incorporated into native diets. The incorporation of cattle marked a major shift in the Ohio Indians' economy. "By the 1760s and 1770s, Indian towns sported fences as natives attempted to gain some control over rooting hogs, free-grazing cattle and horses." (213)

Using ethnohistorical methods, McConnell weaves the diverse participants—settlers, military personnel, missionaries, traders, Delawares, Shawnees, and Senecas—of the Ohio Country into a comprehensive history. By stepping outside the realm of the Iroquois Confederacy, McConnell persuasively broadens the analysis of native-American history during the eighteenth-century. A Country Between explores the degree of political and cultural autonomy among Ohio Indian societies, and their struggles to maintain their independence. Whether confronted by the potential security threats from imperial armies or the influx of European material goods introduced by traders, Ohio Indians were able to adapt or respond to the numerous challenges to their autonomy. A Country Between illustrates the importance of the western country to the understanding of early American history. McConnell's convincing argument and conclusion—that Ohio Country native societies were cultural and political entities—provides an opportunity to debate and re-evaluate native societies along the cultural frontier of Early America.

Gary Pollock
Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania

Making Iron and Steel: Independent Mills in Pittsburgh, 1820-1920
by John N. Ingham

In the years around the turn of the century there was a powerful change in the structure of the American steel industry, as in other advanced industrial countries. It involved new, higher levels of production of "bulk" steels by giant, fully integrated companies and sometimes by even bigger, often absentee corporations. Carnegie Steel and United States Steel Corp. were the very epitome of this trend. This fascinating book focuses on the persistence, liveliness and continuing success of a very different iron and steel industry, characterised by smaller scales of production, in part at least by different processes, and by more traditional forms of business operation.

In the past, many writers have regarded this "independent" section of the industry as largely a relic of progress. Others have championed the small-scale, usually "family" firm as the "moral" core of American industrialisation, otherwise swamped by a regimen of mass-production which dispenses with the old values, and, whatever its protestations, seems to some to have always been purely economic in its motivations and purposes. In fact, as John Ingham shows, the two types for long co-existed, each largely insulated from the other because they were operating within distinct sections or niches of the market. Pittsburgh's distinguished metallurgical history illustrates this theme well.

Most of the literature on the economic development of the district seems to indicate, either expressly or by the implication of silence, that the small, family firm was involved in puddled iron, crucible or low tonnage steel. Siemens furnaces and their associated rolling mills and finishing operations were swept aside and often into oblivion by capital intensive, fully integrated operations involving blast furnaces (and their associated mineral industries), Bessemer...
converter shops, big open hearth melting shops and specialised, high capacity mills. The reality, as depicted by Ingham, was completely different. Some of the old firms and plants failed, some were taken into the big groups and scrapped or reconstructed, but many survived and prospered. New enterprises of this type continued to be established. Though they were visually the most impressive operations in the area, and usually the headline makers, the bigger operations were in many respects the exceptions to the rule.

In 1901 “independent” firms controlled a combined capacity for steel and puddled iron 30 percent greater than that of the plants owned in the district by US Steel and Crucible Steel. This startling statistic looks less impressive, however, when it is noted that over one-third of this capacity was controlled by Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., a fully integrated concern and, at that time, one of the world’s biggest producers. Between one-fifth and one-quarter more was represented by the Union steel works then being built at Donora but which, within a year, were made part of US Steel. Both J&L and Union were independent in 1901, but they were emphatically “big” steel and not like the rest of the so-called independent mills.

There are a number of other places in the text in which the author seems to be stretching his case, even exaggerating. How, for instance, can he claim, against the evidence of his own statistics, that “wrought iron was still king in Pittsburgh in the mid-1890s”? (p. 77) Is it not reading too much into events with the benefit of hindsight to state that the decision of a group of special steel makers to build a Bessemer works and rail mill at Homestead in 1879-1883 “was in many respects a class war ... fought by a group of old family aristocrats against someone [the Carnegies] they viewed as an interloper and an outsider”? (p. 64) Were they not simply trying to break into a trade which was then booming?

However, the author’s central theme is much more important than these occasional questionable details. Ingham breaks with the majority of writers who have represented the surviving independents as anarchons by backing his argument with a masterly survey of these companies. He traces their relations with the big companies but emphasises the ways in which they made their own choices about technologies, scales of operation, labor attitudes and ways in which they found the markets that enabled them to make a success of all the other options they had chosen. Although small, they were often complex in their external production relationships with semi-products, services, and suppliers of materials.

In fact, generalisation about this section of the industry is difficult. There were many independent firms and they followed a variety of development paths. US Steel absorbed 22 formerly independent companies in the area and Crucible Steel another seven, but even after this, the area in 1901 contained 23 independent companies, each of which had been organised before 1895 (in fact, 15 of these had existed before 1870). Many of them did well until the Great Depression: of 40 independents listed in the author’s tables for 1900, 31 still existed in 1920 and 20 by 1930. After that there was a rapid decline to 11 in 1938. In his admitted brief reference to this last phase, Ingham omits to draw attention to another important technical change, comparable in significance to the introduction of crucible steel-making or the adoption of the open hearth process. Before the end of World War I steel-making in the electric furnace was already making rapid advance in the field of quality products and it continued to make headway after that. This new process had its own distinctive economies of production which deserved consideration by Ingham.

The author’s methods of analysis allow him to cover the ownership or leadership of a large number of firms in a concise manner. He does so by classifying the controlling interests as derived from “Core,” “Non-Core,” “Marginal,” or “Elite” families. This is done according to their membership in the area’s prestigious social clubs or groups, but the reader is rather left in the dark as to why an individual is placed in one category or the other. However, these men are then related to their social background in a most illuminating manner, which gets away from the dangerous practice of treating each entrepreneur or controlling group as a wholly separate isolated business decision-maker. There are limits to profitable generalisation. John Ingham recognises this and to some extent copes with it through numerous case studies. But what of those enterprises which did not survive to be carefully analysed? Why did they fail when others succeeded? Why did Jones & Laughlin develop in ways so different from those other apparently similar puddled iron and mill concerns of the mid-nineteenth century? The Laughlin and Jones families were “Core,” but so were many other managing families, initially in the same trades, of comparable longevity, but which sometimes went under, and in no case grew as much as J&L. The great Carnegie operations are usually set against the small-scale, traditional industry, but their roots, too, were in the same trades. At the end of the day each case is unique.

The section dealing with labor relations is excellent. Here again one is struck by the wide variety of responses to the aspirations of workers. Within a few years of the brutalities of the Homestead dispute, and while US Steel was pursuing a remorseless campaign against organised labor, the A.M. Byers Co. had a two-month long strike. It was winter, but rather than use this fact to pressure their men, the company showed extraordinary solicitude. “They gave us coal, they gave us coffee, they gave us a canvas so we could put a tent over the lot they had down alongside there on Sixth Street,” observed one worker. “They told us if we wanted coke or stuff like that, go in and get it ....” (154)
The relation of the old families to politics is also explored, notably in relation to the government of Pittsburgh. I do think more should have been said of the distinction between the politics of control in the city and politics in the mill towns along the rivers. A final and fascinating theme is the role of these old families in the early thinking about a “new” Pittsburgh. The path-breaking Pittsburgh Survey of 1907-08, which exposed the exploitation and poverty of the old order, was strongly supported by members of the old city elite, including those from the independent steel industry. From this assessment they moved on to become pioneers of the vision of a new, cleaner Pittsburgh, a distant prospect which was to be realised only in the second half of the twentieth century.

By the time of the post-World War II “Pittsburgh Renaissance,” the old independent mill sector was in rapid decline. It was shortly afterwards followed by the wholesale shrinkage of Big Steel. By the mid-1990s, in terms of its economic base, Pittsburgh had long ceased to be a steel city. John Ingham has reminded us of and effectively analysed a sector of Pittsburgh’s illustrious industrial history which has all too often been either ignored or given too little attention. His book is well written and therefore easy to read. There are still many points in dispute and a few inaccuracies of fact, but these scarcely detract from the author’s achievement. All economic and social historians of U.S. industrialisation will be indebted to his scholarship. Ingham’s book should be on the shelves of all who wish to be well-informed about the realities and the rich variety of Pittsburgh’s history as America’s premier steel city.

Kenneth Warren
Oxford University, Great Britain
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Doing justice to the Convict Inn

McAfee’s Convict Inn was built north of Pittsburgh along Route 19 in Wexford during World War II. Using second-hand lumber, William H. McAfee modeled his roadhouse after a similar place he operated in Connellsville, Pa. For some reason, lost to time, he used a jail theme at both places. Even his son, also named William McAfee and still living in Wexford, doesn’t know why his father went with the prisoner idea.

When the Convict Inn opened in 1946 it featured a bar and restaurant that had jail cells for booths (opposite page, bottom) — when you sat down, the waitress closed the cell door on you! There was also a lunch counter, a dance floor, and 12 rooms for rent upstairs. On the roof was a chain gang of 12 convicts (top); their arms and legs were hooked up to a motor which made them swing back and forth.

Outside, the place offered a driving range and archery range, and on warm evenings, recalls William McAfee, his father would hang a bed sheet and show movies. The popularity of the movies led to the construction of a drive-in theater. McAfee became too sick to finish it himself, so it