BOOK REVIEWS

The Pennsylvania Railroad, Vol. 1, *Building an Empire, 1846–1917*. By Albert J. Churella. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012. 972 pp. Illustrations, notes, index. $75.)

Like the Pennsylvania Railroad, this book is impressive. It weighs over six pounds, it has over eight hundred pages of text and one hundred pages of notes, and its index is nearly twenty pages long. And it is only the first volume of an eventual two. Albert Churella has done an excellent job of assembling the Pennsylvania Railroad's prehistory and its first seventy-one years of existence (volume 2 will handle the last fifty-one years and, presumably, feature a Penn Central postscript). He has imposed order on the vast tome through four grand themes and the use of thematic chapters that overlap chronologically at times. All in all, he has put together a remarkable and useful set of stories in this first volume.

However, the book—again, like the Pennsylvania Railroad itself—may be too large and comprehensive to be accessible to a broad audience. Fans of the Pennsylvania Railroad and railroad historians will welcome this volume. Although a number of internally produced histories of this once vast enterprise were created in the late nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries, this is the first scholarly work to attempt to examine the corporation as a whole. The Pennsylvania was a vast and complex corporation, and Churella's work will likely overwhelm the casual reader with detail. Even with my enthusiasm for railway history, my eyes glazed over at times during the two chapters devoted to the development of midwestern branch lines. This work's greatest value to a nonspecialist is likely as a reference work that can be consulted when needed to place a local railroad event in greater context.

Churella's research has been thorough and comprehensive. In the chapters in which I knew the story best (Philadelphia and New York in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries), I was impressed by the author's use of both primary and scholarly sources. He goes far beyond the economic and technological matters that dominate most railroad corporate histories and considers social and cultural issues as well. The main narrative is still one driven by money and machinery, but, given the nature of the enterprise under study, this focus is not entirely inappropriate.

What I am less comfortable with is what lessons a historian can draw from this telling of the history of this railroad. In many ways railroad corporate histories are like biographies—the story of a single company or a person can never be as clean as a thematic look at a period, as everybody and everything is involved in too many subplots to make for a clear overall story. This volume covers the period of the Pennsylvania's rise to prominence, by the end of which it could justly declare itself to be the "Standard Railroad of the World." But do we learn from Churella's work why this happened? I remain unsure. Churella's grand themes seem more useful organizational tools than analytical ones. If I applied these same themes to other, less successful railways, would they work there, too? I think yes.

What Albert Churella has produced is an impressive and complex examination of an impressive and complex organization. It nicely engages the existing literature and will likely stand for some time as the definitive scholarly work on the Pennsylvania Railroad. What it highlights is the need for more railroad histories like this one and for a more synthetic work on the railway industry in the United States that combines the cultural insights of John Stilgoe with the detailed economic and operational analysis of John Stover. Churella has made an important step in this direction, but his concentration on just one railroad company limits the reach of this study.

Wilkes University JOHN H. HEPP IV

Across the Divide: Union Soldiers View the Northern Home Front. By STEVEN J. RAMOLD. (New York: New York University Press, 2013. 246 pp. Notes, bibliography, index. $49.)

Steven J. Ramold argues that Union soldiers, "stressed by the demands of combat . . . and burdened by the hardships of army life," often "adopted attitudes and opinions about various facets of the war quite different from those of civilians" (1). This opened several "divides" between soldiers' and civilians' perceptions of the political, moral, and social facets of military service, gender, race and abolitionism, conscription, home-front antiwar movements, and Abraham Lincoln. Each chapter offers a brisk and quite useful survey of military and civilian attitudes on a specific issue.

Yet these surveys do not support the overarching theme of the book. Too often the "divide" identified by the author fails to materialize. The section on gender shows few tensions between soldiers and wives (or any other women), and the chapters on the antiwar movement and the election of 1864 show many more bridges than divides. Not enough attention is paid to the nuances of political loyalty or to change over time; the "civilians" provide moving targets that too often are defined entirely by soldiers' conceptions. Ramold notes early on that "soldier

reactions, to both contemporary and modern observers, can seem reactionary and erroneous" (2). Despite this striking insight, the author nevertheless seems to take this rather unreliable evidence at face value throughout the rest of the book. Of course, its title clearly indicates that the book intends to present only one side of the equation, but examining the sources of these "erroneous" perceptions would have made this a more complex and more useful book.

Equally concerning is the fact that the soldiers and civilians are often far too generalized. For instance, like civilians, there were soldiers on both sides of the racial divide, and although Ramold draws a distinction between "emancipationist" soldiers and "abolitionist" civilians, the difference seems to have had more to do with the postwar debate over civil rights than about wartime policies. Moreover, it is doubtful that most Northern civilians were truly abolitionists. The chapters on antiwar movements and the election of 1864 are really more about many soldiers' disdain for the Knights of the Golden Circle and Copperhead Democrats than disdain for civilians in general.

In the epilogue, Ramold declares that after the war "differences of opinion soon vanished, making the soldier/civilian divide a lost narrative of the Civil War" (169). This does not mesh with recent books on veterans and reconciliation by Barbara Gannon, Caroline Janney, Frances Clarke, and this reviewer, which have shown that many issues and attitudes separated veterans and civilians, ranging from the place of emancipation in the memory of the war to old soldiers' resentment toward those who had remained at home to the expensive pension system put in place for veterans.

Ramold poses an important question and makes a good, if limited, start on our appreciation of the differences between Northern civilians and soldiers. But a true understanding of those tensions requires a more balanced approach.

Marquette University JAMES MARTEN

The Civil War and American Art. By ELEANOR JONES HARVEY. (Washington: Smithsonian Art Museum, 2012. 352 pp. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, catalogue, index. $65.)

Eleanor Jones Harvey has written a good book on a difficult subject. It is not obvious that American art dealt with the Civil War much at all, let alone profoundly. It is difficult to call to mind any memorable portraits of generals or images of battlefields in painting, and a reader of this book had best not look forward to flags, uniforms, and drums of war displayed in familiar European style. The author's genius is to realize that American artists dealt with the war metaphorically—in landscape and in genre paintings—and not in history paintings. Once she threw off the bonds of literalism in dealing with the subject, she could write a very

good book indeed. And, more important, she could deal with America's greatest painters of the period: Albert Bierstadt, Frederick Edwin Church, Winslow Homer, and Eastman Johnson among them. Viewing the art of the American Civil War through the lens of metaphor allows her to arrive at positive judgments on the achievement of American artists. No such judgment is possible if the writer is confined to the period's mediocre generals' portraits and the generally failed attempts to portray battlefield grandeur and heroism.

Harvey offers sophisticated interpretations of carefully selected paintings, and she contextualizes her interpretations with references to ideas and metaphors commonly used in the press and literature of the day. If you want to sample the quality of the results of her approach, read the section of the book dealing with Eastman Johnson's *Negro Life at the South* (later called *Old Kentucky Home*). She argues that the painting was actually about miscegenation, as it came to be called during the Civil War, and was by no means a celebration of contented slaves listening to a banjo player.

American artists of the time, unlike many of their Civil War contemporaries, did not leave us a vast and revealing correspondence about their world and their art. They left few clues beyond an occasional enigmatic title for a painting about the meaning of the images produced in the Civil War period. They poured their world onto canvas with paint; they did not pour their souls into letters. But the landscapes and genre paintings have real soul in them.

The chapter on the artists who dealt most literally with the war, photographers such as Mathew Brady, Timothy O'Sullivan, and Alexander Gardner, is the weakest, and the book might have been better conceived as a book about painting alone. But who can complain about a conception as wise as Harvey's that the theme of the war must be dealt with mostly as metaphor in American art history and not necessarily literally as an attempt to deal with uniforms and weapons and valiant deeds?

Pennsylvania State University MARK E. NEELY JR.

An Eakins Masterpiece Restored: Seeing "The Gross Clinic" Anew. Edited by KATHLEEN A. FOSTER and MARK S. TUCKER. (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2012. 184 pp. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. Paper, $27.50.)

An Eakins Masterpiece Restored is much more than the chronicle of an impressive conservation effort undertaken on an important painting; it serves also as a love letter to a great relationship nearly lost. The relationship, rather sweetly in this case, involves a city, Philadelphia, and its most adored and iconic work of art, Thomas Eakins's *The Gross Clinic*. As conclusion to the text, curator Kathleen A. Foster and conservator Mark S. Tucker note: "with the painting now brought

closer to its original appearance than it has been in almost a century, we have the thrill of seeing *The Gross Clinic* anew"; their chronicle of the events leading up to this "thrill" entertains and enlightens readers with the force of a great romance (133).

Philadelphians did not always love Eakins or *The Gross Clinic*. Indeed, the painting was shown only a handful of times in art exhibitions in its early history and received decidedly mixed reviews. Eakins had calculated that an ambitious painting of the world-famous Philadelphia surgeon Samuel D. Gross would be a fitting contribution to the Centennial Exposition that soon would occupy the city. Despite his brilliant efforts, however, *The Gross Clinic* in 1876 was deemed fit only for display in the Army Medical Department at the Centennial Exposition, rather than with other examples of American art. And although the artist exerted great effort to show the work in following years, its bloody depiction of a surgical scene proved a tough sell. Eakins's rejection in this early moment was especially poignant because it was not for want of effort on his part.

Foster and Tucker meticulously reconstruct Eakins's working methods in preparing the painting. With few preparatory works to guide their efforts, the authors mine for clues with excruciating care, using such tools as X-radiography and infrared reflectography as well as their unique and unparalleled combination of scholarly expertise and conservation experience in working on Eakins's canvasses. Together, they determine the perspectival calculations the artist had to make, note "the speed with which Eakins eagerly buried the white ground on his new canvas with a deep, warm gray meant to cast a background shroud of darkness and space behind his figures," and re-create the mental and technical process of developing arguably the most complex painting in American history (54).

Tucker also provides an extended analysis of past damage to the work and explanation of the conservation program undertaken in 2010. His thoughtful discussion of the influence of changing aesthetics on restoration is a good reminder that we must take care in what we ascribe to an artist's intentions. Foster, meanwhile, insists that we rethink the narrative of rejection that has accompanied the painting, pointing out that "few scholars have credited the length, detail, and complexity of the commentary generated by the painting, which generally began by acknowledging the skill of the artist" (78). To that end, Foster and her team attempt to set the record straight by providing an appendix of every known mention of the painting in its early years.

Although past art historical scholarship is given relatively scant attention, the text does include an essay by Mark S. Schreiner on "Eakins as Witness: The Birth of Modern Surgery, 1844–89," which provides an overview of surgical advances at this moment in medical history. Reception of the painting by doctors was a decidedly different affair in its early years. Oblivious to, or uninterested in, the squeamish and ambivalent views of art critics, the alumni of Jefferson happily paid Eakins an amount equivalent to his expenses and went on to celebrate this painting of their esteemed professor for 130 years.

Every compelling romance benefits from a great villain who threatens to ruin the match, and in this case a perfect candidate emerged on November 11, 2006, when the trustees of Thomas Jefferson University announced that they would sell *The Gross Clinic* to Wal-Mart heiress Alice Walton (via a murky relationship with the National Gallery). The ticket price was $68 million, and the destination was Walton's new Crystal Bridges Museum of American Art in Bentonville, Arkansas. To thicken the plot even further, Jefferson announced at the same time a grand challenge to Philadelphia institutions: match the dollar amount by Christmas and the painting could stay. In an amusing and touching chapter, "Local Hero: *The Gross Clinic* and Our Sense of Civic Identity," Steven Conn recounts how over the following six weeks, an outpouring of donations were received from more than 3,400 individuals and institutions who refused to allow the painting to leave. Today, the painting is jointly owned by the Philadelphia Museum of Art and the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts.

Conn thoughtfully places the fight to keep the painting in Philadelphia in the context of a decade of activism on behalf of cultural landmarks and further considers this phenomenon in light of the concept of civic identity. In a nation of individuals increasingly isolated and, if not displaced, then certainly un-placed, he argues: "whatever might be said about the art-historical importance of *The Gross Clinic*, it is unarguably a Philadelphia painting—a Philadelphia story told through a Philadelphia doctor in a Philadelphia medical school by the preeminent Philadelphia painter. Keeping it in the city thus became a crusade about civic identity, about what it means to be a Philadelphian" (9–10). Concluding on this charming note, we may reflect on the ways in which seeing *The Gross Clinic* anew also helps Philadelphians to see themselves anew.

State University of New York–Fashion Institute of Technology Amy Werbel

Ed Bacon: Planning, Politics, and the Building of Modern Philadelphia. By Gregory L. Heller. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013. 320 pp. Illustrations, notes, index. $39.95.)

From the mid-1950s to his death on October 14, 2005, at age ninety-five—three years after he skateboarded in Philadelphia's LOVE Park—Edmund N. Bacon towered as an iconic, albeit controversial, figure in city planning. Yet, as Gregory Heller confesses in this book, discerning his role and his legacy in the saga of Philadelphia planning proves a complex and difficult task.

Heller's study treats city planner Bacon as a "policy entrepreneur," a term, borrowed from John W. Kingdon, that describes one who promotes and guides ideas that "float around" and become reality through a process of societal decision making (9, 11). The author contends that Bacon, as planning director, lacked the

power and access to capital that made Robert Moses and Edward Logue masters of city rebuilding. Instead, his influence derived from his ability to espouse and advocate for the big idea via policy meetings with public and private groups and individuals. Indeed, Bacon assumed the face of planning policies he influenced—but that were, in reality, finalized by Housing (later Development) Coordinator William Rafsky, the Redevelopment Authority, federal and state highway officials, and powerful city business interests.

Although Heller classifies this work as a "case study" rather than a biography, he includes rich biographical content about Bacon's Quaker roots; his elite education; his stint at Eliel Sarrinen's Cranbrook Academy, followed by housing and planning work in Flint, Michigan; his time in China; his navy duty in the Pacific; his return home to hobnob with Oscar Stonorov, John Edelman, Walter Phillips, and Corbusier; and his 1947 dream (with others) of a "Better Philadelphia." After becoming director in December 1948 of a newly resurrected City Planning Department, Bacon's role was enhanced after 1950 when Democratic Party reformers Joseph Clark and Richardson Dilworth captured city hall and won a new city charter.

In the early fifties, Bacon pioneered a unique approach—likened by *Architectural Forum* to "penicillin, not surgery"—to better house the city's inner-ring slums (59, 69). Ultimately, though, he won fame for downtown renewal. When between 1954 and 1956 the federal government and Rafsky shifted from housing-oriented slum clearance and redevelopment to neighborhood conservation and the renewal of the Central Business District (CBD), Bacon, long interested in the city's historic downtown, energetically made the CBD, not blighted neighborhoods, his primary canvas. His vision, as implemented via the entrepreneurial process, invariably suffered serious dilution in the hands of business and other interests. Nevertheless, Heller argues, Penn Center, Society Hill, Market East, and Independence Mall all reflect Bacon's grand idea in one way or another, and all helped lay the groundwork for downtown revitalization. By 1970, the year he retired from the City Planning Department, thanks to Jane Jacobs and other critics rebelling against modernism and top-down planning, the profession moved sharply away from Bacon and his approach.

After 1970, Bacon taught, worked in private real estate development, lectured worldwide on the "Post-Petroleum City," and, like Don Quixote, tilted at threats to the downtown cityscape: city height limits, alterations to Independence National Park, and restrictions on public use (that is, skateboarding) at LOVE Park. In victory and defeat, Bacon remained a profoundly public voice for his vision of Philadelphia.

Heller's book, which utilizes previously unavailable Bacon archives and personal interviews, uniquely captures the planner's thoughts and viewpoints, offering insight into Bacon's fear of suburbanization, opinions about the automobile, concern for housing in Northeast Philadelphia, opposition to massive highway building, and affinity for the Garden City.

Yet, in the end, Heller's Bacon remains inscrutable, a person who throughout the 1960s could seemingly still spin grand visions even while facing voluminous evidence that Philadelphia was becoming daily a blacker, economically more impoverished city, a point made in 1968 by journalist Nancy Love when she charged that "Bacon's Dream of the City Beautiful [had] turned out the be a Nightmare." Like Bacon during his career, Heller largely mutes the racial dimensions of postwar planning—like, for example, the fact that most East Poplar, Mill Creek, and Morton "slums" early targeted by Bacon's planning department and Rafsky's Redevelopment Authority sheltered African American families. Moreover, as Guian McKee observes in Gabriel Knowles's volume on Bacon's 1959 vision of "Philadelphia 2009," no matter how erudite he was, Bacon failed to grasp the macrocosmic changes (gross employment discrimination, failing urban education, deindustrialization, globalization) undermining his grand ideas. The 1957 "Used House Program," for instance, not entirely Bacon's idea, faced an epidemic of housing deterioration and abandonment in North Philadelphia, especially after the 1964 riot.

Unquestionably, as evidenced by his experiences in Flint and his early Philadelphia years, Bacon harbored concern for the urban poor and the excrescent living conditions of the slums. Yet he dreaded even more the competition posed by suburbanization. He firmly believed that a redesigned city made pedestrian friendly (i.e. Society Hill) and accessible (i.e. Market East) would lure back the fleeing middle class (rich or poor, black and white). In the face of a growing public and professional disillusionment with top-down planning, Bacon never doubted that good, well-promoted design would create the good city.

This book ably illuminates the complexity not only of Edmund N. Bacon and his role in shaping postwar Philadelphia but also the enigma of modern planning and the role of planning in the twenty-first century. In that respect alone it is an important work.

University of Southern Maine JOHN F. BAUMAN

The March on Washington: Jobs, Freedom, and the Forgotten History of Civil Rights. By WILLIAM P. JONES. (New York: W. W. Norton, 2013. 320 pp. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. $26.95.)

The March on Washington of August 28, 1963, is among the most celebrated moments in civil rights history, revisited every year on Martin Luther King Jr. Day and during Black History Month. Is there really anything new to be written about this historic event? William P. Jones, professor of history at the University of Wisconsin, uses the march to refute the "common misperception" that the civil rights movement moved from a "classical phase" emphasizing moral issues and le-

gal segregation to a more ambitious and controversial agenda encompassing economic goals and broad-based social change (xii). Not so, argues Jones, noting that the initiative and much of the organizational strength for the march came from black labor groups whose heritage traced back to A. Philip Randolph's 1941 plan for a march on Washington to protest employment discrimination. The demand for jobs was still clearly on the agenda in 1963—the official name of the event was the "March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom"—and was emphasized by many of the speakers that day. Indeed, an important accomplishment of the march and related lobbying was the addition of a fair-employment section to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, absent in the Kennedy administration's first version. These efforts thus deserve credit for creation of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

A subtheme that might have been more fully developed is that the keywords "jobs" and "freedom" were essentially codes for the northern and southern branches of the movement. Jones credits the idea for a "March for Jobs" to Anna Arnold Hedgeman, a YWCA worker and activist associated with Randolph since the 1920s. Based in Harlem, Hedgeman was not sure how the "southern movement" would react (164). But when she read that the Southern Christian Leadership Conference was considering "a march on Washington, even sit-ins in Congress," to force federal intervention in the South, Hedgeman arranged a meeting between Randolph and Martin Luther King Jr., and plans began to take shape (167). As Harvey Swados wrote in the *Nation*: "The March itself, after all, came into being in a merging of two streams of thought and action" (173). To a considerable extent, the "simplification of the historical narrative" to which Jones objects reflects the fact that subsequent civil rights legislation and enforcement efforts targeted the South far more effectively than other parts of the nation (243).

Another subtheme is that black women were persistently rebuffed in their demands for representation in leadership positions and on the march program, an exclusion barely moderated by token remarks from Little Rock NAACP leader Daisy Bates. Civil rights leaders were dismayed when a Virginia congressman (and civil rights opponent) added "sex" to the list of categories protected against employment discrimination in Title VII of the act. Jones reports an ironic twist on this well-known episode, namely that a forceful memorandum drafted by civil rights activist Pauli Murray was "critical to convincing Lyndon Johnson and other supporters of the bill to retain the prohibition on sex discrimination" (227). Poetic justice.

Stanford University GAVIN WRIGHT