servative masses not yet willing to shoulder the financial burdens then borne by the nation. In '41 the Whig Governor, Chambers, succeeding Lucas, a Democrat, thought he would like to try it again and so in '42 another vote was taken, but not till after exhaustive debate in the press and on the stump. The work under review admirably epitomizes the pros and cons of this great campaign of education. It ended, as the first campaign ended, in the defeat of the measure. Still not satisfied, and relying on recent large additions to the population of the territory, Governor Chambers urged a resubmission of the question of a constitutional convention. In '44 the people again voted, but with a different result. This time, although there was little of the excitement of previous campaigns, there was a large majority for a convention.

The constitutional convention of 1844, with the campaigns which followed, was an epoch-maker well worth the extended space here given it.

The debates in the convention and the discussions on the stump, with the long contest over the western boundary of the proposed State,—whether it should be the artificial line proposed by Nicollet, or the natural boundary made by the Missouri river,—the defeat of the proposed constitution two years in succession, because of the injection of the boundary question into the issue, the transfer of the question to Congress, the final adoption of the constitution and admission of the State with its Missouri river boundary, all together constitute a valuable addition to the history of our State, now for the first time written as a whole.

The convention of 1857 and the constitution it submitted are described in the last two chapters of the book,—more briefly than the importance of the subject would seem to warrant; but, as the author says in his preface, an adequate discussion of the subject would have greatly transcended the limits prescribed for his work. It is to be hoped that, either in book form or in the form of collections published by the State Historical Society, Professor Shambaugh will at an early date present such an outline of the 1857 convention debates, and of the popular discussion following, as he has already given us in his "Fragments of the Debates of the Iowa Constitutional Conventions of 1844 and 1846."

State Library, Des Moines.


This volume is written from a French or rather Napoleonic point of view. The title is a misnomer; for the volume records the cession, not the purchase of Louisiana. "It came to us," says Dr. Hosmer, "through French statesmanship with little agency of our own." The author overrates the former, and depreciates the latter. The volume contains its own refutation in Livingston's "Memoir" to Talleyrand, Feb., 1803, which is given in an appendix.

Talleyrand was the Minister of Foreign Affairs. He had the ear and
the full confidence of Napoleon at that period. That year (1803) was the turning point in Napoleon's career. He was then "First Consul of the French Republic," and acted "in the name of the French people." The next year he was "Emperor of the French." Imperialism, Caesarism, however, was as dominant in Napoleon's mind in 1803, as in 1804. He took all matters into his own hands, and sold Louisiana on his own motion, without consent from the French Assembly, which the Constitution of the Republic made essential to a sale of any portion of French territory. With the same nonchalance he disregarded his pledge to Spain, not to sell Louisiana without Spain's consent. He acted from his own ambitious designs, of which his mind was then full, to invade England, and from an apprehension that some of the British war ships then in the Gulf of Mexico might seize New Orleans. "If I were in their place," said Napoleon to Marbois at the time, "I would not have waited." It was what Talleyrand called "the empire of circumstances" that controlled Napoleon. He sold what he was "certain to lose," as he said to his brother Lucien. He is not deserving of the honor of statesmanship which Dr. Hosmer awards him. In his political heaven "the star of destiny" was his only guide. There was never a greater victim of self-adulation, and the worship he paid himself he required of every one around him.

Jefferson and Livingston were men of a different make and nature. They were patriots of a single eye to the advantage of their country. They knew the importance of New Orleans to western commerce and trade. The free navigation of the Mississippi to its mouth had engaged the attention of Mr. Jefferson from the beginning of the Government, when he was Secretary of State under Washington. He had desired an exploration of the country west of the Mississippi to the Pacific, with a view to discover a route across the continent. Immediately the purchase was made, he sent Lewis and Clark up the Missouri, and also had it in mind to send exploring parties up Red river, up the Des Moines, and up the St. Peters, as he stated at the time to Capt. Lewis.

Livingston had been associated with Jefferson from the time they served together on the committee that drafted the Declaration of Independence in 1776. Their sympathies were in common; they had kindred views. Livingston possessed eminent sagacity. Early in his correspondence with Talleyrand he suggested a cession to the United States of the portion of Louisiana above the Arkansas river. After the ratification of the treaty by the Senate, President Jefferson in writing to Livingston, Nov. 4, 1803, called it "Your Treaty."