As economic history the book is of limited value, for it is premised on a series of questionable assumptions: technological advance was the "taproot of the industrial revolution" (51); the steam engine was the "giant of progress" (41); coal, the source of cheap energy, lay at the heart of nineteenth-century economic change. These assumptions may not be incorrect, but they are sufficiently controversial to require evidence. Yet Binder makes no overall attempt to arrive at some reasonable estimate of the relative importance of steam and water power, or of coal and wood as energy sources. In recent years, Paul Gates (Agricultural History [January 1972]) and Donald Worster (American Studies Newsletter [March 1975]) have emphasized the importance of wood as an economic factor in the ante bellum United States. According to Binder's own estimates, in at least two areas — steamships and locomotives — the dominant fuel in 1860 was wood, not coal.

Perhaps the author's confidence in his assumptions about the dominance of coal stems from his desire to give the book thematic unity based on the concept of "empire." What Binder calls "economic sectionalism" (it is interesting that we have no word that applies specifically to states) clearly existed; Pennsylvania's private citizens and public officials looked to coal as a source of wealth and future greatness for the state. Binder too easily accepts this state-centered view of economic development, equating Pennsylvania coal production with economic growth and with progress in general. If, however, the book has a certain abrasive quality for historians interested in the larger question of growth, as a descriptive and analytical account of coal utilization it is absorbing and highly informative.
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Generations of Americans have boasted that they were a providentially endowed people destined to transform a lush wilderness into great wealth. In the beginning hearty pilgrims endured bitter winters
and brought under tillage the rockbound coastlands of Maine and Massachusetts. These Americans hewed the forests, built mighty ships thence to sail Yankee cargoes to exotic ports infrequently visited by less doughty mariners. Americans reveled in an enterprising heritage and rejoiced in an untrammeled spirit which defied the forbidding vastness of American space. Instead this space lent a mystique of boundlessness to the American dream and enticed Americans to hurdle any obstacle in quest of their manifest destiny. It was this effusive spirit which in the nineteenth century materialized cities out of swamps, forged railroads through tortuous passes, and transformed an agrarian republic into an industrial empire. Such an entrepreneurial people conceived space as potentiality and brooked no limits to creative capacity. In a fitting climax to the nineteenth century, Indiana's senator, Albert Jeremiah Beveridge, flag in hand, marched through the Senate chamber calling out the names of islands and territories remote and not so remote whose destiny, Beveridge believed, was wrapped in the American flag.

Judith Mara Gutman, in her short but exquisite *Is America Used Up?*, employs both photographs and text to describe the culmination and then demise of this American spirit of effusiveness. Gutman believes that following World War II Americans lost their headiness, and regarded life in America as "used up," void — that is of new possibilities. Gutman's photographic essay records a century of American expression. Reflections ranging from the effusive expressions of hope, anticipation, and expectation to the torpor of lassitude and doubt are mirrored by Gutman in a series of photographs of people boarding trains, children hopping trolley rides, settlers posing before a freshly built sod house, men building skyscrapers, soldiers and circus performers, and California suburbanites lolling away sun-drenched hours on a rear patio.

The author uses the gallery of photographic data to illustrate her thesis regarding the transmutation of American expression. Gutman argues, quite forcefully, that Americans no longer conceive the possibilities of new life, new forms, new horizons. Instead, Americans have become constricted within the walls of institutional molds. Individual expression is stifled. Unlike the stonemason on the Empire State Building project who posed proudly for his picture, or the construction worker on the same project who with a gleam in his eye directed the placing of huge steel girders, the rank and file modern worker, asserts Gutman, plods stoically through his workday. He no longer expects fruition or satisfaction through work.
Gutman's treatment of the "used-up" syndrome is prosaic. She extrapolates mountains of conjecture from almost diminutive expressionistic data. But the insights which emerge from her musings on the American character are enticing. Volumes of literary and statistical data exist to support Gutman's view that an effusiveness pervaded large segments of American culture prior to World War II. Historians such as Robert Wiebe, Daniel Aaron, Samuel P. Hays, and others, have described the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century spirit of progressivism in terms of the great hope these reformers harbored for the regeneration of American urban, industrial, political, and social life. In 1888 Edward Bellamy could believe that from out of the filth and squalor of urban slums, rife with the stain of human exploitation, would emerge the gleaming white city of a cooperative commonwealth.

At the same time — the turn of the twentieth century — Americans marked the passing of the frontier. The historian Frederick Jackson Turner noted the impact that the great frontier had exercised on American character and institutions. While the precise significance of the frontier in shaping American character is still moot, historians are at one in acknowledging the profound impact of the burgeoning of bureaucratic institutions on twentieth-century American life. From Middletown to Megalopolis an explosion of corporate, political, and social bureaucracies molded the individual into the more structured roles of the mass society. As Gutman points out in her pictorial language, the consequence of this technological and social revolution can be recorded in the erosion of human expression. One might describe it as the automatonization of American character, whereby, as David Riesman observed in The Lonely Crowd, modern man exchanges his individualism—the gyroscope of personal conscience—for the radar-like apparatus of the mass society. The extreme bureaucratization of American society engendered by the enormous mobilization of World War II completed the transformation of America into what Lewis Mumford considered a depersonalized posthistoric society where human values were graded on utility.

The real danger of this depersonalized society, as Gutman discerns, is that the individual has sacrificed his autonomy, his freedom, and subordinated himself to a highly centralized societal control mechanism into which he has at best minimal input. Gutman, however, sees the liberation of American character in what she espies as the persistence of an other self. It is this other half of the American schizoid personality that refuses to be dehumanized, and that, if unleashed, will move freely beyond the barriers of institutionalization,
and fashion the creative communities of the future.
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Nineteen seventy-four was a prolific year for Nicholas B. Wainwright, Director Emeritus of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and editor of the society’s Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography. Three of his books were published: Sculpture of a City: Philadelphia; Painting and Miniatures at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; and One Hundred and Fifty Years of Collecting by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. The latter volume appeared in conjunction with but not as a catalogue of the society’s sesquicentennial commemorative exhibit, “One Hundred and Fifty Years of Collecting.”

In 1940 Hampton L. Carson, in A History of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, characterized succinctly the society’s collection as follows:

The Society possesses an unrivalled mine of material for the use of students, historians, and genealogists, whether of city, state or nation, as well as meeting the needs of the biographers of individuals. The books were either written, read, or owned by our sires; the pamphlets state their contentions, beliefs and projects; the contemporaneous newspapers record their daily acts; the broadsides contain their proclamations; the documents embody and illustrate their essays in government; the relics survive as precious memorials of themselves; the curios display their tastes in domestic embellishment; the autograph letters preserve their authentic opinions upon public and private matters; the portraits preserve their features and the fashion of their dress; the prints and engravings attest the influence and incidents of their lives (Philadelphia: The Historical Society of Pennsylvania. 2 vols., 1: xvi).

Wainwright’s presentation of an overview of such a tremendous amount of material, difficult at best, is directed to three areas: (1) material related to three famous men, William Penn, Benjamin Franklin, and George Washington, each of whom had important associations with Pennsylvania in general and with Philadelphia in particular; (2) collectors of books, manuscripts, and autographs which have come to the society; and (3) a history of Philadelphia and environs from colonial days to the twentieth century as seen in artifacts of the types