

ably accurate expression of popular views becomes blurred. Estes traces the efforts of leading Federalists to organize pro-treaty meetings and petition drives, then concludes that they indeed won over the public to support the treaty, when it is perhaps more accurate to say that Federalists were more successful in projecting an image of widespread popular support. Despite these reservations, the book is an important contribution to our understanding of the development of early republican politics, since Estes succeeds in demonstrating how the treaty debates forced reluctant elites to ponder such vital issues as the right to petition, the legitimacy of popular politics, and the relationship between representatives and their constituents.

ALBRECHT KOSCHNIK

*Florida State University*

Anne Farrow, Joel Lang, and Jenifer Frank. *Complicity: How the North Promoted, Prolonged, and Profited from Slavery*. Forward by Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham (New York: Ballantine Books, 2005. Pp. xxix, 269, chronology, notes, bibliography, index. Cloth \$25.95).

In the fall of 2002, the *Hartford Courant's* Sunday magazine, *Northeast*, published the first in a series of articles dealing with Connecticut's involvement with the institution of slavery. Anne Farrow and Joel Lang, the lead writers of the original articles, joined up with the series editor, Jenifer Frank, to expand their story to include the rest of New England and the other northern states. *Complicity*, as the original series and the book-length study are titled, is a generally well-written account of the North's role in the development and perpetuation of New World African slavery. With a Forward by Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham and research guidance from Robert P. Forbes, two well-respected scholars of slavery and African-American history, the authors of *Complicity* have succeeded in popularizing much of the best recent scholarship in these fields. While not written with scholars as the primary audience in mind, there is much material here that could help enliven many professors' yellowed lecture notes. Nevertheless, the general thrust of the book and its conclusions will no doubt be familiar to many well-read history buffs and academics.

From the primary role of New York City in the international cotton trade to New Haven's sale of carriages to southern planters to the trade of fish and

other food items to feed the slaves on the sugar plantations in the Caribbean to the northern owned slave ships that plied the waters off the west coast of Africa, both before and after the Federal government outlawed participation in the international slave trade, it is clear that while there were few slaves laboring in the North before its eradication in the decades following Independence, the prosperity of the region was nearly as dependent upon slavery as the South. According to the authors, white Northerners “promoted, prolonged, and profited” from the institution, and not just before the American Civil War, but also well into the last decades of the Nineteenth century, when New England companies bloodied their hands in the international ivory trade, which was intricately tied to the use of slave labor in Africa.

Like Massachusetts Senator Charles Sumner, the authors point an accusatory finger at the alliance “between the cotton-planters and flesh-mongers of Louisiana and Mississippi and the cotton spinners and traffickers of New England – between the lords of the lash and the lords of the loom” (37). With New England textile mills consuming over 150 million pounds of raw cotton a year by the 1850s and with over 2 million slaves involved, directly or indirectly, in cultivation of cotton, the authors agree with Ralph Waldo Emerson, who stated before the outbreak of the Civil War that “Cotton thread holds the union together” (37).

With excellent quotes from Sumner, Emerson, and others, you can almost forgive the authors for opening their chapter on New England’s participation in the triangle trade with the ridiculous statement that “Virginia may have been settled first, but the United States was born in New England” (45). *Complicity* clearly comes from the minds of New England writers; their moral outrage over their discovery of the significant role their native region played in the development of American slavery, echoes the outrage of newly conscience-stricken northern abolitionists of the antebellum period. Indeed, the insights and indictments of the original abolitionists have simply been rediscovered – slavery was understood to be a national sin, for which all Americans shared guilt. In the hands of Farrow, Lang, and Frank, the anti-abolitionism of the North proved to be not only evidence of this complicity, but also a cause of the perpetuation of slavery in the United States. Surely, a popular work of history that draws its readers’ attention to the prevailing anti-abolitionist sentiment of the North is a welcomed contribution after years of celebratory accounts of how white Northern evangelicals, like William Lloyd Garrison and Harriet Beecher Stowe, helped destroy the “peculiar institution” and “set the captives free.”

If *Complicity* succeeds at any thing it succeeds in reminding us that slavery was a horrendous economic institution that involved all parts of Britain's New World empire and that the abolition of slavery in the North following the Revolution did not change the North's fundamental economic relationship with human bondage. While academic historians and other well-read Americans may very well know about this "complicity," perhaps the broader reading public will gain a better appreciation of that complicity, as well as of its complexity, for not only did Northerners "promote, prolong, and profit" from slavery, there were other northerners, black and white – many who were not New Englanders – who colluded to help fugitive slaves escape their bondage and worked to bring about the ultimate end of the institution.

ANDREW LEE FEIGHT  
*Shawnee State University*

Jerome P. Bjelopera. *City of Clerks: Office and Sales Workers in Philadelphia, 1870, 1920*. (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2005. Pp. 208. Photographs, illustrations, notes, bibliography, index, Cloth \$45.00).

Histories of working people in America infrequently consider, analyze, and evaluate the experiences of white collar workers, especially those that are socially and economically situated between blue collar industrial workers and middle class professionals. Particularly in industrializing America, however, a growing cadre of such workers—including clerks, salespeople, and office workers—played important roles in retail establishments, banks, insurance companies, railroad affiliated entities, and other service and consumer product-oriented businesses. Such workers were vital to the daily functions of numerous business enterprises. Not surprisingly urban areas were highly populated with individuals with such jobs as “. . . clerical employment provided an often-traversed bridge between an immigrant world dominated by manual work and a world of less physical labor.” (p. 21). Philadelphia, as author Jerome Bjelopera illustrates, was home to tens of thousands of such workers from 1870 to 1920.

Among Bjelopera's primary sources are the archives of retailer Strawbridge and Clothier and Peirce College—a Philadelphia-based business academy—as well as data from the federal census and the Pennsylvania Bureau of