

which are unpublished manuscripts. His citations and explanatory notes, all conveniently footnoted on each page, will engross the reader almost as much as the main narrative. The maps and illustrations are of high quality and expertly complement the text. The book's appendix provides an excellent summary of the various treaties negotiated by the federal government with the Anishinaabeg. Certainly, Witgen's work is of great utility for all students of Native-White relations in the Midwest.

The lands of present-day Iowa are largely absent; nevertheless, scholars interested in the history of Iowa will find the framework Witgen employs and the concepts he introduces, particularly the political economy of plunder, of great utility in their research. Even a casual understanding of the various treaties made with the Sauks, Meskwakis, Iowas, and Dakotas of present-day Iowa indicate the political economy of plunder characterized the process of treaty making farther west across the Mississippi River. Witgen has given scholars of Native-White relations in Iowa a powerful interpretive framework by which to investigate this phenomenon.

The Paradox of Power: Statebuilding in America, 1754–1920, by Ballard C. Campbell. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2021. vii, 254 pp. Appendix, notes, index. \$34.95 paperback.

Reviewer John Reda is Associate Professor of History at Illinois State University. He specializes in colonial, revolutionary, and early national American history and is the author of *From Furs to Farms: The Transformation of the Mississippi Valley, 1762–1825* (2016).

The once vigorous historiographical debate over whether there was truly a “state” in America before the twentieth century has long since become a rout. In the past generation numerous historians have argued persuasively for a vigorous nineteenth-century state that grew slowly but steadily until the Civil War when its size and scope began a more rapid expansion. Ballard C. Campbell, professor emeritus of history and public policy at Northeastern University, agrees that there was a state and aims to address what he sees as the need to explain the process by which a large American state developed in what he calls the “long nineteenth century” extending from 1754 to 1920. Campbell's explanation is built around his introduction of state and local governments that have largely been ignored in the recent literature. His central claim is that statebuilding in America prior to 1920 was often driven by responses to various challenges posed by geography, population growth, economic expansion, war, and the development of civic identity (nationalism).

This approach has the virtue of directly addressing two of the central—and related—paradoxes of American history: how did a country

born denouncing central authority become one of the most powerful central states in the world in little more than a century? And how did that same country's avowed small-military tradition allow it to repeatedly use coercive force against not only its enemies but also its own population? Campbell sees the answer to both in the idea of a reactive state with sovereignty spread over several levels, able to maintain its essential anti-government, anti-military ideology while steadily expanding its capacity to meet the needs of its citizenry. So as the United States expanded geographically it needed a military capable of displacing Native Americans and departments to survey and sell the lands so acquired. As it grappled with the needs of an exploding population settling in ever-larger urban areas, the nation needed to provide those cities with schools, clean water, and police and fire services. The stress of repeated financial panics in 1819, 1837, 1857, 1873, 1893, and 1907 placed ever-greater demands on state, local, and federal governments to meet the needs of its people, as did wars in 1812, 1846, 1898, and 1917. In all cases "power was divided and distributed functionally and geographically in an arrangement that obscured the actual aggregate application of sovereign authority" (121).

One of the chief virtues of Campbell's approach is his effective use of maps, tables, and an appendix. The reader is frequently struck by the appearance of "facts & figures" not previously encountered. These serve to support a subtle but effective argument: while politicians continued to employ small government or even anti-government rhetoric as the United States grew into a global power, voters accepted or ignored the growing reach of the hundreds of local and state governments that joined the federal government in attempting to solve the nation's problems. Campbell sees this as one of the reasons the United States did not experience a violent revolution or coup in the tumultuous era between the Civil War and WWI. A public ever ready to decry government corruption or interference remained united "by popular consent for its democratic principles as articulated by the core cultural establishment, the competitive arrangement of its party system, and leaders' willingness to force compliance from social and political deviants" (187).

By the twentieth century, Americans, in Campbell's view, could simultaneously express disgust at government corruption at all levels without rejecting the steady expansion of local, state, and federal agencies that reached into people's lives at every turn. By this point, the process was well established. Government grew at all levels but within a framework of problem solving for the American people. Thus, by the time WWI was raging in Europe, Woodrow Wilson could run for reelection in 1916 behind claims of having kept the country out of war and

then reverse course within a year by framing Germany as a threat to democracy—as a problem for Americans to be solved by its government’s deployment of military power.

The Paradox of Power will hopefully find a readership among all those studying the growth of American government as more than a story of its presidents, Congress, and the large events they navigated, but as a story best viewed from the local and state as well as the federal levels.

The Colored Conventions Movement: Black Organizing in the Nineteenth Century, edited by Jim Casey, P. Gabrielle Foreman, and Sarah Lynn Patterson. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2021. Images, charts, notes, digital companions. 363 pp. \$29.95 paperback.

Reviewer Mila Kaut is a Ph.D. student in history at Northwestern University and a co-organizer of the Iowa Colored Conventions Digital Project. Her current research examines the genealogical and historical work of white women’s hereditary organizations in Iowa.

The Colored Conventions Movement: Black Organizing in the Nineteenth Century traces seven decades of Black activism for political, social, and economic justice. Spanning outward from Cincinnati’s 1830 convention to encompass over 400 conventions across the country, the movement included at least 17 conventions in Iowa. Editors Jim Casey, P. Gabrielle Foreman, and Sarah Lynn Patterson frame the collection as a set of entry points for further study on Black political thought and culture. Their work provides a corrective to the literature on antislavery that casts white abolitionists as progenitors and erases Black autonomy. Drawing upon a decade of collective work by the Colored Convention Project (CCP), the volume’s four-part structure probes the origins of these omissions and offers ethical imperatives and methodological strategies for recovering the rich history of Black organizing.

Essays in the first section reveal how expanding our spatial and temporal definitions of where conventions began and ended enables us to recover the outsized yet overlooked contributions of Black women. Psyche Williams-Forsen shows how centering the labor and words of women leads us to locate boarding houses, foodways, and other spaces outside of official convention proceedings as wellsprings for activist cultures. The second section follows the outward flow of political consciousness from conventions. Dispelling claims that locate abolitionism’s origins in the white abolitionist movement, authors show how Black activist communities worked in and beyond the avenues of mainstream politics. Derrick Spires’ essay on collaborative authorship and