities, of the steel industry, of neighborhoods, and of the rise of the CIO—in a way that demonstrates just how interrelated were all of these facets of working-class life. Thanks to the University of Pittsburgh Press's reissuing of Bell's novel in paper, many undergraduates are now discovering the pathos and the triumphs of the Dobrecjaks in American history surveys. David Demarest provided a useful introduction which sets the novel in its historical, and personal, contexts, for *Out of This Furnace* is closely linked to the actual childhood experiences of the author.

Now, Demarest is the narrator for a twenty-minute video aimed at complementing the novel in classroom use. The video provides a walking tour of Braddock, following closely the path described so meticulously in Bell's novel. It combines historical photos with footage of the current state of Braddock's neighborhoods to bring to life the physical environment of the early 20th century immigrant world. Demarest highlights the themes of the novel, shows the blocks of row homes, depicts the plight of working-class widows, and discusses the deteriorating mills. Most importantly he demonstrates how the novel can be used to recapture much of Bell's (born Thomas Belejcek in Braddock in 1903) own past. He even takes the viewers to the cemetery where a gravestone reminds us that Bell's father died in an accident similar to the one that befell Mike Dobrecjak in *Out of This Furnace*. All the while, Demarest juxtaposes passages from the novel with scenes from current-day Braddock.

Ironically, in a documentary which revisits the impoverished neighborhood of immigrant steelworkers, the video evokes little of the oppressive intrusion of the mill in the day-to-day lives of the workers and their families. We get a shot of one mill in the not-too-distant background, but the close physical proximity of the Slovak's home and work life, made necessary by grueling 12-hour shifts and 24-hour swing shifts, is largely absent.

In addition, one wishes for a bit more about the intervening history of Braddock's First Ward. The documentary recaptures some of the connections linking the neighborhood and the industry through the 1930s, but seems to imply that there is a relationship between the abandoned mill and the decrepit state of Braddock in the 1980s. This may be an accurate picture, yet it may also be the case that the history of the First Ward and the nearby steel mills was not so directly linked in the 1940s, 50s, and 60s. Once unionized, steel workers enjoyed far greater prosperity; they moved to the suburbs and purchased automobiles. I wonder if the African-Americans who came to occupy the First Ward in the post-war era obtained employment in the mills, or if they were there for other reasons, reasons that have far more to do with racism

(including the racism of Slovak steelworkers) than they do with industrial geography and class. This video, like so many other products of public history, seems to focus on a particular stage of capitalist development and to recount the trials and triumphs of the workers during that phase. To connect that with an all-too-brief shift to present-day deindustrialization and decaying neighborhoods is both misleading and ahistorical.

It is perhaps unfair to target what was not done in a 20-minute documentary. In the classroom, I am certain that the video will greatly enhance the use of the novel and probably elicit a livelier discussion that might otherwise be the case. Still, I wish that the film makers had taken advantage of the intervening fifty years to tell what happened to those who got "out of that furnace" as well as why others are still there.

Ken Fones-Wolf, *West Virginia University*

By David M. Oshinsky, Richard P. McCormick, and Daniel Horn. *The Case of the Nazi Professor*.

(New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1989. Pp. vii; 157. \$35.00 cloth, \$15.00 paperback.)

Few stories make better reading than those recounting an injustice set right, a reputation rehabilitated, or an unpopular cause vindicated with time. Several years ago, in New Brunswick, New Jersey, a crusade to rectify an old wrong at Rutgers University exemplified the genre. Newspaper attention focused on a former German instructor who had supposedly been dismissed during the depression years because his liberal beliefs collided with the pro-Nazi views of his department chairman. These are the intriguing beginnings of *The Case of the Nazi Professor*, which details what happened to Lienhard Bergel back in the 1930s.

Written by three Rutgers historians commissioned by their university president to find the truth in the Bergel case, this slender but intricately argued and utterly absorbing work has all the earmarks of a good detective novel—plot twists included. The main antagonists include Bergel, the young instructor who lost his job, and his chairman, Friedrich J. Hauptmann, an alleged Nazi spy and propagandist.

For Bergel, the investigation conducted by the authors of this book brought no vindication. The evidence shows that, while neither Hauptman nor the Rutgers administration behaved admirably in terminating Bergel's contract and in the controversy that followed, his dismissal was neither hasty nor ill-conceived. Bergel was haughty in relations with his colleagues, including his chairman, had a mixed reputation (at best) as a teacher, ignored even the most routine functions of a college professor (including attending faculty meetings), and was slow out of the starting gate as a scholar. In a situation in which he was competing for a tenure track slot with an accomplished colleague, it was not irrational or unfair that he should have been forced out after three years. Clamor for a university apology or a special ceremony to set things right (such as research biologist Alex Novikoff was to enjoy at the University of Vermont in May 1983 thirty years after his dismissal for taking the Fifth Amendment before a Congressional committee investigating his membership in the communist party) faded once Oshinsky, McCormick and

Horn released their findings.

The special twist in this case lies in the fact that some of the charges Bergel and his supporters made—most notably, that Hauptmann was a Nazi sympathizer if not a secret member of the Nazi underground—were true. The authors show that Hauptmann agreed with Hitler's racial views and formally joined the Nazi party when he returned to Germany in 1940. For several years during the second world war he served the Hitler regime in a comfortable cultural administration position in Slovakia. As the Nazi empire collapsed in 1945, Hauptmann ran, and he lived out his long life in rather pathetic circumstances.

Although the authors portray Hauptmann as an unlikeable careerist whose ambitions led him to embrace an evil political cause, their book is anything but sensational. It is a model of rigorous research, extending to German archives, and a fairminded exposition of the facts. Because the evidence uncovered by the authors failed to sustain the claims of Bergel's most avid supporters, and because the antihero, Hauptmann, was not a compelling character, *The Case of the Nazi Professor* will never rival other prominent works of historical detection (such as Hugh Trevor-Roper's *The Hermit of Peking*) for sheer narrative power. What the authors have done is nonetheless significant. They have illuminated academic procedures in what seems by today's standards a hopelessly antiquarian era; detailed how university personnel policies and portentous public events could connect with near explosive results; and reaffirmed, in a climate where the reaffirmation matters, that academics *can* follow evidence to logical if untidy conclusions. On the last of these grounds alone, this slender volume deserves to reach a wider audience than it is likely to find.

Michael J. Birkner, *Gettysburg College*