

Johnson over Reconstruction policies. During this long career, Wade is viewed as a champion of Negro rights and a proponent of free homesteads and, in later years, of woman suffrage and favorable labor legislation. As a loyal Whig, he supported the bank and tariff policies of that party.

Wade's Civil War activities and the part he played in connection with the impeachment and trial of Andrew Johnson are treated with reasonable balance and objectivity; however, the controversial aspects of the 1850's and of Southern Reconstruction are handled in such a slanted fashion as to present the Ohio senator in quite too favorable a light.

The author, in pointing out that his subject advocated equality for the Negro, concedes that privately Wade expressed strong racial prejudice. Then Professor Trefousse states: "But it was precisely because Wade was prejudiced that he believed it imperative to guard against public expression of private irrational notions" (p. 312). Yet, in the very speech which the author cites at length (pp. 115-116) to show that Wade felt strongly concerning Negro rights, the senator, declining judgment as to whether the prejudice was right or wrong, stated also that Negroes were "despised by all, repudiated by all"; that they were "just as abhorrent to the southern states, and perhaps more so, than to the North"; that southern states were pressuring them northward, "and we object to them"; and that "it is perfectly impossible that these two races can inhabit the same place, and be prosperous and happy." The only reference that the author makes to the part quoted above is that the Ohio leader felt there was a serious race problem, and "in his reply to Toombs in March, 1860, he strongly advocated colonization again" (p. 118). Further evidence, not cited in this monograph, of Wade's public utterances disparaging the Negro may be found in a Senate speech in December, 1860, answering charges that the Republican party favored racial equality (*Cong. Globe*, 36th Cong., 2d Sess., pt. 1, p. 104).

The Ohio State University

Henry H. Simms

Turbulent Partnership: Missouri and the Union, 1861-1865. By William E. Parrish. (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1963. Pp. xvi, 242. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$5.50.)

The Civil War years were times of fundamental, indeed revolutionary, transformations in federal-state relationships; and nowhere was the nature and extent of these changes more apparent and troublesome than in a border state such as Missouri. Rejecting secession and fully aware that the economic future of the state depended upon adherence to the Union, the people of Missouri nevertheless showed a considerable sympathy for the social mores of the South and an even greater attachment to the division of power characteristic of the prewar republic.

In the years between 1861 and 1865 Missouri faced and solved, more or less successfully, the numerous problems created by secession

and civil war. The state refused to accept secession, but found it necessary to establish a provisional government after the regularly elected officials went over to the Confederacy. Such a *de facto* government, although recognized by the Lincoln administration, encountered many obstacles in its dealings with Washington and with the United States military commanders in Missouri. Additionally it was required to handle the complex issues of civil war within its borders, inadequate finances, emancipation, and the political threat posed by the Radicals who condemned the more conservative provisional government for its failure to keep abreast of the rapidly changing situation. In such circumstances the relationship between Missouri and the Union was indeed a turbulent partnership.

Professor Parrish has given us a remarkably complete and judicious account of this period in the history of Missouri and of the nation. His work is a calm, dispassionate appraisal of turbulent times and is based on sound research. Although his judgments are unusually balanced and objective they are on occasion overstated. For example the comment that the Missouri provisional government "constituted a unique experiment, the only government in the entire history of the United States established by a convention legally in existence for an entirely different reason" (p. 47) ignores completely the example of the federal Constitutional Convention. Professor Parrish's writing is less successful than his scholarship. His style is a straightforward but prosaic one, rarely relieved by liveliness and sparkle. These are but minor flaws, however, in a book with few faults.

It is also regrettable that so good a work is not provided with at least one serviceable map. The one reproduced as the frontispiece is almost totally useless.

Indiana University

John A. Jenkins