

1825. His purpose is to analyze the characteristics of the area and to give an account of the political battles waged there. Drawing principally from the local newspapers for his sources, he describes the minutiae of party alignments and instrumentalities in an informative though ponderous manner. The wing of the Republican party favoring the "delegate" or "caucus" system, as opposed to the "Independent Republicans" (including some unreconstructed Federalists), contributed to the evolution of the "convention" device of nominating candidates and drafting platforms by the middle 1820's. Local "committees of vigilance" and "committees of correspondence" carried on the organizational work of directing campaigns. Mr. Kehl transmits to the reader his thorough familiarity with these conditions, especially with the role of the press. He concludes with a treatment of the elections in western Pennsylvania and demonstrates that area's overwhelming support of Andrew Jackson in 1824.

The author disagrees with Frederick Jackson Turner that the Ohio Valley had essentially uniform characteristics. He finds western Pennsylvania to be a region by itself with its own traits. It was, he asserts, "Western in attitude, but had to depend upon a legislature at Harrisburg that was largely eastern in sympathy" (p. 12). Thus, unlike Ohio, Pennsylvania did not offer an "economic sanctuary" for debtors. In several respects, says Mr. Kehl, state lines and the Alleghenies marked off a distinctive region with a consequently unique pattern of habits and attitudes. The thesis may be sound as applied to this decade of American history, but it would be tenuous if extended to earlier or later years.

Indiana University

Maurice G. Baxter

Frontier Politics and the Sectional Conflict: The Pacific Northwest on the Eve of the Civil War. By Robert W. Johannsen. (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1955. Pp. xiii, 240. Illustrations, map, bibliography, and index. \$5.00.)

One of the less-well tilled fields in the history of American democracy is the evolution of self-government in the territories. Because of special circumstances, the experience in Kansas has been frequently referred to, but until recently

very little attention has been given to that phase of history elsewhere. Fortunately, in the last few years, belated study has been given to these ground-roots activities by men such as R. Carlyle Buley, Paul W. Gates, James C. Malin, Earl Pomeroy, and others. Now another scholar is turning his attention to these neglected historical acres with excellent results.

The Pacific Northwest in the years of its origins was far distant from the population mass of the nation and enjoyed only the most rudimentary means of communication with the rest of the republic. It grew up in almost complete isolation. However, its first citizens in most instances came from the various states in the Union, and the majority of them undoubtedly brought with them habits and traditions of political behavior including membership in one or another of the national parties. As they labored to create the bodies politic of Oregon and Washington, they made use of what they brought with them. Their most dominant motivations, however, which produced leadership were the twin desires to rule and to develop. Their task was complicated by the fact that while they could choose their legislatures, and thus make their laws through their own representatives, and could send a spokesman to Congress, they must tolerate executive and judicial appointments by the Federal government. This division of authority complicated the task and made these isolated pioneers particularly sensitive on the question of self-government.

This issue of self-government dominated in the Northwest even in the tense days of the sectional conflict that was leading to bloodshed during the 1850's. Johannsen traces the local struggles among contending factions as they sought for advantage and shows how they made use of the sectional issues for their local ends in these various contests. The question of slavery by the very nature of the physiographical situation could only be academic, but the problem of territorial self-government raised by the Kansas-Nebraska struggle was not. An intricate pattern of the real and the artificial as elements in political strategy is traced as fully as the paucity and specialized character of the evidence will permit. Unfortunately, this evidence seems to be almost wholly the writings of political journalists, leaders and workers, so it is of necessity incomplete, slanted, and imperceptive. But between

the lines one senses something of the social process which shaped these political behavior patterns and institutions. The author is to be commended for this careful and skillful handling of unsatisfactory and partial evidence. It is to be hoped that he will continue to till this neglected field, for his insights are bound to be increasingly significant. He grasps the fact of greatest significance, namely, the self-contained and locally dominated nature of the territorial political experience.

University of Pennsylvania

Roy F. Nichols

The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States.

By Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955. Pp. xvi, 527. Index. \$5.50.)

Academic Freedom in Our Time. By Robert M. MacIver. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955. Pp. xiv, 329. Introduction, select bibliography, and index. \$4.00.)

Unfortunately, at the present time academic freedom would appear to be one of the poor relations among the various freedoms. For so far as the general public is concerned, any such thing as a claim to academic freedom leaves most people indifferent or, if not indifferent, then mistrustful or even hostile. Worse still, the indifference or mistrust or hostility seems to be compounded of serious misconceptions and misinformation about the nature and purpose of academic freedom.

In the hope of at least partially correcting this situation, these two books were written. More specifically they were written at the behest of the American Academic Freedom Project—a project certainly with a very high sounding title, and consisting of an executive committee and panel of advisers drawn from some of the country's most distinguished educators and men of affairs. Actually, the project would seem to be largely a Columbia University affair. Established as a result of the "initiative and generosity" of Louis M. Rabinowitz, it appears to have been directed and executed by Columbia professors and published by the Columbia University Press. As stated in the foreword, "The study was planned to consist of two parts, one a historical survey of