that policy was made as a result of a belief in the equality of all men and their property (p. 111). To his credit Scheiber frequently recognizes such a distinction, but can one legitimately define an “egalitarian” society as one in which “expectant capitalists” compete in a “desperate struggle” (p. 13)?

The most substantial contributions are contained in the latter two thirds of the book. In part two, which measures the direction and extent of economic change during the canal era, Scheiber significantly revises the so-called “second phase” (1840-1850) of the transportation revolution. State rate making authority caused significant alterations in commercial traffic patterns in the 1840s, prior to railroad competition of the fifties.

A shift from public to private transportation construction and the economic impact of the railroad are analyzed in the final section. Unlike decisions of the 1820s and 1830s, later policy makers turned away from public enterprise as the popular conception of the “commonwealth” declined. Instead private railroading was actively encouraged. This development clearly documents a shifting definition of the \textit{laissez faire} state prior to the Civil War.

In this otherwise substantial and thoroughly researched volume there are some unfortunate omissions and errors. It would have been helpful to add county boundaries to the map of proposed improvements on page 96. Table 8.2 (p. 195) purports to show commodity trade at Portsmouth from 1833 to 1851 but includes data only from 1836. Table 8.5 (p. 204) is similarly incomplete. Perhaps the most unforgivable publishing error is the reference to Stanley Elkins as Saul Elkins (p. 32).

\textit{Humboldt State College, Arcata, Calif.} \hspace{1cm} Stephen C. Fox


Dr. Daniel Drake has been frequently compared with Benjamin Franklin, although on a reduced scale, but the editors here make clear that actually Drake molded himself after two of his mentors: Benjamin Rush and Benjamin Smith Barton. Though Rush was a rationalist and speculative thinker, which Drake was not, Drake greatly admired him as a mover and shaker in his profession. Barton was an empiricist who emphasized the need for careful observation as the first step in understanding nature’s laws and an orderly uni-
verse. Drake could understand that, and it appealed to him because at heart he was a Baconian. The editors regard Drake as “a kind of representative figure struggling to resolve for himself . . . the tensions which dominated American intellectual life during the first half of the nineteenth century” (p. xii). Rationalism was failing, idealism was faltering, and Drake “opted for a kind of Baconian empiricism as a replacement” (p. xii).

Penetrating as their analysis is, the editors have not attempted a biography, but only an introduction to Drake’s ideas on science and society to show the possibilities and limitations of his method. Seventeen of Drake’s essays in whole or in part are reprinted in this book, plus a chunk of his major book, and each has its own editorial preface. Drake seemed to believe that scientific observation was the basis for social order: man must seek his own ends within the context of this knowledge, or he would become the slave of his environment. Drake preferred to generalize from observation rather than to rationalize from abstract principles.

Despite his wide interests and promotional ability (in the best sense of the phrase) Drake’s resemblance to Franklin was never apt because he lacked Franklin’s most conspicuous quality—the ability to get along with people. Shapiro and Miller almost ignore this fatal flaw in Drake. They do not mention it in their perceptive essays, but it crops up in their brief introductions and can be seen indirectly in the short chronology of his activities. Drake was at his best as a writer and editor where he could exhort others to join organizations and movements of reform and local improvement. He became chauvinistic about the West and determined that rather than allow it to be pulled in the direction of either New York or New Orleans it should develop its own culture and hold East and South together. He thus played a commendable role in starting or strengthening local institutions, for which the editors declare he had a mania.

His crowning achievement in writing, he thought, was his \textit{Systematic Treatise, Historical, Etiological, and Practical, on the Principal Diseases of the Interior Valley of North America} (1850) which the editors point out was simply a systematic ordering of the data he had gathered. When it came to examining the etiology of diseases in volume two, which had little to do with the environment in volume one, Drake lacked the imagination to advance hypotheses and so volume two was never completed.

Drake has been the subject of three biographies, but never before has he received such sophisticated intellectual treatment. If he now has little standing among physicians, he does among book collectors, who prize his early accounts of Cincinnati and the Ohio Valley as
source material. The editors have included a bibliography invaluable to the collector, but no index.

Howard H. Peckham

William L. Clements Library,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor


Professor Rice has written an excellent socio-economic history of West Virginia for the years 1730 to 1830. His emphasis is on people and the difficulties involved in establishing institutions in a frontier community. Special attention is given to such topics as the impact of the Alleghenies’ rugged terrain on migration and settlement patterns, frontier life, the role of speculators and absentee landowners in the development of the region, and the exploitative and wasteful practices of frontiersmen. He also considers in some detail the problem of sectionalism within Virginia, particularly the bases of the antagonism between east and west.

An interesting and significant aspect of the book is the attempt to relate West Virginia’s frontier experience to current problems in Appalachia. Rice contends that the rugged terrain of the Allegheny highlands isolated the region and prolonged settlement. Consequently, the development of West Virginia was arrested and the transition from the “pioneer period” to “settled rurality” was almost imperceptible. He suggests, for example, that during the frontier period, “absentee ownership of much of [the] land and resources was fastened upon the state’s people, and the portents of waste and exploitation were clearly discernible” (p. xi). Both are still problems in Appalachia—largely because of the prolonged frontier period.

The arguments presented by Rice are more convincing when he deals with economic questions than when he discusses social and political issues. West Virginia’s frontier experience, for instance, may have prevented widespread intolerance among pioneer churches. Other factors, however, were seemingly more important in the results of the 1960 Democratic presidential primary in West Virginia than this “tradition of religious freedom and toleration” (p. 378). The same difficulty exists in attempting to draw parallels between the problems in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries which retarded educational development. The inability to solve these problems does not necessarily mean they were the same.

The discussion of sectionalism is thorough and well documented for the period of the study. Rice considers at length eastern Vir-