

# Florida Historical Quarterly

---

Volume 49  
Number 3 *Florida Historical Quarterly*, Vol 49,  
Number 3

Article 10

---

1970

## Book Reviews

Florida Historical Society  
membership@myfloridahistory.org



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/fhq>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Florida Historical Quarterly by an authorized editor of STARS. For more information, please contact [STARS@ucf.edu](mailto:STARS@ucf.edu).

---

### Recommended Citation

Society, Florida Historical (1970) "Book Reviews," *Florida Historical Quarterly*. Vol. 49: No. 3, Article 10.  
Available at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/fhq/vol49/iss3/10>

## BOOK REVIEWS

See *Yankeetown: History and Reminiscences*. By Tom Knotts. (Yankeetown: Withlacoochee Press, 1970, vi, 151 pp. Preface, appendices, illustrations, bibliography, index. \$3.36.)

Yankeetown is a word that puzzles and excites the imagination. Reams of delightful newspaper and magazine copy have been devoted by the press of the nation to this picturesque town of Levy County which is located just north of Citrus County. Incorporated in 1925, it fronts on the Gulf of Mexico, adjoins Crackertown (now in Inglis), and is quite involved in the history of the Withlacoochee River.

Tom Knotts, a resident of this intriguing town since 1923, has brought out the last word on Yankeetown in his book which is appropriately named. It is an absorbing study of "Yankee meets Cracker," and the writing obviously was a labor of love. Knotts, a University of Florida graduate, though not a professional historian by trade, makes up for this fact by his zeal for research and by his long involvement as a resident and civic leader in Yankeetown and Central Florida. *See Yankeetown* is dedicated to A. F. Knotts, founder and first mayor of Yankeetown. The author is a grand nephew of the founder and the son of Eugene and Norma Knotts. His father has served as mayor since 1937, and his mother has made a contribution in her own right to the area.

In his delightful account of a frontier setting turned modern, Tom Knotts presents a host of persons including Timucians, Seminoles, Crackers, Yankees, smuggled Chinese, moonshiners, Panfilo de Narvaez, Hernando de Soto, William Bartram, Elvis Presley, Richard Powell, John F. Kennedy, and Richard M. Nixon. In addition, a rich variety of wildlife parades through the book, including owls, panthers, alligators, mullet, buffalo, oxen, razorbacks, and dogs. The book also includes numerous facts such as the 1950 hurricane that dumped 38.7 inches of rain in twenty-four hours.

A welcome contribution, it is written in a conversational

tone and contains only one serious weakness-lack of maps. Much of the material is first-hand, and the colorful pictures from the Knotts Collection are original. Having authored a good first-effort, Floridians can look forward to a second book by Mr. Knotts which will be about Indians.

ERNEST H. JERNIGAN

*Central Florida (Ocala) Junior College*

*Bureau of Historic Sites and Properties: Bulletin* No. I. (Tallahassee: Department of State, Division of Archives, History, and Records Management, Bureau of Historic Sites and Properties, 1970. 43 pp. Illustrations, bibliography.

The Division of Archives, History and Records Management, which was established in the Florida governmental reorganization program in 1969, has been publishing *Archives and History News* since January 1970. Now it has issued its first scholarly bulletin, which announces the full arrival upon the scene of the state agency whose mission it is to discover and preserve the history of Florida.

In the first paper of *Bulletin* No. I, Carl J. Clausen, who is state marine archaeologist for the division's bureau of historic sites and properties, analyzes artifacts collected from the Seminole War post of Fort Pierce. Since only heaps of sand now mark the site after repeated souvenir-hunting, we can indeed be thankful for the preservation of this collection. Mr. Clausen has proven himself very adept at handling materials from disturbed sites-as witness his work at the Spanish salvage camp at Sebastian Beach and among the scattered remains of the 1715 and 1857 shipwrecks. He seems equally at home in historical investigation. He has drawn from and contributed to the literature on military buttons, fort sites, and firearms with this work, which helps the historian-reader to visualize life in a Seminole War fort. *It* should prove **most** instructive **in** the discovery and examination of other forts and encampments of this period.

The second work by L. Ross Morrell and B. Calvin Jones, demonstrates another major concern of the new Florida division -Spain's great seventeenth-century Franciscan mission effort in

Florida. This emphasis has led to the identification and excavation of several of the Apalachee sites, including that of San Juan de Aspalaga, which was located some seventeen miles southeast of Tallahassee. Mr. Morrell, state archaeologist, and Mr. Jones of the bureau have concentrated upon the physical structure of the mission building. Utilizing previous fieldwork and demonstrating solid knowledge of the historical setting, the writers' investigations enabled them to reconstruct the means and type of construction and to present a conjectured floor plan and elevation of the mission. The charred wood remains offer mute testimony to the mission's violent end; it was destroyed by British Governor Moore of South Carolina in the summer of 1704.

Both papers exhibit an ethnohistorical approach; they constitute valuable pieces in the mosaic of Florida history. Certainly this kind of work could be expedited by more meaningful and inclusive indices of all documentation relating to Florida, so that there might be more ready access to the materials of history for students from any discipline. This first publication from the new agency clearly establishes its credentials, and sets a commendable standard. May there be many more!

EUGENE LYON

*Indian River (Fort Pierce) Junior College*

**Aftermath of Revolution: British Policy Toward the United States, 1783-1795.** By Charles R. Ritcheson. (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1970. xiv, 505 pp. Introduction, notes, bibliography, index. \$10.00.)

"To the victor belong the spoils!" How, then, explain America's failure to secure the full rich fruits of her triumph over Britain in the War of the American Revolution? The ready answer, from 1783 to the present, has been "perfidious Albion!" - a gratifying cliché that covers a multitude of sins and a vast quantity of historical writing. To the latter, Charles R. Ritcheson has now contributed a magisterial volume which recounts in generous detail the tortured course of Anglo-American diplomacy between the Treaty of Paris and the Jay Treaty.

The end of the Revolutionary War left unresolved a set

of problems well-calculated to baffle diplomats under the best of circumstances: West Indian trading rights lost and privileges sought, southern slaves sequestered and British debts unpaid, occupied forts in the Old Northwest and Indians on the war-path-not forgetting the sovereign state of Vermont! The Confederation was weak; it could neither demand respect abroad nor control the states at home, and Britons as well as ardent American patriots found cause to welcome the advent of the new federal regime. Yet if union bred strength, it also brought to the fore a dangerous partisanship between Anglophile Hamiltonians and Jeffersonian Republicans who loved not England. Although the aggravations of Citizen Genet's catastrophic mission went far toward offsetting the exigencies of Britain's war against Jacobin France, by 1794 war seemed as likely as peace between the English-speaking peoples-and equally dangerous for both. Happily, "two fair, honorable, and reasonable men," Lord Grenville and John Jay, reached an understanding whereby "substantial and matching advantages accrued to both sides," and an Anglo-American rapprochement was achieved.

Ritcheson's narrative breaks no new ground; it necessarily follows the routes surveyed by S. F. Bemis and A. L. Burt, but it rises above nationalistic limitations and opens a truly trans-Atlantic panorama. Ritcheson is most sympathetic toward the statesmen of old England whose broader imperial vision was first set forth by the Earl of Shelburne, then controverted by the mercantilistic arguments of Charles Jenkinson, ultimately to be fulfilled by the calm determination of Lord Grenville. Less sensitive to the nuances of American politics, Ritcheson finds his villain in Thomas Jefferson (pace Julian Boyd!), a chauvinistic schemer whose hatred of Britain might well have led to war. Extensive and careful study of the British sources enables Ritcheson to challenge older interpretations by American historians, and he is at his best when dealing with the British side of a question. *Aftermath of Revolution* is a scholarly corrective and a balanced explication at the same time, a work which must excite professional attention and win a host of appreciative readers.

ROBERT R. REA

*Auburn University*

*Thomas Jefferson and the New Nation.* By Merrill D. Peterson.  
(New York: Oxford University Press, 1970. x, 1,072 pp.  
Preface, illustrations, bibliography, index. \$15.00.)

Here is an admirable "life and times," a book of enduring value to scholar and layman alike. It is leisurely, reflective, and equally penetrating on Jefferson's ideas and activities. It is organized with great care, blending an extended narrative with studies in depth of the patriarch's interests, personal relationships, and attitudes where appropriate. Peterson's extraordinarily long book has good pace and stimulating rhythm. The prose is always lucid, often elegant. Unhappily, there are an unusual number of typographical errors, and at one point "mortality tables" are transmogrified into "morality tables"!

Jefferson emerges in these pages as a real revolutionary, albeit paradoxically a mute one. The author of the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, and many other ringing pronouncements "was remarkably inarticulate about the processes of thought that conducted him to the revolutionary event. Perhaps he did not understand them himself. Their channels were intricate, devious, and partly hidden from consciousness." (p. 45) As Peterson remarks in his preface, Jefferson's life "exhibited seemingly bewildering conflicts and contradictions, and it is not easy to resolve these elements in the flow of experience." To take merely one example, the Sage of Monticello could urge the emancipation of slaves from high principle and humanitarian feeling, but he was incapable of providing practical leadership for such an unpopular cause in Virginia. "That required moral enthusiasm and political audacity he neither possessed nor trusted. At bottom he did not care enough to sacrifice himself, or even put himself to great inconvenience, for the freedom of slaves, certainly not in the declining years of life." (pp. 999-1,000)

Peterson has written a judicious and balanced book, easily the best single-volume *Jefferson* available, and unlikely to be surpassed in this century. I do, however, question the author's view that there was no crisis of legitimacy in America in 1776 (p. 95). Jefferson himself regarded Virginia's revolutionary constitution as illegitimate—"a mere ordinance or statute with

no permanent and binding power on the government"-and many other pieces of evidence might be invoked to suggest that the American Revolution as a psychological event hinged upon a series of crises of legitimacy. Why else did Jefferson's mind, and those of his distinguished contemporaries, so often seek historical precedents and legal authorities (cf. p. 85).

Jefferson was also fascinated by the science of agriculture. In 1787 he wrote that "agriculture is our wisest pursuit." And later, "The greatest service which can be rendered any country is, to add a useful plant to its culture." Among all the salons of Paris his favorite was that of Comtesse de Tessé, at her country place, Chaville, because she was an avid horticulturist and Chaville a "botanical paradise." I am inclined to believe that Jefferson, and George Washington, and George Logan of Stenton, and William Livingston, and Timothy Dwight, and John Taylor of Caroline ("There is a spice of fanaticism in my nature upon two subjects-agriculture and republicanism") take us to the very heart of the American Enlightenment, which was in its quintessence an *agrarian* Enlightenment. Benjamin Franklin was really a European philosophe, equally at home in London, Philadelphia, or Paris. Jefferson, by contrast, was the truly American philosophe and Nature was his watchword. An urbane Arcadia was more important to him than urban arcades. If we are ever to define and understand the Enlightenment of the young republic, we must investigate its rural attributes, its "country ideology," its devotion to scientific farming, its penchant for natural history and natural law. Where else to begin than with Thomas Jefferson?

MICHAEL KAMMEN

*Cornell University*

*The Amistad Affair.* By Christopher Martin. (New York: Abelard-Schuman, 1970. 240 pp. Bibliography, notes, index. \$5.95.)

The re-writing of history to include lost, overlooked, or suppressed aspects of Negro life is currently a popular-and laudable-project among historians. The motive behind the effort is usually the idea that all men are created equal but have

been made unequal by society, and the job of the modern historian is to restore the Negro to his equal place, at least so far as American history is concerned.

Christopher Martin in this story of black mutiny aboard a slave ship in 1839 seems to be working toward this goal. Unfortunately Martin is not a historian and his book lacks documentation necessary to support the tale. Detractors of the black man maintain that his slave status in this country for nearly 200 years was due to an uncivilized nature and unwillingness to change his own lot. It is this attitude that Martin is attacking by attempting to record a revolt by the Negro against his slave condition, much as others have attempted revisions of the roles of Nat Turner and Denmark Vesey.

The *Amistad* was a slave ship out of Cuba transporting a cargo of blacks recently enslaved in Africa. During the voyage the slaves mutinied and took over the ship. They tried to sail back to Africa by forcing one of their Cuban "owners" to navigate for them. The wily Latin changed course each night bringing the ship closer and closer to the United States coast. Eventually *the Amistad* was captured by an American naval vessel and the affair began. For nearly two years American courts attempted to determine whose property was the ship and whether the thirty-nine blacks aboard could also be considered property.

The months of litigation involved personages as diverse as abolitionist Lewis Tappan, John Quincy Adams, and President Martin Van Buren. To the undisguised pleasure of author Martin the results were a "victory" for freedom, humanity, etc., all of which is of course quite meritorious. The problem is that Martin in the very beginning announces there can be only one possible outcome, but his facts show the case was bitterly contested, the outcome in doubt, and the settlement never really accepted by the losing side. The reader would expect Martin to have presented new evidence to support the court decisions, or to have re-interpreted the evidence. He has done neither. In fact his sources are skeletal and his bibliography includes just nineteen items. Only nine could be considered sources, and one is a historical encyclopedia.

One wishes that Martin, with his substantial literary abilities, had perhaps engaged a good solid researcher to help him

out. Although he *has* written presidential biographies and military history, Martin is essentially a writer. He has been an editor, publisher, correspondent, and writer-producer for television. What is most frightening about the book is that it is well-written. In this sense it is dangerous because the reader cannot help but get absorbed in the author's narrative, and soon be beguiled by the well-told tale.

MARTIN M. LAGODNA

*University of South Florida*

*Industrial Slavery in the Old South.* By Robert S. Starobin.

(New York: Oxford University Press, 1970. ix, 320 pp.

Preface, illustrations, notes, appendix, bibliographical essay, index. \$7.95.)

In this study Professor Starobin has examined the nature of slavery from a new perspective—the use of slave labor in southern industries. Southern industries emerged as early as the 1790s and the campaign for expansion intensified at times when Southerners felt least secure with the Union. By the 1850s approximately five percent of the slave population was working in industrial positions. Some of these blacks were hired from their masters, but a majority were owned directly by the entrepreneurs. Though some Southerners argued that slaves could not be used effectively in factories, Starobin shows that businesses operated by slave labor were generally profitable. Most industrial entrepreneurs employing slaves reached, and many greatly exceeded, an annual rate of return of six percent. According to Starobin slave labor was as efficient as the free labor available to Southerners at the time.

That slave workers were efficient does not suggest that they were happy with their status. Industrial slaves resisted as vigorously and as often as plantation hands. Nevertheless, a relatively tractable work force was created by a variety of means, including the use of incentives, and when necessary, brutal repression. Professor Starobin found that in many cases the level of industrial oppression exceeded that on the plantations. Indeed, Starobin suggests that the plantation slave's life may have been superior to that of the industrial slave in many ways. Industrial

development frequently required harder and longer working days, and "clearly posed greater hazards than did farming." Furthermore, Starobin questions Richard C. Wade's contention that urban bondsmen were better fed and clothed than rural slaves and had a higher standard of living. Most industrial slaves, he said, lived at a subsistence level. Their shelter, clothing and food hardly met their needs and medical care was no more adequate than for plantation slaves.

*Industrial Slavery in the Old South* is a readable, well-researched, well-documented book. It is not a definitive work. Further study of industrial slavery is necessary. Nevertheless, Professor Starobin's study will become required reading for all serious students of slavery in the United States.

JOE M. RICHARDSON

*Florida State University*

*The World the Slaveholders Made.* By Eugene D. Genovese. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1969. xiii, 274 pp. Introduction, acknowledgments, notes, index. \$5.95.)

With an avowed intent of going beyond race, Genovese has produced two stimulating essays on the nature of antebellum southern society. In the first essay, he analyzes similarities and dissimilarities of North American slavery to that produced in Latin America, Europe, and Africa. Stressing the similarities, he finds that everywhere slavery was a systematic form of class oppression. Modes of production and economic institutions were more important in the development of slavery than religious or political institutions. Identifying slave regimes as essentially seigneurial, he believes the economic institutions of the antebellum South were similar to those based on serfdom in Eastern Europe. But in America, particularly in the United States, he insists slavery had profound racial overtones which gave it a dimension not found in European systems. Genovese suggests slavery was harder to eradicate in the United States than in other areas, primarily because slaveholders ruled in the South. Elsewhere, slaveholders comprised only one of several groups within the ruling class, depriving it of the forceful, united leadership necessary to defend adequately the system.

In his second essay, Genovese focuses on George Fitzhugh's writings as the logical culmination of antebellum thought. Insisting that Fitzhugh has been misunderstood by historians, Genovese writes that Fitzhugh believed the South was developing a pre-bourgeois society. Composed of small units, no larger than a state, economically self-sufficient, it would be ruled by a paternalistic class. Genovese believes the South nearly achieved Fitzhugh's ideal—a classical slave society—but failed because that section could not cope with developing world capitalism.

Genovese succeeds brilliantly in his effort to move the investigation of slavery beyond the question of race, while admitting that it was an important factor. Further, he had demonstrated that the institutional analyses provided by Tannenbaum and Elkins are inadequate. At the same time, Genovese fails to provide a satisfactory explanation for the harshness of southern slavery, in part because he accepts the paternalistic nature of the peculiar institution set forth by Ulrich B. Phillips. Genovese's contention that slaveholders were opposed to capitalism is unconvincing. They understood and depended on the world market, and attempted to obtain European recognition of the Confederacy by withholding cotton during the American Civil War. Nevertheless, his sophisticated Marxist analysis will have to be considered by any subsequent analysis of slavery.

ROGER D. BRIDGES

*Ulysses S. Grant Association*  
*Southern Illinois University*

*The Structure of the Cotton Economy of the Antebellum South.*

Edited by William N. Parker. (Washington: Agricultural History Society, 1970. 165 pp. Introduction, tables, index. \$5.00.)

This valuable group of studies is concerned with the economics of cotton culture and slave labor in the Old South. The four major papers are based upon statistical evidence obtained from samplings of the manuscript census returns for 1850 and 1860. These include Robert E. Gallman's study of self-sufficiency in food production on cotton plantations and the amount of interregional trade necessary to supplement production. Gallman used figures from the 1860 census to estimate animal and

slave diets, slaughter weights, and corn consumption, and from these estimates he concludes that plantations were self-sufficient in corn and pork. The study by Raymond C. Battalio and John Kagel is similar to Gallman's. Individual farm records in South Carolina from the 1860 returns were sampled. Battalio and Kagel find that farms and plantations were largely self-sufficient, producing enough food for home consumption and, in some instances, a surplus which provided food for urban populations.

The third study in this group by James D. Foust and Dale E. Swan concerns productivity and profitability of slave labor. Samples from the 1850 and 1860 schedules were used to compute cotton output per slave from various slaveholding classes. Maintenance costs per slave were estimated, also total capital investment per slave, to determine that slavery was profitable, and that an average overall rate of return on investment in slaves was six percent. The fourth study by Gavin Wright centers upon the concentration of agricultural wealth in the cotton belt. The 1850 and 1860 schedules have been used to determine that planters owned more valuable land than their small-farm neighbors, and that agricultural wealth was unequally distributed because of concentration of slave ownership.

Two short papers follow these four statistical experiments. Diane Lindstrom's study centers upon interregional grain supplies. Statistical data obtained from contemporary railroad reports, newspapers, and periodicals was used to show that the cotton South did not rely upon western grain supplies, which premise refutes the previously held idea that the South was dependent upon western foodstuffs. William N. Parker's paper is a hypothetical treatment of slavery and southern economic development. Parker suggests that had there been free labor instead of slave labor, income distribution would have been completely altered; this alteration could have prompted a market demand for local manufactured goods, thus changing the whole course of economic history for the Old South.

The next two papers are commentaries on the Gallman and Parker studies made by Stanley L. Engerman and Eugene D. Genovese. Engerman doubts the validity (from method of testing) of Gallman's demonstration of self-sufficiency in the cotton South, suggesting that a more valid conclusion would involve a comparison of southern imports of foodstuffs with western

output of foodstuffs to determine the relative importance of this interregional trade. Engerman is also critical of Parker's hypothetical study, suggesting that comparisons of nonslave societies populated by blacks should have been included (for instance, blacks after 1865), using the slave South by comparison, to determine to what degree the free Negro's economic status may have been elevated. Genovese believes that the Gallman and Parker studies are both too purely economic in analysis and are thus void of meaningful historical interpretation. Finally, Morton Rothstein, in the last selection of the book, warns that much work remains to be done for a complete understanding of the subject, and that the new methods of quantitative research used by economic historians have added little in substantive knowledge.

Granted, the new techniques for processing data have revolutionized the methodology applied to antebellum economics and have shown much of the older literature of *the* traditional historians to rest upon mythical interpretation. This does not free the new techniques of misconceptions. Econometric analyses from census records should be reinforced with information from records within the counties from which the samplings were taken. Enough of these records are available (complete inventories of estates of deceased planters) to be used analytically. When this is done, more meaningful results will unfold.

JULIA F. SMITH

*Georgia Southern College*

Crisis of Fear: Secession in *South* Carolina. By Steven A. Channing. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1970. 315 pp. Preface, illustrations, map, bibliography, index. \$7.95.)

Professor Channing initially researched and wrote his *Crisis of Fear* as a University of North Carolina doctoral dissertation directed by Joel Williamson. The book has been awarded the Allan Nevins Prize by the Society of American Historians.

In their quest for the explanation of southern secession and the conflict that followed, twentieth century scholars have offered a number of interpretations: Owsley's "Egocentric Sectionalism," Randall's "Blundering Generation," and Donald's "An Excess of Democracy," to name but a few. Yet, Professor

Channing returns to the interpretation held by virtually all northern historians of the Civil War generation. For them, it was obvious that the fundamental cause of secession and war had been the South's peculiar institution.

Channing seeks, however, much more than a reaffirmation of slavery as the primary cause of southern rebellion. "Why slavery was believed to be threatened, why a different structure of race relations than enslavement of the blacks was inconceivable to most whites, what the fears and passions were which were mighty enough to drive a people to revolution"-these are the questions he attempts to answer. That he is largely successful makes his book an outstanding contribution to Civil War historiography.

Through extensive research in private papers, legislative records, and newspaper files, he skillfully guides his reader down the tragic road from John Brown's raid in October 1859 to the meeting of the secession convention in December 1861. The narrative's interlocking thread is fear, an anxious foreboding on the part of Carolinians that the election of a Republican president in 1860 would lead to slavery's destruction. If Negro bondage were to disappear, whites "knew" the end result could only be in Channing's phrase-"the loathsome touch of amalgamation."

While anxiety over the future of slavery was nothing new, prior to John Brown's raid, most inhabitants of the Palmetto State still felt the North could be counted on not to interfere directly with the peculiar institution. But the events at Harpers Ferry, the apotheosis of Brown by northern intellectuals, and the statements of eminent Republicans convinced the political leaders of South Carolina that a break with the North was necessary to preserve their way of life.

The only fault I find with *Crisis of Fear* occurs when its author exceeds the bounds of his research. Even the amount of evidence he presents hardly justifies the assertion that Carolinians were unanimous in favoring disunion. Despite this criticism, Channing's book is essential reading for those who wish to understand the motivations behind the southern drive for independence.

JOHN F. REIGER

*University of Miami*

*The One-Gallused Rebellion: Agrarianism in Alabama, 1865-1896.* By William Warren Rogers. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1970. x, 354 pp. Preface, maps, illustrations, essay on authorities, index. \$10.00.)

The emancipation of the Negro and the economic chaos following the Civil War radically altered the role of a previously latent force in Alabama politics—the small farmer. From 1865 to 1890 he sought by non-political means to change the course of the downward spiral which drove many of his class to tenantry and poverty. Every other panacea failing, he at last resorted to politics and Populism. The plight of the farmer and his quest for relief is the subject of Dr. William W. Rogers' latest book, *The One-Gallused Rebellion*. Subtitled "Agrarianism in Alabama, 1865-1896," it is more comprehensive in scope than John B. Clark's 1927 work, *Populism in Alabama*, and places the political revolt of the farmers, which threatened the power of entrenched Bourbon Democracy, in a deeper perspective.

While the first half of the book deals thoroughly with Alabama farmers' naive ventures into the realm of economics and business through the Grange, the Agricultural Wheel, and the Farmers' Alliance, it clearly builds to the denouement of agrarian discontent, the elections from 1890 to 1896. To these Professor Rogers devotes the last half of his book. The latter three organizations were national in scope and through them Rogers adumbrates the plight of the farmers as a national problem. Belatedly the Alabama legislature created a state agricultural department and by the appointment of Reuben F. Kolb as its second commissioner, the Bourbons created their nemesis. Kolb's role in *The One-Gallused Rebellion* is understandably important, but Professor Rogers has skillfully worked into the narrative men like Joseph C. Manning, William H. Skaggs, and a host of reform newspaper editors, Republicans, and Negro politicians. In fact, one of the most vivid and lively chapters deals with the free-swinging journalists whose zeal for reform was seldom equalled by the refinement of their literary style.

Fusion with the Republicans and accommodation by the Democrats effectively ended the Populist party in Alabama following the 1896 election, but Professor Rogers correctly sees the legacy of the agrarian revolt in subsequent Alabama social and

political history, and with clarity becoming an historian, he views the role of the Negro in post-bellum Alabama politics. It is also interesting to note that in spite of evidently extensive research he did not find strong anti-semitism in nineteenth century Alabama politics. Clearly it is the Bourbon Democrats who are made the villains of the piece. By controlling the machinery of government, they were able to manipulate the Negro vote, and by unvirtuous means maintained the "virtuous and intelligent," that is, themselves, in political power. Professor Rogers allows no extenuations only to this group.

As Rogers points out, the agrarian revolt was both economic and political. The economic aspects of the revolt were largely manifested in the Grange, the Alliance, the Wheel, the state agricultural society, and the state agriculture department; agrarian political interests were represented in the Populist Party, by the Jeffersonian Democrats, and to some measure by the regular Democratic Party. Added to this on the local level were the two branches of the Republican Party and the gold and silver split in the regular Democracy. Further to complicate matters, fusions and alliances on the national level did not always correspond to those on the state level. Rogers has carefully threaded his way through this mystic maze so that the uninitiated can follow the tortuous developments with minimum confusion.

The critical essay on sources and the full footnoting not only indicate Professor Rogers' careful research but also give an excellent picture of resources available for other detailed studies in southern history.

MILO B. HOWARD, JR.

*Alabama Department of  
Archives and History*

*The South and the Nation.* By Pat Watters. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1970. xviii, 390 pp. Introduction, bibliography, index. \$7.95.)

This is a frustrating book. Ambitiously conceived, *The South and the Nation* is Pat Watters' effort to explore the mind of the South during the changing yet changeless 1960s. Explicitly eschewing "painstaking, scholarly research in the accumulated

findings of other people," Watters instead has elected to build his book from a close examination of area newspapers, his travels throughout the region, and from his work, since 1963, as information director of the Southern Regional Council.

Thus his methodological approach has limited the book's utility. Intuitive perceptions gained from a writer's sensitivity and work can give life to any non-fiction study; but when an author limits himself by exclusive reliance on such a technique he binds himself in a needless intellectual straitjacket while demanding of his senses a breathtaking ubiquity. Had Watters' subject been simpler and easier his approach would have been sounder.

Predictably then, when Watters writes of the South of his own experience he writes well and with precision. But one man's South is not every man's South, and when his experience and observations falter, there is too often no help from other scholars and writers to guide Watters through the dark places. His observations about Atlanta's political leadership, a subject Watters knows well, are perceptive and acidulous. One need not agree with all he says of Mayor William Hartsfield, *et.al.*, to know that there is much truth in his judgments. Similarly, his discussion of the newspapers of the South and their notable failure (with some exceptions) to challenge the prejudices of their readers is one of the best parts of the book. Yet even here Watters ignores the rather commendable record of a number of newspapers in the upper South which have attempted to modify virulent racial attitudes; his failure to provide more representative coverage flaws his judgment even when his points are telling.

Watters writes that the central experience of the South's recent change has been its anguished racial struggle; he further contends that the all-consuming racial imbroglio through which the South is passing is an agony from which the nation could learn and profit. Yet this generalization ignores many differences in the nation's racial dilemmas and needs refinement.

Unqualified generalizations also illuminate the book's lack of focus. It is difficult to tell, however, if the book's haziness follows more from Watters' lack of precision or from the blurred images caused by the South's recent changes. As Watters shows, the nation's *industrialization* has come south, often with baleful effect, while the nation has discovered that southern

racial assumptions are part of a larger national tragedy. Hence, as the South has become less southern, the nation's southern assumptions have been exposed, making the South less distinctive and Watters' task more difficult. Unhappily, the book does not surmount this difficulty.

AUGUSTUS M. BURNS, III

*University of Florida*

*The Sacred Grove: Essays on Museums.* By Dillon Ripley. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969. 159 pp. Notes. \$5.00.)

American museums face a crisis. While society is increasingly demanding more of these institutions, people throughout the country have become concerned about the purposes of the museum in a rapidly changing society. This slim volume adds perceptively and provocatively to the continuing discussion.

Dillon Ripley, respected secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, summarizes his impressions of the major problems and opportunities of museums, regardless of type, size, or location. While tracing the evolution of the collecting instinct and institutions for housing artifacts, he notes, "the paradox of collections and collectors . . . and research and scholarship" (p. 37). Or to rephrase, he believes the problem of whether "museums can collect dead things and remain alive" (p. 37) has been unresolved since the nineteenth century. The tendency to become the "attic" for a group of people seriously handicaps the museum from fulfilling its purpose to preserve, document, and record, to sponsor original research, and to educate the public. The author warns that museums have made inefficient or ineffective use of their funds and have slowly alienated themselves from the public; many institutions, consequently, have become static or passive centers irrelevant to their society.

The author suggests that museums "must establish themselves as essential educational institutions equal to or supplementary (but still essential) to all levels of educational activities" (p. 86). Acknowledging that some museums have already accomplished this task, he urges his colleagues to discover how to make these institutions more responsive to their culture, to analyze how objects can communicate to the viewer, to develop neighborhood museums designed for the public rather than