and probably the most valuable of the group, shows what amendments have been proposed to each article and section of the constitution of 1851 and the disposition made thereof. The copious index is well prepared.

The documents and other materials found in this volume will not only be interesting and valuable to the students of the constitutional history of the State but to all those who are interested in revising the fundamental law of Indiana. It is to be hoped that many will give this book careful attention.

JOHN A. COFFIN.


Studies dealing with Kansas in her early, troubled period are of great interest to all readers of American history. The struggles over the Territory produced deeds of violence within her borders, stirring scenes and debates in the halls of Congress, and widespread political agitation, accompanied by a new alignment of voters, during the period of bitter controversy. The careers of many political leaders of the country were made, unmade or profoundly modified by the pent-up forces released by the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854.

Of the politicians who went to Kansas Territory, none became so forceful or so conspicuous as James H. Lane of Indiana. The late William E. Connelley, long a student of the "grim chieftain", wrote, in a brief introduction for Dr. Stephenson's monograph:

General James H. Lane was the outstanding figure in Kansas in the struggle to withstand slavery and found a free state. He possessed an overpowering personality, and was a man of many eccentricities. He was a genius, and the wavy line separating genius from insanity is almost imperceptible—is completely so at times. I think there is no doubt that Lane was at times of unbalanced mind . . . . But that did not hinder him in his enthusiasm for Kansas. Kansas was his burden—his song.

The study under review constitutes an eminently fair, highly informing and very readable biography of Lane, though doctoral dissertations are in bad repute as entertaining reading matter. Professional reviewers, who are enamored of the writings of the present prolific school of journalistic histor-
ians (whose narratives flow just as smoothly when they do not know the facts as when they do), handle the theses of young doctors with undue severity. Indeed, the prejudices of such reviewers in relation to studies “submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of doctor of philosophy” are so pronounced that there must be a reason for them. An observer is inclined to believe that the real difficulty lies in the fact that university professors attempt to train graduate students to weigh the evidence carefully and to write without bias, making the necessary qualifications. Should these offending experts in historical research be ostracised because they tend to make the reading of history less entertaining? Is there not yet some virtue in the ancient saying, “Know the truth and the truth will make you free”?

It is not the contention that doctoral dissertations furnish reading matter to the general public with which to while away happily occasional periods of leisure. They are not written for the entertainment of a wide circle of readers, and should not be judged as if so prepared. They should be justly evaluated, nevertheless, each according to its individual content and style, since in these respects, they differ much as do other types of historical writing.

Professor Stephenson’s work is not just a doctor’s thesis. Before submitting it for publication, he rounded it out by a preliminary survey of Lane’s Indiana career and by adding chapters at the end to complete the life of his subject. In the June, 1929, issue of the Indiana Magazine of History, appeared a paper under the caption, “The Transitional Period in the Career of General James H. Lane”, in which the transformation of the conservative Hoosier Democrat into the Kansas Radical is traced and interpreted. In the September, 1930, issue of the Magazine there was published a carefully-prepared study of Amos Lane, the father of Jim Lane. These papers supplement the longer monograph and place students of the later middle period of American history under heavy obligations to Dr. Stephenson.

In the “balanced biography of Lane”, as Mr. Connelley correctly characterized it, we have the career of this meteoric figure calmly and accurately traced. Growing to maturity in southeastern Indiana, Lane participated in the Mexican War, served as Lieutenant Governor of the State, and was a member of the national House of Representatives before going to
Kansas. He voted for the Kansas-Nebraska Bill in 1854, but was not a candidate for reelection. He started for Kansas Territory shortly after the end of his term in the House in March, 1855. Concerning his political life to this moment, the author concludes (p. 40) that “there is little in Lane's activities in Indiana which foreshadows his strenuous political career after 1855.”

For some time after reaching Kansas, Lane remained a Democrat, his chief ambition, seemingly being to build up and lead the party in the Territory. Caution marked his movements and utterances. It was the “Wakarusa War” of the fall of 1855 that transformed him. Dormant forces in his soul leaped to the surface, and he became a new man. His caution disappeared, and his mental balance seems to have been thrown somewhat out of adjustment from this time forward. His oratorical feats, his rash acts, his fiery zeal, his defiance of enemies, his inconsistencies and his power—these make the narrative of his life from 1855 to 1865 extremely interesting. Dr. Stephenson portrays General Lane in politics and in camp as he was. He does not condone his faults nor fail to give him credit when due.

The decade, 1855-1865, was, of course, the most important and stormy part of Lane's life, to this period nine of fifteen chapters are devoted. After following the activities of an extremist through ten strenuous years, one is startled to read: “On the problem of reconstruction, Lane deserted the radicals in Congress and reverted to conservatism”. Though he criticized some acts of President Johnson, he was by January, 1866, “intrenched with the administration,” his policy of reconstruction being in essential harmony with that of Johnson. The result of this position caused his condemnation to be almost unanimous in Kansas. In 1866, he bowed to the dictation of his erstwhile political friends among the Radicals and took no part in the campaign of that year in Kansas. Furthermore, during his last few weeks in the Senate, he voted with the Radical majority. He ended his spectacular and erratic career on July 11, 1866, dying from a self-inflicted bullet wound of July 1.

In a brief, final chapter, Professor Stephenson discusses the “Character and Leadership” of Lane and undertakes the difficult and hazardous task of contrasting him with his
powerful Kansas rival, Charles Robinson. In regard to the two men, the author says with keen insight:

In laying the foundations of the new commonwealth his [Lane's name] was inseparably associated with that of Charles Robinson. These two pioneers stood in sharp contrast. Lane was rash, hot-headed, daring, persistent, subtle, provocative, warm-hearted, magnetic. Robinson was cool, cautious, calculative, judicious, logical, shrewd, business-like. In method one was the antipode of the other, "for where Robinson would throw on cold water, Lane would apply the firebrand." Lane was an extremist, a radical, revolutionary spirit, the motive power of the free-state movement. Robinson was a conservative, the brake and balance wheel, the ballast which gave the movement equilibrium. Each possessed an insatiable ambition, and each recognized in the other a political rival. It would be useless to speculate upon the relative contributions of the two men. Indeed it was fortunate for the free-state cause that the party contained diversity of leadership.

W.O.L.

The Annual Report of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union for 1930 is a pamphlet of sixty-eight pages. For a copy of this report we are indebted to Mrs. Benjamin D. Walcott of Muncie, who is the Vice Regent for Indiana. The Association has a noble purpose: "Its object shall be to perpetuate the sacred memory of 'The Father of His Country' and, with loving hands, to guard and protect the hallowed spot where rest his mortal remains; to forever hold, manage and preserve the estate, properties and relics at Mount Vernon, belonging to the Association, and under proper regulations, open the same to the inspection of all who love the cause of Liberty, and revere the name of Washington."

The Archaeology of the Whitewater Valley is the title of a study of nearly two hundred pages by Frank M. Setzler. This monograph comprises the whole of Indiana History Bulletin, Volume VII, Number 12, issued in September, 1930, by the Indiana Historical Bureau. The study includes a short account of the early history of the Whitewater Valley, and devotes three pages to its geology and geography. The greater part of the monograph consists of archaeological surveys of Franklin, Fayette, Union and Wayne counties, each treated by townships. A survey of Washington township in Randolph county is also included. The text is illustrated by maps, and numerous drawings. Many fine photographs of mounds, relics, skeletons and other objects of interest to students of