one to be dissected, studied, and contemplated on over a period of time. The effort, at least in the opinion of this reviewer, can be most rewarding.

*Pittsburgh*  

William F. Trimble


This book encompasses more than the title implies in that it includes plans of fortifications and plots of prehistoric earthworks not strictly maps, although they are of an allied graphic nature. Nearly all the maps have received prior publication in widely scattered historical works, some now rare; but this collection has brought them together under one cover. Some, even though previously printed, are reproduced from the original manuscript maps in repositories such as the Library of Congress, the William L. Clements Library, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the Western Reserve Historical Society, and the Ohio Historical Society.

This is a fine printing of Ohio maps, primarily due to modern reproduction methods executed upon paper of superb quality. Due to the format and folio size of the book (nine inches by twelve inches), maps of that size, or spread upon a double page, can be examined more readily.

A chapter is devoted to drafts of some of the most remarkable prehistoric mounds of the early occupants of Ohio. Another chapter the author gives to plans of fortifications and military posts, battle plans, and a drastically reduced map of Bonnecamps depicting Céloron de Blainville's expedition. The map denotes burial locations of Céloron's leaden plates, but it is too small to be read with even the most powerful magnifying glass. This is a marked inconsistency, compared with the immediately following two-page spread of the detailed map of Colonel Henry Bouquet's march into Ohio.

With much satisfaction we observe that Dr. Smith has accorded to Thomas Hutchins, the acting chief engineer with Bouquet's army, later to be geographer of the United States, the credit and honor justly due him as the man who "knew more about this region [Ohio] than anyone else at the time." It is needful to remark, however, that Dr. Smith, being the one other than myself who has given evidence of having seen and noted Hutchins's survey plat map, might have
examined it more critically. As the first-time publisher of this map in 1960 (with The Orderly Book of Colonel Henry Bouquet's Expedition Against the Ohio Indians, 1764), I examined it minutely under many conditions of lighting and magnification. The map had been cut, allowing only the bottoms of letters of a modifying word to show, and leaving the word Encampment distinct. The elusive modifier I deciphered as Indian — hence Indian Encampment. Dr. Smith (p. 61) assumed this place to have been Bouquet's Camp No. 6 (from Fort Pitt). Hutchins's calculation placed Camp No. 6 at 13½ miles 42 perches from the crossing of Big Beaver, just astride the Pennsylvania-Ohio state line. The Indian camp was 3.4 miles west of that location, which has been substantiated by the alternate surveyor's notes and measurements, with the added information: "... at the end of this course a spring & Indian Camp." If this location had been correct, every succeeding camp location would be removed 3.4 miles west of Hutchins's recorded distances. (See "1764: Henry Bouquet's March Through Beaver County," Milestones [Jan. 1979]. In this publication of the Beaver County, Pennsylvania, Historical and Landmarks Foundation, the field notes of the alternate surveyor are printed and annotated.)

A matter not explained is the omission of one of Ohio's most significant maps, drafted by Ohio's Revolutionary hero and pioneer, General Rufus Putnam, surveyor general of the United States, 1803-1804. This is the first map of the new state and the most accurate to date of the streams and watersheds of Ohio. This was the first map to show the West Fork of Little Beaver Creek, the branches and watersheds of which furnished the most important routes of early travel by white explorers, traders, military expeditions, and settlers in central and western Ohio. Putnam's map had much deeper significance than would appear at first glance.

A disappointment has been the near exclusion of the monumental work of Charles E. Sherman, Ohio Land Subdivisions, descriptive of the ten original historical districts, grants, and reserves, together with reprints of all the original ordinances, laws, treaties, and instructions to government surveyors, and including the "present system of public land surveys" (to 1926). This nearly definitive work with its supplement, a forty by forty-two-inch composite map depicting every section, township, and range, also every military survey with its original survey application number, is the epitome of all former survey maps, a few of which are exemplified in this book. Sherman's work is mentioned on pages 147 and 173 but omitted in the bibliography. This
book and map have been of inestimable value in historical geographical work by me and many others in the field. Of course, we realize that emphasis is avowedly placed upon the art reflected in these maps and that there are, after all, many more living-room coffee tables to be graced by this offering of a beautiful book than there are practical historical geographers to be edified.

Pittsburgh

Edward G. Williams


Professor Silbey’s slim volume, divided into ten provocative chapters, is an analysis of the Democratic party, 1860-1868. It is, as he states in the preface, “an institutional and behavioral study.” Using traditional methodology as well as some of the current “new history” quantitative techniques, he portrays a party, although bitterly divided in 1860 and faction-ridden thereafter, that is vibrant and powerful. Largely ignored by specialists of the Civil War and Reconstruction period, the Democrats faced complex problems associated with the decline of an established party amid the reality of its new “minority” status.

Silbey demonstrates, at the county, district, and state levels, that the Democrats were able to unify after the 1860 fiasco. Dismissing the War Democrats as being impotent, he divides the two major factions into the “Purists,” the pro-peace element (symbolized by Clement L. Vallandigham), and the “Legitimists,” those who were partisanly pro-Union and symbolized by Manton Marble, the youthful editor of the New York World. Aggregate election data (county, state, and national) are the basis for each faction’s reaction to the early unifying years (1861-1862), the two most successful elections (1862 and 1867), and the two electoral defeats (1864 and 1868). These elections are analyzed and compared at each level. An index of competition and correlations gives one a macroscopic view of the relative political power in the North. In addition, he uses the ebb and flow of voter turnout to ascertain the impact of this important variable in states which were often won or lost by razor-thin margins.

He concludes that “by 1860 the electorate had become locked in”