

democracy than in why it works within those limits. Both writers focus on the stabilizing roles of religion and the rule of law. One of Wood's most impressive achievements is to show how advocates of democratic self-rule came to terms with that putative bastion of "aristocratic" power, an independent judiciary. By protecting "minorities of all sorts," the Supreme Court "has become a major instrument for both curbing . . . democracy and maintaining it" (468). If lawyers and jurists preached the autonomy of law, thus sustaining the precarious balance between democracy and liberty, preachers in a dizzying array of "sects and movements" Christianized "American popular culture." Disestablished, democratized religion showed how centrifugal tendencies could serve homogenizing purposes, preparing Americans "for nineteenth-century middle-class respectability," legitimizing "freedom and individualism," and moralizing market participation (613).

There are, of course, conspicuous differences between Tocqueville and Wood, most notably on the "radicalism" of the American Revolution. For Tocqueville, Anglo-Americans' colonial experience was all-important: "aristocratic" institutions and practices—municipal institutions, courts, and churches—were already effectively democratized *before* the Revolution. Focusing instead on how independent Americans understood their world, Wood argues persuasively that the Revolution was critical for the emergence of a democratic culture. In the wake of their constitutional settlement, partisans divided bitterly over the meaning of the Revolution and the future of the federal republic. Seeking to perpetuate British-style mixed government under an "energetic" central government, Federalists evoked images of recrudescing "monarchy" and "aristocracy." Republican oppositionists, inspired by the French Revolution, conjured up an American "old regime"-in-the-making, rallying "all good republicans and liberal reformers" to destroy this cancerous, alien growth (216). Anathematizing "aristocracy," Thomas Jefferson and his followers enabled Americans to overcome "the traditional culture's aversion to the term 'democracy'" (718). That conceptual transformation made all the difference, valorizing a republican revolution and its democratizing consequences and giving shape to the way of life that Tocqueville found so extraordinary.

University of Virginia

PETER S. ONUF

A Faithful Account of the Race: African American Historical Writing in Nineteenth-Century America. By STEPHEN G. HALL. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009. 352 pp. Notes, bibliography, index. \$22.95.)

A Faithful Account of the Race charts the emergence of a genre that Stephen Hall identifies as African American historical writing. Importantly, though,

Hall's book goes beyond merely offering a genealogy of "race histories." Instead, he links this literary form to the professionalization of black historians in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In doing this, Hall presents a way of reading historical writing from African-descended peoples in America across time, place, and region. This kind of approach encourages the reclassification of Mariah Stewart as an African American historian, along with the more formal "father" of black history, Carter G. Woodson.

Hall, to his credit, is not interested in searching for exemplars. Rather, he chronicles a repository of black historical writing that is encyclopedic in scope and oriented around five eras: 1817–36; 1837–50; 1850–63; 1863–82; and 1883–1915. Some of these dates correspond to significant events, such as the Compromise of 1850, while others designate the publication date of key texts in African American historical writing, such as William Wells Brown's *The Black Man* (1863).

The book's chapters are organized around the above five eras with one exception: a subsequent sixth chapter that places the "race histories" alongside the evolving history curricula at late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century normal schools and colleges. Although focused on charting African American historical writing from America's founding to the early twentieth-century professionalization of the discipline of history, Hall's text makes additional contributions to the field of African American historiography.

Throughout his book, Hall situates late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century people of color as—to borrow David Walker's terminology—"citizens of the world." According to Hall, these worldly African Americans occupied a black public sphere that was informed by cultural practices from African American, American, and European traditions. Significantly, though, the author reads the creative output of these individuals as more than just sentimental Afrocentrism or metahistorical reinterpretations of white nationalist histories. Hall provides a more nuanced perspective by crafting a narrative that exists outside of what he identifies as the binary-fueled tradition of African American historiography that has tended to offer modernist approaches (as in the work of Wilson Jeremiah Moses) and postmodernist approaches (as in the work of John Ernest). Although his text rests on the intellectual shoulders of Ernest's and Moses's scholarship, Hall proposes a "third way" of analyzing African American historical writing by "situating discussions squarely on the terrain of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century historical practice" (10).

The book's immense strength lies in its breadth and expansiveness. In conducting a chronological examination, as opposed to a "great works" narrative, Hall is able to present a wide range of understudied texts. This strength, though, is also the book's greatest challenge, as he must choose which texts within the genre deserve only a cursory reading and which ones merit additional analysis.

Regardless of this small concern, the book is critically important to the development and evolution of African American historiography.

Purdue University

KAREN N. SALT

The Glass House Boys of Pittsburgh: Law, Technology, and Child Labor. By JAMES L. FLANNERY. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009. 248 pp. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$35.)

Progressive Era social reformers made abolishing child labor a holy cause. For several decades, however, the glass bottle industry of western Pennsylvania proved to be one the most impregnable bastions they faced. James Flannery's monograph focuses on Progressive reformers and the interplay among politics, culture, and technological change.

In the first chapter, Flannery describes key organizations committed to abolition of child labor—the National Consumers League (NCL), the American Association for Labor Legislation (AALL), and the National Child Labor Committee (NCLC)—and the most important activists, especially Florence Kelley. These organizations approached the issue differently, reflecting a gender divide among Progressive reformers. Male reformers, Flannery suggests, viewed social problems as inefficiencies that needed to be rationalized, and they portrayed themselves as disinterested experts above the political fray. The overwhelmingly male AALL approached child labor in this way. Female reformers like Kelley, Flannery argues, considered child labor a moral issue and tended to be more activist and radical. Both approaches proved useful as reformers tried to push child labor reform through state governments.

Child labor reformers pursued a multipronged legislative strategy. They supported laws that prohibited industrial labor below a certain age, restricted children's night work, made education compulsory so as to keep children out of the labor force, and mandated factory inspections to enforce these regulations. On paper, the Pennsylvania legislature appeared to commit itself to all of these programs. But to the frustration of child labor reformers, child labor persisted in the Pennsylvania glass bottle industry because of weak factory inspection policies and because the legislature repeatedly authorized a glass house exception to statutes that limited child labor in other industries.

Flannery argues that four mutually reinforcing factors enabled child labor to persist in the glass bottle industry. First, the glass manufacturers organized as a potent lobbying group. Second, the glass boys came from poor, immigrant families who opposed child labor reform because they needed multiple income streams. Third, the industry's powerful union collaborated with the glass compa-