

great wave of German immigration had subsided. Ironically, by the time the author returns to his original starting point of American participation in the war, the Alliance has collapsed with hardly a push from governmental authorities. Its significant history had taken place earlier, which is a cautionary note against the common tendency to see the war as the decisive turning point in German-American history.

The book has the virtue of raising important questions in the reader's mind, even if it does not answer them. The leaders of the Alliance expended immense energies in trying to preserve German culture. But what did it consist of, and how did its nature shape their political efforts to preserve it? Clearly the culture as perceived by the leaders was not the same as that valued by their distressingly passive followers, much less by the intensely religious Germans of Missouri. Perhaps the nature of German culture, as valued by the highly educated, helps explain why members of the German professional elite, and not German professional politicians, were so prominent politically in this era. The nature and history of this elite in Missouri also begs for comparison to German leadership in earlier periods, such as the 1850s and 1860s, so that a larger picture of the political history of this ethnic group might come into focus. Detjen's book is important enough to help provide a basis for such comparisons.

*The Newberry Library, Chicago*

John B. Jentz

*The Origins of the Federal Republic: Jurisdictional Controversies in the United States, 1775-1787.* By Peter S. Onuf. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983. Pp. xvii, 284. Maps, notes, index. Clothbound, \$30.00; paperbound, \$12.95.)

In this book Peter S. Onuf explores the behavior and experience of states. His thesis is that "the origins of American federalism are . . . to be found in the history of the American state system" (p. xvii). To support his claim Onuf explores "American concepts of statehood and union" as revealed in "jurisdictional conflicts" especially between Pennsylvania, Virginia, New York, and Vermont. He then considers "the connections between jurisdictional issues and national constitutional reform" (p. xvi).

This argument places Onuf in strong contention with past scholarship. For Onuf the creation of the American union cannot be located simply in the "interests and ambitions" of the founding fathers (p. xvii). Likewise, republican ideology, especially as treated by Gordon Wood in his *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787* (1969), cannot explain fully the develop-

ment of the new American republic. Onuf believes that colonial fears of power encroaching upon liberty may explain the outbreak of the American Revolution but not its conclusion.

Onuf's work is careful, detailed, insightful, and particularly useful for students of state history who are interested in the definition, development, and behavior of a state. For instance, American states "did not act like true states" (p. 3) because their sovereignty—especially control of territorial jurisdiction—was best secured by increasing the powers of Congress. In short, "the states collectively guaranteed each state's particular claims" (p. 321) even though such recognition also diminished a state's theoretical independence. In addition, jurisdiction of a territory, as recognized by other states, did not always coincide with the wishes of the governed in that territory. Consequently, a Constitution protecting inhabitants increasingly seemed necessary as a means to protect the states themselves and even to permit them to function as "political communities" (p. 73).

Onuf concludes his argument by explaining the "miracle" of the Constitution. In his view "the Constitution would not have been possible without prior development of concepts of statehood and union" (p. 209). In addition, a new union, in the Federalist vision, could be "dynamic" in expanding through the creation of new states. Paradoxically, too, the Constitution emerged in part out of sectional conflict because a division of larger states could increase a section's voting power.

Onuf's work is at its best in treating state adjudication problems and their resolution. He thoughtfully examines an abundance of sources to infer the nature of political community both between and within states. In contrast, he fails to show how states came to a recognition that union, especially the Constitution, would serve sectional interests. The answer to that question might explain much about the sectional sources of disunion only a few decades later.

*Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.*

Randall Shrock

*Joseph Smith and the Beginnings of Mormonism.* By Richard L. Bushman. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984. Pp. 262. Illustration, maps, note on sources and authorities, notes, index. \$17.95.)

*Mormon Enigma: Emma Hale Smith, Prophet's Wife, "Elect Lady," Polygamy's Foe, 1804-1879.* By Linda King Newell and Valeen Tippetts Avery. (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1984. Pp. xiii, 394. Charts, illustrations, notes, selected bibliography, index. \$19.95.)

Both of these meticulously researched biographies make valuable contributions to the study of the early history of the