

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Walking in the Way of Peace: Quaker Pacifism in the Seventeenth Century.* By MEREDITH BALDWIN WEDDLE. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. xiv, 349p. Maps, illustrations, notes, bibliography, index, \$49.95.)

Given the present debate about "just war" in the United States this book provides some food for thought as we struggle with issues of war and peace. Weddle's intention is to examine the peace testimony of the Society of Friends in a historical context. Although modern Quakers use many of the same terms in their present-day peace testimony, Weddle argues that the meanings of these words have changed. Quakers in the seventeenth century referred to obedience to God's commandment not to kill and individual conviction of this truth rather than the goals of world peace and social justice.

Weddle places herself between two historiographic camps. One group of scholars argue that the peace testimony was an issue of faith while others have claimed that the 1660 Declaration signed by Quaker leaders in England was motivated by politics. Quakers were anxious to distinguish themselves from other radical groups of the time as pacifist and, therefore, nonthreatening to legitimate government. The statement was the last word on the subject and followers of George Fox after 1660 remained consistent in their pacifist beliefs and practices. Weddle argues persuasively that there was a continuum of faith and practice and neither historiographic camp has it entirely right.

Although the author carefully covers the English context, the study quickly narrows to a focus on Quakers in Rhode Island during King Philip's War. Looking beyond the English and at one case, Weddle finds a complex landscape with variable interpretations of pacifism among the Quaker faithful. What constituted non-violence for some smacked of militarism to others. For example, was it more Quakerly to retreat into the fortified house of a town or remain on one's own farm? Some found this retreat to safety logical and consistent with the peace testimony. Others remained in their homes secure in the conviction that avoiding anything to do with the conflict would protect them from harm. Some of these intrepid few survived their ordeal, others did not. Quakers even took up arms, on occasion, before 1660 as well as after. The 1660 Declaration in England was not a watershed of compliance, rather it was the first collective statement of a developing idea.

In addition, a Quaker majority in the Rhode Island legislature had no problem defending the colony. The author found no significant difference between how

Rhode Island and other non-Quaker colonies prepared for the conflict. To the Quaker way of thinking, the duties of a magistrate to defend his colony superseded personal convictions. In addition, they were bound as a people to obey officials whom God had placed in a public office. What did make Rhode Island unique was the 1675 Exemption excusing Quakers from military service along with others who held a religious convictions against war. Pacifists were to be treated like individuals unable to fight, like the disabled and the old. When the Quakers were voted out of power in Rhode Island in 1677 this exemption went with them. By the 1690s they were regularly persecuted in the colony for their unwillingness to serve in the military.

The argument here is persuasive and complex. The thesis, unfortunately, is repeated often and makes the book at times feel like an extended essay. As an aside, the divisions within chapters, often done with partial quotes from within the following section, did not help this reader follow the argument and were at times distracting. Nonetheless, the book is provocative and timely and worth these few rough patches.

Connecticut College

LISA WILSON

*Coming to Terms with Democracy: Federalist Intellectuals and the Shaping of an American Culture.* By MARSHALL FOLETTA. (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001. x, 303p. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$45.)

There is a curiously musty air to *Coming to Terms with Democracy*, Marshall Foletta's study of the young Federalist intellectuals who wrote for the *North American Review* in the 1820s. The book offers, for instance, an assiduous tracing of the "search for a national literature" in much the same terms that preoccupied Russell Blankenship over seventy years ago in *American Literature as an Expression of the National Mind*. It attempts to adapt the thesis of David Hackett Fisher's *The Revolution in American Conservatism* (1965)—that New England Federalists after 1815 were compelled to adopt the "popular" political strategies of their republican opponents—to Federalist literary and intellectual life. It adopts Daniel Walker Howe's discussion of Harvard moral philosophy in *The Unitarian Conscience* (1970) as its framework for trying to make sense of the *North American Review* writers as expressing a Federalist ideology.

In the background of Foletta's account may be glimpsed a body of work even more venerable: that of such Progressive historians as Charles Beard and Harry Elmer Barnes and Vernon Parrington. For it was the Progressives, retelling the story of American society from an unabashedly Jeffersonian or Jacksonian perspective, who set the terms on which Federalism would be discussed throughout the twentieth century. Once a smokescreen of rhetoric about virtue and duty and civic



disinterestedness had been cleared away, they thought, the party of John Adams and George Washington and Fisher Ames could be understood simply as a conspiracy of "aristocrats" or "elitists" out to maintain their own social dominance by instilling habits of "deference" in ordinary people.

The great problem with this analysis is not simply that it is a fantasy originally generated by such organs of Jeffersonian propaganda as William Duane's *Aurora*, but that it so utterly puts out of reach any hope of understanding Federalism as (in James Banner's phrase) a larger structure of thought and expression. Only recently have we begun to see, through the work of scholars like Banner and Linda Kerber and Joyce Appleby, that the Federalists were the classical republicans of the early American republic, mounting a valiant but ultimately doomed resistance to the raw economic individualism—America as a money or market society wholly given over to the pursuit of what William Cobbett called "soul-destroying dollars"—that they identified with Jeffersonian republicanism and, a bit later, Jacksonian backwoods democracy. That resistance would develop in a consistent moral and intellectual line from Fisher Ames's speeches on the floor of Congress through Joseph Dennie's *Port Folio* to the writings of George Ticknor and Edward Everett and Edward Tyrrel Channing in the *North American Review*.

This recent work has made little impression on Foletta. In *Coming to Terms With Democracy*, the Federalist writers appear in their old guise as aristocrats and elitists, their sole object in life being to promote habits of deference among the lower orders. The argument of the book can be given in a nutshell. After the Hartford Convention, a younger generation of Federalists was compelled to continue its search for dominance in altered terms, making apparent concessions to Jeffersonian democracy while silently promoting various principles that would, as Foletta puts it when discussing Federalist policy on public education, "stabilize their social status" and "strengthen the position of men of their caste" (p. 173).

Foletta's account is, from this point on, a tale of unintended consequences. In literary criticism, for instance, the *North American* writers try to promote social deference by appealing to "neoclassical" principles while at the same time extending guarded recognition to a newer "romantic" spirit in literature. But in admitting Romanticism to its pages, the *North American* released a force it could not contain, encouraging an imaginative energy and assertiveness that would frustrate the Federalists' attempts at social control. In the same way, the Federalist writers worked to establish professional standards in the study of law and medicine "as a means of preserving their own elite status" (p. 177), but were foiled by their own success when the new emphasis on formal training unexpectedly opened up the professions to a previously excluded middle class.

In his final chapter, Foletta quotes a telling phrase from *Public Moralists*, Stefan Collini's magisterial study of Victorian social thinkers. Understanding the great nineteenth-century periodicals—*Blackwood's*, *Edinburgh*, the *Fortnightly Review*—

Collini remarks at one point, requires a modern reader to have an "intimate acquaintance with the larger cultural conversation" in which they were engaged.

In *Coming to Terms with Democracy*, there is virtually no sense of the larger cultural conversation in which the *North American Review* was engaged. Yet the major themes of this conversation are crucial to any real understanding of the early American republic. They include: classical republican political theory as reconstructed in Pocock's great work *The Machiavellian Moment*; the otium ideal in Greek and Roman literature and philosophy; the theme of georgic commerce as analyzed by Richard Feingold in *Nature and Society* and David Shields in *Oracles of Empire*; Shaftesburian moral sense theory—and not, as Foletta imagines, the faculty psychology of Thomas Reid and the Scottish common sense school, which were a very late development in the same tradition—as it then led to the thought of Ruskin and Morris in Britain and, in America, of figures like Charles Eliot Norton; the cyclical theory of history and the notion of *translatio imperii* as it echoes ceaselessly—wholly unrecognized as such by Foletta in his chapter on "History"—in the pages of the *North American Review* itself; the emergence of a new conception of party politics as studied by James Roger Sharp in *American Politics in the Early Republic*; the problematic relation between oratory and belles lettres examined in Robert A. Ferguson's *Law and Letters in American Culture*; the American consequences of that momentous alteration in the Habermasian public sphere so brilliantly analyzed by Michael Warner in *The Letters of the Republic*, and much more besides.

None of this, when it is mentioned at all, is given any real explanatory weight in Foletta's account. At some future point, one suspects, *Coming to Terms With Democracy* will be remembered as among the last of those works that chose to begin from a notion of the Federalists as "aristocrats" and "elitists" whose every motive may be traced to a desire for social and political domination. In the meantime, readers interested in Federalist literary and intellectual culture may be referred to older studies like David Tyack's *George Ticknor and the Boston Brahmins*, which, whatever their limitations in light of more recent scholarship, at least attempted to take seriously that vision of civic responsibility to which the Federalist writers devoted their lives and thought.

Rutgers University

WILLIAM C. DOWLING

*A Gentleman of Color: The Life of James Forten.* By JULIE WINCH. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. x, 501p. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$35.)

James Forten (1766–1842) lived a life fully worthy of a book-length biography. He rose from poverty to become a wealthy Philadelphia sailmaker. He was a veteran



of the American Revolution who suffered as a captive on a British prison ship rather than accept an easier lot by giving his allegiance to Britain. He was an influential vestryman in his Episcopal church. His fame and influence spread far and wide in transatlantic reform circles in the nineteenth century. In short, by a combination of hard work, good fortune, and impeccable character, he established himself as a true gentleman who commanded respect from all who knew or knew of him.

But James Forten was also an African American. Thus he was never known simply as "a gentleman," but rather as "a gentleman of color." That he was known under the title of gentleman, no matter how qualified, in Philadelphia and abroad marked him as an exception. But he was the exception that proved the rule(s) of race in the United States. For instance, he wielded political influence by dictating how his white employees would vote. But there is no evidence that he ever cast a ballot in any election. And after Pennsylvania specifically disfranchised African Americans in its 1837 constitution, the wealthy and respectable Forten—who had been born free in Philadelphia—had no more political rights than the most recently freed slave. For all that he had achieved, "what he wanted, and what he felt he deserved, was the title he would never in fact be given: American citizen" (p. 4).

Forten and his family thus learned that in the early American republic neither uprightness nor money "whitened." In fact, the sting of racial prejudice was only sharper for free, talented, respectable African Americans, for the discrimination they faced was based solely on pigmentation. With ability and affluence exceeding most of his white neighbors, Forten's son recognized that "*my color alone stands a partition-wall between me and my elevation*" (p. 278; emphasis added). Worse, their complexion rendered the Fortens vulnerable to manstealers who kidnapped African Americans into slavery. James Forten's wealth and respectability enabled him to recover kidnapped relatives, but the threat remained (pp. 122–24). To explore the life and times of James Forten, then, is to expose the contours and ironies of American race relations in the early nineteenth century, as well as to document the life of an important American figure.

In *A Gentleman of Color*, Julie Winch examines these subjects admirably. Hers is a comprehensive chronicle of Forten's life. While the chapters detailing his work as a tireless antislavery activist are among the most interesting in the book, she describes him as more than an abolitionist—indeed, more than an African American. Winch captures the full human experience of her subject. In these pages, his life as a worker, a businessman, and a family man figure as prominently as any other aspect of his life.

To rescue this biographical bounty from the dustbin of history, Winch has done heroic research. She has gone to a wide array of repositories to track down what is surely every extant document involving Forten—and his ancestors and posterity—in any way. Her success in tracing his wide-ranging business career is an example of her resourcefulness, given that his receipts and account books were not kept.

The book's greatest weakness, however, is related to this strength. Having done this research, Winch and her editors have not sufficiently resisted the temptation to pass it all along to the reader. As a result, masses of superfluous detail plague the narrative. Thus, to take only one minor example, she answers the important question of why James Forten changed his surname from "Fortune," a common slave name. But then follows a nearly page-long accounting of every other Philadelphian named Fortune or Forten, the relevance of which is dubious (pp. 13-14). Throughout this overly dense and lengthy book, Winch and her readers would have benefited from a firmer editorial hand.

While Winch was making this tome's documentary foundation airtight, she was also learning Forten's trade of sailmaking. It is unclear from the narrative, however, what impact this innovative scholarship has on our understanding of Forten. Surely, it rounds out the picture of his life. And perhaps the patience required of a sailmaker explains Forten's steady hand in business and perseverance in seeking to advance unpopular causes. But the reader is left to make these connections for himself, making Winch's time in sail lofts and on sailing vessels something of a missed opportunity.

A thorough telling of Forten's life, *A Gentleman of Color* is also an able account of his times. It illustrates the value of biography in charting change over time. In this case, the central change came in Philadelphia's—and by extension the nation's—racial attitudes, and it was not for the better. At the age of nine, Forten was in the crowd of Philadelphians who heard the Declaration of Independence read for the first time (p. 52). By 1813, however, neither Forten nor other prudent African Americans dared to "be seen after twelve o'clock in the day" on the Fourth of July, for drunken white revelers assailed blacks with impunity (p. 52). In 1788, he may very well have marched with fellow sailmakers in the parade of craftsmen celebrating the ratification of the U.S. Constitution, and listened to that day's toast to "the whole family of mankind" (p. 131). In 1793, he may have witnessed Benjamin Rush and other local white dignitaries waiting on the leaders of Philadelphia's new black congregation (p. 141). But by the 1830s, whites who openly avowed kinship with African Americans hardly received the respect that Rush had; indeed, Philadelphia's authorities looked the other way when a genteel mob burned the abolitionists' Pennsylvania Hall to the ground (pp. 303-4). In the 1790s, white sailmaker Robert Bridges selected and trained the young James Forten to be his successor as master of his sail loft, and white merchants patronized him freely upon his accession. Decades later, as Forten himself prepared his sons to inherit his business, he faced the bitter recognition that his sons could expect hostility, not aid, from the white community (pp. 314-15).

The fact that Robert Bridges was also a slaveholder points up the central, instructive theme in *A Gentleman of Color*, namely the complexities and ironies of race and slavery in the United States. Forten and his family at times grew weary of



the constant scrutiny that came with being what one of them called "abolition property"—of "their every utterance, their every move, being commented upon" by both proponents and opponents of slavery and white supremacy. They were willing to accept the burdens of being "a credit to their race" if it would truly advance the cause (ch. 11, esp. p. 273). But even after reading this narrative of the rise and influence of James Forten, one can see the significance in a white editor eulogizing him as "an exception to his race" (p. 330).

*Eastern Michigan University*

MATTHEW MASON

*Pickett's Charge: The Last Assault at Gettysburg.* By EARL J. HESS. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001. xvii, 497p. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$34.95.)

Earl Hess's effort to create an all-encompassing one-volume history of the most famous portion of the Civil War's most famous battle is a daunting task that he has handled quite well. Few events in American history are more steeped in controversy and confusion than the frontal assault across open ground made by twelve thousand Confederate soldiers into what seemed like an impregnable Yankee position, and the discussions among survivors of the event became so emotional that it left a heap of primary source material that is conflicting and all but impossible to sort out. Pickett's Charge, as it came to be known, is at the very core of the powerful mythmaking that has created a separate Southern heritage, and any author who wades into this murky literature in search of the truth should be given credit for having the scholarly courage to make the effort.

To the extent that it is possible to put together the "what really happened" story of this epic event, as Hess sets out to do, he has created the best description of the charge to date—no small task in its own right—but if the book lacks a major scholarly feature it is its failure to address the ambiguities of historical memory, one of the most popular subfields in recent history. Many historians have come to believe that there is no "what really happened" in our historical past, but rather many different versions of events wherein one belief may last a while as the agreed upon "truth" of the matter. In time, a different spin on the story may take hold and the truth, such as it is, will change to a new description of the event.

In his introduction, Hess takes issue with Carol Reardon's *Pickett's Charge in History and Memory*, which questions whether the "truth" about the battle is possible to determine, given the many forces at work against human memory of warfare. In his text, however, Hess points out many of the flaws in veterans' memories while taking many others at face value, without ever explaining why some and not others are considered reliable. This lack of a thorough explanation of how

he judged his sources will leave students of historical memory disappointed.

Sticklers for Gettysburg details will find ample room for picking apart the fine print. In titling the book, for example, Hess fell into one of the traps he seeks to expose, the tendency to overinflate the importance of Pickett's Charge at the expense of all other portions of the battle. The famous assault that is the subject of the book was *not* the final assault at Gettysburg, a fact of which even moderately interested scholars are aware. After Pickett's men retreated from Cemetery Ridge, Gen. Judson Kilpatrick ordered Gen. Elon Farnsworth to lead a Union cavalry attack on the far right of the Confederate line. Though the attack failed, it clearly took place *after* Pickett's Charge, in fact it was in response to it. Curiously, neither Farnsworth nor Kilpatrick are even mentioned in the book.

Despite these issues, Hess's work does provide Civil War enthusiasts with a solid, single-volume work on a very popular topic. Beyond the engaging narrative, however, Hess offers an interesting bonus. The epilogue of the book, "Making Sense of Pickett's Charge," lays out the reasoned opinions of the author on some of the major topics of debate on his subject.

While recognizing the charge as an unprecedented tactical operation, Hess tries to bring back to earth some overblown conclusions regarding the assault. Contrary to folklore and the romantic notions of literature, Pickett's Charge did not and could not have decided the Civil War. As Hess points out, generations of Civil War buffs have elevated the importance of the charge to such a degree that the future of civilization seems to teeter in the balance. While impressive in its scope, neither the charge nor even the entire Battle of Gettysburg would have given the South a victory in 1863. "In short," Hess argues, "it is extremely difficult to foresee a strategic success in the Pennsylvania raid even if the ultimate tactical victory had taken place on July 3."

Lewiston, Maine

TOM DESJARDIN

*Union Soldiers and the Northern Homefront: Wartime Experiences, Postwar Adjustments.* Edited by PAUL A. CIMBALA and RANDALL M. MILLER. (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002. xvi, 508p. Notes, index. Cloth, \$50; paper, \$25.)

In his article, "The 'New' Civil War History: An Overview," which appeared in the July 1991 issue of this journal (pp. 339-69), Joseph Glatthaar stressed the potential of wars to reveal much about the societies that wage them. Since then, historians have paid increasing attention to the ways in which the Civil War strained American society, forcing Northerners and Southerners to cling to some institutions, ideas, and values while discarding others. *Union Soldiers and the Northern*



*Home Front*, a series of essays by seventeen contributors, adds to the conversation, with uneven results. Some of the essays excel; others disappoint, mainly by failing to place the war in the context of the antebellum United States.

The first and least satisfying section, "Filling the Ranks," treats recruitment and enlistment. Beginning a study of the home front and army at the point at which young men departed the former for the latter makes sense, and each essay conveys the holiday flavor of 1861 and grimmer atmosphere of later years, but contributors rehearse the tired question of whether the Civil War was a "rich man's war and a poor man's fight" rather than offer new insight into recruitment. The authors attempt to force a class conflict analysis onto recruitment without due attention to factors like potential soldiers' ages or number of dependents. The effort fails to persuade, for two types of reasons. The first is methodological. In "If They Would Know What I Know It Would Be Pretty Hard to Raise One Company in York," Mark Snell defines the "'blue-collar' occupational group" from which he argues most soldiers hailed as consisting of "skilled, semiskilled and unskilled laborers, and farmers" (p. 100). Since most Americans in 1860 were farmers or laborers and therefore fell into this category, the revelation that the occupational group that included the majority of northern men contributed the majority of Union soldiers provides little evidence of class discrimination. In "'Volunteer While You May': Manpower Mobilization in Dubuque, Iowa," Russell Johnson notes the occupations of few of his subjects, but of those he does reveal one was an editor (p. 42) and another was a lawyer and farmer (p. 46), which suggests that Johnson also constructed his "poor" too broadly to reveal much about class bias in recruitment.

Inadequate consideration of antebellum culture and society also compromises the book's first section as well as several essays in subsequent sections. For instance, in contending that the Civil War contains the origins of late nineteenth-century American "proletarianization" (p. 67), Johnson treats free labor ideology as evidence that (unidentified) "war supporters" cynically expected the working class to do the fighting (see especially pp. 42-43). This analysis ignores the significance and widespread resonance of free labor values, which soldiers and other Northerners of all classes believed necessary to republican government, as historians like Eric Foner (*Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men*) and Heather Richardson (*The Greatest Nation of the Earth*) have shown.

The best essays in section two, "Northerners and Their Men in Arms," and three, "From War to Peace," succeed because they locate the war in the context of northern culture and society. "Listen Ladies One and All," Patricia Richards's exegesis of advertisements placed by soldiers and women seeking correspondents, sets young male and female letter-writers against the backdrop of antebellum "True Womanhood" rhetoric, and forces a reexamination of women's and men's views of their own proper roles. In "Surely They Remember Me," Lesley Gordon demonstrates how infantrymen in the 16th Connecticut drew on nineteenth-century ideals

such as self-control, duty, and commitment to republican government to withstand imprisonment at Andersonville and to shape their postwar memories. Earl Mulderink's "A Different Civil War: African American Veterans in New Bedford, Massachusetts" and Donald Shaffer's "I Would Rather Shake Hands with the Blackest Nigger in the Land," illuminate ways in which black aspirations and antebellum white racial assumptions influenced each other during and after the war. Especially worthwhile is "Honorable Scars," Frances Clarke's discussion of amputees. Using sources like submissions to left-handed writing competitions penned by veterans who lost right arms, Clarke demonstrates that antebellum values (including self-discipline and determination) and soldiers' concept of the war as a voluntary sacrifice made for worthy goals, aided amputees' readjustments by creating a place for them in mainstream society.

While the best essays make the book worthwhile, the tendency of several contributions to treat the war as the birthplace of the Gilded Age rather than an outgrowth of the society from which participants came, and the editorial decision to avoid emphasizing common themes, ensure that the book's value does not transcend the sum of its parts. Particular essays provide good starting points for researching specific topics, but for insight into the northern home front and the Civil War, works like Phillip Paludan's *A People's Contest* and Reid Mitchell's *The Vacant Chair* remain more instructive.

Harvard University

CHANDRA MANNING

*American Towns: An Interpretive History.* By DAVID J. RUSSO. (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2001. xiii, 350p. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$28.95.)

In his latest book, David J. Russo attempts to synthesize the vast literature on American towns from the colonial period through the twentieth century. He has consulted a wide array of secondary sources, including the works of sociologists, anthropologists, geographers, and economists, in addition to historians, and he reports their findings in a straightforward fashion. *American Towns* consists of six substantive chapters: "Foundings," which focuses on the establishment and initial formation of the towns; "Sites," which examines their physical dimensions and layout; and subsequent chapters on political life, economic life, social life, and cultural life, respectively. These chapters are subdivided into chronological and topical subsections that identify patterns in the colonial period, the nineteenth century, and the twentieth century, as well as variations between different regions and types of communities.

The main point to be gleaned from Russo's efforts is that there was a great deal of variety in the experiences of small towns, and he has something to say about a



number of them ranging from the prototypical colonial New England town to the suburbs of the more recent past. In spite of his subtitle, however, Russo offers very little interpretation of the material that he presents and does not make many significant or overarching arguments about towns and their importance in American history. Consequently, the reader is presented with a great deal of information about different aspects of American towns but little understanding of why it is important or what is at stake in terms of larger historiographical or theoretical issues. Such an interpretive stance is necessary with a subject of this magnitude in order to sharpen one's focus and make the kinds of connections that allow a synthesis to raise new questions as well as distill the current state of understanding.

This results in a number of missed opportunities. For example, Russo correctly observes that towns were situated between the city and the countryside in a cultural as well as a geographical and economic sense, which led to "a profound ambivalence" among town dwellers and a "deeply schizophrenic attitude toward the city" (p. 178). Such tensions and their broader ramifications deserve more attention than Russo gives them, however. This point is made graphically in the photograph of several blacksmiths in Boylston, Massachusetts, which Russo uses as an illustration of typical village craftsmen (p. 151). The most telling feature of the photograph, which goes unmentioned, is the large advertisement for Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show that is painted on the side of their shop. That should raise all sorts of questions about the changing relationships between these "island communities," to invoke Robert Wiebe's famous phrase, and a larger world increasingly dominated by the cities and mass culture.

Still, it is a daunting task to synthesize a subject as large as the American town, whether one is making larger arguments or not, and Russo's organizational framework allows him to cover an imposing number of sources and topics over a very long time span. Moreover, he writes well and clearly. Scholars, however, will not find too much that is unfamiliar to them. Rather, *American Towns*, is best seen as a useful introduction for the general reader.

Harvey Mudd College and  
The Claremont Graduate University

HAL S. BARRON

*Ties That Bind: Economic and Political Dilemmas of Urban Utility Networks, 1800–1990.* By CHARLES DAVID JACOBSON. (University of Pittsburgh Press, 2001. xi, 282p. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$35.)

In *Ties That Bind*, Charles David Jacobson examines the terms by which water, electricity, and cable television are introduced into cities. This work joins an extensive body of literature that considers the relative importance of political,

demographic, social, technical, and intellectual conditions that influence the nature of infrastructure development. Jacobson builds on this body of work by suggesting that economic factors explain much about the nature of the utilities designed and the mechanisms that cities created to manage them. While Jacobson pays attention to traditional market forces such as competition and demographics, and conditions of the local environment such as politics, know-how, and attitudes, his central emphasis is on transaction costs. He argues that analysis of the tangible and intangible costs of providing a service determine what will be introduced, how it will be delivered, and who will manage it. Furthermore, his analysis shows that these costs are affected by the availability of information to service providers, the uncertainty of measuring quantity and quality, and the pace and extent to which the host environment changed, thus rendering the services inadequate or obsolete.

In most cities, municipalities took over the provision of water supply when private corporations failed to provide adequate service. In Boston, for example, changing notions of disease and public health, and the problems associated with purifying water supplies left private companies unwilling to provide quality water in sufficient quantity. In contrast, private utilities have effectively provided electricity since the service was first introduced and, generally, they continue to do so. Why does this utility remain cost effective when privatized, while water supply was not? In San Francisco and Boston, municipal regulation demanded that electric companies expand service as the population grew, which in turn provided the servers with available capital to invest in improvements as appropriate. When the private sector supplied water, on the other hand, neither the quantity nor the quality had been monitored, and the provider shied away from investing in the infrastructure to improve the service as needed. Like electricity, cable television continues to be a service provided by independent corporations, despite the fact that cable companies are not as likely to monitor service as willingly as electric companies. Jacobson finds that complaints over quality control and price fixing abound and he again turns to transaction cost analysis to explain this. Cable service is considered within the context of the history of media broadcasting, following in the tradition of newspapers and radio, and each of these mediums has historically been served by the private sector. Since the First Amendment protects these communication mediums, cities are reluctant to challenge the private sector's service for fear of a cost potentially greater than the quality or price of service—that of reducing or limiting service.

Water supply, electricity, and cable television share similarities that Jacobson argues bind them together especially when looking at how they have been affected by transaction costs. They are all networks of pipes or wires, they provide one-way delivery of services, and they assume public roles in society. Notwithstanding these overarching similarities, I still question whether these services are comparable. Historically, people collected water in cisterns or dug wells and had free access to



water. When private companies and cities assumed provision of this service, they introduced hook-up and usage charges. Similarly, before people accessed television through cable networks, television service was a free service (notwithstanding the electrical charges incurred). I expect that people only slowly and reluctantly accepted costs for these services. In contrast, the public never accessed electricity without paying a price. I wonder how these traditions of service costs affected public expectations and the role government assumed in regulation. In a similar vein, I question whether all services are created equal? Is the expectation and need for clean and copious amounts of water, reliable and adequate electrical service, and general access to cable television perceived to be the same and are transaction costs affected by the relative importance or expectations for these services?

I raise these questions to further probe the usefulness of transaction cost analysis rather than to challenge it. Indeed, Jacobson's study provides an important tool that historians would be well advised to consider when examining municipal infrastructure development. This study is also very important because it places public and private management of utilities central to the analysis and explores some of the implications of adopting one form of management or the other. As public policy makers continue to grapple with various modes of utility management, this book provides a useful framework for consideration. Historians, economists, and those that influence public policy, could be well served by Jacobson's method of analysis and his findings.

University of Northern Iowa

JOANNE ABEL GOLDMAN

*Art, Industry, and Women's Education in Philadelphia.* By NINA DE ANGELI WALLS. (Westport, Conn.: Bergin and Garvey, 2001. xxiv, 182p. Illustrations, notes, appendix, bibliographic essay, index, \$67.)

In 1998 Moore College of Art and Design (originally the Philadelphia School of Design for Women) celebrated its 150th anniversary. To mark the occasion the school hosted a symposium, two exhibitions, and the publication of a book and two catalogues. While these events and publications provided selective new perspectives on the school's remarkable heritage, the subsequent release of Nina de Angeli Walls's *Art, Industry, and Women's Education in Philadelphia* gave the college a scholarly and in-depth account of its extraordinary history. In her informative, well-written, and thoroughly documented treatise Walls reveals how this exceptional institution maintains to the present day its unique mission of separately educating women in the fine and design arts. Moore is currently the only fully accredited women's college in the United States exclusively dedicated to preparing its students for careers in the visual arts.

The wealth of institutional records in the Moore College archives, coupled with Walls's familial awareness of the coterie of women artists trained in Philadelphia—her grandmother, award winning illustrator Marguerite Lofft de Angeli (1889–1987) was influenced by School of Design alumnae Alice Barber Stephens (1858–1932), Jessie Wilcox Smith (1863–1935), and Elizabeth Shippen Green (1872–1954)—offered the author a rare opportunity to explore a rich women's history topic, as well as learn more about her own family. Walls's approach includes a base line history of the school from its beginning to the present, a lively recounting of the lives and experiences of women who attended and taught there, a comparative sampling of students and events from 1882, 1902, and 1922, and an analysis of the social, economic, and cultural forces and networks that allowed the school, with occasional struggles, to thrive. The significance of this book is that it reveals not only experiences of American women who chose careers or life paths in the arts but also that it offers different models of artistic success than those usually considered in traditional art history studies.

A focus on training in the design arts runs like a red thread through the course of the history of the school. Philanthropist and founder Sarah King Peter, who opened the school in 1848 with twenty young women who met in a spare room in her fashionable Society Hill townhouse, proclaimed in 1850 that the commercial arts "can be practiced at home, without . . . interfering with the routine of domestic duty." Her awareness that the school would not merely be training artists, but preparing *women* to become artists and designers, played into a savvy strategy that she and future female managers used to market the school. Both Sarah King Peter and long-time administrators Emily and Harriet Sartain used the strictly defined social roles of proper young women, and the needs of Philadelphia industrialists and educators, to the advantage of all concerned. The arts were treated as vocational skills that could provide genteel young women with acceptable trades for employment. The proficiencies that students acquired—in technical design, engraving, illustration, and teaching—satisfied the business needs of local textile and lighting fixture manufacturers, magazine and book publishers, and school administrators.

The college's successful marriage of art with industry and education is especially evident under the leadership of the Sartain family, whose members dominated the school's management from 1868 to 1946. Engraver John Sartain (1808–1897) joined the board in 1868 and led it as vice president from 1873 to 1887; his daughter, Emily Sartain (1841–1927), directed the school as principal from 1886 to 1920; his granddaughter, Harriet Sartain (1873–1957), served as dean from 1920 to 1946.

The school benefited from John Sartain's ties to the prestigious Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts. His insistence on expanding the curriculum to include training in the fine arts was a crucial turning point in the overall mission of the



school. Emily Sartain used her position as principal to build an international reputation as an authority on art education. She saw her life's work as a cultural mission, transmitting European aesthetics to the American public through her students' work as teachers, painters, and commercial designers. Harriet Sartain represented the post-WWI "new era" in which the school returned to "practical training." During her administration the college developed outreach programs, revised its curriculum, and identified new employment opportunities for graduates. While Harriet never achieved the international reputation of her aunt, she enjoyed the support of women's art groups, local and national education associations, and throughout her career was the only female director of a major American art school. After founder Sarah Peter, the women who exerted the most influence on the development of the school were Emily and Harriet Sartain.

The conservative artistic traditions adhered to by the Sartain family impacted in another way upon the college. Only a few of the women trained there, such as Alice Neel and Theresa F. Bernsten, have gained visible recognition in the traditional art world. The successful careers of such graduates as magazine illustrator Charlotte Harding, ad agency art director Edith Jaffy Kaplan, and fashion designer Adrienne Vittadini are rewarded in very different arenas. While the general public and greater art world may not be familiar with these women artists, the school's emphasis on practical application of the arts for self-sustaining employment suggests an unconventional significance for the school. Its notable legacy—well presented through the multilayered research of Nina de Angeli Walls—is an expanded definition both of the arts and of what it means to be a successful artist.

*Parsons School of Design/  
Smithsonian Associates*

TARA LEIGH TAPPERT

*The Man Who Made Wall Street: Anthony J. Drexel and the Rise of Modern Finance.* By DAN ROTTENBERG. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001. xvii. 262p. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$29.95.)

Any serious student of U.S. financial history becomes aware at some point that Philadelphia banker Anthony J. Drexel (1826–1893) was one of the more important and successful nineteenth-century leaders of American finance. Among his other accomplishments, Drexel was the partner from 1871 to 1893 of J. Pierpont Morgan (1837–1913), a period during which Morgan transformed himself from a young and talented banker to the undisputed leader of American finance. A year after Drexel died, the partnership of Drexel, Morgan & Company became J. P. Morgan & Company, and Morgan went on to even greater heights, becoming a major world figure. Drexel has been known mainly for his relationship with Morgan, who

became a more prominent and better-studied banker.

Dan Rottenberg's readable biography of Drexel, the first such book-length treatment of its subject after many biographies and career studies of Morgan, attempts to mitigate the imbalance of attention historians have accorded the two financiers. The Drexel family comes to life in the book. It is an interesting family with a cast of characters ranging from a draft dodger (Anthony's father, Francis, a native Austrian who went over the hill to avoid having to serve in Napoleon's army, then migrated to Philadelphia in 1817)—to a saint (Anthony's niece, Katharine Drexel, who founded the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament and was canonized by the Roman Catholic Church in 2000). Anthony himself was born and raised a Catholic but became an Episcopalian in mid-life.

Rottenberg's main purpose, however, is to persuade us that Drexel, not Morgan, was the key figure in their banking partnership. Eleven years older than Morgan, Drexel initiated the partnership in 1871 and, Rottenberg argues, Drexel gave Morgan the business mentoring that Morgan's father, Junius, could not. The senior Morgan lived in London, as head of the American merchant bank, J. S. Morgan & Company. Many credit J. P. Morgan with making Wall Street, but Rottenberg, as the grandiose title of his book implies, suggests that Morgan was himself a creation of Anthony Drexel, and that therefore Drexel is "the man who made Wall Street."

For at least two reasons, this is a stretch. First, no one person made "Wall Street," which in Rottenberg's sense stands for the U.S. financial system. The person most responsible, if we were to name one, would be neither Drexel nor Morgan, but Alexander Hamilton, who did much to shape the U.S. financial system long before the middle decades of the nineteenth century. "Wall Street" had been there for half a century or more before either Drexel or Morgan began their careers.

Second, the evidence Rottenberg marshals that Drexel made Morgan and therefore made Wall Street is thin and circumstantial, making his argument more assertive than conclusive. The facts of the case are these. Drexel was a highly successful private banker in Philadelphia, with affiliated firms in New York and Paris. In 1871, he did not think the New York affiliate was all it could be, and he wanted to build his firm's base in London, then the world financial center. Drexel therefore approached Junius Morgan in London, suggesting that he might form a new partnership in New York with Morgan's son, Pierpont, who at the time was similarly displeased with his New York partnership, Dabney, Morgan & Company. Junius suggested that Pierpont meet Drexel. He did, and the Drexel, Morgan partnership was launched.

The Drexel firm put up most of the first one million dollars of capital. Pierpont Morgan put up only fifteen thousand. Yet Drexel guaranteed Morgan 50 percent of the profits of Drexel, Morgan in New York or, *whichever was greater*, fifteen percent of the combined profits of Drexel, Morgan and Drexel & Company in Philadelphia, in which Pierpont Morgan would also be a partner. This arrangement



scarcely seems like a deal a mentor would offer a promising student for the opportunity of tutoring him. Anthony Drexel gained an alliance with J. S. Morgan & Company, a leading merchant bank in London, for which Drexel, Morgan served as American agent, and a brilliant young partner in Pierpont Morgan. Overnight, the affiliated Drexel and Morgan firms in Philadelphia, New York, London, and Paris became a worldwide financial powerhouse that vastly extended the fortunes of the two families.

Anthony Drexel, a wealthy and successful American banker before he took the initiative to partner with J. Pierpont Morgan, became an even wealthier banker, a great philanthropist, and a leading international financier as a result of that initiative. We can appreciate all of Drexel's accomplishments without accepting the exaggerated claims Rottenberg makes for him in this otherwise welcome book.

*New York University*

RICHARD SYLLA

*Big Steel: The First Century of the United States Steel Corporation, 1901–2001.*

By KENNETH WARREN. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2001. xvii, 405p. Illustrations, tables, appendices, notes, bibliography, index. \$32.)

The history of U.S. Steel is one of the central chapters in American business and economic history. At its creation in 1901, with a capitalization of more than a billion dollars, it was the largest industrial corporation in the world and the culmination of the late nineteenth-century merger movement. At the center of these events were notable industrial leaders Andrew Carnegie, Charles Schwab, and J. P. Morgan. For decades after, U.S. Steel epitomized big business. Yet no detailed history of this vitally important enterprise has been written, largely because fears of anti-trust action kept archives and records off-limits to scholars. Kenneth Warren's new history is the first to benefit from access to corporate records and executives.

Warren has written several books on the American and British iron and steel industries, productively highlighting geographic questions. This book is a rather traditional treatment of U.S. Steel, in that Warren generally follows the lines of existing scholarship as he tracks the firm chronologically. Thus he argues that the corporation—perhaps inevitably—failed to live up to the expectations for the largest firm in the iron and steel industry. Determined to overcome the public skepticism caused by its size, chairman Elbert Gary attempted to prove his was a “good” trust. U.S. Steel, dominated as it was by New York bankers, not Pittsburgh steel men, sought stability after the raucous competition of the Carnegie years. The corporation slowly lost market share and abandoned any pretense of technical leadership. Developments such as an early corporate safety programs were undermined by U.S. Steel's recalcitrant labor policy, epitomized by the infamous twenty-four-hour “long

turn" work shift that survived into the 1920s. U.S. Steel lagged behind its rivals in many ways by the end of Gary's term in 1927. New leadership helped the corporation weather the Depression—just barely—and avoid labor chaos by recognizing the steelworkers' union in 1936. The company made huge contributions to the war effort after 1940, yet it also faced Congressional government scrutiny in the late 1930s and again in the late 1940s. And after the prosperity of the postwar years, in the 1960s the corporation continued losing ground to rivals, both overseas producers (especially the Japanese) and American mini-mills. The eventual result was a draconian downsizing that made a much smaller U.S. Steel one of the most efficient steel producers in the world by the mid-1990s. Only one of its integrated steel mills remained near Pittsburgh.

Warren's account emphasizes several explanatory factors. One key argument—developed in his other books as well—is the impact of geography (the location of raw materials, mills, and markets) on the corporation. Thus Warren follows the corporation's approach to plant improvements as well as to regional expansions into the east, south, and west. He sees U.S. Steel's decision in the 1980s to shift production solidly toward Gary and away from Pittsburgh as a belated recognition of, and response to, economic and geographic realities. Warren also highlights management shortcomings, emphasizing the continuing failure to rationalize the many enterprises joined together in 1901. As have other scholars, he portrays an overly-confident corporation and managers resistant to change, personified by Edgar Speer's "romantic attachment to this 'Big Steel' image of the past" (p. 298).

Warren has less to say about government policy and relations as they related to U.S. Steel. This is something of a disappointment, given his access to internal records, since the corporation constantly tussled with federal officials over production and capacity (1950s), steel prices (1950s and 1960s), environmental legislation (1960s and 1970s), and imports (post-1960). Similarly, I am a little disappointed that the people involved rarely come alive. Labor leaders are rather scarce in this account, but often executives are not much more prominent. Appropriately, given U.S. Steel's sprawling size, Warren suggests corporate leaders almost never altered U.S. Steel's course or culture dramatically, but he also prefers to emphasize the greater weight of history, of geographic factors, and the consequences of the maturation of the steel industry. Still, management matters a lot to his argument, yet with the possible exception of David Roderick in the final chapters, individual executives remain distant figures. Perhaps the executives themselves were colorless, but Warren is not able to make them animate. The book contrasts strongly in that regard with journalist John Hoerr's portrait of their union counterparts and workers in *And the Wolf Finally Came* (1988).

Given the challenge posed by the corporation's size, these are minor quibbles. Warren's account is now the basic overview for U.S. Steel's history, and his final chapters bring that history up to the present. Overall, there are few real surprises



from the corporation's records, but the overall result is a solid history of the leading American steel firm of the twentieth century.

*Michigan Technological University*

BRUCE E. SEELY

*Duquesne and the Rise of Steel Unionism.* By JAMES D. ROSE. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001. xi, 248p. Notes, tables, index. \$42.50.)

For generations steel symbolized industrial America. At its peak, the American steel industry employed one million people and made more steel than the rest of the world combined. For that reason, the industry's labor conflicts seemed more important than fights between other workers and employers. The Homestead strike of 1892 marked the obsolescence of an old craft union tradition and signaled the enormous power of corporate capital. The 1919 steel strike was at the time the largest strike in the nation's history. And the 1937 Supreme Court decision which upheld the constitutionality of the National Labor Relations Act—a linchpin of American political economy from the 1930s to the 1970s—hinged on a dispute between J & L Steel and the Aliquippa, Pennsylvania, union local.

Given that heritage, the historiography on steel workers and steel unionism remains surprisingly thin. While David Brody's masterful analysis of the non-union era is a modern classic, no one has yet written a comprehensive scholarly history of the United Steelworkers Union, and the number of scholarly monographs on steel labor is smaller than on several other industries. Thus I approached James Rose's study of the unionization of U.S. Steel's Duquesne Works with anticipation.

Rose delivers a well-crafted and detailed story which raises questions about working-class militancy and class consciousness in the decade many historians see as a high point of working-class mobilization and unity. And, he suggests, the Steelworkers Union adopted a highly-centralized and top-down organizational model not because union bureaucrats betrayed rank-and-file aspirations (as some historians argue) but because workers were less united and less militant than supposed and because only a centralized and bureaucratic union could actually succeed.

The most important difficulty, according to Rose, was how U.S. Steel's employment policies reinforced ethnic and cultural divisions within its workforce. Men paid by the hour, a large majority of the workers, worked the dirtiest and most dangerous jobs for the lowest pay. Southern and Eastern Europeans (first and second generation immigrants) and African Americans filled most of the hourly jobs. Their job ladders offered limited opportunity to learn skills and earn promotions. In contrast, tonnage men—those paid per ton produced by their crews—could earn two or three times as much as hourly workers, avoid the most

dangerous tasks, and expect advancement up job ladders. Natives and immigrants from northern Europe filled most of the tonnage jobs. Tonnage and hourly men, for the most part, mistrusted each other.

While other historians have claimed that working people had begun to overcome ethnic and cultural divisions (at least among whites) by the mid-1930s, Rose is skeptical. At Duquesne, he argues, the unionization drive reproduced the division between hourly and tonnage workers. Eastern European and African American hourly workers organized the Fort Dukane lodge of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, the predecessor of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee (SWOC) of the CIO, in the fall of 1933, and gave the lodge a decidedly left-wing bent in its early years. Only a handful of tonnage men joined the union. In contrast, activists among the tonnage men held centrist or even conservative political views, avoided the Fort Dukane lodge, and chose instead to fight within the company union, the U.S. Steel Employee Representation Plan (ERP). The ERP representatives and the members of Fort Dukane lodge, Rose argues, viewed themselves as rivals, and rarely cooperated. The ERP included men who would be prominent local officials in the first SWOC local including Elmer Maloy, the first local president and the town's CIO mayor in 1937. Earlier accounts suggest that these ERP activists had been underground Amalgamated and SWOC organizers all along who had merely joined the ERP to subvert it from within, but Rose argues that the ERP had been a genuinely functioning organization with significant support among its tonnage constituency. ERP activists cast their lot with SWOC belatedly and reluctantly. Stories of secret infiltration amount to an *ex post facto* rewriting of history, he declares. Ultimately, Rose claims, the ERP men went with SWOC because the company frustrated their sincere efforts to work within the company union, and they recognized that the CIO had resources and political connections vastly greater than they could ever hope to muster.

Rose's story is thoughtfully revisionist. If it is representative of other steel locals (something he does not demonstrate), and even local unions in other CIO industries, his story suggests a need for a less heroic and more contingent history of the CIO. But I also wonder how his interpretation has been shaped both by the contemporary mood and the nature of his sources. In a time when the labor movement is clawing for survival, it may be tempting to emphasize the weaknesses of an earlier era. And, as the author readily admits, his ability to tell this story in detail depended on the recent availability of a massive collection of company records from the U.S. Steel Duquesne Works. But these records do not cover all sides and all participants with equal clarity. Rose, for example, has far more information about the workings of the ERP than of the Fort Dukane lodge. Does the composition of the company archive unwittingly structure the history of labor relations in the mill?

Such questions could, of course, be asked of any case study. Probably not all



readers will agree with Rose's conclusions, but they should find his arguments sufficiently provocative to make this book well worth reading.

University of Pittsburgh

RICHARD OESTREICHER

*The American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century.* By GARY GERSTLE. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001. xv, 454p. Illustrations, notes, index. \$29.95.)

In *American Crucible*, Gary Gerstle shows how much of twentieth-century American history can be understood in terms of the fluctuations in how Americans generally and politicians in particular balanced civic and racial nationalism. Whether or not one accepts Gerstle's division between these two forms of nationalism, this is an important study that sheds a great deal of light on American political and social history. The book never loses sight of the importance of tying rich detail to a theoretical engagement with the subject. Gerstle takes us from San Juan Hill through the multi-ethnic regiments of the "Good War," the challenges of the Civil Rights movement and Vietnam, and on to the Reaganite and Clintonite nationalist resurgence, each chapter providing important insights for the student and scholar alike.

Gerstle's historiographical contribution lies in his attempt to bring the state back into the forefront of consideration among social historians, something that he began in his first book, *Working-Class Americanism* (1989). Social historians have managed to alter our perspectives on race, ethnicity, and immigration by moving our focus from structural considerations (such as the economic conditions motivating migration or the nativist restrictions placed upon immigrants) to the lives and experiences of the immigrants themselves. In the process, however, historians have developed a tendency to romanticize immigrant culture. To counteract this tendency, some have emphasized the importance of emerging industrial capitalism, while a few focused on gender conventions among immigrants and in American society generally. Gerstle has taken us in a new direction here by focusing on the relationship between immigrants and the emerging American state, as revealed through these two manifestations of American nationalism.

Gerstle argues that racial and civic nationalism are two largely separate ideological strains that have animated the political history of the United States in the twentieth century. The former tends toward exclusion and the imposition of a disciplinary state to safeguard borders; the latter tends toward inclusion on the basis of long-treasured political values associated with freedom, equality, and civil and political rights. While supporters of racial nationalism have often attempted to impose strict immigration quotas and laws that reserve superior status for immigrants of northern European parentage, proponents of civic nationalism have

endeavored to dismantle as much of the disciplinary apparatus of the state as possible. But Gerstle is also keenly aware of nuances and deviations from script, as when he describes the work of a man like Senator Pat McCarran. McCarran, who made the first efforts to reopen American doors to immigration in the 1950s, was also a McCarthyite and a supporter of a disciplinary state. The explanation for such an awkward ideological marriage lay in McCarran's desire as an Irish American to undermine the WASP elite while also requiring immigrants to prove their anti-Communist credentials.

If Gerstle stumbles it may be in relying too heavily on Theodore Roosevelt for his inspiration in interpreting the state and nationalism. While Roosevelt certainly left his imprint on progressive politics and on the emerging American state, following other genealogies by examining theorists such as Randolph Bourne or Woodrow Wilson (who both had a greater appreciation for statist theory than TR) would perhaps have clouded Gerstle's distinction between the civic and the racial. Gerstle sees Roosevelt vacillating between these two strands of nationalism in an almost schizophrenic way, though with civic nationalism largely holding sway. Woodrow Wilson was more keenly aware of the racial origins of his own civic nationalism, and Randolph Bourne pointed clearly to the repressive tendencies of the state in both its racial and its civic guise. Wilson and Bourne were less willing than Roosevelt to separate these two ideological strands in their estimation of that "hopeless confusion" that was the state, or at least American thinking about the state.

The weakness here is most pronounced perhaps in Gerstle's efforts to distinguish his understanding of nationalism from those of liberals who have come before, such as when he suggests that Gunnar Myrdal's definition of an American creed in *An American Dilemma* "was flawed, for it presumed that racist thought was extraneous to the creed's core civic principles and thus that such thought could be repudiated without calling into question fundamental notions of American identity" (p. 193). Any division between the civic/inclusive and the racist/exclusive is likely to fall foul of this problem; ever since American slavery and American freedom were conceived together in the same Virginia swamp, the "civic" has never been as universal and inclusive as some Americans have hoped or claimed. Moreover, the only people covered by civic principles are those who have succeeded in winning inclusion. While exclusion can become less crassly racial in a Social Darwinist way than it was during the twentieth century, it will nonetheless exist, determined by a particular religion or belief itself, by gender, or by property and economic rights in a world where these are increasingly contested. With democracy and freedom riddled with these internal contradictions, the vanquishing of racial nationalism by a vibrant civic alternative (which Gerstle seems to be advocating here), may still leave Americans confused as to why the ideals they honor as the universal messages of their history and society can seem to others to be only reflections of their



continued privilege. But while Gerstle may not have settled debates about the parameters of the American state and its potential for reinvigorating liberals even in the aftermath of Vietnam and Watergate, he has nonetheless provided a jumping off point for fruitful discussion.

*Richard Stockton College of New Jersey*

ROBERT GREGG

*Passover Revisited: Philadelphia's Efforts to Aid Soviet Jews, 1963-1998.* By ANDREW HARRISON. (Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2001. 286p. Illustrations, tables, notes, index. \$31.)

On the morning of March 4, 1977, I was in Moscow on a Fulbright fellowship and standing in the kitchen of Jewish friends who were contemplating trying to emigrate from the Soviet Union. They silently handed me a copy of *Izvestiia* in which Anatolii Sharansky, along with Joseph Smukler of Philadelphia and others, was accused of being a spy for the C.I.A. It was chillingly obvious to all of us that the charges were false and that the Soviet government intended the publication of such disinformation to be an announcement of a political tightening against activism for human rights and against activism for emigration. We became depressed, but it was clear to us that Sharansky was a hero, as was, for that matter, the gentleman from Philadelphia.

The emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union and subsequently from the lands of the former U.S.S.R. is one of the great demographic shifts in Jewish history, and the political struggle to free Soviet Jews was a defining moment for the American Jewish community. Little has been written on the Soviet Jewry movement, and Andrew Harrison's treatise on Philadelphia, a leading center of the movement, is most welcome. Harrison is the archivist for the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation in Princeton, New Jersey. His book is the second in a series of three books on the subject under the auspices of Temple University's Feinstein Center for American Jewish History, which is to be commended for its efforts to fill the gap in our knowledge.

*Passover Revisited* argues that Philadelphia's Jewish community was the most organized and effective Soviet Jewry advocacy network in the world. Refuseniks, those who were denied the right to emigrate, noted on numerous occasions the importance of the Philadelphia community to their cause. Other communities in the United States were divided between establishment agencies advocating quiet diplomacy and grassroots groups that favored more assertive and attention-getting tactics. Nationally this split was visible in the differences between the National Conference on Soviet Jewry (NCSJ) and the Union of Councils of Soviet Jews (UCSJ). But through the formation in the early 1970s of its Soviet Jewry Council (SJC), Philadelphia overcame this divide and was able to centralize and integrate its

efforts on behalf of Soviet Jews. Over the years the United States as a whole eventually came to recognize the need for both diplomatic efforts and grassroots protests. Almost from the beginning, Philadelphia operated with one voice.

The book documents in detail the organizational and personal efforts of Joseph and Connie Smukler and the many other Philadelphians who were active in the movement. The Soviet Jewry Council's program of visitation with refuseniks was highly extensive and maintained briefing and debriefing standards that ensured flows of information despite Soviet censorship. The council initiated a variety of attention-getting practices that became widespread throughout the United States such as the twinning of young Americans with refusenik children at bar and bat mitzvahs. Coming as it did at the height of the feminist movement, the SJC became a locus for the activism of women, and women moved into leadership roles within it. Recognizing the need to go beyond the Jewish community, the SJC entered into interfaith coalitions, some of which included African American clergy. It garnered political support at all levels and skillfully used a combination of techniques, including well-organized mass demonstrations and boycotts, to influence federal policies.

Harrison provides much good detail based on interviews and documentary materials, but rarely does he consider causes and consequences. Although the similarity between Philadelphia's leadership in the Soviet Jewry movement and its role in Jewish activism in the nineteenth century is noted, there is no real exploration of why Philadelphia Jews differed from other communities. Nor is there an attempt to explain why Philadelphia organized so well for Soviet Jews and not for Syrian or Romanian Jews, whose efforts to emigrate were also major issues during the period under examination. Without doubt the efforts of activists in the United States were important in securing many Soviet Jews' emigration rights, but international developments and internal changes in the USSR were even greater catalysts. Toward the end of the book we get a hint that a major part of the importance of the Soviet Jewry movement may have been in reinvigorating the Philadelphia Jewish community itself, but the point is not developed. Although refuseniks are presented as individuals, for the most part Soviet Jews are seen only as rescue objects. Indeed, they seem to disappear from consideration by the author altogether once they have left the USSR, when in fact their impact on the Philadelphia community, where they now account for about one-tenth of all Jews, has been great.

Although the text is at times difficult to read due to inadequate proofreading, and the editing of proper names by someone familiar with Russian would have been useful, Harrison has amassed documentation and interviews on a fascinating subject. It is an era that is quickly fading from memory, but it was a time when Philadelphians rightfully could be called heroes.

*National Museum of American Jewish History*

WESLEY A. FISHER



*Football: The Ivy League Origins of an American Obsession.* By MARK F. BERNSTEIN. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001. xiii, 336p. Illustrations, appendix notes, bibliography, index. \$29.95.)

Mark Bernstein's book examines the emergence of football and its extraordinary popularity in the United States from the first intercollegiate game, Princeton versus Rutgers in November 1869, through the 2000 season. He focuses on the varying fortunes, innovations, and tribulations of the eight Ivy League teams whose exploits won the sport early acclaim. Bernstein, a Princeton alumnus, acknowledges that today there is minimal interest in Ivy League football, but his study correctly emphasizes that during the formative years of play, these eastern schools set the game's features in ways we presently know them, including basic rules, team positions, coaching staffs, and All-American teams.

The book begins by examining the period roughly from 1869 through the "Roaring Twenties," the period of "Ivy" prominence. The author scrutinizes playing seasons, Big Three (Harvard, Yale, Princeton) predominance, university regulation of the sport, athletic scholarships, attempts to ban the sport, athlete ethnicity, and formation of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association and National Collegiate Athletic Association. He also mentions celebrated players, including Princeton's Hobie Baker, Yale's William "Pudge" Heffelfinger, Amos Alonzo Stagg, and Albie Booth, Harvard's Eddie Mahan, and scholar-athlete Barry Wood, Columbia's "Bill" Donovan (future OSS director), Penn's Truxton Hare, and Brown's Frederick "Fritz" Pollard, who became the first black All-American. Key coaches appear in the text, including Percy Haughton (Harvard and Cornell), Walter Camp and T. A. D. Jones (Yale), and John Heisman (Penn). Bernstein also vividly describes several exciting period games, especially Yale's 6-3 triumph over Harvard (1916), Princeton's 21-18 triumph over the University of Chicago (1922), and Harvard's 7-6 edging of Oregon in the 1920 Rose Bowl.

In subsequent chapters, Bernstein chronicles the detrimental impact of the Depression, the disruption of World War II, postwar "de-emphasis," and the ensuing decline in attendance and importance. Yet even during these years of decreasing prominence the eight Ivy institutions produced distinguished athletes and coaches and featured exciting contests. Richard Kazmaier was the last Ivy recipient of the Heisman Trophy, while Penn's Charles Bednarik became a professional football great. Harvard's Pat McNally, Yale's outstanding duo, Brian Dowling and Calvin Hill, Cornell's Ed Marinaro, and Dartmouth's civic-minded Reggie Williams all lent excitement to the league. Memorable games include Columbia's startling 21-20 upset of unbeaten Army (1947), Cornell's 1962 see-saw 35-34 triumph over Princeton, and the renowned Yale-Harvard 29-29 tie on November 23, 1968.

Bernstein provides a diverting portrayal of Ivy League football within the context of America's sports history. The text is well-written, containing several delightful

anecdotes. Moreover, it has an extensive bibliography of primary and secondary sources; the chapters are well-annotated; and an informative appendix augments textual details.

Some reservations, however, can be offered about the work. This reviewer feels that Bernstein makes a striking overstatement when he asserts (p. 226) that prior to the 1960s "women had been welcomed in the Big Three grandstands only as dates," and exaggerates in his claim (p. 264) that Columbia's Baker Field could accommodate "50,000 fans." Several factual errors detract somewhat from the book's achievements. The author misnames individuals: Yale's athletic director of the 1950s is mistakenly cited (p. 199) as "Ralph" rather than Bob Hall, while Yale's president is listed as "Ernest" (p. 305) or "Henry" (p. 228), rather than A. Whitney Griswold. He states (p. 162) that during Cornell's miserable 1935 season, they lost to Case Western Reserve University, but Case and Western Reserve were then separate institutions with separate football teams. In the 1952 (not 1953) Harvard-Yale game (p. 216), Yale's "transformed" manager scored only one—not two—extra points when he caught a conversion pass, and during the 1953 season, Harvard's Carroll Lowenstein threw his five touchdown passes against Davidson (p. 208), not Yale. Finally, the description (p. 183) of Columbia's upset of Army (October 25, 1947), is marred by the inaccuracy that the Lions' Lou Kusserow "almost ran for another touchdown late in the second quarter, only to have it nullified because an official had stopped the clock to give the coaches the two minute warning." College football, then as now, had no two-minute warning. Despite these slips, the book is informative and appealing, especially for Bernstein's engaging writing style.

Loyola University of Chicago

SHELDON S. COHEN

## ERRATA

In the article "Toward an Iconography of a State Capitol: The Art and Architecture of the Pennsylvania State Capitol in Harrisburg," published in the April 2002 issue of *PMHB*, the reference to *The Pennsylvania Capitol: A Documentary History* (Harrisburg, Pa., 1987) in note 5 should read "produced by Heritage Studies, Inc., for the Capitol Preservation Committee," and should indicate that the work consists of four volumes. The author and editor apologize for these omissions.