

own familiarity with the history of those places. These are fair grounds, and moreover, Brown does periodically strike out to other parts of the nation.

One such reaching out is his examination of declared aspiration versus reality as respects slavery in the Northwest Territory. The ordinance creating the territory, of course, outlawed slavery from the very beginning, and indeed the constitutions of the various newly created states largely reflected this same policy. Still, slavery and indentured servitude continued to exist. Brown notes Indiana's very early abolition of both these evils, a contrast to Illinois, where notwithstanding legal declarations, indentures remained lawful into the 1840's.

In all, Brown adheres to his early declaration: "Most of all Americans

valued equal opportunities to acquire property, not equal distribution" (p. 24). He expresses disapproval of passing down property to one's children, marking it as a practice that promotes inequality. It is an unusual observation, given that American inheritance tax rates rank fourth or fifth highest in a world where a good many Socialist nations have no such tax at all. To be sure, Brown sees serious tension in the nation over "equal rights, privilege, and pursuit of inequality." He provides a solid work in support of that debate.

RANDALL T. SHEPARD served as Chief Justice of the Indiana Supreme Court, 1987–2012.

doi: 10.2979/indimagahist.114.1.07



Tariff Wars and the Politics of Jacksonian America

By William K. Bolt

(Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Press, 2017. Pp. xvi, 301. Tables, illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. Cloth, \$69.95; paper, \$34.95.)

Finally, scholars and students of Jacksonian America have a monograph that explains convincingly why the tariff was one of the most important issues shaping the course of American politics from the War of 1812 to the eve of the Civil War.

In covering the always volatile tariff issue from the 1812 Tariff to the Morrill Tariff of 1861—and including every tariff proposal, bill, and act in between—Bolt demonstrates beyond a doubt that few other issues, slavery included, dominated the

national political landscape during the antebellum period. The author equally shows how the tariff became intertwined with, often determining, other prominent issues of the day, from the Missouri Crisis to territorial expansion.

In this seminal study, the author addresses every necessary facet of the issue: statesmen's ever-shifting positions between protection and free trade and the reasons for such changing perspectives; the effect of the nation's changing demographic and socioeconomic composition on the tariff debates; the influence of partisan divide on the debates, and vice versa; the sundry arguments for and against a tariff; the varying approaches to the nature and operation of a tariff; the changing theories promoting or opposing the tariff; and the constitutional considerations of enacting a tariff.

Bolt also considers all the major players, including congressmen, presidents and cabinets, state legislatures, and, most importantly, the mass of the people. This last element provides one of the more important themes of the work: the tariff issue shaped and was shaped by the advance of democracy consuming the Age of Jackson. Indeed, the tariff was not determined by those at the upper echelons of the national government, but was more often driven by the people themselves; national statesmen simply reflected what their

constituents desired and what their shifting local economies demanded. Of course, one of the other obvious ramifications of the tariff debate was its sectional division between North and South, fomenting not only sectional animosity but outright disunion. Bolt masterfully considers the tariff divide according to the various geographic regions of the antebellum United States (New England, Middle States, South, and West, both northwest and southwest). The author in no way ignores the partisan nature of the tariff issue, revealing how debate actually shifted back and forth from the former to the latter as the decades progressed.

Bolt offers a *political* emphasis, and one mostly at the national level; the author does not delve into the vagaries of the prevailing theories of political economy and the major economic thinkers underlying the debate between protection and free trade. But this simply reveals how much more research needs to be conducted on the tariff issue, from its operation on the national economy and that of each state and economic interest, to the partisan debate and divide at the state level.

The work is clearly well-researched, with a solid balance of public and private sources, from congressional speeches and private correspondence, to newspapers, pamphlets, and journals, and from petitions of local citizens across the

country to the public addresses of conventions and other public gatherings. Numerous tables outlining congressional voting, broken down by the respective geographic regions of the nation and the various partisan divisions of the day, bolster the study. *Tariff Wars and the Politics of Jacksonian America* is well-written, maintains a smooth narrative, and

offers a consistent, concise analysis in every chapter; it should be on all standard reading lists of any course on Jacksonian America.

DR. WILLIAM S. BELKO is Executive Director of the Missouri Humanities Council

doi: 10.2979/indimagahist.114.1.08



Lincoln and the Democrats: The Politics of Opposition in the Civil War

By Mark E. Neely Jr.

(New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017. Pp. ix, 211. Notes, illustrations, index. Cloth, \$75.00; paper, \$24.99.)

Northern Democrats during the Civil War have been grossly understudied; therefore, we should caution against making broad generalizations about their character and motivations. Such is the general thrust of Mark E. Neely's slender but illuminating *Lincoln and the Democrats*, a book that draws on the author's vast knowledge of nineteenth-century politics, the Constitution, and Abraham Lincoln. If this is, as stated in the introduction, Neely's last book on the Civil War, he will have made another signal contribution to the field. By carefully pruning away questionable interpretive underbrush, he has well prepared the ground for future studies on this crucial topic.

Provoked by a series of unsatisfying historiographical tropes about Northern Democrats, the author uses his deep familiarity of the era to probe the veracity of assertions made by numerous historians. In the process, he topples several long-standing historical narratives, most notably assertions that Northern Democrats were politically treasonous and motivated by white supremacy. In crafting his counter-arguments, Neely is keen to make good use of the party's partisan press, citing lengthy runs of several papers from key states like New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

In fact, Northern Democrats, Neely argues, were firmly loyal to the Union and the Constitution, though