chiefly composed of southerners migrating north after the war. Clearly, this book has much to teach everyone.

While this work is a monumental achievement, there are two points which require special comment. Given the incredible amount of in-depth research which went into the book, it is regrettable that several flawed sources were utilized for background material. George Morgan’s *Annals of Harrisburg* (published first in 1848 and reprinted *ad nauseam* before and after the author’s death) and William Henry Egle’s *History of the Counties of Dauphin and Lebanon* are two works which are extensively quoted in early chapters. Morgan, a man of questionable mental stability, invented many of Harrisburg’s greatest legends. Egle, a brilliant antiquarian, collected and published extensive notes on a wide range of topics without much interpretation or questioning of sources. Perhaps the one problem most embarrassing to me relates to the specific information concerning the history and ownership of the John Harris and Simon Cameron Mansion. (John Harris Jr. stockaded the trading post complex during the French and Indian War rather than his father, who had no reason to be in a defensive posture against the Indians. Harris Sr. did build a portion of the present mansion which was subsequently enlarged by his son in 1766.) While these little details on such a subject may seem trivial, the Harris/Cameron Mansion has been the museum, library and archives for the Historical Society of Dauphin County for more than five decades. As such, it is surprising to see such information printed concerning the building where Professor Eggert did some of his research.

My only other concern is that not enough people will have the opportunity to experience the amazing information in this work. I do not criticize price, distribution, marketing or any other technical aspect of the book but rather the lack of interest and willingness of the local community to read this work. In writing this review, I look out my window toward Bethlehem Steel’s near-failing steel plant in the adjoining town of Steelton. Gerry Eggert surmises that the leading cause of Harrisburg’s industrial demise was the failure of the business leadership to part with much-needed capital to retool local industries. As a result, the majority of local heavy industries ceased to be competitive and eventually just ceased to exist by the mid-twentieth century. The rusting steel plant out my window is an ongoing reminder that we still need to learn the lessons which Gerry Eggert teaches in *Harrisburg Industrializes*.

*Peter Swift Seibert, Ex. Dir., Historical Society of Dauphin Co.*

**The Puzzle People: Memoirs of a Transplant Surgeon**

by Thomas Starzl


No one expects surgeons to write well; scalpels and sutures are their tools, not words. But here is the exception. Starzl, the son of a midwestern newspaper editor, winner of a Latin competition in high school, hero surgeon to Pittsburgh and the world, has a sense for language that moves his extraordinary story at an appropriate clip and produces fine vignettes of colleagues and patients in a sentence or two. Often his use of words approaches poetry: The liver is “hostile to surgeons;” “the most defiant of all organs;” “a textbook of biology is by definition an ode to the cell;” “this disease was worth hating.” In describing his father after a severe stroke, “the sentence was life imprisonment. Although his brain remained in its dungeon for almost 14 years, the messages that were smuggled out through the typewriter never contained a hint of sorrow or bitterness.” Good perceptive writing.

His literary abilities can also be seen from quite another vantage point. Translating medical information from the language of the expert into prose understandable to the layman is not an easy task and many writers have fallen by the wayside. In this case the information is complex for physicians, and one is left to wonder whether even Starzl’s expertise is enough to sustain the medically naive reader’s interest.

Although referred to in some reviews as an autobiography, this book should more appropriately be described as the dual evolution of a process and a man, the author-hero an omniscient god, surprisingly beneficent considering the intricacies of the politics involved (both academic and legal). However, this generosity towards colleagues results in one of the book’s flaws — names drop page after page and fill the index so that it resembles a “Who’s Who of Surgery.” Everyone has a moment of mention and often names clog the pipe of the story.

But the story itself is an adventure tale. A brilliant young surgeon fastens onto the concept of transplantation, first of kidneys and then of livers. He arms himself with tedious painstaking research and infinite study of metabolism and rejection. He mounts his white horse, hoists his spear and rides into battle against medical and political odds that would have daunted a less committed, less obsessed warrior. His often exhausted troops gather behind him and sally into skirmishes; adversaries drop bleeding. Some of his rescue attempts of captive maidens fail, but finally the day is carried and well-deserved medals are handed out.

From his earliest school days he was an intrepid battler. When one of his high school teachers thought he was systematically cheating in his Latin studies, she was finally reduced to a sobbing apology when he wrote a perfect examination and won the prize. He concludes the story with,
“Perhaps I had taken a perverse pleasure in letting the conflict develop, knowing all along what the outcome would be.”

‘One senses throughout his fear of failure, which to physicians takes the form of denying death, an unwillingness to address it, and often desperate and even foolhardy actions to fend it off.’

The reader is left to wonder whether this same derring-do may have applied to his adventures with transplantation, particularly since other small images slither into later descriptions. With a skiing party in the Alps trapped in a severe snowstorm, “although they were convinced that I would not be able to make the solitary 20-mile journey back to Zermatt I arrived there at two in the afternoon.” Another moment, recounted with some apparent embarrassment but nonetheless recounted, had to do with his resignation from the University of Colorado which immediately preceded his appointment in Pittsburgh: “Rumors circulated about the reasons and because there was no simple or single explanation, I said nothing. An innocent response to a journalist’s question made things worse. When someone inquired about a purported battle within the university between titans, I asked, ‘Who is the other titan?’”

The fact remains that Starzl is a titan, that the battles for the technical advances in, and acceptance of, transplantation by the medical community and the public would have occurred far more slowly and far less well had he not been in the war. Like any memoir of battles, objectivity is impossible — one can only fight on one’s own side and describe the events from that point of view. Other books of the history of this drama will appear and they may read differently from this one. But, of all the combatants, Starzl is certainly the most entitled to have written the chronicle and, without question, his will be referred to whenever the topic is addressed in the future.

Readership of the book begins therefore with medical historians and it is difficult to be confident about extending the list beyond them. Patients and the families of patients? Certainly not all of them will be up to its complexities and others might find it too painful. Colleagues? Many will scan it to see how the author describes events they participated in or to smile with pleasure when he refers to them. Others will probably avoid or dismiss it since they were wounded or adversaries in the wars.

Readers of autobiographies who are fascinated by the minds of men and women who have accomplished great things? Starzl appears to be letting the reader into his soul to share his agonies about his own cardiac surgery, about family or patients, but he does so guardedly. One senses throughout his fear of failure, which to physicians takes the form of denying death, an unwillingness to address it, and often desperate and even foolhardy actions to fend it off. To a man whose vocation and avocations have all pointed to living with danger, one assumes that the struggle must be particularly acute, but he speaks of it almost formally, as though speaking of another person.

Ethicists who want to know more about how decisions were reached will certainly be disappointed. Great issues were involved at every step along Starzl’s way: Who got scarce livers and should nationality or regional residence be put in the weighing? Who should be encouraged to take what risks? Is randomization duplicitous or appropriate in the use of new drugs? Should a limit be set on the number of livers any one patient is entitled to in a world of scarcity? What role did/does affluence play in decisions about recipients?

Over time and with experience, many of the decisions, at first haphazard, have been codified locally and nationally. But for the most part Starzl allows his beliefs to stand as the best possible choice without much elaboration.

So one must conclude that this well-written book is many very different things: a history of a dramatic medical process familiar to any TV watcher; a history of one man’s unswerving pursuit for success in it; some, but not nearly all, of the psychic struggles involved in the pursuit; histories of patients, some ending triumphantly, some tragically; documentation of the unattractive realities of medical politics. Readers with sufficient education under their belts will get something worth having from it. The question is only whether any will get everything they were seeking.

Frances L. Drew, M.D.
Associate Dean Emeritus
University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine

The Battle for Homestead, 1880-1892: Politics, Culture, and Steel
by Paul Krause

Most of us learn in school that the Homestead Lock out of 1892 was a turning point in relations between workers and management. Indeed, the only labor history I remember from high school is Homestead. Why, then, does a new book need to be published about the event?

Paul Krause’s new study makes two cases for another look. The first, less important, case is that despite many previous accounts of the lockout, virtually all are flawed. By scouring all extant sources, Krause has written what will surely be considered the definitive history of the lockout. The second, more important, claim for another perspective is