the Ohio took a new lease on life and was pushed to completion during the 1920s. Amidst gala ceremonies, Sibert, now a general, signalled the completion of the nine-foot channel by cutting a satin ribbon at Ohio River Lock 53 on October 29, 1929. Note the date: Sibert's dream had been fulfilled just in time for the Great Crash of 1929 to deal commerce on the inland rivers yet another almost fatal blow.

Chronicling these vicissitudes, Johnson maintains a detached, commonsensical attitude toward their implications for present-day policy on river "improvements." Writing under the auspices of the Corps of Engineers, he would scarcely enter the lists of controversy against the corps. Yet recent environmental debates involving the Headwaters District are all here in outline, with the rival positions summarized by and large with an admirably even hand. This is not a history that evades the recent past: the Kinzua Dam is here, complete with consideration of its impact on the floods following Hurricane Agnes in 1972; the Johnstown floods are here, including that of 1977. Johnson surveys a host of possible projects that environmental considerations have put in abeyance.

Underlying Johnson's approach to the currently debated issues is his thought-provoking observation that to Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, and most conservationists of their generation, "water conservation commonly meant storing water behind dams for beneficial economic and social purposes, rather than letting it waste in annual floods." To today's environmentalists, however, as to John Muir of the earlier era, conservation has meant "preservation of an undisturbed environment" (pp. 299-300). Which approach better serves the future of the planet as well as of humankind is not so simple to answer. This book offers test cases to ponder along with hearty tales for the reader of regional history.
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In February 1861, Miss Emma Holmes, a twenty-one-year-old
member of a large, affluent, and well-connected Charleston family, decided to begin a diary. Most of what she wrote for the next five years has now been edited by Professor Marszalek of Mississippi State University. Well educated, an avid reader, and a high-culture enthusiast, Miss Holmes's diary reflects her elitist, class conscious, and pro-Southern-independence value system. Unlike the female diarist of the war, Mary Boykin Chesnut, Emma's views are predictable and rather narrow. From her entries, one would hardly know that there were black field hands or that the "mobocracy" provided most of the soldiers in battle. She believed every anti-Union rumor, usually ignored Confederate defeats, and preferred to comment on the complex social scene and family matters. (Over forty of her kin served in the war.)

From February until May 1861, when she wrote almost daily entries, one is struck by the continual social activities which related to the war: tours of local defenses, balls, celebrations honoring those "gentlemen" who had volunteered or who were leaving for the Virginia front, and promenading along the Battery on the bay. By August, she was learning to sew "drawers" for the troops. In December, she described the devastating fire which ripped through downtown Charleston and forced her family to flee their home.

During January-May 1862, she continued to read (particularly since so many "gentlemen" were away), attend meetings of the reading club, visit local installations, and comment, usually incorrectly, on military events afield. In May, Emma's widowed mother decided to take the family to the "up country" near Camden. There, isolated from the social set in Charleston, Emma remained, except for a few months, for the balance of the war. She read, knitted, and tried to exist within the monotony of local cultural and social "democratic" restraints. In July 1863, she returned to her beloved Charleston. There she described some of the Union attacks on the bay's outworks and the initial firing on the city. She returned to Camden in late September and soon began teaching in a private school. Thereafter, the journal comments are less frequent and largely restricted to her job, social and church functions, and the war's terrible toll on her family and acquaintances.

The last entries, from October 1864 until April 1866 (only a fraction of the narrative), are the most interesting and significant. She believed all the stories about General Sherman's soldiers' alleged atrocities. When Union troops approached their home, the family, with the aid of their slaves, prepared for the expected devastation — which
did not occur. Emma was taught by a former slave how to cook and iron. She began to sew and on March 1, 1866, wrote: "I'm getting embroidery as well as dress making [orders]." Most of their slaves remained with them until the family could no longer afford their up-keep. She reluctantly accepted defeat, but was sure that she was part of the last of "her race in South Carolina." The economic, social, and cultural transition during those months makes interesting reading.

Professor Marszalek's editing is faulty, especially relative to the "people and events" identification process. In addition, maps of downtown Charleston and of South Carolina should have been included. Emma's mother, who held the family together, is barely mentioned. Politics is eschewed. Newspapers and census data might have helped fill in some detail of Emma's life between 1866 and 1910. There is no bibliography. Finally, the non-Civil War scholar will have difficulty following the rise and fall of the Confederacy from this publication.
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This volume joins a growing list of distinguished monographs dealing with the history of the American criminal justice system. Fifteen years ago there would have been few books on such a list. Readers interested in the history of police forces, of criminal law, of patterns of criminal activity, and of attitudes about crime would have had to be satisfied with brief, superficial comments in criminology texts or else sought the primary sources out for themselves. The only subject that produced a few quality historical studies was that of prisons and prison reform. Even here the work was almost exclusively narrative; for example, Orlando Lewis, The Development of American Prisons and Prison Customs, 1776-1845 (1922) and Harry Elmer Barnes, The Evolution of Penology in Pennsylvania (1927).

That situation has changed radically and for the better. What I