

regret, and [an] extensive—though not complete—repudiation” (pp. 248–49). Others will think that Hoerr is too soft on Quinn and places too much emphasis on Quinn’s denial that he was a Communist, despite his conclusion that “Quinn was, indeed, guilty of associating and working with Communists on union matters, [and] of belonging to a union with Communist leaders” (p. 218). My own view is that by going far beyond serving as a “loyal opposition” to the pro-Communist UE leadership, forcing the UE out of the CIO, and setting up the rival International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE), Rice and his allies gravely weakened trade unionism in the electrical industry and elsewhere. I agree fully with Hoerr’s observation that “much of the accusatory activity and accompanying suffering should never have occurred” (p. 249).

Is there a cautionary tale struggling to get out of this book? Whether one reads it for its putative lessons or as an account of a past long gone and unlikely ever to return, *Harry, Tom, and Father Rice* is a magnificent achievement that deserves the widest audience.

University of Pittsburgh

JOSEPH WHITE

Elections in Pennsylvania: A Century of Partisan Conflict in the Keystone State.

By JACK M. TREADWAY. (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005. xxiv, 296p. Appendix, references, index. \$55.)

“A man could campaign half his life in Pennsylvania and still not know what he’s doing.” So observed George Wallace during his 1972 presidential campaign. Had Wallace had access to *Elections in Pennsylvania*, he may have been less mystified. Likewise, Governor Leader might have revised his recipe for political success: “speak on anything as long you’re against gun control, the Court’s decision on school prayer, and Philadelphia.”

Jack Treadway has analyzed a massive amount of data on legislative, congressional, senatorial, and gubernatorial elections from 1900 through 1998, placed that analysis in a historical context, and drawn several conclusions regarding electoral behavior. Some are not new. It will come as no surprise that “despite the dramatic political transformations . . . the state has always retained a Republican bias” (p. 199). Nor will it shock many to learn that marginal incumbents have been more likely than safe incumbents to lose. The value is not in the conclusions themselves, but rather in the quantitative methods Treadway has applied to demonstrate their validity.

Other conclusions are more intriguing. Democrats’ recent inability (until this past election) to dominate in statewide elections despite a four hundred thousand registration advantage is a good example. Treadway has found that “both parties’ mean share of the vote was less than their mean share of registered voters when

they were the majority party and more than their mean share of registered voters when they were the minority party" (p. 193). The crucial difference has been the size of the majority. Republican majorities ranged from 59 to 80 percent while the Democratic majority has rarely exceeded 54 percent. This comparatively small majority has not been able to overcome the majority party's historic inability to mobilize its base.

Similarly intriguing are Treadway's conclusions regarding careerism in the General Assembly, the lack of political experience among new members of the assembly, and the disproportionate success of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh candidates in statewide elections. This last assertion might surprise observers of Pennsylvania politics. Anti-Philadelphia and anti-Pittsburgh bias may be a very real phenomenon in rural Pennsylvania. But the influence of the vote in the urbanized areas is indisputable. Fifty-eight percent of the winners of statewide elections have come from one of the commonwealth's two major metropolitan areas.

Elections in Pennsylvania is not without shortcomings. Much of the preliminary historical background is drawn from the venerable *History of Pennsylvania* (1973). This may be testament to the quality of Klein and Hoogenboom's work, or to the dearth of political history in the more recent *Pennsylvania: A History of the Commonwealth* (2002). Second, statistical analysis rarely makes riveting reading; the casual student of history may find the going rather tedious. Third, Treadway is dealing with legislative and statewide electoral trends that do not necessarily hold at the county and municipal level—the seat of much political power in twentieth-century Pennsylvania and the preserve of the GOP long after the New Deal. Similarly, African Americans in Chester, Philadelphia, and Harrisburg continued to vote Republican in local elections long after the New Deal realignment of the 1930s, and Philadelphia's 1951 Democratic revolution had little to do with FDR.

These, however, are minor complaints. In the final analysis, *Elections in Pennsylvania* is a well-researched, clearly written, and highly informational monograph that represents a significant contribution to the historiography of politics in Pennsylvania.

Millersville University

JOHN M. McLARNON

Historians in Public: The Practice of American History, 1890–1970. By IAN TYRELL. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005. xii, 348p. Notes, index. Cloth, \$57; paper, \$23.)

Ian Tyrell, professor of history at the University of New South Wales in Sydney, Australia, has traced the manner and mode in which American historians (i.e., professional, university-based academicians holding the PhD) have engaged