The reviewer, once a researcher in the materials of the Civil War, found little to criticize. Possibly the Introduction is none too vigorous. The biographical sketches both in the earlier chapters and again in chapter nine in supplemental or complemental way seem well founded, well organized and well stated. The great campaigns, though adequately described and furnished with good maps, are, as the author suggests, not exhaustive.

The Critical Essay on Selected Authorities is definitely superior. References are made to recent scholarly works.

Possibly regimental histories and articles in historical magazines may not have received full attention. But there is no padding, no waste motion, no wasted line in the volume.

This book, so appropriate for the time, will interest both scholars and general readers. It is a contribution of much merit.

Emeritus Professor of History
University of Pittsburgh

Why the North Won the Civil War. Edited by David Donald.
(Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1960, Pp. xv, 128. $2.95.)

This small volume is the end product of the Civil War Conference held at Gettysburg College in 1958. The book contains a foreword by Major General U. S. Grant, III, and an introduction by David Donald, the editor. The remainder of it is devoted to five essays by outstanding historians each of whom deals with a different topic in an effort to define why the North won the Civil War. This, of course, has been a matter of considerable discussion ever since the two opposing armies laid down their arms. A great deal of time, energy and ink has been expended on this problem, and one doubts that we are any closer to the ultimate answer than when the Civil War ended. In all honesty, one must confess that, probably, there will never be one uniformly accepted explanation for the outcome of this epic struggle, but this is what makes history such an intriguing study for both the professional historian and the layman.

Professor Richard N. Current in his essay, "God and the Strongest Battalion," examines the economic strength and potentialities of the two contesting nations, and, as one would suspect, concludes
that the North possessed an immense advantage which would become more telling as the struggle progressed. In "The Military Leadership of the North and South" Professor T. Harry Williams traverses ground that he has already explored in Lincoln and His Generals, and concludes that the military leadership of the North was ultimately superior to that of the South, and that Grant and Sherman proved capable of learning lessons from the war and applying them in a way that Lee, the greatest of the southern generals, could not. He also examines the military leadership of both nations at the presidential level, and judges Lincoln vastly greater than Davis as a war leader. Professor Norman A. Graebner examines the diplomatic aspects of the struggle in "Northern Diplomacy and European Neutrality," and determines that it was the realities of international politics that prevented the powers of Europe from intervening in the struggle to aid the South. David Donald's essay "Died of Democracy" reaches just this conclusion about the South, while David M. Potter finds in "Jefferson Davis and Confederate Defeat" that the personal, intellectual and political shortcomings of the Confederate president were factors of very considerable magnitude. He also has some comments of importance to make on the inadequacies of southern political leadership in general and the lack of an outlet for political discontent in the South because of the absence of a two-party system. Readers who find their curiosity stimulated by these essays may satisfy it with aid of the long list of books appended to the end of the volume for "Further Reading."

One suspects that this book was prepared for the general reader rather than the specialist. While the essays are all well written, carefully and logically presented, there is little in them that will strike the professional historian as new or indicative of new interpretations. This is further borne out in the mind of this reader by the lack of documentation for each essay. However, if one accepts this work as being designed for the general reader, it must be rated as an excellent and lucid presentation of a series of questions bearing on the central problem of why the North did win the war. It might also be a stimulating change of pace for some of the numerous Civil War Round Tables that are springing up around the nation, as the result of the one hundredth anniversary of this tragic conflict, to consider some of the questions that are raised in this volume instead of endlessly "rehashing" the tactical details of various battles and
skirmishes of the war. Many of the questions raised in this book had a decided bearing on the military outcome of the struggle which might be even more important than who did what at Shiloh or Second Bull Run. In the mind of this writer, it is time that Civil War scholarship turned from an endless reconsideration of the military details of the war — as fascinating and heroic as they are — to a more balanced view of the contest in which all of the considerations of politics, economics, diplomacy and the military struggle are integrated into what appears to be their proper relationship.

However, the book is highly recommended to all Civil War "buffs," and will help to underscore what we owe to the "blundering generation" which brought on this bloody conflict, but redeemed itself, and the nation, by its heroic conduct on the battlefield, and its efforts to bind up the wounds which lacerated the two sections.

University of Pittsburgh

Harry R. Beck

The Prairie Traveler. By Randolph B. Marcy, Captain, U.S. Army (by Authority of the War Department, 1859). (Privately reprinted, 1961.)

Deadly practical things can be, at the same time, delightfully fascinating, though it seldom happens that way. This rare quality is eminently exhibited by an informative little book that has come into the library of the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania. It is not a new book but a reprinting, in a very limited edition, of one originally published in 1859, entitled The Prairie Traveler. The "deadly" practicality of its content lies in the fact that the lives of many hundreds of immigrants, gold-rush fortune seekers, and adventurers of the 1860's and 1870's were preserved by the observance, just as the lives of many more were in jeopardy by the non-observance, of the simple guidance principles herein propounded. The book was designed as a manual of "prairie-craft" for the adventurous easterners intent upon hazarding their all upon successful crossing of the plains, deserts, and mountains to reach the "Promised Lands" of California and Oregon.

Although the necessity that engendered the little manual has long ago passed out of existence, the very obsolescence of its terminology gives it a ring of the new: surcingle, hames, traces,