

image with some familiarity. The approach can be overwhelming, especially in chapters 2 and 5, where Youngner analyzes forty-six images in thirty-six pages of text. It is perhaps a testament to Youngner's ambitious visual scope that one wants to know more about the people involved. The book's coda observes that twenty-first-century Pittsburgh needs strength to "change once again into the city of the future." That suggests a world of ideas and actions beyond the minds of artists, the further exploration of which could only add to the conversation started in this perceptive study.

Susquehanna University

EDWARD SLAVISHAK

Widows and Orphans First: The Family Economy and Social Welfare Policy, 1880–1939. By S. J. KLEINBERG. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006. xiv, 230 pp. Tables, notes, index. \$35.)

Public welfare advocates in the 1930s were delighted at the prospect of federal social policies that would help diminish the dramatic differences in how states and communities cared for the poor. S. J. Kleinberg's examination of public and charitable policies toward widows and orphans at the turn of the century in three cities (Pittsburgh, Baltimore, and Fall River, Massachusetts) demonstrates why such concern was manifest on the eve of the New Deal.

Kleinberg, a historian at Brunel University in West London, United Kingdom, established her reputation with *The Shadow of the Mills* (1989), a fine-grained social history that documented the brutal struggle for subsistence among industrial Pittsburgh's working-class families. Her deep immersion in local sources remains the strength of her newest book, in which she convincingly argues that local economic structures, as well as racial and ethnic attitudes, more strongly determined local responses to widowed mothers and their children than broader attitudes of "maternalism." While scholars such as Linda Gordon have emphasized the influence of maternalist Progressive Era reformers who sought to create public policies that would support mothers at home with their children, Kleinberg shows how varied the actual implementation of such policies was. Fall River, for instance, a textile center that depended on the labor of women and children, showed little compunction about sending mothers out to work, and thus developed little in the way of aid to keep mothers out of the labor market. Pittsburgh, by contrast, with few opportunities for women to work in heavy industry, and with a heightened public awareness of job-related mortality, developed a dizzying array of charitable institutions aimed at widows. Pennsylvania subsequently adopted one of the more progressive mothers' pension programs, which, on paper at least, promised pensions as a *right* to deserving, widowed mothers.

Race and ethnicity also shaped local social provision. Baltimore, like many southern and border states, was loathe to supply much in the way of any tax-supported services to African American widows and expected them to continue to work (which they did at higher rates than whites). Baltimore did not enact a mother's pension law until the eve of the Great Depression, and then funded it grudgingly and allowed few blacks into the program. Pittsburgh, on the other hand, was almost a model of racial equity in its provision of mothers' pensions to white and black widows—though Kleinberg could have devoted more attention to explaining this peculiarity.

Kleinberg observes that “few cities matched Pittsburgh's attention to impoverished widows” (p. 79). However, Pennsylvania's state funding formula for mothers' pensions shortchanged big cities like Pittsburgh, so that only a fraction of eligible mothers received pensions, and those that did rarely received enough to actually allow them to give up work. In Pittsburgh, as in many states and cities that rhetorically embraced the protection of widows and orphans, such policies had little tangible impact on the lives of their recipients.

The heart of Kleinberg's story is in this attention to the intense localism of social provision, a topic that many historians of social policy have noted but few have demonstrated in such close and comparative detail. Her broader points about the gendered and racial divisions of the welfare state largely echo those made by other scholars, but this study nonetheless reminds us in vivid detail that who got helped in what way—even among the most “deserving”—depended strongly on where one lived.

Union College

ANDREW MORRIS