

partisan politics" (p. 230). Rejecting the classic argument of E. Digby Baltzell—that religious traditions explain the major differences between Puritan Boston and Quaker Philadelphia—Koschnik places "the origins of the division between partisan politics and organized culture in Philadelphia in the Federalist withdrawal from politics" (p. 235).

This sharp distinction between politics and religion seems somewhat overdrawn, for surely the distinctive Quaker engagement with postwar public life was directly related to the anti-Quaker tenor of the broad revolutionary era. Some more attention to the continuities and disruptions that the Revolution brought to the colonial order might have led us to see this book's subjects as aspirers to older colonial norms rather than as the innovative reformers that Koschnik describes. Conceptualizing the pioneers of cultural institutions as "conservatives" rather than as "Federalists" might have underscored some of this continuity and would have conveyed a less fixed sense of partisan affiliation. An abstract quality informs some of the assessment here; for example, the local details of Philadelphia politics, especially municipal government, where conservatives often had more success than at the statewide or national levels, receive almost no attention. Our understanding of associational development might also have benefited from noting the period's rancorous struggles over organized labor (such as the Philadelphia Mayor's Court decision in *Commonwealth v. Pullis* [1806] that labor unions were illegal groups), especially in a book that probes the close relationship between law and associations.

"*Let a Common Interest Bind Us Together*" makes an important and original contribution to a new kind of political history that looks beyond election results and officeholders' accounts. This deeply researched and expansive view of the expression of power adds to our understanding of how society became more recognizably modern in the wake of the American Revolution, and it situates the quasi-private world of masculine voluntary associations as a major force within this transformation.

University of Maine

LIAM RIORDAN

Founding Friends: Families, Staff, and Patients at the Friends Asylum in Early Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia. By PATRICIA D'ANTONIO. (Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press, 2006. 253 pp. Appendices, notes, bibliography, index. \$46.50.)

Patricia D'Antonio has written a scholarly work that successfully negotiates the many threads required to understand fully the history of any institution. By carefully placing the Friends Asylum within its layered contexts of nineteenth-century Quakerism, early middle-class formation, nascent medical professionalism,

and changing attitudes towards meanings of insanity, D'Antonio provides insight into all of these areas while also using them to illuminate the particular history of the Friends Asylum. The well-organized book traces the shift over time of the asylum from a re-created family for the insane to a medical institution predicated on the ascendancy of doctors as arbiters of treatment. The appendices provide detailed information on the founders, managers, and contributors, characteristics of the patient population, and the uses of seclusion and restraint as treatment methods. The bibliography and notes provide a wealth of additional information and identify sources for further study on any of the topics raised in the book.

The text of *Founding Friends* can be dense at times. Though D'Antonio gives a thorough and measured summary, those without some background in early nineteenth-century Quakerism will find the section on the Hicksite schism challenging. Readers new to the history of medicine may find the medical terminology difficult to grasp, particularly in the last chapter. However, the book more than rewards its readers in its thought-provoking examination of the agents of the asylum's transformation. For D'Antonio, the asylum is always a negotiated space, both the physical arrangements created by the founders and the social space created by the lay managers, staff, patients, and patients' families. At first the hospital was to serve as a new family for patients. Families would choose the asylum when their needs for peace and predictability could no longer contain the behaviors and provide for the well-being of an insane family member. Unfortunately, the family metaphor of the asylum merely shifted this tension between the individual and the group from the biological family to the institutional family. Here the lay staff, charged with carrying out the vision of moral treatment, encountered the same contradiction between the collective needs of the community and the individual patient's behavior and treatment requirements. In the end, staff chose the medical metaphor of care as a means of addressing this contradiction.

Beyond its specific discussion of this institution, *Founding Friends* contributes to the histories of both nursing and the family in America. Unlike their eighteenth-century predecessors, families today depend on experts to handle everything from teaching algebra, to medicating attention-based learning issues, to caring for the chronically ill, to diagnosing mental illness. From the early nineteenth century, when family members were actively prescribing treatment for their relatives within the asylum, to the mid-twentieth century, when families were largely excluded from treatment decisions made by medical professionals, D'Antonio rightly argues that in the twenty-first century we are once again seeing a paradigm shift among health-care institutions, clinicians, patients, and their families. She suggests that in the early history of the Friends Asylum we can find lessons for navigating these emerging patterns in the engaged and empowering negotiations among families, patients, and lay and medical-care providers.

For D'Antonio, all the voices in these discussions have value and give meaning to the efficacy and quality of treatment and care.

Westtown School

MARGARET HAVILAND

Slavery and the Meetinghouse: The Quakers and the Abolitionist Dilemma, 1820–1865. By RYAN P. JORDAN. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007. xiv, 175 pp. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$29.95.)

The role of members of the Religious Society of Friends—commonly known as Quakers—in opposition to the institution of slavery in the new American nation is well known. Friends were the first in the colonies to record their opposition to slavery—as Germantown Friends did in 1688—and the first to prohibit their members from owning slaves. In 1775, a group comprised primarily of Friends organized the first abolition society in the world. In 1784, the Society for the Relief of Free Negroes Unlawfully Held in Bondage expanded and became a larger organization, the Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery and for the Relief of Negroes Unlawfully Held in Bondage and for Improving the African Race, more often referred to as the Pennsylvania Abolition Society. In 1787, Benjamin Franklin became its president. This organization helped similar groups organize in the several states, held frequent conferences, petitioned the Constitutional Convention to outlaw slavery in the new nation, and, through its “Acting Committee,” rescued many blacks who were captured by unscrupulous slave catchers who intended to sell them in the South. The Pennsylvania Abolition Society also persuaded the Constitutional Convention to end the slave trade in 1808.

Yet, as the abolition movement gained momentum, principally with the organization of the American Anti-Slavery Society by William Lloyd Garrison in 1833, antislavery Friends faced a dilemma. To join with sectarian antislavery groups was to violate the Quaker prohibition of mixing with “the world’s people,” while adopting aggressive methods was at odds with the Quaker reliance on non-violent means to change hearts and minds.

The Quaker solution was to create antislavery societies within the meeting community, but these were small and ineffective. Some prominent Quaker abolitionists maintained their meeting membership precariously, often warned by the elders of the dangers of their actions. Of these, the best known was Lucretia Mott, who remained a member of Cherry Street—later Race Street—Meeting on the basis of her popularity and her ability to defend herself. Others were disowned, or withdrew before they could be disowned (as did Abby Kelley). Some Quakers created their own religious societies, but these largely failed in the long run. For example, many North Carolinian Quakers migrated to Indiana in order