Book Reviews:
By Jack P. Greene. *Imperatives, Behaviors & Identities: Essays in Early American Cultural History.*

For Jack P. Greene, "culture" is "the entire range of values, practices, behaviors, and character traits that identify all the people of specific places, times, or social groupings as distinctive" (p. ix). In sixteen essays, all but one of which have been previously published, Greene uses this concept, with different degrees of explicitness, to study British North America in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He seeks to understand how early Americans dealt with differences among their overarching expectations for personal success, the attitudes they brought with them from Britain (non-British groups receive little attention), and the social and economic realities they encountered in the colonies. These pieces attempt to integrate the findings of social and economic historians from the past two decades with the political questions on which Greene initially focused his scholarship in the 1950s. Methodologically, most are deeply rooted in primary sources, chiefly the printed letters and pamphlets of the elite (Greene believes "that normative groups exercise a more powerful influence in the process of identity formation among groups, and it is with such groups that I am primarily concerned. . .") [p. 145n5]).

Throughout the essays runs the theme Greene argued in *Pursuits of Happiness* (1988): the anglicization over time of the colonies, which in turn increased the cultural similarity among them. This similarity was the foundation for the colonies' resistance to British attempts to increase control over them. While this approach identifies Greene as a neo-Whig, his emphasis is not that colonists were defending a culture perceived as different and superior to Britain's, but rather one which they thought was full of "moral and cultural deficiencies" (p. 172). Indeed, Greene acknowledges the "fortuitous" (p. 209) timing of the American Revolution: a few decades later, the growth of slavery would have so differentiated the South from the rest of the country that effective resistance to Britain would have been impossible.

Greene's focus is on the southern and Caribbean colonies, and Pennsylvania does not figure prominently in these essays. However, in "The Constitution of 1787 and the Question of Southern Distinctiveness" he develops the interesting argument that the attitudes and behavior of the Virginia delegates to the 1787 convention were closer to those of Pennsylvania than the states south of Virginia. For Greene, this pattern shows the limited significance of any "north vs. south" division, a concern which he acknowledges did exist in the country at that time. I am not completely convinced, but Greene's finding does reinforce my belief that continuing to think about Pennsylvania as part of a "middle colonies" model is not fruitful.

Since Greene's essays are so provocative and wide-ranging, their conclusions will be questioned by some scholars. Historians of Pennsylvania, for example, will ask whether the colonies in the eighteenth century were becoming anglicized, or "Pennsylvaniacized," as
Greene’s own example just discussed above might suggest. Others will point out, as Greene acknowledges only fleetingly, that many colonists increasingly saw British cultural patterns—corrupt politics, decadent sexual morality, increasing commercialization of all aspects of life—as practices to be avoided, not emulated. The failure of the movement for royal government for Pennsylvania in the 1760s would seem to support such claims.

All American historians, however, would benefit from reading these essays. They are gracefully written, cogently argued, reflect deep intelligence, and tackle important questions.

Robert J. Gough, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire


(Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992. Pp. xi, 357. $40.00.)

In his introduction to A Country Between McConnell notes that the history of the Ohio Indians has long been marginalized and ignored by historians of the Ohio Valley during the era of the Seven Years' War. According to McConnell, scholars “have often assumed that, because they ultimately lost the contest for control of the middle west, the natives were always bound to lose and so could be readily summarized or dismissed” (p. 2). McConnell admirably redresses the imbalance in this exhaustively researched, well written history of the Ohio Indians during the eighteenth century. He approaches events “from the vantage point of the Ohio Country” (p. 3) rather than from the eastern perspective of Euro-Americans and the Iroquois League. As a result, the Ohio Indians emerge as active participants who met the challenges of warfare, invasion, and colonial expansion with foresight and flexibility as they tried to preserve their cultural integrity and sovereignty.

McConnell sets the tone immediately with a discussion of the initial movement of Indian groups from Pennsylvania and western New York into the upper Ohio Valley during the 1720s. He asserts that the Indians came as “native pioneers” rather than refugees, and that resettlement was “the product of a deliberate strategy . . . to preserve their cultural and political integrity” (p. 20). In the remainder of the book, he traces the Indians' continuing struggle to preserve their independence as the Ohio Country became first a trading crossroads, then a battleground of European empires, and finally the scene of renewed Anglo-American encroachment on Indian land. Through the vagaries of trade, warfare, and accommodation, McConnell deftly unravels the confusing tangle of interethnic alliances and antagonisms that constantly formed and reformed as interests changed on both sides of the cultural frontier.

McConnell's analysis provides a fresh perspective that integrates and balances traditional imperialist, Eurocentric history and his own view from the Ohio Valley. A new history of the eighteenth-century Ohio Valley emerges, complete with both Euro-American and native protag-
onists who cooperated and compromised as long as it was advantageous, but ultimately—perhaps inevitably—met on the battlefield. In this revised view, the Iroquois League is considerably less powerful and influential in the middle west, Pontiac's pan-Indian "conspiracy" becomes the much less unified "Western Indians' Defensive War" (p. 182), and the Shawnees, Delawares, and Ohio Iroquois emerge from "the crucible of a fifty-year struggle for independence" (p. 282) not as conquered peoples, but with new and stronger collective identities.

McConnell's history of the upper Ohio Valley and its native inhabitants is aptly named, for in his account the region is truly "a country between"—between empires and between cultures. Most important, the Ohio Indians are restored to their central role in the multicultural and international struggle for the Ohio Country. He tells the complex story with balance and clarity, redefining forever the history of not just the Ohio Valley, but of colonial America. No scholar of eighteenth-century America, much less of Anglo-Indian relations, can afford to overlook this book.

Nancy L. Hagedorn, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation

Edited by Susan E. Klepp and Billy G. Smith. The Infortunate: The Voyage and Adventures of William Moraley, An Indentured Servant.

(University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992. Pp. 178. $25.00 cloth, $12.95 paper.)

William Moraley's narrative, The Infortunate, introduces a distinct and important view of colonial North America. A more complete knowledge of the past becomes possible with the publication of this autobiography written by an indentured servant who worked in and traveled through the colonies between 1729 and 1734, spending a considerable portion of time in Pennsylvania. Moraley's autobiography, therefore, holds special importance for students and scholars of Pennsylvania history.

Klep and Smith claim "Moraley's autobiography not only tells an entertaining story but it contains much that is of historical value" (p. 5). Historical value is particularly apparent in Moraley's account of life viewed from a position quite unlike his more fortunate contemporaries, Benjamin Franklin and Peter Kalm.

Moraley wrote from a social position only incidentally observed and described by Peter Kalm who briefly visited Pennsylvania, and Benjamin Franklin, whose rise from apprentice to prominence is legend. Neither Kalm nor Franklin, would know life without hope of ascending to or remaining in the ranks of privilege. Misfortune and poverty assume a less speculative character when described by one such as Moraley with experience in servitude and indigence.

Moraley indentured himself shortly after his father died, leaving him only 20 shillings and no prospects. In 1729 he traveled to the colonies and his time was purchased by a "Quaker, but
a Wet one" clock-maker (p. 64). After completing his service, Moraley never achieved economic security. Yet, despite his various misfortunes Moraley remained buoyant throughout his sojourn. An adventurous character, Moraley journeyed to contiguous colonies, telling tall tales, entertaining those with whom he came into contact, eluding creditors, and begging for charity. Moraley vividly recounted surviving his often impoverished state, providing insight into the depths to which some less fortunate individuals in colonial society were driven.

Moraley's travels brought him into contact with various people who otherwise have been neglected in much of the historical literature. He commiserated with whites in circumstances similar to his, sympathized with the plight of African-American slaves and servants, and appreciated Native-Americans' knowledge of their land. Moreover, Moraley candidly described his encounters and liaisons with women. Although his behavior toward this latter group in some instances was less than respectable, his observations about gender relations prove instructive. His descriptions provide important insights into these groups, especially when compared to accounts written by his contemporaries.

Klep and Smith exercise considerable skill in editing the narrative which abounds in contradictions, exaggerations, and discrepancies. In the introduction and thorough footnotes which explain, elaborate, and correct errors, they clearly establish the context for and limitations in Moraley's claims. Yet they never dismiss Moraley, allowing for an informed conclusion about this text's historical authenticity and significance.

It would have been instructive for the editors more rigorously to compare Moraley to his contemporaries in addition to Franklin. The comparison of Franklin and Moraley is justified since both men shared similar experiences in having known forms of servitude, and Moraley may have known of Franklin. Olaudah Equiano and Peter Kalm, however, also shared common experiences with Moraley chronicling their experiences in the colonies. A comparison of Moraley to Equiano and Kalm, as fellow travelers, would have provided a broader context in which to appreciate Moraley's voyage and adventures.

Unlike his more fortunate contemporaries, Moraley did not generate a body of knowledge or experiences endorsed in earlier examinations of the colonial past. Only recently has this interest in diverse perspectives in history begun to emerge. In retrieving a narrative written by an indentured servant, Klep and Smith have extended the foundation for understanding different perspectives among colonial society's various members. This autobiography should receive a hearty welcome in any course examining North American colonial history. The Infortunate indeed was a fortunate find.

Leslie Patrick-Stamp, Bucknell University
Pennsylvania's Quaker legislature and Penn family proprietorship both proved casualties of the American Revolution. If Lorett Treese's engaging book teaches us anything useful, it is that their demise was not undeserved. Governing the province from 1763 to 1776, John and Richard Penn, Anglican grandsons of the idealist Quaker founder William and his capable wife Hannah Callowhill, regarded and acted upon events of the imperial crisis primarily as they affected their income from quitrents and the sale of proprietary lands. When they opposed the Stamp Act and supported the First Continental Congress, they cared less for American liberty and more for keeping royal government from imposing measures which provoked civil unrest, and by extension, from threatening their revenues. The assembly was no better: it let the frontiers burn while it tried to coerce the proprietor into paying taxes for provincial defense. As both sides appealed to British authority to settle the dispute in their favor, new men from outside the political system took over the Revolution, ensuring Pennsylvania's status as Exhibit A for historians who make a case that the war for independence generated social turmoil and class conflict.

Treese's depiction of the Penn family's single-minded preoccupation with their incomes and prestige illustrates the perils of elite Anglicization under way in several colonies in the mid-eighteenth century. Although they were really bystanders, like many future loyalists the Penns provided their countrymen with a vivid reminder that a selfish governing class largely unconcerned with affairs of state except for keeping order and making money was no remote danger, but a real and present threat to communal well-being. Treese defends Governor John Penn from some of the more outrageous charges against him, notably that he took no interest in the Paxton Boys' march on Philadelphia and let Benjamin Franklin and other public-spirited inhabitants handle things. However, she is quick to point out that when he acted admirably, some financial advantage was typically at work.

Hedging their bets about as well as could be reasonably expected during the epic struggle raging around them, the Penns managed to be compensated by both England and the United States. While the compensation represented only a small portion of their losses, it was enough to maintain them in reasonable comfort. There is a certain justice in that they got what they really wanted, although nowhere nearly as much as they thought they deserved. But it is salutary to remember that as people on both sides risked their lives for their vision of the good society, the principal battle undertaken by the Penns was a most unbrotherly lawsuit by brothers Richard and John over their share of the family inheritance, a quarrel that they and their heirs fought from the early 1770s until 1800 in courts on two continents.

Treese's narrative is lively. She does not weigh us down with needless "life and times" baggage since the story of the Revolution in Pennsylvania has been well told many times. Especially valuable are her analyses of the Penns' interest in curbing warfare on the western frontier and keeping Connecticut settlers out of the Wyoming Valley to make sure funds from land sales kept
flowing. I only wish she had examined in greater depth the personal as well as public lives of the Penns. The intriguing but unanswered question behind this book is what happened to the children and grandchildren of William and Hannah Penn that turned the family from champions of religious freedom and political liberty into a greedy and selfish clan. For it was the privatized gentry of Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, escaping from the capitals to country houses and gentry pleasures, who constituted the symbols of government against which their less fortunate fellow inhabitants revolted.

William Pencak, Penn State/Ogontz Campus


The Rise of the Penitentiary focuses on Massachusetts as a case study for the development of American penitentiaries in the early nineteenth century. In it Adam J. Hirsch explicates contemporary discussion of carceral theory leading to the establishment of penitentiaries, and presents the new penitentiaries as the embodiments of traditional ideas on a new and larger scale.

Hirsch traces the origins of the penitentiary to English workhouses of the sixteenth century and the debates of contemporary theorists over the rehabilitative value of imprisonment. Like the administrators of American penitentiaries and almshouses, those of English workhouses struggled to reform inmates and deter potential inmates. Theorists of the nineteenth century wrestled with the same problems: whether individuals could be reformed while involuntarily imprisoned, whether the institution could support itself to any significant extent from the labor of inmates, and what means should be employed to induce inmates to work.

Hirsch follows these problems through the literature on criminology into the nineteenth century. He argues that postrevolutionary legislators turned to penitentiaries only in part out of a sense of the failure of traditional modes of sanction, particularly public punishments such as whipping or the pillory. Equally important was a growing conviction that hard labor, which could only be administered effectively within institutional walls, was a more appropriate punishment for property-related crimes, the most prevalent types of violations. The decision to construct penitentiaries was rooted not in a sudden sense of disintegrating social order, but a recognition that the nature of crime had changed as a result of demographic and economic changes and that the scale of response to crime must also change.

In spite of the good intentions of their founders, the penitentiaries failed to reform inmates, precisely because they removed the offending individual from the community and thus from the context which could best provide both incentive and positive reinforcement for change. They failed to provide effective deterrents to crime for the same reasons; neither the Auburn nor the
Pennsylvania systems were an adequate response to this fundamental problem.

Hirsch sees considerable similarity between incarceration and slavery as institutions; his discussion of the ways in which some of same arguments were used by the advocates of incarceration to advocate the abolition of slavery clearly demonstrates his mastery of the political literature of the period.

The *Rise of the Penitentiary* is primarily an overview of theoretical sources, with concrete examples confined almost exclusively from one state, and is intended to be a supplement to existing studies of prisons in Pennsylvania and New York. Slavery is included as “institutional context”; further development of such context in regard to other institutions, such as almshouses or asylums, would have been helpful in this regard. The book does, however, suggest areas in which further studies could fruitfully be developed. Hirsch’s footnotes are exhaustive, and his command of the material impressive. The study is a valuable addition to the literature on the development of American prisons (particularly as a response to the sweeping assertions of David Rothman), and to the examination of the adoption of institutional solutions for social problems.

Monique Bourque, *University of Delaware*

---


Dowd’s book is an ambitious and penetrating account of the powerful roles religion and ritual play within culture. Although focused on their manipulation by prophets within Native American cultures, religious beliefs and their supporting rituals are ubiquitous features of all cultures both past and present. What makes the book exciting are the parallels that can be drawn between his subject matter and contemporary cultures that are experiencing prolonged stress caused by dependency and fluctuating economic cycles. Equally important is Dowd’s argument that prophets and their movements must be understood as responses to the existing social, political, and economic conditions that formed a continuous assault upon Native American culture.

Dowd has chosen to organize his book into ten chapters which cover the years 1745-1815. These chapters examine the emergence of spiritual opposition to acculturation, loss of land, and colonial interference in Indian civil affairs; its hiatus after 1763 and eventual resurgence after 1781; and its ultimate failure in the early 19th century. Two chapters provide an informative discourse on the federal government’s role in the post Revolutionary War era and a reflection upon why nearly a century of nativism was destined to collapse and fail.

The principal cultures examined by Dowd were the Cherokees, the Creek, the Delaware and the Shawnee. Using these tribal entities, Dowd was able to weave a lucid account of the
complicated dynamics that spawned the nativist movement, shaped its character and impact, and facilitated its longevity, and ultimately caused it to fail. Fundamental to understanding the emergence and ardent support for the nativist cause are the prophets themselves, and their influence upon one another. This fact is a central theme of the book and serves as a nexus for connecting events and the different blocks of time used by Dowd in tracing the "religiously charged struggle for unity" amongst tribes from the Great Lakes to the Gulf Coast.

Despite its strengths, there are a few points where I disagree with the author. The first is his use of oral tradition to help re-establish the location of historically known Native-American cultures during the 17th century. Archaeologists and linguists are still unable to identify unequivocally the original location of several historic Indian cultures within the eastern United States, including the Shawnee. In addition, Native-American movements during the 17th century are also difficult to document because there is often neither independent sources to validate "oral tradition" nor maps drawn on the basis of informants.

Second, the existence of "mixed or polyglot villages," which the author attributes to warfare and land dispossession, could also be caused by disease. Archaeologically, disease can be shown to have preceded the advance of traders, missionaries, and colonization by decades. Since disease does not recognize age nor one's physiological identity, the death of large numbers of people would destabilize whole cultures. Survivors from such epidemics would most likely take refuge with allies and/or kinsmen living with neighboring cultural groups.

Overall Dowd's book makes an important contribution to the growing field of ethnohistory and Native-American studies. I highly recommend it to anyone doing research on Native American-Euro American relations.

John P. Nass, Jr., California University of Pennsylvania

By Kerry S. Walters. The American Deists: Voices of Reason and Dissent in the Early Republic.

(Lawrence: The University Press of Kansas, 1992. Pp. 400. $35.00.)

Kerry Walters presents here an excellent, well-chosen and well-edited collection of primary sources on American deism. In a superb, fifty-page introductory essay, Walters argues that American deism drew inspiration from both the less radical British and the more radical French versions. It took its epistemology and notions of religious reform from the New Learning of Bacon, Newton, and Locke, but it gained its distinctly ethical and political character from French radicalism. Walters contends that the Great Awakening ironically aided the rise of deism by destroying the Calvinist hegemony and thereby providing an opening for new religious ideas. Deism received an additional boost from the Revolution and entered its most intense, militant phase after 1790. Its demise, by 1811, occurred because Enlightenment thought in general was in retreat.
Unlike some historians who have minimized the impact of deism, Walters believes it was "a catalyst for change in both the theological and social arenas" (p. 43). Even non-deistic theologians, as they searched for effective ways to combat this new opponent, "tended to absorb certain elements of the rational religion they sought to refute" (p. 44). In the social realm, deists became "reform agitators" (p. 45) who drew wider attention to the separation of church and state, freedom of conscience, public education, abolition of slavery, and the emancipation of women.

The collection of sources itself is drawn from the writings of seven individuals—Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Ethan Allen, Tom Paine, Elihu Palmer, Philip Freneau, and the Frenchman Comte de Volney (who lived in American from 1795-98 and is included for his influence on American deism). Franklin is described as an "ambiguous deist" (p. 51), characteristic of the early, transitional figures upon whom a residue of Calvinism still lingered. Readers will be intrigued by Franklin's deist credo, liturgy, and adaptation of the Lord's Prayer, as well as contrasting earlier and later essays, reassuring letters to his parents, and a familiar selection from his autobiography. Palmer, whom Walters rightfully describes as "the chief of American deists" (p. 241), lived in Philadelphia periodically and lost his sight in the 1793 yellow fever epidemic; his writings are represented by portions of Principles of Nature (1801).

Jefferson is represented mostly by correspondence, Freneau by poetry. Excerpts are chosen from Allen's Reason the Only Oracle of Man (1784), Volney's Ruins; or, Meditations on the Revolutions of Empires (1791), and Paine's Age of Reason (1794). Three short-lived, but important, deist periodicals—The Temple of Reason (1800-03), Prospect (1803-05), and Theophilanthropist (1810-11)—provide the final set of selections, none of which has been reprinted previously.

Historians of Pennsylvania will be particularly interested in this anthology because of the insight it provides into the intellectual culture of Philadelphia, where many of these individuals and periodicals made their home, if only temporarily. But all historians of colonial America and of American religion should be grateful for this very fine volume.

Charles D. Cashdollar, Indiana University of Pennsylvania


These ten essays on the "Critical Ideas of the Constitution" represent another in the distinguished series produced by Ronald Hoffman and those associated with him in the annual conference of the Capitol Historical Society. Most of these studies explore the framers' intent: some in order to address a contemporary political concern; others to argue against "original intent" jurisprudence. On occasion one or another author worries the question of the intellectual
genealogy of a particular founder. More often the essays use the writings of representative men to generalize about the framers’ thought. Few explore popular political culture or its relationship to the writings of the framers.

The complexity of the arguments developed by each of these distinguished scholars precludes easy summary, but the importance of each essay requires some notice, inadequate or misleading as that may prove to be. John Murrin argues that, contrary to the assertions of the contemporary Evangelical right, the founders shared not a common Christian orientation but rather held and acted upon at least six distinguishable moral systems: Calvinist orthodoxy, Anglican moralism, Scottish moral and common sense, civic humanism, early classical liberalism and “the artisanal radicalism . . . of . . . Paine” (p. 12). The framers themselves were more secular, while the people were more Christian, but the Constitution itself largely reflected the secular humanism deplored by today’s TV evangelists.

Isaac Kramnick demonstrates that the Federalists and the Antifederalists debated the Constitution in at least four distinct idioms: civic humanism, Lockean liberalism, radical Protestantism with its concern for calling and industry; and the language of power and the state which looked to energy, vigor, and empire. Then, as now, he concludes, no one paradigm “obtained exclusive dominance in the American political discourse” (p. 216).

Most of the remaining essays both challenge and confirm this “plurality of paradigms” view. Each of the authors hears the framers speaking in one idiom but each author hears a somewhat different idiom. Jennifer Nedelsky listens to the voice of James Madison, who, she argues, believed that a just government protected both the rights of persons and the rights of property. Madison expected majority rule to achieve the first, and the Constitution to provide the second through prohibitions on state legislation, mediated representation in the national government, and an extended republic whose heterogeneity would preclude majority factions from abusing minorities, especially the propertied few. Today, Nedelsky suggests, the courts, having largely abandoned efforts to prevent legislative invasion of property, seek to buttress autonomy through “judicial protections for privacy and procedural rights in administrative law” (p. 70). Meanwhile, the popular commitment to the sanctity of property, combined with the consolidation of economic and political power, protects the “autonomy, stability, and the security of the wealth and power of the elite” in America’s capitalist system (p. 72).

Edward Erler praises the idealism and the purity of the motives of the framers who spoke the language of the Declaration of Independence and constructed the Constitution on its principles: government by consent, universal natural rights, and human equality. Jean Yarbrough decries current depictions of the framers as moral relativists seeking only to balance interests, and unconcerned with values and character. The framers, she argues, believed that only the highest moral standards and the most disciplined personal character could insure the success of republican self government. They expected the family, the church, and the school, reinforced by the market and participation in local politics, to inculcate values and develop character. Contemporary commercialism, she feels, has eroded these values while the federal courts, “spurred by
the Fourteenth Amendment” have compelled the states to “surrender . . . their responsibilities for moral and civic virtue” thereby threatening the future of “our republican institution” (p. 249).

Ralph Lerner also praises the ideals of the founders, not because these men created an unalterable system but because they “staked their fame on . . . a people’s capacity to govern itself well” (p. 260). We honor the framers, he believers, not by “mindless idolatry” (p. 270), or “thoughtless application of their principles” (p. 258) but by respecting and learning from the past while transcending it. We must school ourselves in the language of equal rights, develop the habits of self-government, and foster the intellectual and moral improvement necessary to be the “self-governing people they [the framers] wished for” (p. 270).

Calvin Jillson maps the interaction of principle and interest at the Convention through close analysis of debates and factor analysis of votes. He concludes that on such “high level” questions as popular election, executive power, bicameralism, and national versus confederation government, regionally defined principles shaped the behavior of moralist Puritan New Englanders, traditional hierarchial southern planters, and Middle Atlantic (including Virginia) nationalist democratic pluralists. On “lower level” issues such as commerce, western lands and slavery, delegates voted their states’ interests. When principle and interest clashed, interest prevailed. For example, the democratic and nationalist middle states disagreed over direct election of Senators, the smaller ones supporting state legislative election in order to gain equal representation in the upper house.

John Diggins implies that the intentions of the framers are largely irrelevant because history proved them wrong. Focusing on two works of John Adams and conflating Adams, “Publius”, and the framers, Diggins argues that the Constitution rested on the assumption of inevitable conflict, principally between the few with property and the many without. In the nineteenth century, however, most Americans shared the same “bourgeois values that became, along with religion and social mores, ‘habits of the heart’ ” (p. 131). Democracy (the many) posed no threat to property (the few). The Constitution, created to mediate conflict, succeeded” only because of the extent of consensus” (p. 131).

J. R. Pole, on the other hand, insists on the importance of the intentions of the framers. They and the people, he believes, expected the Constitution to establish a national government which would operate directly upon individuals and explicitly protect their equal rights. Although eighteenth century Americans were aware “of the fundamentally collective nature of the human condition” (p. 80) they wanted a central government which acted on and for the citizens of the United States as discrete and equal individuals. Furthermore, the Second through the Eighth Amendments to the Constitution exemplified this principle by protecting individuals against state encroachment of their rights as citizens of the United States. In this sense, then, the Fourteenth Amendment reaffirmed the original intent of the framers, despite the Supreme Court’s inclination both before and after the Civil War to interpret that intention otherwise.

Peter Onuf reminds us of the vulnerability of the individual states in the disintegrating confederation, and how a stronger union under the Constitution enhanced their integrity and
autonomy. Absolute state sovereignty threatened republican self-government. The weakness of each isolated state would invite European subjugation or each state would suspend domestic liberty to gear up for inevitable war against its neighbors.

Through their diversity, these essays testify to the end of the republican synthesis, as well as to the lack of a dominant alternative paradigm. Herman Belz, in his introduction, contends that taken together, these essays show the framers intending to reconcile virtue and liberty by dividing "sovereignty between the national government, designed as a commercial republic (i.e. more liberal) and the states, where public morality and education in citizenship (i.e. virtue) were proper concerns of republican government" (p. xvi). Belz may be right, but I suspect that not every reader, nor all of the authors, for that matter, would agree.

In total, the collection somewhat homogenizes the founders. It also slights the role of compromise, politics and contingency, the dissatisfaction individual framers felt with the finished document, the Antifederalist attack, the degree to which the public debate helped some framers to better understand what they had created, and the persistence of what Ralph Ketcham has labeled the desire for a patriot king. On the other hand, these essays certainly fulfill the promise of the conference at which they were first delivered, shedding light on "the political theories and the philosophies of government that informed the minds of the men who created [the Constitution]" (p. viii).

Owen S. Ireland, SUNY College, Brockport


This volume is the nineteenth in a series started in 1970 as a Bicentennial project; the first was published in 1976. The series includes the correspondence of the delegates as well as other writings: debate notes, diary entries, speeches, and reports. The volume includes a chronology of congressional activity for the period and a listing of delegates by state with election and attendance dates. The index is extensive.

During the time covered by this volume, August 1, 1782 to March 11, 1783, Congress was primarily concerned with financial questions and peace negotiations. The first was inextricably linked to interstate differences and the reluctance of the individual states to give national government more authority. Congress was faced with the difficulty of maintaining an army without having funds to support it. An attempt was made to raise revenue with a five percent impost on imported manufactured goods. Under the Articles of Confederation, it was necessary that all thirteen states ratify the measure. Congress appointed a special deputation to Rhode Island to secure the state's passage of the tax which it had earlier rejected. The deputation returned to
Philadelphia the same day it left, after hearing that Virginia repealed its passage of the impost. North Carolina delegate Abner Nash wrote to James Iredell on the matter: "Nothing . . . is more true than that poor America is prepared for peace, indeed it may be said she is prepared for nothing else. In the early periods of the war Congress possessed powers very different from what they do now. . . . they made one attempt to bring the states into a consent that they might Tax imports as far as 5 per Cent & after advocating the propriety nay necessity of the measure . . . for two years they have at length the mortification to find it wont go down. The little State of R. Island has had it in her power to blast the well grounded hopes that were conceived of such a measure & Virge. has since on this head gone retrograde. A deputation from the N. army is now before Congress stating their distresses & prophesying what will be the probable consequence if practising any longer on the patience of the Soldiery. God grant us you will say a happy issue out of all our troubles; so we all say but this wont get the Cart out of the mire" (p. 565).

Peace negotiations with Great Britain are also covered at length in this volume. Included, primarily in James Madison's notes of debates, are delegates' views of the role of France in the negotiations.

The ten Pennsylvania delegates that attended during this period are represented by only ten letters. This lack of letters does not mean that this volume contains little on Pennsylvania. One of the areas of Pennsylvania history discussed is Pennsylvania's disputes with other states: with Connecticut over the Wyoming Valley settlements, New Jersey over the Delaware River, and Virginia over western territory. The settlement of Connecticut's claims was the first conflict between states determined under the Articles of Confederation.

Pennsylvania's violations of Continental flags of truce was an issue that threatened to undermine Congressional authority. The violations occurred when clothing for British prisoners at Lancaster was seized as contraband under a Pennsylvania law forbidding the importing of British goods. The supplies had been sent to Lancaster under a passport from George Washington. Oliver Wolcott, a Connecticut delegate, wrote to Matthew Griswold about the matter. His letter not only described what happened, but gave an unflattering view of Pennsylvania government: "The Legislature of this State are now sitting. Congress by a Committee have represented to the Executive this Atrocious Violation of the Laws of Nations and the Principles of the Confederation. The Executive seem impressed with a Sense of the great Impropriety of this Conduct, but show a Law of the State which passed the last year which Appears to justify Such a Seisure. The Assembly Say that by their Constitution they cannot pass an ex Post Facto Act—in the mean Time I am told that Fresh Seisures are dayly making in Chester County of the Cloathing and which has been countenanced by People of popular Reputation in that County. People in Power here seem at present to imagin that nothing can be done but to perswade those Fellows to give up their Seisures. This Affair places us in a scandalous Situation. I hope that the State will See that the Cloathing is restored—but such is the Party Spirit of this People and the Weakness of their Government, that but little is to be expected from them. If the U States cannot by their Passports give protection I think that no one ought to trust them" (p. 601).
The material in the Letters of Delegates series is not restricted to official correspondence, so the effect of Congressional service on the delegates’ lives is apparent. Elias Boudinot of New Jersey was elected president of Congress November 4, 1782. The day of the election he wrote to his wife Hannah: “You must not blame me hastily for a Step, which from the Nature of the Thing, must be taken before & without Consulting you . . . As to my Affairs at home, you & Mr. Pintard must settle the whole—you must leave home, for at least one Year. I think you had best sell whatever you think we shall not stand in need of . . . You must get all the Cash you can; as that all will not be sufficient . . . I scarcely know what to write. I am all dressed for the reception of Compliments, Congratulations, &c &c. How happy should I be was you here” (pp. 339-340). Nine days later Boudinot wrote to his wife: “It is matter of real grief & sorrow to me that I should ever be the cause of a distressing or uneasy Hour to one who I esteem above all the Honors or Riches of this transitory Life . . . As to directions I cannot collect my Thoughts sufficiently to aid you—In general dispose of those Things that you can sell to advantage . . . But now as to the grand Point. I cannot think of your staying longer than this Week. You must set off on Monday next at farthest. I am like a Pelican in the wilderness . . . I am very anxious for your arrival lest the weather should change, yet I am loathe to hurry you” (pp. 378-379).

The editors have used transcriptions of original manuscripts, while citing where the same documents appear in other publications. Different interpretations are noted and explained. James Madison, in his notes on debates for February 20, 1783, inked out a name. The Letters editors note that “the editors of the Madison Papers speculated [that the name] was ‘Genl. Gates,’ but examination of the MS under a microscope provides no support for this suggestion. Perhaps Madison wrote ‘Knox’ . . . but he lined out the word so thoroughly the conjecture cannot be supported by the physical evidence” (p. 719).

In some cases, the original manuscripts were not available, such as letters to George Clinton that were in the New York State Library before the 1911 Albany fire. The editors in these situations have, of necessity, relied on the work of earlier transcribers.

The series Letters of Delegates to Congress will cover the years 1774-1789 when completed. The editors have done an exceptional job with a monumental task; all historians interested in the Revolution and its aftermath will benefit from this publication.

Laurie A. Rofini, Chester County Archives and Records Services


In this long and difficult book—the first of two proposed volumes—Jonathan A. Glickstein examines the ways in which antebellum Americans viewed “the intrinsic character of manual labor” (p. 1) and the moral implications that they attached to work. In general, he argues that the
major distinction made by those who considered the subject in pre-industrial England and America was that between mental and manual labor—work with one's head versus work with one's hands. Beyond this Glickstein notes that manual labor was stigmatized by its association with low status groups such as "slaves, despised minorities, women and children and the enfeebled" (p. 32).

At the same time most American commentators, other than the extreme elitists and the most radical proslavery ideologues, found themselves forced by the traditional association of leisure with aristocracy to assert the morally uplifting nature of honest toil. This led the majority of the writers here considered into ambiguous and often contradictory arguments on the subject. As he surveys the spectrum of arguments from utopian socialists and land reformers to the defenders of the peculiar institution, looking at each argument sentence by sentence from every possible angle and following out possible alternative meanings, Glickstein reveals a profusion of variations on his basic themes. It is this variety, independent of the social position of the author, that constitutes the main argument of this book.

Toward the end of the conclusion, Glickstein comes close to stating an instance of his thesis: "That factory proprietors and other preindustrial members of the middle classes could assume such a variety of positions with respect to a work-free Sabbath may be taken as an another illustration of the principle of variation on a theme, referred to in chapter one and raised implicitly throughout this study. Individuals who shared an underlying commitment to the industrial capitalist social structure frequently disagreed on the best means of ensuring workers' ability to function compliantly and productively within that structure, and the debates over the value and content of a work-free Sabbath were in many instances one expression of these disagreements over means" (p. 282).

These two sentences give a sense of the density of Glickstein's prose as well as the subtlety of his arguments. The book is long—307 full pages of text and 188 pages of discursive notes, sometimes extending over a page in length. Yet the book seems even longer, because of the author's penchant for exceedingly long sentences. The two quoted above are about average at fifty words, but many are two or three times as long!

Not only are the sentences long, but they are loaded with qualifications. Numerous sentences begin with "But" or Yet." Others include phrases such as "hardly atypical" or "may be more true than otherwise" or "not without significance." This is an overly-nuanced and self-indulgent work that suffers from excessive analysis of texts that, often seem unworthy of the author's effort.

_Concepts of Free Labor in Antebellum America deals with an extremely important topic and is full of insightful and interesting comments. The author's erudition and wide-reading is most impressive. Consequently, it is a chore to read._

William G. Shade, Lehigh University

For three decades historians have been measuring residential segregation in terms of ethnicity, occupation, and stage in life cycle, but the significance of this segregation has not been critically assessed. As Kenneth Scherzer points out, we have tended to assume that a physical neighborhood, usually a ward, somehow coincided with or was a surrogate for a community, particularly if it appeared to be socially or culturally homogeneous. Scherzer argues that both urban and labor historians have made tacit assumptions about the importance of residential segregation which overlook or overrate its importance. He characterizes urban historians as asserting that stable neighborhoods were prerequisites for some sense of community, and that for labor historians segregated neighborhoods were a manifestation of or an incubator for class consciousness.

In the first part of this study Scherzer assesses the extent to which social class, ethnicity, or stage in life cycle was the major determinant in this sorting out process. He relies on a statistical analysis of a sample of four wards from the 1855 New York state census manuscripts. Although he describes his methodology, unfortunately he does not explain how to interpret the findings in very clear terms for those not already familiar with linear flow modeling. If readers have never had experience with anything more complex than a simple cross-tabulation, they will probably have difficulty deciphering the tables.

Scherzer found that there was very little residential segregation by either class or ethnicity in New York before the 1840s, contradicting the work of several other historians of antebellum New York. A factor analysis of the sample data suggests that social class was the primary determinant of residence in 1855, but only because of the enormous overlap between ethnicity and occupation. Using his statistical model to control for the interactive effects, he concludes that nativity was, in fact, the foremost determinant of residence. This did not occur, however, because Irish and German immigrants created ethnic ghettos; those groups were fairly widely scattered throughout the city. The primacy of nativity resulted from the rapidity with which the native-born separated themselves from the newcomers. The most homogeneous wards were neighborhoods of the native born. The fact remains, however, because of the overlap of nativity and occupation that the population was increasingly segregated by socio-economic class.

In the second part of the book Scherzer attempts to determine the extent to which New Yorker's social networks coincided with their physical neighborhoods. Using church records he analyzed the residences of marriage partners and of witnesses to weddings and baptisms. In the absence of membership records from any voluntary organization, it is about the only linkage of personal networks likely to be reconstructed for the period. However, even if his data base were complete and fully accurate, it measures only one kind of social network. With very painstaking research he found that New Yorkers had friends and relatives spread throughout the city as well
as in New Jersey and Brooklyn. Scherzer then suggests that these widespread networks may have facilitated people's search for jobs and housing throughout the city, although this is mainly conjecture. The exception in his finding was among the poorer neighborhoods where marriage partners and witnesses came from the immediate vicinity. He speculates that these more restricted social interactions in the poorer wards may have been inhibiting factors in finding better housing and jobs.

Scherzer reminds us that community is not necessarily a place, but a set of social relationships. He does not deny that the physical neighborhoods increasingly became communities in the post-bellum era, but the study does suggest that we should be cautious of making assumptions about the degree to which place and people's individual social networks overlapped.

Roger D. Simon, *Lehigh University*

---

**By Norris Hansell, *Josiah: White Quaker Entrepreneur***

(Easton, Pennsylvania: Canal History and Technology Press, 1992. 151 Pp., $19.95.)

This cleverly conceived monograph justifies one more treatment of Josiah White and his pioneering efforts as head of the Lehigh Coal and Navigation Company during the first half of the 19th century. Indeed, between 1938 and 1986 the man and his firm have been studied in papers, articles, monographs, and at least three unpublished theses. Enough said—or so it would seem.

Norris Hansell, however, in this slender volume, has managed to enrich the existing body of literature. Hansell has been fortunate to gain access to (and the right to publish) Josiah White's "desk papers." These documents include business correspondence, letters to his family, petitions to the State Legislature and to Governors, and vigorous defenses of the Lehigh Coal and Navigation Company and internal improvements in general. Hansell has arranged these letters and documents chronologically to provide a rough sketch of Josiah White's personal life and business activities. By using commentary to introduce each document, the author offers the reader both text and context.

It is quite evident that Norris Hansell and the Canal History and Technology Press that published this volume, are primarily interested in celebrating one of their heroes. This is not all bad, for—inadvertently, and unwittingly perhaps—they have made some very important points. First, Hansell has reminded everyone of the great truth inherent in the George Rogers Taylor classic *The Transportation Revolution*, namely that projects such as those undertaken by the Lehigh Coal and Navigation Company were the key to self-sustaining economic growth in antebellum America. Furthermore, White's dream of a canal system from the Atlantic to the Mississippi was
not only visionary, but made some sense. (The concept of a national canal system was reaffirmed by Robert Fogel as recently as 1964.) Second, Hansell's book makes it abundantly clear that the history of technology is an integral part of American history. That is, Josiah White's business achievements were, in part, dependent on his creativity and inventions. From the wire suspension bridge erected at the Falls of the Schuylkill in 1816 (today hailed by the Smithsonian) to his improved locks, dams, and gravity railroad, White made a substantial contribution to American technological know-how and often this creativity paid handsome dividends.

Other matters of interest to this reviewer include Josiah White's influence in the shaping of Mauch Chunk as a company town, and charges of monopoly leveled against the Lehigh Coal and Navigation Company in the early 1830s stemming from their control of 100 percent of the anthracite flowing to Philadelphia during the early 1820s. A reduction in tolls by Lehigh Coal and Navigation together with the rise of competition brought an end to the monopoly controversy.

Norris Hansell is much impressed by what he perceives to be his subject's unusual moral and ethical strength, particularly White's articulated desire to "limit earnings and wealth." In addition White's philanthropy included creation of the Institute of Wabash, Indiana for Indians and exslaves and the Iowa Manual Labor Institute.

Full of fascinating maps and drawings, this book will appeal to the general reader interested in the early anthracite trade, early canals, and the history of the Lehigh Valley. More important, it could trigger additional research into the technological developments that have so often been overlooked by business and economic historians.

Thomas R. Winpenny, *Elizabethtown College*

---


In *Fighting for Defeat*, Michael Adams seeks to explain why the Army of the Potomac found it so difficult to defeat Robert E. Lee's Army of Northern Virginia. He finds the key in Northern attitudes about Southerners' inherent superiority in waging war. Yankees believed that Rebels were better shots, better horsemen, and more militaristic. They questioned the warmaking capabilities of democratic society, admiring the efficiency of a supposed despotism led by slaveholders. In short, the bluecoats were intimidated by their foe. George McClellan habitually overestimated Confederate numbers; Ambrose Burnside and Joseph Hooker froze in command; George Gordon Meade lacked the aggressive instinct. By 1863 the Army of the Potomac fought simply not to lose. In sports parlance, it was "psyched out."

Although many of Adams's arguments are suggestive, those familiar with past scholarship will find little new here. His analysis of Union military leadership largely restates the conclusions

---

*Pennsylvania History*
of T. Harry Williams, Kenneth P. Williams, and Bruce Catton. Catton's study of the Army of the Potomac examined how its officers and men regarded their butternut counterparts. It is perhaps best to view this volume primarily as an interpretive synthesis with some new insights. Several of these, including reevaluations of the impact of First Bull Run and Gettysburg, ably challenge orthodoxy; others are open to question. For example, for someone aware of the distortion inherent in stereotypes, Adams nevertheless relies on them in speaking of New Englanders and Midwesterners, failing to submit them to critical scrutiny. There is simply no systematic analysis of the relationship between regional origins, class, and attitudes, let alone the impact of those attitudes on military leadership, themes essential to his argument. Nor does he systematically compare the Army of the Potomac with its western counterparts to demonstrate shared and unique attitudes.

According to Adams, the turning point in the war came with Ulysses S. Grant's ascension to supreme command in 1864. There is no doubt that Grant found the Army of the Potomac's officer corps troublesome. Had Adams gone beyond traditional accounts, however, he might have found that Grant shared many of the same attitudes that supposedly crippled other commanders. Grant could wildly overestimate enemy strength, as when he claimed that over 100,000 Confederates attacked at Shiloh; he insisted that slaveholders dominated antebellum southern society and politics; he described the South as a unified military camp governed by a despotism. Thus holding these perceptions did not in itself result in poor leadership. Ironically, Grant's case deprives Adams's most original argument of much of its force.

Adams has grasped how New England gentlemen worked hard after the war to deprive Grant of the laurels of military greatness. The legend of "Butcher Grant" unimaginatively battering away at the enemy took root in the recollections of certain members of the Army of the Potomac who resented Grant's rise in war and politics. This argument dovetailed nicely with Lost Cause apologists who denied that the Confederacy had been outfought by superior generals but accepted that it had been overwhelmed by superior numbers.

Readers interested in a discussion of Union military performance will find Adams's work intriguing. But one might also conclude that there was something more to the Yankees' fear of Bobby Lee than simple psychological maladjustment.

Brooks D. Simpson, Arizona State University

Edited by Gary W. Gallagher. The First Day at Gettysburg: Essays on Confederate and Union Leadership.


Four essays in this slim volume provide a reassessment of the first day's encounters at Gettysburg. While they fix on disparate aspects of the first day's confrontation, collectively the essays delineate the essentials of the battles.
The author of the new critical biography of "Bobby" Lee, Alan T Nolan continues his attack on the Confederate general. Here he questions Lee's strategic mission in 1863, and then faults Lee for egregious tactical decisions on the first day at Gettysburg. Nolan especially questions the wisdom of Lee's northward march. Lee, Nolan argues, "was committed to the offensive as the South's appropriate grand strategy" (p. 5) rather than fighting a defensive war and wearing the Northern commitment down. Nolan says Lee could have remained on the defensive in 1863 rather than marching north. But the general's strategy was to assume the offense and his Gettysburg campaign was the "apogee of his grand strategy" (p. 10). His offensive strategy already was draining the army of manpower and the losses at Gettysburg weakened the army even more. "Win, lose, or draw, the Gettysburg campaign," Nolan writes, "was a strategic mistake . . . " (p. 12).

Historians traditionally have praised Lee's tactical skills, but Nolan finds significant flaws in the commander's leadership on July 1, 1863. Confederate reconnaissance has frequently been cited as badly flawed in the Gettysburg Campaign, and Nolan contends that Lee's ambiguous orders to J. E. B. Stuart bear the blame. Lee gave Stuart no direct mission and was silent on schedules. At the critical moments of accidental contact, Nolan maintains that Lee failed to gain control of his forward units and events overtook him. In the afternoon of July 1, Lee abandoned caution and forced a battle which resulted in the Union Army securing the better tactical ground.

Criticism of Robert E. Lee is an implicit theme running through these essays. Gallagher's essay on A. P. Hill and Richard Ewell, and Robert K. Krick's exposé of Confederate ineptitude at the brigade level argue that the failures of the Confederate Army ultimately are attributable to Lee's lassez-faire style of command. Success by the Confederates on the first day masked the flaws at the command level of the Army of Northern Virginia.

A. Wilson Green provides a reassessment of O. O. Howard and his much-maligned 11th Corps. As victims of Stonewall Jackson's flanking attack at Chancellorsville, these regiments bore the blame for the Union loss. Overrun north of Gettysburg, they again seemed to be star-crossed or inept. Though Howard may have made some tactical errors on July 1, Green argues that the general adhered to correct strategic goals and secured the Cemetery Hill-Culp's Hill-line for the Army of the Potomac. By holding back the Confederate attack until the Union soldiers secured the better ground, Howard and the 11th Corps performed valuable service.

Despite the complex battlefield maneuvering, the essayists retain the human dimension. The maps included in this volume are well-drawn and sufficiently detailed. Editor Gallagher has attended to his responsibilities well in bringing these essays together.

W. Wayne Smith, Indiana University of Pennsylvania


It seems safe to claim that no folk or vernacular artifact in America has generated more attention and admiration among scholars and laypersons alike than the Pennsylvania Barn, and few, if any, are larger or more visually appealing. It has also inspired a considerable body of publications, most of them dealing with a fairly narrow phase of the subject. I am delighted to report that, at long last, Robert Ensminger has produced as definitive a study as one could reasonably desire of this species of rural architecture in all its historical, geographic, and structural dimensions: a truly comprehensive, eminently satisfying treatise.

This labor of love by a geographer and lifelong resident of Berks County is the result of fifteen years of field work in the United States and Europe, an exhaustive search of the literature, and contacts with scholars and barn buffs on two continents. In particular it builds upon and supersedes such worthy earlier efforts as those by Charles Dombusch, Alfred Shoemaker, Henry Glassie, and Joseph Glass. Although the 150 black-and-white photos, not to mention some 40 maps and diagrams, may intrigue the casual browser, this is decidedly not a coffee table item, but rather a detailed, closely argued account aimed at the serious student. Even though Ensminger's prose is clean and direct, much of the discussion, especially of carpentry details, is decidedly technical and does not lend itself to speed reading. Most readers will find the appended six-page Glossary quite useful.

The first of five chapters, one that treats the origins of this barn type with its diagnostic forebay, or overhang, is likely to prove the most controversial. Contrary to his initial expectations, namely that the Pennsylvania barn originated on American soil, the author concludes after roaming through Alpine Europe and consulting local scholars and studies, that the direct prototype of the barn is to be found in the Prättigau district of eastern Switzerland. He argues that two Teutonic groups, the Walser and Romansch, developed this serviceable building during the 1500s and 1600s using locally available logs and stone. Although I am sure that some specialists will resist the finding, I consider the photographic and documentary evidence quite persuasive. The Swiss and Pennsylvania specimens are virtual twins. What does require further elucidation—the only notable shortcoming in this work—is the means whereby a handful of immigrants from a remote, barely accessible area were able to affect bar architecture so decisively in early Pennsylvania. It is the kind of mystery that parallels the apparent transference of log houses from backwoods Scandinavia into America by a few score Finns and Swedes, as Terry Jordan and Matti Kaups have sought to demonstrate.

The next, and longest, chapter presents an elaborate classification and description of some thirty-odd variants of the Pennsylvania Barn with details as to methods of construction and rationale of design. (Form faithfully follows function.) The following chapter deals with the ways these types and subtypes have evolved. This occurred largely within Pennsylvania, as agricultural technology and farm economy developed, largely within Pennsylvania, from the early 1700s
through their era of greatest elaboration, 1790 to 1840, to the end of the process around 1900, with some marginal input from English barn traditions in Philadelphia's near hinterland. A penultimate chapter traces the dispersion of the barn type from its core region of dominance in portions of Pennsylvania and Maryland into some localities in Virginia, the Carolinas, and Tennessee, but much more strongly into certain sections of the Midwest and even into Ontario. The mechanisms involved were migration from the hearth area, especially by members of the Mennonite and other culturally conservative church groups, local diffusion among neighboring farms, and articles in farm journals.

A fascinating final chapter considers the current and prospective status of the barns during a period of declining farm population and urban encroachments upon the countryside. There is some reason for hope with the rise of the historic preservation movement, the efforts of some devoted barn-owners and hobbyists, and the "adaptive reuse" of some structures. The most emblematic of objects in the Pennsylvania landscape promises to survive for future generations, while Ensminger's study is likely to remain as the ideal handbook for appreciating and understanding them. But the volume is of more than parochial value. As an excellent case study of the processes of cultural and technological change and of spatial diffusion, it will be rewarding reading for geographers, social and architectural historians, and folklorists everywhere.

Wilbur Zelinsky, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park


One grasps in vain for a metaphor flamboyant enough to convey the intensity of the attention turned on Shakerism over the past thirty years. We have seen the founding of Shaker museums and libraries, the mounting of conferences, exhibitions, and auctions, the production of films and television "specials," the establishment of associations and summer seminars and newsletters and journals, the creation of original art work inspired by Shakerism and the reproduction of Shaker furniture inspired by respect for both the Shaker aesthetic and the dollar. The interest has also been embodied in serious scholarly publications, and Stephen Stein's book is one of the best. It clearly replaces its predecessor, Edward Deming Andrew's *The People Called Shakers* (1953), which fostered a simplified image of "classic" Shakerism. Stein's book is in effect a rejoinder to that image, for its central message is the complexity of Shaker culture. Stein examines competing personalities, beliefs, structures, and practices in every phase of Shakerism, and in particular extends his presentation of Shaker history past Andrews' cut-off date in the 1870s, through the conflict between the two surviving communities in the 1970s and '80s, right down to the contemporary fascination with the Shaker legacy.
But Stein’s study surpasses Andrews’s history not only in scope and complexity. It also draws on a much greater richness of sources. Andrews relied chiefly upon his own large collection of Shaker manuscripts and a sizeable number of published accounts. Stein was the beneficiary of Mary Richmond’s intensive bibliography of works written by and about the Shakers, and also of spadework done by others in the 1960s in locating the major depositories of Shaker manuscripts. Perhaps even more significantly, he was the beneficiary of the cataloguing and microfilming of the Western Reserve Historical Society’s mammoth Shaker collection, one scarcely visited by Andrews. Stein used these sources well, and synthesized and incorporated the more limited studies others have been writing. Stein goes beyond Andrews and most other students of Shakerism in two other significant ways: he reads his sources with careful attention to their historical contexts, and he brings contemporary theoretical concerns to bear upon the interpretation of Shaker culture. The result is a very fine book.

Shaker buffs will busy themselves with finding small details to criticize: that Stein did not recognize Eldress Marguerite Frost as the saxophone player in Figure 40, and the like. But these seem to me unimportant. I am impressed by the modesty with which Stein himself calls attention to the need for further research; scattered through his book are suggestions for a dozen future dissertations. My chief concern in recommending the book is that its title promises the one thing this very good empirical social history does not offer: a penetration into the lived experience of Shakers. I am uncertain whether Stein is insensitive to the songs, drawings, stories, dreams, visions, and ceremonies in which Shaker documents, worship, and conversation have abounded, or whether he has bought into a presentational model that is a poor vehicle for conveying the texture of consciousness and feelings. Except in his account of the “Era of Spirit Manifestations,” his study rarely conveys his own sense that “Shaker religion was essentially a lived experience.”

Daniel W. Patterson, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill


From Elihu Bunker’s wooden-hulled Fulton, 1815 to the City of Lawrence, 1867, Long Island Sound’s first iron-hulled steamer to the Puritan, the first steel-hulled steamboat, Edwin L. Dunbaugh traces the history of the passenger and freight night boats that traveled from New York City to Boston and beyond to Maine during a rapidly developing period in the northeastern United States. He uses newspapers and other contemporary accounts and historical records to describe the changing features of and demands on these night boats.

His emphasis is clearly on the steamers themselves. He highlights the various innovations in their engine design; he describes the various architectural and structural designs employed to
best accommodate passengers traveling overnight and to carry heavier and more diverse cargo loads as the century unfolded; he points out the distinctive features of each steamer, from its Main Deck to its various amenities, such as its Grand Saloon; and he documents assorted other modifications, including the introduction of Edison electric lights to replace the gas lights. Dunbaugh painstakingly compares each new steamer’s speed and capacity to its rivals, and each steamer company to its competitors, as he details the changes experienced by the industry.

These night boats had their own personality. This was not just due to the ships’ captains or the steamers’ owners, though many like Captain George Gibbs or owner Cornelius Vanderbilt or Menomon Sanford or J. P. Morgan were certainly individuals with their own unique competitive spirit. But in addition to rate wars, buy outs, and races to provide bragging rights among the ships’ principle owners, builders, and captains on Long Island Sound, Dunbaugh reminds us that these night boats had their own individual ‘persona.’ He described particular steamers respectively as “exceptionally handsome,” “beautifully proportioned,” not “particularly attractive,” or “commanding majesty.”

Essentially a reference source, this book follows the history of each night boat from its building through its operation on one of the many routes between New York and New England to its final days, whether at the bottom of some waterway, broken and battered by tragedy, or sold off to operate in neighboring waters like the Hudson River, or farther away, like the Florida Keys, Alaska or the Yangtze River.

Dunbaugh meticulously follows the rise and fall of steamer lines as they expand and link up with rail service along the Sound, and eventually with Boston directly! He concludes the book at the very point where the New Haven Railroad gains ownership of the last independent steamer line operating night boats on the Sound.

The pages of this book are filled with the history behind changing time schedules, varying routes and stations, and expanding services to newer routes—all presented within the context of a rapidly developing textile industry, the expanding operation of local rail lines, and the steady development of a tourist and summer vacation industry.

In a nutshell Dunbaugh celebrates the very existence of the night boats as they helped support an ever escalating national economy. An appendix alphabetically lists these many steamers, provides their years of completion and their lengths and breadths.

Eugene R. Slaski, Penn State University, Allentown Campus


In the last three decades we have learned a great deal about labor relations and work cultures, about social mobility and its pitfalls, about what values and assumptions wage earners
brought with them to the workplace and about the strategies employers used to get the greatest productivity from their workforces. But the individuals and groups that have been studied had already taken a major step; they had already obtained a job. Missing still from our understanding was the long and complicated path that workers navigated to end up where they were. The labor market, it seemed, was just some huge, impersonal force that gobbled up the sellers of labor power within a radius of a mile or two. Those who did not get swallowed merely moved into some other labor market’s circle.

Walter Licht forces us to reconsider just what getting a job entailed. Drawing upon an intimate familiarity with the industrial landscape of Philadelphia and a unique cache of records and surveys on labor-force participation generated by Gladys Palmer and her associates at the University of Pennsylvania’s Wharton School, Licht outlines the impact of schools, institutions, governments, families, acquaintances and companies on the fortunes of Philadelphians searching for work. What Licht discovered at times matches our speculations and in other cases startlingly destroys our myths. For instance, family or personal connections were instrumental in obtaining first jobs for roughly half of the 2500 surveyed Philadelphians, but those figures did not vary greatly over time or among native-born or immigrant groups. Subsequent jobs were more typically secured through personal initiatives. But, in few cases did schools, employment agencies, unions or any other institutions play a significant role in the century under investigation. Finally, we learn that leaving work was more likely to occur voluntarily among the young, while forced idleness was the condition of the older workers.

Within those broad outlines there are some very interesting observations. The chapter on schools, for example, charts a long history of attempting to make education relevant to getting work. Despite a century of vocational emphasis, schooling seemed largely irrelevant. German-Americans, however, appear to be the only group that understood that connection; their children had far lower school attendance rates than most other ethnic groups as German-American parents opted for apprenticeship instead. African-Americans did just the opposite, in large part because they were excluded from industrial labor markets regardless. Indeed, the major differences in getting work were between races. Almost everything that affected the fortunes of African-Americans in finding a job—schooling, institutions, help-wanted advertisements—had the opposite impact on whites, clear evidence that labor markets were rigidly segregated.

Another important myth largely destroyed by Licht’s work concerns the impact of the state. Labor markets, he notes, were always intensely political. Local officials pursued certain policies because they were aware of the destabilizing potential of massive unemployment. More importantly, though, it is clear that by 1900 government was already a major employment sector in the city, suggesting that the recent policy debates over the dramatic growth of intrusive government and public employment is to a large degree misplaced. Licht ironically divulges that for all the criticism of public employee inefficiency, it was the public—not the private—sector that implemented formality in employment relations.

While we learn much from Licht’s book, there are still a few gaps. The surveys on which he
relies heavily in the early chapters target four industries which may be important ones, but nevertheless may skew the findings somewhat. Perhaps the title should be “getting industrial work,” a more accurate description of the topic. Similarly, there are a few factual errors. For instance, the use of printing as an example of steady union control of a labor market is a mistake. Indeed, in the early twentieth century unions controlled only about 40% of the jobs in the city, and had union shops in fewer than half of the city’s daily newspapers. On the whole, however, there is a wealth of new information and different perspectives on topics that at first appear mundane but in reality are central to our lives. Getting Work, then, belongs with Ileen DeVault’s study of clerical workers and Alexander Keyssar’s investigation of unemployment as work that takes labor history in interesting new directions and raises important new questions.

Ken Fones-Wolf, Institute for Labor Studies, West Virginia University


Ralph Luker has written a work of broad interest which, though it is not related directly to the history of Pennsylvania, will appeal to students of American religious and intellectual history, as well as the history of race relations. In its spirit and content, The Social Gospel in Black and White provides a valuable bridge between the historical scholarship on anti-slavery reform movements in the early nineteenth century and the Civil Rights movement in the twentieth century. Particularly in his discussion of the “conservative social values” which underlay “evangelical neoabolitionism” at the end of the nineteenth century, Luker has made a significant contribution to our understanding of a continuing tradition of scripturally inspired activism in American history.

Beginning with the American Missionary Association of the Reconstruction era, and ending with the emergence of the NAACP, the author focuses his attention on a generation of largely white Protestant clerics and reformers who addressed the deteriorating condition of race relations at the turn-of-the-century. Luker uses the phrase the “social gospel” in a more inclusive sense than some scholars would. But in so doing, he is able to link together an eclectic group of theoreticians, theologians and activists who did not share common philosophical or strategic goals on race matters. One of the great merits of this study is the detailed information which Luker provides on so many important ministers and social critics, as well as the synthetic quality of his discussion of their shifting perspectives on race relations. Of particular note are the discussions of the social thought of Albion Tourgee, Thomas Dixon, Jr., and Harlan Paul Douglass. An important limitation in this study, however, is its failure to give equal treatment to the voices of reform within the African-American churches.

Although Luker takes a generous view of the meaning of “social gospel,” he is careful to dis-
tistinguish between the different ideological and pragmatic approaches contained within its fold. His rather elastic definition of the contours of "American social Christianity" allows him to include not only the "radical cultural assimilation" of Josiah Strong, but also the "radical separatism" of Thomas Dixon, Jr. In his discussions of such a diverse group of ministers and social critics, Luker could have maintained a more critical perspective than he sometimes exhibits. In their unwillingness to embrace the principle of racial equality as the basis of a "beloved community," many social gospel activists betrayed something of the very tradition which informed their personal and public lives.

In many respects this book complements Joel Williamson's *The Crucible of Race* (1984), and readers would benefit from a close reading of both Williamson's and Luker's central themes. *The Social Gospel in Black and White* deserves a wide audience for the manner in which it sympathetically addresses issues of historical and contemporary concern.

Dennis B. Downey, *Millersville University*

---

Edited by Noralee Frankel and Nancy S. Dye. *Gender, Class, Race and Reform in the Progressive Era.*


A few well-defined questions used to drive Progressive-era historiography. Who were the progressives? What were their motives in launching particular reforms? How could we describe the meaning and overall character of this round of reform initiatives? When did the Progressive era begin and end? These questions sparked lively debate, especially during the 1960s and 1970s. Were progressives an anxious and displaced old elite? Or a new, confident middle class? Or consumers, business magnates, or a new breed of machine politicians? Did they seek to control a seemingly unruly and dangerous working class? Or, taking them at their word, did they want to ameliorate class tensions and improve the lives of the urban masses? Was the hallmark of the Progressive era the building of a state that took power from political parties and gave it to bureaucrats and "experts"? Did "efficiency," science, or reform religion provide the goals? Was progressivism repressive? Conservative? Altruistic? Democratic? Undemocratic? Did the movement begin with the depression of the 1890s? With the burst of measures in the middle of the first decade of the twentieth century? Did it end with World War I, or were 1920s policies an extension of reform? Was progressivism a movement at all?

The debate about the character, meaning, and timing of Progressive-era reform was inspired in part by the expansion of government power later in the twentieth century. If the modern state took shape at the turn of the century, then what better period to use in evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of an expanded liberal state? The clearest interpretations of progressive reform—the emphasis on positive achievements, the focus on status-driven reformers in the late 1950s, and the thoroughgoing criticisms of New Left historians in the 1960s and
1970s—were conversations (or shouting matches) with contemporary liberalism. For the past two decades or so, liberalism has been crumbling into an untidy heap, and without a target for praise or criticism, so has Progressive-era scholarship. Like current liberalism, Progressive-era scholarship lacks a sense of direction and purpose. Historians largely have confronted the existing literature, not the modern state, and have shaded in earlier, starker interpretations. The current conventional wisdom, then, tells us that reform movements were many-sided struggles that included impulses toward social justice and social control; they included both reformers with complex motives and people targeted for reform; reform intentions did not usually match the outcomes; and the “movement” consisted of shifting coalitions redrawn with each new issue. Nonetheless, faith remains that we can find the origins of modern America in the early twentieth century, even if scholars do not seem to advance a coherent view of today’s problems, solutions, and the place of the state in them.

The Progressive-era literature includes not only ambitious syntheses of reform but also studies of states, cities, and rural areas, of presidents, governors, senators, and mayors, of journalists, labor leaders, and civil rights activists, and of issues ranging from efforts to “save” children from the clutches of the “wrong” parents to foreign policy and the regulation of business. Yet the last strong flash of interest in progressivism mostly dissipated before the great expansion of work on women’s history: the studies of the 1970s, like the earlier work, were not much concerned with women and gender. The essays in Gender, Class, Race & Reform in the Progressive Era, culled from offerings at the Conference on Women in the Progressive Era held at the Smithsonian Institution in 1988, attempt to correct that imbalance. More ambitiously, as Nancy S. Dye claims in her introduction, they set out to achieve one of the original purposes of women’s history: to transform both the questions historians ask and the answers they offer. The essays “help us construct a new scaffolding for progressivism that illuminates women’s reform efforts and the impact of reform on women of all classes. Then, too, the historical work on women in the Progressive Era gives us new insights into the phenomenon of progressivism itself” (p. 4-5).

How far do these essays take us toward these goals? The essays do a reasonable (but uneven) job with the more modest aim of highlighting the contributions of female reformers and discussing the impact of some reforms on African-American and immigrant women, but otherwise largely echo the prevailing wisdom about progressivism. On the side of the contributions of female reformers, Barbara Sicherman, drawing on her biography of Alice Hamilton, discusses the tensions within the career of a pioneer in the field of industrial medicine. Jacqueline A. Rouse follows the efforts of African-American women in Atlanta to improve the education of African-Americans amidst tightening segregation and vocal racism. Molly Ladd-Taylor analyzes how the women of Hull House made a place for themselves in the federal government with the establishment of the Children’s Bureau and some of the successes and failures of the women bureaucrat-reformers. Roslyn Terborg-Penn underscores the sometimes slighted work of African-American women who fought at the local, state, and federal levels to end lynching. Nancy A. Hewitt outlines different understandings of reform held by Anglo, Black, and Latin
women in Tampa, Florida. Eileen Boris traces the history of efforts to end child labor to suggest that the social control model requires modification.

Other essays are silent on progressivism as such; they are concerned with questions about the identity of various groups of women. Sharon Harley discusses the existence of a working-class consciousness among African-American women, especially teachers. Ardis Cameron does something similar for white immigrant women of Lawrence, Massachusetts: she discusses their ideas about work, among other things. The two remaining essays examine issues in women's history in order to suggest new questions for scholars in other fields. Alice Kessler-Harris analyzes how ideas about gender informed legal decisions allowing wage and hour laws for women but not for men and how the relationship between gender ideology and ideas about labor changed through time. Finally, Ellen Carol DuBois pulls together some themes in working-class women's history and women's politics to outline a shift in generations that brought new definitions of womanhood, new ideas about class, and life (and success) to the woman suffrage movement.

While some of the individual essays provide new information and useful insights, read together they rehearse familiar scholarly themes. Reform itself—at least in the guise of forcing governmental change—was by and large a middle-class affair. Those targeted as in need of reform or ignored by the state were not passive, but the story of the efforts of African-American women, for example, mostly involves persevering through setbacks. Indeed, for all of the apparently fine efforts of "women's" agencies such as the Children's Bureau, racism was imbedded in progressive reform. It was not an afterthought or a blind spot but part of the progressive program, perhaps especially in the South. Yet progressivism was not a movement as much as it was a conflict: many different groups wanted various and contradictory political changes. Perhaps unknowingly, the authors enter the timing-of-progressivism debate and stretch the period out on both ends. A number of authors suggest without argumentation that the Progressive era began in the 1800s; one puts its close as late as the 1930s. In any event, the old stalemate on progressivism remains despite the inclusion of women: progressivism included many players but its most visible were white and middle class. It mixed repression with paternalism and benevolence. In both its conflicts and achievements we can find the origins of modern America.

Traditional concerns of Progressive-era scholarship—business regulation, the restructuring of political participation and the like—get no real attention here. National (or state and local) political developments that did not involve women are slighted also, although some of those subjects might be amenable to a gender analysis. Indeed, despite the introduction's promise, most of the essays are not concerned with asking new questions or solving old problems connected with progressivism—the essays scarcely recognize the older literature. Some efforts to link "women's" progressivism with a "traditional" progressivism seem forced. Cameron's suggestion that we replace the Robert Wiebe's "search for order" with the "ordering of things" would likely add nothing more than an obscure slogan to a field that has enough. Hewitt's notion that progressivism was "locally oriented and organized" (p. 27) is overstated and that
Theodore Roosevelt learned about "race suicide" in Tampa is simply gratuitous. In a more spacious format, however, her idea about linking domestic life to public action could be valuable. Throughout the collection, questions about women's history predominate. How did class and race divide women? What tensions did apparently successful professional women reformers and their programs face? How did class, race, and gender form the identities of women?

This fairly recent concern with questions about gender, race, and class might change the literature on progressivism. But right now, destruction rather than change might be a better description. By expanding what constituted progressivism until most public actions and roughly fifty years around the turn of the century fit the category, the old concept becomes meaningless. Some of the old questions certainly deserved to die. Yet it would be a shame to lose the older engagement with the state and the claims of liberalism that once made progressivism important to both historians and a wider audience.

Paula Baker, University of Pittsburgh


In Working Class Americans, Gary Gerstle reconstructs the creation of the International Textile Union (ITU) in Woonsocket, Rhode Island in the early years of the New Deal. Extending well beyond both Woonsocket and textiles, the ITU grew to become the largest and most powerful textile union in New England, despite its refusal to affiliate with the burgeoning CIO. But the significance of Working Class Americanism lies not so much in its labor history, superbly researched and written though it is. Rather, it is the conceptual development of the political language of Americanism, with its nationalist, democratic, progressive, and traditionalist dimensions, that distinguishes this work.

Gerstle addresses the most vexing of historiographical questions: the problematic interactions of class, religion, ethnicity and state power in the process of union formation and development. To do so, he has selected a highly appropriate regional case study laden with national significance. Situated in the Blackstone Valley, an early center of American textile manufacture, Woonsocket's rapidly expanding woolen and worsted industry attracted thousands of French-Canadian and a relatively small group of Franco-Belgian immigrants (among others). French-Canadian immigrant consciousness was largely shaped by the nationalistic notion of "la survivance": "(t)he perpetuation of French-Canadian faith (devout Roman Catholicism), language, and manners" (p. 25). On the other hand, Franco-Belgian immigrants, class conscious
and steeped in traditions of industrial work, made the mass organization of the city's textile workers a special project.

Beginning in World War I and increasing in importance and tempo in the decades that followed, Americanism became the instrument by which the State, radicals, and ethnics reformulated Woonsocket's union and political environment. Building on the power and results of the intense Americanization campaigns waged by the State, mass culture, and industrialists during WWI and the 1920s, radicals in the 1930s wrenched French Canadian workers from the influence of their ethnic and religious leaders by grounding union organizing drives in appeals to American nationalism, the progressive dimensions of industrial society, the eighteenth century political tradition of republicanism, and traditional values reformulated in the language of Americanism. Similarly, ethnic unionists used Americanist language infused with the state's rabid anticommunism in their purge of radicals from ITU leadership.

Despite the thoroughness of Gerstle's research, his extensive use of oral history, and the near-full accountability of his model for explaining labor and political development in twentieth century Woonsocket, his work has some shortcomings. Most significantly, there seems to be some slippage in terminology—as when he calls the philosophy of the National War Labor Board "industrial pluralism" (p. 313) even though his definition of this concept closely parallels that of "corporatism" (p. 248), and when he labels ethnic ideologies "corporatist" (p. 303) despite their strong resemblance to outright militancy. And there is little analysis of one of the most problematic aspects of 1930s unionization—the relationship of skilled craftsman to semi- and unskilled machine operatives.

These problems notwithstanding, this is clearly one of the most significant works on the labor upheavals of the 1930s yet to appear. It is must reading for those interested in the problems of New Deal unionism and the origins and transformation of ethnic identity, historical issues of great import for Pennsylvania's industrial past.

Richard O'Connor, Historic American Engineering Record


"They don't teach you about unions in journalism school," commented one reporter (p. 131). In With Just Cause author and editor Walter Brasch attempts to combat the widespread ignorance among journalists about the existence and function of unions in their profession. This collection of over forty articles, many authored by Brasch himself, is a comprehensive tour of media unions and their history and of the work environments of reporters, writers, printers, and
other media workers. Not only does Brasch uncover such specific shop floor issues as protecting the integrity of reporters' by-lines and ensuring editorial support for maintaining the confidentiality of sources, but the book also highlights a broader struggle in which media unions are engaged: fighting the concentration of capital in the media industry and attempting to maintainjournalistic quality in the face of publishers' obsession with the bottom line (p. 385).

Brasch admirably sets these concerns in their historic context. Journalism unions are rooted in part in old-fashioned bread and butter struggles. Early twentieth-century reporters were notoriously overworked and underpaid. Yet accounts from such notable historic voices as Edward Scripps and Upton Sinclair remind the reader of the roots of journalism's union impulse in the muckraking era. Reformers like Sinclair, dismayed by the prevalence of publishers whose newspapers served the interests of their advertisers and the wealthy, looked forward to the day when newspaper workers' unions would force newspapers "to print the truth" (p. 194). Such a historic context helps explain the dual nature of unions such as The Newspaper Guild. While squarely in the AFL-CIO tradition of economic unionism, it retains its character as an upholder of professional standards and quality journalism.

With Just Cause is as concerned with contemporary issues as it is with historic roots. Two case studies, both in Pennsylvania, highlight the impact of the recent wave of management "restructuring" on media workers. In Bethlehem, the Globe-Times combatted declining sales by firing fifteen percent of its workforce, including more than forty percent of its editorial staff. These non-unionized workers were given little notice and almost no reason for their dismissals. Many of them had recently been promoted or had received awards for their work. The newly restructured paper replaced its former emphasis on hard news with an editorial concern for a "positive" image. Hardhitting, critical news stories were a thing of the past.

In Wilkes-Barre, the media giant Capital Cities Corporation faced a solidly unionized workforce in 1978 when it attempted a restructuring of its recent acquisition, the Times Leader. A fierce strike ensued during which unions established their own paper The Citizens' Voice, whose existence continues to this day. The strikers were so successful that within six months the Times Leader saw its circulation decline from 70,000 to slightly over 10,000. But Capital Cities had nearly unlimited resources, and after a time it prevailed, ending the strike by obtaining decertification votes from its new workforce.

If there is a criticism to be made of this book it is that its format does not permit sustained analysis of the complex and tantalizing issues raised by the intersection of unionism and the pursuit of truth in news reporting. Part handbook, part history, the book perhaps unrealistically attempts to be all things to all people. Yet the pace is energetic, the writing insightful, and the issues provocative. With Just Cause should serve as a wake-up call to labor historians and journalists alike.

Janet Irons, Lock Haven University
By John A. Saltmarsh. *Scott Nearing; An Intellectual Biography.*

Radical educator and economist Scott Nearing is the subject of John Saltmarsh's "intellectual biography." The book examines Nearing's "thoughts, ideas, writings, and experience" (p. 1).

Saltmarsh is writing to fill a gap in the historical record. He argues that scholars have shunned the monumental task of analyzing Nearing's controversial and sometimes conflicting attitudes and beliefs. Saltmarsh's analysis is based on Nearing's voluminous publications, his private papers, interviews of Nearing's contemporaries, and other primary and secondary sources.

Part one of the book focuses on Nearing's formative years, living in a Pennsylvania coal town ruled by his grandfather, a coal company superintendent. Nearing received a Ph.D. in economics in 1909 from the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School of Finance and Economy. A short time later, he joined the Wharton School faculty. Nearing's mentor, Simon Nelson Patten, taught him that social scientists could "institute a new vision of society" (p. 23).

Part two examines Nearing's brief teaching career at Penn. He used his academic position to work for social change, a factor that led to his dismissal in 1915. In part three, Saltmarsh analyzes Nearing's unsuccessful battle for his job and academic freedom. In 1917, Nearing accepted an invitation to join the faculty of the University of Toledo where opposition to American involvement in World War I led to his dismissal and arrest under the Espionage Act.

In part four, Saltmarsh focuses on Nearing's activities during the 1920's and early 1930's. He lectured at the Rand School, ran unsuccessfully for office on the Socialist Party ticket, traveled to the Soviet Union, and joined the Communist Party of America. In part four, Saltmarsh discusses Nearing's gradual withdrawal from society. In 1932, Nearing and his second wife, Helen Knothe, began a homesteading experiment in Vermont. Nearing's image as a radical folk hero was further enhanced when he appeared as a witness in the movie "Reds." During the 1960's and 1970's, hippies and members of the New Left discovered the Nearings as a result of their book, *Living the Good Life*.

Saltmarsh's most serious shortcoming is his failure to persuade his readers why Nearing's metamorphosis took place. Why did the namesake of the Morris Run Coal Company superintendent become an outspoken opponent of child labor and worker exploitation? Why did the boy who considered a career in the military and the ministry become an ardent pacifist and an advocate of the redistribution of wealth and political power?

Saltmarsh admires Nearing, but he is critical of Nearing's unwillingness to publicly condemn the Soviet Union for the tactics used to censure political opposition. He is also dismayed by Nearing's estrangement from his son John. Saltmarsh believes that Nearing's faults pale, however, in comparison to his admirable crusade to bring social justice to industrial America.

Saltmarsh's conclusion addresses the question of whether or not Nearing was a disillusioned man when he died at age 100. Arguing that Nearing was a fighter to the end, Saltmarsh quotes a line Nearing wrote in 1954: "'Life is enriched by aspiration and effort, rather than..."
by acquisition and an accumulation’ " (p. 264). Although Nearing won few battles against
class bias, sexism, racism, poverty, and injustice, he should not be forgotten. His fight was a
valiant one.
Kristen M. Szylvian, University of North Carolina at Wilmington

By W. Ross Yates. Lehigh University: A History of Education in Engineering,
Business, and the Human Condition.
In his supplemental bibliography to the 1990 reprinting of Frederick Rudolph’s 1962 classic,
The American College and University: A History, John R. Thelin of the College of William & Mary
gives generally high marks for the quality and quantity of scholarship on higher education his-
tory in that interim. The glaring exception, Thelin notes, “is that the genre of ‘house histories’
has improved little since 1962.” This occurs because most commissioned institutional histories
tend to look inward, rather than outward, with small attention paid to connecting the specifics of
campus life to the larger social, political, and economic context.
That is always the precarious balancing act for the author of an institutional history, who by
definition must teeter and tilt to the side of campus events. Yet W. Ross Yates, a Lehigh Univer-
sity historian and political scientist for three decades, does an admirable job of interpolating his
account of one of Pennsylvania’s most distinguished universities with larger developments in
the state and nation.
“Two forces in American industrial life converged to form Lehigh University,” Yates writes
(p. 17). “One was the wave of scientific and engineering education spreading westward during
the nineteenth century. The other was the energy of Asa Packer”—a Lehigh Valley railroad mag-
nate and industrialist who gave $500,000 to found the school in 1866, infused it yearly with sub-
stantial operating funds, and left it a $2 million bequest in 1879.
As a result, Lehigh set a high yet carefully calculated trajectory from which it never really
departed. “Lehigh has always been a small private university of high standards having a principal
emphasis on applied science and engineering,” Yates says (p. 8). Indeed, it assumed that
present day shape as early as 1880. One is struck by the early and unrelenting success of Lehigh
as contrasted with the rocky beginnings of what is now The Pennsylvania State University, the
land-grant institution that, after a spectacular start in agricultural science, reverted under inept
leadership and institutional penury into a backwoods classical college.
Yates’s Lehigh benefited from the Packard fortune, but other factors contributed to its
steady climb. One was the alumni association—from the start an interventionist group that agi-
tated (unsuccessfully) for a complete restructuring of the University in the 1870s and actively
governed the university in fundraising, new construction projects, and athletics in the 1920s.
The other was students—always quiet, serious, hardworking and intellectually vibrant, the majority of them Pennsylvanian. A third was the unending line of quality presidents, with only one lemon in the lot. These leaders included such luminaries as Henry S. Drinker, who was enamored with the Wisconsin Idea of public service for the private Lehigh, and Charles R. Richards, who energized and reorganized “the new Lehigh” after World War I and was perhaps its greatest president.

Yates does especially good work in sorting out why Lehigh—after World War I—did not tend in the direction of the emerging major research universities. The outcome of that conflict was to forge a new “ideology of science” in service to society as a result of the wartime organization of science that yoked government (the National Research Council), private industry, the major foundations and, of course, certain major universities.

At Lehigh, Yates notes, the predominant engineering faculty was reluctant to accept graduate work, as was the case at many engineering schools at that time. Although President Charles Richards successfully encouraged research sponsored by external sources, his plans for a $2 million research institute to subsidize faculty research in the colleges of the arts and sciences and business administration were rejected by a conservative board of trustees.

The author succeeds at placing Lehigh’s development in the context of the symbolic stature of the American engineer. Until the Great Depression, engineering education stressed the moral responsibilities of engineers in reorganizing an efficient and just society, and the public responded by electing an eminently successful engineer—Herbert Hoover—to the White House. It was at this apex of the “Hoover Syndrome” that the new Lehigh coalesced. After World War II, the image began to reverse itself: “For many people the engineer was no longer a hero but a threat if the products of engineering did not destroy life, the engineers, by imposing their techniques on social relations, would make life intolerable” (pp. 225-6).

In response Lehigh initiated a general studies program for engineering students, broadened its appeal in the arts and sciences and business administration, and delved into teacher education—all without losing its essential focus on applied science and engineering.

What is lacking in Yate’s narrative is any developed sense of student and faculty cultures. What, over time, has attracted them to Lehigh, as opposed to other schools, and given the school its special flavor? Lehigh is nearly a *sui generis* in American higher education—with some similarities to Rensselaer and Carnegie-Mellon—yet there is more to its history than a school adhering to its mission statement through thick and thin. The human side of Lehigh deserves richer treatment than the author allows.

Nevertheless, Yate’s cleanly written history, adroitly intertwined with social context, is a solid contribution to the history of higher education in Pennsylvania in particular and the United States in general. And unglamorous as they may be, institutional histories still provide the grist for historians who write thematically or “horizontally”—across many institutions. The genre of “house histories” could be improved, however, by selecting a sample of peer institutions, to which the subject college would be compared at appropriate junctures. But that would consider-
ably enlarge the scope of the project; perhaps that methodological step will be taken by the next generation of institutional historians.

Roger L. Williams, *The Pennsylvania State University, University Park*