SPECIAL ISSUE: DEFINING THE MID-ATLANTIC REGION

BOOK REVIEWS

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Pennsylvania History presents previously unpublished works that are of interest to scholars of the Middle Atlantic region. The Journal also reviews books, exhibits, and other media dealing primarily with Pennsylvania history or that shed significant light on the state's past.

The editors invite the submission of articles dealing with the history of Pennsylvania and the Middle Atlantic region, regardless of their specialty. Prospective authors should review past issues of *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*, where they will note articles in social, intellectual, economic, environmental, political, and cultural history, from the distant and recent past. Articles may investigate new areas of research or may reflect on past scholarship. Material that is primarily of an antiquarian or genealogical nature will not be considered. Please conform to the *Chicago Manual of Style* in preparing your manuscript.

Articles should be submitted online at www.editorialmanager.com/PAH. Authors will need to register, create a profile, and then will be guided through steps to upload manuscripts to the editorial office.

Send books for review and announcements to Beverly Tomek, School of Arts and Sciences, University of Houston-Victoria, 3007 N. Ben Wilson Street, Victoria, TX 77901, tomekb@uhv.edu.

IMPORTANT NOTICES

THE PENNSYLVANIA HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Pennsylvania Historical Association advocates and advances knowledge about the history and culture of Pennsylvania and the mid-Atlantic region, because understanding how the past informs the present helps us shape a better future. PHA achieves this mission by fostering the teaching and study of Pennsylvania history and culture through:

– Publishing *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*,
– Publishing a Study Series on historical topics of interest,
– Hosting an annual conference, and
– Connecting and encouraging the networking of scholars.

For more information visit www.pa-history.org.

On the cover: A satellite view of the Mid-Atlantic region. Courtesy of TerraServer.

INTRODUCTION: DEFINING
THE MID-ATLANTIC REGION

*I*n 1997 *Pennsylvania History* added "A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies" to its masthead. The addition was a convenience, or confession, in recognizing that the journal was publishing articles on subjects beyond the borders of the Commonwealth rather than a conviction that a definable Mid-Atlantic region existed. That question rattled around discussions of the scope and direction of the journal, and indeed even of the Pennsylvania Historical Association, for a time, but nobody fixed on a definition that was definitive. The subtitle thus served more as an invitation to scholars to send along work on "the region," whatever that was, than as any claim to knowing what geographic, demographic, economic, conceptual, or other boundaries such a creature might have. Perhaps, the thinking went, the scholarship that came from such encouragement would settle the matter. In the meantime, any definition of the region remained fluid, and even elusive. It remains so today.

To be sure, many scholars have addressed the question of what a Mid-Atlantic was, and is, and why knowing such would matter. Scholars have variously cast the region as the "motley middle,"

largely for its location between a supposedly discernible and definite New England and South, or as no region at all but rather, in its demographic, religious, and economic diversity, really America in the making from the colonial period through the nineteenth century, or as something else. Whatever it is, or is not, scholars do agree that the Mid-Atlantic lacks the social and cultural cement of a self-conscious regionalism that holds people to place and each other as it does elsewhere. Nobody calls him- or herself a Mid-Atlantian or waves a flag of regional pride. No business brands itself as "Mid-Atlantic" to summon up bonds of loyalty among customers, for the regional label functions only as an indicator of administrative or service reach. Nobody argues how much the Mid-Atlantic is a mentality more than a distinct geographical place, as have scholars measuring the power and persistence of "southern" and "western" identities that survive, and even thrive, across time and space. No proliferation of Mid-Atlantic studies centers populates college/university campuses, as exists for regional studies in the South and West. No one profitably trades on being a Mid-Atlantic artist, or novelist, or comedian, or anything, as some do for other regions in the United States. And so on. Curiously, as the idea of region has gained currency as a way for Americans to order and manage their economic, social, and cultural worlds amid the swirl of globalizing and other forces that threaten the loss of particular identities and control over one's resources, finding and building a Mid-Atlantic identity and interest remains largely on the margins of discussion. One can fairly wonder whether searching for a Mid-Atlantic is a fool's errand.

And yet the term persists. It begs inquiry and explanation as to its form and function, at any time and over time. Thus, this special issue devoted to "Defining the Mid-Atlantic Region."

This special issue offers ways to approach and think about region as a concept and analytical tool and thereby to discover a "Mid-Atlantic," but it makes no promise of a comprehensive exploration into the question or of a consensus on what the Mid-Atlantic was, is, or might be.

What is missing from this issue points to work still needful of inquiry. The purpose here is to pose questions of region and their applicability to a "Mid-Atlantic," to chart directions and boundaries for consideration and investigation, to describe physical and human features that might distinguish a region, and to posit new definitions of region that might include

and encompass a "Mid-Atlantic." It also is to consider the possibility that no Mid-Atlantic exists, or ever existed, except as an intellectual construct. It is, then, as much an invitation as an investigation. And we now invite readers to engage the question.

Randall M. Miller
Saint Joseph's University

Beverly C. Tomek
University of Houston–Victoria

Guest Editors

MID-ATLANTIC COLONIES, R.I.P.

Daniel K. Richter
University of Pennsylvania

Abstract: For the period before 1760, the distinguishing characteristics of a Mid-Atlantic region have always been hard to define. Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware are usually described in terms of social, ethnic, and religious pluralism. But pluralism is inherently problematic as a unifying concept for colonies composed of countless fractious local communities and groups. Other efforts to find coherence are just as vexed by a collection of communities that virtually no one in the seventeenth or early eighteenth century on either side of the ocean seems to have recognized as a region. Recent turns toward continental and Atlantic frameworks for interpreting colonial North American history make unifying factors for these colonies all the more elusive and indeed undermine the entire concept of region as an interpretive category.
Keywords: Mid-Atlantic historiography; Mid-Atlantic Colonies; Quakers, New Netherlands; Pennsylvania; Susquehannocks; Iroquois; Mid-Atlantic region

*E*very few years, historiographers try to discover and define a Mid-Atlantic region for the colonial era. Their essays often begin with a cliché about the "cliché among early American historians that a preponderant share of scholarship has been devoted to New England and the South." Dangerfieldian complaints out of the

way, they usually find a rich literature on New York and Pennsylvania, a far thinner one on Delaware or New Jersey, and an infinitesimal output, except by historiographers themselves, on the region as a whole. Authors lament the difficulty of pinning down the nature of the collectivity that so few have written about, and sometimes they even question whether such a place existed at all in the colonial period.[1] Since the turn of the twenty-first century, these existential questions have become more profound, as the entire concept of region—whether for the Mid-Atlantic or elsewhere in the colonial world—has become increasingly problematic as an analytical category. Yet the zombie idea of the Middle Colonies as a coherent and distinctive region continues to roam the historiographical landscape. It is at last time to put the corpse out of its, and our, misery.[2]

The defining characteristics most often attributed to the Middle Colonies are ones that themselves defy definition, even by the people who lived there. "Who has ever heard citizens of New York, Philadelphia, and Wilmington in joyous affirmation of their common origin as Middle Atlantickers?" historian Richard H. Shryock complained as long ago as 1943. "The phrase is 'merely a geographical expression'." Two decades later, Frederick B. Tolles refused even to go that far. "There is," he complained, "little or nothing about this area that would lead a geographer, looking at a map, to describe it as a region, save that it does lie between two well-defined regions," New England and the Chesapeake. "Perhaps this is why," Tolles concluded, "most historians, desperate to characterize it somehow, can only in the end refer to its 'middleness.'"[3] With this, Shryock's and Tolles's few scholarly predecessors would have agreed. What is generally regarded as the first monograph on the middle colonies, John Fiske's *The Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America* (1899), in the best late-nineteenth-century just-the-facts-ma'am fashion, makes few generalizations at all. The next scholarly foray (and virtually the only one before Tolles's time), T. J. Wertenbaker's *The Founding of American Civilization: The Middle Colonies* (1939), was less interested in the region as a region than in how, "in the Middle Colonies the heterodox character of the population, the diversity of economic conditions, the isolation of certain racial groups from their mother countries, created[d] the perfect laboratory for observing a new civilization in the process of formation."[4]

The diversity of that laboratory allowed a multiculturally inclined generation of historians that followed Wertenbaker and Tolles to posit something more than "middleness" to set these colonies apart. As Douglas Greenberg put it in 1979, "social diversity and ethnic-religious pluralism

were the Middle Colonies' mark of distinction," along with "a political life [that] assumes the aspect of a mystery novel."[5] But, try as historians might, there was no single political mystery novel to be found, any more than there was a single social or ethnic-religious order that unified diverse middleness. Or so it appears from Alan Tully's careful comparison of the politics of New York and Pennsylvania, which concentrates on the inherently fragmenting realms of localism, factionalism, and self-interest. New York and Pennsylvania were, Tully concludes, societies where "the primary political arena for all but a few upper-level placemen was the provincial one, where imperial ties could best be exploited or circumvented in the interest of North American concerns," concerns that almost never crossed provincial boundaries to encompass anything like a coherent region.[6]

Diversity and pluralism and mystery, then, are concepts without form and void, weak glues to meld varied communities into a regional whole. They adhere no better at smaller provincial levels. In what remains one of the few serious studies of early New Jersey politics, Brendan McConville finds inhabitants unable to agree on anything, not even something as basic as "the origins and nature of property." At best, a form of tribalism he labels "ethnodeference" cut across divided "ethnic and religious groups" who "refused to acknowledge the authority of a culturally alien gentry."[7] Similarly, John Smolenski's analysis of the "creolization" of Pennsylvania society finds little resembling a happy mélange of European, Native, and African cultures. Instead, Smolenski portrays the transmogrification of one of many transplanted cultures—English Quakerism—into a distinct North American variant that satisfied neither its creators nor the many minorities who comprised the fragmented non-Quaker majority.[8] From a completely different perspective, Jack D. Marietta and G. S. Rowe find evidence of pluralism's dysfunctions in Pennsylvania's extraordinarily high crime rate, a rate that apparently set it apart from New York and other provinces in and outside the Mid-Atlantic zone.[9]

The incoherence evident at the provincial level extends downward to localities as well. Rural and inland communities tended to be monochromatic enclaves rather than rainbowed melting pots.[10] The cities where peoples, religions, and commerce mixed most jarringly may have stumbled into some sense of order by the late eighteenth century, but in earlier decades they were, as Serena Zabin says of New York City, "dangerous economies." "The transience of the city's people, its goods, and its fortunes," she notes, "created a notably fluid social hierarchy, a structure that did not do away

with distinctions of status but made it difficult to establish one's own status or verify another's." New York was a city poised to release violence at almost any time, as it did in the pogrom against free and enslaved African Americans that followed a series of mysterious fires in 1741.[11] Even such a relatively small node of mixture as Carlisle, Pennsylvania, "had an infamous reputation as a disorderly place," writes Judith Ridner. The town, she says, "sat in-between regions and cultures," marking "a contested space between east and west, north and south, Europe and America, and European and Native American."[12] Meanwhile, in massively larger Philadelphia, diverse groups of inhabitants virtually gave up on collective governance in favor of voluntary associations that epitomized not just the chaotic diversity of the Mid-Atlantic but the lack of any broader structures that might have given the city or province, much less the region as a whole, some unity. As Jessica Choppin Roney concludes, "If the city was a vessel, its contents did not meld together, but smashed into and reacted off of one another, retaining their distinctiveness, their individual trajectories." This non–melting pot "was a city born and governed not out of brotherly love but a vigorous spirit of opposition."[13]

It is hard to find anything like a regional identity in such localized tales spun from diverse private interests, fragmented communities, and weak provincial governments. And whatever broader coherence that may have emerged in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries did little to set Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware apart from Britain's other North American colonies. Thus Richard Beeman finds unity in diversity *everywhere* in British North America, not just in the colonies usually labeled Mid-Atlantic. On a parallel track, those who subscribe to John Murrin's concept of "Anglicization" trace a common eighteenth-century process whereby diverse British colonies "developed similar features and beliefs, not by copying one another . . . but by imitating the mother country." Anglicization is, as Murrin's student Andrew Shankman concludes, "a synthesis useful and compelling" for New York and Pennsylvania, but it is equally useful for Massachusetts (to which Murrin first applied the concept), Virginia, South Carolina, and elsewhere. "The colonists by 1760 inhabited a world that offered them three targets of political loyalty: their province; the continent, or 'America'; and the empire," Murrin explains. "Province and empire outweighed America in every respect." And, one might add, region hardly figured at all. Historians such as Brendan McConville and Owen Stanwood also emphasize transregional Anglicizing themes, most notably the unifying British symbols of a Protestant king and virulent anti-Catholicism.

Both authors are well attuned to local differences in the way those themes played out, but neither identifies much that would collectively set New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware apart from other provinces of British North America. From a very different perspective, Jack P. Greene similarly characterizes whatever "distinctive sociocultural configurations" marked the Middle Colonies as essentially "variations" on a general "developmental model" first developed in the Chesapeake colonies.[14]

If regional identity is to be found, then, it must reside in other registers. One possibility might be that old and still productive perennial of economic historians: the staple thesis. As summarized in the classic work of John J. McCusker and Russell R. Menard, the thesis posits a system in which "colonists can maximize income by producing resource-intensive goods for an external market." This "strategy leads to regional specialization within colonies, with the particulars determined by the interaction of local resources and metropolitan demand." Thus the Chesapeake region came to be defined by its reliance on staple tobacco, the West Indies on sugar, and so on. In this framework, the staple of the English Mid-Atlantic was foodstuffs, and it is undeniable that the export of food produced on small farms predominated nearly everywhere. Yet what eighteenth-century Philadelphians called "the provision trade" was as diverse as the Mid-Atlantic colonies' populations and never reducible to a single commodity such as wheat. And so that trade, like other supposedly defining characteristics, divided more than united the region. Cathy Matson's and Thomas Doerflinger's standard studies of merchants in New York and Philadelphia, respectively, explicate not only intense rivalries for control of a variety of coastal and West Indian trades but also the very different ways in which the two cities' merchant communities and economic systems were organized. The rival ports had distinct hinterlands and exploited overlapping but not contiguous catchment areas, and neither area confined itself to what is usually termed the Mid-Atlantic. New York's involved much of New England, including the ports of Boston and Providence. Particularly after 1750, Philadelphia's drew increasingly on wheat suppliers from Maryland and Virginia.[15]

All of these difficulties in identifying markers of regionality lead Wayne Bodle to argue that historians should "dispense altogether with the idea of regions as contiguous bundles of *characteristics*—whether identical, substantially similar, or merely comparable." Instead they should "concentrate on regions as loci of interactive behavior."[16] The founding English Mid-Atlantic behavioral locus was the Duke of York's conquest of Dutch New

Netherland in 1664. A project of the Dutch West India Company, New Netherland welcomed—or at least put up with—a motley collection of colonists from continental Europe and the British Isles and elsewhere, along with substantial numbers of enslaved Africans. This accidental mélange bequeathed later English colonies their famous pluralism. Meanwhile, the West India Company never clearly decided if New Netherland's defining purpose was agricultural settlement or trade with Native people, contributing further to the region's many diversities. Whatever the case, New Netherland's hopes rested on the potential of two great river systems, the Hudson and the Delaware. Each led to the heartland of the Dutch colony's principal Native American trading partner, the Haudenosaunee, or Iroquois Five Nations. The far-flung Haudenosaunee networks of trade, warfare, and diplomacy, intersecting with the trading and settlement patterns of the Dutch, Bodle convincingly argues, set the terms for English colonization along the Mid-Atlantic coast during the postconquest period.[17]

But none of this occurred in a linear fashion or in a unifying direction. Instead fragmentation immediately set in. Under the royal patent that authorized his conquest, James, Duke of York, became proprietor of what was dubbed New York. Even before the conquest of 1664 was accomplished, however, James spun off what a few years later devolved into East and West New Jersey to courtiers George Carteret and John, Lord Berkeley. James's brother Charles II carved out Pennsylvania for William Penn in 1681, and the Three Lower Counties on the Delaware gradually assumed their ambiguously separate status in subsequent years. Those years saw a Dutch reconquest of New Netherland in 1673 and then a return of the region to the English in 1674. In this tangled way, what Bodle calls "interactive behavior" became shared experience. According to Ned Landsman, then, "perhaps the most important argument for the coherence of the Mid-Atlantic as a region is the extent to which those colonies shared a common history."[18]

From that common history, Bodle sees a Mid-Atlantic region emerging, in deed if not in word or landscape. It was "a *fabricated* spatial and cultural entity, one erected—to a degree perhaps unique in early American experience—by identifiable parties, agents, and interests from the rubble left by . . . imperial consolidation and colonial reorganization." People and things moved up and down the river systems, creating a network of alliances among otherwise disparate communities. "Formal legal or political boundaries . . . had little capacity to constrain many of the activities that most deeply shaped their identities: marriage, migration, economic exchange, or social opportunity."

As polities, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware claimed few permanent loyalties, because "the formal *political* boundaries of the Middle Atlantic colonies never came close to containing or constraining even the high politics of their constituent provinces, much less the underlying socioeconomic structural foundations on which we now presume 'politics' to lie."[19]

There is much to Bodle's argument, and, as his essay in this issue contends, for the mid- to late eighteenth century, it may even be persuasive. But for earlier periods, the Mid-Atlantic's historical and geographical coherence, and distinctiveness, remain as elusive as its provincial and political boundaries. As much as Dutch and Native American experiences shaped New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, they also shaped developments elsewhere in eastern North America. The historical tentacles of New Netherland stretched far beyond the Mid-Atlantic coast. In Virginia, the first recorded enslaved Africans arrived in 1619 on an English privateer flying a Dutch flag under letters of marque issued by the Prince of Orange. More important, before the 1660s most of the enslaved Africans who toiled anywhere in North America arrived in Dutch ships, which also carried much of the Chesapeake's tobacco to Europe; the Chesapeake, no less than points northward, developed on a Dutch substrate. The thousands of Africans and their descendants who comprised 15 percent of New York City's early eighteenth-century population and who labored on farms and what large operators revealingly called *plantations* in Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey knew that well.[20]

So, too, though they seldom dared admit it, did New Englanders. Dutch traders introduced Plymouth colonists to the wampum trade and supplied most of the goods they exchanged with Native people in the colony's earliest years. Contests between the English and Dutch over control of commerce with Indians and of trading posts on the Connecticut River helped spark the Pequot War of 1637. The intertwining of Mid-Atlantic and southern New England affairs continued through the English conquest of 1664, which was focused as much on rebellious Massachusetts as on pesky New Netherland; the same English officers who seized New Amsterdam also held royal commissions to investigate New England Puritans' alleged misbehavior. Moreover, the Duke of York's charter included lands that surrounded New England, on the north through Maine and on the south through Long Island, Martha's Vineyard, and Nantucket. The pincers closed in 1685 when the entire region was incorporated into the Dominion of New England. It dissolved back into its various constituent fragments only when James's reign ended with the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89.[21]

Like the shared experiences of Dutch, English, and African peoples, interactions between Native people and Europeans also refused to be confined to the colonies called Middle or to neatly defined Hudson and Delaware river systems. Only on the upper reaches of the Hudson, at what became the city of Albany, did Dutch-Iroquois relations predominate in New Netherland. Downriver, near Manhattan, Algonquian Munsee-speaking Native people lived in nearly constant friction with the people and government of Manhattan and points adjacent on both banks of the Hudson. On Long Island, meanwhile, the European population was largely English rather than Dutch and, unlike their compatriots across the sound in Connecticut, coexisted relatively peacefully with Algonquian groups.[22]

To the west and south, Algonquian Lenape-speaking peoples dominated both sides of the Delaware River well into the post-English conquest period, and, until the mid-1670s, the major Iroquoian-speaking power was not the Haudenosaunee but the Susquehannocks. Their homeland was in the next river system to the west of the Delaware, the eponymous Susquehanna. That waterway empties into Chesapeake Bay, bringing English Maryland into the same interaction sphere as the portion of New Netherland that had originally been known as New Sweden. After the Dutch conquered the Swedes in 1655, Europeans in the Delaware River watershed were governed not by the West India Company but by the city of Amsterdam, from its North American capital at New Amstel, introducing further fragmentation. With the English conquest, New Amstel became New Castle, first as part of the duke's province and later as seat of one of William Penn's Three Lower Counties. If the jumbled European history of Delaware epitomized regional noncoherence, so too did that of its Susquehannock neighbors. Virtually conquered by the Haudenosaunee in the mid-1670s, they relocated to Maryland and points southward, where they found themselves in a war with Virginians that led to the political conflagration known as Bacon's Rebellion.[23] The disunited European and Native peoples of what we know as the Mid-Atlantic thus indeed shared a tangled and complicated history, but they shared it with many others in eastern North America as well.

Not surprisingly, before the mid-eighteenth century, few, if any, of those peoples imagined that they lived in something called a "Mid-Atlantic region" or "the Middle Colonies." It is of course difficult to prove the absence of something, particularly something as slippery as geographic consciousness.[24] Yet it is significant that keyword searches in several major databases of pre-1763 sources yield hits for only a single set of publications, Philadelphian

Lewis Evans's *A General Map of the Middle British Colonies in America* and its related book, both published in the 1750s. Evans's definition of the Middle Colonies, however, was not exactly the one that later took hold; it included *Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Pensilvania, New-Jersey, New-York, Connecticut and Rhode-Island*, as well as *Aquanishuonigy, the Country of the Confederate Indians*.[25] The contemporary invisibility of a Mid-Atlantic region is also visible in another, earlier map, the marvelously jumbled frontispiece to Nathaniel Crouch's 1685 compendium, *The English Empire in America*. No clear colonial boundaries, much less sharp regional divisions, appear there at all; the word "Philadelphia" nestles between "Virginia" and "Mariland," while "N. York" hugs the coast and "New England" sits well inland, apparently under assault from Native people and a very large moose.[26]

Crouch's geographical imprecision was shared at the highest levels of metropolitan officialdom. In 1697 the president of the Board of Trade, John Egerton, Third Earl of Bridgewater, scrawled some notes during meetings devoted to a proposal to remerge the government of New York with those of the New England colonies. On one occasion, after inexplicably jotting that "Bosston is the Best place," he noted that "new yorke is not under the title of newIngland," before lumping together in a single list

Road Island
province: of main=
& the Jerseys

Two days after this unsuccessful effort to wrap his mind around a North American geography where Maine and New Jersey cohabited, Bridgewater again had to remind himself that "new yorke is of itt selfe & not in new IngLand." Wherever New York was, it was not in some place called the "Middle Colonies."[27]

The absence of contemporary regional consciousness and experiential distinctiveness led Michael Zuckerman to declare in 1982 that the Mid-Atlantic's sense of itself was all but inseparable from that of the continent as a whole. "From the first," said Zuckerman, "the people of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York acted under conditions of cultural pluralism that only came to characterize the rest of the country in the nineteenth century." Same too with "religious liberty, partisan environments, economic ethics of legitimate self-interest" and countless other traits. "The Middle Atlantic did

FIGURE 1: This late-seventeenth-century map suggests the absence of any clear concept of a Middle Colonies region. R. B. [Nathaniel Crouch], *The English Empire in America: Or A prospect of His Majesties Dominions in the West-Indies* (London, 1685), frontispiece. Courtesy of the Library Company of Philadelphia.

not need a special history," he concluded, placing a positive spin on the what Shryock had lamented. The void existed "because 'American' history was so nearly the history of the Middle Atlantic configuration writ large."[28] More recently, Landsman echoes that "the Middle Colonies . . . may have been the region that best represented the diversity of American society." The region's lack of a strong sense of its own identity made it "all the more possible to extend the region's principal characteristics beyond its borders," with the result that "already by the second half of the eighteenth century, European observers and American writers were looking to the Mid-Atlantic region for the answer to the question, 'What is the American?'"[29]

The first framer of that question was J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, who, in *Letters from an American Farmer*, adopted the literary pose of a Pennsylvanian. But he never actually lived in Penn's Woods. Born in Normandy, he subsequently lived in New France before taking up residence in Orange County, New York, where between 1769 and 1779 he compiled the journals on which *Letters* was based. He wrote the book itself in France, to which he had fled during the American Revolution, as evoked in the final chapter, entitled "Distresses of a Frontier Man." After the Peace of Paris in 1783, Crèvecoeur returned to North America for two stints as Louis XVI's consul to New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, before resettling permanently on a farm near Paris. This man who was born and died in France, who lived in New France and New York, who posed as a Pennsylvanian and "A Frontier Man," also happened to have a son who emigrated to New Jersey. What better exemplar could there be of the indistinctness of the Mid-Atlantic colonies, the porousness of their borders, and the elusiveness of the fabricators of their supposed identities?[30]

Crèvecoeur's identifications with Paris and "the Frontier" are particularly noteworthy in light of recent historiography that tries to transcend the implied exceptionalism of the word "American" by employing instead the broader frames called "Atlantic" and "continental."[31] Each perspective replaces narrow regional close-ups with wider-angle lenses that, almost necessarily, blur regional particularities even for areas more keenly resolved than Britain's coastal colonies.

It may no longer be true, if it ever was, that "We are all Atlanticists now," as David Armitage proclaimed in 2002. Still, Atlanticist goggles have become inevitable for the colonies between New England and Maryland, given their roots in the epochally Atlantic trading activities of the Dutch West India Company, their history of conquest by the rising English Atlantic empire,

and their economies anchored by great port cities, through which goods and people flowed in and out from Europe, the Caribbean, and Africa. Adopting what Armitage calls a "circum-Atlantic" perspective—envisioning "a particular zone of exchange and interchange, circulation and transmission"—is especially valuable for understanding the ethnic and religious diversity associated with New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.[32] An Atlantic framework for understanding both Dutch and later English governmental responses to religious diversity and toleration, for example, allows Evan Haefeli to make sense of things in ways no scholar rooted in North America alone could. Similarly, religious developments among Moravians, Lutherans, radical German Anabaptists, Ulster Scots, and others of various levels of zealotry achieve new clarity through the Atlantic-oriented scholarship of Aaron Fogleman, Katherine Engel, Gregory Roeber, Philip Otterness, and Patrick Griffin.[33] Yet the more one understands about the ongoing Atlantic connections of these groups—Moravians and Lutherans went to the Carolinas and Georgia, and Ulster Scots went nearly everywhere—the less their experiences appear in any way distinctively Mid-Atlantic. The nonregion becomes more a receptacle than a crucible of diversity.

Something similar occurs with what Armitage calls "cis-Atlantic" scholarship—which "studies particular places as unique locations within an Atlantic world and seeks to define that uniqueness as the result of in the interaction between local particularity and a wider web of connections."[34] For historians such as Sarena Zabin, Christian Koot, and Daniel Hulsebosch, attention to New York's networks of trade and politics explains the seeming chaos of the city, the enduring resistance of the area's merchants to imperial trade regulations, and the ways in which empire was defined at the periphery as much as from the imperial center. But this is to portray New York as an Atlantic example, rather than as a distinctive Mid-Atlantic regional phenomenon. Tellingly, Zabin encourages her readers to consider "New Yorkers as Britons living on the edge of empire rather than incipient American citizens"; Koot begins his study of *Empire at the Periphery* by pairing turn-of-the-eighteenth-century engravings of New York City and Bridgetown, Barbados; and Hulsebosch places New York "on the edge of a vast ocean marketplace," a position that made it "much like Bristol, its trading partner on the west coast of England." Hulsebosch also compares New York to Georgia and to Massachusetts, after each, like New York, came under royal government.[35] New Jersey and Delaware, with their indirect imperial rule through proprietary governments,

and proprietary Pennsylvania, with its Quaker-dominated lack of any formal military establishment, do not so easily compare.

So New York as an Atlantic city no longer seems in any meaningful way part of a Mid-Atlantic region, and even the "middleness" to which Tolles clung slips away. When Gotham assumes its rightful place on the western periphery of the Atlantic, then, the modifier "mid-" must necessarily migrate well east from the coast of North America to attach itself to some other place more truly in the center of the Atlantic world. New Yorkers might like to have thought of themselves as dwelling "in the navel of his majestyes Territory," but Bermuda had a stronger case for floating "almost in the middle of the King's dominions in America" and "in the eye of all trade," the true Mid-Atlantic.[36]

If the New Netherland roots of New York and its neighbors draw an Atlantic lens, their Iroquoian origins demand a continental, North American scope.[37] From such a perspective, New York City and Philadelphia appear not in the middle but on the periphery of a landscape that the Iroquois and Susquehannocks dominated from the headwaters of the Hudson, Delaware, and Susquehanna river systems. For that landscape, the English conquest of 1664 may have been less transformative than the Iroquois conquests in their mid-century wars, which displaced, killed, and took captive thousands of people from the St. Lawrence Valley, the Great Lakes region, the Ohio and Mississippi watersheds, and the Appalachian highlands. Even more significant were unintended conquests by European viral diseases, which created what Robbie Ethridge and Sheri Shuck-Hall call a "shatter zone" across much of eastern North America and drove the Iroquois and others to ever-widening campaigns to restock their populations with captive people. Firearms, metal weapons, and other trade goods entered this Native continent from Atlantic peripheries at New York and Philadelphia, but they also did so from Charleston, New Orleans, Montreal, and other places that belied Mid-Atlantic distinctiveness.[38] Judgment about where this Native continent's center might be found depends on where the historical lens is focused and for which decade it is calibrated. Perhaps the middle was Iroquoia; perhaps Anishanaabewaki in the Great Lakes region; perhaps Creek country in the Southeast; perhaps the Arkansas valley or Comancheria, closer to the continental heartland; perhaps North America's literal geographical center in what is today North Dakota, the land the Mandans called "the heart of the world."[39] It was certainly not Philadelphia or New York, whose only middleness lies in their location between Mandan country and Bermuda.

That kind of middleness, however, does provide a focal point to merge continental and Atlantic lenses into a binocular image.[40] As Landsman observes, "the Middle Colonies are well suited to combining these approaches" because "the Mid-Atlantic region was itself the creation of a series of contests for power and position in eastern North America, involving a succession of European and Indian nations and empires as well as powerful commercial companies." The appeal of the Mid-Atlantic as a "Crossroads of Empire" seems nowhere more compelling than in efforts to understand the complicated stew of global and continental forces that combined during the eighteenth century to produce the Seven Years' War. After all, in 1754 in what is now western Pennsylvania, a Native American named Tanaghrisson, accompanying an ill-trained force of British-American provincials, killed a Frenchman named Joseph Coulon de Villers de Jumonville and ignited a conflict between Britain and France for control of the continent and of much of the broader world.[41] A shelf-full of brilliant studies finds in the region where Jumonville died the origins not just of global war but also of the racial formations that shaped Native and Euro-American interactions for decades to come. Iconic book titles tell the tales on continental, Atlantic, and human scales: *The Middle Ground*, *Into the American Woods*, *Promised Land*, and *Breaking the Backcountry*; *At the Crossroads*, *Elusive Empires*, *Crucible of War*, and *American Leviathan*; *Friends and Enemies in Penn's Woods*, *Our Savage Neighbors*, *The Texture of Contact*, and *Setting all the Captives Free*.[42]

Each of these books explores additional answers to the question, "What is the American?" and returns in new ways to Zuckerman's "history of the Middle Atlantic configuration writ large." American, yes, but Mid-Atlantic, not so much. Jumonville's Glen lies between the Youghiogheny and Monongahela rivers, roughly 350 miles west of any ocean shore. The provincial troops whom Tanaghrisson accompanied were from Virginia, led by George Washington, no one's idea of a Middle Atlanticker. And if the territories where they fought were unquestionably a vital, if not exactly Mid-Atlantic, "crossroads of empire," so too were other places, among them the Lake George–Lake Champlain corridor, New Orleans and the lower Mississippi Valley, and the Gulf Coast.[43] So we are back not just to Americanness but to porous boundarylessness.

The problem may be less with the concept of a Mid-Atlantic region—which, at least since the days of Tolles and Greenberg, has been recognized as an interpretive fiction—but with the analytical concept of region more generally, a concept that continental and Atlantic perspectives each tend

to erase.[44] In the 1970s, much less in the 1890s, almost no one would have questioned Greenberg's assumption that the Mid-Atlantic sat between two British colonial regions that had distinctive identities.[45] Yet, in the 2010s, thanks to a generation of scholarship written through continental and Atlantic lenses, few would argue for anything as simple as the old regional dichotomies between *Puritans and Adventurers*, between *Religion and Profit*, between uniquely New England *Peaceable Kingdoms* and a distinctive *Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* through which the paradox of *American Slavery, American Freedom* revealed itself. Historian T. H. Breen thus followed his brilliant 1980 collection of essays contrasting *Puritans and Adventurers* in New England and the Chesapeake with an equally brilliant 1986 essay uniting of both regions in "An Empire of Goods," and then a 2004 survey of *Colonial America in an Atlantic World* coauthored with Timothy Hall. Meantime, Ira Berlin, April Hatfield, and John Coombs made it impossible to consider English enslavement of Africans in any way a distinctively Virginian ordeal.[46]

Recent historians also remind us that Virginia had "Eschatological Origins" nearly rivaling New England's and that, at least rhetorically, there were such a thing as *Puritan Conquistadors*. Fittingly, then, *Religion and Profit* has become the title not of a comparison of the New England and Chesapeake regions but of a transatlantic study of Moravian communities in Pennsylvania. Region plays almost no analytical role in any of these recent works. Authors zoom in and out from the local to the continental or oceanic, with no loss of fidelity to the complexities or generalities of the human experiences they explore.[47]

If—despite very real differences between local places—the distinctions between New England and the Chesapeake blur when seen through Atlantic and continental lenses, what then can set a Mid-Atlantic region distinctively apart, and what analytical work can region do? Pennsylvania's radical German sectaries demonstrate that New England held no monopoly on religious zealotry. Delaware's and New Jersey's plantations show that "the south" was not the only place that exploited enslaved agricultural labor. Penn's Woods' killing fields during the Seven Years' War belie fantasies of mid-Atlantic racial harmony. Even the nonregion's ethnic pluralism appears less extraordinary in the context of an everywhere-diverse Atlantic world. Its early politics remained opaque, but perhaps no more so than those of other colonies in their own ways. Even its rivers refused to confine themselves to a regional frame; as waters are wont to do, they gathered from diverse points in the continental interior

and spilled outward into the Atlantic. In this and other ways, nature always reminded residents that little inherently distinguished the area from points to the north and south; assaults by both nor'easters and hurricanes blew the message home. Other essays in this issue may argue that a human-fabricated Mid-Atlantic region later came into existence, but in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries there was no such place. Rest in peace, Middle Colonies.

NOTES

1. Douglas Greenberg, "The Middle Colonies in Recent American Historiography," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 36 (1979): 396–427 (quotation appears on p. 396); Michael Zuckerman, "Puritans, Cavaliers, and the Motley Middle," in *Friends and Neighbors: Group Life in America's First Plural Society*, ed. Zuckerman (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982), 3–25; Robert J. Gough, "The Myth of the 'Middle Colonies': An Analysis of Regionalization in Early America," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 107 (1983): 393–419; Wayne Bodle, "The 'Myth of the Middle Colonies' Reconsidered: The Process of Regionalization in Early America," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 113 (1989): 527–48; Bodle, "Themes and Directions in Middle Colonies Historiography, 1980–1994," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 51 (1994): 355–88; Bodle, "The Fabricated Region: On the Insufficiency of 'Colonies' for Understanding American Colonial History," *Early American Studies* 1 (2003): 1–27; Ned Landsman, "Prologue: Region and History," and "Essay on Sources," in Landsman, *Crossroads of Empire: The Middle Colonies in British North America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010), 1–7, 223–32.

2. I make this assertion despite proudly directing the McNeil Center for Early American Studies, which "facilitates scholarly inquiry into the histories and cultures of North America in the Atlantic world before 1850, with a particular but by no means exclusive emphasis on the Mid-Atlantic region" (http://www.mceas.org/about.shtml, accessed February 25, 2015). I also make this assertion acknowledging a debt to my friends and colleagues Wayne Bodle and Ned Landsman, who kindly offered their contrary thoughts on a draft of this essay, and Jessica Roney, who forced me to think about wheat. Other useful criticism came from generous audiences at Temple University and at the McNeil Center.

3. Richard H. Shryock, "Historical Traditions in Philadelphia and in the Middle Atlantic Area: An Editorial," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 67 (1943): 115–41, quotation appears on pp. 115–16; Frederick B. Tolles, "The Historians of the Middle Colonies," in *The Reinterpretation of Early American History: Essays in Honor of John Edwin Pomfret*, ed. Ray Allen Billington (San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1966), 65–79, quotation appears on p. 66.

4. John Fiske, *The Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America*, 2 vols. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1899); Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, *The Founding of American Civilization: The Middle Colonies* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938), quotation appears on p. 347. It is difficult to pin down when "middle colonies" became a historiographical commonplace. The imperfect measure yield by a "Google Books Ngram" finds no published use of the term before 1910. That is demonstrably

incorrect, yet apparently it was sometime around the turn of the twentieth century when the usage took hold. Samuel Adams Drake published a school text on *The Making of Virginia and the Middle Colonies, 1578–1701* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893), as a companion volume to his books on New England and the West. Perhaps the first scholarly study to include a separate chapter on the region was Emberson Edward Proper, *Colonial Immigration Laws: A Study of the Regulation of Immigration by the English Colonies in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1900), 38–55. By contrast, the two standard early twentieth-century surveys organized themselves by chronology and form of provincial government, rather than by region: Herbert L. Osgood, *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*, 3 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1904–7); Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period in American History*, 4 vols. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1934–38).

5. Greenberg, "Middle Colonies in Recent American Historiography," 398.

6. Alan Tully, *Forming American Politics: Ideals, Interests, and Institutions in Colonial New York and Pennsylvania* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), quotation appears on p. 416.

7. Brendan McConville, *Those Daring Disturbers of the Public Peace: The Struggle for Property and Power in Early New Jersey* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999), quotations appear on pp. 2–4. See also Ned C. Landsman, *Scotland and Its First American Colony, 1683–1765* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985).

8. John Smolenski, *Friends and Strangers: The Making of Creole Culture in Colonial Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010).

9. Jack D. Marietta and G. S. Rowe, *Troubled Experiment: Crime and Justice in Pennsylvania, 1682–1800* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

10. Sally Schwartz, *"A Mixed Multitude": The Struggle for Toleration in Colonial Pennsylvania* (New York: New York University Press, 1987); Donna Merwick, *Possessing Albany, 1630–1710: The Dutch and English Experiences* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

11. Serena R. Zabin, *Dangerous Economies: Status and Commerce in Imperial New York* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), quotations appear on p. 7. See also Jill Lepore, *New York Burning: Liberty, Slavery, and Conspiracy in Eighteenth-Century Manhattan* (New York: Knopf, 2005).

12. Judith Ridner, *A Town In-Between: Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and the Early Mid-Atlantic Interior* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), quotations appear on pp. 3–4.

13. Jessica Choppin Roney, *Governed by a Spirit of Opposition: The Origins of American Political Practice in Colonial Philadelphia* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014), quotation appears on p. 10.

14. Richard R. Beeman, *The Varieties of Political Experience in Eighteenth-Century America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); John M. Murrin, "England and Colonial America: A Novel Theory of the American Revolution," in *Anglicizing America: Empire, Revolution, Republic*, ed. Ignacio Gallup-Diaz, Andrew Shankman, and David J. Silverman (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), 9–19, first quotation appears on p. 11, third quotation appears on p. 15; Shankman, "A Synthesis Useful and Compelling: Anglicization and the Achievement of John M. Murrin," in *Anglicizing America*, ed. Gallup-Diaz, Shankman, and Silverman, 20–56, second quotation appears on p. 20; Brendan McConville, *The King's Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America, 1688–1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Owen Stanwood, *The Empire Reformed: English America in the Age of the Glorious Revolution* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011); Jack P. Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early*

Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 124–51, quotations appear on p. 124.

15. John J. McCusker and Russell R. Menard, *The Economy of British America, 1607–1789* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), esp. 17–34, 189–208 (first and second quotations appear on p. 26); Cathy Matson, *Merchants and Empire: Trading in Colonial New York* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998); Thomas M. Doerflinger, *A Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise: Merchants and Economic Development in Revolutionary Philadelphia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), third quotation appears on p. 97.

16. Bodle, "'Myth of the Middle Colonies' Reconsidered," 548.

17. Bodle, "Fabricated Region," 14–22. On New Netherland, see Oliver A. Rink, *Holland on the Hudson: An Economic and Social History of Dutch New York* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986); and Jaap Jacobs, *New Netherland: A Dutch Colony in Seventeenth-Century America* (Leiden: Brill, 2005). On the Haudenosaunee, see Daniel K. Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992).

18. Bodle, "Themes and Directions," 357–58; Landsman, *Crossroads of Empire*, quotation appears on p. 4.

19. Bodle, "'Myth of the Middle Colonies' Reconsidered," first quotation appears on p. 530; Bodle, "Fabricated Region," second quotation appears on p. 3 and third quotation on p. 9.

20. Engel Sluiter, "New Light on the '20. and Odd Negroes' Arriving in Virginia, August 1619," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 54 (1997): 395–98; David Eltis, "The Volume and Structure of the Transatlantic Slave Trade: A Reassessment," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 58 (2001): 43; Daniel K. Richter, "Dutch Dominos: The Fall of New Netherland and the Reshaping of Eastern North America," in Richter, *Trade, Land, Power: The Struggle for Eastern North America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 97–112.

21. Neal Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England, 1500–1643* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982); Andrew Charles Lipman, "The Saltwater Frontier: Indians, Dutch, and English on Seventeenth-Century Long Island Sound" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2010); Robert C. Ritchie, *The Duke's Province: A Study of New York Politics and Society, 1664–1691* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977).

22. Merwick, *Possessing Albany*; Merwick, *The Shame and the Sorrow: Dutch-Amerindian Encounters in New Netherland* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006); Paul Otto, *The Dutch-Munsee Encounter in America: The Struggle for Sovereignty in the Hudson Valley* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2006); Robert S. Grumet, *The Munsee Indians: A History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009); Tom Arne Midtrød, *The Memory of All Ancient Customs: Native American Diplomacy in the Colonial Hudson Valley* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012).

23. C. A. Weslager, *The English on the Delaware: 1610–1682* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1967); Francis Jennings, *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1984), 1–185; Amy C. Schutt, *Peoples of the River Valleys: The Odyssey of the Delaware Indians* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 1–59; Cynthia J. Van Zandt, *Brothers among Nations: The Pursuit of Intercultural Alliances in Early America, 1580–1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); Jean Soderlund, *Lenape Country: Delaware Valley Society Before William Penn* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014); James D. Rice, "Bacon's Rebellion in Indian Country," *Journal of American History* 101

(2014): 726–50; Matthew Kruer, "'Our Time of Anarchy': Bacon's Rebellion and the Wars of the Susquehannocks, 1675–1682" (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2015).

24. As Bodle observes, "we still know almost nothing in a systematic way about the spatial consciousness of early Americans" ("Fabricated Region," 3). The lack of contemporary recognition that there was such a place as the Mid-Atlantic helped Robert J. Gough to posit a "Myth of the 'Middle Colonies'" that, he said, "may obscure more than clarify" profound local and provincial distinctions. Instead, he argued, there were two distinct Mid-Atlantics. On the one hand were "New York, parts of western Connecticut, eastern New Jersey, and the northeast corner of Pennsylvania." On the other were "most of Pennsylvania, part of Maryland, and all of western New Jersey and Delaware." The first was oriented more toward New England, the second toward the South; more fundamentally, differences in soils, climate, settlement patterns, politics, and countless other factors, he argued, made the two Middle Atlantics more different than alike (Gough, "Myth of the 'Middle Colonies,'" 393–419, quotations appear on pp. 393–94). More different than alike, surely, but dividing the region into two imposes little more order on the many local characteristics that resist any coalescence.

25. *A General Map of the Middle British Colonies in America, viz.: Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Pensilvania, New-Jersey, New-York, Connecticut and Rhode-Island, of Aquanishuonigy, the Country of the Confederate Indians . . . of the Lakes Erie, Ontario and Champlain and Part of New France* (London, 1756); Lewis Evans, *Geographical, Historical, Political, Philosophical and Mechanical Essays, The First, Containing an Analysis of a General Map of the Middle British Colonies in America . . .* , 2 editions, the 2d in 2 states (Philadelphia, 1755). "Middle colonies," "'middle' and 'colonies,'" and "'middle' and 'America'" returned no other relevant hits in keyword searches for works between 1660 and 1763 in *Early English Books Online; Eighteenth-Century Collections Online; Early American Imprints, Series I Evans*; and *Colonial State Papers* (all accessed through the University of Pennsylvania Libraries, March 2–3, 2015). The term "middle colonies" does begin to appear in printed North American texts after the Seven Years' War; there are ten hits between 1768 and 1776: *A Collection of Tracts from the Late News Papers, &c. . . .* (New York: 1768), 430; *Votes and Proceedings of the House of Representatives of the Province of Pennsylvania . . .* (Philadelphia, 1769), 20; *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 1 (1771): 266, 274; *Directions for Breeding Silk-worms, Extracted from a Letter of Joseph Ottolenghe . . .* (Philadelphia, 1771), 3; Benjamin Rush, *An Address to the Inhabitants of the British Settlements in America, upon Slave-Keeping* (Philadelphia, 1773), 36; *The Substance of the Evidence on the Petition Presented by the West-India Planters and Merchants, to the Hon. House of Commons . . . 16th of March, 1775* (New York, 1775), 5, 44, 45, 48, 51, 53–54; James Chalmers, *Plain Truth; Addressed to the Inhabitants of America . . .* (Philadelphia, 1776), 100, 131; Chalmers, *Additions to Plain Truth . . .* (Philadelphia, 1776), 100; *Proceedings of the Provincial Conference of Committees, of the Province of Pennsylvania . . .* (Philadelphia, 1776), 20; John Morgan, *A Recommendation of Inoculation, According to Baron Dimsdale's Method* (Boston, 1776), preface pp. 9, 13, and text pp. 11, 15.

26. R. B. [Nathaniel Crouch], *The English Empire in America* (London, 1685), frontispiece.

27. Notes, 1, February 4, 1697, Papers of John Egerton, Third Earl of Bridgewater, 1594–1700, EL 9652, Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

28. Zuckerman, "Puritans, Cavaliers, and the Motley Middle," 5–6.

29. Landsman, *Crossroads of Empire*, 1–2.

30. J. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer* (London, 1782); Katherine Emerson, "Crèvecoeur, J. Hector St. John de," *American National Biography Online*, http://www.anb.org/articles/16/16-00853.html, accessed February 9, 2015.

31. Landsman, *Crossroads of Empire*, 2.

32. David Armitage, "Three Concepts of Atlantic History," in *The British Atlantic World, 1500–1800*, ed. David Armitage and Michael J. Braddick (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 11–27, quotations appear on pp. 11, 16. For general introductions to what has become a vast field, see Bernard Bailyn, *Atlantic History: Concept and Contours* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005); and Jack P. Greene and Philip D. Morgan, eds., *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009). For discussions of Atlantic history's limitations, see Philip J. Stern, "British Asia and British Atlantic: Comparisons and Connections," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 63 (2006): 693–712; Peter A. Coclanis, "Atlantic World or Atlantic/World" *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 63 (2006): 725–42; Alison Games, *The Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560–1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

33. Aaron Fogleman, *Hopeful Journeys: German Immigration, Settlement, and Political Culture in Colonial America, 1717–1775* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996); Fogleman, *Jesus Is Female: Moravians and the Challenge of Radical Religion in Early America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); Katherine Carté Engel, *Religion and Profit: Moravians in Early America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009); A. G. Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property: German Lutherans in Colonial British America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998); Philip Otterness, *Becoming German: The 1709 Palatine Migration to New York* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004); Patrick Griffin, *The People with No Name: Ireland's Ulster Scots, America's Scots Irish, and the Creation of a British Atlantic World, 1689–1764* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001).

34. Armitage, "Three Concepts of Atlantic History," 21.

35. Zabin, *Dangerous Economies*; Christian J. Koot, *Empire at the Periphery: British Colonists, Anglo-Dutch Trade, and the Development of the British Atlantic, 1621–1713* (New York: New York University Press, 2011), 1; Daniel J. Hulsebosch, *Constituting Empire: New York and the Transformation of Constitutionalism in the Atlantic World, 1664–1830* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 2–3. On empire as defined from the periphery, see Jack P. Greene, *Peripheries and Center: Constitutional Development in the Extended Polities of the British Empire and the United States, 1607–1788* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986); David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000); and Christine Daniels and Michael V. Kennedy, eds., *Negotiated Empires: Centers and Peripheries in the Americas, 1500–1820* (New York: Routledge, 2002).

36. Richard Wharton to ?, September 24, 1673, CO 1/30, no. 66, The National Archives, Kew (first quotation); Isaac Richier to Lords of Trade and Plantations, February 4, 1693, J. W. Fortescue, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and the West Indies, January, 1693–14 May, 1696* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1908), 14 (second quotation); Michael J. Jarvis, *In the Eye of All Trade: Bermuda, Bermudians, and the Maritime Atlantic World, 1680–1783* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 4 (third quotation), and see also the Bermuda-centered map of the Atlantic, 3.

37. James Axtell, "A North American Perspective for Colonial History," *History Teacher* 12 (1979): 549–62. For subsequent discussions, see Daniel K. Richter, *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); Alan Taylor, *American Colonies* (New York: Viking, 2001); Paul W. Mapp, "Atlantic History from Imperial, Continental, and Pacific Perspectives," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 63 (2006): 713–24; Claudio Saunt, "Go West: Mapping Early American Historiography," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 65 (2008): 745–78; Eric Hinderaker and Rebecca Horn, "Territorial Crossings: Histories and Historiographies of the Early Americas," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 67 (2010): 395–432; and Michael Witgen, "Rethinking Colonial History as Continental History," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 69 (2012): 527–30.

38. Richter, *Ordeal of the Longhouse*, 50–189; José António Brandão,"*Your Fyre Shall Burn No More": Iroquois Policy Towards New France and its Native Allies to 1701* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997); Daniel P. Barr, *Unconquered: The Iroquois League at War in Colonial America* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2006); Paul Kelton, *Epidemics and Enslavement: Biological Catastrophe in the Native Southeast, 1492–1715* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007); Robbie Ethridge and Sheri M. Shuck-Hall, eds., *Mapping the Mississippian Shatter Zone: The Colonial Indian Slave Trade and Regional Instability in the American South* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009); Christina Snyder, *Slavery in Indian Country: The Changing Face of Captivity in Early America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010).

39. "View from Sault Ste. Marie, Map 8," in *Atlas of Great Lakes Indian History*, ed. Helen Hornbeck Tanner (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), 36; Michael Witgen, *An Infinity of Nations: How the Native New World Shaped Early North America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011); Joshua Piker, *Okfuskee: A Creek Indian Town in Colonial America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004); Kathleen DuVal, *The Native Ground: Indians and Colonists in the Heart of the Continent* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006); Pekka Hämäläinen, *The Comanche Empire* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008); Elizabeth A. Fenn, *Encounters at the Heart of the World: A History of the Mandan People* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2014).

40. Axtell's original formulation explicitly married what we now call continental and Atlantic perspectives ("North American Perspective for Colonial History," 550–51). Nonetheless, many scholars since have questioned the possibility of doing so. For varied positions, see Mapp, "Atlantic History from Imperial, Continental, and Pacific Perspectives"; Paul Cohen, "Was There an Amerindian Atlantic? Reflections on the Limits of a Historiographical Concept," *History of European Ideas* 34 (2008): 388–410; Daniel K. Richter and Troy L. Thompson, "Severed Connections: American Indigenous Peoples and the Atlantic World in an Era of Imperial Transformation," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Atlantic World, 1450–1850*, ed. Nicholas Canny and Philip Morgan (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 499–515; and Richter, "Tsenacomoco and the Atlantic World: Stories of Goods and Power," and "'That Europe be Not Proud, nor America Discouraged': Native People and the Enduring Politics of Trade," in Richter, *Trade, Land, Power*, 13–41, 53–68.

41. Landsman, *Crossroads of Empire*, 2–3 (quotation); Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754–1766* (New York: Knopf, 2000), 3–7; David Preston, *Braddock's Defeat: The Battle of the Monongahela and the Road to Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015).

42. Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); James H. Merrell, *Into the American*

Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier (New York: W. W. Norton, 1999); Steven Craig Harper, *Promised Land: Penn's Holy Experiment, the Walking Purchase, and the Dispossession of Delawares, 1600–1763* (Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press, 2006); Matthew C. Ward, *Breaking the Backcountry: The Seven Years' War in Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1754–1765* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003); Jane T. Merritt, *At the Crossroads: Indians and Empires on a Mid-Atlantic Frontier, 1700–1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003); Eric Hinderaker, *Elusive Empires: Constructing Colonialism in the Ohio Valley, 1673–1800* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Anderson, *Crucible of War*; Patrick Griffin, *American Leviathan: Empire, Nation, and Revolutionary Frontier* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2007); William A. Pencak and Daniel K. Richter, eds., *Friends and Enemies in Penn's Woods: Indians, Colonists, and the Racial Construction of Pennsylvania* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004); Peter Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2008); David L. Preston, *The Texture of Contact: European and Indian Settler Communities on the Frontiers of Iroquoia* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009); Ian K. Steele, *Setting All the Captives Free: Capture, Adjustment, and Recollection in Allegheny Country* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013).

43. Ian K. Steele, *Warpaths: Invasions of North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Daniel H. Usner, *Indians, Settlers, and Slaves in a Frontier Exchange Economy: The Lower Mississippi Valley Before 1783* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992); Cécile Vidal, ed., *Louisiana: Crossroads of the Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014); Kathleen DuVal, *Independence Lost: Lives on the Edge of the American Revolution* (New York: Random House, 2015).

44. Notably, Alan Taylor's recent distillation of his excellent effort to highlight regionalism in Atlantic and continental contexts omits the Mid-Atlantic from its otherwise regionally organized table of contents and instead folds material on New York and Pennsylvania into a chapter entitled "British America" (Alan Taylor, *Colonial America: A Very Short Introduction* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2012], 90–96; compare the "Middle Colonies" chapter in Taylor, *American Colonies*, 245–72).

45. Greenberg, "Middle Colonies in Recent Historiography," 396–97.

46. T. H. Breen, *Puritans and Adventurers: Change and Persistence in Early America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980); Engel, *Religion and Profit*; Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1975); Breen, "An Empire of Goods: The Anglicization of Colonial America, 1690–1776," *Journal of British Studies* 25 (1986): 467–99; Breen and Timothy D. Hall, *Colonial America in an Atlantic World: A Story of Creative Interaction* (New York: Pearson Longman, 2004); Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004); Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998); April Lee Hatfield, *Atlantic Virginia: Intercolonial Relations in the Seventeenth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); John C. Coombs, "Beyond the 'Origins Debate': Rethinking the Rise of Virginia Slavery," in *Early Modern Virginia: Reconsidering the Old Dominion*, ed. Douglas C. Bradburn and John C. Coombs (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011), 239–78; Graham Russell Hodges, *Root and Branch: African Americans in New York and East Jersey, 1613—1863* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999).

47. Douglas Bradburn, "The Eschatological Origins of the English Empire," in *Early Modern Virginia*, ed. Bradburn and Coombs, 15–56; Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra, *Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550–1700* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006); Engel, *Religion and Profit*.

THE MID-ATLANTIC AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Wayne Bodle
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Abstract: This essay explores the mutual effects of the American Revolution and the Mid-Atlantic region on each other, with its principal emphasis on how the Revolution impacted the region, and somewhat less on the obverse consequences. Reviewing previously published and forthcoming arguments about how New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware were a "fabricated" regional entity—a construct of political, economic, and social intention as much as or perhaps more than spatial imagination and geographical expression—it suggests that the cumulative impacts of the Seven Years' War, the British "imperial crisis" from 1763 to 1775, and the war of the American Revolution itself, uprooted and otherwise destroyed much of the spatial framing systems of the earlier colonial era. Notwithstanding these consequences, the article argues that the region's structural and functional integrity, as a shaper of both elite and more ordinary experience, largely survived the collapse and peeling away of this colonial "scaffolding." It offers some tentative suggestions about how that improbable outcome may have obtained, and proposes some areas to which future research attention to the Mid-Atlantic should be paid.
Keywords: Mid-Atlantic historiography; American Revolution; Mid-Atlantic colonies; New York; New Jersey; Pennsylvania; Delaware; Eastern American regions; Mid-Atlantic region

Thinking about the Mid-Atlantic region in the Revolutionary and Early Republic eras raises two different, if fairly obvious and

basically symmetrical, questions: how did the region affect the Revolution, and what enduring impacts did that event have on the region? The former question might begin with a few counterfactual imaginaries. What if independence had not been declared (or been only partly declared) because Pennsylvania's voters rejected it in May of 1776 (which they effectively did), and because John Adams and his allies in the Continental Congress, mindful of disorders in Boston during the Stamp Act crisis, considered but finally declined to help a group of radical—but to them dangerous and socially inferior—local agents overthrow an elected provincial government so that the colony's delegates could be instructed to vote "yes"? Or what if New York's delegates, days or weeks late in signing the Declaration and knowing the deep political divisions back at home, had quietly left Philadelphia without acting on the matter?

Adams's fabled 1818 metaphor about the timing of independence might have needed to describe "making *eleven* clocks strike at *more or less* the same time." No declaration of *anything* was required for committed insurgent groups to shift from organizational militancy to armed resistance, but the region's stubborn indifference to growing calls for self-rule from the colonies to its northeast and south should not be dismissed as the colorful death rattle of a doomed *ancien regime*. At the pleasure of kings, generals, and congressmen, the Revolution's war would undoubtedly still have surged into the area between the Hudson and Potomac rivers, but it would have gone there without the presumably energizing legitimation of unanimously proclaimed and well-articulated "self-evident truths."[1]

What if General John Burgoyne had packed lightly, marched more briskly, and reached Albany, or if his shrewd extraction of a *convention* treaty after his defeat at Saratoga rather than a traditional surrender had cowed Continental congressmen legislating morosely in York, Pennsylvania? Louis XVI, with the solvent effects of the Enlightenment on his own *ancien regime* illustrated by the approach of the dying Voltaire toward Paris, might have declined to seek revenge against his British counterpart, George III, with a risky American alliance. With no global war against France looming, British ministers might not have abandoned Philadelphia for a quixotic pacification campaign in the Lower South. Historians may savor Benjamin Franklin's reported quip in a Paris salon in late 1777 that Philadelphia had "*taken*" General Howe, but who can read the sullen complaints of congressmen in York that winter and predict the success of a rebellion steered by lawmakers permanently confined to small interior towns, and relying on an inexperienced army to pacify the hinterlands of two port cities still in the hands of Redcoats?[2]

We tell students that counterfactual analysis is alluring but a hopelessly weak tool for historical understanding. But so is reading back from known outcomes to causal circumstances. Whatever their limitations as analytical methodology, asking such "what if" questions forces us to acknowledge the forbidding terrain offered by New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware to the social, economic, political, and military processes that became "The Revolution." Members of the region's divided political classes were comparably educated to the wigged elites who came to Philadelphia from Savannah, Charleston, Williamsburg, Annapolis, Hartford, and Boston to oppose the Intolerable Acts in 1774–75. They read the same books and pamphlets, consumed the same British exports, worried similarly about the political and moral consequences of that consumption, and debated the same limited array of mostly unattractive remedies. But their merchants had found different niches in the Atlantic economy, their commodities had not been as regulated or taxed as those of the Chesapeake or New England regions, and many of them embraced a "logic of moderation" that balked at confrontation if compromise was possible. In the hinterlands of their seaports, many of the rural commodity producers whom they claimed to "represent" spoke with literally different voices on these and other issues. We might even ask if the region's diagnostic trait of pragmatic toleration (sometimes without very much real tolerance) in a plural society as a way of maximizing and protecting its longstanding material prosperity can help to explain its leaders' inclination to make different, and perhaps somewhat riskier, bets on the moral balance between corruption and virtue, or debt and dependence, than did New England minister-magistrates or Chesapeake and Carolina planters.[3]

It may be wise here to shift to the question of the Revolution's impact on the region. I have called the Middle Colonies a *fabricated* region. *All* geographical entities or phenomena, of course, are *constructions* of human consciousness—of habits and vocabularies, of environmental perceptions and perspectives, and of the boundary-making acts that proceed from those things. This must have been so between Connecticut and Maryland, but I have found little evidence—none really—of contemporary articulated consciousness by people living in these places of their being the "Middle" part of *anything*. Thirty-two years ago Robert Gough warned that positing regional characteristics across this terrain would "obscure more than clarify" complex realities on the ground. That assertion drew me into the debate about early American regional structures and I would still reject his wider argument. But it cannot be denied that the spatial mentalities that characterized denizens of

the "Motley Middle" in the eighteenth century were behavioral impulses or predilections more than they were expressive or cognitive phenomena.[4]

To put in a nutshell what I am straining to squeeze into a large book, early Dutch settlers at Manhattan and Fort Orange (Albany), and investors in Amsterdam, by a kind of energetic inadvertence persisting over two generations, created a dispersed, amoebic, spatial entity out of a tertiary continental enclave that, by resonating with similar Indian geopolitics, sustained trade, agricultural, social, and domestic functions, but not very much in the way of politics or government. That entity was easy enough for the restored Stuart regime to conquer in 1664, but it looked deceptively severable to the Duke of York, to his militarized household of retainers, and to his brother, King Charles II. So sever it they did, into New York, Pennsylvania, *two* New Jerseys, and a string of settlements on the lower Delaware, to gratify the expectations of loyal allies and to make the coastline look busy enough on the map to discourage any reconquerors.

The conquest part worked out, sort of, but the severance process faltered from the start. It could not dissuade or prevent colonists on the ground from continuing to pursue their interests across vaguely inscribed new provincial boundaries as if they did not exist. What it severed instead was the jurisdictional ability of infant provinces to constrain, contest, or even effectively respond to such behaviors, making a difficult-to-govern place potentially all but ungovernable. A few able executives in the first decade gamely kept these problems in check. But the surge of Quaker settlers into the Delaware Valley after 1676 ignited explosive development energies that threatened to overwhelm the region and to engulf or destroy its primal province, New York. The response of lesser Stuart governors and functionaries after 1683, to seek a political "*do over*" by annulling these new colonies and reassembling New York in the footprint of New Netherland, also failed. In the decade of the Glorious Revolution, the collapse of the Dominion of New England, and the connections drawn by John Locke between liberty and property as things requisite to each other, no confiscation of the proprietors' new territorial rights was possible.[5]

Into the breach stepped two generations of regional actors, personified by William Penn, and by men he employed, or by the colonial and imperial agents with whom they transacted. Penn, a radical Whig, utopian pacifist, and businessman, had complex ties to the Stuart regime. He displayed a parental ferocity when interposing himself between his colony and any forces that seemed to threaten it, but he knew that unchecked cross-border

disorders would hurt his interests as much as anyone's. From the day of his arrival at Philadelphia in late 1682 he developed and nurtured complex informal networks of cooperation and measured contestation with imperial and proprietary agents in New York and both Jerseys. He handed these soft assets, by now intangible geopolitical ligaments, to his American surrogate, James Logan, early in the eighteenth century. Logan, as a tactician to Penn's strategist, administered and elaborated them for three decades. From that beginning, the Middle Colonies were characterized by interprovincial structures that had no official governance standing, but that effectively allowed those places to be governable.

Those structures and the processes involved in their creation have been described before, and I intrude too far already on Dan Richter's designated chronological turf, but the anchoring beams of this "fabricated" regional exoskeleton were a royalist hub centered in New York City, a proprietary hearth in Philadelphia, and an indigenous pillar of alliance-making planted at the ceremonial council fire of the Five Nations at Onondaga in Iroquoia. This resilient system of relationships and mechanisms, albeit unauthorized in imperial discourse or theory, mostly worked, and it allows us to recall colonial Mid-Atlantic societies as having been dynamic and even turbulent in character, but never really chaotic and certainly not anarchic or dysfunctional.

The Revolution uprooted and destroyed these beams and shredded many connecting links between them, from Albany to Annapolis, Barnegat to Bedford, and Montauk to Monocacy. In rights-and-property terms, the "biggest losers" of the Revolution were George III, the Penn Family, and the Iroquois Confederacy. British power fled from America from the same spot in Manhattan in 1783 where the Duke of York's conquistadors landed more than a century before. The center of gravity for the Pennsylvania proprietorship was already back in England when the imperial crisis began in 1763. With an inexperienced third-generation governor in America, the Penns barely contested their overthrow in 1776, but rather turned toward liquidating their American interests in return for compensation. The Iroquois learned that there was indeed such a thing as defeat-by-proxy at the hands of triumphant Americans, as there had not been for French-allied Indians at the hands of Anglo-American victors in 1763, and they were driven into exile.

These outcomes were as much the result of the existential fact of the British loss of the Revolution as they were of the specific manner of that loss in the Mid-Atlantic region. But cracks in the skeletal framework of regional stability forged by Penn and others after 1680 began to show by 1750, and

they widened in response to strains put on the region by the imperial crisis. The same geopolitical facts that made the Champlain-Hudson corridor an occult chute to disaster for Burgoyne in 1777 fostered brutal stalemates between French and British forces from 1755 to 1763. Its deceptively passable course from the St. Lawrence Valley to the Atlantic beguiled the strategic imaginations of military planners on all sides in both wars. This made New York the tactical partner of the New England colonies and brought "Yankee" and "Yorker" cultures into fraught contact with each other for the first time since their entanglements dissolved with the Dominion in 1688. Coincidentally or not, New York also joined in intense boundary contests with Connecticut, Massachusetts, and with "Green Mountain" insurgents in these years.

During the same generation, and in the same complex context of the Seven Years' War, Pennsylvania settled its long border contest with Maryland. That "settlement," symbolized by Mason's and Dixon's survey (1763–1767), however, itself had conflictual implications. If Dutch, Huguenot, and German-infused militias suddenly had to cooperate with alien Yankee provincial units at places like Ticonderoga in a plagued effort to break through to Canada, Pennsylvania's soldier-cubs became the fortuitous and uneasy partners of culturally remote neighbors from Maryland and Virginia in risky probes into the western country between 1755 and 1758.

These military circumstances mirrored economic and social processes that were warping the Mid-Atlantic's edges with New England and the Upper Chesapeake. The migration of Ethan Allen and his neighbors from western Connecticut into the Green Mountains coincided with the westward drift of Yankees onto the Highland, Cortlandt, and Philipsburg manors or patents in the lower Hudson Valley, and the incursion of landless Massachusetts farmers onto the Livingston and Van Rensselaer grants farther north. These movements provoked clashes over boundaries and property rights that persisted for generations and helped to draw New York's geopolitical consciousness back to the north and east, where it had been forged in the seventeenth century. In the Chesapeake, the shift from tobacco to grain cultivation on the Delmarva Peninsula and west along the new Pennsylvania border was punctuated by briefer "wars" between Calvert and Penn title claimants. It made much of the upper Chesapeake a part of Philadelphia's economic and political hinterland, and it brought into Pennsylvania's political orbit men who were critical to the Revolution there on both sides, symbolized by John Dickinson and Joseph Galloway.[6]

These centrifugal stresses frayed the Mid-Atlantic core, especially at the juncture between New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. As with an opportunistic infection erupting in a compromised organism, Connecticut's claims based on its 1662 royal "sea-to-sea" charter spawned repeated settlement probes into the Susquehanna Valley of northeastern Pennsylvania. These incursions provoked secondary conflicts in western New Jersey and in adjacent parts of New York, but Thomas Penn in London and his Philadelphia agents were unable to mobilize a coalition of regional interests to resist it, as William Penn or James Logan would have routinely done earlier in the eighteenth century. They instead took passive advantage of the onset of the Seven Years' War in the 1750s, of an Indian massacre in the 1760s, and of the Revolution itself in the 1770s, to hold off or beat back the onslaught of settlers. But the jurisdictional question landed in the lap of the post-Revolutionary Confederation Congress to resolve on national terms.

The Revolution's war built on these early trends, and it ravaged the Mid-Atlantic. Some of the most iconic battles of that war, at Lexington and Concord, Bunker Hill, and Yorktown, came in Massachusetts and Virginia, at the chronological and spatial edges of that war. But the stalemate that developed between those polities festered in local pockets, and it fueled fierce internecine clashes. The Hudson Valley, before and after Burgoyne's debacle, had to be held by the rebellious side. Its lower reaches, near the British-occupied hub of New York City, became a "Neutral Ground," ravaged by bandits, guerrillas, and deserters from both armies. Pennsylvania experienced only one year of military occupation, not seven like New York did. But that episode completed the work of uprooting the old colonial establishment that began with the pragmatic "withdrawal" of strict Quakers from political life in the mid-1750s. Franklin's ill-advised campaign for royal government traced a direct line between the decline of Quaker power and the acquiescent abdication of proprietary authority in 1776. The destruction of Iroquoia can be even more directly attributed to factors and forces intrinsic to the Mid-Atlantic. When the "seat of war" veered south after 1778, commanders-in-chief on both sides remained in the New York City area, facing off but mostly unwilling to engage each other with serious military force. Washington's only real strategic thrust in the north thereafter was led by General John Sullivan into Iroquoia in 1779. As a classic military campaign, the maneuver lacked dramatic clarity, but its destructive effects on the roots of Native society in the region led to Iroquois exile after 1783.

The relevant point here is that the regional edifice assembled by proprietary actors and imperial agents from the debris of Stuart triage after 1680 survived the Revolutionary War's destruction of its system of patchwork jurisdictional repair. Indeed, it barely wobbled in the 1780s as the scaffolding of that system tore loose and fell away. The edifice frayed a little on the Hudson side, where Loyalist exile, land redistribution, tenant resistance, and Green Mountain rebellion plagued New York well into the nineteenth century. And it blurred or smudged a bit to the south, where the legal boundary between Pennsylvania and Maryland, the ragged agricultural divisions between declining tobacco and emerging grain cultures, and the differential economic erosion of slavery or the political geography of gradual abolition carved separate, shifting, and overlapping lines where previously there had been none. But the region's center basically held.

Or at least I say it did. The "proof set" for such an assertion is hard to imagine even in abstract terms, and empirical evidence for it based on focused research is barely suggestive yet. The bundle of relationships and relationship-based practices that I described above as a regional "exoskeleton," the handiwork of Pennsylvania officials like William Penn and James Logan, New York–New Jerseyans like Robert Hunter and William Burnet, or interprovincial proprietary functionaries like Lewis Morris, James Alexander, and many Livingstons, matured by the 1720s. During a generation of relative Atlantic peace, from 1715 to 1740, it was interwoven with and reinforced by professional actors, mainly merchants and lawyers working simultaneously across multiple colonies. It began to fray as a result of generational exhaustion and the familial nonreplacement of key members by 1750. Then it was shredded, uprooted, and dismantled by the imperial and military events described above. In its ascent, at its peak, and during its decline, it was "exoskeletal" in the way of an orthopedic splint, cast, or brace, stabilizing fragments of territory sundered by the restored Stuarts while underlying societal bones, organs, and soft tissue institutions bonded, wove, or knit back together into a functional sociocultural whole.

We have barely begun to know or even be curious about how the latter process worked. My own research has mainly hovered over the forest canopy, harvesting readily reached, high-hanging fruit in the abundantly preserved papers of regional elites with the material means to act in their own interests over distances and across provincial lines. The more enduringly critical "organic" work of spatial and cultural fusion done by migrating yeoman families or vagabond middling opportunists is less

likely to have been strategized, blueprinted, minuted, or expressed than the officious data in bureaucratic files, or at gubernatorial council sessions or proprietary shareholder meetings. But we will not know whether that is so until we have looked. And in any case, if the real "chorus" of Mid-Atlantic regionalization and regional consciousness was a work of kinetic behavior rather than linguistic expression, we will have to find or create new ways of "listening" to it, comprehending it, and interpreting its main themes and nuances.

The most fruitful ways to do this may be found in intraregional migration studies, best framed around much heralded but still only vaguely described "big data" "data mining," or "geospatial" research strategies, and in a cautious but creative resort to the community studies methods that bloomed in early New England a generation ago but that never made much more than tentative appearances west of the Hudson River. By reconstructing, hopefully in vivid chorographical ways, the patterned mobility vectors of large numbers of ordinary people (both individually and in groups) across provincial boundaries but largely within the Mid-Atlantic terrain, and by describing the settlements they created when they reached their often quite temporary destinations, we may learn how the region could have survived functionally even as many of its defining colonial era institutional ligaments or tendons died with the Revolution.[7]

These mobility studies should probably be collaborative enterprises, conducted by teams of scholars with technical competences and access to data gathering and digital mapping tools. They would almost inevitably be substantially Colonial rather than specifically Revolutionary in their chronological focus, although close attention to the impacts of the frequent spatial traumas of Revolutionary events would be necessary and feasible. Community studies might reward more traditional individual investigative efforts, although they could most usefully be arranged in clusters within selected subregional spaces, and shaped around consistent sets of agreed-upon thematic subjects or framing questions. Some of the revealed migration pathways would necessarily be extraregional, crossing into or out of the Mid-Atlantic domain. Settlements knotted along such trajectories would predictably be described by many scholars in terms of the presumed relative contributing character of either the originating or the destination cultures. Such descriptions, however inevitably reductive, would provide starting places to address questions about the very nature or even the existence of separately cognizable regional cultures.

I would suggest a few places where such investigations might usefully begin. We need renewed attention to the Revolution and its long-term consequences in the Lower Hudson Valley. This area had a special place in progressive historians' accounts of the Revolution as a contest over "who should rule at home." Their "consensus" successors rejected this characterization across the colonies and later states, but they never convincingly refuted it for either New York *or* Pennsylvania. Modern scholars of *neo*-progressive bent have renewed the attention, especially to the Upper Hudson. There, where the manorial system survived the Revolution because of the political choices of its landowners, Martin Bruegel and John Brooke have shown, respectively, how a liberal "market society" and a "civil society" evolved into the mid-nineteenth century. Reeve Huston has described how Rensselaerswyck Manor rebounded as a social and economic enterprise, even to the unlikely extent of attracting Daniel Shays, the Massachusetts radical, as a resident, and how it took more than a generation for "anti-rent" forces to do to agricultural tenancy there what the Revolution substantially did in less than a decade downriver. For the middle valley, in Ulster County, Thomas Wermuth has also addressed the "market question," with somewhat more mixed or nuanced conclusions about the degree and nature of changes.[8]

In the cradle of progressive scholarship east of the river in Dutchess and Westchester counties, however, new research for the Revolutionary and post-Revolutionary eras has been much thinner in scope or narrower in focus. The collapse of the manorial system because of the Loyalism of members of the Philipse and Van Cortlandt families is widely known as a legal and administrative matter, but how it evolved on the ground in the middle of a combat zone, and its long reach into the nineteenth century, are less well understood. Attention has been paid to the agonizingly slow demise of slavery by a combination of legislated emancipation and grudging private manumission. At the level of glancing allusions in articles and book chapters devoted to the Hudson Valley as a whole—with some essay collections focusing on the lower valley—the Revolutionary experience of the downstate counties has remained in play. But nothing like the overlapping monographic convergence that Brooke, Huston, Bruegel, and Wermuth bestowed on the areas north of Poughkeepsie, Kingston, or New Paltz has appeared in the last generation.[9]

This divergence can be a source of interpretive opportunity as much as surprise or chagrin. There is not much use in asking whether the Revolution here was a struggle over "who should rule at home." That it was seems to be a historiographically stable conclusion for now, although much more

work should be done on exactly how that struggle proceeded. But Orange and Westchester counties, and lower Dutchess County (the Philipse family's "Highland Patent," which became Putnam County in 1812), can provide useful control sites for some of the more sophisticated conclusions of the upriver studies. The probably different nature, degree, and timing of market transition on lands closer to the Atlantic Ocean than those in Albany, Columbia, and Ulster counties, should be measured rather than inferred. The microcosmic character and significance of the shift from manorial to freehold land tenure and communal life wrought by revolutionary confiscation and land redistribution programs rather than glacially slow political success by previously subordinate populations is well worth recovering. In 1965 Beatrice Reubens took an economist's axe to the 1939 findings of Harry Yoshpe about the meaning of that shift at Philipsburgh Manor in Westchester. The literature since has mostly shrugged, but we could instead investigate, or replicate it, on the Philipse Highland patent.[10]

In particular, the Lower Hudson offers an opportunity to get the relationship between social history and the "new" military history right. I often tell students that in the late eighteenth century there was not enough war to go around to fill up the Revolution; that contending armies rattled like marbles in a half-empty cereal box; and that unexpected proximity to, or surprisingly abrupt distancing from, actual military institutions and activities had distorting (and disclosing) effects on people's perceptions and behaviors. John Shy told us that much a generation ago. After 1778, the "war" moved into the South and the spaces from the St. Lawrence River to the head of the Chesapeake Bay experienced a different kind of Revolution. But the main armies and their commanders stayed in the north. If we scrutinize the ebb and flow of daily life in the no-man's land of Westchester County, the intra-denominational battlegrounds of Bergen County, or the private feuds of Monmouth County, New Jersey, it seemed enough like war to civilians to have generated behaviors that we need to understand. Continental mutinies in New Jersey and the Arnold treason crisis at West Point stand proxy for this misery in the north. But quotidian anomie, savagery, corruption, and desperation in the Hudson Valley from Hackensack to Fishkill were the contexts for both phenomena. Sung Bok Kim, whose critique of the classic progressive account of manorial life quietly leavened and in some ways facilitated the reception of the new version, used Westchester County to challenge John Shy's account of the relationship between war and Revolutionary social mobilization. The literature, again, mostly just yawned, but we can probably do better by harnessing new data collection techniques to new kinds of questions.[11]

Finally, efforts should be made to interrogate claims and assumptions about the nature, degree, and significance of repeated intrusions by New England settlers and Yankee "ways" into Mid-Atlantic spaces, beginning as early as the Stuart seizure of New Netherland. The assertion by scholarly partisans that the Middle Colonies "prefigured" or "anticipated" "modern" America, in contradistinction to nineteenth-century claims about the foundational import of New England, is challenged by these migrations. It is perhaps especially mitigated by some scholars' reflexive invocation of "*New England*[*s*] *Extended*," or "*Yankee West*[*s*]," planted by the descendants of Puritans and nurtured by their articulate and relentless willingness to make new "errands into the wilderness" that for generations after 1783 seemingly overran their neighbors to the west.[12]

This narrative trope is almost impossible *not* to caricature in a short essay, but versions of it litter many narratives about early America. Brendan McConville has called the seventeenth-century area southwest of Manhattan "New Jersey's New England." Paul Moyer's account of the Pennsylvania–Connecticut struggle for control of the upper Susquehanna Valley, if only by its title, "Wild Yankees," may seem to conflate the stories it tells of efforts by yeoman farmers to preserve their personal independence through land ownership with an affirmation of *regional* cultural rather than class attributes. Alan Taylor's narrative of *William Cooper's Town* ends with that apostate Quaker community builder's naïve design to be a "father of the people" frustrated by swarming tribes of post-Revolutionary Yankee voyagers to the west, who imposed their own definitions of communal leadership by "friends of the people" on their hapless patron. And tales about the replacement of Iroquoia—from just west of Cooper's Otsego County to Niagara—with the "Genesee Country," settled by emigrants from New England, sound like just such errands. Beyond our subject region, histories of the Western Reserve, or Marietta, or the "Yankee West" that emerged in southern Michigan, offer modestly different versions of the same narrative.[13]

This is not at all to suggest that any of these authors are peddling bad historiographical medicine, but rather that the existence of the stock figure of the resolute Yankee, driving his "patriarchal caravan" west surrounded by family members, livestock, and wagonloads of goods, in efficacious imitation of his 1620s forebears, is almost too available to have needed proving or to be systematically challenged. Who wonders if men like Daniel Shays or George Robert Twelves Hewes became Yorkers instead of Yankees on the New York frontier? Who knew that when the Dutch briefly seized their old colony back from the duke in 1673, the residents of East Jersey towns settled by

migrants from New England swore allegiance to the States General in higher percentages than did the remnant Dutchmen living in Bergen County? Who asks whether the "Connecticut people" settled at Wyoming on the Susquehanna, on the many days when they necessarily were *not* being "Wild," bothered to be "Yankees" in meaningful ways—relating to farming practices, family formation, religious polity, inheritance customs, or other phenomena that drove the new social history in the 1960s? When Pennsylvania won the sovereignty battle beyond the Delaware after the Revolution, were the Yankee settlements stranded in the "Endless Mountains" more like Paxton than they were like Providence, Prospect, or Pawtucket?[14]

   Is it relevant that, under the 1801 "Plan of Union" among Calvinist church bodies, Congregationalist communities more often tended to affiliate as Presbyterians? Or that émigré Yankee pastoralists embraced the Chester and Lancaster county staple of wheat culture once settled on the fertile lands of Genesee?[15] Or that some New Englanders arriving in Cooper's Town willingly became tenants rather than freeholders, despite Mr. Cooper's criticism of that practice? Or that substantial Connecticut landowners like the Wadsworth family became landlords at Genesee, withholding thousands of their best acres from the market, preferring to lease them to their poorer countrymen for cash and in-kind rents and improvements?[16]

Even if we acknowledge, as I think we must, Dan Richter's wise strictures in the previous essay on the idea of an articulated Mid-Atlantic (colonial) regional "identity," his doubts about any recoverable "coherence" for the place even as a behavioral entity, and his argument that the Atlantic tsunami and continental tectonic plate shifts of the past generation have forever altered our spatial imaginations, I think the regional "zombie" will walk again through the back wall of the Revolution into Early Republic, perhaps, like Rip Van Winkle, shaking its head in wonder at the exotic icon-creatures that now adorn and illustrate calls for papers and conference programs. Members of human societies, if in very different degrees, inhabit both overlapping and highly divergent spatial layers and planes. We need to comprehend these spaces simultaneously rather than sequentially in our ongoing scholarly practice. Methodological lenses, whether transiently fashionable or evermore acute and useful (but doubtless in some combination of these things) can only disclose, not determine, the underlying human structures they apprehend and recover.

   The regional "moment" emerged partly from scholars' sense that the persistent study of the "little communities of early America" was not adding

up to much even in New England, and working less well everywhere else.[17] The urge to reconstruct the dispersed and far less nodal Chesapeake in the 1970s highlighted the complex areas between those places, and gave regions as early American phenomena their modern weight.[18] My recommendation for a "cautious but creative" return to community studies hints that there is (and will continue to be) a cost for this kind of abrupt categorical shift from one analytical plane to another. The emergent disinclination to dissect localities made it harder to resolve, or even to see, some problems of regional analysis. Mapping the social and cultural geomorphology of the upland places where the Atlantic surge splashed onto and perhaps overflowed the continental thrust-plates of indigenous and non-English imperial America may be similarly impaired if we now archive the study of region—even in its peculiarly if not even defiantly refractory Mid-Atlantic manifestation—as one more form of worthy but ultimately disappointing past practice. We can, and probably should, strip that obdurate beast of any implications of magical analytic utility, and maybe even mute some gauzy claims about its formative, or predictive, role in constructing the modern worlds we take for granted. With that modest retreat, I would submit, we can continue to profit from the effort to put substantive human flesh back on the skeletal spatial remains that I have sketched above.[19]

NOTES

I am grateful to Sarah Gronningsater and to Patrick Spero for reading and offering valuable comments on an earlier draft of this essay.

1. Richard Alan Ryerson, *The Revolution is Now Begun: The Radical Committees of Philadelphia, 1765–1776* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978), 173–74; David Freeman Hawke, *In the Midst of a Revolution* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961); Charles S. Olton, *Artisans for Independence: Philadelphia Mechanics and the American* Revolution (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1975), 75–77; Steven Rosswurm, *Arms, Country, and Class: The Philadelphia Militia and the "Lower Sort" during the American Revolution* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1987), 92–93. The May 1 election in Philadelphia was a by-election, to fill empty seats and to elect representatives to newly created districts, and historians have expressed divergent views about both its representativeness and significance. Edward Countryman, *A People in Revolution: The American Revolution and Political Society in New York, 1760–1790* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1989); John Adams to Hezekiah Niles, February 13, 1818, *Works of John Adams* (Boston: Little and Brown, 1851), 10:282–89, when he recalled that "thirteen clocks were made to strike together" in July of 1776. But see also Adams to Benjamin Kent, June 22, 1776, when, before the fact, and in Revolutionary real time, he acknowledged that "you can't make thirteen

Clocks, strike precisely alike, at the Same Second." *Papers of John Adams*, vol. 4, Massachusetts Historical Society, Digital Editions (accessed December 31, 2014).

2. For Burgoyne at Saratoga, see John S. Pancake, *1777: Year of the Hangman* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1977); Richard M. Ketchum, *Saratoga: Turning Point of America's Revolutionary War* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2014). For the dying Voltaire's trip to Paris from his place of exile in eastern France in February of 1778, see Ian Davidson, *Voltaire: A Life* (New York: Open Road Media, 2010), chap. 33. For the travails and persistent discontents of the delegates to the Continental Congress in York, Pennsylvania, during the winter of 1778, see Paul H. Smith, et al., eds., *Letters of Delegates to Congress*, 26 vols. (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1976–2000), vols. 8 and 9. The exact provenance and circumstances of Franklin's quip are complex and obscure matters, but for some nineteenth-century expressions of that supposed event, see Benson John Lossing, *The Pictorial Field-book of the Revolution* (New York, 1852), 2:303; Lord John Russell, *The Life and Times of Charles James Fox* (London, 1859), 1:142.

3. Thomas Doerflinger, "Logic of Moderation," in *A Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise: Merchants and Economic Development in Revolutionary Philadelphia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 180–85; Sally Schwartz, *A Mixed Multitude: The Struggle for Toleration in Colonial Pennsylvania* (New York: New York University Press, 1987); Richard W. Pointer, *Protestant Pluralism and the New York Experience: A Study of Eighteenth-Century Religious Diversity* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 1988); Randall Balmer, *A Perfect Babel of Confusion: Dutch Religion and English Culture in the Middle Colonies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); and Patricia U. Bonomi, *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society, and Politics in Colonial America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

4. Wayne Bodle, "The Fabricated Region: On the Insufficiency of 'Colonies' for Understanding American Colonial History," *Early American Studies* 1 (Spring 2003): 1–27; Robert J. Gough, "The Myth of the 'Middle Colonies': An Analysis of Regionalization in Early America," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 107 (July 1983): 393–419; Wayne Bodle, "The 'Myth of the Middle Colonies' Reconsidered: The Process of Regionalization in Early America," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 113 (October 1989): 527–48; Michael Zuckerman, "Introduction: Puritans, Cavaliers, and the Motley Middle," in *Friends and Neighbors: Group Life in America's First Plural Society*, ed. Zuckerman (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982), 3–25.

5. The discussion and analysis in this and the next six pages rely mainly on Wayne Bodle, *The Fabricated Region: Making the Middle Colonies of British North America*, and on the sources found therein (forthcoming). For the Quaker surge in energizing the region economically and politically, albeit in a largely asymmetrical way, see Gary B. Nash, *Quakers and Politics: Pennsylvania, 1681–1726* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968); and Robert C. Ritchie, *The Duke's Province: A Study of New York Politics and Society, 1664–1691* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977).

6. Patrick Spero, "The Conojocular War: The Politics of Colonial Competition," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 136 (2012): 365–403; Paul G. E. Clemens, *The Atlantic Economy and Colonial America's Eastern Shore: From Tobacco to Grain* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1980).

7. It is hardly a sophisticated modern treatment or analysis by any account, but the reconstruction of the peripatetic migration trajectory of the members of one extended early Mid-Atlantic family offered by Theodore Thayer in "An Eighteenth-Century Farmer and Pioneer: Sylvanus Seely's Early

Life in Pennsylvania," *Pennsylvania History* 35 (1968): 45–63, from Orange County, New York, to Tulpehocken, near Reading, and then to Wyoming in Pennsylvania, and finally to Chatham, New Jersey, is illustrative of the kinds of behavior that presumably helped to cement the region together at the communal and societal base as the middle and late colonial periods evolved.

8. Carl Lotus Becker, *The History of Political Parties in the Province of New York, 1760–1776*, 2 vols. (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1909); Irving Mark, *Agrarian Conflicts in Colonial New York, 1777–1775* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940); Staughton Lynd, *Anti-Federalism in Dutchess County, New York* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1962); Thomas Humphrey, *Land and Liberty: Hudson Valley Riots in the Age of Revolution* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2004); John Brooke, *Columbia Rising: Civil Life on the Upper Hudson from the Revolution to the Age of Jackson* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010); Martin Bruegel, *Farm, Shop, Landing: The Rise of a Market Society in the Hudson Valley, 1780–1860* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002); Reeve Huston, *Land and Freedom: Rural Society, Popular Protest, and Party Politics in Antebellum New York* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); and Thomas S. Wermuth, *Rip Van Winkle's Neighbors: The Transformation of Rural Society in the Hudson River Valley, 1720–1850* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2001).

9. Humphrey, *Land and Liberty*; Robert A. East and Jacob Judd, eds., *The Loyalist Americans: A Focus on Greater New York* (Tarrytown, NY: Sleepy Hollow Restorations, 1975); Sung Bok Kim, *Landlord and Tenant in Colonial New York: Manorial Society, 1664–1775* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978); Howard Pashman, "The People's Property Law: A Step Toward Building a New Legal Order in Revolutionary New York," *Law and History Review* 31 (2013): 587–626 (I am grateful to Sarah Gronningsater for calling this article to my attention); Michael Groth, "Slaveholders and Manumission in Dutchess County, New York," *New York History* 78 (1997): 33–50.

10. Beatrice G. Reubens, "Pre-Emptive Rights in the Disposition of a Confiscated Estate: Philipsburgh Manor, New York," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 22 (1965): 435–56; Harry B. Yoshpe, *The Disposition of Loyalist Estates in the Southern District of the State of New York* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939).

11. John Shy, *A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggle for American Independence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976); Sung Bok Kim, "The Limits of Politicization in the American Revolution: The Experience of Westchester County, New York," *Journal of American History* 80 (1993): 868–89; Sung Bok Kim, "The Impact of Class Relations and Warfare in the American Revolution: The New York Experience," *Journal of American History* 69 (1982): 326–46; Catherine S. Crary, "Guerrilla Activities of James DeLancey's Cowboys in Westchester County: Conventional Warfare or Self-Interested Freebooting?" in *The Loyalist Americans*, ed. East and Judd, 14–24; Adrian C. Leiby, *The Revolutionary War in the Hackensack Valley: The Jersey Dutch and the Neutral Ground, 1775–1783* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1962); Harry M. Ward, *Between the Lines: Banditti of the American Revolution* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002); Michael S. Adelberg, *The American Revolution in Monmouth County: The Theater of Spoil and Destruction* (Charleston, SC: The History Press, 2010); David J. Fowler, "Loyalty Is Now Bleeding in New Jersey: Motivations and Mentalities of the Disaffected," in *The Other Loyalists: Ordinary People, Royalism, and the Revolution in the Middle Colonies*, ed. Joseph S. Tiedemann, Eugene R. Fingerhut, and Robert W. Venables (Albany: SUNY Press, 2009), 45–77.

12. For the colonial Mid-Atlantic "prefigurement" or "anticipation" of national traits, see Zuckerman, "Puritans, Cavaliers, and the Motley Middle"; Zuckerman, "A Blueprint in Invisible Ink: The Middle Atlantic Region and the American Nation," in *Interpreting American Culture: A Regional Approach*, ed. Melvyn Hammarberg (Dundee: Culture Studies Association of Scotland, 1992). On New England's imperial efficacy across early American space, see D. W. Meinig, ed., *The Shaping of America: A Geographical Perspective on 500 Years of History*, vol. 1, *Atlantic America, 1492–1800* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988). Meinig, to be sure, entertains the idea of significant limitations to traditional expressions of this view.

13. Brendan McConville, *These Daring Disturbers of the Public Peace: The Struggle for Property and Power in Early New Jersey* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), esp. 50–53; Paul B. Moyer, *Wild Yankees: The Struggle for Independence Along Pennsylvania's Revolutionary Frontier* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007); Alan Taylor, *William Cooper's Town: Power and Persuasion on the Frontier of the Early American Republic* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1995), esp. chap. 10; Wayne Bodle, "Begat and B'golly: The Newberrys, the Huntingtons, and the Yankee Errand into the New (York) Wilderness, 1783–1860," unpublished paper, Newberry Library Fellows' Seminar, May 27, 1998, esp. 1–19; Harlan Hatcher, *The Western Reserve: The Story of New Connecticut in Ohio*, rev. ed. (Cleveland: World Publishing, 1966); Susan E. Gray, *The Yankee West: Community Life on the Michigan Frontier* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

14. Robert A. Gross, ed., *In Debt to Shays: The Bicentennial of an Agrarian Revolution* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993); Alfred F. Young, "George Robert Twelves Hewes (1742–1840): A Boston Shoemaker and the Memory of the American Revolution," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 38 (October 1981): 561–623; John Pomfret, *The Province of East New Jersey, 1609–1702: The Rebellious Proprietary* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1962), 75–76. For the term "patriarchal Caravan," see Samuel Huntington to Moses Cleaveland, November 15, 1801, cited in Lois Scharf, "'I Would Go Wherever Fortune Would Direct': Hannah Huntington and the Frontier of the Western Reserve," *Ohio History* 97 (1980): 9.

15. Mary Kupiec Cayton, "Congregationalism from Independence to the Present," and "Presbyterianism," in *Encyclopedia of the American Religious Experience: Studies of Traditions and Movements*, ed. Charles H. Lippy and Peter W. Williams (New York: Scribner's, 1988), 1:481–510, esp. 486–88, 502; Edwin Scott Gaustad, *Historical Atlas of Religion in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), 60–64, 89–93; Howard S. Russell, *A Long Deep Furrow: Three Centuries of Farming in New England* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1976); Peter C. Mancall, *Valley of Opportunity: Economic Culture Along the Upper Susquehanna, 1700–1800* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991), 171–80; Taylor, *William Cooper's Town*, 90–91; Neil Adams McNall, *An Agricultural History of the Genesee Valley, 1790–1860* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1952).

16. Taylor, *William Cooper's Town*, 318–21; McNall, *The Genesee Valley*, 22–32, 52–65; Henry Greenleaf Pearson, *James S. Wadsworth of Geneseo: Brevet Major-General of United States Volunteers* (New York: Charles Scribner's, 1913), chap. 1; Alden Hatch, *The Wadsworths of the Genesee* (New York: Coward-McCann, 1959).

17. Darrett B. Rutman, "Assessing the Little Communities of Early America," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 43 (1986): 163–78; Richard R. Beeman, "The New Social History and the Search

for 'Community' in Colonial America," *American Quarterly* 29 (1977): 422–43; John M. Murrin, "Pluralism and Predatory Power: Early New York as a Social Failure," *Reviews in American History* 6 (1978): 473–79; Murrin, "Review Essay," *History and Theory* 11 (1972): 226–75.

18. Michael Zuckerman, "Regionalism," in *A Companion to Colonial America*, ed. Daniel Vickers (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), esp. 311–12.

19. Wayne Bodle, "Atlantic History Is the New 'New Social History,'" *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 64 (2007): 203–20.

THE ONLY THINGS YOU WILL FIND IN THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD ARE DOUBLE YELLOW LINES, DEAD FROGS, AND ELECTORAL LEVERAGE: MID-ATLANTIC POLITICAL CULTURE AND INFLUENCE ACROSS THE CENTURIES

Kenneth J. Heineman
Angelo State University

Abstract: The Mid-Atlantic region of the United States, from its very inception, attracted visionaries, exiles, pacifists, and warriors—often united only by their suspicion of an overly assertive government. Over the course of the past four centuries, the Mid-Atlantic engendered melting-pot politics and a spirit of private initiative—allowing for partnerships with government when necessary. The middle of the Eastern Seaboard ultimately influenced the political culture of the middle of America—helping to bind the North together during the Civil War, laying the foundation for the New Deal, and continuing to influence national elections through the twenty-first century.
Keywords: Mid-Atlantic region; Eastern American political culture; labor; Virginia Military District; Pennsylvania industry; Pennsylvania historiography

Historical change may begin with small or great events. In 1646 an English cobbler named George Fox proclaimed that legitimate political authority came from the Heavens, not from the Crown.

Acting upon this belief, Fox set into motion a chain of events leading to the establishment of a new religion (the Society of Friends, or Quakers) and a colony 3,000 miles across the Atlantic (Pennsylvania). A generation after Fox began his spiritual journey, Catholic and Protestant armies clashed at an Irish river called the Boyne. Having spent a century fighting Irish Catholics, and serving as military buffers behind which the English authorities ruled, the Scots-Irish settlers had become a fiercely independent, fighting people. Although the Protestants won, tens of thousands of impoverished Scots-Irish Presbyterians flocked to Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey. Thanks to sectarian strife and divine revelation, America's "middle colonies" became a haven for warriors and pacifists—and for visionaries and the desperate poor seeking a better life. Their ideals, as well as their fears and grievances, produced a political culture that was as cautious of governmental authority as it was (often) violently disruptive.

For scholars of early America there has been general concurrence that the English colonies could be grouped into regions with distinctive economies, mores, and politics. "Albion's seed," as the historian David Hackett Fischer observed, had a distinctive DNA. A self-righteous Massachusetts Puritan and a profane Scots-Irish Pennsylvanian would have recognized that their similarities were in proportion to their differences—and both would have found an aristocratic Anglican Virginian to be too full of himself for their tastes. Even still, the Puritan, the Anglican, and the Presbyterian were more akin to each other than they were to the African slaves, German pacifists, and Dutch traders who also came (willingly and not) to the American colonies.[1]

Historian Michael Zuckerman produced a harsh appraisal of New England, a region which he found to be lacking when compared to the Middle Colonies: "By persisting in intolerance as the rest of the English empire came to new accommodations to religious diversity, [the New England colonies] consigned themselves to inconsequence in the wider world of Western Protestantism." Moreover, Zuckerman continued, "By failing to garner gold or grow staples, they confirmed their insignificance in the estimation of metropolitan mercantilists." Zuckerman's assessments have merit. Dynamic Boston devolved after the American Revolution into a regional economic center. As for the Puritans, their exemplar city of the Protestant Reformation acquired a distinctive Irish Catholic accent in the nineteenth century.[2]

Unlike Boston, New York City after the Revolution emerged as a national economic force, as well as a multiethnic port of entry where the world came to trade. As a driver of the American economy, and as chief

architect of the nation's cultural melting pot, the Mid-Atlantic region became, in Zuckerman's formulation, *the* template for the United States writ large: "In economic action and attitude, Americans of later ages also followed in paths prepared by the middle colonist." Then again, even if Boston became an economic and political backwater in the nineteenth century as Philadelphia and New York City thrived, at least New England was not the South. Below the Mason-Dixon Line could be found a virulent region where, Zuckerman pithily observed, "slavery subtly infected every ambition." Philadelphia birthed the republic; Charleston poisoned its soul.[3]

William Pencak, a contemporary of Zuckerman's, constructed a powerful, often amusing, analysis of the Mid-Atlantic region. As Pencak wrote of New York City's early leaders, they had chosen "not to complicate their social vision with a strong sense of religious mission." New York, which established an international standard for unethical politics, never set out like Boston to be a moral beacon to those living in darkness. It was always about the money—switching from Dutch to English masters meant that only the currency and letterheads changed.[4]

Puritan Boston, with its zeal for order, enacted speed limits, as well as trash disposal and fire suppression ordinances. Quaker Philadelphia and "amoral" New York were less coercive. If New Yorkers and Philadelphians wanted a street repaired, then they had to contribute their share of money and labor. This was not surprising. A colony like Pennsylvania, founded by Quakers who were suspicious of government, inevitably regarded civil administration as a necessary evil that had to be constrained as much as possible. New Yorkers embraced the same sentiment, if not the theology.

Historian Sam Bass Warner described this sentiment as "the spirit of privatism," where the pursuit of wealth operated side by side with a fear of expensive and expansive government. Confronted with contaminated drinking water, streets buried under layers of horse dung, and violent gangs, Philadelphians and New Yorkers of the early nineteenth century cautiously expanded the power of municipal government. Mid-Atlantic citizens did not emulate either the authoritarian New Englanders or the localist southerners who appeared to view nearly all governmental activity (and certainly any activity above the county level) as despotic.[5]

As Pencak observed, colonial New England represented "a fairly homogenous society outside Rhode Island," in contrast to the pluralistic Mid-Atlantic, which contained settlements known for their "contentious population." Such people of the Mid-Atlantic, Pencak believed, seemed "prone to offend one

another." In Philadelphia, the "City of Brotherly Love," colonial-era mobs led by women murdered other women they suspected of being witches. The Salem Witchcraft trials were, in comparison, models of due process and calm deliberation. Of course, the end results were the same—regardless of whether the perpetrators were civil representatives or those acting outside legal authority.[6]

It also may be fairly added that while Boston had its share of ignominy across the centuries, it was New York City, as historian Tyler Anbinder recounted, that gave America a slum of epic proportions. New York's "Five Points" neighborhood achieved a storied place in the popular consciousness that has endured into the twenty-first century. Five Points inspired a 2002 blockbuster Hollywood film starring Leonardo DiCaprio and a riveting BBC America television series (2012–13) enlivened by blood-soaked Irish Catholic Democrats and opium-addled Protestant Republicans.[7]

After Independence, the Mid-Atlantic's religious, ethnic, and racial groups continued their violent contests for political power—the addition of new immigrant groups further compounding the difficulty in achieving public order. Ultimately, Pencak wrote, "institutions and reform movements arose in the early nineteenth century to quell democracy run amuck." Reform movements, while gradually improving all-important sanitary conditions, had their limitations. Reformers never fully suppressed gang violence, but eventually succeeded in weakening the criminals' hold over the Democratic political machines. Temperance was a clear-cut loser in the cities, though if civil rights success was measured in terms of reducing body counts over the long haul, it may be said that Irish Catholics, African Americans, and Scots-Irish learned to battle each in the electoral arena more than in the neighborhood streets.[8]

There is no question that Zuckerman, Pencak, Warner, and Anbinder are correct in viewing the Mid-Atlantic region as a model for interpreting American cultural, economic, and political evolution. It is also clear that the Mid-Atlantic, as Zuckerman and others have argued, provided a template for the post-Revolutionary development of America's western frontier. Most particularly, the Mid-Atlantic asserted enormous influence over the "Northwest Territory"—the region that became known as the Midwest. However, the same observation could be made for New England and for the South. When Americans of the nineteenth century decided to move west, they often meant it literally.

The remnants of New England Puritanism headed westward to the upper reaches of the Midwest. Along the banks of Lake Erie, in what was called the Western Reserve of Connecticut, could be found settlements

named New Haven and Yale. Here the advocates of abolition, Catholic immigration restriction, and temperance held political sway. New England's transplants viewed government as a weapon with which to strike down foes and to empower the righteous. By the eve of the Civil War, the Great Lakes Rim produced such Radical Republican senators as Ben Wade (Ohio) and Zachariah Chandler (Michigan). To Wade and Chandler, political compromise was little more than complicity with the devil.[9]

In lower Ohio there was an area designated as the "Virginia Military District." Unable to pay its Revolutionary War veterans, the Old Dominion offered them land grants in the Ohio Territory. Southerners, who paid homage at the altar of Andrew Jackson, brought with them their racial attitudes and fear of an overweening federal government. Virginians named their settlements Georgetown and Washington Courthouse and wrote constitutions (in Ohio and Indiana) that denied blacks citizenship rights and access to public schools. During the Civil War, southern Ohio elevated antiwar "Copperhead" Democrats, notably congressmen Clement Vallandigham (Dayton) and George Pendleton (Cincinnati). Vallandigham had the distinction of being the only congressman in US history to be exiled by the federal government for disloyalty, while Pendleton ran as the antiwar Democrats' 1864 vice presidential nominee.

In the middle of the Midwest, in line from Pennsylvania and New Jersey, came the Mid-Atlantic's Scots-Irish, Irish Catholics, Germans, and even reformist Hicksite Quakers leaving the conservative confines of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. As the Mid-Atlantic stood between the ideological extremes of New England and the South and, demographically, represented the American melting pot in all its contentiousness and accommodations, so too the middle of the Midwest stood between Yankee Cleveland and the Virginia Military District. Although the Midwest as a historical region has not received the scholarly attention given to the colonial Mid-Atlantic, a few historians, most notably Nicole Etcheson, have begun to give the area west of the Alleghenies its due.[10]

It was in central Ohio that two new settlements came into existence: Delaware and (New) Lancaster. Delaware received hundreds of settlers from the Delaware River Valley. Among the Pennsylvanian migrants who arrived in Delaware village and county was an ethnic Dutch family named Rosecrans. This family produced one of Ohio's 200 Union generals (William Rosecrans) and the first bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Columbus (Sylvester Rosecrans.) Both William and Sylvester Rosecrans converted to Catholicism

before the Civil War—a practice more common in the Mid-Atlantic and the Midwest than in New England.

(New) Lancaster came into being at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Lancaster's founders hailed from Pennsylvania, the streets were plotted and named on the basis of the Philadelphia grid, and its first newspaper was published in German. While most of Lancaster's settlers were from the Mid-Atlantic, Connecticut Yankees and Virginians could be found in the town and in Fairfield County. During the Civil War, Lancaster and its county sired five Union generals (four of which came from the same family), an ethnic German regiment, and the first two recipients of the Medal of Honor—all the while rejecting the abolition of slavery. (The 61st Ohio Volunteer Infantry received the nickname, "The Flying Dutchmen," in recognition of its German, or "Pennsylvania Dutch," heritage, and for how fast troops ran away from the Confederates at Chancellorsville. Fittingly, the 61st Ohio redeemed itself at Gettysburg.)

The history of Thomas Ewing and his family illustrates the influence of the Mid-Atlantic on the Midwest. Thomas Ewing's Scots-Irish ancestors fought at the Boyne and then departed Ulster for New Jersey. His father, George, served in two New Jersey regiments during the Revolution, endured the hardships of Valley Forge, and settled in southern Ohio. Raised in poverty, Thomas Ewing taught himself Latin, labored as a salt boiler, became the first graduate of the first public college west of the Alleghenies (Ohio University), and settled in Lancaster where he read law. He subsequently married an Irish Catholic woman whose ancestors had fought against the Scots-Irish. In melting-pot fashion, they raised their children in the Catholic Church and scornfully dismissed the virulent nativists in the Western Reserve.

In the decades before the Civil War Ewing became a wealthy lawyer, confidant of Whig Party leaders Henry Clay and Daniel Webster, US senator, US secretary of the Treasury, and US secretary of the Interior. Ewing adopted William Tecumseh Sherman, the son of his deceased friend, Charles Sherman. Thomas Ewing got Sherman into West Point and welcomed him as a son-in-law when he married his daughter Ellen. Extended family members included US attorney general and New York native Henry Stanbery and Republican presidential nominee and Pennsylvania native James Gillespie Blaine. Sons Hugh, Tom, and Charley Ewing, like their brother-in-law Sherman, became successful Union generals, battling guerrillas in Missouri, laying siege to Vicksburg, and marching through Georgia.

As a Whig politician before the Civil War, Ewing had advocated a partnership between business and government in the development of canals, roads, and railroads. Ewing greatly admired New York's Erie Canal, which had linked New York City to Lake Erie, and envisioned Ohio tying Lake Erie to the Ohio River. He believed that the federal government should provide subsidies for infrastructure and promote a stable national banking system. In turn, entrepreneurs, *not government officials*, would provide the labor, materials, and leadership for the economic development of the West. On the issue of slavery, Ewing had taken a moderate stance. He opposed the expansion of slavery on the basis of economic, rather than moral, grounds, and was willing to see the peculiar institution contained in the South rather than abolished outright.

The Radical Republicans of the Great Lakes Rim and the Democrats of the Virginia Military District despised political moderates like Thomas Ewing. During the Civil War, Ewing warned President Abraham Lincoln against embracing emancipation as it would alienate many in the Midwest who were fighting to preserve the Union but not to abolish slavery. Southern Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois Democrats excoriated the Ewings and their allies, charging that they were destroying states' rights by fighting for the Union and allowing for a federal role in tying the East to the West with subsidized railroads. Radical Republicans, outraged by Ewing's stance on emancipation, regarded him as a traitor.

In the Lancaster area the political dynamics of the Civil War were clear to see. Nearly all the young ethnic German males whose grandparents came from Pennsylvania fought in the Civil War and voted Republican; nearly all the English Anglicans and Methodists whose family came from Virginia and Maryland decried the Union's military operations and voted Democratic. Historians, in describing American politics after the Civil War, have observed that northerners and southerners "voted the way they shot." An addendum may be in order: many northerners chose whether or not to shoot in the first place based on ethnic, familial, and geographical considerations.[11]

If not for the presence of Mid-Atlantic transplants to the central Midwest serving as buffers between the ideological extremes of the upper and lower portions of the region, it is difficult to see how Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois would have provided the Union with legions of soldiers, the best military commanders (William T. Sherman, Philip Sheridan, and Ulysses Grant), and enormous amounts of provisions. Instead, a civil war within a Civil War

would have been a strong possibility in the Midwest—in which case the South might well have achieved its independence.[12]

For decades after the Civil War voting patterns in the Mid-Atlantic and the Midwest (as was true in the South and New England) were rigidly fixed. Democrats in Pennsylvania could be found either in the Irish Catholic neighborhoods of Philadelphia, or in the counties bordering Maryland. Adams County, Pennsylvania, which narrowly gave a plurality of its votes to Lincoln in 1860, went Democratic in 1864 and voted that way after the Civil War. Not coincidentally, Gettysburg, which had witnessed some of the worst carnage of the Civil War, served as the Adams County seat. Pennsylvania at large, however, became firmly Republican—not giving its Electoral College votes to a Democratic presidential candidate until 1936.

In Ohio the Virginia Military District remained staunchly Democratic, northern Ohio rock-ribbed Republican, and the center of the state was split. Central Ohio determined which party won the state's Electoral College votes; that outcome often decided national presidential elections. It should be recalled that while disputed votes in the South were at the center of the 1876 presidential election controversy, Ohio governor Rutherford Hayes carried his home state by just 7,516 ballots. Had Hayes not fought for every vote in central Ohio, the Republicans would have lost the White House regardless of the actual outcomes in Florida, Louisiana, and South Carolina.

The electoral realities described above have not changed in the twenty-first century, even while the political dynamics were fundamentally altered. Republican areas of strength in nineteenth-century Pennsylvania and Ohio are now fiercely Democratic, while formerly Democratic areas are bastions of the Republican Party. Two facts, however, have remained constant. First, central Ohio continues to hold the balance of power in the state and remains a battleground for presidential candidates (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York in recent decades have not been "swingers" like their Buckeye kin). Second, in terms of ideology southern Ohio and Pennsylvania are just as distrustful of an assertive federal government in the twenty-first century as they were in the nineteenth century. They key is that the parties changed—and it was cities in the Mid-Atlantic and the Midwest that made this change possible.

Toward the end of the nineteenth century great industrial centers arose in the western reaches of the Mid-Atlantic and in the Great Lakes Rim. Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, and Chicago were linked in a booming economy of automobile and steel manufacturing, as well as oil refining

and electronics assembly. Such industries depended upon vast quantities of unskilled, inexpensive workers. Industrialists recruited immigrant workers from southern and eastern Europe. Forty million immigrants came to America before the 1920s, of which half remained in the United States. Croatian, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish, and Slovak Catholics went to the "Industrial Heartland," as did the Greek and Russian Orthodox and Eastern European Jews. They spoke a dozen languages (none of which were English), and did not vote or join labor unions.[13]

For many Republican politicians immigrants were a perfect constituency. Their numbers swelled the US House delegations and Electoral College votes of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan. Best of all, since immigrant workers were not citizens and could not vote, Republicans ignored them. That would prove to be a politically damaging stance in the long run. The southern and eastern European Catholics and Jews who settled in America reproduced at rates far higher than native-born Protestants. Their children claimed birthright citizenship and spoke English. Millions of them reached the voting age of twenty-one nearly simultaneously—at the beginning of the Great Depression. Between 1920 and 1936 the US electorate increased 40 percent; nearly all that increase occurred among the children of immigrants in cities like Pittsburgh and Chicago. Their political loyalties were a question waiting for an answer.

The Democrats provided the answer: federal funding for public works jobs, Social Security, unemployment insurance, the minimum wage, and collective bargaining rights for industrial workers. At the same time, Catholic clerics in Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Cleveland, and Chicago placed the moral weight of their Church behind labor union organizing. Drawing inspiration from Pope Leo XIII's 1891 encyclical, *"On the Condition of Labor,"* and Pope Pius XI's 1931 encyclical, *"Reconstructing the Social Order,"* Bishop Hugh Boyle (Pittsburgh) and George Cardinal Mundelein (Chicago) defended unions and the New Deal from communist and corporation attack. In Pittsburgh, Catholic priests walked on union picket lines and offered their churches as safe places for union meetings.

Meanwhile, Irish Catholic Democrats in the cities of the Industrial Heartland built multiethnic and religious political machines. In Boston and New York, Catholic Church leaders were often hostile to labor unions, while Irish politicians, as political scientist Steven Erie observed, proved unwilling to share power with Italians, Jews, and blacks. (Philadelphia's Irish Democrats behaved no differently, but a Republican machine built around Jews, blacks,

FIGURE 1: Arthur Rothstein, "A Group of Steelworkers discussing Politics, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania." Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division, FSA/OWI Collection fsa 8a09939 (American Memory website).

and Italians had locked them out of electoral power since the late nineteenth century.) In Pittsburgh Democratic machine boss David Lawrence forged alliances across religious, ethnic, and racial lines. While the Buffalo, Chicago, and Cleveland Democratic machines followed suit, the integration process went much further in Pittsburgh. The Catholic Church, the steelworkers' union, and the Democratic Party became an indivisible "Iron City Trinity." Even Republican industrialists, like the Scots-Irish Presbyterian Mellon family, would be welcomed by the Iron City Trinity in the common cause of revitalizing Pittsburgh's infrastructure and environment after World War II.[14]

There were others who did not welcome the political changes occurring in the Mid-Atlantic and Midwest. Southern white Democrats were no more pleased than the Boston Irish with the growing political clout of Pittsburgh and Chicago. In spite of that, their loyalty to the Democratic Party continued well into the next generation. Southerners believed states' rights were secure so long as the federal government did not promote unions and civil rights in Dixie. Southern Democrats also rationalized that receiving billions in federal subsidies for agriculture, electricity, oil, and water did not constitute any

weakening of states' rights. Subsidies were just overdue reparations from the North for having waged an unjustified war on the South—not an opening for greater federal oversight of Dixie's labor and race relations.[15]

For the rural white Protestants of southern Pennsylvania and Ohio in the 1930s, like the big-city industrial managers whose forebears had been anti-Catholic Radical Republicans, there could be no Dixie-style rationalization. Unlike southerners, they witnessed immediately and first-hand the assertion of federal power and heavier taxation that came with the New Deal and Franklin Roosevelt's presidency. Federal tax revenues and borrowed money flowed to urban Catholics and Jews; only a trickle went to the rural Protestant hinterlands. Meanwhile, small-town and urban white Protestants saw their political power slipping away.

Violent, often lethal, strikes swept Cleveland, Chicago, and the lesser mill towns and coal patches of the Midwest and Mid-Atlantic. Small-town Ohioans and Pennsylvanians blamed the violence on the heavily Catholic and Jewish Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), rather than on a well-armed management. As they could not seek political shelter (and federal funds) from the southerners who controlled most of the all-powerful committee chairs in Congress, the rural bastions of the Democratic Party in nineteenth-century New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio turned increasingly to the Republicans. Southern white Democrats took longer to make the switch, but by the early 1990s were in ideological lock step with Ohio's Virginia Military District and Adams County, Pennsylvania.

Republican strategist and George W. Bush adviser Karl Rove understood the electoral dynamics of the Mid-Atlantic, Midwest, and South better than many academics and campaign managers. Building upon Kevin Phillips's insightful 1969 analysis of the electoral interplay between region and ethnicity, Rove identified 100 key exurban counties. These counties were areas of rapid population growth that had emerged at the periphery of urban counties. While some urban counties had continued to experience population growth after the economic restructuring of the 1980s (particularly those in the south), many in the north had declined. Northerners had either left for the booming Sunbelt, or moved to neighboring exurban counties to escape rising crime rates, disappearing jobs, and failing public schools. As the deindustrialized cities of the north contracted, so did the ranks of Democratic-aligned labor unions and the electoral base of party of the New Deal.[16]

As in the nineteenth century, the middle of the Midwest, largely settled by migrants from the Mid-Atlantic, held the balance of electoral power. It

was not unusual in 2000, 2004, 2008, and 2012 for the residents of Fairfield and Delaware counties to see George W. Bush, Bill and Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama, and John McCain at some political function—and to see them on multiple occasions. Al Gore and John Kerry either failed to make an appearance, or made a quick visit and then disappeared. Rather than slug it out in central Ohio's exurban counties, they kept to the 1930s campaign model and rode motorcades through the deserted streets of Cleveland. Gore and Kerry did the same thing in Pennsylvania—scattering legions of pigeons in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia. Although exurban Philadelphia proved more forgiving of Gore and Kerry than exurban Columbus, by losing Ohio they lost the national election.

While surveying 400 years of regional politics in a few pages is a daunting proposition, we can confidently conclude with a few broad observations. Historians assaying colonial and early nineteenth-century America, such as Pencak, Zuckerman, Warner, Fischer, and Anbinder, have given students of politics an enduring framework for understanding the social roots of contemporary elections. The Mid-Atlantic region certainly stood apart from New England and the South, offering up melting-pot politics, political accommodations, and a balanced approach to the issue of how much power should be given to government. From the Mid-Atlantic perspective, government should neither be a tool of coercion (New England) nor stand completely aside as education and infrastructure needs are unmet and the civil rights of groups repressed (the South). In that regard the Mid-Atlantic and the central Midwest are siblings, navigating around extremists and determining who is worthy to be president of the country.

Historians, political scientists, and journalists are well advised to study demography and geography. While demography may not be destiny, the cultural, ethnic, and ideological characteristics of people, as well as their historical aspirations, fears, and grievances, shape our electoral contours. America's regions, while sharing DNA, have some peculiar chromosomes that make for interesting, and sometimes bickering, offspring. The best contemporary political analysts and media commentators, notably Michael Barone and Joel Kotkin, understand this point very well.[17]

In addition to appreciating region and demography, scholars would be well served by looking at more than small fragments of the past. Historiographic evolution, by its very definition, requires time. Moreover, continuities and discontinuities become clearer over the long haul. The strength of Sam Bass Warner's classic work, *The Private City*, is that he examined Philadelphia from

the colonial era to the twentieth century. Tyler Anbinder cheerfully investigated the nineteenth century, detailing the many wondrous, and baleful, contributions the Five Points neighborhood made to American politics and culture. Steven Erie, in *Rainbow's End*, examined Irish machine politics over a 145-year period and across a dozen cities—and thus created a model for studying urban politics that has maintained its analytical value. To understand the dynamics of contemporary presidential election in a battleground state such as Ohio, it is necessary to study the nineteenth century and subsequently discern the ideological and cultural influences exerted on the Midwest by the legacies of colonial Mid-Atlantic, New England, and the South.

On a final note, one which my generation of historians should appreciate, I offer an observation from the most baneful, yet entertaining, television show of the 1970s, *The Love Boat*. I recall an episode featuring the cruise ship doctor, helpfully known as "Doc," who received a reproach from a former medical school colleague and passenger aboard the *Pacific Princess*. The world-renowned specialist chided Doc for throwing away his intellectual potential to become a generalist—"knowing less and less about more and more." Doc retorted that his blinkered colleague "knows more and more about less and less." This exchange has stuck with me over the decades. Good scholars will shape our understanding of political history for years to come because they intuit that Doc had the better perspective.

NOTES

1. David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

2. Michael Zuckerman, "Introduction: Puritans, Cavaliers, and the Motley Middle," in *Friends and Neighbors: Group Life in America's First Plural Society*, ed. Zuckerman (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982), 3–25.

3. Ibid.

4. William Pencak and Conrad Edick Wright, eds., *Authority and Resistance in Early New York* (New York: New-York Historical Society, 1998), xii.

5. Sam Bass Warner Jr., *The Private City: Philadelphia in Three Periods of Growth* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987).

6. William Pencak, "Introduction," in *Riot and Revelry in Early America*, ed. William Pencak, Matthew Dennis, and Simon P. Newman (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002), 6–7.

7. Tyler Anbinder, *Five Points: The Nineteenth-Century New York Neighborhood that Invented Tap Dance, Stole Elections, and Became the World's Most Notorious Slum* (New York: Free Press, 2001). *Gangs of New York*, 2002, Miramax Films; *Copper*, 2012–2013, BBC America.

8. Pencak, "Introduction," 10–11. See as well William Pencak, "The Middle Atlantic," in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of American Political History*, ed. Michael Kazin, Rebecca Edwards, and Adam Roth (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009).

9. The discussion of the Midwest and the Ewing family draws upon Kenneth J. Heineman, *Civil War Dynasty: The Ewing Family of Ohio* (New York: New York University Press, 2012). For Lancaster, Ohio, see David R. Contosta, *Lancaster, Ohio, 1800–2000: Frontier Town to Edge City* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2000).

10. Nicole Etcheson, *The Emerging Midwest: The Upland South and the Political Culture of the Old Northwest, 1787–1861* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996).

11. For sectionalism and post–Civil War voting patterns, see V. O. Key, *Southern Politics in State and Nation* (New York: Vintage Books, 1949); and Richard Franklin Bensel, *Sectionalism and American Political Development, 1880–1980* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984).

12. Ginette Aley and J. L. Anderson, eds., *Union Heartland: The Midwestern Home Front during the Civil War* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2013).

13. The discussion of religion, politics, labor, and immigration in the Industrial Heartland draws upon Kenneth J. Heineman, *A Catholic New Deal: Religion and Reform in Depression Pittsburgh* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999); Heineman, "A Tale of Two Cities: Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and the Elusive Quest for a New Deal Majority in the Keystone State," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 132 (October 2008): 311–40; and Heineman, "Iron City Trinity: The Triumph and the Trials of Catholic Social Activism in Pittsburgh, 1932–1972," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 22 (Spring 2004): 121–45.

14. Steven P. Erie, *Rainbow's End: Irish-Americans and the Dilemmas of Urban Machine Politics, 1840–1985* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Michael Weber, *Don't Call Me Boss: David L. Lawrence, Pittsburgh's Renaissance Mayor* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1988.)

15. For southern politics and attitudes see Richard K. Scher, *Politics in the New South: Republicanism, Race, and Leadership in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Paragon House, 1992); Michael Perman, *Pursuit of Unity: A Political History of the American South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009); Roger Biles, *The South and the New Deal* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1994); and Kenneth J. Heineman, "Asserting States' Rights, Demanding Federal Assistance: Texas Democrats in the Era of the New Deal," *Journal of Policy History* (in press).

16. Kevin P. Phillips, *The Emerging Republican Majority* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1969). The discussion of Karl Rove, exurbs, and contemporary electoral patterns is drawn from Kenneth J. Heineman, *God Is a Conservative: Religion, Politics, and Morality in Contemporary America* (New York: New York University Press, 2005).

17. Michael Barone, *Our Country: The Shaping of America from Roosevelt to Reagan* (New York: Free Press, 1990); Michael Barone, *Shaping Our Nation: How Surges in Migration Transformed America and its Politics* (New York: Crown, 2013); and Joel Kotkin, *The Next Hundred Million: America in 2050* (New York: Penguin Books, 2011).

IN SEARCH OF A USEABLE—AND HOPEFUL—ENVIRONMENTAL NARRATIVE IN THE MID-ATLANTIC

Chris J. Magoc
Mercyhurst University

Abstract: Beyond a survey of some of the most recent traditional and public environmental history scholarship and trends in the Mid-Atlantic, this article—drawing from and reinterpreting the Turner Frontier Thesis—argues that the region both embodies broad currents of US environmental history and helped to establish American attitudes and patterns of behavior that migrated westward and shaped the course of national development. The article suggests that a Mid-Atlantic environmental history marked by such stories as mountaintop removal coal mining, urbanization, industrial disaster, environmental injustice, and the despoliation and ongoing recovery of rivers and watersheds like the Chesapeake and the Hudson is not only "typically" but "exceptionally" American. Further, the author notes that geography, environment, and natural resource history have shaped and informed heritage areas and other important recent work in public history, seeing in those trends the genesis of an era in which regional and subbioregional environmental histories can help inform and inspire new directions toward a more hopeful and sustainable future.
Keywords: Mid-Atlantic Region; Frederick Jackson Turner; Frontier Theory; mountaintop removal; environmental history; Chesapeake Bay; Hudson River; water pollution; Anacostia River; West Virginia; New Jersey; Hawk's Nest Tunnel Disaster; MCHM pollution; environmental historiography; Pittsburgh; Donora; pollution; Mid-Atlantic region

*T*his essay begins with a discomfiting posture for any historian: intellectual surrender. In order to offer a lens through which we might reimagine the environmental history of the Middle Atlantic, I want to suggest that it is time to consider the possibility that a cohesive environmental narrative for the region along the lines of William Cronon's seminal work on New England, and the subsequent excellent histories of other regions that have followed, may not be forthcoming.[1] I am driven to the prospect of a white-flag position in part by the sprawling nature of the physical and cultural geography of the Mid-Atlantic and the longstanding difficulties of even defining its precise outer boundaries. It may very well be that I am wrong, that a synthetic interpretation of an area that extends from the estuaries of Chesapeake Bay up the Piedmont to the Appalachian Mountains, and northeast to Long Island, Staten Island and on to the Catskills—no less, according to some definitions, the upper reaches of the Adirondack Mountains and the shores of the eastern Great Lakes—may be achievable. A holistic environmental history of the Mid-Atlantic could quite logically, for example, employ a watery scheme. One might begin at the mouth of Chesapeake, Delaware, and New York Bay and Long Island Sound, continue north and northwestward via the migration and settlement patterns that largely followed the major rivers coursing through and jutting around the mountainous, historical heart of the region. This framework would demonstrate the centrality of waterways to a region where the diagonally cutting Appalachian Mountains loom so large, and presumably reveal the inextricably entwined relationships of land, water, and people.[2] It is hard to not notice, however, that no one has yet done it—deterred perhaps by the dozen or more watersheds within the region whose individual histories complicate and make daunting indeed such an epic-scoped framework.

Although every region poses its own unique set of challenges in this regard, the environmental history of the Mid-Atlantic has unfolded across centuries on a vast landscape of some 200,000 square miles of widely variegated natural features and cultural influences, as well as complex, interrelated but often discrete, historically determinative forces that are in some ways more challenging than the more culturally identifiable and geographically delineated South or Rocky Mountain West, for example, have proven to be. Even the best environmental histories of bioregions within the Mid-Atlantic—see, for example, David Stradling's very fine *The Nature of New York: An Environmental History of the Empire State*—have laid bare the inborn challenges of such a project. If the monumentally significant Chesapeake Bay watershed of 64,000 square miles that embraces parts of six states and the nation's capital is not mighty enough to frame a comprehensive environmental history, it may be time for another tack.

After endless rumination over this question of a delimiting biophysical, geographic logic for the Mid-Atlantic, I want to suggest that we think in new directions that might help cultivate a different kind of regional environmental identity. In search of a pole star, I have come back—don't we all, eventually, willingly or not?—to Frederick Jackson Turner, who declared in his famous 1893 Frontier Thesis that the Mid-Atlantic, by virtue of its "Middle" position geographically, pluralistic cultural makeup and patterns of political organization, was "nonsectional," least conscious of itself as a region. Further, Turner argued that the "Middle region," possessing a unifying determinative focus of "material prosperity," was "typically American."[3] Well what does *that* mean, then or now? And how could this reductive and pompous characterization possibly be helpful here? Turner's thesis has been exhaustively and rightly critiqued for over a century. And yet the fundamental impulse of what might still be deemed an intellectually brave search for unifying currents of American political and cultural life may be instructive in thinking about how to frame the far-flung nature of Mid-Atlantic environmental history. Indeed, not long ago in these very pages historian James Longhurst intimated this argument, positing that while we might well not accept Turner's premise of a search for national identity or character, the eminent historian had put his finger on the natural features and historical forces that are foundational to Mid-Atlantic environmental history.[4]

At the risk of revealing myself a closet Turnerian, I want to chase this idea a bit further. Stipulating that no region's story mirrors or is prognostic of another, it is also true that *this* region not only embraces broad currents of US environmental history, but it also helped establish those attitudes and patterns of environmental behavior that migrated westward and shaped the course of development as well as ideas about "nature" in the United States. Further, its expansive and variegated geography holds a rich assemblage of pivotal episodes as well as key figures of environmental history. I am irresistibly drawn to the notion that the Mid-Atlantic is not just typically, but exceptionally American. It may be that we have the whole shebang right here in the Mid-Atlantic. As Longhurst noted, the Mid-Atlantic possesses a concentration of transformational patterns of the national environmental story, from the fateful encounter of Native peoples and Europeans to westward moving, market-driven, monoculture cash cropping, industrialization, intensive natural resource extraction, and the resulting policy response to environmental crises since the second half of the last century.

Underneath that history, however, may lie something more fundamental. Turner was more right than he knew in locating the font of what we now agree is a profoundly problematic frontier mythology in the Mid-Atlantic. And if national patterns of development and endlessly expanding economic growth are logically derivative of Turner's assertion of the Mid-Atlantic as single-mindedly driven by "material prosperity," might it be that the Mid-Atlantic represents a kind of Rosetta Stone for understanding important national elements of both historical and contemporary environmental experience? Is it not true, after all, that the bedrock of our environmental crisis *is* the frontier myth, the idea that there always is *more*, that Americans are entitled to it, that consumption without consequence is our birthright, and that whatever environmental or resource-related scarcity problems attend our consumer-driven industrial society will ultimately be solved by our national scientific and technological genius?

What follows, then, is a brief survey of key elements and representative patterns of Mid-Atlantic environmental history, particularly (though not exclusively) as revealed in recent scholarship, that on the whole suggest that there just might be value in asserting the region as not only "typically American," but emphatically so. Even as geography and the wide-ranging body of multi- and interdisciplinary scholarly work of the past generation remind us how wildly disparate this "least sectional" section of the nation is, it could be that on one level its very expansive nature holds the key to formulating a cohesive environmental narrative and identity for the region. I will suggest, too, the importance of putting to work in the public sphere the enlivening trends of the field in ways that can help secure a more hopeful environmental future. From the depletion of fisheries to endless ecologically punishing fossil fuel extraction to the fouling of urban waterways because there was always more open water to dilute the waste, the Mid-Atlantic distills much of America's frontier ethos. Fortunately, it also has encapsulated Americans' love of "nature," as well as the sobering confrontation with environmental crisis that together have given rise to inspiring, heartening movements for environmental recovery.

No matter where the outer perimeters are drawn, most interpretations of the Mid-Atlantic and its environmental history point to the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed as the identifying natural epicenter of the region. Featuring the third-largest estuary in the world, holding more miles of shoreline than the entire west coast of the United States, its watershed embracing more than 100,000 rivers and streams, the Chesapeake has earned a massive body of

literature. The most comprehensive volume may be *Discovering the Chesapeake: The History of an Ecosystem*, a multidisciplinary compendium examining the Chesapeake's remarkable natural and human history. Beginning with the origins and complex hydrological systems of the bay, continuing with the Native American presence and enduring imprint on the landscape, and extending through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries of intensifying human exploitation of the fishery and related natural systems, the collection makes clear the profound, centuries-long interconnections between the waters of the Chesapeake, the peoples of the region, and the critical importance of land use throughout the watershed. Although flawed in a number of respects, Richard D. Albright's recent work, *Death of the Chesapeake: A History of the Military's Role in Polluting the Bay*, suggests an important area of critical examination for scholars of this and many other regions: the central role that largely unregulated manufacture and disposal of munitions (including chemical weapons) for the US military have had in polluting the bay over the past century.

John R. Wennersten's acclaimed works on the bay are also worth noting—*The Oyster Wars of the Chesapeake* and *The Chesapeake: An Environmental Biography*. The latter delivers a scientific, eloquent, and nuanced history of the bay that leaves the reader with a disquieting sense that, despite decades of scientific research and fervent "Save the Bay" activism, this watery cradle of American civilization remains endangered. One comes away with the discomforting conclusion that there are no villains here; we are all descendant from and beneficiaries of a history of tobacco, logging, canal and railroad building, over-oystering, and I-95. We have met the despoiled watery frontier and she is us.

If as Jack Temple Kirby has declared, the history of Virginia without the Chesapeake is "unthinkable," and if we extend that assertion to the Mid-Atlantic and its environmental history, and if indeed the Mid-Atlantic is a defining region that established key patterns of American experience, we might logically ask whether the current state of the bay is not also distressingly prognostic.[5] It may be instructive to ask what the history and continually threatened Chesapeake suggests about the fate of less iconic waters and watersheds elsewhere.

The Chesapeake epitomizes how elemental the region's waterways are to Mid-Atlantic environmental history. Wennersten's *Historic Waterfront of Washington DC* traces the central role of the Potomac and Anacostia rivers

in shaping the course of the nation's capital. Peter C. Mancall's *Valley of Opportunity: Economic Culture along the Upper Susquehanna, 1700–1800* delivers an environmental and economic history of an important connective waterway in the northern reaches of the Mid-Atlantic. Mancall argues that following an early period of generally benign economic and cultural exchange and localized, modest impacts on the biophysical landscape, powerful economic forces tied to the transatlantic economy altered relations among peoples and accelerated the pace of environmental transformation. He offers an enlightened understanding of how distant but powerful economic forces in colonial America could transform both human and natural worlds—an urgently relevant thesis for our own time. Moreover, as Strother E. Roberts has pointed out, Mancall discards any attempt to delimit his study by arbitrary political divisions, and instead grants determinative agency to the natural features of the Upper Susquehanna to shape his work. The river, its tributaries, and the natural features of the Upper Susquehanna drive the story—demonstrating, among other things, the historiographical distance we have traveled from Turner.[6]

One of the great cities of the world and ostensibly the very definition of an "unnatural" place, New York City and its Lower Hudson River bioregion have been the subject of original and important works that collectively are helping to reshape urban environmental history. Betsy McCully's *City at the Water's Edge: A Natural History of New York* posits that New York City's resplendence might be surpassed only by the wondrous depth of its natural history. McCully reminds us that, despite centuries of human transformation, Gotham remains an urban ecosystem whose history and current condition portend important lessons as we ponder the fate of this and all coastal cities in a climate-changed world. Straddling environmental history and ecojournalism, Tom Anderson's *This Fine Piece of Water: An Environmental History of Long Island Sound* examines one of America's most beautiful but heavily used and abused estuaries.

Robert D. Lifset's recent *Power on the Hudson: Storm King Mountain and the Emergence of Modern American Environmentalism* offers a compelling account of this monumentally significant episode in the shifting terrain of environmental law in the 1960s. Lifset makes clear that what happens on land—Long Island's celebrated suburbanization, for example—is every bit as important as its marine history. Frances Dunwell's exquisitely illustrated *The Hudson: America's River* underscores the Hudson River's exalted place in

both the nation's emerging nature aesthetic of the early nineteenth century and, by the 1960s, the national movement to confront the crisis of severely degraded waterways. Finally, Matthew Gandy's *Concrete and Clay: Reworking Nature in New York City* weaves issues of public space, environmental justice, and shifting, often-contested conceptions of "nature" into a multilayered history of the city's water supply, Robert Moses's parkways, and the creation of Central Park to produce a book that might well establish a pathbreaking new direction for urban environmental history. Gandy's book is perhaps most striking for its deft extension of the past into the present, shedding light on how past public policies, social movements, and the pastoral ideal of nature are visibly expressed in the contemporary landscape of New York City.

Moreover, in this and other recent works of both traditional and public environmental scholarship throughout the Mid-Atlantic we find a realization

FIGURE 1: Since the 1820s, the Hudson River has been an iconic place in the American environmental imagination. That history continued in the 1960s, by which time the river had become a horrific, representative microcosm of river pollution across the country. Its recovery over the past decades has been equally significant, helping to point the way toward more sustainable management of waterways everywhere. Photo courtesy of Riverkeeper.org.

of Van Wyck Brooks's century-old call for a "useable" American past. As Vagel Keller argued recently in these pages, the need for environmental narratives of the past to inform contemporary policy choices has never been more imperative. Keller specifically urged an application of the principles of environmental justice to the region's largely impoverished rural countryside that is threatened increasingly by the expansion of natural gas hydrofracturing in the Marcellus Shale.[7] Turner is never far away: the extractive frontier of opportunity never "closed" in *any* of America's Wests. Like North Dakota, large swaths of Pennsylvania have been riding high the new "fracking" frontier of massive natural gas and oil development—even as the legacies of past fossil fuel extraction persist.[8]

As I have written recently, museums and other sites of public history throughout the region have been moving increasingly toward addressing the manifold resonant links between the region's environmental history and contemporary local, national, and planetary concerns from river restoration to global warming. Natural history institutions such as New York City's American Museum of Natural History and the Cayuga Nature Center in Ithaca, New York, have in the past decade featured powerful exhibitions illustrating the macro and regional impacts of climate change, the paramount environmental issue of our time.[9]

Even more impressive was the Smithsonian's Anacostia Museum exhibit in 2013 titled "Reclaiming the Edge: Urban Waterways and Civic Engagement," a multilayered, historically framed examination of Anacostia River history. The exhibition vividly chronicled the profound effects of human settlement and development on the river, pointedly addressing along the way issues of environmental justice and the larger "social and racial ecology" of the city—specifically the ways in which the befouling of the Anacostia disproportionately impacted its overwhelmingly African American and economically distressed communities. After noting the river's role in shaping culture, recreational life, and local identity, the exhibit emphasized the importance of local grassroots citizen activism over the past few decades in restoring the Anacostia. The exhibition extended these themes across the Mid-Atlantic to other urban waterways, the Allegheny and Monongahela of the Pittsburgh region, and then flung its net toward the Los Angeles River, the Thames of London, Suzhou Creek in Shanghai. With John R. Wennersten serving as lead consulting historian, the exhibition offered a dynamic, inspiring model for how other museums might address the complex history of all forms of environmental degradation. Beyond demonstrating the important but

overlooked fact that environmental history lies under our feet and in the life-giving waters of every community, the exhibit shined a rare spotlight on the role of citizen activism in redressing the recklessness of the past.[10] Although the movement to reclaim and restore urban waterways after more than a century of exploitation is certainly not unique to the Mid-Atlantic, the telling of this history at a neighborhood satellite of the nation's museum situated near the watery heart of the region suggested limitless opportunities elsewhere to pull the lessons of the environmental past into the public realm.

As with the Anacostia, the topography of the Mid-Atlantic is wrinkled by historic waterways of generally less appreciated national significance. Historian and author Adam Goodheart recently made a compelling case for the Brandywine River. More a creek than a river, the unassuming Brandywine that runs with increasing insistence from southeastern Pennsylvania toward Wilmington, Delaware, became the source of one of the nation's important early manufacturing enterprises: the DuPont Company. As Goodheart says, DuPont explosives "blasted the way for the Erie Canal and the transcontinental railroads; opened veins of California gold and Nevada silver; cut terrible swaths of destruction through Confederate armies, Indian tribes, and buffalo herds."[11] Fittingly, the built landscape of the Brandywine's rich history is now a centerpiece of Delaware's first national park.

The north-flowing Monongahela's watershed fans out across the mountains and valleys of northern West Virginia, its main stem coursing famously into Pittsburgh, where it meets the Allegheny and Ohio. The "Mon" was critical to the shipbuilding that opened the trans-Appalachian west, as well as the steel-making enterprise of Andrew Carnegie. Alongside this important economic history there lies the environmental nightmare of the "Donora Smog." In October 1948 the residents of Donora experienced the worst air pollution disaster in American history, one that killed twenty people outright and led to the premature deaths of many more unnumbered.[12] The event proved instrumental in the national movement to address the scourge of air pollution, something the now largely deindustrialized community embraced a decade ago with the opening of the Donora Smog Museum, whose slogan reads proudly, "Clean Air Started Here." According to Brian Charlton, its volunteer director, the museum continually strives "to make a clear and natural connection to contemporary environmental concerns . . . [learning] the lessons the smog disaster has to teach us . . . and [applying] them in an active and diligent way" on issues ranging from the nation's energy needs to climate change.[13]

Shrouded in those same mountains on the western edge of the Mid-Atlantic are other environmental histories of national import. The Hawks Nest Tunnel Disaster of the early 1930s that took the lives of at least 700 men—the vast majority poor African Americans from the South—under Gauley Mountain, West Virginia, has only fairly recently been brought into the orbit of environmental history. The nation's worst industrial disaster transpired over a period of years as desperate Depression-era workers quickly succumbed to silicosis while tunneling through 16,240 feet of silica-rich Gauley Mountain on a project engineered by Union Carbide. Generally forgotten for decades, Hawks Nest has been given new consideration by historians like Robert Gottlieb in light of the environmental justice movement that emerged in the 1980s, as well as coincidental, overlapping efforts to forge a new relationship between the environmental and labor movements around occupational and public health issues.[14]

Gauley Mountain stands near the southeast end of Kanawha Valley, known to many in West Virginia as "Chemical Valley" for the extensive concentration of chemical plants—according to one study, the largest in the country for nearly a century.[15] Not surprisingly, it also has been the scene of rising cancer rates, along with repeated accidental chemical releases into the environment. Most recently a spill of 10,000 gallons of a chemical compound known as MCHM in January 2014 contaminated the drinking water of more than 300,000 people.[16] MCHM's use in coal processing links it to another environmental story of enormous consequence, albeit obscure to most Americans who don't live there: mountaintop removal coal mining. Although more firmly belonging to the eleven-state expanse of terrain we know as Appalachia than the Mid-Atlantic—here again, the problem with geographic boundaries—the long history of coal and its effects on both nature and communities straddles the two regions. Mountaintop removal has leveled more than 500 mountains and buried hundreds of miles of streams across 1.5 million acres, devastating areas of southern West Virginia and southwestern Virginia, encompassing one of the most biologically rich regions in North America.[17]

Other stories are concerned not with plunder but conservation. Driven by the economic desperation of the Great Depression, and further inspired by a desire to reverse the effects of deforestation around the country, President Franklin D. Roosevelt established the Civilian Conservation Corps in April 1933 near Luray, Virginia. The "CCC Boys" there and elsewhere left a remarkable and complex legacy that helped to shape the future of conservation.[18] Among their contributions was helping to advance the Appalachian Trail as

FIGURE 2: Practiced in the Mid-Atlantic and Appalachian regions since the 1960s, Mountaintop Removal (MTR) employs fewer workers and allows companies to extract greater volumes of coal more cheaply. MTR has resulted in the destruction of more than 500 mountains from Kentucky to Virginia. Thousands of miles of headwater streams and valleys have been polluted and filled in the process of producing coal that helps power the nation. Photo by Vivian Stockman/www.ohvec.org. Flyover courtesy SouthWings.org.

it snaked over forested mountains and through valleys across the heart of the Mid-Atlantic. A generation later, not far from Camp Roosevelt in those same mountains, Supreme Court Justice William Douglas famously led an eight-day hike, sparking what became a successful effort to preserve the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal corridor from highway development. Eventually the C&O National Historical Park, along with other Mid-Atlantic sites of deindustrialization and environmental despoilment like Johnstown and Pittsburgh, helped inspire new directions in the National Park Service that asserted a broader, more richly interdisciplinary mission.

Indeed, since the 1980s the Mid-Atlantic has been at the center of the movement to preserve and interpret nationally significant histories that are bound by geography, the development of natural resources, and the transformation of regional environments. Canal heritage parks, the Johnstown Flood Memorial

Museum and nearby Allegheny Portage site, iron- and steel-making sites, the oil heritage region, the National Road heritage corridor, lumber museums, and too many more to enumerate point to the fundamentally central role of environmental history throughout the region. Each of these sites represents an opportunity to link regional natural and human history in meaningful ways that can help both inform and incite dialogue over such issues as water quality, transportation policy, long-term energy security, climate change, and the attendant environmental dimensions of a globalized economy. In addition, from Native American displacement to the Hawks Nest disaster to the communities and lives negatively impacted by fossil fuel extraction, the region encompasses an abundance of revealing histories of social-environmental injustice of urgent contemporary resonance.[19] Thus it seems equally imperative that historians continue not only to examine previously unexplored chapters of the Mid-Atlantic's environmental and ecocultural history, but also to explore avenues for disseminating their work to the widest possible audience. Visitors to museums and historic sites in the region that tell an environmental story should come away not thinking that the despoiling of land and water is a history entirely hermetically sealed in the past, but rather challenged to think about the regional and universal reverberations of those histories for our own time. The past may be both prologue and provocation to act. As Keller argued, the extent to which we—as teachers, public historians, bloggers, consultants, writers of magazine and newspaper articles, and more—can put environmental history to work in educating our fellow citizens will determine in part the relevance of Mid-Atlantic environmental scholarship and the degree to which it can be effectively deployed to help shape public policy. How citizens and elected officials treat the fracking boom in the oil and gas industry may well set the course nationwide. Will it be New York or Pennsylvania? Will we ban or lightly regulate, support renewable energy or not? Which politician's reading of climate history, whose telling of the fossil fuel industry's track record will win the day?

In this ramble that has admittedly moved us not one inch toward a more cohesive regional narrative, at least this much is clear: the Mid-Atlantic reminds us that the American relationship with nature is laden with contradictions that approach the absurd. Look no further than New Jersey. As Neil Maher made clear in his fine edited collection of essays, the state is marked both by centuries of determined wetland destruction *and* dogged efforts to restore, protect, and celebrate them as ecological wonders essential to New Jersey's coastal identity; menacing industrial contamination of the

Passaic and other rivers *and* heroic efforts to reclaim, redeem, and reimagine state waterways; sprawling suburbs and parkways that were in part responsible for the loss of so much of the "garden" in the "Garden State" *and* a more recent visionary campaign to preserve and promote local sustainable agriculture. It boasts the nation's first National Reserve in the Pine Barrens, one of the most extraordinary and largely unknown ecocultural regions in the country.[20] The paradox permeates regional environmental history: the Mid-Atlantic may be home to mountaintop removal, Levittown, and Three Mile Island, but it is also the birthplace of Wilderness Act author Howard Zahniser, Rachel Carson, John McPhee, Annie Dillard, and Edward Abbey. It seems to me that like Mid-Atlantic environmental history itself, the words and lives of these environmental giants argue against the frontier ethos (well, Abbey excepted).

Meanwhile, as our own methane-dispensing fracking frontier roars on, Arctic sea ice cover is at another near-record low, opening up whole new frontiers of exploration and development for oil, gas and mineral companies.[21] The fate of the Arctic is now at the mercy of the geostrategic interests of global powers, and those of us whom they purport to serve.[22] One begins to wonder if the times in which we find ourselves have rendered regional environmental history irrelevant. Time and space collapse under melting glaciers. In the end, the large looming question of whether, and how quickly, Americans can come to terms with the limited capacity of the planet to heal itself, with the cold geological, biophysical, and atmospheric fact that there is only so much *more*, may hinge on how forthrightly and in what forums we can confront our national environmental history. And that may in turn depend on this most ardently American region. Whether we can finally turn the corner and feel confident about the recovery of the Mid-Atlantic's ecologically precious estuaries depends in part on how candid policymakers are willing to acknowledge the sullied history that provoked recovery efforts in the first place and that continues in new forms. The same can be said about the deep, environmentally dark legacies of coal and the unfolding horror of mountaintop removal.

Hope lies in history—and in the inspired efforts of citizens working to arrest centuries of frontier-driven despoliation. In reclaimed rivers, revived historic neighborhoods, in watchdog citizens' organizations, in farm-to-table food systems emerging on old industrial landscapes, and elsewhere one can see the emergence of a new kind of frontier—one that provides a glimpse of a new sustainable paradigm, one that may yet—if Frederick Jackson

Turner was right and the Mid-Atlantic is not just typically but prophetically American—foretell our prospects for a more environmentally responsible future. At bottom, I remind myself, the frontier was always about hope and the future.

NOTES

1. William Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983. Other regional environmental histories include, for example, Albert E. Cowdrey, *This Land, This South: An Environmental History* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996); Mikko Saikku. *This Land, This Delta: An Environmental History of the Yazoo-Mississippi Floodplain* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2005); and Timothy Silver, *A New Face on the Countryside: Indians, Colonists, and Slaves in the South Atlantic Forests, 1500–1800* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990). One example of the sort of far-flung geographically expansive work that might yet be produced for the Mid-Atlantic is the edited volume of Adam M. Sowards and Mark R. Stoll, eds., *United States West Coast: An Environmental History* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO Press, 2007), and yet it, too, reveals the severe challenges of synthetic history of a region inherently, naturally resistant to it.

2. I am grateful to Randall Miller for this important observation.

3. Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Henry Holt, 1921), 26–28.

4. James Longhurst, "'Typically American': Trends in the History of Environmental Politics and Policy in the Mid-Atlantic Region," *Pennsylvania History* 79 (Autumn 2012): 410.

5. Jack Temple Kirby, "Virginia's Environmental History." *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 99 (October 1991): 451.

6. Strother E. Roberts, "Changes in the Genre: A Brief Survey of Early Mid-Atlantic Environmental Histories." *Pennsylvania History* 79 (Autumn 2012): 346–49.

7. Vagel Keller, "'Visit My Community': The Need to Extend Environmental Justice to the Countryside," *Pennsylvania History* 79 (Autumn 2012): 395–408.

8. Nicholas Casner, "Acid Mine Drainage and Pittsburgh's Water Quality," in *Devastation and Renewal: An Environmental History of Pittsburgh and Its Region*, ed. Joel A. Tarr (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003), 89–109.

9. Chris J. Magoc, "Reflections on the Public Interpretation of Environmental History in Western Pennsylvania," *Public Historian* 36 (August 2014): 50–69.

10. Robert Garcia and Daphne P. Hsu, "It's Our River and Urban Waterways and Civic Engagement at Smithsonian Anacostia Museum," KCET Link, Los Angeles, CA, September 13, 2013; available at http://www.kcet.org/socal/departures/columns/green-justice/its-our-river-urban-waterways-and-civic-engagement-at-smithsonian-anacostia-community-museum.html; accessed February 12, 2015.

11. Adam Goodheart, "History's Backyard," *National Geographic* 223 (April 2013): 63–77.

12. Devra Davis, *When Smoke Ran Like Water* (New York: Basic Books, 2003), 5–30.

13. Magoc, "Reflections on the Public Interpretation of Environmental History," 65–69.

14. Robert Gottlieb, *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2005), 236–40; see also Patricia Spangler, *The Hawks Nest Tunnel: An Unabridged History* (Proctorville, OH: Wythe-North Publishing, 2009); and Dwight Harshbarger, *Witness at Hawk's Nest* (Huntington, WV: Mid-Atlantic Highlands Publishing, 2009).

15. Nathan Cantrell, "West Virginia's Chemical Industry," *West Virginia Historical Society* 18, no. 2 (April 2004): 1–15; link to pdf file available at Laura Parker, "A Century of Controversy: Accidents in West Virginia's Chemical Valley Lead-up to Spill," *National Geographic*, January 16, 2004, http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2014/01/140116-chemical-valley-west-virginia-chemical-spill-coal/; accessed February 23, 2015.

16. Michael Wines, "Owners of Chemical Firm Charged in Chemical Spill," *New York Times*, December 17, 2014; available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/18/us/owners-of-chemical-company-charged-in-elk-river-spill.html?_r=0; accessed February 23, 2015.

17. Several very good scholarly works on mountaintop removal have been produced over the past decade. Perhaps the best is Shirley Stewart Burns, *Bringing Down the Mountains: Mountaintop Removal on Southern West Virginia Communities* (Morgantown, WV: University of West Virginia Press, 2007).

18. Neil Maher, *Nature's New Deal: The Civilian Conservation Corps and the Roots of the American Environmental Movement* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).

19. My thanks to Beverly Tomek for the reminder of this key issue.

20. Neil Maher, *New Jersey's Environments: Past, Present and Future* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2006).

21. National Snow and Ice Data Center; http://nsidc.org/arcticseaicenews/; accessed March 1, 1015.

22. Elisabeth Rosenthal, "Race Is On as Melting Ice Reveals Arctic Treasures," *New York Times*, September 18, 2002; available at http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/19/science/earth/arctic-resources-exposed-by-warming-set-off-competition.html?_r=0; accessed March 1, 2015.

A *LABORED* MID-ATLANTIC REGION DEFINED, NOT DISCOVERED: SUGGESTIONS ON THE INTERSECTIONS OF LABOR AND REGIONAL HISTORY

Rachel A. Batch
Widener University

Abstract: Despite expansive agendas in labor and working-class history, a Mid-Atlantic regional perspective has not been, and likely will not be, deemed useful in discerning historical change and causation for core questions in the field. Following a brief survey of labor historiography and its emerging directions, the author considers diverse ways of "finding" a region and regional identities through routes of work and place, and suggests that a Mid-Atlantic labor identity might be found in the "drama and debris" of the Great Strike of 1877 and during deindustrialization in the 1970s.

Keywords: Mid-Atlantic region, labor history, 1877 Railroad Strike, labor strikes, deindustrialization, labor historiography, Pennsylvania labor history, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey

"One inescapable reality of American labor history" is "the never-ending struggle between workers and bosses for power," writes Melvyn Dubofsky in *Hard Work: The Making of Labor History*.[1] In that collection of essays and articles drawn from decades of his research and teaching the "new" labor history, Dubofsky succinctly captures a fundamental topic explored by historians

in the subfield. The "new" labor history, begun in the 1960s, had departed from the "old" labor history's institutional focus on trade unions and labor leaders and, by the 1980s, had produced voluminous research on working people and their work (work settings, occupations, labor processes, labor markets, modes of managerial control, and work cultures) in community and case studies. Such work was cross-cut by ethnicity, gender, and race, and considered workers' experiences both inside and outside of workplaces to understand working-class formation and class consciousness, working-class communities, families, and many other social, fraternal, religious, and political networks operating in—and by and for—workers' worlds.[2] By the 1990s this "new" labor history seemed "not so new." Emerging research on the "cultural" or "linguistic" turn in labor history focused less on materialist and structural sides to the stories of "struggle," industrial and other relations in working-class life, and "power" (or control, or will, or agency), and more so on language and expression, to reveal operational hierarchies of power, such as whiteness and patriarchy.[3] Yet all of these labor histories—the old, the new, and the "new, new"—continue in the twenty-first century. As Dubofsky describes it, "labor history has become a moveable feast."

> Its practitioners have indeed restored voice to the previously inarticulate, turned those at the bottom of society into historical subjects with will and agency, and portrayed working people in all their ethnic, racial, gendered and cultural diversity. They have continued to write solid institutional histories and substantial biographies; add more and more working-class communities to our knowledge base; broaden substantially our understanding of nonwhite workers; explore how gender has governed the behavior of workers; interrogate the language and cultural practices of working people; and probe the ever-changing relationship among workers, the state, and the law.[4]

But what of a *Mid-Atlantic* labor history? Historians of labor and working-class history have assayed regional characteristics of all manner of work in the South, New England, the Midwest, and the West, but they have not yet offered any sustained and discernible *Mid-Atlantic* regional perspective in their studies. To be sure, labor historians have studied workers and work in communities and in regions that fall geographically within the political boundaries of the Mid-Atlantic states—for example, the anthracite region of

northeastern Pennsylvania; the "industrial heartland" of Pittsburgh and its many surrounding mill towns; the coke region of southwestern Pennsylvania, or the Philadelphia metropolitan region—and they have done so in varying, historical time periods.[5] Industrial geographies of either manufacturing/extractive/commercial pursuits, or transportation systems, or market "revolutions" seem to define such regions—or better labeled "subregions"—should a Mid-Atlantic region be discovered.

By way of contrast in seeking a Mid-Atlantic region, historians have referenced other regions such as "the South," "the West," or the Sunbelt and the Rust Belt, and whether in scholarly literature or popular recognition, the monikers conjure narratives of historical trajectories and ones not just based in place and time but in "a sense of place," a "knowingness," and an identity of difference that, for example, westerners or southerners had from "the East" or "the North."[6] Scholars of the "New Western history" have been successful in critically redefining a regional history of "the West" from that of westward expansion (the Turnerian frontier) to researching distinctive and shared characteristics of the region based in the historical legacies of "conquest" and "colony" and in experiences unique to westerners.[7] In doing so, the New Western history helps to animate how conceptualizations of region shape the American, national history. Yet, a complete mapping of "the West" remains undone, and as one scholar claims, "to conceive of a West as a single, integrated, homogenous region is to force a 'square peg' historical geographic reality into a 'round hole' regional label."[8] I anticipate that even for the expansive (and currently expanding) field of labor history, a Mid-Atlantic regional lens will focus attention on what is ultimately an artificial, and forced, construct.

Just where (and, more significantly, when, and definitely why) would this Mid-Atlantic region be located and useful to define for the study of labor history? Shall we begin our mapping of the area along the New York–Philadelphia–Baltimore axis in the east, and travel from Baltimore moving upstream on the Susquehanna River and along the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad? Doing so will capture workers, work, and industries of Trenton and Patterson, Camden and Chester, Wilmington to Sparrows Point, and north again to Williamsport. The 1846 charter for the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the earlier years of traversing the Alleghenies, were too important not to connect this Mid-Atlantic east to western Pennsylvania and to the three rivers that meet in Pittsburgh. We might also include the area north of Pittsburgh, to Erie and Buffalo, and head east again to Rochester and Albany, and to the

Hudson River either on canals or rails. Boundaries of a Mid-Atlantic region are blurry in 1855 as they would be in 1955, and yet, however far north (to Connecticut?), or far south (to Virginia?), or far west (to Ohio or West Virginia?) one draws this region, Pennsylvania is its center and likely is its connective core.[9]

We could follow an economic linkage of railroads to draw a Mid-Atlantic laboring region, but why not canals, rivers, the Chesapeake Bay, or the Atlantic Ocean? Or turnpikes, interstate highways, and airports? Or we might track coal, coke, and steel, though we'd neglect glass, pottery, textiles, clothing, and earlier, timber, charcoal, iron, and many water-powered mills and, one hopes, we would not completely ignore agriculture.[10] Such approaches based on "industry" or "technology" or "economic history" might devalue labor and working-class experiences in defining a Mid-Atlantic region.[11] The unevenness of capitalist development in different sectors of the economy combined with the total diversity of laboring experiences across place and time—in other words, a holistic heterogeneity from historians' vantage—may well be the defining feature of this Mid-Atlantic map. I would suggest this is the reason labor historians have not written theoretically or comparatively about the significance of a Mid-Atlantic *region* for the culture, politics, and organizational structure of working-class life, or in the traditional "institutions" approach to the study of unions and labor leaders in comprehending the dynamics of working-class struggle in the United States.

In fact, two more recent agendas in labor historiography will likely submerge a focus on region for the national story. The first is transnational history, which includes those "processes and actors that move across territorial boundaries of diverse nation-states," and those processes that are "extremely diverse," including "economies, demographic movements, capital flows, ideas, cultures and commodities." Labor historians using a transnational lens adopt a global perspective, pose research questions no longer contained by a nation-state's borders, and accord "flow and movement itself as constructive of change, as causally significant, and thus producing history."[12] Scholars of contemporary and historical im/migrations have pursued transnationalism with vigor and offer labor historians refined models of transregionalism and transcultural spaces in thinking about economic connections and information networks that im/migrants have used, and still use, to insert themselves into segmented labor markets.[13]

A second agenda comes from a recent issue of *International Labor and Working-Class History* that calls for explorations of "labor geographies," that

is, how workers attempt to shape the geographies of capitalism. The issue suggests future research on topics such as population density and class formation, or contiguity of work and home, or the relationship between property ownership and class identity, and which might probe "how capitalism functions as a spatial system and explore what this means for workers' social praxis."[14] Perhaps labor history will develop a "spatial turn" wherein "region" might become a lens to discern effects of globalization on international solidarity movements, diasporas, or commodity chains. As of yet, a "Mid-Atlantic" region has not been historicized as part of a transnational or transregional project.[15]

Returning to the sheer diversity of labor and working-class pasts in the Mid-Atlantic: what labor did the area (region) not depend on? Slave labor or cowboys driving cattle? Did only workers in the Mid-Atlantic experience (as the aptly titled works convey) *Lives of Their Own* or *Work in a Disaster-prone Industry*? Mid-Atlantic communities certainly came to understand *Family Time and Industrial Time* (as did communities in New Hampshire), and the area's workers contributed to *Making a New Deal* (as did workers in Chicago).[16] We might also ask: which immigrant, ethnic, and racial groups did not work in Mid-Atlantic economies over time? Waves of immigrants, Great Migrations, migrant workers, and deindustrial diasporas are captured in labor and industrial community histories, and cumulatively such studies demonstrate how diversity and uneven prosperity have assisted and hindered worker struggles in a capitalist wage-labor system. Further, such studies emphasize the significance of ethnic, gendered, and racial identities in the making of opposition cultures and in working-class life. Yet, these studies supply little evidence or argument for a *Mid-Atlantic* regional cohesion, let alone for workers' own awareness of a Mid-Atlantic *identity* upon which to act as historical agents in the shaping of capital-labor relations.[17]

Perhaps there were historical "moments" when members of a Mid-Atlantic working class saw themselves as part of a shared region of "inequality and stratification, differing social mobility, [and] work discipline" and conjured a movement culture and *mentalité* based in mutual recognition that their labor existed as commodity and themselves as fundamentally different from capitalists.[18] In a pessimistic suggestion of shared experience (perhaps sentimentalist, because I am offering reactive examples), a Mid-Atlantic laboring identity might be found in the "drama and debris" of both the Great Strike of 1877 and in capital's mobility that occurred throughout the mapped area a century later. Such "moments" actually span years of

connected and unconnected responses to capitalism(s) by industrializing and deindustrializing societies. In order to seek a Mid-Atlantic laboring identity, our quest would be to find "existing qualities, beliefs, experiences, situations that together transcend sub-regional heterogeneity and bind together people and places."[19]

On our map of the Mid-Atlantic, Martinsburg, West Virginia, is uncannily at its center. Though the Great Upheaval began there and on the B&O Railroad in July 1877, Herbert Gutman saw its "prelude" in the years of 1873–74 when workers struck again and again in "small railroad towns and in isolated semi-rural regions" throughout Mid-Atlantic states, and, just as in 1877, strikes occurred in locations farther west and south. Gutman emphasized the railroad workers' "readiness . . . to express their grievances" with or without the direction from railroad brotherhoods, yet commonly and crucially with support from their local communities.[20] Strikes occurred along the Erie Railroad and at its shops in the northeastern Pennsylvania town of Susquehanna Depot and along its western connective hub at Hornellsville, New York; more strikes happened in towns connected by the Lehigh Valley Railroad between Pittston, Pennsylvania, and Waverley, New York, as well as along the Delaware, Lackawanna, & Western Railroad at Hoboken and New York City, and the western divisions of the Pennsylvania Railroad system at Pittsburgh and farther west to cities and towns in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Key characteristics of this prelude to 1877 included how in those many small towns "local discontent sparked the strikes," and that "unlike in the cities . . . the discontented worker still was viewed by his fellow citizens as an individual and was not yet the stereotyped 'labor agitator.'" According to Gutman, that striking workers and supportive communities were able to stop trains and "take over" railroad properties signaled shared "institutional and ideological factors [which] added to the strength of the workers and temporarily, at least, weakened the power of employers."[21]

It is not, though, in the strikers' demands or in the strikes' debris (and there was less debris resulting from violence and railroad destruction in 1873–74 than in the upheaval of 1877) that I would seek a Mid-Atlantic regional and laboring identity. Instead, I would look to that period's present and ensuing drama of how companies and states attempted to restore the working of the roads and to prevent disruptive working-class discontent, in 1873–74 and again in 1877, and to help us discern (or better yet, imagine) a regional pattern of both working-class peoples' experiences with "law and order" and their expectations for an equitable social contract. At Susquehanna

Depot, a town of 8,000 became an "armed camp" with 1,800 soldiers from the Wilkes-Barre militia and supplemented by Philadelphia soldiers. Martial law was declared, 1,200 workers fired, and the Erie Railroad reasserted its control.[22] At Hornellsville the railroad conceded to all striking workers, though "trouble" there reached back to 1869 and forward to 1880s as a "rights consciousness" permeated the social contexts of railroad workers' lives.[23]

Workers along with their sympathetic and supportive communities throughout Mid-Atlantic areas would come to recognize the establishment—and the force—of "state militias," those National Guard units sent to supplement the railroad police, or the "Cossacks," a.k.a. the Coal and Iron police, or sent to aid the professional "finks" from such private police forces as Baldwin-Felts or Pinkerton. Workers and communities in rural areas also saw the establishment of the state police, and the building of many arsenals near to industrial worksites. Discovering and defining a Mid-Atlantic region through the drama (and trauma?) of "law and order" imposed by publicly funded forces and military strikebreaking would not, I admit, be contained solely within a Mid-Atlantic area, but residents of the region's places and spaces in the 1870s surely shared concerns about capital's and, increasingly, the state's unilateral terms for a (revised) social contract.

In another example, discovering region might also be found in the debris of deindustrialization and its representations. I wonder, does the Mid-Atlantic have more monuments and historical markers commemorating work, labor leaders, and labor actions than any other region? Does the region have more museums exhibiting working lives and industry? I think the Mid-Atlantic might have the most "ruin porn": popular and professional images taken of crumbling sites of industry, haunting interiors of factory floors, where once there was activity and noise: now silence, not grease on the machines but dust, from which viewers conjure (or mourn?) imagined men at work. A recent collection of photographs, *Modern Ruins,* captures the rusting Bethlehem Steel in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and weeds and young trees overtaking the Carrie Furnace at Rankin, Pennsylvania.[24] Its introduction asks if these industrial ruins are "fossils," or "remnant anatomies," or "survivors," and ponders our fascination with them: is it due to a delight in witnessing destruction or in reliving those "disturbed layers of a traumatized consciousness"?[25] Visual evidence of a deindustrial sublime include the anthracite counties' culm banks or Ashley's coal breaker, the latter of which inspired local preservation efforts *in order to* remember and stave off the "future of amnesia," whereas the outdoor mall at Homestead ("for

shopping, dining, and entertainment at 'The Waterfront'") inspires poetry and photography about long-time residents' social dislocation.[26] Artistic renderings and preservation efforts aside, Mid-Atlantic residents are surrounded by material evidence and social memories of many declines: from Hazelton and Trenton, to Camden and Chester, or Coatesville and Sparrows Point, and not just in towns like Brownsville or Braddock, but across rural counties' landscapes.[27] Whether the debris is considered environmentally damaging, or heroic, or nostalgic, those former industrial sites contain a drama, currently in attempts to represent, and certainly in labor historians' research about the recent, lived pasts when workers and communities heard the silence of the coal tipples, train trestles, and factory floors.

In *The Face of Decline* Thomas Dublin and Walter Licht define Pennsylvania's anthracite region in two ways: "distinctive" due to its geologic and industrial history, and also in its social dynamics comprised of "crises, coping, resilience, and love of place" due to the long decline of anthracite mining.[28] Multiple oral histories inform their study: we hear from extended generations of working families and learn about their strategies to maintain livelihoods and communities, and also adapt in the present and plan for the future. The range of economic problems that wove the "labor question" in the late nineteenth century came to be respun in the late twentieth century with deindustrialization (and in the anthracite region since the 1920s.) Capital's mobility (often in its quest for cheaper labor) and its effects on workers and communities are subjects of important recent studies of Mid-Atlantic industries, for example, Dan Sidorick's study of Camden's Campbell's Soup, Jefferson Cowie's study of RCA, and Ken Wolensky's study of New York City's "run-away" (garment) shops to Wilkes-Barre.[29] Guian McKee and James Wolfinger in separate studies describe the frictions of race and labor politics in the City of Brotherly Love during shifting economies in the mid-twentieth century, and on the other side of the state during the decline and fall of the steel industry, Charlie McCollester contends a laboring identity is the *Point of Pittsburgh* (even in the absence of work).[30]

Might a Mid-Atlantic regional identity have formed (or have appeared) in workers' empathy with other workers—even those residing hundreds of miles away—during moments (and over the course of years) when "the necessity of downsizing" was heard? Or, following devastations to rural, often countywide, economies, might a Mid-Atlantic region convey a wry excitement at the announcement that a Wal-Mart was planned? Could a shared recognition about the "number of new jobs," and not the quality of work or pay of those

jobs, have been a defining, regional characteristic: an identity of difference that marked a generation who experienced the permanence of a postindustrial Mid-Atlantic?

Perhaps not. Maybe instead workers in their communities became insular, protective, and parochial and so even less suited for a fast-paced global capitalism where corporations have no stake in geographic or political boundaries.[31] Perhaps in the face of decline during the late twentieth century is another call to labor historians to seek out working-class conservatism: "working people who neither joined unions, nor radical political organizations, nor resisted employers but instead shared a belief in an 'American way of life,'" who cast votes counter to their economic interests, or rejected an aging New Deal liberalism (or who never fully embraced it) as a shared characteristic of a Mid-Atlantic region.[32]

These speculations on shared "dramas and debris" have attempted to connect place with experience (i.e., a sense of place) that workers held and that shaped communities' responses within Mid-Atlantic economies. In both of these overgeneralized and imaginative examples in search of a Mid-Atlantic regional identity, labor historians would likely agree that geographic power was linked to workplace power: whether seen in the "moments" of 1873–1874/1877 railroad strikes when geographic power was necessary for an increase in workplace power (albeit temporarily) or, by the 1970s, in the representations about its uncoupling. Further, historians in search of region also might conceptualize how a Mid-Atlantic urban-rural divide may have been bridged by capital-state punitive power to restore order during the late nineteenth century, or investigate how "class happens" across urban-suburban-rural settings in the late twentieth century. Such topics would add to the *hard work* that labor historians do: there is a rich body of work on labor history in the Mid-Atlantic states, and this body of work does not come close to constituting a Mid-Atlantic labor and working-class history. A "Mid-Atlantic region" has not been considered as a variable or a lens; it has been more so a "setting" or a "do-able" (researchable) location with boundaries often defined by industry. I cannot say that a "regional identity" will never be found for the Mid-Atlantic; however multiple, key works of labor history find more useful subregions within a Mid-Atlantic, and several current trends in labor historiography militate against the search for subregional cohesion.

In current writings on how to revitalize a contemporary labor movement authors suggest how region is key—rather, region needs to become central— to organizing strategies and to reverse the decline of labor unions.[33] One

critique of the 2005 AFL-CIO/Change to Win debate argued that initiatives did not emphasize the need to build regional power across communities (e.g., "Union Cities") and urged the transformation of the role of central labor councils into regional bodies by acknowledging that "globalization has increased the importance of regional economies as key sites for public and private decision making."[34] Calls for regional "place-based" power building with social vision have great appeal: creating coalitions with activist groups and across multiple social and economic justice issues. As labor historians continue their historical investigations of locales and workers in new economies and document organizing movements in both the private and the public sectors—at worksites that cannot move—labor identities of place, space, and transregional networks for mobilization may well be topics to explore.

NOTES

1. Melvyn Dubofsky, *Hard Work: The Making of Labor History* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 183.

2. Indeed, James Green's *The World of the Worker* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1980) evidenced one of several attempts to synthesize the many community and case studies researched by labor historians who, like him, were influenced by the "fathers" of the new labor history: David Montgomery, Herbert Gutman, and David Brody. Another important synthesis was David Brody's *Workers in Industrial America: Essays on the Twentieth Century Struggle* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980). Calls for synthesis continued and a fine collection of essays edited by Leon Fink, *In Search of the Working Class: Essays in American Labor History and Political Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), offered several strategies and also suggested restoring elements of analysis from John R. Commons and the Wisconsin School. Key works by the "fathers" of the new labor history include David Montgomery, *Workers' Control in America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), and *The Fall of the House of Labor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Herbert Gutman, *Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America: Essays in American Working-Class and Social History* (New York: Vintage, 1977); and David Brody, *Steel Workers in America: The Nonunion Era* (New York: Harper and Row, 1960).

3. On "whiteness" see David Roediger, *Wages of Whiteness: Race and The Making of the American Working Class* (New York: Verso, 1991); and Eric Arnesen's critique, "Whiteness and the Historians' Imagination," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 60 (Fall 2001): 3–32, and in the same issue, James Barrett's "Whiteness Studies: Anything Here for Historians of the Working Class?" 33–42. New questions about the historical intersections of race and class (and gender) identities are raised by Guenther Peck, "White Slavery and Whiteness: A Transnational View of the Sources of Working-Class Radicalism and Racism," *LABOR: Studies in Working-class History of the Americas* 1 (Summer 2004): 41–63. On gender, see Joan W. Scott, "On Language, Gender, and Working Class History," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 31 (Spring 1987): 1–13; Alice Kessler-

Harris, *Women Have Always Worked: A Historical Overview* (Old Westbury, NY: Feminist Press, 1981); and Ava Baron, ed., *Work Engendered: Toward a New History of American Labor* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991).

4. Melvyn Dubofsky, "Historiography of American Labor History," in *Encyclopedia of Labor and Working-class History*, ed. Eric Arnesen (New York: Routledge, 2007), 600.

5. Robert P. Wolensky and William A. Hastie Sr., *Anthracite Labor Wars: Tenancy, Italians, and Organized Crime in the Northern Coalfield of Northeastern Pennsylvania, 1897–1959* (Easton, PA: Center for Canal History, 2013); Eric Leif Davin, *Crucible of Freedom: Workers' Democracy in the Industrial Heartland, 1914–1960* (New York: Lexington Books, 2010); Kenneth Warren, *Wealth, Waste, and Alienation: Growth and Decline in the Connellsville Coke Industry* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2001); Muriel Earley Sheppard, *Cloud by Day: The Story of Coal and Coke and People* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1991); Phillip Scranton, *Figured Tapestry: Production, Markets and Power in Philadelphia Textiles, 1855–1941* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); and Francis Ryan, *AFSCME's Philadelphia Story: Municipal Workers and Urban Power in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2010).

6. Finding "region" through folklore and in American cultural studies is Barbara Allen and Thomas J. Schlereth, eds., *A Sense of Place: American Regional Cultures* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1990). On the "regionalist impulse," see Edward L. Ayers, Patricia Nelson Limerick, Stephen Nissenbaum, and Peter S. Onuf, *All Over the Map: Rethinking American Regions* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996); and, more recently, Timothy R. Mahoney and Wendy J. Katz, eds., *Regionalism and the Humanities* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008).

7. Patricia Limerick, *Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West* (New York: Norton, 1987); and Richard White, *"It's your misfortune and none of my own": A History of the American West* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991).

8. Peter S. Morris, "Where Is the American West? Creating a Base Map for a New Regional History," paper presented at Ninetieth Annual Meeting of the Association of American Geographers, San Francisco, CA, April 1, 1994

9. Pennsylvania as the Mid-Atlantic's "connective core" is mainly based in its geographic location, though Pennsylvania labor history certainly has more than its share of labor leaders and major (and alternative) labor movements and actions. The Pennsylvania Historical Association (PHA) and Pennsylvania Labor History Society has published a "Pennsylvania Labor History Bibliography" available at the PHA's website, http://www.pa-history.org; and see "Labor's Struggle to Organize" on the public history and heritage website, ExplorePAHistory.com, http://explorepahistory.com/story.php?storyId=1-9-22.

10. Cindy Hahamovitch and Rick Halpern, "'Not a 'Sack of Potatoes': Why Labor Historians Need to Take Agriculture Seriously," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 65 (Spring 2004): 3–10.

11. Donald R. Adams Jr., an economic historian, periodizes a 1790–1860 Mid-Atlantic economy (and did not cross the Alleghenies). He examines supply and demand for labor in these years, capital flows, and wage rates in somewhat arbitrarily defined the Mid-Atlantic and does not compare his findings interregionally, though he admits that more could be investigated intraregionally. See "The Mid-Atlantic Labor Market in the Nineteenth Century," in *Working Papers from the Regional Economic History Research Center*, ed. Glenn Porter and William H. Mulligan Jr. (Greenville,

DE: Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation, 1980), 99–112. Borders of this Mid-Atlantic map would not necessarily take one hundred years to shift, and a southern (sectional) economy may not only be distinguished by slave labor. As John Majewski finds in his comparative study of Albemarle County, Virginia, and Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, antebellum citizens and boosters in both places welcomed infrastructure improvements to link markets and increase prosperity. Yet competition between rival Virginia cities hampered the political process of financing railroad development, marking a divergence in economic development of the two counties in the 1830s. Majewski, *A House Dividing: Economic Development in Pennsylvania and Virginia before the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

12. Julie Greene, "Historians of the World: Transnational Forces, Nation-States, and the Practice of U.S. History," in *Workers Across the Americas: The Transnational Turn in Labor History,* ed. Leon Fink (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 13.

13. Dirk Hoerder, "Overlapping Spaces: Transregional and Transcultural," in *Workers Across the Americas*, ed. Fink, 33–38. See also Marcel van der Linden, "The Promise and Challenges of Global Labor History," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 82 (Fall 2012): 57–76.

14. Andrew Herod, "Workers Space and Labor Geography," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 64 (Fall 2003): 112–38.

15. Hoerder, "Overlapping Spaces," 33–38.

16. John Bodnar, Roger Simon, and Michael P. Weber, *Lives of Their Own: Blacks, Italians, and Poles in Pittsburgh, 1900–1960* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982); Anthony F. C. Wallace, *St. Clair: A Nineteenth-Century Coal Town's Experience with a Disaster-Prone Industry* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981); Tamara Hareven, *Family Time, Industrial Time: The Relationship between The Family and Work in a New England Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

17. A detailed historiographical note listing all of those labor histories and industrial community studies of "waves of immigrants, Great Migrations, migrant workers, and de-industrial diasporas" in Mid-Atlantic areas would be impractical here.

18. These "broad strokes" of class consciousness are from Sean Wilentz, "Against American Exceptionalism: Class Consciousness and the American Labor Movement, 1790–1920," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 26 (Fall 1984): 1–24.

19. Morris, "Where Is the American West?," n.p.

20. Gutman, "Trouble on the Railroads in 1873–1874: Prelude to the 1877 Crisis?" in *Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America*, 295–320.

21. Ibid., 318–19.

22. Ibid., 315–17.

23. Shelton Stromquist, "'Our Rights as Workingmen': Class Traditions and Collective Action in a Nineteenth-Century Railroad Town, Hornellsville, N.Y., 1869–1882," in *The Great Strikes of 1877*, ed. David O. Stowell (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 55–75.

24. Shaun O'Boyle, *Modern Ruins: Portraits of Place in the Mid-Atlantic Region*, introduction by Geoff Manaugh (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010).

25. Geoff Manaugh, "Introduction: The Survivals," in ibid., viii–xii.

26. Jim Daniels and Charlee Brodsky "Homestead from Mill Town to Mall Town," *LABOR: Studies in Working-class History of the Americas* 4 (Winter 2007): 7–21; and Judith Modell Schachter, *A Town Without Steel, Envisioning Homestead* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1998). Also for the former Homestead Steelworks' Waterfront strip mall and the "ghostly" or "nostalgic" twelve smokestacks that remain, see Jefferson Cowie and Joseph Heathcott, "The Meanings of Deindustrialization," in *Beyond the Ruins*, ed. Cowie and Heathcott (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 1–18. The Huber Breaker Preservation Society (http://www.huberbreaker.org) is one of many grassroots organizations that since the 1990s attempted to "save" Glen Alden Coal's Huber breaker. It was dismantled in 2014 to the dismay of those leading local preservation efforts in Ashley: http://dcist.com/2014/01/abandoned_huber_coal_breaker.php#photo-1.

27. Of course, residents in Mid-Atlantic states are surrounded by the remains of earlier declines. Though not a labor historian, Anthony F. C. Wallace began his 1972 study *Rockdale* with a pervasive sense of place and the remains of past industry: "There is a village in America called Rockdale where the people used to manufacture cotton cloth. It lies along the banks of Chester Creek in Delaware County, in southeastern Pennsylvania, between Philadelphia and Wilmington. None of the people who worked in the first cotton mills is alive anymore, but some of their children's children still live there, and the ruins of stone factories, as well as stone tenements and fine stone mansions, are yet standing. Nearby are remains of the other hamlets that made up the Rockdale manufacturing district—Lenni, Parkmount, West Branch, Crozerville, Glen Riddle, and Knowlton—where cotton yarn was spun on mules and throstles and cloth was woven on looms powered by water wheels." Wallace, *Rockdale: The Growth of an American Village in the Early Industrial Revolution* (New York: Norton, 1972), 4.

28. Thomas Dublin and Walter Licht, *The Face of Decline: The Pennsylvania Anthracite Region in the Twentieth Century* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005), 1.

29. Daniel Sidorick, *Condensed Capitalism: Campbell Soup and the Pursuit of Cheap Production in the Twentieth Century* (Ithaca, NY: ILR Press, 2009); Jefferson Cowie, *Capital Moves: RCA's Seventy Years Quest for Cheap Labor* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999); Kenneth C. Wolensky, Nicole H. Wolensky, and Robert P. Wolensky, *Fighting for the Union Label: The Women's Garment Industry and the ILGWU in Pennsylvania* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002).

30. Guian A. McKee, *The Problem of Jobs: Liberalism, Race, and Deindustrialization in Philadelphia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008); James Wolfinger, *Philadelphia Divided: Race and Politics in the City of Brotherly Love* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); John Hoerr, *And the Wolf Finally Came: The Decline and Fall of the American Steel Industry* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1988); Charles McCollester, *The Point of Pittsburgh: Production and Struggle at the Forks of the Ohio* (Pittsburgh: Battle of Homestead Foundation, 2008).

31. Questioning the "power of community" are Robert Bussel and Amy Bischof, "'Everybody's Town': Defending the Social Contract in Hershey, Pennsylvania," *LABOR: Studies in Working-class History of the Americas* 1 (Summer 2004): 27–39; and Cowie, *Capital Moves*, 185–90.

32. This call to explore workers' conservatism—about workers who chose to support "an American way of life and proved more loyal to their churches or religious faiths than to their unions or class"—is from Dubofsky, *Hard Work*, 231. A recent reformulation of New Deal liberalism is Jefferson Cowie and Nick Salvatore's "The Long Exception: Rethinking the Place of the New Deal in American

History," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 74 (Fall 2008): 3–32. See several historians' responses in the same *ILWCH* issue, especially Nancy MacLean's critique, "Getting New Deal History Wrong," 49–55.

33. On the role of central labor councils and possibilities of social movement unionism see Bill Fletcher and Fernando Gaspasian, *Solidarity Divided: The Crisis in Organized Labor and A New Path Toward Social Justice* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009); and Rick Fantasia and Kim Voss, *Hard Work: Remaking the American Labor Movement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004). Twentieth-century historical perspectives are in David Brody, *Labor Embattled: History, Power, Rights* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2005).

34. Amy Dean and David B. Reynolds, "Labor's New Regional Strategy: The Rebirth of Central Labor Councils," *New Labor Forum* 17, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 46–55.

IN THEIR PLACES: REGION, WOMEN,
AND WOMEN'S RIGHTS

Susan Klepp
Temple University, Emerita

Abstract: Was there a distinct Mid-Atlantic region for either women or gender relations? An examination of women and politics between the early eighteenth century and the early twentieth century suggests the answer is no, there was not. A regional definition for politically active women encompassed the entire northeast, not just the mid-Atlantic and became the center of the suffrage movement. As late as 1915, however, the anti–women's rights forces were dominant and it was the far west that led in the movement for the vote.

Keywords: Lenape; Munsees; Iroquois; Quaker women; Elizabeth Ashbridge; New England; Delaware Valley; New York; New Jersey; Pennsylvania; American Ladies' Association; Women's rights advocates; women's suffrage.

*W*as a Mid-Atlantic regional identity shaped by American women or were American women influenced by the geographical space they happened to inhabit? What follows is a quick look at a few historical examples that suggest there was no fixed Mid-Atlantic region for women. Sometimes this region was primarily confined to the valley of the Delaware River; at other times Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York were subsumed within the much larger region of the industrialized, free northern half of the

United States. Currently, progressive stances on gender rights in Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey are often seen as a part of an East Coast or bicoastal region defined by culture, cosmopolitanism, and more liberal political leanings. The settlement patterns of particular religious groups, the presence or absence of slavery, the existence of discomfiting nearby regions, particularly the contrast with the South, are among the important factors producing regional affinities among activists, that is a developing regional identity on women's issues.

Regional identities are sometimes visible only to historians; at other times they are acknowledged, even embraced, by contemporaries, once to the point that they sparked a civil war. The creation of a region can also be an artifact of scholarly research, a means by which historians create manageable projects based on the accessibility and richness of relevant archives and the time constraints of academic life. Mid-Atlantic then becomes a synecdoche for modal American culture, structures, or events.[1] Region can be a geographic and a cultural space as well as a pragmatic device by historians to plot trends and affinities in a complex and elusive past.

A study of physical space yields little to support the existence of a readily identifiable feminine Mid-Atlantic region or any other region for that matter. For most of American history, women were not free to choose where they lived. Plotting their lives and experiences on a map generally says more about men's interests than women's. The vast majority of American women, especially before the middle of the twentieth century, received minimal formal educations or other training and expected that their fate was to marry and bear children. They would raise those children or the children of others and nurse the sick, while tending the orchard, garden, and dairy, and providing largely nondurable products, especially clothing and other textiles, food, and beverages to their overlords, who might be fathers, husbands, adult sons, guardians, employers, or masters. Even wage work tended to follow these same paths. Whether in Maine or Mississippi or Maui some variant of this schematic prevailed and was defended as natural, eternal, and pleasing to religious authorities.

It is, of course, in the details of women's lives and aspirations, in slavery or freedom, change over time, private or public, rural or urban, illiterate or literate, poor or comfortable and wealthy and in the relative degree of power afforded or claimed by women that regions might be defined. Neither gender nor geography was in fact fixed as most of the voluminous scholarship on women suggests. Women's experiences and regional definitions evolved

and mutated over time. What follows are a few instances where the study of women, particularly women in public reform activities and in politics, might identify unique local cultural geographies. A different set of examples or topics might produce a very different history of women and region.

The first case study looks at gender among the Lenape and Munsees of the eighteenth century. Lenape avoidance of war, preference for diplomacy, and constructions of femininity and masculinity produced unique identities. A second example of regionalism and women involves the settlement of Europeans and Africans in the "motley middle" of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Scholars have noted the heterogeneous, "motley" mix of religions, ethnicities, races, and statuses in these three colonies although the affinity of these three colonies is far more apparent to current historians than it was to contemporaries.[2] The third study considers the creation of a regional locus for American women's rights advocacy that emerged in the nineteenth century in both the Mid-Atlantic and New England. The primary "other" to the Northeast was the Deep South. At times contiguous or even noncontiguous areas could be added to or dropped from the regional designation—in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries these might include the old Northwest or the Chesapeake, or in the Rocky Mountain states. Currently East Coast/West Coast seem combined as locales where a majority of the inhabitants support progressive rights for women, including, for a few examples, marriage equality, access to contraception and abortion, political office, ending pay and promotion barriers, and considering "traditional" feminine roles not as normative but as only one possible choice.

A Region Where Everyone Was a Woman

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, an autonomous portion of the region now identified as the Mid-Atlantic encompassed the Delaware River in the south and the Hudson River in the North. The Lenapes controlled what is now southeastern Pennsylvania, southern New Jersey, and northern Delaware, and territory as far west as the Susquehanna River. The closely related Munsees controlled areas from Minisink, Pennsylvania, to Esopus, New York, on the west bank of the Hudson River. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries this region was called the Lenapehoking.

In the middle of the eighteenth century, the culturally and linguistically related Lenapes and Munsees would unite as the Delawares. These were

matrilineal and matrilocal societies based on hunting and horticulture, as were most Eastern Woodland peoples. As historian Gunlög Fur has shown, however, the inhabitants of this area were unique in that the men accepted being called "women" even though this was a form of derision employed by their more powerful neighbors, the Iroquois. The Delawares preferred diplomacy and peace to battle defeat when outnumbered by potentially hostile Iroquois to the north, expansionist French and their allies to the west, and grasping British colonists to the east. The designation "women" was also misunderstood by English colonial officials as proof of subordination, if not conquest. But a third understanding was the belief among these Algonquian speakers that "association with feminine qualities did not contaminate male persons" because "masculinity contained peacemaking as well as warmaking aspects" so that "metaphorical femininity received sanction in the highest circles of Delaware leadership."[3]

The inclusive definition of "woman" could be accepted and dropped as need be, but was based on a culture in which women controlled property. Lenape/Delaware women themselves, like Hannah Freeman (1730–1802), were "independent" and able to "adapt to constantly changing economic opportunities." It was an unusual and complex gendered identity that the Delawares embraced as they were surrounded by potential enemies, and it allowed them to avoid, at least for a time, a war that they surely would lose. The Delawares' gender norms seem to have had no influence on either contemporary colonial settlements or on subsequent developments among the Delawares.

The Subversiveness of Radical Godliness

Quakers migrated to the Lenapehoking starting in the 1680s. Settling primarily in Pennsylvania, southern New Jersey, and northern Delaware (although eventually establishing outposts in New England, North Carolina, and elsewhere), they had a substantial impact on the culture of the Delaware Valley.[4] From the beginning they intended to modify English gender norms by giving women some religious roles independent of husbands. Women had their own separate meetings for business where they doled out charity to poor neighbors and closely supervised marriages. Women were not only allowed to preach, but also were often financially supported in ministering to distant meetings. The impact of more tangential practices was also important,

if less evident. Initially, Quaker men were discouraged from entering the professions, especially law, and they had no use for trained ministers. They therefore had little use for colleges. Quakers saw these professions as contrary to the simplicity and egalitarianism promoted by the sect. Since university training and the professions were closed to all women, one source of women's supposed inferiority, their traditional lack of access to higher education and to the professions, diminished in importance.

As with the Delawares' avoidance of war, Quaker pacifism helped moderate another customary difference between masculine and feminine roles. Quaker men's refusal to adopt warrior ethics or go to war or support military activities would cause most Quakers to leave political office at the outbreak of the French and Indian War and concentrate instead on social policy, where men and women could jointly or separately practice their interpretation of Christian benevolence by establishing charitable institutions, expanding primary education for the poor, reaching out to native Americans, or opposing slavery. Quaker women in the Delaware Valley had a larger public presence than did other women.

In addition, Quaker tolerance of monotheistic religions coupled with William Penn's financial incompetence brought a diverse mix of European and African ethnicities and sects to the "motley middle." For a few women this brought a chance to choose among various Christian faiths. Elizabeth Ashbridge (1713–55) was raised an Anglican, came close to converting to Catholicism, and discussed theology with Presbyterians and Puritans before finally converting to Quakerism and becoming a public Friend and traveling minister in the colonies, England, and Ireland. There was, as her editor Daniel B. Shay has noted, a "Pennsylvania of the Soul" revealed in Ashbridge's autobiography, a chance to experiment and find a new identity among the doctrinal choices available.[5] By the mid-nineteenth century, Quaker mistrust of the professions had waned and members established colleges and the Female Medical College among other institutions for women, but there were earlier colleges for women in New England.

Puritans from New England settled on Long Island and in northern New Jersey in the late seventeenth century, bringing with them not only fairly typical contemporary English notions of female irrationality and lack of self-control, but also the theological position that women, as well as men, could be elected by God as saints. As saints, they were tasked with enforcing a godly regime over the vast majority of sinners benighted by following Satan's blandishments. Historian Elaine Crane has noted, "Despite the patriarchal

and hierarchal nature of the [Congregational] church, membership and participation offered women political, organization, and financial opportunities. Such cumulative experience was at once public and prestigious."[6] While women saints could not preach, vote, or govern, they could seek out sin and disorder and inform the proper authorities of their findings. This was an especially important role for women since unredeemed women were considered weak, disorderly and irrational, prime candidates for witchcraft.

For their supervisory role and for the salvation of their immortal souls women needed to be able to read the Bible and take notes of sermons. Esther Burr (1732–1758) of New Jersey and other Puritans "believed that their proper vocation . . . required them to teach others by the example of their [spiritual] striving and by the model they might provide as 'godly women'" through their writing, according to historians Carol F. Karlsen and Laurie Crumpacker.[7] Religious duty could be superior to other claims of feminine subordination. Schooling for girls was far more widespread in these areas than was typical and women assumed important responsibilities in carrying out God's commandments.

What about New York? With godly societies to the north and south of that state offering women a few public positions of responsibility, does the same apply? The most ambitious work on the major subcultures in early America, David Hackett Fischer's *Albion's Seed*, skips over New York and northern New Jersey in three lines of a 900-plus-page book.[8] If the religious tenets of the Puritans and Quakers seem to establish a foundation for later historical developments in these areas of settlement, then New York appears to be an outlier, at least before the early nineteenth-century Second Great Awakening swept across the state. Then women and men embraced the promise of another path to spiritual rebirth and social perfectibility through the "androgynous spirit" of evangelical reform, as John Brooke has called it, coupled with the culture of the radical Enlightenment.[9]

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was Dutch women's property rights, not religion, that historians have found that distinguished greater New York from other colonies and later states. Brendan McConville has pieced together the remarkable story of Madelaine Fauconier Valleau (active 1740s). She was from a French Huguenot family and married an Englishman who also was of French ancestry. They settled in New York City. She soon changed her name from a francophone Madelaine to the Dutch Magdalena and began attending the Dutch Reformed Church. Both moves provide evidence of her "self-conscious recreation of herself

as Dutch." She used her control over property to become politically active as a leader of violent protests against northern New Jersey land policies.[10] Valleau was exceptional in her ability to choose between two different economic cultures, just as Ashbridge may have been somewhat unusual in her ability to choose among different faiths. It is doubtful that most early American freeborn women had that freedom of choice although the number of wives who ran from their husbands and who were advertised in the newspapers by their spouses suggests a more widespread discontent with limited options.[11]

While religious toleration was a feature of early New York as well as of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the scholarly literature suggests that an unusual toleration of nontraditional, even scandalous or criminal behaviors characterized the city of New York from the earliest days of the new republic, if not before. Nancy Randolph Morris (1774–1837), rumored to have murdered her newborn baby conceived in an incestuous relationship in Virginia, later married Gouverneur Morris and achieved a degree of respectability at their estate in the Bronx.[12] There were other examples. Was New York City a den of iniquity from the early days of the republic or do historians of New York expect Wall Street and worldliness to gain a stronger foothold there than elsewhere?

To sum up: there were at least four regions in the eighteenth century. They included a beleaguered Lenape polity, a Quaker-influenced culture in the Delaware River Valley, a distinct religious orientation and polity in New England and the Delaware Valley, and, it seems, an emerging urban center in New York of unbridled market rather than religious values.

The Failure of Revolution

Regionalism was less a factor for women in the power struggles during the Revolutionary War than either very local divisions or on the development of a nascent nationalism. Esther DeBerdt Reed (1746–80) and Sarah Franklin Bache (1744–1808) established a pro–American Ladies' Association that briefly mobilized women in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, and Virginia (New York was then in British hands, while much of the South was embattled) to raise money for the troops. That they chose Martha Washington to head the organization indicates the national ambitions of the group, despite its Philadelphia origins.

In breaking from Great Britain, supporters of the Revolution seemed at first to be moving toward greater political participation by taxpayers. But five of the largest states specified for the first time in their new constitutions that only male taxpayers were eligible to vote. These were Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Georgia—hardly a regional reaction to questions about women's place in the new nation.

Yet one state, New Jersey, specifically granted the vote to unmarried women who owned property as well as to African Americans who met the property qualifications. While Quakers have sometimes been given the credit for this remarkable break with tradition because of their relatively egalitarian stance on gendered issues, there is no evidence that this was the case.[13] Had this been a Quaker move, the Yearly Meeting of the Quakers, which governed local meetings, would have provided a uniform policy, considering the controversial nature of the issue. There is no evidence of such an intervention. Between 1790 and 1807 the highest turnout of women in New Jersey elections came from the northern counties in the state where Congregationalists and Reformed churches, not Quakers, dominated and where the lingering Dutch influence allowing women more control over inherited property still had some salience. And since the franchise was meant to represent property rather than individuals (that shift lay in the future), propertied women may have been more motivated to vote where their ownership of land and goods was most clearly in their hands. By 1807 both Federalists and Democratic Republicans were embarrassed by the large numbers of both women and African Americans voting in New Jersey. The franchise was limited to white males in 1807. The linkage of African American and women's rights would continue, albeit uneasily, until the present—the race for the Democratic presidential nomination of 2008 being a recent example. Regionalism and a nascent nationalism jostled for pre-eminence during the American Revolution and thereafter.

Two Regions Emerge

The emergence of a woman's regional geography came in the early nineteenth century and was primarily an artifact of the intensifying controversies over slavery rather than being directly defined by women. Between 1775 and 1804 the states from New Jersey north provided for the eventual abolition of bondage while states from Delaware on south preserved the legality of the

slave system. Most northern legislation plotted a gradual transition from enslavement to indenture to a second-class freedom. Yet African American women as well as men shaped their own path. They moved from rural areas into northern cities and began dismantling the remnants of slavery by creating institutions that would support their new communities: economic development, marriage, child custody, education, churches, benevolent and literary societies, and more. Full equality was the goal for both men and women in these rapidly growing communities.[14]

The rise of the colonization, antislavery, and abolitionist movements involved growing numbers of women who faced legal limitations of their own, as is well documented in the last half century's scholarship.[15] The consequence was the emergence of a women's rights movement at Seneca Falls, New York, which combined Quaker, Calvinist, Methodist, and evangelical women, many of whom had been active in the temperance, antislavery, or abolitionist movements. Most had been born in New York, Pennsylvania, or New England.[16] While there was a national elite of women and men that transcended region, the upper-middle-class and middle-class women who launched the women's suffrage movement were to be found primarily in the Northeast. The Civil War, Reconstruction, and Republican politics only widened the gap between the North, upper Midwest, and far West on the one hand, and the South on the other. Yet it would be the western territories and states that led in the establishment of suffrage rights for reasons that included a stronger socialist presence, less industrial presence, and boosterism.[17]

A Region for Women's Rights Activists

The most prominent of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century women reformers moved from place to place over the course of their lives, but they found the Northeast and upper Midwest to be the most desirable places to settle. A geographic map of reformist activity in favor of women's rights was emerging. Sojourner Truth (1799–1883) left rural New York for the city and eventually retired to Battle Creek, Michigan. Angelina Grimke (1805–79) came north from South Carolina to live in Philadelphia and New Jersey. Mary Gove Nichols (1810–84) resided in New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York City. Lucy Stone (1818–93) was born in Massachusetts, educated at Oberlin in Ohio, spent time in New Jersey, and eventually returned to Massachusetts. Susan B. Anthony (1820–1906) was born in Massachusetts,

educated in Pennsylvania and New York, and lived most of her adult life in Rochester when she was not traveling for the cause of women's right to vote. Antoinette Brown Blackwell (1825–1921) was born in upstate New York, went to Oberlin, and then moved to the New York City area. The often scandalous Victoria Woodhull (1838–1927) was quite transient as a young woman. She briefly spent time in Ohio, Illinois, California, and Ohio again, before settling first in New York City (perhaps not a surprise) and then in England. Frances Willard (1839–98), the most conservative of this cohort of activists, preferred the Midwest to Rochester and lived in Ohio, Wisconsin, and Illinois. The Northeast region was where activist women were at home.

A second generation of reformers, born in the second half of the nineteenth century, ranged more widely but still clustered in the Northeast. Carrie Chapman Catt (1859–1947) went from Wisconsin to Iowa and California before settling in New York. Ida B. Wells-Barnett (1862–1931) was forced to leave the South for New York and Europe because of her staunch anti-lynching stance. Cornelia Pinchot (1881–1960) was born in Rhode Island and then lived and worked in New York, Pennsylvania, and Washington, DC. Alice Paul (1885–1977) was a New Jersey native and a University of Pennsylvania PhD who lived in New York City, Europe, and Washington, DC, before retiring to Connecticut.

It was not just the leadership of the rights movements that developed a regional orientation. The locations of the first women's rights conventions starting in 1848 followed the same pattern of favoring the Northeast and upper Midwest, meeting in upstate New York, Ohio, Massachusetts, and Philadelphia. Obviously these sites were chosen for their strong grassroots support for women's rights. Not until 1903 did the National American Women's Suffrage Association hold a meeting in the South as part of a "Southern Strategy" designed to produce a truly national movement—national, that is, in terms of white superiority. The strategy was in vain, not only because it further divided the movement along racial lines and under-mined the argument that human equality required political equality, but also because most southern states were not persuaded.

The Debacle of 1915—A Different Take on the Northeast

By 1915 most western states and Illinois had opened the polls to women. By dint of considerable effort the women's movement had placed referenda

supporting female suffrage on the ballot in the four states that had been the core of their strength—New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts. These were all urban and industrialized, all "motley" because of immigration, and most heirs to Quakerism, Congregational Calvinism, and religious toleration. The suffrage leadership was confident that that the weight of these important states, long their regional stronghold, would tip the balance in favor of the vote throughout the remainder of the country.

New Jersey was the first to vote, on October 19, 1915. There were high hopes for a victory. President Woodrow Wilson had recently been converted to the suffrage cause and made a special, well-publicized trip to his home base in Princeton to cast his ballot in favor of women's suffrage. When the votes were counted the next day, only Cape May County had a small majority in favor of women's rights. The "Antis" had garnered 58 percent of the vote. Even Wilson's own precinct was "a bad loser for the suffragists, as they only polled 64 votes there while the 'antis' got 150. The heavy negro vote probably decided the result in the district and the choice of the students of the University," noted the *Philadelphia Inquirer.* The vicious racism engaged in by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony after the Civil War and the National American Women's Suffrage Association's "Southern Strategy" at the turn of the century rallied African American men against the suffragists. The outcome in New Jersey presaged the defeats to come in November.

On November 2, suffrage lost in Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts. Pennsylvania might have been carried by pro-suffrage supporters but for the large turnout in Philadelphia orchestrated by the Republican machine. In Massachusetts the Catholic Church issued "strongly worded statements" against women voting and the referenda were defeated there and in New York.[18] The regional home of the women's rights movement was also the region where industrialists feared the women's vote would bring an end to child labor and to women workers as a cheap reserve labor force against strikers, while the American Federation of Labor generally argued that women in the workforce drove down men's wages. The brewing industry alone was a major funder of anti–women's rights organizations because they feared prohibition. Big city political machines felt that women voters would be harder to control than men. And women were in fact divided on the issue of rights. Some women preferred protection to equality. The women's right activists had badly misjudged their core region.

After this defeat, the pro-vote forces acquired a new leadership that concentrated on a national strategy, civil disobedience, and publicity to

gain passage of the Nineteenth Amendment. The radicals in the Women's Party suffered arrest and forced feeding in their campaign for the vote. The regional strategies had not worked either in the South or the Northeast. While the northern states rallied to the cause of women's suffrage once passed by Congress, southern states would not ratify the Nineteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution until 1969–71, and Mississippi not until 1984. These may have been only symbolic votes since the amended federal Constitution trumped even reluctant states, but they indicate the perpetuation of entrenched regional differences regarding gender and rights.

The connection of a northeastern regionalism and expanded rights for women in the United States continues. The same southern states that refused to ratify the Nineteenth Amendment are the same states (plus a few others) that still refuse to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment, although there are current efforts in Virginia and Illinois to alter earlier failures to ratify. Other issues, including access to contraception and abortion, health care, marriage equality, child care, employment, domestic violence, and rape, have regional components. Much of the upper Midwest, snarkily labeled the "fly-over district," no longer can be counted on to support progressive issues, while Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia now might be classed among the more progressive places on women's issues, with those places now more frequently identified as East Coast than as Northeast. Meanwhile, the "Left Coast" and East Coast are not dissimilar in politics. Information technology may be making physical proximity less salient. Historically, the Mid-Atlantic was almost always too narrow a category to encompass the activists interested in expanding women's rights to a public participation in politics. How this will play out remains to be seen now that it seems likely, as this is written in April 2015, that the first serious woman candidate for president will appear on the ballot in 2016.

NOTES

1. My own work has sometimes used the Delaware Valley to suggest broader themes in American history, both for practical reasons relating to archival accessibility and because US Census data shows that the adoption of family limitation proceeded more rapidly to the north and more slowly in the South. The Mid-Atlantic was in fact the middle. Susan E. Klepp, *Revolutionary Conceptions: Women, Fertility and Family Limitation in America, 1760–1820* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 28–29.

2. Michael Zuckerman, "Introduction: Puritans, Cavaliers and the Motley Middle," in *Friends and Neighbors: Group Life in America's First Plural Society*, ed. Zuckerman (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982), 3–25.

3. Gunlög Fur, *A Nation of Women: Gender and Colonial Encounters among the Delaware Indians* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 187. See also Jane T. Merritt, *At the Cross Roads: Indians and Empires on a Mid-Atlantic Frontier, 1700–1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 220–24; and Dawn G. Marsh, *A Lenape among the Quakers: The Life of Hannah Freeman* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2014), 143.

4. Mary Maples Dunn, "Saints and Sisters: Congregational and Quaker Women in the Early Colonial Period," *American Quarterly* 30 (1978): 582–601; Margaret Hope Bacon, *Mothers of Feminism: The Story of Quaker Women in America* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986); Rebecca Larson, *Daughters of Light: Quaker Women Preaching and Prophesying in the Colonies and Abroad, 1700–1775* (New York: Knopf, 1999); and Catherine La Courreye Blecki and Karin A. Wulf, eds., *Milcah Martha Moore's Book: A Commonplace Book from Revolutionary America* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997).

5. Daniel B. Shay, "Elizabeth Ashbridge and the Voice Within," in *Journeys in New Worlds: Early American Women's Narratives,* ed. William L. Andrews et al. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), 130–31.

6. Elaine Forman Crane, *Ebb Tide in New England: Women, Seaports, and Social Change, 1630–1800* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998), 86; Carol F. Karlsen, *The Devil in the Shape of a Woman: Witchcraft in Colonial New England* (New York: Norton, 1987); Susan Juster, *Disorderly Women: Sexual Politics and Evangelicalism in Revolutionary New England* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994). See also works by Marybeth Norton, Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, and others on women in New England.

7. Carol F. Karlsen and Laurie Crumpacker, eds., *The Journal of Esther Edwards Burr, 1754–1757* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984), 20.

8. David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 887.

9. John L. Brooke, *Columbia Rising: Civil Life on the Upper Hudson from the Revolution to the Age of Jackson* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 362.

10. Brendan McConville, *These Daring Disturbers of the Public Peace: The Struggle for Property and Power in Early New Jersey* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999), 124–29; David E. Narrett, "Men's Wills and Women's Property Rights in Colonial New York," in *Women in the Age of the American Revolution,* ed. Ronald Hoffman and Peter J. Albert (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1989), 91–133.

11. See the articles in Larry D. Eldridge, ed., *Women and Freedom in Early America* (New York: New York University Press, 1997).

12. Cynthia A. Kierner, *Scandal at Bizarre: Rumor and Reputation in Jefferson's America* (New York: Palgrave/Macmillan 2004). See also Alan Pell Crawford, *Unwise Passions: A True Story of a Remarkable Woman—and the First Great Scandal of Eighteenth-Century America* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000). Two other examples are Patricia Cline Cohen, *The Murder of Helen Jewett* (New York: Vintage, 1999); and Amy Gilman Srebnick, *The Mysterious Death of Mary Rogers: Sex and Culture in Nineteenth-Century New York* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

13. See Rosemarie Zagarri, *Revolutionary Backlash: Women and Politics in the Early American Republic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); and Judith Apter Klinghoffer and Lois Elkis, "'The Petticoat Electors': Women's Suffrage in New Jersey, 1776–1807," *Journal of the Early Republic* 12 (1992): 159–93.

14. Erica Armstrong Dunbar, *A Fragile Freedom: African American Women and Emancipation in the Antebellum City* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008).

15. Jean Fagan Yellin and John C. Van Horne, eds., *The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women's Political Culture in Antebellum America* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994); Richard Newman and James Mueller, eds., *Antislavery and Abolition in Philadelphia* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011).

16. Judith Wellman, "The Seneca Falls Women's Rights Convention: A Study of Social Networks," in *Women's America: Refocusing the Past,* ed. Linda K. Kerber and Jane Sharron De Hart, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 203–15; Lori D. Ginzberg, *Untidy Origins: A Story of Woman's Rights in Antebellum New York* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005).

17. Marjorie Spruill Wheeler, ed., *One Woman, One Vote: Rediscovering the Woman Suffrage Movement* (Troutdale, OR: NewSage, 1995). For the social and intellectual bonds of northerners and southerners before the Civil War, see Daniel Kilbride, *An American Aristocracy: Southern Planters in Antebellum Philadelphia* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), and Mary Kelley, *Learning to Stand and Speak: Women, Education, and Public Life in America's Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

18. "Wilson's Precinct Opposes His Wishes," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, October 20, 1915, 1. Eleanor Flexner and Ellen Fitzpatrick, *Century of Struggle: The Women's Rights Movement in the United States* (Cambridge: Belknap Press/Harvard University Press, 1996), 262–64.

FREEDOM'S GRAND LAB: ABOLITION, RACE, AND BLACK FREEDOM STRUGGLES IN RECENT PENNSYLVANIA HISTORIOGRAPHY

Richard S. Newman
Library Company of Philadelphia

Abstract: While often marginalized in Atlantic world studies of slavery and freedom, Pennsylvania's civil rights past has attracted a new round of scholarly scrutiny. Whether examining the rise of Atlantic abolitionism or documenting the longstanding struggles of African Americans to achieve freedom, justice and equality, historians have over the past fifteen years reimagined Pennsylvania as a most ramifying place. Indeed, building on the work of Gary Nash, Emma Jones Lapsansky, Jean Soderlund and others, scholars have reintegrated Pennsylvania into the Atlantic world. What happened in the colony and the state was potent—anything but hidebound in the world of slavery and freedom. This essay highlights some of the main historical trends.

Keywords: Mid-Atlantic region; Pennsylvania; abolition; slavery; Edward Raymond Turner; Harriet Tubman; civil rights; Philadelphia; free blacks; Quakers; voting rights; Martin Delany

In 1910 a young professor authored a prize-winning work on slavery, abolition, and black freedom struggles in a seemingly unlikely place: Pennsylvania. The book from which that project emerged was soon published under the title *The Negro in Pennsylvania*.[1] An instant classic within radical and black history circles, the book made Edward Raymond Turner an

authority on the nation's earliest civil rights battles. Indeed, by showing that abolitionism and emancipation in Pennsylvania had a deep and ramifying history, he made clear that southern Reconstruction—a much debated topic when he wrote—was actually part of a broader black freedom struggle with deep roots above the Mason-Dixon line.

Though much has changed, we might still read Turner as a prophet who predicted the shape and contour of new histories of abolition, race, and black freedom struggles. For just as historians now realize that emancipation battles in the Quaker State reflected and refracted regional, national, and Atlantic world understandings of slavery and race, so too do they follow Turner in seeing the black struggle for justice itself as one of the key themes in Pennsylvania's past.[2] For more than three centuries now, Pennsylvania has been freedom's grand lab.

Reexamining Quaker Abolitionism

Early abolitionism remains a focal point of Pennsylvania historiography. As scholars have long known, from the late 1600s onward, the greater Philadelphia region became a Quaker stronghold. By the revolutionary era, the Society of Friends had mobilized a wide-ranging antislavery network in Anglo-American culture, claiming several abolitionist victories along the way. While slaveholders jeered this development, generations of abolitionists cheered it. Though he overplayed their impact, as Dee Andrews and Emma Lapsansky-Werner note, the great nineteenth-century British abolitionist Thomas Clarkson was among the first figures to hail Quakers as an antislavery vanguard.[3]

A new generation of scholars has revisited this claim. While highlighting Quaker accomplishments, historians now focus more than ever on the complexity of Friends' antislavery commitments. For some, Quakers still deserve a prominent place in the antislavery pantheon. As Geoffrey Plank and Brycchan Carey have reminded us, the Society of Friends began examining bondage soon after cohering as an institutional body in the 1650s.[4] Friends' proximity to bondage, particularly in Barbados, where both Quaker missionaries and slaveholding businessmen settled, inspired early antislavery feeling. Settlement of William Penn's visionary colony with slavery spurred further, though still limited, antislavery querying. The most famous antislavery work of the era, the Germantown Protest

of 1688, sharply condemned slaveholding. But the audience was small: a regional Quaker meeting. And Friends themselves engaged in decades of debate before finally banning slave trading in the 1750s and then slavery itself in the 1770s. With this protracted antislavery history in mind, Plank and Carey warn historians not to engage in Quaker hero worship. Carey's own monograph makes a similar point: Quaker abolitionism, though laudable, was not inevitable.[5]

Still, Carey, Plank, and others see Quakers as critical because they consistently questioned slavery's problematic nature in Atlantic society. A new round of biographical portraits of celebrated Quaker abolitionists—and their allies—has bolstered this notion. For instance, David Waldstreicher reads Englishman Thomas Tryon as perhaps the missing link in early Quaker abolitionism. Though not a member of the Society of Friends, Tryon drew inspiration from Penn's visionary colonial experiment; his writings on war and antislavery also influenced a generation of Quakers to follow his dissenting ways.[6] Similarly, both Plank and Thomas Slaughter resurrect John Woolman as a notable antislavery figure intent on overturning racial hierarchies. A New Jersey native, Woolman gained notoriety for his travels in and around Philadelphia, where he meditated on bondage's injustice in encounters with everyone from enslaved people to masters. Significantly, neither Plank nor Slaughter hails Woolman as a lone prophet; in fact, they both highlight Woolman's indebtedness to antislavery discussions within Quakerism. Yet like other great social reformers—from Gandhi to King—Woolman's genius was to imbue social dissent with a universalism that made others take notice. Little wonder that his journal has rarely been out of print since the American Revolutionary era![7]

Woolman helped inspire perhaps the most famous Quaker reformer: Anthony Benezet. Like Tryon and Woolman, Benezet was marginalized for some years. But many (Anglo-American) scholars now see him as a global antislavery trendsetter. Maurice Jackson's fine biography set the tone for this reinterpretation, calling Benezet the "father of Atlantic abolition."[8] According to Jackson, Benezet not only provided more searching critiques of the racial status quo than most reformers but touched all corners of Atlantic society to create his antislavery worldview. Benezet consulted enslaved people on the docks of Philadelphia, read French *philosophes*, mined slave traders' journals, and corresponded with Anglo-American reformers. For Jackson, Benezet clearly prefigured William Lloyd Garrison: he was a radical white

reformer who used the power of print to help synthesize a far-flung antislavery movement.

Jonathan Sassi also sees Benezet as a formidable Atlantic abolitionist. Hailing him as a "pivotal" part of the first trans-Atlantic abolitionist campaign, Sassi shows that Benezet was not merely an antislavery cleric but a key organizational leader of the nascent abolitionist movement. Benezet created a network of Quaker printers, Anglo-American politicians, and global writers who spread abolitionism into newspapers, legislatures, and schools. Emphasizing enslaved people's political rights as well as spiritual equality, Benezet was the perfect figure to galvanize abolitionism in the Age of Revolution. With Benezet pulling the strings, Sassi comments, organized abolitionism took flight "as never before."[9]

Other scholars remain skeptical. In his global survey of slavery and freedom, British historian Jeremy Black dedicates just a paragraph to Quaker antislavery. Similarly, Robin Blackburn sees Benezet as a representative of personal virtue and not a ramifying global emancipationist. Even David Brion Davis, who once lauded the Quaker Internationale, has downgraded Benezet-style protest, calling it rather feeble. Like others, Davis now sees enslaved protestors in Atlantic society—especially the heroic revolutionaries of St. Domingue—as the true spark behind Atlantic abolition.[10]

These critiques notwithstanding, it would be foolish to underestimate the power of Quaker abolitionism in and beyond Pennsylvania. In a world of wealth-making from black bodies, Quakers stood apart, heralding a new age of political as well as social reform that, as Edward Turner would put it, began "breaking up" slavery into pieces.[11]

Race and Emancipation in the Mid-Atlantic Borderland

As Turner also recognized, Pennsylvania's 1780 Gradual Abolition Act was the next big thing in American abolition. Though problematic on a number of fronts—the law liberated enslaved people born after March 1780 at the age of twenty-eight—it was the western world's first abolition statute. Passing the law was no easy feat. Gary Nash and Jean Soderlund's now-classic study, *Freedom by Degrees*, recounts Quaker State politicians' ability to transcend lines of class, ethnicity, and religion to secure gradual emancipation.[12] By 1804 every northern state had a similar law or freedom statute, although the struggle to secure gradual abolitionism elsewhere was

halting and often incomplete.[13] Nevertheless, Pennsylvania helped initiate the age of gradualism and in many ways remained the nation's first abolitionist republic.

Scholars still underscore the significance of Quaker State abolition. My own work has emphasized the national importance of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society (PAS), whose members lobbied for the 1780 abolition act and then tried to export it nationally.[14] In this manner, the PAS helped define organized abolitionism's first wave by carrying antislavery out of hidebound religious bodies (such as Quakerism and Methodism) and into the broader legal and political realm. As Paul Polgar has recently pointed out, both the PAS and the New York Manumission Society (NYMS) offered a "progressive" agenda of race reform that pushed white activists to overcome racism even as they battled bondage in the North.[15] The PAS and the NYMS had international designs, too. By building a trans-Atlantic network stretching from France to the Caribbean, as J. R. Oldfield and Caleb McDaniel have shown, the PAS sought to make abolitionism itself a hallmark of both global modernity and humanitarian cosmopolitanism.[16] Even in the hardheaded realm of diplomacy, Pennsylvania abolitionism offered a light of hope. According to Ronald Angelo Johnson, Philadelphia's emancipation experiment and committed band of race reformers inspired federal politicians (based in the City of Brotherly Love) to form the first cross-racial diplomatic alliance between US officials and envoys from revolutionary St. Domingue.[17] Though it was eventually repudiated by Thomas Jefferson's administration, this alliance offered Americans a model for diplomatic negotiations with Haiti during the Civil War.

And so it went into the antebellum era: black and white reformers struggled mightily to make Pennsylvania a herald of freedom. Ira Brown was one of the first historians to trace Pennsylvania antislavery into this later period, paying attention to immediatists in the mid-Atlantic even when most historians remained focused on the gradualists. Recently, more historians have begun to follow his path. In major new studies, both Eric Foner and Ezra Greenspan highlight the Quaker State's enduring significance in the grand American antislavery struggle. While Foner's book on the Underground Railroad ostensibly focuses on New York, Pennsylvanians nearly steal the show, as black and white reformers in the southeastern part of the Quaker State coalesce into a powerful antislavery network that funneled thousands of enslaved people to freedom. Greenspan's massive biography of fugitive slave and celebrated black author William Wells Brown returns several times to

Pennsylvania, where Brown felt eternally at home. In one pivotal scene from the 1840s, Brown learns that William and Ellen Craft—the famous fugitive couple from Georgia—were being sheltered by Quakers in Bucks County. After lecturing in Philadelphia, Brown hurries to meet them. "Brown's most intimate new friendship," Greenspan writes, "came as a result of geographical serendipity" in Pennsylvania![18]

Antislavery women remained among the most steadfast activists in antebellum Pennsylvania. Carol Faulkner's excellent biography of Lucretia Mott argued that, much like Benezet, this key reformer had been overlooked by generations of academic scholars. Yet Mott was far from a quiet Quaker who happily stood on the side of the antislavery struggle. Rather, she was the foremost female abolitionist in the United States. Mott was among the first white Philadelphians to support immediate abolitionism, among the first to support Free Produce (which disavowed slave-derived goods), and among the most vibrant supporters of the Philadelphia underground (which aided fugitive slaves). In her public life, no less than in her theology, Faulkner concludes, Mott was an American heretic who sought to rout racial injustice.[19]

Mott's heroic example loomed large during the Civil War era. Across the state, women became essential rank-and-file reformers, staffing almost every level of the antislavery movement. In Pittsburgh Jane Grey Swisshelm rose to prominence as a writer and organizer; in Philadelphia Anna Dickinson became a well-known lecturer. Indeed, as Matthew Gallman observes, Dickinson was perhaps the most important supporter of Lincolnian emancipation in the early 1860s and a valued stump speaker for the embattled Republican Party. Drawing on a tradition of fearless antislavery women, she held firm and won many friends of freedom.[20]

No group of Pennsylvania race reformers proved more dynamic than African American women. As Erica Armstrong Dunbar has carefully detailed, free black women's activism encompassed everything from neighborhood struggles for equality to formal political protest against slavery and racism. Even within reform circles, black women helped expand the struggle for justice. Margueritta Forten and Sarah Mapps Douglass were perhaps the most visible part of a black female front that supported the nation's first integrated women's abolitionist group (the Philadelphia Female Antislavery Society), helped spawn a wave of uplift organizations, and instilled in families a deep sense of racial pride. Though black women were the demographic majority of African Americans in antebellum Philadelphia, they remain vastly understudied, as elsewhere in the Mid-Atlantic region. Yet it is clear that their

collective actions in and beyond the formal abolitionist movement shaped notions of race and justice in Pennsylvania for generations to come.[21]

Clearly, recent scholarly work has deepened our understanding of abolitionism within the Quaker State. But another trend has found historians re-examining race and emancipation through a regional lens. Pennsylvania remained an abolitionist center not only because it was the first American polity to legally ban bondage but because it served as a perennial middle ground between slavery and freedom. Located at the heart of Mid-Atlantic society, Pennsylvania abutted the nation's most populous slave states in the early national period: Virginia and Maryland (Delaware had a smaller slave population but never embraced emancipation either). The Mid-Atlantic also saw free black populations swell far beyond anything seen in New England or the emerging Midwest. Indeed, by the 1830s Baltimore and Philadelphia were black meccas and New York City was not far behind. Well before the Civil War, then, the Mid-Atlantic, generally, and Philadelphia in particular, became the staging ground for what the twentieth-century sociologist Gunnar Myrdal would famously refer to as "The American Dilemma": the conflicted fate of racial justice in an avowedly egalitarian society.

In this way, scholars have reframed Pennsylvania's antislavery standing: no longer is it viewed as a leading light of northern abolition; rather, the state is now often seen as part of an antislavery borderland where racial attitudes were constantly in flux. As Emily Clark has shown, Pennsylvania helped expand racialized conceptions of gender in the Revolutionary Atlantic world.[22] Though her story begins in the Caribbean and ends in New Orleans, Clark notes that Pennsylvania helped unleash white fears about mixed-race women in American culture. In 1807–8, factions of antiblack Democratic–Republicans deployed vicious stereotypes of unruly mixed-race women in Philadelphia, hoping that this would scare voters into opposing Federal tickets. Clark calls this episode part of Pennsylvania's forgotten racial past, where the state's economic and philanthropic ties to fleeing slaveholders from St. Domingue (not to mention nearby Chesapeake masters) mingled uncomfortably with homegrown fears of emancipation and black equality. But the racial backlash in Pennsylvania was potent. Indeed, while Clark's tale moves on to the American Southwest, where images of mixed-race women took on perhaps their most recognizable form in lurid tales of the "tragic mulatta," she notes that Philadelphia had already established a rude rendering of race in American literary and political culture.

Other scholars agree that Philadelphia remained a staging ground for white Americans' conflicted understandings of race. Both Heather Nathans and Jenna Gibbs point scholars' attention to the Philadelphia theatre, where early national playwrights, actors, and audiences consistently battled over how to depict abolitionism, blackness, and people of color. Even reformers succumbed to the ravages of race debate.[23] As James Alexander Dun has shown, abolitionists initially depicted Pennsylvania as a potential reform nirvana for its path-breaking gradual abolition act. Yet such perfectionist visions soon fell apart on the altar of race. With the revolution in St. Domingue raging, and many Americans unsure about black freedom, American abolitionists and their allies retreated from their formerly grandiose visions of building a philanthropolis—an abolitionist heaven—in Philadelphia.[24]

As these studies indicate, many scholars see Pennsylvania as regressing toward the racial mean of neighboring Mid-Atlantic states—areas where free African Americans were constantly under attack. Take Maryland, for instance, the origination point for a large contingent of black Pennsylvanians. Here, the combination of black activism, masters' guilt, and proto-capitalist economic developments created a wave of private manumissions that undermined Maryland bondage. By the 1830s, there were ten times as many free people of color in Baltimore as slaves. In Annapolis, too, as Jessica Millward illustrates, black freedom flowered thanks to the struggles of newly empowered black women.[25] Yet black freedom was always challenged by fierce anti-emancipation sentiment. As Seth Rockman trenchantly notes, race became a "salient feature of [Maryland] politics" during the antebellum era, with many white Baltimoreans agreeing that freedom itself remained a "zero-sum game": the more liberty blacks gained, the less freedom whites enjoyed.[26] But Maryland was not alone in this regard. As Nic Wood notes, Pennsylvania's decision to eliminate black suffrage in 1837 flowed from Quaker State politicians' desire to appeal to anti-abolitionist whites in the South as well as North.[27]

According to Andrew Diemer, black activists in Pennsylvania and Maryland tried to overcome these hurdles by engaging in a variety of new political activities, including appeals to white citizens that underscored their "American" roots.[28] Yet they could not outrun racism. Across the Mid-Atlantic region, white colonization societies rose to prominence in the 1820s and 1830s, with adherents often (if not always) claiming that American society must remain the province of white citizens. While, as Eric Burin has pointed out, the Pennsylvania variant tried to accent abolitionism over

race hatred, colonization nevertheless became a potent vehicle of antiblack rhetoric throughout the Mid-Atlantic region.[29] As Beverly Tomek has movingly shown, the horrible burning of Pennsylvania Hall in May 1838 flowed from the race-baiting rhetoric of colonizationists and anti-abolitionists in Jacksonian Philadelphia. Yet for decades, city authorities actually blamed abolitionists for fomenting the riot, refusing to let free blacks or abolitionists speak at other public events in Philadelphia, including the Sanitary Fair of 1864 and the Centennial Exposition of 1876. Tellingly, Pennsylvania Hall was never rebuilt. In some ways, it still burns in the city's mind.[30]

On the eastern side of Pennsylvania, New Jersey was continually haunted by racial concerns. As James J. Gigantino illustrates, New Jersey was long divided on matters of race and slavery, with eastern settlements allowing bondage to prosper while western settlements (where Quakers resided) registered increasing opposition to the institution. These divisions extended into the new nation. Many state leaders opposed abolitionism not merely because they feared its economic impact but because black freedom itself might undermine the polity. Even after it passed a gradual abolition law in 1804, New Jersey was far from a haven of freedom. In the Civil War era, New Jersey voted twice against Lincoln and many white voters openly sided with slaveholders. And the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment, Gigantino concludes, fomented new rounds of racial fears among whites. Sadly, African Americans would not enjoy civic equality or suffrage rights until the passage of the Fifteenth Amendment. But again, New Jersey was not alone in deferring democracy: Pennsylvania would not revive black suffrage either until 1870.[31]

African American Freedom Struggles

Just as recent scholars have highlighted the gaps in both Pennsylvania abolitionism and Mid-Atlantic race reform, so too have they underscored the myriad ways that African American reformers sought to revitalize the black freedom struggle. No sooner was emancipation made a political reality at the close of the eighteenth century than African Americans in Philadelphia, New York, Baltimore, and a host of other Mid-Atlantic locales rolled out a series of community building initiatives aimed at mainstream civil rights reform.[32] Building on the seminal work of Gary Nash, Emma Lapsansky, and others, scholars have provided a new round of studies on black abolitionists,

ranging from Richard Allen and James Forten in the early national period to Robert Purvis and James McNeal Turner in the Civil War era.[33]

Yet many historians have eschewed the idea that there was either a unified black community or an all-encompassing black leadership class. Rather, scholars now see the Mid-Atlantic black community as variegated, with individuals constantly moving in and out of antislavery and civil rights networks. Indeed, we now have telling portraits not only of community builders but also community dissenters. On the ideological front, black emigrationists have been reintegrated into the world of black reform. Robert Levine's seminal studies of black nationalist Martin Delany, who was born free in western Virginia but eventually settled in Pittsburgh, reveal the way that alternative strategies of race reform took shape in the Quaker State and the region.[34] At the nexus point of the trans-western migrations that brought tens of thousands of whites to Middle America, the booming frontier town inspired Delany and his mentor Lewis Woodson to imagine black resettlement—and autonomy from whites—as the key to racial justice. For Delany, a separate black nation would fulfill the biblical prescription of African redemption while also creating a model of black manhood that repaid the injustices of bondage. As Beverly Tomek notes, so committed was he to emigration that Delany even worked with white missionaries and colonizationists to drum up support for a black exodus to Africa.[35]

While some took exception to Delany's rhetoric, other emigrationists agreed that black destinies lay outside of the United States. Indeed, dating to the late eighteenth century, there had always been a significant strain of emigrationist thinking within black abolitionism. Defined as a voluntary movement controlled by people of color, emigration was in many ways the opposite of colonization (especially when emigrationists argued that blacks could return to the United States if they desired). As Jane Rhodes has illustrated, Delaware's Mary Ann Shadd Cary became a leading advocate of this brand of struggle. Cary hailed from a notable black family originally dedicated to race reform within the United States, and she was no stranger to Philadelphia's black community. But frustrated by Mid-Atlantic racism, Cary eventually resettled in British Canada, where slavery had been banned and fugitive slave communities appeared in the antebellum era. She published the *Provincial Freeman* in the 1850s and wrote a seminal emigrationist pamphlet to boot.[36] Repudiating Delany's exclusionist rhetoric, Cary noted that women as well as men would become heralds of racial uplift outside of the United States.

A subset of black activists within the United States also embraced what Steven Hahn has termed "paramilitary" protest to combat racial violence.

For Hahn, the saga of William Parker illustrates the grim reality facing many people of color in Pennsylvania's conflicted heartland of freedom. An escaped slave from Maryland who settled in southeastern Pennsylvania, Parker headed a local vigilance group aimed at protecting black communities from the "terrorist raids" of slaveholders. On one key occasion, a defiant Parker literally fought back, killing one Maryland master before fleeing to Canada. In Hahn's eyes, Parker's refusal to countenance the normative boundaries of the black freedom struggle made him a grassroots hero. Drawing inspiration from Caribbean maroon society, which retained a modicum of autonomy by attacking white imperial authority, Parker exemplified mass black culture's aim to redefine the freedom struggle on its own terms.[37]

Other black freedom fighters pushed the boundaries of legality and antislavery propriety—which often dictated nonviolent action—to achieve liberty. Though not a revolutionary, Philadelphia's William Still constantly challenged fugitive slave renditions. As Elizabeth Varon has shown, Still was creative and savvy in equal measure, utilizing a whole bag of tricks to keep freedom seekers out of harm's way. He was an exemplar of the "practical" black abolitionist who appeared again and again in the Mid-Atlantic antislavery borderland. Before Still, there was Robert Purvis; before Purvis, there was New Yorker David Ruggles, whose exploits helped liberate hundreds of fugitives (including a man named Frederick Douglass).[38] Like those figures, Still moved seamlessly from underground activity to political protest, challenging streetcar segregation and disfranchisement during the 1860s.

Of course, no race rebel remains more famous than Harriet Tubman. The subject of several biographies, Tubman has become an icon to scholars looking for North American links to a black revolutionary tradition stretching back to Africa.[39] After escaping bondage in 1849, Tubman famously returned to the Mid-Atlantic borderland several times (often passing through Philadelphia) to help others find freedom. Some abolitionists celebrated Tubman's bravery and no less a figure than John Brown referred to her as "General Tubman"; unsurprisingly, as Celeste-Marie Bernier argues, Tubman became a hero to later generations of African Americans for her martial—rather than peaceful—commitment to ending bondage.[40]

But again, Tubman's restive spirit was the proverbial tip of the iceberg. As Phillip Seitz has detailed, that enduring spirit of resistance could be found among long-forgotten freedom seekers such as Charity Castle. An enslaved woman shuttled between Maryland bondage and Philadelphia freedom, Castle staged a daring accident to ensure that she would remain

in abolitionist Pennsylvania beyond the six-month grace period allotted to visiting masters. Castle relied on members of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society to make legal arguments on her behalf. But Castle ultimately trusted no one, disappearing into anonymity soon after her health improved.[41]

Even when looking at the formal abolitionist struggle, scholars have spotlighted unheralded activists and novel antislavery strategies. Aston Gonzalez's work on graphic artist Robert Douglass nicely illuminates the way that some Pennsylvania activists merged art and politics to revitalize abolitionism. The freeborn Douglass crafted enduring images of antislavery reformers, including respectable portraits of white figures (such as William Lloyd Garrison) as well as new renderings of the black men and women battling for equality. Similarly, both Erica Ball and Mary Maillard illuminate the workings of black literary activists. With a relatively high literacy rate, black Philadelphians played a key role as antislavery correspondents, reporters, novelists, and poets. As Ball indicates, black writers used a wide array of literary styles to portray black freedom itself as the ideal representation of democracy.[42] Maillard shows how Frank Webb used elements of his family history to create one of the earliest black literary critiques of race in his novel *The Garies and Their Friends*.[43] A dark romance, the story is really the tale of failed emancipation dreams in the Mid-Atlantic region.

Even in the Civil War era, we have learned about the heroic struggles of formerly unheralded black activists. Daniel Biddle and Murray Dubin's powerful biography of black activist Octavius Catto shows that African Americans remained a civil rights vanguard in the 1860s and 1870s.[44] A freeborn man who hailed from a distinguished black family, Catto was yet another important African American reformer whose activist career in Philadelphia remained buried in plain sight. One of the leading voting rights activists of the age, Catto lost his life after being gunned down in a Philadelphia election of 1871. His killer was never convicted. But Catto can truly be said to have helped define the parameters of America's "dual Reconstruction"—namely, eradicating racial injustice in the North as well as the South.

New Directions

Where do we go from here? For one thing, scholars can never go back to a time when Pennsylvania played a marginal role in national and international debates over slavery, race, and black freedom. Whether it is new stories

(Pennsylvania's role in the second slavery) or new studies of key reformers (Quaker, African American, and female abolitionists), scholars must recognize the saliency of the colony and then state in America's longest running civil rights movement.

But there is always more to be done. We still need more studies of black and female reformers in Pennsylvania, and, indeed, in the Mid-Atlantic region. From unheralded African Americans like John Vashon and Lewis Woodson of Pittsburgh to the myriad women who ran the Philadelphia Female Antislavery Society, we cannot know enough about the grassroots reformers who made Pennsylvania abolitionism go. So, too, for women abolitionists in New York and New Jersey. We also need more work on slavery's demise and race relations in central and western Pennsylvania and in New Jersey and New York, both in the city and upstate. How did Pennsylvanians, and others, see slavery, race, and black freedom? Finally, we need more on Reconstruction Pennsylvania—and beyond. Hugh Davis, in his seminal book, *"We Will Be Satisfied with Nothing Less,"* lays the foundation for such work.[45] In what ways did the longstanding struggle for black freedom in the Quaker State and the Mid-Atlantic region, with all its variety, flow into modern civil rights movements? Only when we know the answers to these and myriad other questions can scholars truly claim to have lived up to the standard established a century ago by the great Edward Turner.

NOTES

Thanks to Randall Miller, Beverly Tomek, Linda Ries and Therese Boyd for expert editorial advice and work.

1. Edward Raymond Turner, *The Negro in Pennsylvania: Slavery—Servitude—Freedom, 1639–1861* (Washington, DC: American Historical Association, 1911).

2. On the long struggle for justice in the Quaker State, see Joe William Trotter Jr. and Eric Ledell Smith, *African Americans in Pennsylvania* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997).

3. Dee Andrews and Emma Lapsansky-Werner, "Thomas Clarkson's Quaker Trilogy: Abolitionist Narrative as Transformative History," in *Quakers and Abolition*, ed. Geoffrey Plank and Brycchan Carey (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2014), 194–208.

4. Plank and Carey, eds., *Quakers and Abolition*, 1–13.

5. Brycchan Carey, *From Peace to Freedom: Quaker Rhetoric and the Birth of American Antislavery, 1657–1761* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012), introduction.

6. David Waldstreicher, "The Origins of Antislavery in Pennsylvania: Early Abolitionism and Benjamin Franklin's Road Not Taken," in *Antislavery and Abolition in Philadelphia: Emancipation*

and the Long Struggle for Racial Justice in the City of Brotherly Love, ed. Richard S. Newman and James Mueller (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011), 45–65.

7. Geoffrey Plank, *John Woolman's Path to the Peaceable Kingdom* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012); Thomas Slaughter, *The Beautiful Soul of John Woolman, Apostle of Abolition* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2009), 11.

8. Maurice Jackson, *Let This Voice Be Heard: Anthony Benezet, The Father of Atlantic Abolitionism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).

9. Jonathan D. Sassi, "With a Little Help from the Friends: The Quaker and Tactical Contexts of Anthony Benezet's Abolitionist Publishing," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 135 (January 2011): 33–34, 71.

10. Jeremy Black, *A Brief History of Slavery: A New Global History* (London: Constable and Robinson, 2011); Robin Blackburn, *The American Crucible: Slavery, Emancipation and Human Rights* (New York: Verso Press, 2011); David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Emancipation* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2014).

11. Turner, *The Negro in Pennsylvania*, 54, 64.

12. Gary B. Nash and Jean R. Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees: Emancipation in Pennsylvania and its Aftermath* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

13. As Patrick Rael's terrific new synthesis of emancipation studies shows, Vermont was actually the first polity to ban bondage via fundamental (or constitutional) law in 1777, but Pennsylvania's gradual abolition act was the first statutory prohibition on bondage. See Rael, *Eighty-Eight Years: The Long Death of Slavery in the United States* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2015).

14. See Richard S. Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

15. See Paul Polgar's PhD dissertation, soon to be a book, "The Standard Bearers of Liberty and Equality" (City University of New York, 2013), introduction.

16. J. R. Oldfield, *Trans-Atlantic Abolitionism in the Age of Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 20; W. Caleb McDaniel, "Philadelphia Abolitionists and Antislavery Cosmopolitanism," in *Antislavery and Abolition in Philadelphia*, ed. Newman and Mueller, 149–73.

17. Ronald Angelo Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White: John Adams, Toussaint Louverture and Their Atlantic World Alliance* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2014), 39–40.

18. Ira V. Brown, "Miller McKim and Pennsylvania Abolitionism," *Pennsylvania History*, 30 (January 1963): 56–72, and "An Anti-Slavery Agent: C.C. Burleigh in Pennsylvania, 1836–1837," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 105 (January 1981): 66–84; Eric Foner, *The Gateway to Freedom: The Hidden History of the Underground Railroad* (New York: Knopf, 2015), introduction; Ezra Greenspan, *William Wells Brown* (New York: Norton, 2014), 184.

19. Carol Faulkner, *Lucretia Mott's Heresy: Abolition and Women's Rights in Nineteenth-Century America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 4.

20. Sylvia D. Hoffert, *Jane Grey Swisshelm: An Unconventional Life* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014); J. Matthew Gallman, *America's Joan of Arc: The Life of Elizabeth Anna Dickinson* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

21. Erica Armstrong Dunbar, *A Fragile Freedom: African American Women and Emancipation in the Antebellum City* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008).

22. Emily Clark, *The Strange History of the American Quadroon* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013).

23. See Heather Nathans, *Slavery and Sentiment on the American Stage, 1787–1861* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013); and Jenna Gibbs, *Performing the Temple of Liberty, 1760–1850* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014).

24. James Alexander Dun, "Philadelphia not Philanthropolis: The Limits of Pennsylvania Antislavery in the Era of the Haitian Revolution," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 135 (January 2011): 73–102.

25. Jessica Millward, *Finding Charity's Folk: Enslaved and Free Black Women in Maryland* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, forthcoming December 2015).

26. Seth Rockman, *Scraping By: Wage Labor, Slavery and Survival in Early Baltimore* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), 255.

27. Nicholas Wood, "'A Sacrifice on the Altar of Slavery': Doughface Politics and Black Disenfranchisement in Pennsylvania, 1837–1838," *Journal of the Early Republic* 31 (Spring 2011): 75–106.

28. Andrew Diemer, *"Watered with our Tears and Blood": Black Politics in the Mid-Atlantic Borderland* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, forthcoming 2016).

29. Eric Burin, *Slavery and the Peculiar Solution: A History of the American Colonization Society* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008).

30. Beverly Tomek, *Pennsylvania Hall: A Legal Lynching in the Shadow of the Liberty Bell* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

31. James Gigantino, *The Ragged Road to Abolition: Slavery and Freedom in New Jersey* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015).

32. On Philadelphia's black community, see Gary Nash, *Forging Freedom: The Formation of Philadelphia's Black Community, 1720–1840* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991); on Baltimore, see Christopher Phillips, *Freedom's Port* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997); on New York City, see Shane White, *Somewhat More Independent* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991). See also Emma Jones Lapsansky, "'Since They Got Those Separate Churches': Afro-Americans and Racism in Jacksonian Philadelphia," *American Quarterly* 32 (Spring 1980): 54–78.

33. See Richard S. Newman, *Freedom's Prophet: Bishop Richard Allen, the AME Church, and the Black Founding Fathers* (New York; New York University Press, 2008); Julie Winch, *A Gentleman of Color: The Life of James Forten* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); Margaret Hope Bacon, *But One Race: The Life of Robert Purvis* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2007); Andre E. Johnson, *The Forgotten Prophet: Bishop Henry McNeal Turner and the African American Prophetic Tradition* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2014).

34. Robert Levine, *The Martin Delany Reader* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003).

35. See Beverly Tomek, *Colonization and Its Discontents: Emancipation, Emigration, and Antislavery in Antebellum Pennsylvania* (New York: New York University Press, 2012), 209.

36. Jane Rhodes, *Mary Ann Shadd Cary* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998).

37. Steven Hahn, *The Political Worlds of Slavery and Freedom* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 39–41.

38. Elizabeth Varon, "'Beautiful Providences': William Still, the Vigilance Committee, and Abolitionists in the Age of Sectionalism," in *Antislavery and Abolition in Philadelphia*, ed. Newman

and Mueller, 229–45. See also Graham Hodges, *David Ruggles* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012).

39. See, for example, Kate Larson, *Bound for the Promised Land: Harriet Tubman: Portrait of an American Hero* (New York: One World/Ballantine, 2004).

40. Celeste-Marie Bernier, *Characters of Blood: Black Heroism in the Transatlantic Imagination* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2012).

41. Phillip R. Seitz, "Tales from the Chew Family Papers: The Charity Castle Story," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 132 (January 2008): 65–86.

42. Aston Gonzalez, "The Art of Racial Politics: The Work of Robert Douglass, Jr., 1833–1846," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 138 (January 2014): 5–38; Erica Ball, *To Live An Antislavery Life: Personal Politics and the Antebellum Black Middle Class* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011).

43. Mary Maillard, "'Faithfully Drawn from Real Life': Autobiographical Elements in Frank J. Webb's *The Garies and Their Friends*," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 137 (July 2013): 261–300.

44. Daniel R. Biddle and Murray Dubin, *Tasting Freedom: Octavius Catto and the Battle for Equality in Civil War America* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011).

45. Hugh Davis, *"We Will Be Satisfied With Nothing Less": The African American Struggle for Equal Rights in the North during Reconstruction* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011).

DEFINING A MID-ATLANTIC REGION

Howard Gillette Jr.
Rutgers University–Camden

The first time my wife heard the pop song "Hopelessly Midwestern," she turned to me and said, "That's you." Looking back at the lyrics, I'm not sure she was right, except perhaps referring to the opening line, "If you live life in the middle and not on the edge, You're hopelessly Midwestern." Knowing I grew up in Illinois, she recognized my roots, even if I would have had a hard time describing them as lasting much beyond the curse of being a lifetime Cubs fan. Aside from a decade in New Haven in college and graduate school, I have lived my entire adult life in the Mid-Atlantic, if Washington, DC, counts as much as the Philadelphia area. Yet no one would be tempted to call me "hopelessly Mid-Atlantic." And therein lies the problem. When we articulate regional characteristics, immediate images emerge when describing New England, the South, and the West, to say nothing of the Midwest. The Mid-Atlantic proves more problematic. Historian Carl Abbot confirms that observation, recounting his experience arriving as a middle-westerner at college in the East: "I discovered that friends from New Mexico

and Georgia . . . knew that they came from regions, but that friends from New York and Philadelphia did not."[1]

This conundrum assumed more than simply academic proportions when I was asked as a new arrival to Rutgers' Camden campus in 1999 to cochair with Temple University's Morris Vogel an initiative designed to bring new humanities resources to the Mid-Atlantic states. The source of our interest was a major challenge grant, initially envisioned as being $5 million, to introduce a third level of program development, between state humanities councils and the National Endowment for the Humanities. The challenge was the brainchild of William Ferris, who before assuming the chairman-ship of NEH had made a national reputation for himself as director of the Center for Southern Culture at the University of Mississippi. Now he wanted to seed university-based centers in ten regions of the country based on the belief that "region inspires and grounds the American experience." "Because Americans are so deeply immersed in their sense of place," he declared in the introduction to each of the ten volumes on America's distinct regions as defined by the NEH initiative, "we use region like a compass to provide direction as we negotiate our lives."[2]

I had no problem embracing the importance of regionalism that drove Ferris's vision. A long-time follower of journalist Neal Peirce's citistate news column and an associated book, I was convinced by his argument that the main drivers of the modern American economy are the nation's major metro-politan regions.[3] At the same time, as a student of cities, I was acutely aware of the unevenness of modern development that virtually remade some areas while leaving others behind. Looking at that experience, it appeared that those in metropolitan areas were as divided among themselves as they were set apart from those living in entirely different regional settings. However much Neal Peirce nationally or Theodore Hershberg locally repeated Benjamin Franklin's reputed warning that we best all hang together or else we hang separately, regional coherence seemed entirely allusive.[4]

As scholars, we bear some of the blame for that problem. As much as our forbearers, writing especially in the years following World War II, sought to identify and disseminate the essentials of American character, subsequent scholarship has focused on particulars, notably race, class, and gender. Even a professed historian of a distinct region—the West—Patricia Limerick has described regionalism as the place where scholars go to take a nap.[5] If Limerick was being somewhat facetious, she nonetheless could not help

but recognize the considerable distance between scholarly priorities and lived realities, if Peirce is right, of those living in communities bound by formidable, if not always fully legible regional ties.

The journalist and social commentator Joel Garreau identified one reason for making the effort to form judgments about regional identity, however fluid they might prove over time. Describing how he came to identify the "nine nations" that constitute North America, he explained that the United States as a whole is simply too expansive and too diverse to conceive as a whole. The alternative, which was superior to state designations that seemed arbitrary indicators of cultural identity, was to recognize groupings of characteristics that helped both insiders and outsiders to those regions understand what bound them together as well as what divided them from others culturally as well as geographically.[6]

Abbott recounts more systematically how scholars have dealt with regions. Looking across disciplines, he recognizes a tension between particular places and broader national trends. According to prevailing modernizing theory, those areas of the country that remain distinct are inevitably pulled toward a national norm. "Place—locality and region as an amalgam of localities with things in common," Abbott reports, "has been treated as a residual. The stronger the local attachments or the regional identification, the less the place is thought to have been influenced by modernization and incorporated within modern institutions."[7] Celebrating regional differences—one readily thinks of the South—often serves as a protest against modernizing or, more broadly, homogenizing tendencies. Even Limerick's students, though supposedly bored by the topic of regionalism, could identify with such sentiment once they were asked to name what they did not like about modern life, a list that included mass culture and mass media.[8]

The scholarly literature on region further suggests the contingent nature of the concept. Characteristics dominant at one point erode over time with the influx of new flows of human and monetary capital. In Abbott's case study of Washington, DC, the dominant early influence was southern, with strong manifestations of that regional character lasting at least into the 1970s, even as the government town fell increasingly under modern influences. By the end of the twentieth century Washington had experienced substantial accommodation to the public values of the North but remained tied to the South in many ways. "The endurance of Washington's southern character, despite strong cosmopolitan influences," Abbott reports, "supports the larger argument for an enduring South that can modernize without

northernizing. 'New' has meant northern and megalopolitan, but it has also meant southern and Chesapeake."⁹ Such studies confirm one observation about the Mid-Atlantic—namely, that if the core of a geographic area remains resistant to change, its edges are subject to blending, with the result that over time they cease to represent borders so much as borderlands where people and cultures mix. A whole field of scholarship has developed around this concept, focusing most prominently on the reciprocal influences of Hispanic with Anglo or related cultural groups on one another.

It could be said of the Mid-Atlantic as a whole that its own identification with so many core national experiences has made it, like Abbott's college classmates, sublimely confident of its normative standing in the national narrative. Yet such consensus-like sentiment runs counter to the diversity so manifest within the region, not the least at its edges, especially south and west, but also within the multiple metropolitan areas that help define the area as a whole as largely "modern." Clearly, if scholars are to make use of a regional context and convey its significance to a general public as well as to fellow academics, they have to provide some guidelines for understanding the dynamics that allow for judgments about the nature of its constituent parts.

This was the challenge taken up by our regional humanities center. We believed we had an obligation not just to aggregate resources. We had, after all, very little monetary capital to add to what other, already financially stressed humanities organizations could offer. Our contribution had to lie in the academic resources that were already in hand, but according to our mandate they also had to be accessible to the general public.

My first inclination, though not recognizing it at the time, was to revert to an already established metropolitan approach. Under this interpretation, cities were identified as the central agents for the development of the Mid-Atlantic, much more so than either New England or the South, both of which lacked the ports that facilitated trade and thus dictated settlement patterns in the colonial and early national periods. Once established as key agents of growth along the Atlantic hinge with Europe, New York and Philadelphia especially in foundational years and later Baltimore and Washington, DC, linked maritime trade to their hinterlands, ultimately forging ties to the western portions of the region through emerging cities at the western hinge: Pittsburgh, Buffalo, and Rochester to name a few, with a good number of cities in between. Farmers were bound by trade to the cities, and while the rhythms of their lives may have differed from their urban counterparts, their

personal fortunes were linked by the efficacy of the ties that bound them, whether they were turnpikes or canals, railroads, or ultimately highways.

A maturing economy brought with it differentiations that divided farmers from merchants and manufacturers, natives from immigrants, cities from suburbs. The pluralism of identity and belief that gained ascendency in the Mid-Atlantic, still within a concept of one nation, strained regional alliances, often pitting groups in close proximity against each other as much as against the collective interests found in other parts of the country. Yet even as some bemoaned fragmentation and dispersion, others embraced regional differences as essential safeguards against homogenizing national tendencies. To help us comprehend and categorize the set of changes that recast the region as it evolved, I turned to my Rutgers colleague Philip Scranton, a business historian who managed to deepen my largely social vision of the region with his expertise in economics. Together, we moved a brief description from our regional center's website into a more complete description of the Mid-Atlantic for the online *Encyclopedia of American Studies*. In that assessment, we identified four broad bands, running roughly from the northeast to the southwest:

At the Atlantic's edges from Montauk, New York, through the Chesapeake, lies a world of shores and estuaries that from the seventeenth century sustained distinctive social, economic, and cultural ways of life. Parallel to this first band—and progressively further inland—arose a string of early commercial cities and surrounding countryside that, once linked by rail and telegraph, became the nation's defining metropolitan corridor, running from New York through Newark and Trenton to Philadelphia, then through Wilmington to Baltimore and Washington. In the third and broadest band, occupying the rolling hills west to the Appalachians' modest peaks, Americans farmed the land, mined the hard coal and iron ore, and felled the trees that fed the creation of industrial and urban complexes. Last, along a line from western New York to southwestern Pennsylvania, migrants settled the cities of Buffalo, New York, and Erie, Pittsburgh, and Johnston, Pennsylvania, which developed heavy industry, especially steel and later electrical manufacturing, while initiating a further round of extraction—this time soft coal and oil. Each of these subregions drew and held dramatically different populations and became platforms on which contrasting cultural, political, and economic

milieux emerged, eventually being tied together by key East–West connectors: the National and Cumberland roads, the Erie Canal, the Pennsylvania, Baltimore & Ohio, and New York Central railroads, and ultimately auto routes including the Pennsylvania Turnpike and the New York Thruway.[10]

Teasing out the implications of these different sectors, we provided some examples as to how they could be mined to animate stories distinctive to the region. Looking at the coastal district we identified transitions that moved cultures of commerce ultimately to locations for recreation as, for instance, the New Jersey shore became "The Shore." At the far western edge, the story was very different, marked by the emergence of extractive industries, the rise of manufacturing, and, more recently, the reinvention of the metropolitan economy. Pittsburgh could not have been further distant from its fellow East Coast cities, physically or emotionally, and yet by the twenty-first century Philadelphia, as well as Camden across the Delaware River, was looking to that city as a model for reinvention through its dynamic partnerships between educational and medical institutions.

Ultimately, a small organization such as our regional center, in order to maximize its impact, like good scholars, needed to take up a manageable task, in this case a demonstration project close to home. The choice, which I remain a part of in partnership with my successor as director of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Center for the Humanities, Charlene Mires, and Randall Miller, is an encyclopedia of greater Philadelphia. Regional in the most immediate sense of encompassing a major metropolitan area, the encyclopedia does not tell the story of the Mid-Atlantic, so much as to suggest its richness. This is a case, I would hope, where sensitivity to the region as a whole might better inform the collective scholarship that goes into this effort. A few examples are in order.

The entry on the New Jersey shore is not yet in hand. Still, I envision a rich story that reminds us of the deep and not always understood ties that make region a viable category for understanding. The architectural historian George Thomas frequently describes the multiple revolutions that shaped the character of Philadelphia. Among them was a pattern of rising wages that enabled laborers to purchase modest rowhomes near their places of employ-ment and, over time, gain the leisure time that allowed them to vacation at "The Shore" as well as other nearby regional resorts, such as the Pocono Mountains. Thomas credits the introduction of the methods of scientific

management by Frederick Winslow Taylor, who was born into the burgeoning industrial economy of the larger Philadelphia region, with rising wages for workers, a proposition that deserves further scrutiny. Still, the story of the diffusion of Taylor's methods, well before they became national practice, was a regional one, helping to explain much of the success of regional manufacturing and, possibly, resulting forms of leisure time among workers.[11]

Another topic still to be completed is that of "inner-ring suburbs," a phenomenon that is hardly unique to Philadelphia, but has yet to be addressed fully in metropolitan terms. These settlements, as the first to materialize outside city limits, often represented extensions of urban form, in streets and housing type, if not land use and its restrictions. They attracted the upwardly mobile in one generation, but many of their descendants have chosen to locate either further from city limits or to return to neighborhoods that are gaining value with the impetus of tax breaks combined with desirable cultural amenities. In the process of shifting settlement patterns, these older suburbs are changing identity, as both their racial and ethnic character and their politics shift. These patterns clearly contribute to the metropolitan region's shifting postindustrial identity.

Like the treatment of the region as a whole as I have described it, encyclopedia contributors need to better understand the swaths of modern settlement and their interaction with adjacent territory, at the core as well as at the periphery, if we are going to draw conclusions about the destination of the metropolitan area. A primary goal of the encyclopedia in doing that is to help its users locate themselves both in time and space. *Pennsylvania History* shares that purpose. As the Keystone state, Pennsylvania lies at the region's core. It has served in many ways to diffuse ideas and innovation as well as a gateway for peoples who moved through the region and into other parts of the country, carrying with them their ideas and their values particularly into Ohio and the central Mississippi Valley. At the periphery, Washington, DC, absorbed more of a southern culture than its northern neighbors, but, as Abbott points out, the city was itself a borderland, neither fully southern nor northern.

It may well be that region remains a place where scholars take a nap, but it is hard to deny that region remains a vital component of everyday life. We may not choose to identify as individuals as "Mid-Atlantic-ers," but the region touches us in many ways, even if we tend to take it for granted. Being more self-conscious about its evolving influence should help us sharpen and deepen our research agendas while at the same time serving an important

civic function by informing a public for whom regional considerations do not simply constitute an academic exercise.

NOTES

1. Carl Abbott, *Political Terrain: Washington, D.C.: From Tidewater Town to Global Metropolis* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press 1999), 20.

2. William Ferris, "Foreword," in *The Mid-Atlantic Region*, ed. Robert P. Marzec (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2004), viii.

3. Neal R. Peirce, *Citistates: How Urban America Can Prosper in a Competitive World* (Washington, DC: Seven Locks Press, 1993). According to the citistates website at http://citistates.com/, the 314 metro regions in the United States provide 84 percent of new jobs, 95 percent of high tech jobs, and 88 percent of the country's income.

4. As the founder and director of the Center for Regionalism at the University of Pennsylvania, Hershberg used Franklin's phrase on the cover of an ambitious conference handbook that culminated in raising regional awareness in greater Philadelphia. Neal Peirce served as the opening keynote speaker, May 25, 1995.

5. Patricia Nelson Limerick, "Region and Reason," in Edward L. Ayers, Patricia Nelson Limerick, Stephen Nissenbaum, and Peter S. Onuf, *All Over the Map: Rethinking American Regions* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 84.

6. Joel Garreau, *The Nine Nations of North America* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981).

7. Abbott, *Political Terrain*, 16.

8. Limerick, "Region and Reason," 86.

9. Carl Abbott, "Dimensions of Regional Change in Washington, D.C.," *American Historical Review* 95, no. 5 (1990): 1393.

10. Philip Scranton and Howard Gillette Jr., "Mid-Atlantic Region," *Encyclopedia of American Studies*, on line at http://eas-ref.press.jhu.edu/.

11. Daniel Sidorick, "Scientific Management," *Encyclopedia of Greater Philadelphia*, at http://philadelphiaencyclopedia.org/archive/scientific-management/.

BOOK REVIEWS

David J. Minderhout, editor. *Native Americans in the Susquehanna River Valley, Past and Present* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2013). Pp. 244. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. Hardcover, $75.00.

Laurence Marc Hauptman. *In the Shadow of Kinzua: The Seneca Nation of Indians since World War II* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2014). Pp. 424. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. Cloth, $45.00.

The history of Native American presence within the northeastern section of the United States is both rich and troublesome. For while the tribes who have resided in this area played an integral role in the early years of this nation, most have encountered tremendous pressures as they faced a way of life not of their choosing. Yet, the Native American story in this region is one of resilience—from weathering internal factions to responding to external resistance.

In the inaugural work of the Stories of the Susquehanna Valley series, editor David Minderhout employs the contributions of experts from a variety of disciplines to chronologically portray the fact that Native Americans have through perseverance continually remained a presence in Pennsylvania and, more specifically, on the Susquehanna River from prehistoric times through today. This approach is designed both to inform the general reader and to refute the erroneous claim, still found in books, that indigenous peoples no longer populated this state after the eighteenth century.

From the first chapter that discusses the prehistory of Native Americans in the Susquehanna River Valley through the afterword by Ann Dapice, herself both a scholar and member of the Lenape and Cherokee nations, this volume identifies and explains the external forces encountered by the Susquehannocks and Lenapes as they strove to maintain a presence on their native lands. One of the biggest factors that dictated the manner in which the Pennsylvania natives altered their lifestyles was the incursion upon their lands by colonists as well as the disruptive aftermath of the French and Indian War. Whether it was the fraudulent sale of lands to the Pennsylvania government, the lack of immunity to newly introduced diseases, the strength of the antinative sentiment, or the use of blood quantum, Minderhout expertly establishes that the native peoples of the Susquehanna River have constantly withstood difficulties created by outside forces by reinventing the manner in which they have subsisted.

Additionally, this volume demonstrates how the rise and fall of the Iroquois Confederacy harmed the long-term interests of the Susquehannocks and Lenapes. In fact, the Iroquois compelled the Susquehannocks to move farther south in Pennsylvania and Maryland, took the key diplomatic role in all negotiations with the government of Pennsylvania, and sold land that rightfully belonged to the Lenapes. However, in no short measure, the Lenapes were to a certain extent responsible for the difficulties that arose because of their early habit of retreating and compromising in the face of aggression. This naturally led the colonists to push farther west and the Iroquois to become more assertive in Pennsylvania Indian affairs. As a result, the Lenapes were continually adjusting to dictates given to them by both the Iroquois Confederacy and the Pennsylvania government.

Donald Repsher's essay particularly demonstrates how their long-standing custom of hospitality and avoidance of warfare when conceivable rendered the Lenapes susceptible to assimilation as well as intermarriage. This intermingling of bloodlines from other tribes as well as white people permitted the Lenape to remain on their ancestral lands but with a less distinctive identity,

fueling oftentimes the intentional impression among prejudiced whites that Native Americans no longer existed in Pennsylvania.

Similar to Minderhout's work, *In the Shadow of Kinzua* provides a history of a northeastern Native American tribe that has persevered in spite of all the issues it has encountered. Laurence Hauptman chooses to focus his attention on the Seneca Indians and their tribulations in post–World War II America instead of providing an overall history of the Seneca Nation. Rather convincingly, the author argues that the construction of the Kinzua Dam shook the moorings of this Indian nation that nevertheless withstood the ensuing external and internal discord.

Particularly the tribal and the US governments eventually found the means both to open Seneca lands for public use and to eliminate federal fiscal responsibility for the Seneca nation. At the same time Salamanca leaders worked to acquire lands that were rented from the Seneca Nation and the Seneca leaders battled the discrimination leveled at their members from citizens of neighboring communities. In addition, Hauptman highlights the manner in which public policy and special interests groups often dictated the stance taken by politicians at both the state and federal levels. For example, the federal government's termination and energy policies, Pennsylvania's goal of expanding industry in the western section of the state as well as need to find another source of energy besides coal, and New York's long-held policy of totally disregarding past treaties, along with its desire to obtain more land for highway development, contributed to the expropriation of 10,000 acres of Seneca land for the development of the Kinzua Dam. As a result, it is this event that has been viewed by Senecas as a turning point in their history and continues to linger in their minds today as the critical event of the twentieth century. In the wake of this tragedy, the Seneca heroically struggled to create a more effective tribal government and, as a result of the dislocation, adapt to new opportunities, including the gaming industry.

However, Hauptman concedes that at times the Senecas have created problems for themselves. Indeed, in-fighting among tribal members occurred when deciding the manner in which to dispense with monies awarded upon the settlement of a land-loss claim against the United States. Moreover, repeated questioning of decisions made by the tribal council often limited its effectiveness and permitted external entities to exploit tribal division. Sometimes this led to internecine violence, especially when antigaming and gaming Senecas physically confronted each other over the tribal council's decision to suspend employees who actively participated in an antigaming protest.

Throughout, Hauptman provides ample examples of the leadership as well as tribal members of the Seneca Nation adjusting to the changes wrought by dam building through activism and organizing. Specifically, the tribal council reacted to the events in part by finding housing for its displaced members as a result of the construction of the Kinzua Dam, bringing land-loss claims under the Indians Claims Commission Act to court, and lobbying the help of key political sympathizers at both the federal and state levels. In addition, the federal government's termination policy forced the tribal council to build an infrastructure that allowed the Seneca Nation to become self-sufficient with successes in the areas of health care, the expansion of a library and museum, the settlement of a key lease act, as well as the formation of three casinos. Thus, the author intimates that the repeated success of the tribal council members in responding to events during the post–World War II was nothing short of heroic.

Ultimately, *Native Americans in the Susquehanna River Valley Past and Present* and *In the Shadow of Kinzua* reveal the ability of ethnic groups, specifically the Lenapes and the Senecas, to adapt, survive, and endure against great odds. Minderhout effectively reveals the long history of the natives in Pennsylvania through the discussion of prehistoric Indians and their rock art to the emerging acknowledgment of the continuous presence of Native Americans living within Pennsylvania today. "We are still here" (Minderhout, xiii), is a common cry among the descendants of Native Americans who were thought to be the last of this ethnic group residing in Pennsylvania. Likewise, Hauptman effectively articulates the manner in which the Senecas' long history often influenced the course of action that the tribal council chose to take in its goal of recreating its nation to meet the demands of a more modern world. He illustrates what Professor William N. Fenton said long ago: "If anthropologists have discovered anything important about the Iroquois or Iroquois culture, it is significant that it has refused to go away. In each generation and in each century, it has managed to adapt itself to the contemporary stream of events so that it has managed to survive" (Hauptman, xxiv). Given the calamities that the Lenape and the Seneca have faced across time, their persistence is remarkable.

KATHIE BEEBE
Florida State University

Alan A. Siegel. *Disaster: Stories of Destruction and Death in Nineteenth-Century New Jersey* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2014). 210 pp. Cloth. $29.95.

Alan A. Siegel's *Disaster: Stories of Destruction and Death in Nineteenth-Century New Jersey*, is a fun book suitable for the young scholar or reader of popular history with an interest in New Jersey. It also provides a solid starting point for scholars interested in secondary sources pertinent to examinations of natural and manmade disasters in New Jersey, Philadelphia, and New York City.

Not a scholarly work—Siegel is an attorney with a strong interest in his state's history and has written several works of regional and county history—*Disaster* is a chronicle of many of New Jersey's worst "moment" disasters that captured the attention of contemporaries and, in some cases, spurred new regulations and innovations to avoid or ameliorate future catastrophes. Siegel writes with an eye toward the lay reader of history, someone interested in disaster or New Jersey history but not in need of an annotated scholarly work. The book's organization is rational with the chapters marked by type of disaster—train or steamship, for instance—and not by chronological occurrence, which would have made the manuscript choppier than it need be.

As Siegel suggests in his introduction, disasters provoke a macabre interest on the part of readers and his descriptions of victims' suffering and the efforts of unheralded heroes should prove attractive to a popular audience, especially the young reader whose imagination will be carried by Siegel's writing. The scholar or college reader may also find *Disaster* interesting because its use of extensive direct quotations from period newspapers highlights the different manner in which heroes, villains, and what in the nineteenth century might be considered simple bad luck, were described by reporters and understood by the public; in twenty-first-century America, two trains crashing because of poor signaling, or a ship's captain who runs his vessel aground and kills dozens because he retired to his bed at night and in a dense fog, would hardly pass without criminal charges and civil suits.

Siegel did not set himself to writing an academic piece and the finished work is compelling to a lay audience but scholars, beyond leads concerning newspaper accounts of various disasters, will find little of the contextualization and theory standard in academic works. Furthermore, Siegel decided to concentrate upon "moment" disasters: wrecks of various sorts, tornadoes, hurricanes, blizzards, and the like. The most serious disasters to befall New Jersey during the nineteenth century were not wrecks or weather events;

rather the greatest loss of life resulted from disease outbreaks and this omission is disappointing. For instance, the cholera epidemic of the early 1830s in virtually every town and city in the state killed more citizens in just its first visitation than all the deaths in all the disasters Siegel recalls combined. Outbreaks of smallpox, typhoid, and the influenza pandemic of the early 1890s should have at least received some mention as each of these medical disasters provoked awful suffering, opportunities for bad actors and heroes to emerge, and regulations to be passed. In short, epidemics fit seamlessly into just the sort of narrative Siegel compiled.

Siegel's *Disaster* is an outstanding addition to a young reader's library and the lay reader's bookshelf, its illustrations and descriptions of human suffering and the triumph of the human spirit gripping the reader to such an extent that, at times, the skin crawls. The academic will find source material, but little contextualization. Siegel did not set out to write a treatise, but rather a compilation of his beloved state's worst (with the exception of disease) travails and in this narrow field he succeeded.

JAMES HIGGINS
University of Houston–Victoria

Joseph F. Spillane. *Coxsackie: The Life and Death of Prison Reform* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014). Pp. 296. Notes, essay on sources, index. Cloth, $44.95.

Joseph F. Spillane's study of the birth and death of prison reform begins with a gripping description of the December 1977 hostage crisis at New York's Coxsackie Correctional Facility. When Coxsackie opened as a reformatory for adolescent male offenders in 1935, liberal-minded staff members hoped that social-educational and vocational programs would transform young offenders into law-abiding men. However, external and internal factors made it almost impossible to implement the facility's initial mission. The inmates who took eleven staff members hostage may not have known the institution's initial goals, but they knew that racism and brutality defined its day-to-day life. The hostage takers felt that they had no other recourse to protest devastating cuts to the prison's educational and vocational programs. Although the crisis ended peacefully, it marked the end of the facility's focus on reforming offenders and ushered in an era

of discipline-focused custody. Spillane's goal is to explain why and how the Coxsackie facility, which began as a reformatory, transformed in the span of forty years into a custodial warehouse. His case study of Coxsackie also sheds light on the historical origins of mass incarceration in the late twentieth-century United States.

Divided into three parts, the book begins with an analysis of the birth and expansion of prison reform in New York from 1929 to 1944. Chapter 1 examines the liberal reformist vision that guided the founders of Coxsackie. Artist Ben Shahn's proposed mural for New York City's Rikers Island Penitentiary, Spillane suggests, provides a window into the "liberal penal imagination." Although Shahn's mural was not created, it depicted the importance of social citizenship and adult education, the challenges of youth, and the failure of punitive incarceration. In chapter 2, Spillane turns his attention to the context of New York prison reform in which Coxsackie was established. During the 1920s and 1930s, New York's prisons suffered from two management crises—prison labor and overcrowding—thanks to the Great Depression and tough-on-crime Baumes Laws. It was in this atmosphere that the supporters of punitive incarceration begrudgingly gave way to the reformist recommendations of the Lewisohn and Engelhardt commissions.

Spillane next focuses on inmates and their worlds outside and inside the reformatory. Chapter 3, built upon a 5 percent sample of the approximately 7,500 inmate case files housed at the New York State Archives, argues convincingly that a perfect storm of conflicts—family, education, and work—pushed "adolescents adrift" and into Coxsackie. Chapter 4 analyzes the world inmates entered while confined at Coxsackie. In this chapter, Spillane brings inmates' voices to life to highlight their perspectives on the facility's racial segregation and inmates' masculinities and sexualities, as well as their views of guards, to illustrate that confinement at Coxsackie was a "transformative experience, but only in a profoundly negative sense" (113). Chapter 5 details the difficulties reformers faced implementing their ideas because of external and internal constraints, such as underfunding and conflicts over educational and vocational programs.

In the final section, Spillane explains the factors that led to the end of prison reform in New York State between 1944 and 1977. In the years following World War II, Coxsackie became overcrowded. Jaded officials began to refer to inmates, especially gang members and heroin addicts, as "uneducable" and "ungovernable." In hope of establishing order and stemming interracial conflict in the institution, officials transferred "troublesome" inmates

to the Great Meadow Prison at Comstock. In chapter 9, Spillane again shifts his attention outside the institution to an examination of state-level prison politics. During the 1960s and 1970s, due to the actions of guards, their unions, and tough-on-crime politicians, incarceration regimens focusing on custody, control, and discipline replaced reformatory regimens. In a suggestive epilogue, Spillane shows how the failures of liberal prison reform help explain the origins of mass incarceration, and how reformers' obsession with "objective" measures of success, such as recidivism rates, led to their own undoing. Finally, Spillane reminds us of the human consequences of New York's prison experiments.

Spillane has written a wonderful book peppered with lively prose and poignant vignettes that bring reformers, inmates, and prison staff to life. His analysis rests on a solid foundation of archival research and engages with the literatures of prison history, criminal justice, and corrections. His brief essay on sources at the conclusion of the text provides a valuable overview for scholars and students of incarceration in the twentieth-century United States.

Like all good books, Spillane's *Coxsackie* left me with a few unanswered questions, mostly about context. How did New York's Coxsackie and its regimen compare with other states' reformatories and their regimens? Likewise, how might have officials' efforts at Coxsackie informed the treatment of female juvenile offenders at other New York facilities during the same period? Finally, might it have been possible to collect and incorporate oral histories from former inmates who are still alive today? Although answers to these questions would not have changed Spillane's argument significantly, they might have enriched it.

Historians working in numerous fields will find Spillane's book of value. Historians of prisons will find his case study of Coxsackie and its relationship to the beginnings of mass incarceration in the late twentieth-century United States of interest. Likewise, historians of drugs will find Spillane's analysis of the postwar heroin epidemic of significance. Similarly, historians of reform and public policy will appreciate Spillane's nuanced analysis. Spillane's *Coxsackie* will also be a welcome addition to twentieth-century US history classes at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

JONATHAN NASH
The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's Universit

Steve Longenecker. *Gettysburg Religion: Refinement, Diversity, and Race in the Antebellum and Civil War Border North* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2014). Pp. xiv, 264. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. Cloth, $45.00.

In this book, Steve Longenecker explores the social forces that shaped the character and development of religious life in Gettysburg in the antebellum era up through the Civil War. He is particularly interested in tracing how religious life interacted with broader culture. As the subtitle indicates, he finds three dominant forces—refinement, diversity, and race—at play within the town's religious communities. He argues that these forces not only gave religious life in Gettysburg its vibrancy, but that they also foreshadowed the religious patterns of modern America. For that reason, he finds Gettysburg an intriguing case study. With its geographic location on the border between North and South, its economic ascendency from rural village to regional center, and its social diversity along ethnic, racial, and religious lines, it provides a representative glimpse of the nation well before the war secured Gettysburg's place in history.

The six chapters are arranged thematically. The first sketches the history of Gettysburg and provides a profile of the community. The next two focus on the issue of refinement, calling attention to the ways religious communities responded "in theory" and "in practice." Although some smaller sects resisted refinement's pressures, Longenecker finds most congregations eager to demonstrate their status and respectability through material improvements. Whatever reservations arose generally had more to do with finance than faith. Put more bluntly, "refinement was expensive" (64). The cost of elaborate buildings, gas lighting, quality music, and educated clergy drove several congregations deeply into debt. One wonders whether such experiences inspired some of the era's moral critiques of market capitalism and economic speculation.

The book next devotes a chapter each to ethnic and racial diversity. With Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Catholics, and others all living alongside one another, Gettysburg religion was "unusually mixed" (73). The presence of small, nonconforming sects like the Dunkers added even greater complexity, and provides unique points of contrast. Some of the most interesting portions of the book trace the patterns of divergence and convergence between them and the more mainstream denominations over issues like material display and wartime patriotism. A sizeable free black

population further contributed to Gettysburg's religious diversity. Looking at race relations through a religious lens, Longenecker uncovers instances of mutual assistance but finds little interracial contact within the churches. Not surprisingly, conflicted views on slavery arose within and across assemblies.

The final chapter turns its attention to the war's effects on Gettysburg religion. As fighting fell on the town's doorstep, religious routines were interrupted and churches turned their attention to caring for the sick and dying. The war also forced religious communities to reassess their relationship with the nation-state and fostered the rise of a more pronounced strand of "civil religion." Yet by and large, Longenecker argues, the war brought only "moderate change" (5) to Gettysburg religion. While it is important to recognize that the war did not bring radical change to every facet of life, this claim is only partially convincing. It may hold when one looks at congregational life broadly, but is more difficult to accept on the personal level given the realities of suffering and loss. Congregations may have continued about their business as usual, but personal lives and moral outlooks would be profoundly changed.

Interspersed among the chapters are a series of "divertimenti"—short portraits of individuals or families whose personal history illustrates the central theme of the chapter that follows. The first chapter, for instance, is preceded by a profile of Samuel Schmucker, the first professor at the new Lutheran seminary, and his wife, Mary Catherine, the daughter of a prominent local family. Their educational and economic standing placed them firmly among the new antebellum middle class and heralded the growing refinement of the community. These portraits acquaint readers to members of the local community and help convey the personal dimensions of the period's religious and social transformations.

Though moderate in its claims, the book nevertheless challenges some of the prevailing narratives of antebellum religious life. In particular, it raises questions about the dominance of revivalism and the power of upstart religious denominations. Neither one seemed to have hit Gettysburg with the force generally attributed to them. Likewise, anti-Catholic hostility seemed not to plague the community—even though nativist sentiment was echoed in the local press—perhaps because Catholics enjoyed a long-established presence in the region.

Extensively researched, the book draws upon a wealth of local sources, including congregational records, local newspapers (both religious and secular), and family papers. For students of religious history, the book demonstrates the value and usefulness of local church records. As Longenecker's

work reveals, they can tell us much about how religious communities operated and maneuvered. At the same time, however, one must be aware that congregational records can mask as much as they reveal. Church officials may have been reticent to record disagreement or reluctant to admit controversy. Longenecker says little about how Gettysburg religion reacted to antebellum politics or the emergent women's rights movement. Perhaps the sources are silent about these issues, but the silence itself is then telling and needs to be explored.

If there is one weakness to the book, it is that Longenecker's discussion of religion and culture can be somewhat unbalanced. While he offers a detailed discussion of how social conditions influenced the town's religious communities, the book has much less to say about the ways in which their distinct religious beliefs, thoughts, and practices shaped Gettysburg society in return. Longenecker deftly notes how religion contributed to the diversity and refinement of the community, but more could be said about religion's role in education, social reform, and family life.

That criticism aside, the book provides a fine case study of religious development in antebellum north. It provides a foundation for studies that trace religious transformations of the post–Civil War era and adds to a growing literature on the mid-Atlantic as a region whose religious and social diversity prefigured the future path of the nation.

THOMAS RZEZNIK
Seton Hall University

Carl Smith. *City Water, City Life: Water and the Infrastructure of Ideas in Urbanizing Philadelphia, Boston, and Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013). Pp. 327. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. Hardback, $35.00.

In *City Water, City Life: Water and the Infrastructure of Ideas in Urbanizing Philadelphia, Boston, and Chicago* (2013) Carl Smith sets out to write an intellectual and cultural study of how people conceptualized the development of urban waterworks in nineteenth-century Boston, Chicago, and Philadelphia. His analysis rests on the proposition that "cities are built out of ideas as much as they are of timber, bricks, and stone, and that the discussion of city water is a kind of a universal solvent that reveals this in striking ways" (2).

Thus, Smith sophisticatedly explores the development of waterworks as an "infrastructure of ideas" that serves to reveal larger lessons about the cultural and intellectual changes brought forth from rapid urbanization in three of America's prominent nineteenth-century cities.

To better understand the shift from rural to urban cityscape through water development, Smith explores a healthy body of source material, including various print sources such as reports and surveys made by engineers and health officials, newspapers, periodicals, poetry, paintings, sculptures, and the built environment itself. Smith admits that the majority of his sources express the ideas of a small elite group of white men. He defends his choice by noting that these were precisely the individuals who dominated conversations of city water. Once one accepts his admittedly limited albeit unique use of primary materials, the intellectual and cultural histories of Philadelphia (1790s to 1820s), Boston (mid-1820s to 1850), and Chicago (1840s to 1870) are revealed through dialectics of what water meant for the common good in terms of politics, progress, urban growth, sanitation, temperance, health, and the commodification of water. The issues in turn reflect similarities in the histories of the three cities.

"As cities grew larger and more polyglot, and their social and economic divisions became more distinct, the sense that all residents were united by a common cause and the feeling that every individual should think of the welfare of others in the community became harder to sustain," writes Smith, noting that the idea of the common good varied along class and ethnic lines (53). The need for water, however, challenged those assumptions. "However much the growth and diversification of a city's population might have weakened ties among individuals," notes Smith, "its size empowered its members to do great new things," such as spend large sums on public waterworks projects (54). The overwhelming need for water transformed urbanites and urban America, connecting individuals and individual property into a central water supply by a simple service pipe. Hooked up to water, one indisputably became an urban dweller and part of a larger diverse city population composed of individuals connected to a shared resource. Although the desire to tap into public water transcended sectarian, sectional, party, race, class, and ethnic lines, that was not to say that diverse citizens automatically fit neatly into a common urban core. Smith explains these issues through an examination of how water challenged values at many levels.

The issue of water brought to light political disagreements over whom constituted "the people" and who should provide the resource in a growing capitalist

democracy that fiercely valued freedom of individual action. Individualism and water seemed incompatible, as more and more city dwellers were put "on the grid" in an ever more complex centralized landscape. Although all three major cities decided on publicly owned systems rather than private, Smith's discussion of the debates over public and private water demonstrates how a city's need for centralized public works clashed with traditional American values of limited government. "Building a central system enormously expanded the size, responsibility, and expense of urban government," explains the author (58). Despite a historical suspicion of political rulers, faith in free capitalism, fear of incompetent and corrupt public officials, and an overall aversion to government involvement in city life, leaders and voters in Boston, Chicago, and Philadelphia overwhelmingly supported public water.

Smith reconciles this apparent inconsistency by presenting how city leaders and urban planners emphasized the connection between water, progress, and the common good of the city. Resting his claims on plenty of interesting and entertaining primary sources, Smith shows that political leaders wanted to encourage the wide use of water, thus making it affordable and easy to access. This in turn made their cities appear to the nation as modern and progressive. Waterworks expressed civic achievement and commitment to the public good. Smith explains how even the design of the infrastructure was meant to symbolize a city's "heroic sense of itself and what it aspired to be" (66). Accordingly, cities had no qualms spending extra sums to make otherwise utilitarian structures visually impressive. For instance, Philadelphia's original pumphouse at Centre Square included the famous *Water Nymph and Bittern* statue by William Rush that "depicted a nubile maiden in a diaphanous gown, which clung to her body as if it were actual cloth dampened by the slender jet of real water that sprayed a dozen feet or more into the air from the regally upturned bill of the bittern perched on her shoulder" (67).

Besides political leaders, other city dwellers touted water as the source of progress and promise for burgeoning cities, explains Smith, even if their goals were fueled by misguided xenophobic assumptions and perceptions of cities as dirty, gritty hubs of sin. Smith draws on the sanitary movement, the temperance crusade, and the water cure movement to illuminate how water indeed quenched the needs of social and moral reformers. In all three movements, water was a cure-all and thus a necessity for the collective good. In what is arguably the most interesting chapter of Smith's monograph, the author explains a new sense of interdependence in cities and the need for water to ensure that city dwellers were healthy. "Sanitary reformers claimed

that water was the best deterrent against disease-breathing filth, temperance leaders hailed it as the salutary alternative to demon alcohol, and water-cure practitioners declared that it could remedy almost any ailment," explains Smith (161). The author masterfully makes real the connections felt by nineteenth-century reformers between the individual natural human body and the collective human-made body of the city.

While environmental historians such as Donald Pisani, Ted Steinberg, and Richard White arguably remain the go-to scholars for water history, Carl Smith has undoubtedly added a useful and unique study. His ability to draw on local sources makes his monograph strong and his ability to link those sources to a thoughtful interpretation of the intellectual history of three developing American cities makes Smith's project truly distinctive.

NATALIE SCHUSTER
Frostburg State University

Patrick Griffin. *America's Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013). Pp. xviii, 342. Illustrations, notes, index. Cloth, $39.95.

Patrick Griffin presents a masterful synthesis of the revolutionary era in *America's Revolution*. Emphasizing the Revolution as a process, based on a triptych model that includes a beginning, middle, and end, Griffin provides a new interpretation that helps to connect the revolutionary era and beyond. In this comprehensive yet concise narrative, Griffin compellingly argues that throughout the revolutionary process, the idea of sovereignty informed and shaped much of the way that individuals interpreted and acted during the years encompassing the American Revolution.

In part 1 of the book, "The Beginning," Griffin establishes a firm foundation for understanding the revolutionary era by tracing the history of the British colonies back to their founding during the seventeenth century. He first presents an overview of the different regions of the colonies, while examining the process of becoming "British." He details the regional variation in this process, yet also acknowledges how this common identity bound the colonists together through their political institutions and, more significantly, their familiarity with the idea of dividing sovereignty. He moves into the eighteenth century and focuses on how the Seven Years' War affected the relationship between the colonies and the Crown, arguing that "cultural realities and political expectations fractured

British authority" (xiv). Griffin reinvigorates the familiar story of the origins of the Revolution by demonstrating the persistent concerns over sovereignty and authority that colonists expressed in response to the Sugar Act and the Stamp Act, as well as the proliferation of agrarian unrest that crystallized in two places in the form of Regulation, albeit with different visions and goals. In doing so, Griffin demonstrates how the collapse of imperial sovereignty occurred concurrently to rising domestic tensions and turmoil.

Griffin presents part 2 as "The Middle," the years during which the actual fighting of the American Revolution took place. Throughout this section, he strives to provide a balanced view of the Revolution by examining the conflict not only through the eyes of illustrious figures like George Washington and Sam Adams but also through various perspectives including white women, African Americans, Native Americans, and poorer and middling white men. According to Griffin, these men and women utilized the vacuum of authority as an opportunity to assert their own agency as they sought to translate their vision of American society into reality. Stressing how competing notions of authority resulted in much chaos, Griffin reminds us of the violence that erupted among colonists. Moreover, he exposes "the American paradox" detailing how common men and women were becoming self-sovereign actors at the same time that they were preventing other individuals from doing so, namely those of other races.

The final section of the book, "The End," provides a fresh and compelling interpretation of the culmination of the American Revolution. Griffin rejects other historians' claim that the Constitution served as a fulfillment of the years of conflict and instead posits a different view. He argues that the Constitution was only one part of the broader settlement of the Revolution. With much nuance and careful attention to events following the end of war, Griffin illustrates the ways in which individuals continuously struggled to define the meaning of the conflict for themselves and others, exemplifying his model of understanding the Revolution as a process. In doing so, Griffin complicates more simplistic narratives of the era, exposing the contradictions rife in memory and myths of the American Revolution. For Griffin, the years following the end of the Revolution featured a variety of debates, including not only those of the ratification of the Constitution but also the future of the West, the meaning of citizenship, as well as ideas about gender and race. He connects these public discussions to the process of establishing sovereignty and authority and, more significantly, the process of making sovereignty meaningful through a plan and practice of government. Griffin emphasizes the ways in which the culmination of the Revolution represented

a compromise of divergent interests, a true settlement rather than a mythic story of triumph.

Throughout the book, Griffin provides a rich and commanding narrative of the revolutionary period that will be engaging and useful within the classroom. Griffin's incorporation of widely known stories from the American Revolution, including those of Molly Pitcher, Deborah Sampson, and Thomas Jefferson, among many others, makes this book appealing and accessible to use with undergraduate students. His effort to provide a comprehensive view of the era will also help to facilitate discussion about the broader framework of the English Atlantic World. In placing the conflict within the context of the Atlantic World, Griffin enriches our view and effectively links Ireland, Scotland, the Caribbean, and Canada to the process of the American Revolution. However, there is still room for other historians to extend his arguments within the larger scope of the British empire to include places such as India and the role of the British East India Company in the process and development of the Revolution and the broader challenges of authority the Crown faced throughout this period.

In line with other recent work on this period, such as T. H. Breen's *American Insurgents, American Patriots*, Griffin advances discussions of the American Revolution beyond the confines of schools of thought contending that the questions that historians have once asked have become outdated. In fact, he suggests that the seminal question of whether the American Revolution was about home rule or who should rule at home is "the wrong question" arguing instead that the persistent issue revolved around authority (120). In doing so, Griffin effectively bridges the ideological gap between neo-Progressives and neo-Whigs and presents a model to demonstrate how scholars can work to advance our knowledge of the American Revolution, while still acknowledging the fruitful debates generated by such schools of thought. Griffin's work also reflects recent trends in the scholarship of this era, highlighting several themes that were also featured at the prodigious American Revolution Reborn Conference in 2013, including the American Revolution as civil war, global perspectives of the conflict, and violence. Overall, Griffin's work illustrates the new directions of the field and will likely shape several of the debates unfolding in the years to come.

RACHEL ENGL TAGGART
Lehigh University

David Grant. *Political Antislavery Discourse and American Literature of the 1850s* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2012). Pp. 225. Chapter endnotes, index. Hardback, $75.00.

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. wrote from an Alabama jail cell that the "great stumbling block" to African American freedom was the "white moderate" who "prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension" over "a positive peace which is the presence of justice."[1] David Grant reveals that antislavery authors wove a parallel argument into texts calculated to jolt northern readers out of demeaning compliance with proslavery compromises, and into the Republican Party. This is not a comprehensive study of political antislavery discourse. But Grant contributes to the growing scholarship on the popular, and arguably more effective, strands of antislavery activism that flourished in the 1850s. Historians such as Eric Foner, Richard H. Sewell, Michael D. Pierson, Jonathan Earle, and James Oakes have underscored the important contributions of nonabolitionist opponents of slavery. This book highlights the literary effort that helped transform the Republican Party into a vehicle for antislavery politics.

Grant, a member of the Department of English at Grant MacEwan University, offers detailed readings of fiction and poetry by Harriet Beecher Stowe, Walt Whitman, John Greenleaf Whittier, and Nathaniel Parker Willis. Their task was to convince northerners that it was both possible and necessary to channel the latent energy of a vibrant free labor society into resistance to the backward but dominant southern "slave power." At stake were northern liberties and the fate of the US republic itself. The challenge, especially after the Compromise of 1850, was that northern "Union-savers" equated conciliation with patriotism, defining acquiescence to the slave power as a duty, and habituating northerners to shameful subordination. In response, antislavery writers called upon northerners, as individuals and as members of a sectional collectivity, to free themselves from fear or apathy, and to sustain the Union by purging it of proslavery policy. These authors never doubted that the North could triumph, but they had to persuade northern readers that they possessed the agency and the duty to act. Victory over the slave power was a matter of willpower. Grant concludes that these literary efforts "fed the political call for a new Northern subject" (214), one that would not misidentify tranquility as justice. His source base and analysis suggest that this undertaking was necessarily literary. Hence his thesis develops out of the "assumption that the dominant rhetoric of compromise . . . would

not have yielded place to political antislavery practices if there had not been a massive cultural project dedicated to its overthrow" (6).

Through meticulous readings of selected texts, Grant surveys the vital role that literary works played in that project. Stowe's *Dred: A Tale of the Great Dismal Swamp* (1856) traced the history of the slave power's rise to dominance, using the novel's narrative to explain why slavery threatened to overrun Kansas. In *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852), Stowe sharply criticized northern conservatives' association of emotional suppression with political harmony. She maintained that carefully channeled passion would empower northerners to resist slavery's encroachments and rejected the notions of citizenship and selfhood that underlay conservative calls for northerners to sacrifice their hearts on the altar of the Union. Whittier, whose poetry braided elements of abolitionist and moderate antislavery ideals, dramatized how surrender to the slave power enslaved northerners. Compromise only emboldened slaveholders to make more outrageous demands, which required additional concessions that would lock northerners into a degrading cycle of appeasement. Northerners must rise in their collective sovereignty to preserve the West for freedom. Willis's *Paul Fane*, serialized between 1854 and 1856, warned against falling under the quasi-aristocratic spell of slaveholders, who posed an internal threat to republicanism even more insidious than European nobility. Self-respecting northerners knew to resist suave southern tyrants. The legions of poets who celebrated the marital and political partnership of John C. Frémont and Jessie Benton Frémont concluded that northern homes would instruct individualistic free-state inhabitants to combine forces against Dixie's would-be aristocrats. These messages melded in Whitman's poetry, which lambasted northern conservatives for defending a static, moribund proslavery Union rather than revitalizing a progressive Union by rescuing it from slavery. True preservation of the Union on antislavery principles required the political energy of self-assured northern subjects.

Grant has read widely in the relevant historical literature and acknowledges his debts to scholars such as Foner and Pierson. Building on their foundation, he develops interpretations that are as compelling as the texts he explores. Among the strengths of the book is Grant's willingness to take the slave power concept seriously. He perceptively characterizes opposition to the slave power as much more than a watered-down version of "real" antislavery activism. As Robert E. Bonner has demonstrated, slaveholders did strive to graft their peculiar social order onto American policies, institutions, ideals, and identity.[2] The cultural counterattack that Grant analyzes was, therefore,

absolutely necessary if northerners were to free themselves, politically and intellectually, from this odious influence. Grant and Bonner's works could be read together with great profit.

Some aspects of this study might, however, narrow its scholarly influence. Grant appears to write with a highly specialized audience in mind and the absence of brief summaries of the novels would make it extremely difficult for readers unfamiliar with these texts to follow the analysis. Historians, moreover, might chafe at the tendency to remove these novels and poems from their economic, social, and political contexts. Grant's learned observations expose some of the limitations of a purely literary study. Readers encounter northern selves and subjects, but few northern people—people whose jobs, faiths, partisan affiliations, and ethnic identities certainly shaped how they read and responded to literature. Grant raises the right questions, but only within their richly layered contexts can the political influence of these texts be evaluated conclusively.

<div style="text-align: right">

MICHAEL E. WOODS
Marshall University

</div>

NOTES

1. Martin Luther King Jr., "Letter from a Birmingham Jail (1963)," in *American Political Rhetoric: A Reader*, ed. Peter Augustine Lawler and Robert Martin Schaefer, 5th ed. (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005), 269.

2. Robert E. Bonner, *Mastering America: Southern Slaveholders and the Crisis of American Nationhood* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

RACHEL A. BATCH is associate professor and chair of the History Department at Widener University in Chester, Pennsylvania. She teaches courses in modern US history of labor and immigration. Her current research focuses on Croatian Americans during the middle decades of the twentieth century and how transnational networks shaped their ethnic and class-based activisms in the United States and abroad, in the former Yugoslavia. She is also recording secretary of the Pennsylvania Historical Association.

WAYNE BODLE teaches in the Department of History at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. He is the author of *The Valley Forge Winter: Civilians and Soldiers in War* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002), and of a book-length manuscript nearing completion, tentatively titled "The Fabricated Region: Making the Middle Colonies of British North America." His current research is on the American career of Charles Wollstonecraft—the brother of Mary Wollstonecraft—from his arrival in 1792 until his death in 1817, and on the complicated lives of his two wives and his daughter by the first wife, from 1781 until 1882.

HOWARD GILLETTE JR. is professor emeritus of history at Rutgers–Camden, coeditor of the online *Encyclopedia of Greater Philadelphia*, and author of *Class Divide: Yale 1964 and the Conflicted Legacy of the Sixties*, published by Cornell University Press in 2015. His 2005 book, *Camden after the Fall: Decline and Renewal in a Post-Industrial City* (University of Pennsylvania Press) won best book awards from the Urban History Association and the New Jersey Historical Commission. A founder and first director of the Center for Washington Area Studies at George Washington University in the 1980s, he cofounded the Mid-Atlantic Regional Center for the Humanities at Rutgers–Camden, serving as director from 2001 to 2010.

KENNETH J. HEINEMAN, professor of history at Angelo State University, is the author of five books, including, *A Catholic New Deal*, which received the Pennsylvania Historical Association's Philip S. Klein Prize, and, most recently, *Civil War Dynasty*.

SUSAN KLEPP is professor of history, emerita, Temple University. Her last book, *Revolutionary Conceptions: Women, Fertility and Family Limitation in America, 1760–1821*, won the Joan Kelly Prize in women's and gender history of the American Historical Association. Her current project is a biography of Alice, a Slave.

CHRIS J. MAGOC is professor of history and associate dean of the School of Social Sciences at Mercyhurst University in Erie, Pennsylvania. In addition to teaching courses in American and environmental history and directing the public history program, Magoc coordinates the Sustainability Studies program at Mercyhurst. Among his publications are *Chronology of Americans and the Environment* (ABC–CLIO, 2011), *Environmental Issues in American History* (Scholarly Resources, 2007), and *Yellowstone: The Creation and Selling of an American Landscape, 1870–1903* (University of New Mexico Press, 1999). He and Mary Ellen Magoc are the very proud parents of Ethan and Caroline Magoc.

RANDALL M. MILLER is the William Dirk Warren '50 Sesquicentennial Chair and professor of history at Saint Joseph's University. He is the author or editor of many books on a variety of subjects, including as co-editor with William A. Pencak, *Pennsylvania: A History of the Commonwealth*. He is also a past president of the Pennsylvania Historical Association.

RICHARD S. NEWMAN is the director of the Library Company of Philadelphia. A specialist in African American history and US reform, particularly the abolitionist movement, his books include *The Transformation of American Abolitionism* and *Freedom's Prophet: Bishop Richard Allen, the AME Church, and the Black Founding Fathers*. He serves on the advisory boards of the Gilder Lehman Center for the Study of Slavery, Resistance, and Abolition and the Society for Historians of the Early American Republic. He co-edits the book series "Race in the Atlantic World," published jointly by the Library Company and the University of Georgia Press.

DANIEL K. RICHTER is the Richard S. Dunn Director of the McNeil Center for Early American Studies and Roy F. and Jeannette P. Nichols Professor of American History at the University of Pennsylvania. His books include *Trade, Land, Power: The Struggle for Eastern North America* (2013), *Before the*

Revolution: America's Ancient Pasts (2011), *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America* (2001), *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (1992). and *Friends and Enemies in Penn's Woods: Indians, Colonists, and the Racial Construction of Pennsylvania* (2004), co-edited with William A. Pencak.

BEVERLY C. TOMEK is author of *Colonization and Its Discontents: Emancipation, Emigration, and Antislavery in Antebellum Pennsylvania* (New York University Press, 2011) and *Pennsylvania Hall: A "Legal Lynching" in the Shadow of the Liberty Bell* (Oxford University Press, 2013). Her most recent project, a collection of essays titled *Reconsiderations and Redirections in the Study of African Colonization*, is forthcoming from the University Press of Florida. An assistant professor of history at the University of Houston–Victoria, she is also co-editor of the Pennsylvania Historical Association's study series and is currently writing *Slavery and Abolition in Pennsylvania* for the Pennsylvania Historical Association.