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izations of hapless Indian victims succumbing to the white man's advancing frontier.

The Osages followed a complex cultural tradition for centuries before non-Indians came to their land. They arranged themselves in five villages originally and maintained five band identities when the old living patterns splintered into multiple towns. Each band maintained its own political structure, with twenty-four clans contributing to decision making and ceremonial matters. Tribally, the people were divided into moieties, the Tzi-zhu and Hon-ga, from which dual leaders were chosen for each band. Tribal society was decidedly undemocratic, with important functions the province of specific clans, although the elaborate social and political structure did not possess much in the way of coercive power, a condition that Europeans consistently refused to believe based on their own more monolithic national governments. Osage economic expansion into the fur and slave trades, a means of establishing and keeping hegemonic control of their land, eventually created political divisions demanding compromises that ultimately proved inadequate to maintain tribal integrity, and unity was irrevocably lost.

Rollings carefully and lucidly balances his narrative with close attention to internal issues and external affairs. General readers should find his prose easygoing, and scholars will appreciate the subtleties of his analysis. The only cavils likely from either group are the paucity of illustrations (four) and maps (one) and an eccentrically arranged bibliography that fails to separate primary and secondary sources.


REVIEWED BY JOHN C. HUDSON, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Anyone who enjoyed Atlantic America, 1492–1800, the first volume of geographer Donald Meinig's The Shaping of America, surely will not be disappointed with this second installment. With one well-received volume already behind him, the brush strokes on this great canvas he has chosen to paint have only grown bolder and more confident. The project itself has expanded, with the third volume (1850–1915) listed in preparation and a fourth (1915–1992) projected. Meinig has undertaken more than a geographer's task of interpreting history; he has recast the familiar time and place of historical events into a geo-
graphical framework that offers a truly new perspective on the present as well as the past.

In a striking four-page tableaux, Meinig portrays and contrasts the views of regional development implicit in the Turnerian “savagery-to-civilization” transition, the North American traditional system, and of changing linkages that would be expected in what he terms a “modern world system” view. Beyond being typically Meinigian, the successive frames that show transitions in settlement pattern, economy, and society reveal the author’s strong commitment to writing a regional geography that focuses more on generic processes than on particular facts. Meinig is the undisputed dean of American historical geographers, but this book, typical of his innovative thinking, reads more as an argument in favor of space and place than as an endorsement of historical geography for its own sake.

As an example of his method, Meinig devotes roughly 15 percent of the book to the Civil War and its antecedent causes, less space than a historian would devote to the major event of the period under study but a proportion that is considerably magnified when the graphics are considered as well. Although slavery figures prominently in the ensuing discussion of secession and war, as it must, Meinig cautions against determinism, geographical or otherwise. He identifies “a cluster of geographic conditions” that impinged on the crisis. Most indicative, perhaps, is his assertion that the “North and the South were not primary regions of the United States.” Abolitionists were mainly Yankees and Quakers, and they did not dominate the entire North; neither did South Carolina, the most important locus of slavery and secession, typify the South. The root differences lay in the divergence between industrial, entrepreneurial, materialistic Yankees and agrarian, paternal, conservative Cavaliers; these differences were magnified into caricatures in the clash of ideologies that followed.

In one of the best maps of mid-nineteenth-century regional cultures I have ever seen (488), Meinig shows the northern “Yankee Land,” southern “Secession Land,” and, most importantly, the much larger and equally populous zone extending from Pennsylvania to Iowa to Arkansas, where Copperheads, pockets of slavery, and support for or opposition to Abraham Lincoln’s 1860 presidential candidacy are linked in a manner that reflects the role of previous migration patterns, good farmland versus poor, and the northern limits of planter culture. Taken together, these patterns explain a good deal about the complex sectional geography of that period. The map proves the relevance of Meinig’s “cluster of geographic conditions,” and it is far more illuminating than the proverbial “thousand words” of text.
Meinig's dominant theme is the expansion of the United States within what he terms the “frame” offered by the North American continent. As in volume one, he details the conflicts that thereby resulted, not only in the expansion of the national space we know today but also at the extremities, as in our dealings with Mexico, Canada, Cuba, and the West Indies, where American ambitions were more than occasionally focused. Questions about the U.S.-Mexican border were particularly complex. In yet another intriguing map (“The View from Washington: ‘How Much of Mexico Should We Take?’”), Meinig swaps latitude and longitude to show the vast array of possible borders, ranging from the southern limit of Oregon to a line just north of Mexico City.

Well within this frame of national aspirations were the four familiar regional cultures (New England, Midlands, Virginia, and Cotton Belt/South Carolina), to each of which he appends the suffix Extended to signify their westward expansion. Strangely, in this case he omits cartographic proof that the cultures were separate or that their extensions mattered, a potential problem for interpreting regions such as the Middle West, given the importance he grants to internal cultural divisions. One can only wait for volume three to learn the answer.


REVIEWED BY WENDY HAMAND VENET, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

In his brief foreword to Divided Houses, James M. McPherson writes that the book “marks the full coming of age of social history for the Civil War era” (xvii). Complaining that military historians of the war have ignored the home front and that social historians are equally culpable for having disregarded military issues, McPherson correctly views this volume as an important bridge that can help create a broader understanding of the war. Its eighteen essays offer a wide variety of topics, encompassing military as well as nonmilitary issues, all with gender as their central focus.

Divided into five sections, the book includes two overview essays — “The Civil War as a Crisis in Gender” and “The Politics of Yeomen Households” — then groups the remaining sixteen articles under the general categories: “Men at War,” “Women at War,” “The Southern Homefront,” and “The Northern Homefront.” Each section includes a brief introduction providing background and tying together the