Louisville, Kentucky, judiciously, and the result is impressive. Perhaps an editorial determination dictated by size limitations prevented Lofaro from using endnotes or footnotes, and this decision has somewhat limited the usefulness of the book to the serious scholar.

Lofaro does not digress, which is obvious in such a small volume, but his preciseness allows him to cover his subject without losing the charm which makes the book readable. He has produced an inexpensive volume which examines the life of one of our most famous frontier heroes without embellishment.
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This short but expensive work serves two purposes: the first to reconstruct the life of a man remembered as the nemesis of Button Gwinnett; the second, and far more important, to reconstruct the struggle for military and political power among Georgian leaders of the Revolutionary period. Lachlan McIntosh was the son of a Jacobite rebel who had made his peace with the victors and emigrated to Georgia when Lachlan was eight. Information about the son's early life is limited, due to a dearth of evidence, and Jackson is forced to substitute conjecture for fact too often to give one a wholly convincing portrait of his subject. Enough is known, however, to indicate that through his connections with the Laurens family, his abilities as a surveyor, and advantages wrung from the new royal government of Georgia, he accumulated thousands of acres of prime coastal land. By the 1760s McIntosh and his equally grasping brothers had become local powers — prickly members of the raw Georgian elite.

McIntosh was not a political animal: quite the contrary, he seems to have been so maladroit as to be tragi-comical. His leanings were naturally conservative, and he surprised friend and foe alike when he broke ostentatiously with the crown in 1775. Jackson ascribes principled motives to the man, but, glancing over the evidence, it is equally possible that ambition lured him into taking advantage of factionalized politics for personal gain. Characteristically, having once
made a bold stand, he retreated from it — scarcely the hallmark of disinterested patriotism.

He was elected lieutenant-colonel of the Georgia Continentals as a compromise between conservative and radical nominees. Jackson's explanation about McIntosh's Scots ancestry and his concern over British political measures may be correct as an explanation for McIntosh's joining the patriot cause, but they may not provide the complete answer.

As senior officer in Georgia McIntosh was not a success. He had to make bricks without straw and he was placed at a crushing disadvantage when a brother was found trading with the enemy. His greatest enemy, though, seems to have been himself; a man so jealous of his position and personal honor was not the best man to work in harness with Georgia's radical leaders. It is no wonder that after a year of chaos and wrangling, ending with his murder of Gwinnett, McIntosh was posted north to Valley Forge.

His career there was also lackluster, and Jackson is kinder to the man than the facts suggest. To be removed from one command and to fail adequately to carry out his orders in another warrants a harsher look at his performance. In an apparent effort to unify a troubled western department by placing a disinterested person at its head, Washington sent him to Pittsburgh with the responsibility of capturing Detroit from the British. He failed to do so; he fell afool of provincial rivalries, was distracted by Indian attacks, aroused the hatred of the Pennsylvanians, and wrecked his command with the ill-advised construction of Fort Laurens. The demoralization of his little army at the end of his campaign reflects poorly upon his abilities as disciplinarian and leader. Jackson is correct, however, in stating that it was in Pennsylvania that his career was most distinguished, for his troops helped hold a strategic frontier just when it was weakest.

McIntosh's last active service occurred during the siege of Charleston. There, after undistinguished participation in the councils of war, he was captured.

Life after the war passed in a world so changed that McIntosh appears never to have come to grips with it. His long memory, unabated sense of grievance, and abrasive combativeness were tiresome to Georgia's new leaders. Beset by creditors, his estates neglected, this embittered man received gratefully the few crumbs of office flicked to him. In none did he distinguish himself by honesty or disinterested service, and it occurs to this reviewer that fate might have been kinder to McIntosh had Gwinnett's aim been unerring. It must have hurt to
continue living among the ruins of a world he had helped to destroy.

Although the section in the book covering McIntosh's military command in Pittsburgh has real authority, it is as a socio-political historian that Jackson succeeds. When he records the confused swirl of political infighting at local and state levels he makes a valuable contribution. It is with particular skill that he shows how McIntosh illustrates the fate of his class; the soldier, as in so much else, was a loser in the bitter struggle over who should rule at home once the British had been ejected. As an example of the "better sort" his career reveals how slim were the pretensions upon which his claim to social superiority rested and, perhaps, how fortunate Georgia was that he and his kind lost.
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Ms Coward has written a very readable account about what would appear to be a very dull subject: the process by which Kentuckians developed their Constitutions of 1792 and 1799. As they wrote their first constitution and established a new state government in 1792, Kentuckians looked to their parent state Virginia for counsel and advice (especially to Thomas Jefferson and James Madison). While a strong ministerial and legal element dominated the first convention, under the leadership of George Nicholas the 1792 constitution consolidated power in the hands of the elite (the governor, the senate, and the court of appeals) in order to check any tendency to unruly democracy. Not only was a strong central government established but slavery was recognized as an established institution.

Subsequently, Kentucky's population grew rapidly with a marked increase in slaves in the central part of the state. As such, a number of new counties were created. Kentucky's first legislature under the Constitution of 1792 established a court system, levied taxes, and established an educational system. While Kentucky's first governor, Isaac Shelby, was extremely cautious and rarely used the veto, his successor, James Garrard, advocated greater public spending and frequently used the veto power. In national politics, Kentuckians were