groups, especially the Senecas, remain in the region of north-west Pennsylvania and continue to impact the state, such as fighting against and getting compensation for construction of the Kinzua Dam in the 1950s-1960s that flooded thousands of acres of their land. Beginning in 1879, Pennsylvania became a crucial part of assimilationist efforts by the United States government to convert Indians into literate manual laborers via the Carlisle Indian School created by former Army captain Richard Pratt. The school had a mixed legacy that continued well after it closed in 1918. To many Native students from all over the country it was a place of imprisonment and death, but it also incubated a Native American intellectual class that formed new pan-Indian organizations to address Indian problems and needs. To this day, over 18,000 persons calling themselves Native American live in Pennsylvania and the Indian story of Pennsylvania continues. Readers seeking an introduction to the American Indian history of Pennsylvania and surrounding regions could do little better than starting with this concise, intelligent, and readable volume.

GREG O'BRIEN
University of Southern Mississippi


American historians, especially students of the early republic, who have long valued the observations of foreign travelers, who will welcome the publication of the journal of the Italian nobleman Paolo Andreani. Indeed, with so much interest at the moment in the “internationalization” of American history, Andreani’s comments on conditions and cultures in the Hudson and Mohawk valleys take on added meaning. Yet, interesting as Count Andreani’s travelogue sometimes is and valuable as the annotations provided by editors Cesare Marino and Karim Tiro often are, the real highlight of the book is its epilogue. There, and in a series of letters included in an appendix, Marino and Tiro offer a glimpse into the strange turn that the Count’s encounter with the United States took following his journey through upstate New York.

The journey itself was a brief one, occupying only one month in the late summer of 1790, as is the journal, which in published form covers only a little more than fifty pages. Beginning in New York City, the thirty-seven year
old Count moved up the Hudson, along the way providing short descriptions of the villages through which he passed. Much of the commentary on rural life in the Hudson Valley is unremarkable, though Andreani’s fascination with rocks and minerals reminds readers that his vision is not ours. So, too, the Count’s obsession with counting reflected, as the editors point out, the quantifying spirit “that suffused Europe, and the Italian states in particular, in the eighteenth century” (1). Weighing in on various natural and cultural phenomena, Andreani entered the debates about the Americas that engaged intellectuals on both sides of the Atlantic. Without claiming that Andreani’s “diary embodied some kind of essentially Italian or Milanese sensibility,” Marino and Tiro do contend that the Count’s perspectives on what was called the “dispute of the New World . . . were less polemical and ideologically driven than” the generally oppositional views of English and French travel writers (31).

Leaving Albany, Andreani traveled up the Mohawk River into what was still Iroquoia. Already, though, the evidence of impending changes impressed itself on the Italian visitor. Where “a few years ago one could find very few dwellings, . . . a considerable number of families from New England” were now settling in the valley and the “roads were covered with men, women, livestock and farm tools” (53). Most of the country, however, remained the possession of the Iroquois, and Andreani attempted to dissect their culture. Like almost all Europeans (and Americans), Andreani insisted that the idleness of Indians left the land far less improved than it could be. Typically, too, the Count pinned most of the blame on the laziness of Indian men, while decrying the excess labors expected of Indian women. More original, if equally inaccurate, was Andreani’s belief that “the custom of breastfeeding the offspring for about two and more years . . . contributed naturally to weakening the mother and the child” (58). Andreani, though, was not wholly critical, crediting the Indians’ “hospitality” and acknowledging that “in the family they love each other greatly, and their filial love is no less than that which exists amongst ourselves” (59). The journal also includes several pages of detail about the language of the Oneidas and the Mohawks, which should be of value to specialists. Of more general interest is Andreani’s account of an Oneida lacrosse game, made more noteworthy by containing the first known description of a lacrosse stick.

The journal concludes with a section on a Shaker community and with Andreani’s return to the Hudson Valley. But the Count’s adventures (or, more accurately, misadventures) in the United States were not at an end. Happily, editors Marino and Tiro add an epilogue that summarizes the rest of the story.
First embraced by the new nation’s elite, Andreani’s candid (or impolitic) comments about American ladies quickly put him on the outs with Philadelphia society. Trivial as the whole affair seems, it opens a fascinating window on cultural and gender politics in the early republic. Indeed, Andreani’s post-journal saga merits a book of its own in which his journey along the Hudson and Mohawk would be mere prologue.

STEPHEN ARON
UCLA and Autry National Center


Civil War historiography is dominated by studies of campaigns and battles. Generally, however, each battle is analyzed in isolation, without an understanding of how warfare, strategy, and tactics evolved during the four year conflict. Little attention has been paid to the study of overarching strategies, and particularly the development of field fortifications. Edward Hagerman’s American Civil War and the Origins of Modern Warfare (1987), provides a general overview of the evolution of warfare and strategy during the war, but only a cursory analysis of fieldworks. Earl Hess’ Field Armies and Fortifications in the Civil War: The Eastern Campaigns, 1861–1864, fills the gap in Civil War military scholarship, with a solid analysis on field fortifications.

Hess, history professor at Lincoln Memorial University and a prominent Civil War historian, disputes the popular notion that eastern operations in 1861 through 1863 were dramatically different from operations and strategies in the war’s final years of 1864–1865. Rather, Hess argues that field fortifications were intrinsic to armies’ campaigns and strategies from the beginning of the war and that the difference between fortifications in 1861 with those of 1865 is only “one of degree” (xvi).

Hess analyzes Union and Confederate operations in the eastern theater from Big Bethel (June 1861) through Plymouth (April 1864) and questions “how much and why fortifications played a role in the success or failure of Civil War field armies” (xiii). Accordingly, the belief that early battles were fluid and open, and then suddenly evolved into the stalemate of trench war-