Paul Goodman, *Of One Blood: Abolitionism and the Origins of Racial Equality* (Berkeley: University of California Press 1998).

Paul Goodman's *Of One Blood* is a major contribution to recent scholarly efforts to restore moral purpose to understanding abolitionism. The book offers fresh evidence and ideas to restore the abolitionists' own claims to act in the name of moral purpose to the center stage of anti-slavery studies.

Published posthumously, *Of One Blood* argues that a commitment to racial equality as much as a call for immediate emancipation distinguished abolitionists from more compromising anti-slavery activists who backed gradual emancipation and colonization, and who disparaged the achievements and capacities of free African Americans in doing so. This commitment to racial equality originated with free blacks in the growing urban African-American communities of the Early Republic. Goodman shows how central the condition of men and women of colour was to colonizationists' arguments that did more to prop up slavery than to undermine it. In making their case for the exportation of free blacks to Liberia, colonizationists (a group that included many of the nation's political leaders) claimed that these men and women had failed to advance their condition beyond that of slaves. This perceived failure, for Charles Fenton Mercer and other such meliorists, stemmed from the inherent inequality between the races. Goodman shows how Thomas Jefferson's view that blacks and whites could not live together as equals was widely held among the political elite. For free blacks, attacking the myth of white superiority was an essential step in overcoming not only white support for slavery, but also the colonizationist threat to expel them from their native land.

From his lively reading of such 1820s African-American anti-slavery writers as John Russwurm and David Walker, Goodman moves to the late 1820s to show how these black activists radicalized a smaller number of white reformers, Garrison being the most prominent. Exposure to anti-colonization free blacks was one of the common experiences shared by the white abolitionist leaders of the 1830s and 40s. By analyzing the involvement with free blacks of whites like Garrison, Prudence Crandall, and William Goodell, Goodman offers a common sense explanation for the conversion of the abolitionist vanguard to cause of immediatism. This history by-passes the complex and tenuous social and psychological interpretations of the movement that look to such indirect causes as status anxiety; diversion of attention from wage exploitation; or a visionary understanding of market culture's long-range obligations.

Putting African-Americans and questions of social justice at the forefront of the abolitionist struggle also enables Goodman to support an argument for the

radical egalitarianism of abolitionists. The second half of the book concentrates on class and gender among white abolitionists. Goodman challenges recent work by labour historians who argue for the white working class's belief in "whiteness," a racial identity that demonized blacks as inferior others. The book's quantitative profile of rural and urban members of immediatist anti-slavery organizations undermines the impression that this was a middle-class movement. Men and women from families of small farmers and artisans predominated. Not only did the abolitionists draw the most support, albeit minority support, from the upper strata of manual labourers, they also forthrightly critiqued class exploitation as it manifested itself in the market revolution. This view of workers and abolition rebuts the argument of Marxian scholars like Eric Williams who highlight the role of industrialists like the Tappans in order to portray abolitionism as a movement that, among other purposes, diverted attention from the degradation of factory labour. Goodman's evidence also challenges the line of interpretation running from David Donald to Thomas Haskell that conceives of abolitionism as a middle-class reaction too the insecurity of the market. While their specifics varied, these historians generally see abolitionists as professionals and businessmen reacting to reflections on their own uneasy social condition rather than from their look outward to the actual exploitation of slaves, workers, and women.

Goodman devotes three chapters to female abolitionism. As elsewhere, he views women immediatists as motivated first and foremost by their hatred for slavery and their commitment to racial equality. In these pages, Goodman shows that "special risks"(174) confronted female abolitionists. These risks made the decision to engage in immediatist anti-slavery activism more of a challenge to the social order than did reforms like temperance and education which had the backing of politicians and the wealthy. Goodman agrees with the views of contemporary female abolitionists who argued that their fight against slavery also required them to confront patriarchal privilege associated with the social convention of separate spheres. Goodman provides a compelling account of the cost that abolitionism and feminism extracted from women like the Grimké sisters and Elizabeth Chandler who for various reasons had to break with family and friends in order to follow their convictions. As with working men, the main reason anti-slavery women fought racial and gender inequality was because they thought it was wrong.

Commenting on the growth of abolitionist societies from almost nothing in 1830 to more than 120,000 members in 1838, Goodman argues that "the formidable obstacles facing immediatism made its growth as a mass movement an extraordinary phenomenon that challenges historical explanation." (123) To

back up this claim for abolition as a popular movement, Goodman has to explain why more people didn't take it up. He couples an emphasis on the inhibiting factors of elite opposition with a case for the unique reaction of white abolitionists to the market revolution. In place of Haskell's humanitarian sensibility, Goodman identifies a perception common to small farmers and skilled labourers that the market not only threatened their livelihoods but that it also replaced the mutuality and egalitarianism of their local communities with the self-interest and competitiveness of the trans-local economy. Goodman pays attention to evangelical sources of abolitionism, but he also casts doubt on the Second Great Awakening's role as the prime mover of anti-slavery activism by showing that many non-evangelical Christians and people from irreligious backgrounds joined the movement.

The minority status of abolitionism among white Northerners has absorbed many works on the movement. These works often begin from a perspective of abolitionists as extraordinary people willing to act on unconventional motives. Goodman offers at least two ways out of this familiar framing of the problem. First, he takes the abolitionists' morality at face value, and asserts that the injustice of slavery and racism was plain to all willing to look. For those that did take the risks of the abolitionist, motives become a simpler matter.

Secondly, a focus on the passive decision of millions of Northerners to stay out of anti-slavery societies might shed new light on the active decision of those that joined. Although not the main concern of his book, Goodman's attention to the disincentives inhibiting support for abolitionism call to mind the scholarship on slavery that has reversed the question put to the study of abolitionism. In studies of slavery, historians frequently try to explain why many slaves did not act forthrightly for immediate emancipation rather than why a minority risked their lives in rebellion and escape. That scholarship has attended to the power relationships of society that discouraged rebellion and gave incentives for slave quiescence. It also looks at other forms of resistance to slavery aside from flight and rebellion. Keeping in mind the death of more than 300,000 Northern whites in the Civil War, historians might search for the less visible ways that they resisted slavery before 1861. Doing so might help explain why a political culture dominated by racism in 1860 and after produced emancipation by the end of the war's end. Understanding how power relationships favored Northern politicians and businessmen interested in maintaining the goodwill of the South would shed more light on what may have been a broader anti-slavery constituency that the number of abolitionist society members indicates.

Frank Towers
Bilkent University