

The study aims to combine newfound biographical and historical insights with a reading of Brown's novelistic corpus in order to explore Brown as the initiator of an "American Gothic" mode. Yet the study never engages with the rich, ever-expanding body of recent scholarship on the gothic and its cultural twin, sentiment. Consequently the discussion of the gothic, and of Brown's novels, is extremely limited and based on aestheticized and psychologistic assumptions concerning the period's literary modes and their functions. This reliance on older scholarship also leads the study to provide a somewhat lopsided perspective on Brown's corpus as a whole, maximizing the role of the first four ("gothic"- "Godwinian") novels while minimizing or even negating the significance and complexity of the later novels and nonnovelistic writings. Further, it leads the study to repeat dated commonplaces regarding Brown's supposed Federalist and conservative leanings in the post-novelistic years, without noting reviews in anti-Jacobin and Federalist periodicals or other evidence that suggests that contemporary Federalists saw Brown as an opponent rather than an ally. Overall, the version of Brown that appears here leans toward present-day, founding father revaluations, presenting Brown (and the gothic mode) as nationalistic, backward looking, and dependent on previous generations, an antimodern reading that obscures Brown's radical-democratic, cosmopolitan, progressive lineage and the gothic's role in the Atlantic revolutionary age.

Most dramatically, the study relies on exaggerated and often tendentious psychobiographical speculation that construes Brown's writings as expressions of an inner psychological reality. The inner Brown, on this reading, is a creature of atavistic neuroses and obsessions related to the "tribal drama" of the Quaker community (p. 79; a notion of Brown's "tribal" consciousness is developed and emphasized throughout). Such psychologistic speculation provides a particularly unpersuasive view of Brown's development and writings, even though it figures occasionally in Brown criticism since the 1815 Paul Allen-William Dunlap biography and has recently been emphasized by Steven Watts (1994) and Caleb Crain (2001).

*University of Kansas*

PHILIP BARNARD

*Manufacturing Revolution: The Intellectual Origins of Early American Industry.* By LAWRENCE A. PESKIN. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003. xi, 294p. Illustrations, notes, bibliographical essay, index. \$49.95.)

*Manufacturing Revolution* is an exceptional study of the actors, events, and especially the ideas that laid the groundwork for industrialization in the early American republic. For Peskin, people and circumstances matter far more than the "broad impersonal forces" offered by Marx's angst-ridden stage theory,

Smith's celebrated invisible hand, or market trends (pp. 1, 3). The result is a rich narrative of the way groups of individuals—mechanics, merchant-manufacturers, farmers, artisans, politicians, and publicists—promoted their personal, communal, and ultimately, they believed, the national interest in self-sufficiency.

Remarkably concise, this book (only 225 text pages) covers a lot of ground without oversimplifying the subject. The slow process towards economic independence began, almost accidentally, as colonists opposed parliamentary acts they believed undermined the “harmonious reciprocal dependence” provided by British mercantilism. As this “British system” disintegrated, evidenced by the 1774 nonimportation associations and ultimately revolution, many colonists argued for a more diversified economy, including a stronger manufacturing sector. Peskin suggests that “manufacturing of all sorts expanded rapidly in the 1780s” (p. 61), until derailed by the commercial opportunities of the Napoleonic Wars. During this postwar “critical period” mechanics like Mathew Carey, an Irish immigrant to Philadelphia, invoked anti-English rhetoric to win mild government support for manufacturing. Guided by what Peskin calls “popular neomercantilism” these “mechanic protectionists” advocated an expanded domestic market and (unlike their European counterparts) de-emphasized the importance of foreign trade.

Such early promoters proved far better with words than with actual results. Nevertheless, their rhetoric positioned the urban public and some policymakers to embrace the opportunities afforded during commercial and actual warfare from 1808 to 1815. The postwar period witnessed the continued expansion of industrialism in urban areas but also the spread of manufacturing into rural areas. These developments enabled farmers to experience the benefits offered by a stronger domestic economy (helping to win their support for protective tariffs in the 1820s) while also increasingly marginalizing urban mechanics (in part setting the stage for heightened class tensions). Ironically, just as protectionism reached its pinnacle (symbolically represented by the Harrisburg convention of July 4, 1827), divisions within class, party, and section were undermining the very “harmony of interests” that manufacturers had long sought.

Though this is primarily an intellectual history, Peskin's findings (and the context they provide) will be invaluable to economic and political historians as well as scholars interested in class and even gender. His adept analysis of political parties substantiates suggestions by John Nelson and John Crowley that, despite Hamilton's 1791 report on manufactures, Republicans rather than Federalists provided the main political tent for manufacturing entrepreneurs. While class tensions remained present throughout the period, Peskin suggests (in what is sure to be a controversial but possibly accurate claim) that shared interests and elastic definitions of “manufacturer” and “mechanic” prevented true “class conflict” until the 1820s.

That the “harmony of interests” concept resonated so widely among the

nation's diverse groups raises some issues that might have been further explored. The author notes that much of the nation's industry took place in rural regions. Yet, one wonders, especially in light of still influential books like Paul Johnson's *A Shopkeeper's Millennium* (1978), precisely how these communities reconciled urban promoters' rhetoric with the practical changes manufacturing presented. Similarly, despite very occasional references to Charleston, it would be interesting to know more about how southern planters (and their slaves) participated in or pondered early industrialization and ultimately why, by the 1820s, as Peskin notes, they so flatly rejected the "harmony of interests" that supporters of the American System were peddling. These are, however, minor and answerable quibbles about a truly stimulating and well-written book on an oft-ignored topic.

At a general level, Peskin's analyses should force us to question what we mean when we talk of a so-called "market revolution." From a *conceptual* perspective the "market revolution" of the period from 1760 to 1830 may not be the further entanglement of peoples in global commerce. The colonies had after all been founded largely for that purpose. Instead, it may be that "far more revolutionary, at least in the United States [or at least the Northeast], was the rapid turn away from an economy based on agriculture and overseas trade toward one in which manufacturing (whether factory-based, craft-based, or anything between) was the most dynamic component" (p. 4). In addition, Peskin shows that far from being opposed to state participation, these early United States capitalists almost universally advocated some sort of government intervention on their behalf, be it aid for manufacturing societies, government bounties, or protective tariffs.

*California State University, Sacramento*

BRIAN SCHOEN

*The Fashioning of Middle-Class America: Sartain's Union Magazine of Literature and Art and Antebellum Culture.* By HEIDI L. NICHOLS. (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2004. 165p. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$57.95.)

Heidi L. Nichols joins the ranks of other recent literary critics and historians in examining the cultural work performed by mid-nineteenth-century magazines. Concentrating solely on one Philadelphia monthly, *Sartain's Union Magazine of Literature and Art*, and narrowing her focus further to the last two and a half years of the magazine's publication (1849–52), Nichols argues that *Sartain's Union* played a key role in promoting authorship in America and in constructing social roles for an emerging middle-class readership.

In chapter 1 Nichols lays out a brief history of the magazine, including the editorship of popular frontier novelist Caroline Kirkland, and of the change in ownership in 1849 to John Sartain, Philadelphia's leading mezzotint engraver.