

within St. Michael's and Zion. After failing to secure English services within the church and its governing institutions, the pro-English men resigned and pursued their case with the Pennsylvania Assembly. Despite initial favorable action by the assembly, the state had no authority to force the German community to abandon its language and "rights" (177). Ultimately, the pro-English group split from the main body of the church just as another substantial component of pro-English supporters had done in the early nineteenth century. So, Baer wisely shrinks from making an easy conclusion about this fight between two factions in one community, both of which had a good cause for concern about their place and future in the new nation. In doing so, Baer has shed light on the dynamic processes by which immigrants—of all ethnicities—have fought to live together in the United States.

Binghamton University, State University of New York DOUGLAS BRADBURN

Deserter Country: Civil War Opposition in the Pennsylvania Appalachians. By ROBERT M. SANDOW. (New York: Fordham University Press, 2009. 234 pp. Figures, tables, appendix, notes, bibliography, index. \$55.)

Wartime opposition, both North and South, played a major role not only in Federal and Confederate state policies but also in daily social interactions between soldiers and civilians on both sides of the conflict. Although there is little to suggest that ideological opposition physically inhibited either government from carrying out military policy, numerous historians have identified the psychological stress and anxiety that accompanied disloyalty. This is especially true in the North, where the widespread opposition by Peace Democrats, or "Copperheads," was seen as a Confederate conspiracy rather than a democratic, constitutional protest against the federal government's infringement upon individual rights. Robert Sandow's book, *Deserter Country: Civil War Opposition in the Pennsylvania Appalachians*, is a case study of wartime opposition in the rural North, and it illuminates the regional variances that influenced dissent and the broader social and political reactions that pitted local citizens against the federal government.

Copperheadism, as an extension of the Democratic Party, has traditionally been linked to urban areas where high-profile incidents, such as the draft riots in New York City in July 1863, occurred. Historians tend to view Northern antiwar sentiment as a product of the growing class and ethnic tensions that accompanied industrialization (8, 101). Studies of Southern Unionism have also focused on issues of class, as historians have noted the economic disparity that existed between men and women of the Southern "hill country" and those who occupied the more fertile agricultural land. Sandow, however, rightfully suggests that past

studies of Northern opposition have oversimplified the oft-complex reasons that led men and women to challenge the federal government on issues such as the draft and county quotas. By examining the Appalachian region in its entirety, the issues of class and economic viability in wartime protest, both North and South, are made readily apparent. As a case study of Northern opposition to the war, the Pennsylvania Appalachians provide valuable insight into the impact of the Civil War on the rural North.

Sandow proposes that wartime resistance stemmed from the growing antagonism during the 1850s between rural farmers, who had traditionally made part or all of their yearly income through rafting, and larger lumber corporations, whose tactics of floating logs to the mills not only made rivers unnavigable but also drove down market prices. "The dramatic transformations in the regional economy," Sandow writes, "threatened the survival of poorer farmers and gave urgency to wartime dissent" (28). This dissent, first manifest in the Raftmen's Rebellion of 1857, was symbolic of antigovernment protest as many people saw a direct correlation between government intervention on the behalf of large lumber corporations in the antebellum period and the extension of federal power during the war itself. War opposition, whether in the form of political organization into Democratic clubs or more open defiance through draft resistance, desertion, and aid to these men, was conceptualized in this context. Despite individual notions of self preservation and republicanism, Sandow points out that neither the government nor local Unionists were willing to see these actions as anything but treasonous, which motivated provost marshals to arrest anyone associated with these types of activities. The interplay between the government and resisters illuminates the contrasting personal beliefs of these Pennsylvanians and their localized reactions to the war within the larger social construct of opposition during this period.

Robert Sandow's study of the Pennsylvania Appalachian region is an excellent example of the new direction in Civil War history. As we move away from broad interpretations of the war and towards more localized studies, we may better understand the interplay that existed, not only between soldiers and the home front, but also between local communities and the larger nation.

Fordham University

RYAN W. KEATING

Pittsburgh: A New Portrait. By FRANKLIN TOKER. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009. xv, 528 pp., Illustrations, further reading, index. \$34.95.)

In the early 1950s, American city mayors, planners, and urbanists alike hailed Pittsburgh as a model for urban renaissance. In the 1980s, Pittsburgh trans-