

## Book Reviews

By Robert Middlekauff. *Benjamin Franklin and His Enemies*.

(Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1966. Pp. xix + 225. \$22.00 cloth.)

Most of us, academics and general readers alike, grew up thinking that the great Benjamin Franklin could have had no enemies. How could anyone have disliked this genial, smart, and politically astute man who was as at home in his little house in Philadelphia (skeletalily outlined for us today at Franklin Court) as he was in the French court of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette and the wider, scientific, and philosophic circles of Europe? How could anyone calling himself or herself an "American" have distrusted the American patriot Franklin who out of pure patriotism even disliked his own son who remained loyalist at the time of the Revolution? That is, most of us were raised in a tradition of popular cultural history that protected the "great men" of the revolutionary era from careful critical analysis that included their warts, just as we heard about the era of the "American Revolution," not that of (taking the vantage point of England) "colonial rebellion." For those of us who later became academics and learned something more detailed and complicated about Franklin, the story Robert Middlekauff tells in *Benjamin Franklin and His Enemies* will not come as a surprise. For general readers, however, the story Middlekauff relates about the key events in Franklin's public life will likely seem a refreshingly informed, historically astute analysis of the ways in which even the greatest of revolutionary heroes had problems in his own day.

Surely Franklin had more friends than enemies during his long life. Middlekauff to some extent acknowledges this in the first chapter of the book, which examines the important and unfailing friendships Franklin established with the tradesmen and artisans of his younger years, the scientists, philosophers, and statesmen of his middle years, and the international diplomats and some women during the later years. In the six chapters after his initial, summary discussion of the friends of Franklin, Middlekauff examines Franklin's "enemies" in roughly similar chronological fashion.

Although Middlekauff does not handle Franklin's life this way, it can be divided into three parts: the years of his involvement in printing, science, philanthropy, and politics in Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, roughly the late 1720s through the 1750s; the years of his statesmanship and developing scientific reputation in England, roughly the late 1750s to middle 1770s; and the years of his international diplomacy with France, roughly the late 1770s through the early 1780s. What seems to have happened at each stage in his life is that in each of the key arenas where Franklin engaged himself, those with whom he dealt could become distrustful, sometimes jealous, frequently two-

faced, and often peevish. As Middlekauff concludes about Franklin and the enemies who emerged along the way, “Franklin was proud of his achievements and generally pleased with his world. Although his papers offer little evidence of his deepest feelings about his enemies, he seems, on the surface at least, to have regarded several of them with some serenity, much as he might have regarded wayward children” (212). The papers do indeed provide evidence of Franklin’s attempts, especially as he became more experienced in public life, to deflect the attacks by largely de-personalizing the situations: if people attacked him, it was for reasons having to do with those people, not with Franklin himself. Thus, for instance, he explained Arthur Lee’s attitudes about the treaty situation in France as a jealousy of Franklin’s reputation there: “I am too much respected, complimented and caressed by the People in general, and a Deference a little too particular paid me by some in Power,” Franklin wrote at the time, concluding that this was what distressed his colleagues, “those unhappy gentlemen; unhappy indeed in their tempers, and in the dark uncomfortable passions of jealousy, anger, suspicion, envy, and malice” (quoted, 167).

Who *were* the enemies of Benjamin Franklin? In his earliest years in public life, they were primarily the Penns, descendants and relations of founder William Penn, and the supporters of the Proprietary—such as William Smith—in Pennsylvania. Middlekauff’s chapters 2 and 3 treat the earliest encounters. During the years of struggle in Pennsylvania, the Proprietary refused to pay taxes to support the commonwealth; Franklin and many others thought the Proprietary ought to be taxed, and Franklin was particularly singled out by the Penns as inimical to Proprietary interests. For Franklin’s part, given the Proprietary’s insistence on its right to rule the colony despite its tax-free status, the Proprietary needed to be overthrown and replaced by a royally appointed governor. Thus, during his years as a statesman in England, Franklin sought royal conciliation for the colony and, failing that, an overthrow of power and embarrassment of Penns.

As Middlekauff shows in chapters 4, 5, and 6, Franklin’s ultimate goals of ousting the Penns and the British imperial presence were thwarted during his stay in England, even though Franklin found key friends who understood and could back the colonists’ causes. Middlekauff only glances at the possibility that Franklin might have been attempting to secure for himself a royal governorship of Pennsylvania, and he doesn’t mention Franklin’s attempts to find assistance for a scheme to develop his own colony in the Ohio territory. Instead, Middlekauff focuses on the most notable outcome of Franklin’s highly hopeful yet ultimately futile attempts to find English support for his colonial people. Having entered England with distinct Anglophilia, Franklin left it in profound disillusionment with George III, his ministers, and the British colonial system as a whole. It was a disillusionment sorely felt by Franklin, who reported to son William in 1768 that “this whole venal nation is now at market, [and]

will be sold for about Two Millions; and might be bought out of the hands of the present bidders (if he would offer half a million more) by the devil himself” (quoted, 131).

When the break with England occurred, the colonies brought their suit to the other European powers with colonial interests in the Americas. Franklin, the senior statesman who had an international reputation, was sent to treat with France, along with Silas Deane, Arthur Lee, Ralph Izard, and ultimately, John Adams and John Jay. In chapters 6 and 7, Middlekauff discusses Franklin’s negotiations with France primarily by way of discussing the American negotiators Franklin dealt with during these years. If Deane seems to have had unsteady morals in business dealings where personal interest became commingled with the interests of the Anglo-Americans, Lee and Izard seem to have had personal animosity that drove them into jealous rages wherever Franklin engaged in negotiations. Adams had a difficult time understanding Franklin’s wise instructions about diplomacy in Europe, but especially with France. “Our Credit and Weight in Europe,” Franklin warned Adams, “depend more on what we do than what we say: And I have been humiliated with the Idea of our running about from Court to Court begging for Money and Friendship, which are the more withheld the more eagerly they are solicited, and would perhaps have been offered if they had not been asked” (quoted, 194). When Franklin finally submitted Adam’s papers to Congress so that it could look into Adams’s affairs for itself, Adams wrote to Abigail Adams that he considered himself a “Man running a race upon a right line barefooted treading among burning Plowshares, with horrid Figures of Jealousy Envy, Hatred Revenge, Vanity Ambition, Avarice Treachery Tyranny Insolence, arranged on each side of his Path and lashing him with scorpions all the Way, and attempting at every Step to trip up his Heels” (quoted, 199).

Middlekauff’s books begins with psychological assessments about Franklin that find Franklin faulty for expressing passion, for behaving in ways that seem to Middlekauff irrational, and finally for hating England and all the Empire stood for. Indeed, for more than half of the book, Middlekauff seems to measure Franklin according to a system of weights that gives “plus” for “rationality” and “minus” for any expression of feeling. In the situation with Thomas Penn, for instance, Franklin was “blinded by passion” and “wanted to hurt Penn more than anything else” (76), resulting in his “obsessive conviction that he would succeed against” the Proprietary (102). Yet the last two chapters of the book—those on Lee, Izard, and Adams—engage in psychological analyses of the three Franklin detractors rather than of Franklin. The method seems a little inconsistent, in that the first two thirds of the volume psychologizes about Franklin’s failings lying in his passions and the last chapters treat the passions of others as their failings. Indeed, the bipolarized oppositions of passion versus reason, heart (and heat) versus head (and cool rationality), is also

somewhat facile. Yet this is an interest methodology, one that attempts to mingle historical analysis with discussion of the very personal reactions these key men had to the situations in which they found themselves.

Ironically for one who had been, in Middlekauff's view, so passionate himself as a younger man entering politics, Franklin could not forgive his own son William's passionate insistence to remain loyal to the British government. Franklin's heart failed him in this instance, Middlekauff concludes in the epilogue to the book. It would seem that Franklin's greatest "enemy" might have been, as Middlekauff implies, his own "Moral or Prudential Algebra." Even great men have failings, but perhaps their greatest enemies lie within themselves, not in other persons. Middlekauff's book goes a long way toward humanizing the Benjamin Franklin available to us in the late twentieth century, making Franklin less the great humanist icon of the U.S. 1940s and 1950s and more a man who developed good friendships and troubled relationships during the course of his long, vividly interesting life.

Carla Mulford, *Pennsylvania State University*

**By Charles Morse Stotz.** *The Early Architecture of Western Pennsylvania*, with a new Introduction by Dell Upton.

(Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 3d., 1995, originally published 1936, this ed. based on 1966 ed. Pp. lit, 296. \$60.00.)

In releasing a third edition of *Early Architecture of Western Pennsylvania* the University of Pittsburgh Press has done more than reprint an important pioneering architectural survey. This sumptuous edition has been upgraded with enhanced photographs and a new critical introduction.

*Early Architecture* is the most visible artifact of the 1932-36 Western Pennsylvania Architectural Survey (WPAS) jointly sponsored by the Pittsburgh Chapter of the American Institute of Architects and the Buhl Foundation. Under the direction of Charles Morse Stotz, WPAS documented and photographed pre-1860 construction in 27 counties. The survey also made measured drawings of a limited number of buildings and structures. *Early Architecture* presents selections of the survey's most important and the most representative findings. The first part of the book introduces the historic context of the region's buildings, sketches the development of the region's architectural styles, discusses construction methods and materials, and concludes with a call for the preservation of this vanishing heritage. In doing so, Stotz presents a more richly detailed vision of the built environment that Solon and Elizabeth Buck's contemporary study *The Planting of Civilization in Western Pennsylvania*, also funded by the Buhl Foundation. It is the second part, bursting with photographs and drawings arranged by building type, which forms the heart of the present volume. When compared side-by-side with the earlier editions, the results of 280 hours spent reprinting the photographs from the original

nitrate negatives are stunning: the tones are significantly more balanced than the second edition and the new images are more detailed than in even the first edition. Presumably, cost considerations and the primacy currently attributed to photographs prevented reshooting the drawings.

A leading scholar of vernacular architecture, Dell Upton's introduction makes it possible to assess how Stotz's motivations and biases shaped the WPAS and *Early Architecture*. The WPAS was one of many architectural surveys nationwide that were created in the context of the Great Depression-induced reaction to industrialization. Anti-industrial sentiment and the related Colonial Revival were a yearning for an idealized pre-industrialized rural society that Upton calls the "Other America." Seen in this context, WPAS was an effort to preserve, or at least document, the cultural values and identity of the "Other America" before they were utterly lost. Ironically, in his search for this truth, Stotz retouched certain photographs to conceal signage or alterations that distracted from this vision. Likewise, the final drawings are not "as is," but as contemporary scholarship thought the buildings once were. While Stotz was not atypical in considering style as the key to understanding architecture, he broke with this view to include buildings and structures, such as log houses, iron furnaces, and covered bridges, that were outside stylistic traditions. This makes the WPAS unusually thorough for its day, but Stotz, understandably, did not have the intellectual framework to go beyond inventory and description. The links between the colonial past and the "Other America" focus *Early Architecture* on upper class buildings and classical styles. Consequently, Stotz largely ignored the Gothic Revival and metal bridges. The former, such as the romantic suburban development of Evergreen Hamlet, had "little intrinsic merit" (17). Of the later, Dunlop's Creek Bridge, the nation's first cast iron bridge, had obvious links to the industrial era. In contrast, the only other survey of Pennsylvania architecture before *Early Architecture*, Eleanor Raymond's 1931 *Early Domestic Architecture of Pennsylvania*, limited its scope to one segment of the state's architecture and then to only those examples east of the Susquehanna.

Potential users of the WPAS can consult the collection in the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. Several library reorganizations have dispersed the WPAS materials throughout the library: index cards, field notes, and photographic prints are in the Art and Music Department; the photographic negatives are in cool storage in the Pennsylvania Department; and the drawings and other records are in Special Collections. Unfortunately, critical topographic maps showing the locations of all surveyed structures, not merely those included in the book, are apparently missing.

Sixty years later Stotz's work remains the only published architectural survey of the entire region. This is about to change, however, as funding had been secured for the Western Pennsylvania volume of the *Buildings of the United*

*States*, a long-term project of the Society of Architectural Historians. Consequently, the appearance of the present edition of *Early Architecture* is a timely service to the architectural history of Western Pennsylvania. It offers important lessons and sets the highest standards for the new project. Finally, the appearance of *Early Architecture* brings attention to the need to make copy negatives of the original nitrates before the inevitable chemical decay robs us of this important source.

Mark M. Brown, *University of Pittsburgh*

**John W. Kleiner and Helmut T. Lehmann, *The Correspondence of Heinrich Melchior Mühlenberg*, vol. 1 (1740-1747).**

(Camden, Maine: Picton Press, 1993. xxiii + 376 pp. \$63.00 postpaid.)

In 1986 the German publisher de Gruyter began publishing the correspondence to and from the early Pennsylvania Lutheran minister, Henry Melchior Muhlenberg. This project provided scholars with a wealth of new information not only about Muhlenberg, but also about ethnic political culture, linguistics, folklore, and religion in general in Pennsylvania. These volumes have become a major source for the study of early Pennsylvania Germans, along with Muhlenberg's famous journals (3 vols., edited and translated by Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Doberstein, Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, 1942-1958), his reports to the Lutheran authorities in Germany (D. Johann Ludewig Schulze, ed., *Nachrichten von den vereinigten Deutschen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Gemeinen in Nord-America, absonderlich in Pennsylvanien*, Halle, 1787), and his autobiography (*Selbstbiographie, 1711-1743*, edited by W. Germann, Allentown, 1881). However, the prohibitive costs of the de Gruyter volumes (on average about \$260 each) and the fact that they were reproduced in the original language—usually German—have made this information practically inaccessible to all but institutions and a few specialists.

In 1993 Picton Press began publishing English translations of Muhlenberg's correspondence edited by John W. Kleiner and Helmut T. Lehmann at a more affordable price and in English translation, making this valuable source more available to the general reader rather than merely to specialists. Some of the critical scholarly apparatus from the Kleiner-Lehmann volumes has been omitted; however, there are still footnotes and an introduction explaining the methods for editing and translating the work. Also, each letter is introduced with a brief summary of its contents and a reference to the letter in the German version. All in all this appears to be a fine project of much importance for those interested in the early history of Pennsylvania.

Many important features of volume one should be pointed out, especially in relation to information available in Muhlenberg's journals and to the German volume of his correspondence. First, this volume covers many important periods for which there are no entries in Muhlenberg's journal, including May 1743

to March 1745 (23 letters), March 1746 (one letter), October 1746 (one letter), and February 1747 (two letters). Moreover, the Kleiner-Lehmann work contains both the incoming and outgoing correspondence of Muhlenberg, which means that we get not only Muhlenberg's view of events in Pennsylvania (as in the Journal), but also the views of others writing to Muhlenberg about those events. Second, the Kleiner-Lehmann version covers the years 1740-1747, as opposed to 1740-1752 in the German version of the correspondence. More importantly, there are eight letters in the English version (making a total of 77) which were inadvertently omitted in the German version. Thus with the Kleiner-Lehmann volume we have significantly more information than in the Journal concerning this important period of church building and settlement for the early Lutheran immigrants, and even a bit more than in the German volume of correspondence.

There are some shortcomings to this volume, however. While there is a good index of names and places, a subject index is lacking. Instead there is an index of scriptural references, which is handy, but less useful. Thus it is impossible to find the references to, for example, German women, without reading through each letter of the entire volume. Perhaps this critical omission could be corrected in future volumes. Also, there is no bibliography for this work. Given the large number of documents and secondary literature cited in the footnotes, a bibliography could be useful.

But in spite of these negatives, the Kleiner-Lehmann work is still an excellent volume. It reveals a great deal of new information about Pennsylvania in the 1740s in clear, straightforward, accurate translations. The organization and presentation of the volume are good. The short summaries at the beginning of each letter are invaluable, as are the references to the letters in the German volume. And, while still expensive, this volume is much more affordable than the German version. I look forward to seeing future volumes in this series and believe that, like the English edition of Muhlenberg's journal, they will play an important part in future studies of early Pennsylvania.

Aaron S. Fogelman, *University of South Alabama*

By Philip E. Pendleton. *Oley Valley Heritage, The Colonial Years: 1700-1775*. (Birdsboro, PA: The Pennsylvania German Society and Oley, PA: The Oley Valley Heritage Association, 1994. Pp. 232, bibliography, appendices, subject index, personal name index.)

*Oley Valley Heritage* is a handsomely produced local history that provides much more than a detailed litany of events, people, and personalities. It addresses the colonial history of the Oley Valley through broad themes: settlement, economics, architecture, religion, and community. Some sections are more successful than others, but Philip E. Pendleton has incorporated social history, genealogy, architectural history, and cultural geography into a satisfying portrait of a community.

Located in Berks County, in southeastern Pennsylvania, the Oley Valley was one of Pennsylvania's earliest settlements. The events and personalities of the colonial era Oley Valley are considered from a "social-historical perspective" that emphasizes the activities of everyday life. Pendleton's research is undergirded by a "comprehensive investigation of colonial-period property ownership records." He identified all land owners within the Valley, and made further forays into probate, tax, court, and church records, as well as period newspapers. This methodology offers perhaps the best chance at a broad understanding of a historical community, but is obviously weighted in favor of the propertied and the landed. Applying a "social-historical perspective" certainly represents an improvement in method over more traditional forms of local history, which often celebrate great men and prominent families; however, despite this improvement in the historian's net, the smallest fish must continue to pass through the mesh unharmed and perhaps even unglimped. The past is indeed a foreign country. Despite our best efforts, and Pendleton's considerable labors, we will never be able to obtain a truly comprehensive portrait of any past community or period.

Pendleton divides his text into five chapters. The first addresses the establishment of the European settlements in the Oley Valley. The area's settlers hailed from a variety of European origins, with Germans and English predominant by 1750. The original residents, the Lenape Indians, and the initial European settlers, the Swedes, were concentrated in small portions of the Valley. Pendleton describes how the pattern of settlement evolved, with each European ethnic group clustering around influential and economically successful early settlers. Relations among the area's Swedes, Germans, Welsh, and Lenape Indians remained largely amicable throughout the colonial period.

The second chapter describes the economy, based upon the commercial production of wheat. Pendleton portrays farmers committed to maximizing production and profits. Despite this market orientation, area farmers abused the land, foresaking traditional European systems of crop rotation in favor of continual plantings of grain. The Valley's German settlers appear to have been less profligate with the land than their neighbors. Gristmills, sawmills, fulling mills, oil mills, and tanneries supported the agricultural efforts of local farmers. Larger enterprises, including merchant flour mills, merchant sawmills, paper mills, iron furnaces, bloomery forges, and iron refineries produced largely for markets outside the Valley. Pendleton analyzes tax assessments from 1731 and 1767 to convey the complexity and diversity of economic life within the valley. The 1731 assessment depicts a pioneer community with relative economic equality and a lack of differentiation in occupation among residents. By 1767 the Valley had developed a sophisticated agricultural economy with clear economic distinctions between "entrepreneurs," land-owning farmers, laborers, and slaves and servants.

Chapter three details the architecture of the Oley Valley. Pendleton's background as a historic preservationist is obvious in this, the book's strongest chapter. He provides clear descriptions of various construction methods, architectural styles, and building details. Distinctions between German and English building traditions and methods are explained and illustrated with clear photographs and excellent line drawings. Pendleton includes information on floor plans and interior finishes, effectively drawing the reader beyond the front facade and into the living and working spaces of the valley's buildings. The architectural environment is much more than houses, and Pendleton includes brief discussions of house-mills, ancillary houses, barns, and mill buildings. Unfortunately the photographs and drawings are not keyed to the text. Occasionally the relevant graphic is not even on the same page as the textual point it is intended to illustrate, forcing the reader to search for the appropriate image.

The fourth chapter, the weakest, addresses the religious life of the community. It relies heavily on quotations from period sources. The various churches and religious groups active in the valley are described, with particular emphasis upon the Moravian mission.

Lastly, Pendleton focuses on what he terms "community." He describes the nuclear family as "the basic social unit underpinning the colonial Oley valley community" and claims that the main objective of the valley residents was to "raise children and send them forth as well prepared for life and work as possible" (p. 135). These are noble sentiments, and may indeed be true for that portion of the community for which Pendleton has evidence, but they ignore the poor, slaves, indentured servants, among others. Pendleton acknowledges family discord, but the emphasis upon the nuclear family and providing for the future of one's children seems more in tune with the 1990s than the 1750s. Neighbors and government comprise the other components of Pendleton's community. He describes differences in German and English social and religious practices, but notes that the English government imposed a degree of uniformity upon all residents through its reliance upon the English language and English common law.

A series of appendices follow the text. These include lists of colonial period schools, ministers, and household heads; an excellent glossary of architectural terms; a series of useful isometric projections of various house types that are invaluable to readers unfamiliar with architectural plans; and a series of maps that show businesses, social institutions, settlement patterns by nationality, and property ownership. These last represent an enormous service to future Oley Valley researchers.

Patrick O'Bannon, *Kise, Franks & Straw, Philadelphia*

By Roger H. Brown, *Redeeming the Republic: Federalists, Taxation, and the Origins of the Constitution*.

(Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993, Pp. xiii, 337. \$38.50.)

In October 1787, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Paine, and other members of Philadelphia's Society for Political Inquiries met to choose a topic for the Society's annual essay competition. The topic they chose reflected what was, for them, the most important issue of the day: the proper form that taxation should take in the infant republic. Roger Brown doesn't cite this incident, but he might well have, for it confirms his thesis in *Redeeming the Republic*. Taxation was easily the most volatile political issue in the early republic, a fact that is hardly surprising considering that the Revolution had in large part been fought over the issue of internal taxation and that wartime economic disruption continued its hold on many Americans, making their ability to pay taxes limited at best. Against this backdrop Brown makes an even more puissant claim for the issue of taxation. For him, taxation was *the* issue that not only accounts for the creation of the Constitution of 1787, but explains the political positions of both its Federalist proponents and Anti-Federalist detractors.

According to Brown, by the mid-1780s, Federalists had lost all hope of funding the national government through state tax requisitions. The requisition system had functioned poorly enough during the Revolution, Federalists claimed, but in the immediate postwar years their frustrations reached the point of exasperation as one state government after another failed to collect the funds that would keep the Confederation government in operation. Arguing against those who claim that state legislatures simply dragged their feet in meeting the financial needs of Congress, Brown finds that most states made good-faith efforts to collect national imposts. The problem, wasn't irresolution, but politics. What stemmed the flow of much-needed federal revenue was popular resistance to national taxation, resistance that was rooted in economic uncertainty and popular fears of ceding taxation powers to a remote and potentially uncaring government. It was state legislators who sympathized with their mostly rural constituents and passed tax-relief measures which postponed the payment of federal requisitions that, according to Brown, propelled Federalists into the reconstitution camp. Only a more powerful central government, the Federalists reasoned, would enable the national government to collect the revenue that would allow it to save the Republic from imminent dissolution.

Brown adds an important perspective to our understanding of national politics during the 1780s and convincingly raises taxation to the prominent place it deserves in debates about the era. Yet, like all monocausal explanations, his singular focus on taxation ignores equally critical issues. By tying nearly every aspect of reconstitution to the issue of more effective tax collection,

Brown overlooks, for example, the question of authority. Brown's Federalists are a mostly disinterested group of men whose main objectives were strengthening the national government and saving the republic. Brown too easily accepts the Federalists' view of themselves. An alternative approach to the taxation, as apparent in many of the Federalist writings he quotes, would view them as men driven by concerns about the growing distance between their notions of public authority and the more democratic opinions of people at large. Viewed from this perspective, taxation was merely one in a series of issues that convinced Federalists that the new nation required the social and political discipline a strong national government could provide.

Ronald Schultz, *University of Wyoming*

By Richard D. Brown, *The Strength of a People: The Idea of an Informed Citizenry in America, 1650-1870*.

(Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina Press, 1996. Pp. 304 Cloth \$29.95.)

In the crisis atmosphere that surrounds education in the United States today it is not unusual to hear the defenders of schools declare that learning is a prerequisite for good citizenship. But according to Richard D. Brown, such rhetoric does not reflect reality. In *The Strength of a People* Brown's purpose is to show when and how Americans connected education with suffrage in the first place and why they subsequently undid this relationship. In Britain's thirteen colonies, he argues, the idea that it takes an informed electorate to choose wise and just leaders flourished, only to give way by the time of Reconstruction to the belief that government should carry out the will of the people, no matter how ignorant or narrow-minded. By equating private interest with the public good, Americans uncoupled citizenship from education with profound and often deleterious consequences.

In eighteenth-century England and colonial America political participation was a privilege reserved for those men who could afford a formal education. Some, like the British social theorist Bernard de Mandeville, actively opposed charity schooling for the poor, arguing that such a misguided policy would only generate widespread discontent. However, by the 1760s many Americans believed that all men should be educated to protect the colonies against British tyranny. In his *Letters from an American Farmer*, John Dickinson held up the country gentleman as the bulwark of American liberty. Thomas Jefferson and John Adams urged states to develop educational systems because they were convinced that an informed citizenry was essential to both political freedom and social order. By conveying knowledge and instilling virtue, education safeguarded Americans from tyranny, not just from without but also from within.

Between 1780 and 1830 education gradually came to be associated more

with economic than civic life in America. No longer just a defense against political oppression, it assumed the mantle of liberator, the chief instrument of progress in a capitalist society. It was the key to both individual advancement and social control. By facilitating the free flow of information, lyceums, museums, libraries, and even the United States postal service were expected to further opportunity without unleashing the forces of anarchy. Of course, Americans regarded public schools as the most important institution for promoting freedom without license. According to Brown, the idea of a common school system, open and free to all, had come of age by the 1830s. But as his own analysis of educational reform in North Carolina clearly shows, Americans were still struggling to define the meaning and scope of public education at that time. The idea of educating rich and poor alike in schools funded and controlled by the state was yet to be fully worked out, especially in the South. Educational reformers like Horace Mann and Henry Barnard would probably be surprised to learn that they placed personal advancement ahead of civic virtue in the mission statement of public education.

In the book's final chapter, Brown argues that when education switched its allegiance from politics to economics, women and minorities met with more difficulty than ever justifying their claim to suffrage. Because being informed had become irrelevant in policies, it no longer mattered if they were educated. Race, gender, and social status were now the principal determinants of political participation. Whether educated or not, being white and male distinguished those who could vote from those who could not in most states. This original argument is characteristic of Brown's book as a whole. Thoughtful and interesting if not always convincing, it rewards the reader with a nuanced interpretation that has something to offer both the historian and the modern policy maker.

William W. Cutler, III, *Temple University*

**By John C. Hennen. *The Americanization of West Virginia: Creating A Modern Industrial State, 1916-1925.***

(Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1996. Pp. 240. Cloth \$32.95.)

Historians and other scholars have during the past two decades produced a wide range of outstanding studies on Appalachia in general and West Virginia in particular. David Corbin, Ronald Eller, Rhoda Halperin, Ronald Lewis, Richard Lunt, Paul Salstrom, Henry Shapiro, Crandall Shifflet, Joe Trotter, Altina Waller, John Williams, and many others have written a shelf of books which have given a new view of late 19th and 20th century Appalachia and West Virginia. John C. Hennen now adds his important, stimulating and provocative work to this collection.

Hennen argues that in West Virginia national and state elites, including

the captains of industry, managers, educators, religious leaders, politicians, and bureaucrats seized upon the patriotic outbursts of World War I and the fears engendered by the Red Scare to “Americanize” West Virginians. The elites persuaded their compatriots to support a world-wide crusade, a campaign for democracy against foreign radicalisms, and a new perception of America and West Virginia based on a developmental, free market, open shop, business dominated ideology. Hennen’s work makes excellent use of a wide range of manuscript materials including the papers of the West Virginia Executive Council of Defense that document the administrations of John J. Cornwall (1917-21) and Ephraim Morgan (1921-25). His exhaustively researched and well-crafted narrative gives a dense yet lucid account of the rapid cultural changes that flowed from war-time mobilization, the fears of radicalism, and the acceptance of developmental attitudes.

According to Hennen, the war-time emergency mobilized a wide range of individuals that included ministers, politicians, businessmen, and labor leaders. Only a handful of supposed IWW and socialist radicals were excluded. Immediately following the war, business groups capitalized on their influence and beat back efforts to organize labor by raising the specter of both foreign and native anti-American radicals. Finally, during the 1920s, the same groups sponsored a new culture which mixed development and anti-labor ideas with patriotism and anti radicalism and completed the “Americanization” of a state that in 1916 had been badly divided and had begun to create relatively important Socialist and labor movements. By 1925 the followers and successors of the captains of industry discussed by John Williams had established a broad-based coalition and consensus that appeared to include everyone from Phil Conley to John L. Lewis.

The book makes an important contribution to both West Virginia and American history. Hennen gives us a detailed picture of how the war emergency created a new culture that reached down into local towns and counties and influenced the ways West Virginians thought about their nation and their society. He makes West Virginia a participant in the same processes that affected Ohio, Pennsylvania, and other leading industrial states during the War and the early 1920s. Also, by effective use of manuscript collections, Hennen gives us an account of how countless school board members, local officials, small businessmen, county politicians, and many other “typical” citizens discovered their attitudes and ideals changing as they responded to the propaganda and developments produced by war, labor unrest, and economic growth.

This excitingly written, well-researched book, is simply a “must” read for anyone interested in either the history of West Virginia or Appalachia or for those who are interested in the impact of the first World War on American attitudes.

Van Beck Hall, *University of Pittsburgh*

By Georgina D. Feldberg, *Disease and Class: Tuberculosis and the Shaping of Modern North American Society*.

(New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1995. Pp. 330. Cloth \$52.00.)

Tuberculosis (TB) in the nineteenth century was both a fearsome and fascinating disease. Consumptives, as they were then called, early in the century found themselves and their condition sentimentalized at the same time as their family and medical attendants watched them dying by degrees. By the end of the century, attention focused not on the ethereally romantic middle-class sufferers, but on the conditions of poverty and crowding in which most of the cases of tuberculosis seemed to flourish. As the nineteenth century gave way to the twentieth, argues Georgina D. Feldberg, the medical establishment in the United States came to respond to tuberculosis in a unique manner, at variance with both its near neighbor Canada and European nations. *Disease and Class* attempts to explain that uniqueness.

By the middle of the twentieth century, physicians in the United States had congratulated themselves on the disease's virtual eradication. They celebrated too soon, as the recent reappearance of TB among the poor and sufferers from AIDS, in strains apparently more drug-resistant and "deadlier" than those of a century ago, has all too clearly indicated. Feldberg locates both the contemporary response to tuberculosis, and, at least to some extent, the resurgence of the disease itself, in the ways in which physicians and public policy makers dealt with the disease in the first half of the twentieth century. She demonstrates quite convincingly that physicians treating tuberculosis in this country emphatically did not conform to the common image of doctors "ravished by science, [who] moved swiftly and systematically away from policies that encouraged moral reform or the modification of individual behavior toward the public application of procedures that directly attacked microorganisms" (p. 5). Rather, although they did not deny the importance of bacteriology and chemotherapy, leading U.S. experts on tuberculosis "continued to acknowledge the importance of social circumstances, and . . . let those circumstances shape their clinical/therapeutic and experimental judgment" (p. 5).

United States specialists found themselves at odds with their counterparts in Canada and in Europe. During the 1920s Albert Calmette and Camille Guerin, of the Pasteur Institute in Lille, France, developed a vaccine against tuberculosis. Called BCG (for bacillus Calmette Guerin), the vaccine became broadly used in France. By the end of the 1940s, every Canadian province used it among groups considered particularly susceptible. In the United States, by contrast, researchers and clinicians viewed BCG with suspicion. In the 1920s, they questioned its safety. When it appeared to be safe, they questioned its efficacy. When the vaccine did appear to reduce mortality from the disease, they then challenged its "appropriate[ness]" (p. 175). BCG never became

accepted in the United States. By the 1940s, antibiotics became the treatment of choice, but experts still argued for public health measures as well.

Why the aversion to a vaccine? Feldberg argues that United States experts in the treatment of tuberculosis continued to hold to the view that “microbes” alone did not cause disease—that social factors of poverty and overcrowding remained significant. Their underlying motives, she avers, was their belief that only by teaching the tubercular to change their habits of living—to mirror their middle-class values of those who treated them—could they hope to become disease free. One does not have to accept her class-based explanation, however, to appreciate the fine comparative analysis of the ways in which different nations and cultures have created medical policy.

Margaret Marsh, *Temple University*

By Frederick Moore Binder, *James Buchanan and the American Empire*.

(Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 1994. Pp. 318.)

No president of the nineteenth century has been maligned more than Pennsylvania’s James Buchanan. His inability to prevent the secession of southern states and his pro-southern inclinations generally have relegated him to the bottom third of the list of our favorite and successful presidents.

Frederick Moore Binder, in *James Buchanan and the American Empire*, has softened this negative image by showing that, despite his questionable record as the country’s chief executive, Buchanan still ranks as one of America’s outstanding diplomats to occupy the White House. Only John Quincy Adams may have had comparable credentials in foreign affairs before becoming president.

No one better represented the expansionist spirit of Manifest Destiny than Buchanan. Both a nationalist and expansionist before the American Civil War, Buchanan was in the mainstream. As minister to Russia, and finally, as America’s president, he espoused, initiated, and implemented an aggressive foreign policy that furthered the “American empire.” “Much of his diplomacy,” Binder writes, “was strategic and economic rather than ideological.” So confident was he in his abilities to extend and protect his country’s interests abroad, that, as president, he functioned as his own secretary of state.

Binder characterizes his subject as a visionary with a dream of seeing all of North America, and maybe some of Central America, as well, someday coming under the American flag. Yet the author assesses Buchanan’s vision of America to be “clouded by the haze of the past and by his inability to comprehend the forces that swirled about him.” England persisted in being Buchanan’s greatest opponent. With its vast territorial and commercial interests in the western hemisphere, London worried about American encroachment. As a result, Anglo-American relations became a victim of Buchanan’s jingoism, particularly with regards to Oregon, Mexico, and Cuba. His rationale for an

empire was simple enough. If England could stake claims around the globe, why not the United States? What harm was there in extending English law, language, and Christianity and converting uninhabited regions into civilized communities?

Despite the positive spin Binder gives to Buchanan's many achievements, he does not neglect the downside. Inconsistency and not telling the truth were just two of Buchanan's faults. While he prided himself in staunchly defending the Monroe Doctrine, he ignored English and French intervention in Argentina. He denied to John Crampton, the English minister that the United States had any intention of acquiring Cuba when everyone knew differently. In addition, mercurial moods and differences over how policy created problems between himself and President James K. Polk that nearly resulted in his resignation as secretary of state.

The book's great asset may well be in the author's description of Buchanan's strength of character and weaknesses in dealing with prominent figures, including Czar Nicholas I, President Polk, and the English minister, Lord Clarendon. Binder tends to repeat himself, but this is pardonable within limits because reviewers often miss points authors so painstakingly make. Several times the reader is told that Joshua Bates "held a high position" with Baring brothers, that Buchanan's niece, Harriet Lane, was admired by Queen Victoria, and that Buchanan did not like Lord Palmerston.

Stressing the diplomatic side to Buchanan's illustrious career, Binder brings in only as much politics as he feels is necessary. Perhaps more could have been written about the impact political events in Pennsylvania may have had upon Buchanan's handling of foreign affairs. Issues like abolitionism, free soil, nativism, and economic agendas within the American System were indeed dynamic enough in every state to direct the nationalists one way or another. Buchanan was too integral a part of the Commonwealth's political muddle not to have been affected by public opinion and party swings on these issues. His "exile" to Russia as our representative and his annoyance with the selection to the Supreme Court of a political opponent, George Woodward, were good examples of factional politics in his home state.

In his extensive research, Binder makes good use of primary sources and demonstrates a familiarity with recently published accounts. Well written, this book is a fine contribution to the diplomatic history of the nineteenth century and to a better appreciation of one of our tragic presidents.

Robert D. Ilisevich, *Crawford Historical Society*

Edited by David Ketterer. *Charles Heber Clark: A Family Memoir. The Autobiography of the American Humorist "Max Adeler."*

(American University Studies, Series XXIV, American Literature, Vol. 15. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1995. Pp. lxi, 417. \$64.95.)

Was Samuel L. Clemens (alias Mark Twain) a plagiarist who copied the plot for *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* from a Philadelphia editor and publisher? This is the major question posed by David Ketterer, a professor of English at Concordia University in Montreal, in his introduction to the memoirs of Charles Heber Clark. Clark had published "Professor Baffin's Adventures" under the pseudonym Max Adeler for the first time in *Beeton's Christmas Annual* in 1880, nine years before Mark Twain published his classic. Clark's piece reproduced at the end of the *Memoir* should convince skeptical readers that the American celebrity Mark Twain had in fact stolen his plot.

Besides providing the evidence for a literary detective story, Professor Ketterer has given us a long-lost view of a major Philadelphia literary figure in the forty years after the Civil War. Clark, whose unpublished memoir remained with his family until his granddaughter agreed to this publication, was part owner and publisher of the Philadelphia *Bulletin*, a publisher of the *Manufacturer* and the *Textile Record*, a major trade journal, and an internationally known comic writer.

Clark's *A Family Memoir* is a reminiscence of his childhood and early adulthood. He grew up in poverty, the son of a unsuccessful Episcopalian minister who moved from parish to parish in Pennsylvania and several surrounding states. Born on July 11, 1841, Clark had few long-lasting ties to any place during his youth and was sometimes "homeless."

In 1856, at the age of 15 with his father unemployed, Clark moved to Philadelphia. For the next decade, he held a series of menial jobs which paid a dollar or two a week, lived with an uncle, and wore shabby hand-me-down clothing. He also saw action briefly in the Civil War in July, 1863. In 1865 Clark got a job at the Philadelphia *Inquirer* as a reporter and moved to the *Bulletin* in 1867, where he remained as an editor and part owner until 1882. During this period, he developed a reputation for his humorous writings which were published in the United States and abroad. He also married Clara Lunkens, and moved to the prosperous Conshohocken suburb.

Clark's recollections presents us with a charming look at a life and its hazards in Philadelphia at the end of the nineteenth century. The reader learns a great deal about the author's family as he attempts to reconstruct the lives of his ancestors. True to his reputation as a humorist, these tales are full of irony. In 1907 Clark poignantly remembers the thousands of miles he walked along Chestnut Street during the previous fifty years, recalling faces he passed by as young men who were now old or who had died. Clark wonders what the street would look like in another fifty years.

Since *A Family Memoir* was not written for publication, it is not as polished as Clark's stories. But it is worth reading for the slice of Pennsylvania life, for the background of one of America's major humorists, and for its interesting genealogical materials. But, alas, like many books published today, its \$65 price is too costly for most readers. But it would be a good purchase for libraries in the state.

Herbert B. Ershkowitz, *Temple University*

By David L. Kirp, John P. Dwyer, and Larry A. Rosenthal. *Our Town: Race, Housing, and the Soul of Suburbia*.

(New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1995. Pp. x, 267. \$66.95.)

Although barely 200 pages long, this is a broad-scoped book encompassing contemporary urban history, suburban history, city and suburban politics, race relations, and even deindustrialization and its hideous offspring, urban decay. Yet, it is at the same time tightly focused and extremely well written. *Our Town* explores New Jersey's historic Mount Laurel decision, regarded as the *Brown v. School Board* (1954) of fair housing. Actually, a trilogy of separate decisions reached between 1977 and 1985, overthrew Mount Laurel's exclusionary zoning in New Jersey, in principal, if not in fact, these cases opened up the Garden State's suburbs for "fair share" low and moderate income housing.

In this forcefully and compellingly written book the authors, professors of public policy and law at the University of California, Berkeley, unveil the tangle of federal, state and local politics, cultural bias, and blatant racism that in New Jersey Chief Justice Robert Wilentz's words, splintered the country into "a collection of islands, white islands and black islands, not happy with each other at all, potentially hostile, a black and Hispanic population overwhelmingly poor, a white population trying to have ends meet, not having it easy at all" (p. 174).

What might have been a torpid, legal disquisition into zoning, codes, civil law, and housing injustice *Our Town* unfolds as an odyssey, rooted in New Jersey's Quaker past, born of the 1960s, and as timely as Henry Cisneros. Kirp, Dwyer and Rosenthal transform court transcripts and legal intrigue into a fast-paced drama about the rise and dreadful decline of Camden, New Jersey, and the development of the Jersey suburbs. Likewise, they tell the story of poor black families, young civil rights lawyers, aspiring mayors, ambitious governors, real estate developers and state supreme court justices. In so doing, the authors configure the saga of Mount Laurel into a parable about modern American racial segregation, a subject masterfully treated from the sociological perspective by Douglas Massey and Nancy A. Denton. (*American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard, 1993). Using historical case studies instead of sociology, Kirp et al. just as skillfully,

illuminate the intractability of urban/suburban segregation and the social and political forces that operate to preserve them.

This is good urban/suburban history. The authors provide a brief but scintillating history of the rise and fall of Camden capped by the city's ghetto uprising of 1971, and the razing of the Campbells' Soup factory in 1991, and the failed effort to turn the city's economically dormant waterfront into a glitzy Rouse-type apartment complex. But if Camden is context, Mount Laurel struts on the stage. Founded as a 17th-century Quaker refuge, rural Mount Laurel grew slowly through the 19th and early 20th centuries. It then boomed after World War II, fueled as were so many suburbs by postwar highway building, federal housing laws, and white flight from the cities. However, in Mount Laurel's case the crush of white home seekers engulfed a small black community (Springville) whose roots reached back into the 18th century. The authors beautifully blend these spatial and demographic facts with the politics of the 1960s, especially the Kennedy-Johnson civil-rights/citizen-participation movements. As a result in 1970 two black Springvillians, Mary Robinson and Ethel Lawrence, aided by Camden community action lawyers, Peter O'Connor and Carl Bisgaier, challenged Mount Laurel's zoning ordinance which banned multi-family, low-income housing. The case rocked New Jersey politics and land use policy nationally, and launched the career of New Jersey Governor Thomas H. Kean. But, as the authors decry, by 1994 the case had achieved relatively little in the way of significantly altering the racial/residential landscape of New Jersey. After decades of heated litigation some townships still openly defied the court ordered "fair share" housing. Others, to the joy of developers anxious to use federal dollars to exploit the lucrative low-to-moderate income market, traded their "fair share" quotas to cities such as Camden equally anxious for more government assistance in decently housing the poor.

I can say little negative about *Our Town*. It is not history in the conventional sense. The authors include a bibliography and some fairly useful notes, but this is more a book which effectively employs rather than exhausts history. Historical detail, especially the facts about the people and the litigation, underscores the social need for housing justice, the pain of exclusionary zoning, and the uphill battle to bring America's poor within the orbit of the American dream. As a fairly concise, eminently readable, almost lyrical case study, the book, once published in paperback, might make an ideal supplementary text in urban or even contemporary United States history courses.

John Bauman, *California University of Pennsylvania*

By Phil Schaltenbrand. *Stoneware of Southwestern Pennsylvania*.

(Pittsburgh and London: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1996. Pp. x, 216. \$49.95, cloth; \$22.95, paper.)

Phil Schaltenbrand, Professor of Art at California University of Pennsylvania, succinctly and eloquently describes (p. 11) the subject of his book as follows:

For approximately seventy years (1820-1890), a type of stoneware was produced that was boldly spirited, primitive, optimistic, and unmistakably nationalistic. In this brief period America carried on a love affair with blue and gray pottery. Every home, farm, roadside inn, and tavern used a variety of stoneware products. It has been said that cobalt-decorated pottery was the art of common people, and while this may be a romantic observation, it is difficult to imagine the evolution of nineteenth-century America without the ubiquitous crock.

From paper plates and plastic coffee cups to elegant tablewares, we are surrounded today by a host of containers that facilitate our lives but to which we pay scant attention. The diversity and utter disposability of most such containers dulls our appreciation of the importance, and often of the art, embodied in the bottles, jugs, crocks, mugs, chamber pots, pans, and other ceramic forms that were in widespread use in the everyday life of earlier centuries. Phil Schaltenbrand's book brings this importance to life from the dual perspectives of one who has long studied the history of the ceramic industry of southwestern Pennsylvania and who is himself a contemporary stoneware potter. The latter affords a rare if not unique viewpoint that allows him to see the potter's craft "from the inside out," so to speak. (Schaltenbrand also owns the Westerwald Pottery in Scenery Hill, Pennsylvania, where he continues the stoneware potter's craft.) The result is an informative and well-illustrated book that will be of interest to a relatively diverse audience, chiefly historians (especially those interested in the history of technology), stoneware pottery collectors, genealogists, and a lay audience who may be completely unaware of the significant volume of output (and, especially in its earlier years, the artistry), that southwestern Pennsylvania potters attained, albeit briefly, in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Salt-glazed stoneware—a dense, vitreous, highly fired, grayish ceramic coated with a thin, durable glaze produced by vaporizing salt thrown into the kiln—was an old form of pottery even when, according to Schaltenbrand (p. 9), Anthony Duche, a potter of Huguenot extraction, produced the first Pennsylvania specimens in Philadelphia during the 1720s. Indeed, stoneware technology had originated in the Rhineland several hundred years before, where it was used to produce wine bottles (usually known as bellarmine), most notably from about 1550-1700. This book tells the story of how this ancient

German pottery form was later adapted to the needs of farmers, storekeepers, tavern owners, and everyday people by potters working at different times in some 50 separate potteries in 13 towns and villages of the upper Monongahela and Youghiogheny River Valleys in southwestern Pennsylvania, principally from the early 1840s until the 1890s, although both earlier and later examples are known. By the latter nineteenth- and beginning years of the twentieth-century, potters of the Monongahela and Youghiogheny River drainages, who individually turned each piece on a potter's wheel, faced increasing competition from larger, more commercialized, and technologically advanced potteries, such as those found in East Liverpool, Ohio. Development of glass containers, refrigeration, legislation requiring equal measure of product, and an ever-advancing western market also contributed to the rapid demise of southwestern Pennsylvania's stoneware pottery tradition.

Schaltenbrand's discussion of this final period is necessarily time, place, and person-specific, and this section of the book may drag a bit for the general reader although it will be of great assistance to the stone ware collector and historian. Tracing out the chronological and personal histories of the potters who worked in the several towns is a difficult and confusing proposition, but Schaltenbrand has assisted the process. It would have been helpful for all readers, however, to have included a really good map showing the locations of each of the pottery-producing towns. General readers, especially those unfamiliar with southwestern Pennsylvania, may have some difficulty understanding where these small, often inconspicuous towns are located.

*Stoneware of Southwestern Pennsylvania* represents a substantial outgrowth of the author's earlier but much slimmer book on the same subject (*Old Pots: Salt-Glazed Stoneware of the Greensboro-New Geneva Region*. Hanover, Pennsylvania: Everybodys Press, 1977). Although some of the same illustrations are used in the more recent book, these are augmented considerably, and the author has presented the reader with a good sample of the range of stonewares produced by the potters he discusses. Although one or two color pictures of the pottery would have increased the overall visual appeal of the book, the author has added several sidebars on specific potters and related topics that provide greater depth to the text and offer personal glimpses into the lives of individual potters.

Like its predecessor, the current book first discusses the chronology (organized as beginning, growth, and decline) of the stoneware industry in southwestern Pennsylvania and presents many details of the potters and their families. A number of these families intermarried and, almost in the manner of a medieval guild, perpetuated what was often a family-based craft and business.

The second section of the book is devoted to an explanation of the art and craft of stoneware production and decoration, a topic to which the author

brings many years of his own experience as well as scholarship. Several appendices help the reader to understand the variety of stoneware forms that were produced as well as the techniques of decoration used by individual potters. Information derived from the U.S. decennial census manufacturing schedules between 1850 and 1880 (expanded from similar data in the 1977 book) summarizes production data for some of the potteries Schaltenbrand discusses and will be of interest to historians.

The book's final section is devoted to stoneware collecting, a reminder of the contemporary role that these once strictly utilitarian pieces now occupy as collectibles, and high-priced ones at that. One cannot help but wonder how the potters discussed in the first part of the book would react if they knew that pots they produced by the hundreds during arduous ten-hour days for pennies each now sold for hundreds of dollars or more!

Ronald C. Carlisle, *Brown Carlisle & Associates, Inc.*

By Simon J. Bronner. *Popularizing Pennsylvania: Henry W. Shoemaker and the Progressive Uses of Folklore and History*

(University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996, pp. 277. \$45.)

Colonel Henry W. Shoemaker (1880-1957) is not well-known. Yet, as historian Simon J. Bronner illustrates, the Keystone State and its residents owe a great debt to this distinguished gentleman and public servant for his tireless and, presumably, selfless efforts to preserve the state's cultural heritage, conserve its natural beauty, and awaken state government to its responsibility to act as guardian of these natural and historical treasures.

Simon J. Bronner gives the reader a tightly crafted, extensively researched, sensitive and scholarly account of Shoemaker's life. As a Republican progressive, Shoemaker supported Theodore Roosevelt. He advocated reform in government and business to create greater efficiency. He also contributed to groups promoting the welfare of women, children, immigrants, and blacks.

Shoemaker, born to a wealthy New York City industrialist and his wife, directed much of his progressive impulse to conservation of Pennsylvania's natural resources—in particular the central and north central regions of the state. A Pennsylvanian by virtue of his parents' origins and summer vacations spent in the state (in McElhattan) as a child, he possessed a deep love of the state's natural beauty and enthusiasm for its folklore all his life. As a youth he began to collect natural history specimens and folk tales. Later, as a journalist (having purchased several Pennsylvania newspapers, among which was the *Altoona Tribune*) who possessed appropriate Republican credentials, including associations with Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, Shoemaker devoted his energies to popularizing Pennsylvania and, in his view, its mystical cultural heritage. He wrote (and self published) extensively about old Pennsylvania

legends and about stories told him or passed on to him. After losing his inherited wealth in the Great Depression, Shoemaker settled permanently in Pennsylvania near Lock Haven (later dividing his time between this home and another, in Harrisburg) and devoted the remainder of his life to preserving the state's cultural heritage through collecting, writing, and public service.

Bronner offers an excellent analysis of Shoemaker's stories, all the more important from the scholar's perspective since Shoemaker's work as a folklorist triggered a lively and, at times, harsh debate within the historical community. Some saw Shoemaker's folk tales as the work of a rank amateur; others, even more severe, believed Shoemaker to be a "fakelorst" (p. 159). Bronner's study makes it very clear that Shoemaker's stories were essentially narratives, retellings and, in some instances, refinings of oral history or tradition. Shoemaker, himself, readily admitted he was a popularizer not a scientific folklorist. Even so, Bronner asserts that "without his determination, Pennsylvania highlands would probably not have gained notice for their culture or their scenery . . . the Pennsylvania mountain region has not had another writer with the output of Shoemaker." (p.173).

Shoemaker held a number of impressive positions in Pennsylvania related to historical preservation: State Archivist; director of the State Museum; chairman of the State Historical Commission; member of the State Geographic Board and State Forest Commission, and, perhaps most significantly, State Folklorist. The controversy surrounding his writings and health problems related to advancing age combined to bring about his abrupt dismissal. Moreover, the Folklore division of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission that Shoemaker headed appears to have lost status—in fact it may have been that the position was created to gracefully kick Shoemaker upstairs, out of the Archivist's post. However, in spite of the many frustrations Shoemaker suffered in this position, he, nonetheless, was able to achieve his most "lasting monument" here by "promoting conservation, cultural and natural, and Pennsylvania identify . . . through a popularized mythology or narrative mystique" (p. 163).

Concluding this informative and relevant work, Bronner gives the reader the opportunity to experience the mystique of Shoemaker's narrative by including an Appendix containing a number of his better known tales, such as: "The Legend of Penn's Cave" and "Nita-nee: The Indian Maiden for Whom Nittany Mountain is Named." Bronner awakens in the reader an appreciation for the contribution of a conservationist who valued the past, the natural landscape, and small, seemingly inconsequential things and people. A Progressive to the end of his days, Shoemaker believed that from such as these comes the greatness and goodness of this land.

Kathleen P. Munley, *Marywood College*

By Randall M. Miller and Paul A. Climbala, editors. *American Reform and Reformers: A Bibliographical Dictionary*.

(Westport, Connecticut. Greenwood Press, 1996. Pp. 576. Cloth \$115.)

In 1897 William Dwight Porter Bliss published an *Encyclopedia of Social Reform*. It was an odd collection of essays and sketches, but Bliss, a rather eccentric Christian Socialist, had the faith of many of his generation. He believed that if one discovered and recorded enough information about past reform movements it would lead to a greater and more successful reform movement in the future. No such motivation drives *American Reform and Reformers*. In fact it is not clear what is the exact purpose or the intended readership for this volume. It includes thirty-eight sketches organized alphabetically (from Addams to Willard) in a dictionary form. In each essay the person represents a movement, though in some the fit is better than in others. Those who are primarily writers and politicians are excluded and civic reform is stressed over political reform. But thirty-eight individuals can hardly stand for American reform over more than 150 years, especially if the book is meant primarily as a reference tool. The choice of characters is, in any case, somewhat arbitrary. We get Stanton but not Anthony, Garrison but not Weld, Sylvester Graham but not John Humphrey Noyes, Mary Baker Eddy but not Mother Ann Lee, Barry Commoner but not Rachel Carson, Henry George but not Edward Bellamy. The volume's usefulness as a reference tool is further diminished by an inadequate index. (Robert Woods, Lucy Stone, Walter Raushenbusch and Horace Greeley, for example all appear in the text, but not in the index.)

Most of the essays were written by young scholars who have not published major books on their subjects. But there are exceptions: James Harvey Young has written many works on pure food reform and Ellen Chesler has published a biography on Margaret Sanger. All the essays are competent, incorporate the most recent work, and contain useful bibliographies. A few are brilliant. Elisabeth Lasch-Quinn, in "Dorothea Dix and Mental Health Reform," manages to confront the major literature on mental illness over more than a century, while at the same time writing something fresh and provocative about a familiar movement. George B. Cotkin, in "John Dewey and Pragmatic Education," clarifies Dewey's own meandering prose and places his thought in the context of a broad movement. But perhaps the most valuable essays in the book are those on new and relatively unanalyzed reforms: Richard Griswold del Castillo, "César Chávez and Migrant Workers"; Raymond Wilson, "Russell Means and Native-American Rights"; R. Lane Fenrich, "Harvey Milk and Gay Rights."

Randall Miller's valuable introduction borrows from Ralph Waldo Emerson when he argues that reform constitutes the marrow of American identity. "Since the creation of the republic," he writes, "American reformers

have believed in America as a special society capable of being reshaped to achieve a more perfect world." Neither in the introduction nor in the essays is any specific explanation for reform or for the motivation of reformers argued. Reform versus social control, a status revolution, religious revivalism, cycles of reform are all alluded to but not consistently analyzed.

Altogether this is an interesting and in spots, a provocative, book. It would serve better as a text than as a reference book. It deserves a wide audience. But who, other than a few libraries, will buy it for a price tag of \$115?

Allen F. Davis, *Temple University*

Compiled and Edited by Jean Barth Toll and Mildred S. Gillam. *Invisible Philadelphia: Community through Voluntary Organizations.*

(Philadelphia: Atwater Kent Museum, 1995. Pp. 1,364, \$62.50.)

Philadelphia demonstrates the truth of Alexis de Tocqueville's generalization of a century and a half ago that "Americans of all ages, all conditions, and all dispositions constantly form associations" (frontispiece). The editors could not possibly describe every Philadelphia association in existence, but after consulting "scholars and civic leaders" (p. xxxi), they identified and included as many as possible of "the city's oldest continuing organizations" (p. xxxi) as well as groups that formed comparatively recently. All are "non-state, common purpose organizations with voluntary memberships" (p. xxix).

Topically, the book is encyclopedic. A mere list of categories would exhaust the space allotted for this review. The essays most likely to interest historians describe organizations that support archival and manuscript repositories, libraries and museums, historical societies and historic preservation, immigration and ethnic groups, neighborhoods and housing, religious denominations' outreach services, business and labor, politics and reform, and education. More present-minded readers may be interested in essays on groups concerned with the environment, social services, health care, science and technology, sports, the arts, and music. Historical background is included. Most helpful in providing an overview are excellent introductory essays by the editors and Frederic M. Miller.

Movement from one essay to another is rough; there are no deliberate transitions. This probably will not bother readers. Most will want to pick and choose, and use the book as an encyclopedia. Initially, it may be difficult for readers to get a sense of "community" from the essays. Yet, recurring themes and names help to hold together the mosaic that is Philadelphia.

The compilation and editing of this book must have been a formidable task. The editors obtained and revised when necessary 585 essays by 500 authors. Some of the writers are historians long familiar to readers of this journal, including John F. Bauman, Edwin B. Bronner, Dennis Clark, Thomas

C. Cochran, Randall M. Miller, Jean R. Soderlund, and Emma J. Lapsansky. Other are long-time scholars and civic leaders, such as Whitfield J. Bell, Caroline Golab, Frederic Miller, Harry C. Silcox, Leon H. Sullivan, Margaret B. Tinkcom, Nicholas B. Wainwright, Maxwell Whiteman, and Edwin B. Wolf. Most, however, bear names that readers may not recognize.

To enable readers to visualize what the authors discuss, the editors have included numerous pictures, charts, and maps. These indicate the growth of the city's population; locations of municipalities that became a part of the city in its consolidation of 1854, historic sites, parks, recreation areas, concentrations of particular ethnic groups; and significant developments and events, such as the celebration of the "Nation's Sesquicentennial in 1926" (frontispiece).

Contents are easy to locate because the book's scholarly paraphernalia are excellent. A twenty-one page table of contents, brief bibliographies for most essays, and eighty-one pages of indices also are inclusive and detailed. Concluding the book are concise biographies of the editors and even "A Note on the Type" (opposite p. 364).

Everyone involved in the production of this book deserves commendation. Editors, authors, designer, and publisher. Its contribution to our understanding of the Philadelphia "community" is immeasurable. Although its sociological dimension may become dated before long, its historical passages and, indeed, the volume itself as a description of the innumerable voluntary organizations that existed in the 1980s, will be informative far into the future.

John B. Frantz, *The Pennsylvania State University, University Park*

John Catanzariti, Eugene R. Sheridan,\* J. Jefferson Looney, Elizabeth Peters Blazejewski, and Jean-Yves M. Le Saux, eds., *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume 26, 11 May to 31 August 1793.*

(Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1995. Pp. xxxvii, 875. Cloth: \$75.00.)

Volume 26 of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* covers one of the more significant periods of the Republic's earlier years, March to August 1793, when Jefferson was serving in his final year as George Washington's Secretary of State. This richly documented volume contains over 700 pieces of correspondence, notes, and memoranda, touching upon a variety of issues confronting the Washington administration. Most significant was the crisis created by the French minister to the United States, Edmond Gênet, whose persistent efforts to embroil the nation in Revolutionary France's war effort against Great Britain and its allies threatened America's self-proclaimed neutrality.

The volume also reveals Jefferson's increasing disenchantment with the government and his opposition to Alexander Hamilton and the Federalist Party. An early document contains Jefferson's confidential letter to his friend James

Madison (13 May 1793) expressing his growing uneasiness with the direction of the Cabinet, its pro-English slant, and the indecisiveness of the President, who “always contrives to agree in principle with one, but in conclusion with the other.” Gênet’s arrival did not make Jefferson’s tenure any easier. While initially, favorably disposed to Gênet, nonetheless, within two months Jefferson was admonishing him for the “impropriety of his conduct in persevering in measures contrary to the will of the government” (10 July 1793). At issue was Gênet’s determination to outfit privateers in American ports to attack British vessels. In addition to the intense propaganda effort he waged on behalf of revolutionary France among the American citizenry, Gênet directly appealed to Americans to urge Congress to reject President Washington’s proclamation of neutrality. Such behavior was not only an affront to the government but an embarrassment to Jefferson’s supporters. By August Jefferson had advised Madison that the party should declare “unequivocally” in favor of neutrality and should avoid “little cavils about who should declare it.” The editors have provided brief, but thorough, and extremely useful, introductory notes on Jefferson and the American debt to France, the administration’s discussion of neutrality, and the recall of Gênet.

The volume also covers the continuing opposition of Jefferson to his formidable rival and intellectual equal, Alexander Hamilton, secretary of the Treasury. Although he worked with Hamilton to define more precisely the government’s position on neutrality and how that affected European belligerents, including the nation’s ally, France, and its former colonial overseer, Great Britain, Jefferson could no longer tolerate the preeminence of his counterpart and the Federalist Party. The volume contains his 31 July letter submitting his resignation to Washington, and his 6 August notes of a meeting with the President, where Jefferson discussed more frankly his reasons for leaving. He stressed his forced socialization with people who bore him “peculiar hatred, that is to say the wealthy Aristocrats, the Merchants connected closely with England,” and the newly “created paper fortunes.” In addition Jefferson informed the president that the continued “opposition of views” between the two secretaries made his responsibilities “peculiarly displeasing.” Jefferson agreed, however, with Washington’s request that he remain in office until the end of the year.

The volume also covers Jefferson’s negotiations with Spain and the possibility of war with that country; the delicate discussions with the unhappy Creek Indian nation; an architectural dispute over the design of the proposed Capitol; and detailed directions and observations on the agriculture, furnishings, repairs, and endless other matters involving one of his true passions, Monticello. The volume contains illustrations, which are thoroughly discussed and placed in context in the front matter, and a short chronology of Jefferson’s life and the volume itself. The edition is yet another of the continued examples of the

strong and solid work performed by the editors of the *Jefferson Papers*, and a testimony to the herculean tasks they have undertaken in producing this volume.

Joseph S. Foster, *Biographical Dictionary of Pennsylvania Legislators*, Temple University

\*The editor notes with sadness the tragic death of Eugene J. Sheridan, editor-in-chief of the *Jefferson Papers*, a gentle, caring man and superb scholar, in May, 1996.

Paul H. Bergeron, editor. *The Papers of Andrew Johnson*, Vol. 12, February-August, 1867.

(Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1995. Pp. xxviii, 558. Illustrations, notes, appendices, index. \$49.50.)

Anticipating congressional passage of the First Military Reconstruction Act, Francis P. Blair, Sr., wrote to President Andrew Johnson on February 24, 1867, and advised a firm stance against the Radical Republicans. "To retreat before furious dogs, invites pursuit," warned Blair. "That man only is safe who confronts them & stands upon his defence" (p. 59). Seven days later, Johnson vetoed the bill, along with the Tenure of Office Act, and demonstrated his willingness to defy opponents despite threats of impeachment. Vetoes of the Second and Third Military Reconstruction Acts followed. In August, he further provoked the fury of his political enemies by suspending Edwin M. Stanton as Secretary of War and removing Major General Philip H. Sheridan from command in the South. Such action may have been Johnson's only recourse, as Blair suggested, but confrontations with Radicals simply encouraged their ferocity. They quickly overturned his vetoes, then began impeachment proceedings on February 24, 1868.

The period covered in volume 12 of *The Papers of Andrew Johnson*, February through August, 1867, marked Johnson's final attempts to block Radical programs, and documents published in this edition reveal his determination. In his vetoes, along with four newspaper interviews and three speeches, Johnson argued for the protection of individual liberties, portrayed himself as guardian of the Constitution, and justified his position as one of moral courage. "It is easy to apply the word "traitor" to me," Johnson told an audience in Baltimore, ". . .but I defy any man to put his finger on any great principle of the Constitution, or of liberty, that I have abandoned" ([. 361). Johnson held tightly to a Jacksonian ethos that explained his ideology and motives. His disregard for African Americans, for example, rested in the belief that they should succeed on their "own merit, courage and energy" ([. 303).

Scholars will easily recognize the defensive and purposeful Johnson that appears in volume 12, but the edition also offers a glimpse at the Americans,

from both North and South, who endorsed his views. "The Rubicon is now passed," wrote a Philadelphia lawyer who favored the president's vetoes. "You are right and as sure as God is just your cause must triumph" (p. 117). Frequent correspondents giving advice and reassurance included Blair, Reverdy Johnson, Charles G. Halpine, and Ethan A. Allen. Reconstruction politics consumed Johnson's presidency, but other policy matters occasionally attracted his attention in 1867. He welcomed a Japanese commission in May, proceeded with the acquisitions of Alaska, and dealt with issues relating to Native Americans.

This recent addition to *The Papers of Andrew Johnson* provides a convenient tool for historical research. Paul H. Bergeron and his staff have collected and transcribed documents from a variety of sources, primarily the Library of Congress and National Archives, that elucidate Johnson's world. As in earlier volumes of this project, there is an introductory essay, informative footnotes with each document, and a chronology of Johnson's life. The result is a helpful resource for scholars and students that produces an insightful portrait of people and events in 1867. Used in conjunction with other relevant documentary collections (for example, volume 17 of *The papers of Ulysses S. Grant*); this edition adds depth and acuity to an important and controversial period in American history.

J. Thomas Murphy, *Temple College, Temple University*

**By Earl C. Kaylor, Jr. *Martin Grove Brumbaugh: A Pennsylvanian's Odyssey from Sainted Schoolman to Bedeviled World War I Governor, 1862-1930.***

(Cranbury, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1995. Pp. 382. \$45.00.)

Martin Grove Brumbaugh (1862-1930), governor of Pennsylvania from 1915 to 1919, was a fascinating figure. The son of German immigrant farmers, he graduated from Juniata College in Huntingdon in 1881. After receiving a doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania, he held the chair of pedagogy on that campus. A former superintendent of schools, Brumbaugh was elected president of the Pennsylvania State Teacher's Association in 1896; he also served as president of Juniata College. In addition, Brumbaugh authored various books, including *Stories of Pennsylvania* (1893), *History of the Church of the German Baptists Brethren* (1895), and *The Making of a Teacher* (1905). Commissioner of education for Puerto Rico from 1900 to 1902, Brumbaugh afterward spent several years teaching until 1914, when three parties (Republican, Keystone, and Liberty) supported him for governor. Despite former President Theodore Roosevelt's endorsement of his Democratic challenger, the conservative Brumbaugh won the election. His governorship was characterized by libertarian ideals. Although a pacifist, he organized a Council of Defense during World War I. Brumbaugh married Anna Konigmacher,

then Flora Belle Parks, and raised two children.

Earl C. Kaylor, Jr., professor of history emeritus at Juniata College, has written an absorbing account of Brumbaugh's life and career. The most serious weakness of the book is the absence of footnotes. Kaylor freely quotes Brumbaugh, and some statements no doubt came from the governor's papers. Yet without a single footnote, it is impossible to know from where the quotes originated, except in those few cases where a magazine or newspaper is mentioned as the source. Alas, to his credit, Kaylor presents a chapter-by-chapter bibliographical essay in which specifics are offered for background material and relevant reading. Interestingly enough, Kaylor remarked that Brumbaugh's short dissertation on the poetry of John Donne was "sparsely footnoted" (p. 99).

Other annoying problems subtract from the book's significance. First, there are neither credits given in most cases for the several fine pictures in the book nor an introductory page presenting these illustrations in order. Second, some of the lengthy indented quotations could have been paraphrased. Third, the author overuses dashes to note abrupt breaks, pauses, or separate elements in sentences. Fourth, in virtually all cases the author's one-sentence paragraphs could have been interwoven into the preceding or following paragraph. In fact, some careful editing by the publisher would have improved sections considerably. Finally, the author decided not to append a list of Brumbaugh's articles, books, pamphlets, and other works, noting that incomplete lists exist in the two theses and in the Winter, 1968, issue of *Brethren Life & Thought*.

Although Presidents Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, and Woodrow Wilson are mentioned in the book, one wonders if the author is aware of the existence of Brumbaugh's letters in their collections in the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress. Manuscript collections of other contemporaries in Pennsylvania and the nation are also neglected. Surely some of these valuable sources contain Brumbaugh material. But there is no listing of manuscript collections used except a description of Brumbaugh's papers and the Juniata College archives.

These criticisms are not meant to detract from the book, an overall solid contribution. The good features of the book outweigh the shortcomings. Pennsylvania's academic libraries in particular will want to add this book to their collections.

Leonard Schlup, *Akron, Ohio*

By Kathryn Kish Sklar. *Florence Kelley and the Nation's Work: The Rise of Women's Political Culture, 1830-1900.*

(New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995. Pp. 436. Cloth \$35.00.)

Kathryn Kish Sklar's 1973 biography of Catherine Beecher detailed a determined woman's efforts to construct a model of domesticity that would

give women a place in an emerging democratic society. Now Sklar has produced the first half of a two-volume biography of an equally determined woman who two generations later pursued a similar mission. For Florence Kelley (1859-1932) the challenge was to reshape women's public culture to provide a place in the public life of modern industrial society powerful enough to serve as a base for reforming that society. That meant finding a place from which she could work to change Americans' views about government responsibility for human welfare. Sklar's purpose is to explore how Kelley's generation of middle-class Americans sought to change American society "by reshaping the civil space that stretched between the state and the economy." Her interest is in "the process through which gendered (perceived as 'natural') cultural categories gave rise to conscious mobilization." Sklar argues that the success of women like Kelley in finding a meaningful location in civic life brought new ideas, energy, and creativity into the nation's public life at a crucial point in its history.

Florence Kelley was born into a prominent Philadelphia family. Her father, Republican Congressman William Darrah Kelley, provided most of her early political education, instilling a belief in an activist state committed to human welfare. Abolitionist and women's rights activist Sarah Pugh, the sister of Florence's grandfather, showed her the radical potential of women's political activism. Kelley's education was completed at Cornell University, where she studied contemporary social and political issues and wrote a thesis on the changing legal status of children, women's rights, and the role of women in civic culture. She then faced the dilemma of finding suitable "brain work."

This was not easy for Kelley. Nor was building a personal life. An extended stay in Europe led to a disastrous marriage, three children, and a conversion to socialism. She continued writing on state responsibility for the welfare of working women and children. Kelley's "apprenticeship" ended in 1891, when she fled her abusive husband, taking her children to Chicago. She contacted Jane Addams and quickly found in Hull House the center of her life for the next few years. The settlement's efforts to recast the relationship between middle-class women and the working class, provide women an alternative to the "family claim," and translate knowledge into power and power into state action were exactly what Kelley sought.

In 1892 Kelley served as a special agent of the Illinois Bureau of Labor Statistics and directed an investigation of the Chicago slums as part of a national study by the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics. These positions gave her access to the political mainstream. In 1893 Governor John Peter Altgeld appointed her to the important post of chief factory inspector for the state of Illinois. For Kelley, knowledge was power; she built a coherent reform approach that combined investigation of conditions, the production of reports designed to educate the public to win support for needed reforms, and the preparation of legislation.

In 1897, Altgeld's successor fired Kelley, she was quickly reminded that reform-oriented professional women had few career options. In early 1899, however, she found the position she would hold for over three decades: secretary of the National Consumers' League. Sklar promises to cover most of Kelley's action on the national political stage, including her work with the NCL and the National American Woman Suffrage Association, in volume two.

Sklar's is an ambitious biography, based on exhaustive research. She fully chronicles Kelley's active and complex life. However, since she wants to use that life to explore women's political culture and the nation's civic life in general during a transitional period, she also includes extensive discussions of the settlement house movement, American socialism, various political activists with whom Kelley worked, and many other subjects. Sklar does an excellent job of moving between the details of Kelley's life and the wider world within which she acted. A comparison of Kelley and her friend Henry Demarest Lloyd, for example, illustrates the differing political options open to middle-class women and men in the 1890s, showing that at times women's options, while more limited, could be more effective. Discussions of the relationships among the residents of Hull House, political infighting among socialists, and a number of related topics are equally instructive. This does mean that the completed biography will be quite long, which will deter some reader. This is unfortunate, because Kelley's life provides rich insights into issues of gender and civic culture.

As the first of a two-volume biography, this book cannot fill Sklar's entire agenda. She begins by describing some of her intellectual debts, including Thomas Bender's definition of public culture, Gramscian-inspired cultural studies, and the work of Jürgen Habermas. These clearly have informed her work, though at times they fade into the background, obscured by the densely detailed biographical focus. By the time Sklar reaches the end of Kelley's life, the interpretive structure will no doubt be fully developed. If the second volume lives up to the promise of the first, Sklar—and Kelley—will have contributed greatly to our understanding of American civil society, the gendered nature of public life, and the process of state formation in industrializing America.

Gary L. Bailey, *Indiana University of Pennsylvania*

**By Michael Kammen. *The Lively Arts: Gilbert Seldes and the Transformation of Cultural Criticism.***

(New York: Oxford University Press, Pp. 495. Cloth \$35.)

Gilbert Seldes was a critic who could see things whole and speak to both audience, artist, and media executives. "Things whole," was nothing less than the transformation of American culture in the middle-third of this century, for Seldes witnessed more changes in communication modes in his lifespan than had all previous history combined. Seldes was ten years old when Edwin

Porter produced "The Great Train Robbery." He died in 1970, the year after television broadcast the first human footprint from the surface of the moon.

Michael Kammen puts Seldes' life in the historical perspective, Seldes himself insisted on changes in media which may, in retrospect, seem inevitable were anything but as each developed. Kammen keeps the spotlight on Seldes but lets us taste the flavor of his critical debate as, for example, when some feared that adding sound would end film as an art form.

Seldes insisted that each medium be judged on its own merit. It was never that the popular media failed to do enough for high culture, but that "they failed to satisfy the cultural needs of large numbers of ordinary people." But he also saw the positive in each medium. If radio reduced the audience to soap operas, it introduced symphonic music to millions.

From his first book, *The Seven Lively Arts*, in 1924, Gilbert Seldes wrote about popular culture often in prescient terms. He saw the electronic media bringing about major qualitative change, since the audience no longer paid directly for what it chose for experience. With radio, entertainment entered the home for the first time and, being free, became universal. Television completed the integration of entertainment into the fabric of daily life, not as an option, but as a given. Seldes foresaw television as a primary force in the creation of a unified entertainment industry.

Seldes sometimes sounds quaint by today's standards. He called for an "utterly neutral news broadcast," for example, which by post-modern academic standards sounds naive. But he had advice to which academics would do well to hearken. College courses do a good job, he said, of preparing people to live in the world of books, theatres, concerts, and museums, but do not give students the bases for understanding the public arts of film, radio and television.

If Seldes was not a progenitor of cultural criticism, he was certainly a forerunner. He published his work in popular magazines and plays and radio scripts. In the late 1930s he was first Director of Television for CBS and in 1959 became founding Dean of the Annenberg School of Communications at Penn.

Above all, Gilbert Seldes believed that popular culture could be both democratic and distinguished. He was dedicated to the conviction that the public could grow in maturity and intelligence, given the sound guidance of clear critical writing. Michael Kammen has done well by those standards, combining solid historical research with writing style that is a pleasure to read.

Lynn Boyd Hinds, *West Virginia University*

Edited by Frank G. Novak, Jr. *Lewis Mumford and Patrick Geddes: The Correspondence.*

(London and New York: Routledge, 1995. Pp. xvii, 372. \$45.00.)

This volume consists of some one hundred and sixty letters and documents by Mumford, the American literary and cultural critic, and Geddes, the Scots biologist, sociologist, and planner. Geddes, fifty-one years older than Mumford, desperately sought in him a surrogate son, secretary, collaborator, and disciple. Mumford, who only learned the identity of his father late in life, found in Geddes, a paternal figure and much-needed inspiration at the start of his career. Geddes was a “Jovian father,” Mumford wrote in 1936, “stern and practically omniscient.”

Mumford frequently praised Geddes as one of the heroic intellectuals of the twentieth century, yet the correspondence between the two men leaves the reader wondering why he maintained this myth. As Frank Novak points out in a lengthy and valuable interpretative introduction, their relationship was strained, especially when they were together, and flourished in inverse proportion to proximity. Geddes’s early writings, particularly *City Development* (1903) and *Cities in Evolution* (1915), exemplified the liberating effects of interdisciplinarity, of a holistic approach to human and ecological development, that Mumford found so inspirational. Tragically, by the time they met, the older man had become hopelessly trapped within his own intellectual system. How deeply Geddes inspired and hurt his young disciple was evident in 1925: in July Mumford named his first-born son after Geddes, yet two months later described his Scottish mentor as a “pathetic man” who wanted a deferential protégé, an acquiescent secretary, rather than someone with the independence Mumford developed at least in part as a result of reading Geddes’s early writings.

In succeeding years Mumford’s frustration increased as Geddes continued to seek his collaboration in transforming piles of notes into intelligible prose, as Geddes squandered money and time on the buildings and gardens of the *College des Ecosais* he established at Montpellier, as Geddes leaped from project to project but could not find the discipline to write the book that Mumford hoped would be the culmination of his career. Mumford had promised in 1925 to “retain the memory of the comrade I found too late” (p. 342), and in his published writings he represented Geddes as he first encountered him, the younger author of exciting ecological and historical studies of cities, rather than the older man who had “compartmentalized his own thinking and arrested the free play of his mind” (p. 369).

In addition to the insight they provide on the relationship between the two men, these letters document their respective careers. Mumford’s letters delineate the intellectual milieu of New York City during the 1920s and early 1930s, chronicle the development of the books he was writing, and illuminate his involvement with members of the Regional Planning Association of America

in its various endeavors, including the preparation of "The Regional Community" issue of *Survey* (May 1, 1925), and the attempts to incorporate garden city principles in the design and construction of Sunnyside Gardens, Queens and Radburn, New Jersey. Similarly, the correspondence details Geddes's planning efforts in India and Jerusalem, his deep involvement in British sociological circles, his educational ideas, and his extensive network of friends.

Although biographers of each individual have drawn extensively on these letters, in published form they provide the historian with a remarkable transatlantic exchange of ideas. But as valuable as they are, the correspondence would be more useful if the editor's annotation were stronger and more pointed. Too often the context of letters remains unexplained. References critically important to the reader's understanding of the correspondence are not provided. Mumford and Geddes deserve better, and so do readers of this volume.

David Schuyler, *Franklin & Marshall College*

By Howard Gillette Jr. *Between Justice and Beauty: Race, Planning, and the Failure of Urban Policy in Washington, D.C.*

(Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995. Pp. xiii, 297, Cloth \$32.95.)

Image and reality have never been fully reconciled in our nation's capital city. One indication is a recently proposed enlargement of the city's "monumental core" through a multi-billion dollar redevelopment project entitled, "Extending the Legacy." Like the landmark 1901 McMillan Commission plan that revived and implemented the original vision of L'Enfant's 1792 plan, this latest beautification effort seeks to reinforce the ceremonial role of Washington. Yet, as one analyst put it, monumental Washington is just a facade for an inherently flawed city. The real D.C. is a "District of Calamity," as one analyst describes it, a city with monumental problems such as falling housing values, huge job losses, a public service system functioning below capacity and basic needs, a \$379 million deficit that is growing, and high (and rising) crime. Washington is not a source of pride but evidence of urban failure.

Is this current discontinuity between image and reality in Washington just a transitory phenomenon? Howard Gillette Jr., suggests that the roots of this tension run deep. The discontinuity between the monumental federal city as a symbol of national power and the persistent failure to provide a livable city for its inhabitants has been a characteristic of Washington since its inception in the late 18th century.

Gillette's saga begins with the first half century of Washington's development after the 1780s, a period which he regards as one of "failed intentions." L'Enfant's plan remained unrealized, the infrastructure of the city was inadequately developed, and its commercial prospects lagged far behind

its main rival, Baltimore. Gillette contends that Washington's unique "political culture," with federal legislators rather than local entrepreneurs in control, "retarded growth and stifled development." (p. 26) Its status as a federal city, meant that it was subject to whims of those in power in Congress. "Whether it was George Washington's determination to use Washington to bind the new republic together, Charles Sumner's effort to forge new opportunities regardless of race, or Marion Barry's determination to utilize black political power for social renewal, each generation embraced a 'New Washington' where it could put to work its vision for urban development" (p. 208). The one New Washington that was successfully realized, Gillette points out, was the "City Beautiful" at the turn of the twentieth century and "the triumph of a largely national ethos over local interests" (p. 108).

The singularly most valuable contribution of *Between Justice and Beauty* is to show convincingly that the race issue was central to Washington's social and political culture from its beginning in the early nineteenth century, not just in connection with the modern Civil Rights movement and the emergence of black political domination in the District. Washington has always been a laboratory for innovative national social and urban strategies. For instance, Gillette examines the "specter of race" in Washington involving the extension of rights to free blacks and the attempts by Radical Republicans to create racially-integrated institutions in the Reconstruction era. The black slums that dated to the late nineteenth century were confronted in the 1930s by the nationally prominent housing reformer John Ihlder, which led to establishment of the nation's first local housing authority in 1934 (p. 139). The removal of largely-black-occupied alley dwellings quickly moved from the social policy arena into the political arena as Ihlder sought new public housing as replacements for those that were torn down to clean up the city. Gillette discusses also the dissent that emerged from the black community as the rehousing aspects of urban redevelopment gave way to pressures to use federal funds to build highways, to clear land for new non-residential construction, and to relocate low-income people out of these prime development areas.

The grim story that Gillette conveys regarding Washington's experience with urban redevelopment, especially from the standpoint of its impact on the black community, conforms to the other in studies of race, planning and urban development elsewhere in the post-World War era. What makes Washington unique is its lack of "home rule" and the ever-present hand of the federal government, not just as a conveyer of funds, but as meddler in the city's day-to-day affairs.

The rise of black political power, especially in Marion Barry's political career, flowed directly from opposition to this federal receivership relationship. The restoration of an elected city government after 1974 provided the opening for the social activist Barry to become mayor in 1978. Yet according to Gillette,

Barry failed to be consistent in his neighborhood-based improvement strategy during his two terms. To maintain competition with the increasingly more powerful suburbs, he often “sacrificed social welfare to other priorities” (p. 206). Barry’s remarkable political comeback after his personal debacle of the late 1980s can be explained by the continued resiliency of “welfare-oriented politics” in a city plagued by deep-seated social problems. While appeals to race proved politically valuable, according to Gillette the rhetoric of racial injustices “stood in the way of advancing any long-term solutions to persistent social welfare problems” (206).

Historian Gillette offers a simple solution to Washington’s persisting fiscal, political, and social plight. Give up independence, he suggests and (except for the core complex of federal structures) join the city to the state of Maryland. This rather bold (but not unprecedented) proposal is raised in the author’s far-too-brief concluding chapter (six pages) along with some belated references to other cities where planning, politics and race intersected significantly. The overall lack of a comparative base to Gillette’s study is unfortunate, and inclines him to overstate the uniqueness and centrality of the Washington experience to national urban policy development. Also, by largely limiting the discussion of planning issues to their intersection with black community needs, *Between Justice and Beauty* fails to sufficiently illuminate the planning visions and processes that affected overall city development, especially after World War II.

The gaps in Gillette’s study are far less noteworthy than the creative and intelligent way that it merges social, design and political considerations into a comprehensive historical urban portrait. *Between Justice and Beauty* deserves serious attention by urban scholars, although its lucid style will extend its appeal to a broader readership. Proponents of the monumental “Extending the Legacy” will not find solace in its historical and contemporary analysis. Yet they will find an extremely valuable analysis of the tensions between the physical and social components of the city that must be addressed if the legacy of L’Enfant is to be truly celebrated, not just by tourists but also by Washington’s citizens.

Christopher Silver, *Virginia Commonwealth University, currently, Urban Development Advisor, National Development Planning Agency, Jakarta, Indonesia*

By W. Anthony Gengarelly, *Distinguished Dissenters and Opposition to the 1919-20 Red Scare.*

(Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1996. Pp. 408. \$109.95.)

The post-World War I Red Scare has attracted a good deal of scholarly interest because it has commonly been viewed as a harbinger of events to come, specifically the anti-Communist panic of the McCarthy era. J. Edgar Hoover’s critical presence in the earlier events seems to confirm that 1919-20 was a dry run for later persecutions. Gengarelly discusses the groups and

individuals who were to speak “on the right side” in this controversy, who resisted panic and who spoke up for the rights of the most unpopular political minorities at a time when it was very unsafe to do so. Though drawn from a wide variety of standpoints—socialist, liberal, labor, and religious—their opinions stand as powerful monuments to democratic and libertarian ideology. For lawyers particularly, the combined shocks of the Red Scare and the Sacco-Vanzetti prosecution detonated far-reaching questions about the profession’s social responsibilities, issues which resonated for decades afterwards.

Gengarelly is a qualified optimist. He argues that although the 1919-20 era was indeed marked by mob violence and vigilantism, legal and extra-legal, the scare “was tamed by a combination of influential figures inside and outside the government who killed sedition laws and curtailed arbitrary deportations while discrediting the policies and actions of leading Scare proponents.” Notable in this latter category was A. Mitchell Palmer, whose repressive policies isolated him politically. Even in this parlous situation, therefore, the “libertarian check” within the American constitutional system ultimately worked. Gengarelly illustrates this balance by a painstaking examination of the progress of anti-sedition legislation through Congress, with surprising abundant evidence of growing opposition from business sources, who were terrified of losing large numbers of aliens who ideally would contribute to the ranks of low-paid unskilled labor.

As far as it goes, Gengarelly’s position is well-documented. Indeed, even the bloodiest official outrages of this era pale by comparison with those of truly repressive regimes like the Soviet Union of the 1930s. However, that not every seditious alien was deported, or that legality did prevail from time to time, should not give us too much cause for celebration. Perhaps the reason the purge was relatively milder than it might have been was that it achieved its goal with amazing speed, and thus outlived its usefulness. Why waste the admittedly limited resources of the federal government on radicals who obviously had shown themselves no serious threat in face of the vigilantism of the American Legion and employers’ goon squads? Gengarelly’s cheerful conclusion makes particularly odd reading when we think of the immediate post-1921 aftermath of the crisis, with the Ku Klux Klan about to achieve national celebrity, and the draconian 1924 Immigration Act already in the works. *This* is a happy ending? I find fatuous Gengarelly’s conclusion that “The nation’s political center will react to protect certain democratic freedoms because influential people value them and will fight to preserve them.” Indeed they will, but only when expedient.

The degree of commitment to civil liberties also comes to mind when Gengarelly draws a comparison with what he terms “the McCarthy era 1950-54” (xvii), which he sees as stemmed by the forces of decency in the Eisenhower administration and the political elite, a touching picture, were it not so

inaccurate. The anti-Communist wave long predated Joe McCarthy, and found its richest vein of paranoia under the official policies of the Truman administration. By 1954, McCarthy was so obviously irrelevant because he was pressing against organizations and political movements which had long since been destroyed and discredited. The only way he could squeeze mileage out of the red issue was by digging far deeper for Communist moles, and by excavating in the recesses of the military and political elite. Naturally, he was destroyed for his pains. However, the real anti-Communist persecution under Truman continued utterly unchecked by any "libertarian" qualms. It ceased only when it achieved complete success, with the purging of the unions and the annihilation of Left political culture for a generation.

Though lengthy and widely researched, the book does show some remarkable omissions. Gengarelly certainly should have been aware of Samuel Walker's excellent history of the ACLU, *In Defense of American Liberties* (1990). In fact, few sources are cited from the last decade or so. Among very recent books which the author could not have been expected to consult, anyone interested in his themes should refer to Richard Gid Powers, *Not Without Honor: The History of American Anticommunism* (1995). However, Gengarelly should probably have used works like Joel Kovel, *Red Hunting in the Promised Land: Anti-Communism and the Making of America* (1994), and especially David Kennedy's *Over Here* (1980). Kennedy's book is critical for understanding the First World War anti-German panic, the essential prelude to the anti-red events of 1919. Since Gengarelly makes quite frequent comparative reference to the events of the 1950s, he might also have cited works like David M. Oshinsky, *A Conspiracy So Immense: The World of Joe McCarthy* (1983), and Thomas C. Reeves, *The Life and Times of Joe McCarthy* (1982).

Philip Jenkins, *The Pennsylvania State University*

**By Lynn Boyd Hinds, *Broadcasting the Local News: The Early Years of Pittsburgh's KDKA-TV.***

(University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995.  
Pp. 173, \$40.00 cloth, \$16.95 paper.)

Lynn Boyd Hind's *Broadcasting the Local News: The Early Years of Pittsburgh's KDKA-TV*, documents the development and growth of one television station in Pittsburgh, from 1949 to 1960. It is obviously a well-researched history based on over thirty oral history interviews, many radio and television scripts housed at the University of Pittsburgh's Hillman Library, and newspaper references. It is also a serious history, footnoted and indexed, and therefore useful as a reference.

One is immediately struck by the surprisingly rich legacy of broadcasting in Pittsburgh. As Hinds notes:

A University of Pittsburgh professor and former Westinghouse engineer, Reginald Fessenden, made that first radio broadcast. With two Pittsburgh investors, Hay Walker, Jr. and Thomas H. Given, Fessenden had formed the National Electric Signaling Company, and it was from the company's experimental station in Brant Rock, Massachusetts, that Fessenden made a Christmas Eve 1906 broadcast, playing carols and reading poems. One can only imagine the amazement of radio operators on ships at sea who for the first time heard a human voice through their headphones, rather than the dots and dashes of "the wireless," as it existed in those days (pp. 1 & 2).

Pittsburgh also developed the first community-sponsored, educational, non-commercial station in America, WGED, which was granted a license on April 1, 1954. A year later Dumont sold WDTV to Westinghouse Broadcasting which changed the call letters to KDKA.

Pittsburgh's first television broadcast was on January 11, 1949 on WDTV, Channel 3, on a Thursday evening from the now demolished Syria Mosque in the Oakland neighborhood of Pittsburgh. Four thousand people attended the premier of "Your Magic Window," but most Pittsburghers could only read about it, for they had yet to acquire TV sets.

*Broadcasting the Local News* details very well the slow growth of the television medium, the staying power of radio (broadcasting soap operas until 1960), the temporary delay World War II brought to television production, and finally the dominance of television news. As Hinds notes: "Polls have shown that television is the primary source of news for a majority of Americans, and in the 1990's it is the only news source for the majority" (p. 9).

Nearly exclusive popular reliance on television news means that understanding the selection of television news stories is very important for an informed citizenry. They must have pictures and must appear to be authoritative; they represent an official view of the world. Therefore they rarely cover issues for which the only information comes from "talking heads," and rarely cover complex topics in depth.

Hinds relays in great detail the permutations of the early newscasts. They evolved from "rip and read" broadcasts—announcers simply reading news summaries from the wire services—to programs incorporating the realization that *local*, not just international and national news, might hold some interest. Early newscasts were done entirely on 16 mm. film with great hardship and, to our modern eye, amazing slowness. Today, although filming the news is done faster and with computers, the artificial constraints needed to meet the expected format of television still exist:

The packaged account played during the 'live shot' compresses time, reducing an event that may have developed over hours to a

minute or so. Thus, again what may appear to be a simple 'window on reality' is really a careful construction of reality (p. 141).

Hinds hopes that local newscasts can break away from their "faster and flashier" patterns to present a "more balanced version of reality and to provide citizens with a more adequate basis for making decisions as we move toward the twenty-first century. (p. 145)" His history, he hopes will demystify the making of television news so more people understand the conventions of the medium and its limitations.

Hinds describes an amazing series of "almosts" in the development of television as we know it, from "theater television," to "phonevision" and "stratovision." It took nearly four years for Pittsburgh to acquire a television station, initially the intent was to make a profit from the sale of television sets (p. 18). Producers were slow to realize that profits could be made from the broadcasts themselves.

Included in the history are brief biographies of many early Pittsburgh television luminaries, such as Bill Burns, Al McDowell, Florence Sando, and Eleanor Schano, as well as behind-the-scenes producers, directors, photographers and news directors. Hinds concludes that despite the vast improvements in technology and graphics, the conventions of television were established with its first decade (p. 131).

With the dearth of resources on television broadcasting in the 1940's and 1950's this book is a welcome addition to local historians bookshelves.

Lu Donnelly, *Historical Consultant, Pittsburgh*

**Jo Chesworth.** *Story of the Century: The Borough of State College, Pennsylvania.*

(State College, PA: Barash Group and Borough of State College, 1995. Pp. 212, \$29.95.)

The Stage Manager in *Our Town* once observed that "On the whole, things don't change much in Grover's Corners." No doubt Thornton Wilder's character could have made that assessment about many small towns across America. The fictional Grover's Corners would have little in common with State College, Pennsylvania, however, as Jo Chesworth ably demonstrates in her lively one-hundred year community study.

Although inhabited since the Revolutionary War period when an adopted son of an Indian warrior became the first permanent settler in College Township, State College was not officially incorporated as a borough until 1896. Unlike many communities with histories spanning more than two centuries, State College has experienced almost uninterrupted prosperity and growth since its founding. Known as "Lion Country" in the 1990s because of Penn State University's Nittany Lions (named for "Nita-Nee," a mythical Lenni-Lenape Indian princess), the State College area might well be called "Iron

Country,” Chesworth notes, since some of the highest quality iron produced in the United States created an economic boom that lasted through the first half of the nineteenth century.

Particularly evident in Chesworth’s anecdotal narrative is the parallel evolution of town and gown. When the charcoal-iron boom fizzled in the late 1850s, State College benefited from the introduction of higher education. As Penn State University grew from its founding as Farmers’ High School in 1855 with sixty-nine students enrolled four years later to its present-day status as a preeminent, nationally recognized university and a student body of nearly 40,000, State College also experienced a dramatic transformation from an isolated sleepy village to a thriving community. At the core of the Centre Region’s 72,000 residents, State College has grown spatially and demographically while maintaining a standard of living most communities would envy. The author reminds us that Rand-McNally recently rated State College as the twelfth-best place in the country for retirees, *Money* magazine cited it as one of the “300 Best Places to Live,” and *U.S. News & World Report* consistently ranks Penn State as one of “America’s Best National Universities,.” (p. 184)

Throughout the book, Chesworth integrates amusing and informative first-hand glimpses of everyday life in State College. She relates, for example, that when considering where to locate Farmers’ High School, one member of the Board of Trustees cautioned his colleagues that “Boys had better be away from the temptations and annoyances peculiar to railroads whilst acquiring education (p. 13).” We also observe how the changing technology influenced local politics when “An ordinance to restrict animals was enacted in 1897, but not without heated discussions (p. 25).” Ten years later readers must have been aghast when the *Centre Daily Times* reported how a First National Bank employee suffered a crushed right leg after he was suddenly thrown from his automobile “when without a moment’s warning the steering gear dropped, causing the machine to cut a few fanciful figures on the road (p. 36).”

We are aware of social life on the “gown” side, too, often in the form of University-related pranks. In 1897 students disgruntled with their chemistry grades shot out every window in the front of Old Main using powder from the College arsenal to fire two Civil War cannons packed with sod (p. 36). On another occasion students celebrated an unexpected 13-13 tie in a football game with heavily favored Harvard the following Monday morning by igniting a three-story bonfire with five barrels of gasoline. The explosion shattered windows in town and on campus, hospitalizing two participants. (p. 36)

Despite general prosperity throughout most of its history, State College was not immune to the economic hard times most of the country experienced during the Great Depression. One poignant photograph shows several unemployed townsmen earning fifteen cents an hour from the WPA covering the Penn State athletic field with topsoil (p. 109).

These are just some of many fascinating nuggets Chesworth has provided in a well-organized, comprehensive community history. The author provides a useful index and good primary source material, including dozens of photographs that serve as an excellent visual record, and excerpts from the local newspaper. Numerous sidebar profiles of homes, civic organizations, and the individuals who comprise State College's rich and colorful history enhance the narrative.

About 300 residents lived in State College when it was incorporated in 1896. A century later State College's heterogeneous population enjoys a myriad of amenities that have lured businesses and individuals from around the nation. If the past is an accurate barometer of future, State College's second century promises to be as prosperous and exciting as its first.

*Story of A Century* will interest residents who can easily relate to sites and namesakes, but it should also appeal to the general reader and students of local history. Chesworth has produced a delightfully informative and fun read.

John C. McWilliams, *Penn State-DuBois*