

and fought the nefarious liquor dealers. In July, 1884, he became a United States commissioner and was admitted to the bar in May, 1885. His role as a municipal judge involved issuing warrants for arrest, administering oaths, imprisoning and discharging convicts, and doing his utmost to strengthen the Organic Act of 1884, which Senator Benjamin Harrison of Indiana and Jackson, who became general agent for education in Alaska the next year, shepherded through the Congress of the United States.

After spending nineteen years as a businessman, staunch advocate of Alaska's future, commissioner, and judge, Brady was appointed governor by President William McKinley in 1897. It was an ideal choice. Brady knew Alaska's needs, wrote informative reports and recommendations, traveled extensively, was an excellent speaker in clubs and churches, entertained visitors and officials, and cultivated the friendship of his fellow Hoosier, Senator Albert J. Beveridge of Indiana, whose Committee on Territories aided Alaskan legislation. Governor Brady guided the territory through the crisis years of the Klondike rush and the Nome stampede. Above all, he demonstrated a genuine love for the natives and was sincerely committed to the best interests of Alaska.

Ted C. Hinckley has written a superb biography—built solidly on primary sources—of a significant governor whose nine-year term of office was longer than that of any other incumbent except that of Ernest Gruening (1938-1953).

*University of Southern California,*  
*Los Angeles*

Leland H. Carlson

*The Triumph of Sectionalism: The Transformation of Ohio Politics, 1844-1856.* By Stephen E. Maizlish. (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1983. Pp. xiv, 310. Map, illustrations, appendixes, tables, historiographic note, notes, bibliography, index. \$25.00.)

Denying that pre-Civil War politics was shaped significantly by ethnocultural issues, Stephen E. Maizlish argues in this study of Ohio politics that sectionalism was indeed responsible for the breakup of the second party system. Economic issues, Maizlish argues, brought about the formation of political parties in Ohio, but as the Democrats' economic views (notably on banks) proved impractical in an economically maturing state in need of credit sources, their party factionalized along hard money/soft money lines, causing a once unifying issue to become divisive. As party cohesion declined, sectional issues that touched on important concerns for Ohioans, such as free labor and the fear of southern

domination, became important. From 1844, when the Texas annexation issue dominated the presidential campaign, sectionalism shaped politics. By 1848-1849, when Democrats joined the Free Soilers to repeal Ohio's Black Laws and elect Salmon P. Chase to the Senate, ideological consistency with the past had vanished. The Compromise of 1850 led to voter disgust and apathy, not the diminution of sectional feeling. Apparent voter interest in nativism and temperance resulted from the political vacuum created by party decline. Such issues were too divisive to be significant in the formation of new coalitions. What differentiated the newly emergent political organizations was their orientation to the coming sectional conflict.

Maizlish's methodology as well as his interpretation is traditional. He relies heavily on the correspondence of state and national politicians supplemented by newspapers from Ohio's major cities. Although he provides in an appendix an ecological regression analysis (actually prepared by William Gienapp) of the transition in voter support for different parties between 1848 and 1856, it plays a minor role in his analysis. Ethnoculturalists will probably not be persuaded by such evidence. Many of Maizlish's quotations, one might argue, could be equally well interpreted as showing the continued strength, not weakness, of political party identifications in the face of emerging sectional issues. And, in the absence of a systematic analysis of the power structure in Ohio, it is difficult to judge what weight to give to the opinions expressed. If voters imposed their priorities upon politicians, as Maizlish suggests, one must examine actual voter shifts and not depend on the random and sometimes contradictory comments of politicians concerning public opinion. Maizlish is too ready to build an analysis upon assertion, such as his claim that the continued debate over banking in 1850 (long after he argues it had become irrelevant) was a sign of "ritualistic gestures of respect for the doctrines of a bygone era" (p. 164). One feels that Maizlish appreciates the aspirations of those who wanted to war against the obscenity of slavery but that he has chosen an approach that assumes, rather than convincingly proves, that slavery actually shaped political reality in Ohio.

*Ohio University, Athens*

Phyllis F. Field

*Free Frank: A Black Pioneer on the Antebellum Frontier.* By Juliet E.K. Walker. (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1983. Pp. xii, 223. Tables, illustrations, figures, maps, notes, bibliographic note, index. \$20.00.)

Until recently very little scholarship has addressed the involvement of blacks in the development of the American frontier.