

eye on the end he wished to achieve, but was flexible in reaching that end.

One of the persistent and vexing controversies surrounding Lincoln as Commander in Chief was his willingness to go beyond the law. Historians differ in their evaluations of Lincoln's wartime policies on civil liberties. McPherson, to this reviewer, skates rather quickly and somewhat superficially over this controversy. He seems a bit too sanguine about Lincoln's legal violations, and while "necessity" is a powerful argument in Lincoln's favor, a more thorough examination, incorporating a stronger stand by McPherson one way or the other, would have been useful. On this McPherson instead steps gingerly, avoiding the hard decisions, which is disappointing; the way Americans deal with this controversy had implications not only in Lincoln's age, but also our own.

McPherson is an excellent storyteller with a great story to tell. The reader comes away once again amazed with the skill and acumen of Lincoln the man and the leader. This

book covers a remarkable man at a remarkable turning point in United States history, and James McPherson once again establishes himself as one of our more insightful Lincoln scholars.

MICHAEL A. GENOVESE currently holds the Loyola Chair of Leadership, is Professor of Political Science, and Director of the Institute for Leadership Studies at Loyola Marymount University. Professor Genovese has written seventeen books, including *The Paradoxes of the American Presidency* [with Thomas E. Cronin] (2004); *The Power of the American Presidency: 1789-2000*, (2000); *The Presidency and the Challenge of Democracy* [with Lori Cox Han] (2007); *The Encyclopedia of the American Presidency* (2004); and *The Presidency and the Law: The Clinton Legacy*, [with David Gray Adler] (2002). Professor Genovese appears frequently as a political commentator on local and national television and is associate editor of the journal, *White House Studies*.



### *Lincoln's Censor*

*Milo Hascall and the Freedom of the Press in Civil War Indiana*

By David W. Bulla

(West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 2008. Pp. xviii, 340. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$39.95.)

Historically, wartime has been the most dangerous time for free speech in American history. That has been true in virtually every war the country has fought since the Revolution,

but the suppression of speech during the Civil War was perhaps the most bleakly paradoxical occasion. In the country's bloodiest war, a war fought to liberate one group of Americans

from the chains of slavery, the civil liberties of a different group were stomped on, shredded, and snuffed out by a government led by “the Great Emancipator.” The irony of this is not lost on Iowa State University journalism professor David W. Bulla in this new study of military censorship in Civil War-era Indiana.

Bulla’s work follows a recent line of scholarship examining how civil liberties fared in both the North and the South from 1861 to 1865. One of the more prominent authors in this area is Mark Neely. In another ironic turn, both Bulla and Neely have found that the Confederate press faced far less interference from either military or other government sources. The military suppression that Bulla specifically addresses was more common in both the South and the North than was prior restraint by either of the other branches of government.

To examine the issue of press suppression by military officials in the North, Bulla turns his spotlight on the experiences of journalists in one mid-western state during the spring of 1863. The tormentor in this case was Milo S. Hascall, a Union general in command of the District of Indiana.

For the most part, when a Civil War general silenced a journalist, he did so to protect military operations. Hascall’s reasoning was a bit different, according to Bulla. Hascall had little cause to worry about harm to military operations from anything Indiana newspapers might publish; Indiana papers were far from the

front, and by the time they reached the field, their news would be too old to matter.

According to Bulla, Hascall’s motivation was instead partisan politics. Hascall was not so much a military tyrant as he was a loyal general and Republican who believed journalistic dissent could undermine the Lincoln administration and therefore should be stopped. Hascall, however, was clever. He was selective about which Democratic newspapers he suppressed. He went after any he was sure he could intimidate, such as papers from the smaller towns where Republicans held the leading political offices, and where few would be few willing to step forward to defend Democratic editors.

Bulla builds his case methodically by examining Hascall’s censorship efforts against the backdrop of theoretical and historical perspectives on American press freedom, including a section in his conclusion that compares censorship during the Civil War to censorship during Iraq war. These chapters could have benefited from a bit of deft editing by the publisher, for while they cover important ground that helps contextualize Bulla’s arguments, they are almost overly ambitious in scope.

Bulla’s case study is an important work. It offers a specific example that complements Neely’s work, and, more importantly, it also offers a superb example of how political dissent on the local level was dealt with in the guise of military administration. Fur-

ther, the book is a good read for anyone interested in the political history of Indiana and in the attitudes citizens held regarding the pressing political issues of their day: emancipation and Union. Bulla writes with the authority of one who knows his subject well, as indeed he does. Press suppression in the North during the Civil War has been Bulla's primary interest since his days as a graduate student, and he is presently expanding his work to consider other mid-western states. This first book puts him well on the road to completing this important work on the complex

issue of how a country at war over slavery could justify suppression of one of the most important groups in any society, the press.

DEBRA REDDIN VAN TUYLL is a professor of communications at Augusta State University. She is author of *The Southern Press in the Civil War* (2005) and co-editor of *The Civil War and the Press* (2000). Her third book, *Knights of the Quill: Reassessing Confederate Correspondents and Their Civil War Reporting*, will be forthcoming in 2010.



*Man of Douglas, Man of Lincoln*  
*The Political Odyssey of James Henry Lane*

By Ian Michael Spurgeon

(Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008. Pp. x, 291. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$42.50.)

Ian Michael Spurgeon has written an intriguing and thoroughly researched biography of controversial nineteenth-century American politician James Henry Lane. During his colorful public career, Lane was a Mexican War colonel, a Democratic congressman from Indiana, and a free state advocate and Republican senator from Kansas. Due to the unique trajectory of Lane's career, Spurgeon argues here that contemporaries and historians alike have, however, consistently mischaracterized Lane as volatile, irrational, unprincipled, and opportunistic. Spurgeon contends instead that Lane's "political odyssey" was rational and consistent with his

overall and lifelong ideological commitment to popular sovereignty, white supremacy, and unionism. By effectively utilizing Lane's personal correspondence and speeches as well as relevant newspaper accounts concerning Lane, Spurgeon analyzes Lane's personal tragedies and political exploits within the context of American sectionalism.

Spurgeon indicates that Lane's political journey parallels the experiences of other Americans navigating through the politically turbulent antebellum period. As an example, Spurgeon examines Lane's endorsement of the 1854 Kansas-Nebraska Act along with his ardent support of Stephen