

approach to market relations in the 1750s and 1760s is not a subject of discussion in this volume, however, and deserves further study.

Kars' work also revisits ideas made popular in Rhys Isaac's study of the evangelical contribution to revolutionary ideology in Virginia. While recent work has emphasized the conservative nature of southern evangelicalism in the Old Dominion over the long haul, bringing Isaac's interpretation under review, Kars makes a supporting case for the socially challenging potential of dissent. In North Carolina a weaker established church and a greater variety of more radical sectarians argue for the plausibility of this interpretation. While it is possible that "evangelical revolt" found a home among the Tarheels, Kars' assertion that many denominations might be taken together under the rubric of the "new light" is open to challenge. To be sure, Quakers and Moravians demonstrated a pronounced willingness to disengage from the mainstream when it challenged their moral principles, but Baptists and Presbyterians in other colonies were decidedly less comfortable in that role. Historians of religion in colonial North Carolina are blessed with the journals of Anglican missionary Charles Woodmason, but his inability to distinguish between the dissenting groups he despised should not provide guidelines for scholars.

In the end, this book does a masterful job of uncovering the sources of the Regulation and tying backcountry farmers of the eighteenth century to their more famous nineteenth century descendants. We now must await the next chapter of the story from Kars' or others' pens to discover how participants in the Regulation went into, and came out of, the Revolution itself.

Jewel L. Spangler  
University of Calgary

Richard S. Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism: Fighting Slavery in the Early Republic* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

In 1775 a small group of Philadelphians met at the Sun Tavern to form the Pennsylvania Society for the Abolition of Slavery (PAS), the world's first organization ending human bondage whose "distinctly conservative style of activism" "set the standard" (p. 16) for early national American abolitionism. The story of the PAS is the subject of this fine study by Richard S. Newman. In telling the history of this key organization, Newman also tells the story of American abolitionism in the early republic and its transformation into a radical and interracial movement in the antebellum years.

Not to be mistaken for a mere trend, the PAS incorporated in 1789, winning legal recognition and standing. Their membership, the group touted, was made

up of “Gentlemanly” and “honorable” men of “character” (40). Their membership and leaders also included lots of lawyers, the PAS corps. Newman points out that after 1776, the law shaped American slavery more than ever before: “northern gradual abolition schemes, southern slave laws and anti-emancipation statutes, federal fugitive slave provisions, black challenges to slavery in court” all required a jurist’s expertise. It was they who crafted proposals for new laws, looked for loopholes in existing ones, and plotted the tactics to be used in court to help runaways and kidnapped blacks.

The PAS mastered the art of the petition, deferentially apologizing for their zeal and “requesting only constitutionally sanctioned doctrines from Congress” (41). The PAS did not seek to extend or amend the contours of the Constitution, least of all as it applied to individual states. Rather, federal PAS petitions addressed those areas of slavery that Congress could regulate: first, the Atlantic slave trade, a topic that drew at least ten PAS petitions between 1787 and 1820 (to end the trade and to regulate the Middle Passage); and then, after 1808, enforcement of the ban. Pennsylvania’s bill of rights, however, spoke of the state legislature’s responsibility to ensure the “human freedom” of all of its “inhabitants” (45). Such broad language gave PAS lawyers plenty of material for their petitions, which they bolstered with back-room lobbying by members who made the most of their insider status to argue for petitions and to distribute reports and essays that provided information they wanted legislators to know. All the while, they heeded PAS guidelines: “join moderation to your zeal” (44).

The PAS’s conservative strategies grew from the same Quaker roots that had given rise to its liberal ambition. Pennsylvania Quakers had a distinguished history of objecting to slaveholding, one that dated back to the 1688 “Germantown Protest” document criticizing slavery. And by the 1750s, Quakers did not allow themselves to hold slaves; those who insisted on keeping their human chattels were banned from meetings. But Quakers were committed to this “privatist” strategy (17); they morally pressured members of their group, lectured to others against bondage, and wrote pamphlets.

The PAS remained committed to the same emphasis on persuasion over legal compulsion. The reason, Newman argues, was the “politics of Union” (37) that prioritized the cohesiveness of the new union of states over the lofty principles that had fired their fight for independence. (It was, in part, the politics of union that explains Massachusetts’s early absence from organized anti-slavery work. Racial fears and the state’s economic connections with slavery in Africa, the Caribbean, and the South also worked to dampen early abolitionist sentiment. But Newman does not show that Pennsylvania lacked those same racial prejudices and economic connections.) PASers were equally committed to their insider strategy: political reform was best accomplished by elite men who could work among their own. Black Americans and women were not welcome to join them in their organizations.

In many ways, the strategy worked. In 1780, Pennsylvania passed the world's first law manumitting the state's enslaved population – gradually. Other northern states followed suit and by the early 1800s all the northern states had abolished slavery, although the gradual form they adopted left many people unfreed throughout the antebellum years. And in 1808 participation in the Atlantic slave trade was outlawed. Perhaps most important of all, the PAS, the New York Manumission Society, anti-slavery groups in New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island as well as the short-lived ones in Virginia, Maryland and Kentucky all reversed slavery's "centuries-long normative standing among philosophers and statesmen" (20) in the Atlantic world. These groups engaged a small but growing conversation among whites about how Thomas Jefferson's "sentiment" would have "been enhanced a thousand fold if Jefferson had practiced what he preached," as one PAS member put it (20).

Once the northern states had passed emancipation laws, and Congress had banned participation in the Atlantic slave trade, slavery became, in large measure, a southern problem. Yet the politics of union prevented early national abolitionists from insisting that Congress pass legislation regarding a state concern. The civic and legal strategy had hit a roadblock. Early republican abolitionists encountered another problem, this one of substance. The American Colonization Society (ACS), founded in 1817 for the purpose of expatriating emancipated black Americans to Africa, seemed to a minority of its members, including a young William Lloyd Garrison, to be anti-black in its motives.

Dissatisfied ACS members found common ground with the black and women's abolitionist societies that had sprung up out of exclusion from the abolitionist establishment of the early national years. This second generation of abolitionists came together around not only the principle of emancipation, but also rights for blacks in the U. S.; they shared the belief that American racism was the scourge to be eradicated, not black Americans. This second generation of abolitionists was a product of its political age and departed from many of the old ways. Eschewing their insider networking of the first generation, young activists capitalized on new forms of print media and democratic politics, emphasized mass action, and appealed to the citizenry at large, not just the civic and legal elite. Second-generation abolitionists toured cities and the countryside giving speeches, wrote and distributed pamphlets, and underwrote the publication of "authentic" testimonials from those who knew slavery the best, ex-slaves. Indeed, their own inclusiveness and cooperation across race and gender lines embodied the more democratic ideal of the time. Garrison's "ardent and hectoring electioneering style" (11) personified this aspect of the "immediatists," as Garrison coined the movement to which he belonged. Garrison's impassioned and self-righteous proclamations ("I will be heard!") were also shaped by the era's revivalism. Influenced by the Second Great Awakening's valorization of feeling (rather than the clergy or the law) as an avenue to truth and redemption,

as well as by the tradition of black anti-slavery work, antebellum abolitionism strove to move Americans emotionally and stir them to action. Rejecting the abolitionist establishment's politics of deference and gradualism, they demanded abolition now.

Newman's greatest accomplishment is his demonstration that antebellum abolitionism not only departed radically from the first generation in method, style, and mission, but built on the work of those categorically excluded from earlier organizational work: black Americans themselves. Refused admission to first-generation abolitionist groups and the halls of power, black Americans took their message directly to the people with "an arsenal of strategies and tactics that diverged sharply from the learned and dispassionate legal/political activism of white abolitionists" (87). Black abolitionists of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century were convinced that the only way to win was to assault "slavery morally as well as politically" (87). In pamphlets, narratives, speeches, and essays, black abolitionists passionately and graphically drew a picture of what it meant to be enslaved and of what dangerous outcomes lurked ahead for white Americans. In 1813, well before Garrison founded the *Liberator* (1831) or founded the New England Anti-Slavery Society (1832), James Forten was describing his work as an "appeal to the heart" (87). Garrison himself spoke of assimilating black abolitionists' "enthusiasm" and "authentic[ity]" (104) into the movement he envisioned.

*The Transformation of American Abolitionism* is an exceptionally well-written and insightful study of the transformation in style and substance of American abolitionism between its first generation in the Revolutionary-era and early republic and its second, better-known generation in the antebellum period. It is a well-researched, careful, and detailed exploration of two generations of American abolitionism and the differences between them. A few criticisms are nonetheless in order. The book's analysis gives little attention to some key issues at the heart of the topic. Newman's account of the second generation's interracialism would be strengthened by acknowledgment of the tensions between black and white abolitionists; and his discussion of debates about the ACS would have been more nuanced had it included the debate among black Americans about the organization. Instead, Newman depicts the debate about the ACS as one between black abolitionists, who were against it, and many white abolitionists, who supported it. The book's thoughtful discussion of black abolitionism might have benefitted from attention to the changes in black abolitionism between the early national and late antebellum years. The role of violence, for a single example, certainly gained more black support after the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850. Finally, neither first nor second-generation American abolition existed in isolation from British abolitionism. Did the transformation of American abolitionism reflect a different relationship to British anti-slavery?

Despite these criticisms, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism* is an

engaging and edifying read. Historians of slavery, nineteenth-century social movements, African American politics, and American politics will do well to consult this study. Its conciseness also makes it well suited for the classroom where it will offer a great deal to students and professors alike.

Stephanie M. H. Camp  
University of Washington, Seattle

Ray Hudson, *Producing Places* (New York: The Guildford Press, 2001).

We live in a time when most urgent political questions relate to boundaries of one sort or another. Globalization, of course, is reconfiguring the shape and meaning of those at the national level. Related pressures have pushed back the institutional frontiers of the welfare state, rearranging communities and families to make room for market forces. A wide-ranging assault on civil society is now being conducted in the name of national security, using measures that only recently were considered beyond the pale. Those who oppose such intrusions find themselves grappling with the limits of solidarity, for inclusiveness and diversity demand attention to borders, if not respect for them. And any consideration of who is “us” and who is “them” is likely to be entangled – at least metaphorically – with spatial boundaries. The distinction between “core” and “peripheral” workers is illustrative here.

In this context it seems reasonable to consult geographers on the changing meaning of space and place. And economic geographers seem to be well positioned to comment on the global extension and domestic intensification of work. In *Producing Places*, Ray Hudson examines both “places in which production occurs” and “the production of places” where “the realms of use values and exchange values” intersect (v-vi).

Much of the book is an attempt to rehabilitate traditional Marxist economic theory by melding in regulationist approaches and highlighting the spatial dimensions of production (especially uneven development). This argument seems to be aimed at mainstream geographers who neglect or obscure the pervasive impact of capitalism on their objects of study. By focusing on production, Hudson is able to synthesize a wide range of theoretical material, covering production’s relationship with states, labour markets, corporate strategies, worker organizing, places, spaces, and nature. He therefore makes a very comprehensive case for the relevance of Marxist theory in a geographic context.

Those familiar with similar debates elsewhere may find little that is novel in this strand of the book beyond a useful synthesis of existing material. And at times they may be put off by Hudson’s dry, abstract, and