encouraged a greater reliance on hierarchical solutions and appeals to Roman authority. Likewise, despite anxieties about appearing foreign, the institutional weakness of Catholicism in the early republic encouraged priests (often European-born) to look to Europe for models. This theme is most promisingly spelled out in the chapter on the sensory world of Catholicism. Priests returned to familiar, European forms to create sacred spaces in a Protestant world, importing holy oils, sacred vessels, linens, and artwork that both amazed and horrified Protestant observers. Departing from historians who have emphasized the Americanization of Catholicism in the early republic, Dichtl cogently argues that circumstances on the American frontier—and clergy’s awareness of Protestant opinion—ironically fostered clerical reliance on European authority, rituals, and practices. One might wonder how uniquely western this process really was; John T. McGreevy’s *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History* (New York, 2003) shows that a transnational Catholic revival both strengthened ties between Rome and an increasingly conservative clergy and encouraged Catholics to emphasize Catholic distinctiveness. Yet Dichtl’s work helps explain how, precisely, that shift occurred.

Dichtl, moreover, demonstrates the early fluidity of Catholic-Protestant relations (although he relies heavily on Catholic sources, primarily from priests). Initially, clergy looked west with nervous optimism. Protestant landowners welcomed Catholic clergy, partly in hopes that their presence would attract Catholic buyers and boost land values; Protestants donated land and money to build Catholic churches, observed Catholic rituals, married Catholics, and sent children to Catholic schools. Priests, in turn, struggled to define their relations with Protestants: Should they sanction those mixed marriages, or allow Protestants to hold services in Catholic churches? The early fluidity congealed into rigid sectarian divisions by the late 1820s, as Catholics could boast of an increasingly strong institutional presence in the West. Catholics and Protestants emphasized their points of difference, and they engaged in heated apologetic contests. Dichtl’s focus on the early republic—a curiously neglected period in the historiography of Protestant-Catholic relations—is one of the most important contributions of the book. Shifting attention away from the antebellum period—and its lurid sex tales and convent burnings—reveals the complexity of those relations, which cannot be reduced to mere anti-Catholicism (or anti-Protestantism). Instead, Dichtl’s work reveals a world of cooperation, however tentative and temporary, and its gradual disappearance.
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John Craig Hammond offers an excellent, detailed study of the slavery expansion issue in the years before the controversy over the admission of Missouri to the Union. Hammond claims that Congress’s ban on slavery in the Northwest Ordinance and its exemption of the Southwest Territory from that ban established the right of Congress to “allow or prohibit the expansion of
slavery in federal territories” (p. 2). However, Hammond demonstrates that by 1819 the national government had effectively abdicated these powers, as slavery spread across the West and southerners insisted that Congress had no right to legislate on the fate of slavery in any of the territories.

In the aftermath of the American Revolution, slavery appeared to be on the defensive with the institution abolished in the North, the international slave trade nearing prohibition, southern planters manumitting their slaves, and even Kentuckians debating an end to human bondage. But in the short span of thirty years, what had been thought to be an assured “empire for liberty” in the West was transformed into an “empire for slavery” by the spread of an aggressively expansive institution (p. 3). Hammond asks why this dramatic reversal occurred. Unlike historians who have focused on the qualified antislavery positions of the Founders to explain this turn of events, Hammond finds the answer in the power of western settlers to determine the destiny of the peculiar institution in their own region.

Hammond explains that the United States in its early years was a weak and overextended nation that could not be confident of the loyalty of those living on its western periphery. Settlers’ threats to leave the Union had to be taken seriously, and their demands had to be respected. Time and again western settlers were able to use this power to ensure the continuation of slavery. The result was a slave empire the Founders had never envisaged.

Hammond shows that in Tennessee slaves were present in such large numbers that the national government could not deny a place for the institution there. In Mississippi Territory, Natchez settlers, who were threatening secession, demanded and received federal acquiescence to slavery. The federal government initially placed restrictions on slavery in Louisiana, but there, too, as Hammond convincingly demonstrates, threats of secession caused Congress to let those restrictions lapse. Finally, Missourians viewed themselves as part of the southwestern slaveholding community and so were unwilling to see slavery prohibited.

The story in the Old Northwest was different. The congressional ban on slavery was maintained there, but the source of this prohibition was the same as the reason for slavery’s establishment in the Southwest: local settlers determined the outcome. In Ohio, competitive politics focused the citizenry on the slavery issue, and that resulted in slavery’s exclusion. Territorial leaders, including William Henry Harrison, initially attempted to gain federal support for slavery in Indiana and Illinois. But there, too, the people—with the aid of a Congress now more confident of its authority in the territories—rejected such efforts. “The Northwest Ordinance of 1787,” Hammond concludes, “did not itself produce the ‘free Northwest’”; the area’s inhabitants did (p. 125).

Hammond argues that following the War of 1812, with nationalism on the rise, many in Congress were at last ready to challenge the institution of slavery in the West, as they would during the Missouri crisis. But by then, southerners were insisting that slavery could not be legally excluded from any territory. The nation would no longer be divided between East and West. North-South conflicts would now control events. Hammond has expertly helped us understand how this sectional division came into being.
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