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reacted to this veto by chartering more banks. Ohio followed suit, but the continued fear of a central bank meant that the legislature opted for a network of local banks instead of a centralized state bank.

Although the BUS’s federal charter expired in 1836, Biddle obtained a charter from Pennsylvania, and the bank continued to operate under state auspices for several years. The Ohio legislature responded by forbidding the BUS of Pennsylvania to operate any banks in the state. Even after the BUS closed its doors and went into trusteeship in 1841, it had a lasting impact in Ohio. Over the next twenty years, the state’s distrust of banks was evident in a number of laws passed to control banks and keep any giant financial institution from dominating the state.

Brown’s use of sources ably supports her study of the BUS from both the national and local perspective. She uses standard collections such as the papers of Langdon Cheves and Nicholas Biddle as well as those of lesser-known figures connected to the Ohio branches. Based on this rich variety of source material, Brown builds an effective analysis of the tempestuous relationship between the BUS and the state of Ohio.


REVIEWED BY WILLIAM HEWITT, WEST CHESTER UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

From the end of the Civil War until the end of the nineteenth century, the police of St. Paul, Minnesota, informally regulated brothel prostitution. Each month a police sweep of the vice district brought madams and prostitutes before the city’s municipal court to be charged with keeping houses of ill fame or prostitution and fined accordingly. “In this case,” according to Joel Best in Controlling Vice, “the police were an important group because everyone involved in the debate over vice policy assumed that the police force was the appropriate agency for controlling prostitution” (138). St. Paul’s policies using the existing prohibition apparatus (laws against prostitution, arrest powers, and so on) as a framework for regulation, Best says, “can be contrasted with fully legitimized regulatory programs, such as state alcohol control commissions, which feature formal regulatory codes, special enforcement agencies, and the like” (138).
Using municipal court dockets, newspapers, police ledgers, and sociological theory, Best describes the far more typical regulation of prostitution in St. Paul as opposed to the better known but brief experiment with legalization tried in St. Louis. Historical research on prostitution has concentrated on a few cities with large, notorious vice districts, such as New York and San Francisco, on the frontier, and on regulation in St. Louis and New Orleans. Far less is known about prostitution and its control in more typical American cities’ red light districts where regulation was covert. Best’s case study adds to a growing body of research about regulation and reform of prostitution in small-town middle America.

Broadly supported regulation gave way to reform, however, as a small group of critics upset the established arrangement. According to Best, “At least some citizens believed that vice enforcement in general and regulation in particular perpetuated the evils of prostitution. Something had to be done. In efforts to stop regulation, prohibit vice, and restore morality, reformers organized a series of campaigns. Between 1870 and 1883, St. Paul was the scene of five moral crusades against vice and its regulation” (87). In the first crusade, Judge Thomas Howard, presiding over St. Paul’s police court, increased fines from the customary $25 on madams plus $10 per inmate, to $100 plus $25 per inmate. The police responded by arresting madams only on alternate months. Demands for change escalated until the fifth effort, led by mayor Christopher O’Brien, who had won office with the support of reform leaders, ordered the brothels closed and gave the inmates three days to leave town. O’Brien’s policies drove vice underground. Best’s analysis ends with O’Brien’s reforms “because, by driving vice underground for two years, the policies created a gap in the court records, making it nearly impossible to trace individual madams and prostitutes” (97).

The book’s most satisfying section stays narrowly focused on prostitution in St. Paul from 1865 to 1885. The author, however, makes numerous broad generalizations that are not related to St. Paul specifically. His attempt to connect what happened at the end of the nineteenth century with a sweeping review of the twentieth is not convincing. He concludes, for example, that “reduced demand, coupled with social control campaigns, pushed criminal syndicates out of brothel prostitution and into more profitable rackets” (114). As a consequence, streetwalking, call girls, and eventually massage parlors emerged as the modern counterparts to brothels, so that, “by the 1960s, prostitution had already dropped from public notice” (114).
The book’s most unsatisfying chapter is the concluding one, “Social Control: Strategy, Practicality, and Morality.” Ostensibly providing a theoretical context for the study, it seems to be a detached conference paper designed to stand by itself, more than an integral part of his study. For 20 pages Best fails to integrate what happened in St. Paul specifically into the sociological literature discussed. Nonsociologists will find the review of sociological literature slow going, but shortcomings aside, this book will appeal to anyone interested in the history of prostitution in the Midwest and the processes and consequences of late nineteenth-century reform.


REVIEWED BY EARLINE RAE FERGUSON, ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

Elizabeth Hayes Turner has written a book that captures southern progressive women’s activism in Galveston, Texas. *Women, Culture, and Community: Religion and Reform in Galveston, 1880–1920* is a welcome addition to an already productive field of scholarship on women’s culture and activism in the New South in the 40 years surrounding the turn of the twentieth century. The foundation for Turner’s work is a database that contains information about the almost 400 women she identified as activist women—their religious affiliations, biographical data, and family and organizational ties. That data has enabled her to recount in rich detail not only the work and consequences of progressive women’s activities at the local level, but also to examine identity and the role race, religion, and class played in their entrance into civic life.

Turner found that in Galveston, unlike in other southern seaport cities, progressive women civic leaders and activists belonged to that city’s white Protestant (predominantly Episcopalian) social elites, and that their elitism dominated that city’s cultural, benevolence, and reform movements. Beginning with the 1870s, she carefully traces the development of the progressive women’s movement from charity work in poor relief societies through the creation of benevolent institutions in the 1880s and cultural associations in the 1890s. Prompted by the hurricane of 1900, Galveston’s women activists created three organizations that would be the primary movers of reform in the two decades that followed—the Women’s Health Protective Association...