

the relationship between what they term “liberalism” and crime. The authors show that Pennsylvania experienced a strikingly high level of crime (both of violence and against property) throughout its first century and a quarter compared to its sister colonies and even England. They take pains to analyze a variety of possible social explanations (class, poverty, class fears, potential rebellions, transience, age, gender, ethnicity, and race) to better understand the roots of this ongoing criminality. In their telling, while different variables influenced different sorts of criminal activities, they cannot provide a consistent social explanation for them (with the possible explanation of African Americans whose particularly vulnerable position structured their experiences of crime and the law). But if none of these social explanations fully explain Pennsylvanians’ high criminality, what would? The authors answer is a liberal society. They contend that the Quaker commitment to relaxing external forms of authority (particularly the weakened authority of church and state), combined with the emphasis on markets and material well-being when confronting a society of ethnic and religious diversity and immigration, produced a colony with strikingly high rates of crime and violence.

Not all will be convinced by this argument. For one thing, it is not clear what exactly the authors mean by liberalism. They seem to equate it with a decline of traditional structures of authority and their replacement by “free-markets” and “democracy.” But liberalism was more interventionist than that. Eighteenth-century thinkers did not discover the economy: they invented it. The market was not simply a counterpoint to the state: the state helped create it. Rather than the unexpected result of an explosion of liberties that began in the eighteenth century and continue till today, crime and the law exist within the larger history of shifting economies of restraints and freedoms—for surely liberalism ushered in many new restraints as well as its laudable freedoms.

Still, *Troubled Experiment* is an important and provocative work. The authors are to be commended not only for their research and analysis but for their open recognition that the subject demands critical and ethical reflection on its meaning for liberal societies. Their desire to engage in that reflection is a welcome breeze in the often too dusty rooms of academic distance.

*University of California, Los Angeles*

MICHAEL MERANZE

*Sex among the Rabble: An Intimate History of Gender and Power in the Age of Revolution, Philadelphia, 1730–1830.* By CLARE A. LYONS. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006. xii, 420 pp. Illustrations, appendix, notes, manuscript bibliography, index. Cloth, \$55; paper, \$22.50.)

Forget about hippies. The sexual revolution that took place in Philadelphia nearly two hundred years earlier makes the 1960s appear tame. The evidence of

a sexually permissive culture is plentiful: bastardy rates skyrocketed, prostitution flourished, and adultery became an increasingly viable option. Prostitutes were visibly identifiable, walking the streets soliciting clients, and bawdy houses could be found in nearly every neighborhood. There was no shame. One prostitute wrote that her life and occupation were “perfectly agreeable” to her and that she was “happy and contented” (p. 331). An elite gentleman who frequented prostitutes reputedly left his horse tied to a post outside of a bawdy house “so that everyone knows when he is there and exactly how long he stays” (p. 279). The city did not mount an organized attempt to eliminate prostitution—or fornication, bastardy, or adultery, for that matter. Such “nonmarital sexual behavior” was rarely criminally prosecuted. Officials relied on individuals to file charges in morals cases and for the most part, Philadelphians of the revolutionary era could not be bothered. In this regard, they were quite different from their rural neighbors.

Of course, these are generalizations, and some distinctions can be found when one takes the race, sex, and class of the actors into account. And this is where Lyons’s deftness as a historian is most apparent. Race and class unmistakably affected one’s participation in the city’s social, political, and economic life. Interracial social relations and sexual liaisons were tolerated in postrevolutionary Philadelphia, though were more common among the lower classes. Many African Americans served extended terms of servitude as a condition of freedom from slavery. Because servants could not marry without their masters’ permission, they were still denied freedom of personal and sexual relations. While people of all classes enjoyed nonmarital sexual behavior, they subscribed different meanings to it. For many of the “lower sort” such practices were assertions of “love or romantic attachment” over the institution of marriage. Elites viewed their liaisons as “casual” and characterized by “multiple sexual affairs” (p. 236).

Just as the 1980s put an end to the 1960s, the nineteenth century brought with it a class-based bifurcation of sexuality. Elite and middle-class Philadelphians used cultural representations of sexuality, benevolent reforms, and more rigid enforcement of legal codes to shift the dominant discourse and restrict illicit sex. This resulted in two sexualities: a dominant and public sexuality marked by virtuous women and virile men and a licentious, “uncontrollable” sexuality of poor people and African Americans, also known as “the rabble” (p. 390).

Sex is the center of this history, but sexual desire and sexual acts are viewed through the lens of their historical meanings and consequences. Other dominant themes of the era—republicanism, racism and slavery, the position of women, and class relations—are all illuminated through this study of sexuality. In a work of such depth and analytical sophistication, it is mystifying that the subject of same-sex “nonmarital sexual practices” or “intimate lives beyond marriage” that involve same-sex relations are not included. Lyons has based this study on an astoundingly large body of court, institutional, and legal records that are peppered with references to sodomites and buggers. This otherwise masterful account

falters by furthering the idea that same-sex desires and relations are “exceptions” that need not be integrated into this story of gender and power, which is our loss.

*Connecticut College*

JENNIFER MANION

*The Philadelphia Campaign*. Vol. 1, *Brandywine and the Fall of Philadelphia*. By THOMAS J. MCGUIRE. (Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 2006. x, 420 pp. Illustrations, notes, glossary, bibliography, index. \$34.95.)

Despite the gentlemanly words used so often to describe eighteenth-century warfare, campaigns and battles were hotly contested events that elicited a brutality and savagery that has been the true hallmark of war in all ages. Local citizens of all political persuasions that were swept up in the tumultuous events of the American Revolution were indelibly marked by their encounters with battle. Thomas J. McGuire's book, *The Philadelphia Campaign*, reminds readers of the impact that marching armies and bloody battles had on the population of rural America and, perhaps more importantly, of the divisive nature of what truly was a civil war.

In McGuire's words, “*The Philadelphia Campaign* is a story about people—soldiers and civilians, husbands, mothers, fathers, and children—all of whom shared a common experience in the American War for Independence” (p. 4). His remarkably thorough research enables him to unfold the story of the campaign through the eyes of its participants, men and women, adults and children, soldiers and civilians, British and American. McGuire's exhaustive explorations of libraries, archives, and private collections uncovered surprising new documents, which shed greater light onto the Philadelphia Campaign. For example, he discovered two previously unpublished watercolors that are the only two known images created while the British army was in the field. One of these images, entitled *A Rebel Battery on the Heights of Brandywine*, is the only participant-created image of the Battle of Brandywine.

McGuire deftly leads the reader through the maneuvering of Howe and Washington's army and the eventual clash along the banks of the peaceful Brandywine Creek. Nine-year-olds Sally Frazer and Tommy Cope, both of Chester County, witnessed the conflict along the Brandywine. While neither one of them actually participated in the battle, McGuire points out that “both were directly affected by it and never forgot it. Their world was forever changed by the Revolution, and Brandywine was one of the largest battles of the war” (p. 2).

McGuire also addresses the poor reconnaissance and lack of intelligence by the Continental army that ultimately led to its defeat at Brandywine. McGuire assigns blame to Major General John Sullivan, who in McGuire's estimation, “knew little if anything about what lay above his position at Brinton's Ford . . .