

cance of the Fugitive Slave Law in deepening sectional hatreds and justifying the southern revolt is too brief. This caveat, however, cannot detract from the value of Campbell's findings: this is a good piece of research which must alter our treatment of the Fugitive Slave Law.

*Upsala College, East Orange, N. J.*

Thomas M. Brown

*North of Reconstruction: Ohio Politics, 1865-1870.* By Felice A. Bonadio. (New York: New York University Press, 1970. Pp. xi, 204. Notes, index. \$8.95.)

Felice Bonadio's carefully documented monograph is an important addition both to Ohio history and to Reconstruction historiography. He finds that the issues which dominated northern political dialogue during the five years following the Civil War were the questions concerning southern reconstruction and Negro rights. By concluding that the direction of national politics and policies are often determined by local circumstances and issues, Bonadio follows the course set recently by Michael F. Holt's *Forging A Majority* (1969) and Paul Kleppner's *The Cross of Culture* (1970). Bonadio maintains that a true understanding of national history depends upon a knowledge of what was taking place at the state and community level.

The major theme developed in *North of Reconstruction* is that Ohio's political leaders were less concerned with a sincere discussion of the issues of southern reconstruction and Negro rights than historians have commonly assumed. As Holt found in Pittsburgh during the 1850s, Bonadio finds in Ohio in the 1860s that ideology had little place in the political struggle of the period. Bonadio questions the validity of the thesis of John and La Wanda Cox' study, *Politics, Principle and Prejudice* (1963). He agrees that the Democrats made political capital by playing on prejudice, but he sees little of idealism and principle in the action and measures of the Republican party, especially in Ohio.

Factional struggles plagued the Republican party in Ohio after the war, and the national issues were used for local advantages by factions within the party as a means of gaining control for selfish purposes or to split the party in order to create a new alignment which would make use of seceders from the Democratic party. Political bartering, jobbery, and plunder were the order of the day, and President Andrew Johnson played a less dominant role in distributing patronage in Ohio than historians have generally assumed.

On the one hand Bonadio challenges the theories of Charles A. Beard and Howard K. Beale, who argued that military reconstruction

was the result of a plot by northern businessmen eager to keep the South out of the Union until the business community had established an economic system which would benefit its own class. On the other hand he rejects the positions taken by Eric McKittrick and the Coxes that Johnson was to blame for the military reconstruction because of his selfish political objectives which alienated the Republican moderates and caused them to join the radicals in imposing a harsh settlement. "The program of military reconstruction," insists Bonadio, "was the expedient hit upon by the new Republicans . . . who wanted to preserve their party's national supremacy by keeping the South impotent as long as possible" (p. 52). In Ohio time was needed to secure party harmony and unity.

Bonadio's study is weakened by his failure to look beyond an analysis of the stated motives of political leaders. Since politicians talk political expediency and patronage to each other, by concentrating on an examination of intraparty correspondence Bonadio does not explore the mixed motives of politicians and does not reveal the influence of the larger constituency. Before the reconstruction issues can be pronounced a sham platform, there is a need for a comprehensive examination of other sources, such as religious, political, labor, and business records and journals.

The most significant contribution of Bonadio's study is the thorough and revealing analysis that he gives of the intraparty strife, third party tendencies, and lack of cohesion in the Republican party of Ohio during the 1860s.

*Morehead State University, Morehead, Ky.*

Victor B. Howard

*An Illinois Reader.* Edited by Clyde C. Walton. (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1970. Pp. xvii, 468. Illustration, maps, notes, index. \$7.50.)

Clyde C. Walton, former executive director of the Illinois State Historical Society, has compiled twenty-five essays for this sesqui-centennial volume on the history of his native state. The articles were taken exclusively from the periodical publications of the society and their impact is impressive. If anyone has forgotten the names of the distinguished scholars who were interested in the history of Illinois, the table of contents will serve as an excellent reminder. James Alton James, Benjamin P. Thomas, Ray A. Billington, Paul W. Gates, David Donald, and Allan Nevins head the imposing list.

Walton has organized *An Illinois Reader* along chronological lines. Five sections, each roughly eighty pages in length, treat sequentially with five periods: the prestatehood, the frontier state, the