

Neither calling it a “gamble” nor “choosing sides” quite captures the dynamic at work. Smith alternates between stressing the “bargaining power” that some African Americans gained during the war and reminding us that the war’s progress reinforced suspicions of Africans as a fifth column. He does not so much neglect white “fear and apprehension” as occasionally mention and naturalize it, as he does with Andrew Jackson’s crafty betrayal of the slave and free Louisianans he “co-opted” (p. 205). Perhaps what we need next is a book that includes slaves as soldiers but does not privilege their experiences in the story of the war.

David Waldstreicher
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

doi: 10.1093/jahist/jau026

Free Trade and Sailors’ Rights in the War of 1812. By Paul A. Gilje. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013. xii, 425 pp. Cloth, \$85.00. Paper, \$29.99.)

Although the War of 1812 is often dismissed as a small and inconclusive conflict that looked more to the past than to the future, it left a powerful and enduring legacy. Those who served in it dominated the political and military landscape until the Civil War, and the victories at the Battle of the Thames and the Battle of Horseshoe Bend opened doors to territorial expansion and the spread of democracy and slavery in the West. In addition, the many symbols and sayings produced by the war shaped the national identity. Two of those sayings—Don’t Give Up the Ship and We Have Met the Enemy and They Are Ours—are still part of the national vocabulary, but a third—Free Trade and Sailors’ Rights—actually enjoyed greater currency during and after the war even though it has since faded from the public memory. Paul A. Gilje traces the origins and evolution of that slogan in his book.

The saying enjoyed great popularity because it so succinctly and eloquently captured the principles for which the young Republic was contending: an end to the British orders-in-council (which restricted U.S. trade with

the European continent) and impressment (the Royal Navy’s conscription of seamen from American merchant vessels to crew its chronically undermanned warships). The phrase did not originate, however, until two weeks after the war began, when Capt. David W. Porter flew a flag featuring the slogan from the U.S. frigate *Essex* as it departed from New York Harbor on a cruise that ultimately led to the Pacific Ocean and the destruction of the warship in a bloody battle near Valparaiso, Chile.

An accomplished scholar who has written extensively about seamen and life on the waterfront in the early republic, Gilje does a superb job of tracing the eighteenth-century origins of the patrician doctrine of free trade (which had several meanings), the plebian concept of sailors’ rights, and the gradual marriage of these two notions in the run-up to the War of 1812. Gilje also examines the use of the slogan during the postwar period, when various groups appropriated it to promote their policies, some of which—such as a protective tariff—were antithetical to the meanings of the words.

Some of the topics that Gilje covers—territorial expansion, Indians, and postwar commercial developments—might have been omitted to produce a more streamlined and focused book. But there is no denying that he has shed considerable light on the twin issues embodied in Porter’s slogan, and the book is commendably free of errors despite its scope. This work deserves a central place on bookshelves devoted to the nation’s second war with Great Britain. All students interested in the origins of the War of 1812 and its aftermath will profit from it.

Donald R. Hickey
Wayne State College
Wayne, Nebraska

doi: 10.1093/jahist/jau

American Zion: The Old Testament as a Political Text from the Revolution to the Civil War. By Eran Shalev. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013. xii, 239 pp. \$40.00.)

Eran Shalev’s *American Zion* is so packed with insights and argues so convincingly for “the role that the Old Testament played in the pol-

itics of the early republic and in Americans' negotiation of nationhood" that one stands in awe of what it accomplishes (p. 1). His book is a resounding success as it systematically and cogently argues for a vast expansion of "our sense of the role of the Hebrew Bible, and particularly the role of biblical Israel, in the formation of an American national and political culture from the Revolution to the Civil War" (p. 2).

Shalev's book gives readers five chapters, plus an introduction and a conclusion, that take them through specific Old Testament passages focused on the political history of the Israelites to provide new insights into the importance of the Hebrew Bible in American political discourse. Perhaps the central nugget of wisdom that Shalev offers is how the notion of the United States as divinely chosen as a new Israel "manifests a deep ambivalence toward a secular vision of modernity and Enlightened politics based solely on human reason and will" (*ibid.*). The book is an insightful and rewarding study of the implications of this ambivalence as well as a case study of how the Bible recedes from national political discourse by the end of the nineteenth century.

When most scholars think of the historical models embraced by early Americans in making sense of their new nation, the Roman republic takes precedence. The first two chapters of *American Zion* explore the deep connections between ancient Rome and Israel in the American political mind. Shalev makes clear that while the Founding Fathers relied heavily on republican Rome as their model in the late eighteenth century, by the 1830s and the Second Great Awakening, ancient Israel had become a more prevalent trope in the American political imagination. Chapters 3 and 4 demonstrate how thoroughly Americans used the stories and language of the Old Testament to create a biblical past for their nation, while chapter 5 explores how certain understandings of ancient Jewish history and politics came to reshape American biblical exegesis and attitudes toward the Bible. One slight weakness in the book is the concerted attention it gives Mormonism as an example of pseudobiblical thinking. Mormonism is an important example of the transplantation of ancient Israel to American shores, but Mormons were also

a tiny antebellum restorationist splinter group that did not initially have wide political influence.

In the end, Shalev makes a powerful argument that one cannot understand early American political culture without appreciating how early Americans "drew on their sense of ancient Israel's political history and the ways in which that history helped construct their views of their nation" (p. 14). This book is a welcome addition to early American political thought, and it will be of interest to a wide range of scholars, including historians, political scientists, and those in religious and literary studies.

Paul Gutjahr
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

doi: 10.1093/jahist/jau028

Church-State Relations in the Early American Republic, 1787–1846. By James S. Kabala. (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2013. x, 264 pp. \$99.00.)

James S. Kabala joins a growing list of church-state scholars who look beyond the American founding—"beyond the First Amendment"—for keys to understanding relations between religion and government in the early republic (p. 11). He seeks not to divine an inchoate church-state principle for current application but to engage the early republic on its own terms, "exploring sixty years of contentious debate" about the "role of religion in public life" (p. 1).

Yet the founding remains more prominent than it first appears. The First Amendment limited "the federal government's power in relation to the states," not state policy or even federal policy in the territories and the capital (p. 9). This federalism illuminates many church-state policies, Kabala explains. It allowed religious services in the House of Representatives and federal funding of missionary-owned schools. Yet it resisted Sabbath prohibitions on Sunday mail and, for some, presidential thanksgiving and fast-day proclamations. Individuals embodied these federal principles. President Thomas Jefferson attended religious services in the Capitol—priding