

In regard to Iowa's boundaries, Stein proves somewhat more reliable than in other chapters. His discussion of the contentious southern line is understandably simplified, considering the many complications that defined the boundary with Missouri. But his discussion of Missouri's western line, which preceded and affected the design of Iowa's southern boundary, misses several key elements involving the role of the Osage and ignores the "Platte Purchase" of 1836. He also fails to observe the importance Iowans placed on access to the Missouri River leading up to statehood, and excessively credits Congress rather than Iowans themselves with playing the most effective role in determining the state's ultimate shape.

For a topic so desperately in need of thorough treatment as state boundary making, *How the States Got Their Shapes* falls far short of the mark. The fact that it went to print with so many factual errors and grandiose yet unsubstantiated claims also reflects poorly upon its publisher; one would expect better from the Smithsonian. For a better researched and organized — not to mention more accurate — recent discussion of state boundaries, readers should consult Gary Alden Smith's *State and National Boundaries of the United States* (McFarland, 2004). The reader finishes Stein's book feeling like the audience of a play destined to close on opening night, wishing the experience had lived up to the promise emblazoned on the marquee.

Man of Douglas, Man of Lincoln: The Political Odyssey of James Henry Lane, by Ian Michael Spurgeon. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008. x, 291 pp. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$42.50 cloth.

Reviewer Christopher Phillips is professor of history at the University of Cincinnati. He is the author of five books, including *Missouri's Confederate: Clayborne Fox Jackson and the Creation of Southern Identity in the Border West* (2000).

Among the parade of characters who bled Kansas during its territorial and Civil War periods, only John Brown surpassed Jim Lane in the attainment of historical fame — or infamy. For pure weirdness, he was unmatched. In this new political biography, Ian Michael Spurgeon has brought to life this icon with all of his complications. His attempt to reclaim Lane's image from those who depict him as an unprincipled opportunist and fanatical (even suicidal) demagogue is not as successful.

Lane's charisma and warring will in Kansas are epic. Known widely as the "Grim Chieftain," Lane exacted justice for a half-decade of proslavery sins in Kansas. A Mexican War veteran and native of southern Indiana, where he practiced law and served one term each as

lieutenant governor and U.S. congressman, Lane was a conservative Democrat who actually voted for the Kansas-Nebraska Act prior to his move to Kansas in 1855. Allegations that he “knew no difference between a negro and a mule” (41) initially put him at odds with the territory’s antislavery settlers, but his outrage at voter fraud and paramilitary invasions soon led him to political leadership of them. Unlike Brown and other abolitionists in the territory, Lane’s radicalism did not support black citizenship, leading Spurgeon to judge his reputation as largely a contrivance of political opponents. Publicly scorned by Illinois senator Stephen A. Douglas for presenting his party’s statehood petition to Congress in 1856, Lane, still as a “Nebraska Dem” (71), broke with his lifelong party and assumed leadership of the moderate wing of the Free State Party, the Kansas iteration of the Republican Party prior to its formation there in 1859. He became the voice of free-state Kansans throughout the Old Northwest, personally led western free-soil emigrants through Iowa and Nebraska — his famously politicized “Army of the North” — to the embattled territory, and then organized and led armed Kansans against proslavery forces there. In 1861, by then a Republican, he was elected as one of the new state’s first two U.S. senators.

Later that year, Lane obtained a brigadier general’s commission directly from the new president, Abraham Lincoln, at the urging of key northern abolitionists who had funded John Brown’s extremism in Kansas and Virginia. Not surprisingly, his zealotry would go well beyond recruiting Kansas Jayhawkers and Redlegs. With James Montgomery and Charles R. Jennison, Lane made good on his boast that he would play hell in Missouri. His western way of war included unauthorized confiscations of property (including slaves), emancipation, and recruitment of African Americans, all begun in his region before federal commanders instituted such practices elsewhere and in violation of federal policy in border slave states such as Missouri. For such initiatives, Lane was made a perpetual target, frequently forcing Lincoln to run interference.

Spurgeon’s consistent defense of his controversial subject and frequent responses to historians critical of Lane’s inconsistencies suggest that the long shadows of the border war still stretch to the side of the state line from which one hails. (The author is a native Kansan.) Lane’s penchant for self-aggrandizement and duplicity on the stump, he argues weakly, resulted from attempts “to maintain party and convention integrity” (144–45). Despite ample contemporary evidence to the contrary, Spurgeon intimates that Lane’s wanton destruction of Osceola, Missouri, in September 1861 was warranted. After William Quantrill’s

bloody raid on Lawrence, Kansas, on August 21, 1863 (from which Lane narrowly escaped with his life), Thomas Ewing Jr., the federal commander on the border, issued his Order No. 11 expelling virtually all civilians of four Missouri counties, the most sweeping violation of civilians' rights during the war. Spurgeon hedges on whether Ewing issued the order out of fear that Lane would make good on his vow to invade Missouri in an unauthorized war of extermination, despite strong evidence for just such a conclusion. Lane's support for Andrew Johnson's veto of the 1866 Civil Rights Bill was for the author less a personal protest against the Radical Republicans' racial egalitarian agenda than an example of his principled defense of the Constitution.

General readers will find this an enlightening study of a Kansas icon. Historians will likely be less charitable toward the author's conclusions about him.

Awaiting the Heavenly Country: The Civil War and America's Culture of Death, by Mark S. Schantz. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008. x, 245 pp. Illustrations, notes, index. \$24.95 cloth.

Reviewer Michael J. Steiner is associate professor of history at Northwest Missouri State University. He is the author of *A Study of the Intellectual and Material Culture of Death in Nineteenth-Century America* (2003).

Death has been the subject of renewed interest in recent years following a century of cultural aversion to the topic, particularly among American historians. There have been some notable exceptions, including Robert Habenstein and William Lamers's *History of American Funeral Directing* (1955), David Stannard's *Death in America* (1975), James Farrell's *Inventing the American Way of Death* (1980), David Sloane's *The Last Great Necessity* (1991), and Gary Laderman's *The Sacred Remains* (1996). In the early 1990s a trio of collections of post-mortem photographic images — Jay Ruby's *Secure the Shadow: Death and Photography in America*, Stanley Burns's *Sleeping Beauty*, and Barbara Norfleet's *Looking at Death* — focused attention on the peculiar practice of photographing the deceased in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Mark Schantz's *Awaiting the Heavenly Country* joins two other recent books, Drew Gilpin Faust's *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (2008) and Mark Neely's *The Civil War and the Limits of Destruction* (2007), in a wealth of recent study of death and the Civil War. The former two books focus directly on the carnage of the war itself; Schantz has instead crafted an interesting and perceptive analysis of the antebellum cultural context in which the slaughter of