
Ira Berlin’s *Generations of Captivity* represents a distinguished and distinctive work of scholarly synthesis in the burgeoning field of Atlantic slavery studies. Written in crisp prose with nuanced interpretive insights, the narrative offers a compelling assessment of the state of the field and the complexity of American slavery itself. For its author, *Generations of Captivity* is a refinement and enlargement of his seminal 1998 study of colonial slavery, *Many Thousands Gone*. Referring to the “rapid and often traumatic changes in black life” (p. 16) that accompanied slavery’s expansion in the first half of the nineteenth century, Berlin carries his analysis forward to engage issues of emancipation and new struggles to define liberty.
One of the great virtues of *Generations of Captivity* is its ability to move across time and space, interweaving generational and geographic considerations that influenced North American slavery. As he meanders chronologically from slavery’s African origins and the so-called Charter Generations to the fifth and final Freedom Generations, Berlin devotes considerable attention to evolving regional variations and how the continuous “recasting of slave life took a variety of forms” (p. 208). This gives the study an admirable comparative (albeit North American) dimension.

Especially interesting is Berlin’s discussion of the importance of Atlantic creoles and American bondage, and the character of the seaboard South as an exporting region to the interior continent. The theme of migration is not only a narrative device bridging disparate elements of a sophisticated story, Berlin demonstrates its historical importance in shaping the institution’s triumph and eventual demise in an age of westward movement.

While readers will be familiar with the distinction Berlin draws between a “society with slaves” (the North) and a “slave society” (the South), they will find more novel his evidence that “it remains an open question when, prior to January 1, 1863, the North became a free society” (p. 18). Borrowing from Don Fehrenbacher, Berlin argues forcefully that the entire United States remained a “slaveholding republic” throughout the antebellum era. In other words, emancipation came hesitantly and unevenly in the northern states, and it was no guarantee of full freedom or equality.

By extending his analysis into the nineteenth century, Berlin actually reshapes his earlier interpretation of slavery. “It now appears that the period of slavery’s most rapid change in mainland North America was not its first two hundred years but the half century preceding the Civil War” (p. 17). “Ties of kinship, common experience, and shared aspirations,” he writes toward the end of the book, “had created powerful bonds of solidarity that allowed black men and women to act in concert” (p. 259).

Slavery and freedom stand in relationship to each other throughout the narrative, much as they did in early American life. So too do the economic and social features of plantation life. What emerges is a concise view of the world—the system and the culture—black and white Southerners forged together. More than a story of labor relations, political economy, or cultural hegemony, Berlin’s narrative ultimately is the tale of African-American agency linking generations of black (and white) Americans in the nation’s great social drama. Of the impulses for freedom that converged in the Civil War, Berlin
observes: “Slavery collapsed under the pounding of the federal troops from the outside and the subversion of plantation-bound black men and women from the inside” (p. 259). This is a nice turn of phrase that demonstrates the author’s capacity to capture complexity in succinct declarative sentences.

Those who find *Generations of Captivity* overly general in the specialized academic discourse on American slavery, or relying too heavily on secondary sources, miss the larger point. Ira Berlin has succeeded in distilling a lifetime of learning into a narrative characterized by its breadth, rich insights, and engaging prose style. As such, *Generations of Captivity* is a learned treatise that is ideal for classroom use and a general audience.

DENNIS B. DOWNEY

*Millersville University*


Those interested in late British-American colonial history will find in this superbly edited and voluminously documented sourcebook a rich resource for understanding the complex interrelationships of Native Americans and Euro-Americans up to and during the critical Revolutionary era. That this resource was created by two German scholars is testimony to the increasing realization that developments in early American history can best be understood within trans-Atlantic parameters. (On this subject see the recent interview of, and article by, Professor Wellenreuther in *Early American Studies*, Fall 2004).

This extensive volume was translated by Julie Tomberlin Weber from its prior German publication by the same editors – *Herrnhuter Indianermission in der Amerikanischen Revolution: Die Tagebücher von David Zeisberger* (Berlin, 1995). The American edition differs from the original only in that the introduction was revised by Wellenreuther. The sourcebook parallels the detailed doctoral dissertation of Carola Wessel, published as *Delaware-Indianer und Herrnhuter Missionare im Upper Ohio Valley 1772–1781* (Tübingen, 1999). Sadly, Dr. Wessel died suddenly in early 2004 prior to the publication of the sourcebook in its English version. Her coeditor dedicated the volume to her memory.
The very helpful introduction presents the background needed to understand the translated diaries (twenty-four in number); its length (eighty-seven pages) was required because of the complexity of the scene. It contains the historical context of the aftermath of the Seven Years' War, the geography and Native American ethnography of the Ohio Region, the missionary theory and methods of the Moravians, and the provenance, present location, and prior (partial) translation of the diaries, with some brief concluding remarks about the principles of translation followed.

The diaries were intended as reports to churchly superiors, sited in the Moravian center in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, whence copies were forwarded to the Moravian headquarters in Germany. Conversely, periodic directives (and occasional personal visits) were received by Zeisberger in the four Moravian settlements in the Muskingum River valley. It is remarkable, given the distance involved and difficulty of connection, how determined were both sides in attempting communication.

Several conclusions can be drawn from a perusal of these pages. First, the relative success of the Moravian missionaries in converting substantial numbers of Native Americans (as contrasted to contemporary attempts by other religious denominations) becomes more understandable. Moravian faith was predominantly based upon emotional responses rather than upon doctrine, and was thus easier to transmit across cultural barriers. Although not totally devoid of prejudice, the missionaries considered their converts to be brothers and sisters, strove to learn their languages, worked the fields side by side with them, and shared privation or surplus. Indigenous women, and especially widows, received respectful attention. Moravian know-how in economic matters produced greater and longer-lasting yields, especially when compared to the results of prophecies of Native American “preachers” (based on visions) which at times caused outright famines.

Second, Moravians were able to establish trusted connections with Indian leaders and conscientiously sought their permission to establish their settlements. While not always able to navigate readily the ever-shifting tribal alignments, Moravian missionaries, especially Zeisberger, were ordinarily very well informed of the current status among these “nations” and the ever-encroaching inroads of whites. Most importantly, the Moravians remained alert during the actual years of armed hostility to the varied tides of conflict among British, American, and Native American forces. Moravian attempts to remain neutral elicited questioning from both patriots and loyalists. It was not for lack of diligence and intelligence of their leaders that the Moravian settlements on the
Muskingum eventually (in late 1781) fell victim to the suspicions of tribes associated with the British. The missionaries and their several hundred converts were forced to relocate to the Upper Sandusky area, amid great suffering; later when a large contingent of converts returned to their villages to recover supplies, they were massacred by Revolutionary militiamen.

Third, one is able to glean from Zeisberger’s pages the personalities of many of the converts. There is, for example, the case of Sister Lucia (pp. 155–56), who despite illness “was a faithful co-worker among her fellow women.” She “endured many trials when people tried to lead her away from the congregation.” Or that of Brother Anton (pp. 157–58) who served as an interpreter for his fellows and “carried out this office with much faithfulness.” He was also a preacher who was often asked by Indians “to repeat in his house what he had heard in the service.”

One of the many benefits of this outstanding volume is the lengthy “Register of Persons” included as an appendix (pp. 573–611); the longest section gives the native and mission names of all those mentioned in the diaries, along with vital statistics and other information, often amounting to mini-biographies. Also in the “Register” is information on “Euro-Americans” and “Unconverted Indians” whose names appear in the text.

Space does not permit further itemization of the great merits of this volume, but the judicious assessments of both primary and secondary sources included in the often extensive footnotes should be cited. In sum, this is an excellent and informative volume recommended for all libraries and scholars of frontier America.

DONALD F. DURNBAUGH
Juniata College


In 1766, after British Prime Minister William Pitt guided a repeal of the Stamp Act through Parliament, English pottery manufacturer Josiah Wedgwood hit upon an idea to boost sales in the American colonies. If he could quickly produce and market “crockery ware” bearing Pitt’s likeness, “a quantity might certainly be sold there now & some advantage made of the
American prejudice in favor of that great man.” As Wedgewood sensed, colonial Americans increasingly mingled their imperial politics with their desire for British-made consumer goods. To this day, collectors and museums display British teapots manufactured for the American market, bearing the slogan, “No Stamp Act.”

In *Marketplace of Revolution*, distinguished historian T.H. Breen links the emergence of revolutionary politics between 1764 and 1774 with the unprecedented expansion of the consumer marketplace in late colonial America to explain how ordinary American colonists managed to overcome the profound differences, distances, and distrust that separated them. When Parliament began levying new taxes on the colonies in the 1760s, colonists responded by pledging to each other that they would boycott their coveted, imported British-made consumer goods. According to Breen, the communities from New Hampshire to Georgia that participated in the boycotts helped “bring forth an imagined national community” (p. xiii). Ultimately, the stories of shared sacrifice implicit in this “imagined national community” nurtured the trust needed to transform colonial resistance to Parliamentary taxation into a movement for independence.

The first half of the book focuses on the sudden, widespread availability of British-made consumer goods in colonial America. Beginning in the 1740s, an unprecedented flow of relatively inexpensive goods – bolts of cloth of myriad designs, fabrics, and colors, china tea sets, pewter spoons, ivory combs, and decorated snuff boxes, in short, “the Baubles of Britain” – became readily available to ordinary men and women in the colonies. Hardly self-sufficient, yeoman farmers of the Jeffersonian ilk, by 1760 the American colonists were fervent consumers awash in a veritable flood of goods. Deep changes in material culture produced equally profound social, economic, and political changes by broadening the realm of choice and granting ordinary men and women greater freedom to fashion their own identities. The expansion of the consumer market to the colonies also inflated the importance of colonial consumers in the imperial economy. The colonies imported £ 4.5 million worth of British goods in 1770, accounting for roughly one-quarter of Britain’s exports. No longer rustic provincials on the margins of empire, the colonies were a dynamic part of an ever-expanding British economy.

Breen’s reconstruction of a colonial consumer economy and his analysis of how it transformed everyday life and the colonists’ understanding of their place in the British empire alone make for a fine book. Yet Breen extends his analysis further, linking these changes to the American Revolution itself. By
the 1760s colonial consumers had elevated “choice” to a right; when imperial policies threatened the colonies, they turned “choice” exercised in the consumer marketplace into a weapon of political resistance. Colonists readily understood that boycotts offered a powerful tool for resisting Parliament’s new taxes. After 1764, as the falling out between Parliament and the colonies moved from one crisis to another, ordinary men and women pledged to do without the “Baubles of Britain,” turning private acts of consumption into individual and communal statements of political resistance.

At the local and colony level, the boycotts, by inviting most members of the community to join, broadened the political community and created a new type of popular politics that stretched beyond officials and the electorate. The language of the boycott petitions also encouraged deeply provincial colonists to identify with the larger interests of “America in general.” Newspapers reprinted stories of the boycotts’ trials and tributes in towns throughout the colonies. The stories of shared sacrifice, whether from Philadelphia or some obscure farming village in Massachusetts, created a sense of trust that by 1774 had helped turn local protests into a sustained, colony-wide resistance movement.

Characteristic of Breen’s work, *Marketplace of Revolution* lays out the most pressing historiographical issues and is informed by a keen sense of everyday life in late colonial America. Breen also self-consciously explains his historical reasoning – his chapter explaining evidence for an expanded consumer culture after 1740 is particularly instructive. Finally, the book brims with images, illustrations, and photographs of everything from consumer goods, to late colonial prints illustrating the bustling commerce of colonial seaports, to non-importation agreements. Frequent, extensive quotations provide another window into eighteenth-century consumer culture. These features will make it a welcome addition in the classroom. In places, however, this is a dense, complex book, rendered more complicated by the absence of a straightforward narrative, with the exception of the first chapter which lays out a brief analytical summary.

Breen’s imaginative analysis of the importance of consumer culture in shaping colonial resistance is less convincing than his thesis for the first half of the book. Nonetheless, Breen offers a provocative reinterpretation of colonial resistance that will surely inspire further work on the emergence of a consumer society and the American Revolution.

JOHN CRAIG HAMMOND
*University of Kentucky*

*The Enlightened Joseph Priestley* is an impressive work of scholarship that is the fruit of forty years of research into one of the most significant figures of the English Enlightenment. During his lifetime, Joseph Priestley was one of Europe’s most celebrated intellectuals, but by the time of his death in 1804 his reputation was greatly diminished. Today he is most famous for his discovery of oxygen, but he was also a philosopher, historian, preacher, theologian, and political activist. While such a range of activity would challenge any biographer, Schofield is able to discuss every aspect of the multidimensional and graphomaniacal Priestley. In doing so, he opens a fascinating window on eighteenth-century England and America.

This second volume of Schofield’s Priestley biography begins with a discussion of the patronage of Lord Shelburne, who financed Priestley’s chemical experiments and his impressive library collection. Schofield discusses Priestley’s experimental work with a keen awareness of the difficulties faced by any pioneer. Priestley’s scientific papers presented his innovations in research apparatus as well as his careful observations of phenomena that he could not fully understand. Although Antoine Lavoisier soon discredited many of Priestley’s theories, Schofield demonstrates that Lavoisier’s own work depended on Priestley.

Scientific discovery sometimes proceeds from flawed theories and methods. Priestley’s false assumption was that a substance called phlogiston is responsible for combustion. In rejecting Lavoisier’s new chemical theory, Priestley wasted much of his later scientific writing in defending a theory that had been superceded. The field that Priestley helped establish quickly passed him by. Unfortunately, Schofield assumes a greater knowledge of the history of chemistry than most historians possess. It would have been helpful to provide more explanation of the theory of phlogiston as well as the many archaic technical terms Priestley used.

Priestley gave up his position as a Dissenting minister when he accepted Shelburne’s patronage, but he continued to view himself primarily as a preacher and theologian. Schofield brings together the scientific and theological sides of Priestley. Contrary to the popular notion that religion impeded scientific advancement, Schofield notes that the “period of Priestley’s most vigorous activities in metaphysics was also that of his most sustained achievement in science” (p. 91). His discussion of Priestley’s view of matter and
spirit is particularly insightful. Priestley rejected Cartesian dualism and concluded that it is the brain that thinks. He thus denied the existence of an immortal soul, but unlike atheist materialists such as Baron d’Holbach, Priestley argued that both the Old and New Testaments support the idea that there is no human existence apart from the body. Thus Priestley could promote the Christian belief in the resurrection as consistent with his natural philosophy. In discussing Priestley’s firm belief in miracles, prophecy, and revelation, though, Schofield would have been helpful by exploring the influence on Priestley of John Locke’s *Reasonableness of Christianity*.

As a Dissenter, Priestley’s religious activities were closely connected to his political views. He was an early and consistent advocate for the type of political freedom advanced in the American and French Revolutions. In addition to political tracts and letters agitating for the right to dissent, Priestley published erudite and controversial works on Christianity, most notably *History of Corruptions of Christianity*. He argued that the Trinitarian orthodoxy demanded by the Test Act was the result of a long historical process rather than the teaching of the apostles. He argued publicly that Unitarianism is the most authentic form of Christianity, and he helped establish Unitarian congregations and academies in the face of popular resistance.

Opposition to Priestley’s theological and political writings turned violent in 1791 when a mob in Birmingham burned Priestley’s home, destroying his scientific apparatus and numerous manuscripts. Schofield argues that the violence was orchestrated by leaders of the Establishment as part of a broader campaign against liberal dissent in the wake of the French Revolution. In 1794, Priestley wisely decided to immigrate to Pennsylvania where his political and religious writings were valued as highly as his scientific works. Quickly, though, he became caught up in the political struggles of the early republic. At one point Priestley was in danger of being deported under the Alien and Sedition Acts, but fortunately he had a strong supporter in Thomas Jefferson.

The best contribution of this study to our understanding of Priestley is Schofield’s judicious assessment of his diverse intellectual achievements. Though a partisan of Priestley, Schofield points out many of Priestley’s mistakes, especially in chemistry. The book would have been strengthened by a general introduction outlining Priestley’s career and providing some context for readers unfamiliar with eighteenth-century England.

CRAIG D. ATWOOD

Wake Forest University Divinity School

John Ferling has written a lively, highly readable, and enjoyable book that will either introduce readers to or remind them of the drama, significance, and anxiety that surrounded the presidential election of 1800. Part of Oxford’s Pivotal Moments in American History series, *Adams vs. Jefferson* provides a fully contextualized snapshot of this critical election and of the principles, personalities, maneuverings, and interests that almost caused electoral politics to descend into constitutional crisis and armed conflict.

Ferling uses half of the book to discuss the election’s background. He describes how post-Revolutionary events produced a worried nationalism. Ferling makes his case that the election of 1800 was a momentous event that had a lasting impact on the nation’s culture and society. He describes the social, economic, and cultural cleavages that produced conflict in the 1790s, and the organized political competition that approached party politics. Ferling sees significant differences between the Federalist party of George Washington and Alexander Hamilton (eventually and uncomfortably led by John Adams), and the Republican opposition headed by Thomas Jefferson. Ferling refreshingly reminds us that though when judged from our modern perspective Jefferson and his followers seem sorely lacking, during the mid-1790s contemporaries rightly identified the Federalists with concentrated power and oligarchy, and the Republicans with a more open and democratic future. Through a discussion of the democratic social and cultural forces encouraged by the American Revolution, Hamilton’s financial system, the impact of the French Revolution in America, and the notorious Alien and Sedition Acts, Ferling explains why by the late 1790s many “were coming to see the Federalists as the Jeffersonians had long seen them: as monocrats and Anglophiles, royalists who hoped not only to conserve the scorned hierarchical and deferential practices of the Anglo-American colonial past but to frustrate the shining promise of the American Revolution” (p. 128).

*Adams vs. Jefferson* joins a growing list of books written by highly reputable scholars for a general audience. It does not seek to break new ground. Though for the most part he does not challenge prevailing scholarly views, Ferling resists recent historical efforts to rehabilitate the Federalists. *Adams vs. Jefferson* is ideal for literate general readers, advanced undergraduate early national courses, and possibly even introductory surveys.
Quite intriguing is Ferling’s highly positive treatment of Jefferson. Of late, many scholars seeking a popular audience (including Ferling in his 2000 work *Setting the World Ablaze*) have had little use for Jefferson. Yet by pursuing Jefferson’s career into the 1790s (in his earlier book Ferling stopped in 1783) when the Virginian led the only alternative to the Federalists, Ferling sees a great deal to admire. He finds Jefferson more responsible than Madison (who rarely appears in *Adams vs. Jefferson*), far less conniving than Hamilton, and nowhere near as petty or petulant as Adams. When Ferling concludes that with the election of 1800 “Republican government came with a new tone, a new style, and a new ideology that enabled the nation to move piecemeal from the habits of 1800, laced as they yet were with restrictive customs ... towards egalitarianism and democratization,” Jefferson emerges as admirable (p. 209).

Ferling’s book and the Pivotal Moments series require a final observation. Writing in the April 7, 2005 edition of the *New York Review of Books*, William Dalrymple described an appalling situation in India where Hindu religious and nationalist extremists (including elected officials) have physically threatened and censored historians whose professional scholarship challenges their grandiose and fundamentalist myth-making. Though the fault for these outrages lies decidedly with the zealots, Dalrymple considers intellectually sound, but often jargon-riddled and impenetrable Indian historiography, and concludes “unless Indian historians learn to make their work intelligible and attractive to a wider audience, and especially to their own voraciously literate middle class, unhistorical myths will continue to flourish” (p. 65).

Such myths also flourish in this country. Events covered in the Pivotal Moments series are chosen because they lend themselves to narrative and drama. For the most part, the series concentrates on battles and elections. It is trite to expect those of us who study less pleasingly shaped topics to write the same sorts of books. Yet the forces of unreason are growing, the liberal arts and sciences are in trouble, and the Pivotal Moments series is a small but vital response.

ANDREW SHANKMAN
*Rutgers University, Camden*

Reading this book I was reminded of lines from one of my favorite Stephen Stills songs: "There's something happening here/ What it is ain't exactly clear." That is not a reflection on the clarity of the argument or the writing in Stephen P. Rice's fine *Minding the Machine*. Rather, it is a general description of the befuddlement that grew alongside the emergence of the mechanized factory system in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. For instance, what were people in New York City in 1826 to make of the "celebrated and only Automaton Chess-player in the world" (p. 12) when it defeated not one but two accomplished human chess players? What would it mean for society that machines might, in the near future, take over not only manual labor but also the ability to reason that is associated with mental labor? For much of the last two centuries these concerns have been the stuff of an entire genre of science fiction, one so popular that one of its products now lives in the governor's mansion of the most populous state in the nation.

Rice is not concerned with the fantastical manifestations of these concerns but instead with the ways that an emerging middle class constructed its identity and, more importantly, its authority through a popular discourse about the wonders and the woes of mechanized production. The topics of this public discourse at times seem far removed from the implicit purposes of class formation, particularly in Rice's own formulation as "more in terms of how power is wielded than in terms of how power is resisted" (p. 8). He looks at the mechanics' institutes, the manual labor schools, writings on popular physiology, and the coverage of steam boiler explosions. In all cases, those engaging in the popular discourse looked for ways to harmonize the developments that they associated with mechanized factory production, particularly the separation of manual and mental labor. Proponents of mechanics' institutes argued that workers could gain the technical knowledge that would enable them to combine mental work with their hand skills, while the founders of manual labor schools felt it was dangerous for scholars to ignore their physical development. Underlying both was a fear that machines would create a class-based chasm separating the people responsible for mental work from those performing manual labor.
Such public discussions, however, were hardly without notions of power and authority. Indeed, the strength of Rice’s work is to demonstrate how writings about physiology or boiler explosions framed conceptions of proper social relations that replaced oppositional notions of class with conceptions of a “series of relations” that seemed both natural and necessary: “the head needed to govern the hand, as the mind needed to govern the body, as the human needed to govern the machine. Because each of these relations figured the relation between proprietors of managers and wage-workers, the lines of deference and authority in the one realm extended to the other” (p. 146). To the extent that Rice is concerned with the process of creating a middle-class identity that enabled managers to pat themselves on the back for recognizing natural laws and wielding their power accordingly, his reading of the sources is convincing. But by his own admission, mechanics’ institutes, manual labor schools, and other elements of the popular antebellum discourse had relatively short lives. These implicit languages soon gave way to much more real uses of power and assertions of authority. It makes one wonder just how convinced his antebellum managers were.

I have to admit to always being a little skeptical of trying to read too much into words alone, although I think Rice is correct in insisting that “class is as much about the comprehension of social relations as it is about the making of social relations” (p. 4). But I feel more comfortable when the popular discourse is linked a bit more to politics after the fashion of, say, Heather Cox Richardson or Amy Dru Stanley. Rice achieves this in his chapter on steam boiler explosions and the efforts to regulate engineers. In sum, this is a fine book, exploring seemingly unimportant institutions and writings to tease out some of the perplexed searchings undertaken by people who were not exactly clean about what was happening in those mechanized factories.

KEN FONES-WOLF
West Virginia University

*Party Games* seeks to reemphasize the importance of party and partisanship in the control and management of Gilded Age politics. The theme of this book is political manipulation. As the author stresses from the outset, "popular politics of the Gilded Age . . . was a guided popularity" (p. xii). And how politicians went about directing that work underscores the author's two main points: how parties acquired, maintained, and utilized power not only helped shape the character of politics during the era, it also circumscribed political change in late nineteenth-century America.

In designing their blueprints for success, politicians in both major parties emphasized loyalty to the party as the bedrock of a voter's political identity. This emphasis on partisanship was not new. It was part of a tradition that had been nurtured for decades, reemphasized in the public press, and reinvigorated by political clubs, parades, and the spoils of office. Having established that identity in the political culture, the two dominant political parties used any means (legal and illegal) to shape election outcomes to their ends. Standard procedures included voter manipulation through hoopla (parades), hype (publicity), and scare tactics that ranged from negative campaigning to race-baiting and nativistic attacks on ethnic minorities. Party officials manipulated the voter registration process and often sanctioned outright intimidation at the polls. Trickery, bribery, and fraud (vote buying and illegal vote counting) helped the dominant parties secure political advantage. Redistricting and gerrymandering helped them maintain it.

Because control by one of the major parties was never complete, Democrats and Republicans crafted their organizations into political machines designed to mobilize voters and win elections. In a commonly used analogy, parties were designed to function like armies—organized and disciplined. A chain of command connected capitolts with wards and precincts. The "key to success was not public spirit but discipline among the ranks of the true believers" (p. 43), whose duty it was to make it to the polls when commanded. In the process, politicians were most often selected for reasons of personal popularity or personal wealth, not for their capabilities. The goal was always to win, not to crusade for principles. As a result, parties—not the aspiring candidates—defined the political debate and prioritized issues. Interestingly, most of the money needed to run political campaigns came from politicians as
personal contributions or from assessments levied on officeholders and not from businessmen. When outside money did come from corporate America it more often came from business “men” more than businesses and primarily out of partisan loyalty rather than political aspiration. And that was how the major parties wanted it. Their top priority was to maintain power not to facilitate business, and it was the everyday functioning of the “system” (not the “big-money men”) that gave them advantage.

Entrenched party domination harbingered the end for dissenters and for fundamental change. Partisanship encouraged conformity and undermined criticism. Control of the press placed minority parties at a distinct disadvantage. It allowed for distortion and sensationalism to set the tone of campaigns and kept minority parties constantly on the defensive. The ability of the two major parties to use established machinery to muster voters and mobilize money allowed them to control caucuses, primaries, and party nominating conventions. Intimidation reduced voter turnout and further stifled political opposition. Scare tactics distracted attention from real issues and victory became an acceptable substitute for any program of positive change. In addition, parties often adapted their programs to co-opt dissent, but did so always within the context of self-interest and with as little disruption to the political status quo as possible. Summers credits partisan calculations with the passage and implementation of the first federal civil service act, new voter registration laws, and the adoption of the Australian (secret) ballot.

This readable, well argued, and well researched study by an acknowledged authority on Gilded Age politics achieves what the author intended—“to cast new, often harsh light, on politics as most Gilded Age observers would have grasped it, the kind worked out through elections and the doings of those striving to hold office” (p. xiii). To accept the argument in its entirety, however, requires the reader to all but abandon the notion that reformers effected change any more than the power brokers let them and that even their failures were not their own.

STEVEN L. PIOTT

Clarion University of Pennsylvania

400

William C. Kashatus’s *September Swoon: Richie Allen, the ’64 Phillies, and Racial Integration* is an engaging account of the traumatic 1964 baseball pennant race. Kashatus sets the stage by providing an historical context for the racial attitudes in the City of Brotherly Love, reminding the reader of Philadelphia’s rich Negro League heritage and contrasting it with manager Ben Chapman’s verbal assaults on Jackie Robinson in 1947. He then proceeds to explain the actions of Phillies management, most notably owner Bob Carpenter and general manager Herb Pennock, in delaying the integration of the ball club, contending that they used the success of the all-white “Whiz Kids” in 1950 as a justification for their failure to pursue African-American and Latino ball players until the early 1960s. Because of this reluctance to integrate, non-white players who were traded to the Phillies expressed reluctance to joining the club and even contemplated retirement rather than accept reassignment to what they perceived as the most racist and least tolerant team in the National League. At the same time, a shift in management during the early 1960s opened the door to sign African-American players such as Richie Allen, but these new players experienced discrimination as they progressed through the farm system and attended spring training in Clearwater, Florida. Out of these acquisitions, though, came the nucleus of the team that pursued the 1964 pennant until the final day of the season.

The focus of Kashatus’s study is the 1964 pennant race in which the Phillies energized southeastern Pennsylvania and surprised the National League by taking a 6½ game lead with twelve games to play, then suffered the most monumental collapse in baseball history in losing the pennant to the St. Louis Cardinals by one game. Kashatus does much more than rehash the highlights and lowlights of the epic campaign, from Jim Bunning’s perfect game to Richie Allen’s Rookie of the Year performance to Manager Gene Mauch’s overuse of Bunning and Chris Short in the waning days of the season. Kashatus effectively places the events at Connie Mack Stadium that summer—with Richie Allen as the Phillies’ first African-American baseball hero—alongside the racial tensions exploding in Philadelphia that summer and fall, some of them occurring within blocks of the ballpark. In addition,
the author recounts the special relationship that developed that summer between the Phillies and their fans.

The last quarter of the book explores the aftermath of the "September Swoon," as the Phillies returned to the second division the following year and stayed there the remainder of the decade. The focus shifts from the unity of the 1964 club to the dissension that tortured the franchise. Key to the sudden decline of the Phillies after 1964, according to Kashatus, was the volatile relationship between Allen, management, and the Philadelphia newspapers. Over the next few seasons, Allen became increasingly disgruntled at the situation—especially after he was blamed for the team's waiver of popular first baseman Frank Thomas following a brawl—and rebelled by defying authority and attempting to force a trade. Allen, in a sense, served as a scapegoat for the team's failures, although Kashatus neither condemns nor justifies Allen's actions. Moreover, continuing racial turmoil enveloping Philadelphia during the mid to late 1960s created chaos for stadium attendance and, ultimately, the financial success of the team. Kashatus's study concludes with the Phillies, fed up with Allen's antics, trading their star player and two others to St. Louis in exchange for Curt Flood and three other players—a move welcomed by Allen but abhorred by Flood, whose refusal too report to the Phillies set in motion the labor-management disputes that would envelope the baseball world for the next quarter century.

Kashatus's history of this fateful year is well researched and well written. Frequently illustrated with photographs of the key participants in the epic tragedy, September Swoon effectively conveys the drama of a baseball pennant race while placing the events in a broader historical context. He incorporates contemporary newspaper accounts and oral history interviews with the main participants as they reflect upon their experiences in the famous chase for the title. Particularly noteworthy is an appendix that informs the reader of the future careers and current status of the 1964 Phillies. September Swoon is an outstanding book that should be read not just by baseball fans but by anyone interested in the impact of race relations on American society during the 1960s.

KAREN GUENTHER
Mansfield University