Florida Historical Quarterly

Volume 50
Number 3 *Florida Historical Quarterly, Vol 50, Number 3*

Article 10

1971

# Book Reviews

Florida Historical Society
membership@myfloridahistory.org

# BOOK REVIEWS

*The Lost Legacy of Georgia's Golden Isles.* By Betsy Fancher. (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1971. 216 pp. Preface, introduction, photographs, epilogue, selected bibliography. $6.95.)

Perhaps no region in the Southeast has been described more frequently and with more enthusiasm for its charm than Georgia's coast and its off-shore sea islands. The long and rich history of this area, its unsurpassed natural beauty, and its romantic legends have been equally attractive to historians, artists, journalists, and novelists. This book betrays its author as somewhat of a rare combination of all these craftsmen. The narrative embraces some legend (including stories of a few ghosts of departed natives) and much history. Unlike its predecessors it presents a convincing plea for the recognition of the ecological significance of the region and for its preservation from industrial-age predators. If the purpose of the book is to convey a feeling for the region which one is not likely to get from other written accounts, the author has succeeded in a remarkable manner.

Unusually well described is the charm and historical heritage of Savannah, as well as the Gullah Negro to the southward. His peculiar dialect, voodoo superstitions, and primitive religious rites are briefly but adequately recorded. The discussion of Fannie Kemble and her controversial *Journal of a Residence on a Georgia Plantation in 1838-1839* is a brilliant one. Few historians would find fault with the methods and standards used to assess the validity of Miss Kemble's statements about slavery on Butler's Island. The failure of the Civil War "Gideon" experiment to transform slaves on Hilton Head into responsible freedmen is described, as is Tunis Campbell's experiment in black separatism on St. Catherine's Island during Reconstruction. A description of the fabulous millionaire's club on Jekyll Island completes the broad scope of the story, but interwoven are romantic stories about such famous coastal families as the Spaldings, the Coupers, and the Dents. However, none of these shares the attention devoted to Bessie Jones, the descendant of slaves and one of the last living authorities on slave songs of the Georgia Coast.

The book is written in elegant and flawless style. Since it was not designed as essentially historical writing, it is presented without footnotes. It has a well selected bibliography of more than fifty titles. It suffers from the absence of an index, which books of this nature generally deserve.

JAMES C. BONNER

*Georgia College at Milledgeville*

*Laboratory for Liberty: The South Carolina Legislative Committee System, 1719-1776.* By George E. Frakes. (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1970. xii, 201 pp. Foreword, appendices, bibliography, index. $12.50.)

The central weakness of this book is a lack of focus. It reputes to be a study of the South Carolina legislative committee system, but the author never defines the committees he is describing and drifts off into a general history of the province, equating most public actions with committee actions. On page 49 the author states that it is time to turn "to a detailed examination of assembly committee activity," but the vagueness continues with the statement: "The afternoon of June 15 was filled with more committee activity" (p. 51). Six standing committees are referred to (p. 22), but these are never identified by the author except in a footnote on page 23 where Roy Smith's list is mentioned (religion, privileges and elections, grievances, trade, and courts of justice"). The author believes there were more than two standing committees but does not name them. On page 27 he refers to five. The index only adds to the confusion by referring to the following types of committees: ad hoc, extraordinary, extrasessionary, joint conference, joint legislative, sessionary, special, standing, steering, subcommittees, of the whole house. There is also a tendency to confuse committees with commissions as on page 64: "The committees' work was implemented by commissioners, constables, and the night watch."

What was needed was an identification of all committees at the beginning of the book. At that time a distinction should have been made between committees of the legislative body and other bodies such as firemasters, packers, woodmeasurers, com-

missioners of the streets and of the markets, who were annually elected by the people of Charleston. Each legislative committee should have then been described in all of its activities over the entire colonial period. This would have been difficult, but it certainly could have been done for the period of the published records of the Commons House of Assembly, 1736-1750, since those volumes of South Carolina's colonial records have been beautifully indexed and the work of each committee can therefore be followed step by step. The author has gone wrong where so many go wrong in wanting to tell the full story of the colonial period rather than concentrating on the particular institution under observation.

Peter Timothy, C. C. Pinckney, James St. John, and Thomas Cooper are rather odd members to single out and study. Why not men who really ran the assembly such as Thomas Lynch and Christopher Gadsden? But the author was drawn off base by a weak attempt to comment upon social structure. Nor can one find much illumination among the voluminous tables in the appendices. In Table II of Appendix III the parishes have been divided into geographic areas: central, coastal, northwestern, northeastern, etc.— and yet all of these areas are still in the low-country. This attempt at categorization shows a lack of understanding of the South Carolina region, a lack which seriously hampers this analysis of the committee system.

GEORGE C. ROGERS, JR.

*University of South Carolina*

*The Jay Treaty: Political Battleground: of the Founding Fathers.* By Jerald Combs. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970. xi, 254 pp. Preface, appendices, notes, bibliography, index. $7.75.)

British seizure of American ships in the West Indies, her retention of posts on American soil in the old Northwest, and her tampering with the Indians led to an Anglo-American war scare in the 1790s. The American envoy extraordinary, John Jay, concluded a treaty with Britain in 1794 which Republican critics promptly denounced as disgraceful. Samuel Flagg Bemis in 1923

published his classic study of the diplomacy of this treaty based on intensive research in American, British, Canadian, French, and Swedish public records. Combs's approach, however, differs from Bemis's.

The emphasis of this study is on domestic politics in the 1790s and its influence on foreign policy. Focusing on the roles of six key Americans– Washington, Hamilton, Jay, Jefferson, Madison, and John Adams, Combs argues that these statesmen agreed that, if possible, the United States should not depend on Britain, France, or any European nation. All were willing to exert American power to retain American independence and dignity. The partisan contention surrounding ratification of the Jay Treaty, according to Combs, concerned not so much bickering over a pro-British or pro-French ideology but disagreement over how best to employ limited American power. The Federalists– Hamilton, Jay, Adams, and Washington– felt that during American infancy friendly relations with Britain were mandatory because Britain was the only nation capable of destroying the United States. The Republicans, led by Jefferson, from the start were willing to risk waging economic and, if necessary, military warfare against Britain. Hamilton felt this would ruin his financial programs and American industry and cities. The agrarian Jefferson did not overly worry about destruction of cities.

Combs has extensively used the papers of American politicians and has profited from recent literature concerning the origin of American political parties. His examination of private papers of British statesmen gives new insights into British policy, though in general he is less effective on the British side. This is a well-researched, provocative work delineating the areas where the young republic's leaders agreed and disagreed. His study effectively depicts the interaction between domestic politics and foreign policy which is helpful in interpreting not only the 1790s but also Jefferson's and Madison's administrations.

J. LEITCH WRIGHT, JR.

*Florida State University*

*Ordeal of Ambition: Jefferson, Hamilton, Burr*. By Jonathan Daniels. (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1971. x, 446 pp.

Illustrations, sources and acknowledgments, bibliography, index. $8.95.)

*Ordeal of Ambition* must be judged by two sets of canons. One set applies to the volume as the production of an intelligent layman, extraordinarily well-read and perceptive, the author of eighteen books of commentary, recollection, and popular history. Bound by his editorial calling and by temperament to ruminate on complexities that enmesh persons and events in the web of contemporary history, Mr. Daniels here turns with the sure instinct of a newspaper man to a trio of personalities who were making history over a century and a half ago. Specifically he treats twenty crucial years when the careers of Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, and Aaron Burr interlocked intimately and incessantly.

The story unfolds as these three, different in background, divergent in principles, clash and coalesce in crises on their pathways toward their ambitions. In life each created his own legend. After their deaths history and public opinion settled them finally in their places. "Mr. Jefferson is safe on his pedestal Hamilton's picture properly graces the American ten-dollar bill. Colonel Burr, like Lucifer, will never be lifted to the heaven from which he fell, or was 'hurled headlong.' Any attempt to alter their allotted places now would be a pretentious folly. Yet, it should be possible to examine the anatomy of their antagonism. That is what I have tried to do."

Performing his anatomy Mr. Daniels encounters not only the great– Washington, Madison, Adams– whose shadows flicker on the screen but also a host of fascinating minor characters from Jul, the slavey in a Paris pension, to John Beckley, a neglected Jeffersonian henchman. These and the Callenders, Swartwouts, and Wilkinsons give lifelike texture to the fabric, but Jefferson, Hamilton, and Burr form the pattern in the carpet. Burr, the enigma, has a special fascination for the author. Smooth, cool, and unquestionably ambitious, Burr roused contemporaries to levels of hate and reprisal as few other men. Something– his charisma perhaps, his suppleness in politics– put them off. Historians since then have picked at the lock to open Burr's secrets. Mr. Daniels comes close to making him the central character.

There is nothing of apologetics in this volume: none of the main characters becomes a saint, or even a hero. As he projects them against the background of their times the author manages to tell, entertainingly, a lot of contemporary history– the Whiskey Rebellion, the election of 1800, the Louisiana purchase, the "Burr Conspiracy," and the like. Moreover he discerns and conveys to the reader a sense of inherent personal tragedy, relieved at times, as all tragedy must be, by touches of the comic or commonplace. Here, then, is that union of human individuality with impersonal forces that makes for readable history, a genre for which the author has a genuine flair.

By traditional scholarly canons the review is briefer. To begin with the author poses no scholarly problem of a conventional sort. At the end the "Burr Conspiracy," for example, is no clearer than heretofore, and understandably so because the sources are almost wholly the secondary accounts. As a think piece that invites the reader to mull over some interesting views, the text contains expressions a critical scholar might hesitate to voice. Is it allowable to say that Hamilton's hand was behind the pistol of John Barker Church, who came within inches of killing Burr in a duel (p. 199)? Is it quite accurate to say that Jefferson "used" Callender, the unbridled pamphleteer? Students will find more than one bone to pick with the author's conclusions and imputations.

And yet the bold, sweeping approach often conveys a feeling for the times that scholarly texts do not impart. The very real fears– now faint in retrospect– of New England secession (pp. 275, 289) set a background for the unrelenting hatreds that mark politics of the Jefferson period. When national survival seemed at stake political differences became irreconcilable. Whether Mr. Daniels intended analogy to America of the present decade or not, several points of similarity come to mind in the reading. What this performance lacks in original scholarship it compensates in suggestiveness.

AUBREY C. LAND

*University of Georgia*

*James Madison, a Biography*. By Ralph Ketcham. (New York: Macmillan Co., 1971. xiv, 753 pp. Preface, abbreviations and

short titles, illustrations, selected bibliography, source notes, index. $17.50.)

In view of the vast quantity of materials now available about James Madison, it would be difficult to write a short biography of him, and Ralph Ketcham, professor at Syracuse and former assistant editor of *The Madison Papers,* has not tried to do so. This is a long, authoritative, often engrossing book.

The portrait drawn by Professor Ketcham is that of a man who as a youth was "uncertain, introspective, and affectedly grave" (p. 67), as a young man was "reserved" and "awkwardly shy" (p. 89), and even as congressman and secretary of state "created the impression that he was indecisive, irresolute, ineffective, and evasive" (p. 471). In the presence of strangers and crowds, he was "cold and reserved"; and because he was little (5'6") and spare and weak-voiced, he made a very indifferent public impression Only in private conversation and "in councils of government conducted over long periods of time," did his keen, well-informed mind and his brilliant powers of reasoning and persuasion become evident and effective. It was not surprising, therefore, that when he became president, he could not unify the nation before the declaration of war in 1812, or that his efforts to unify it during the war were fumbling and ineffective. Professor Ketcham is candid in acknowledging, first, that Madison's course towards Britain and France between 1809 and 1812 was "innocently implausible" and ill-advised; second, that he took the United States into war "dangerously unprepared" and "absurdly unfit" (pp. 531, 533); and third, that during the war his errors were manifold: he indulged foolish hopes, he tolerated "deceit, insubordination, and incompetence" in the army and in the executive branch, he seemed not to know how to counteract bungling, and he was incapable of providing the vigorous leadership that could give direction to events. Yet, in his admiration for Madison, Professor Ketcham accepts Madison's own rationalization (p. 586): "Madison believed, with much justification, that he could not conduct a war to validate a republican independence in the manner of an imperial proconsul without destroying that cause in the process. Had he done that, his failure would have been a moral one, permanently disastrous to the country . . . . The result was a mere temporary anxiety

and destruction, perhaps a small price to pay to save the vital political character of the nation." After this kind of defense, it cannot be surprising that Professor Ketcham thinks that when Madison retired in 1817, "a public career [had] ended in glory" (p. 612). The central thread and the crowning achievement of Madison's public life were that in war as well as in peace he strove successfully "to vindicate the whole republican concept of government" (p. 599).

The most successful of Professor Ketcham's chapters are those in which he describes Madison's role in drawing up the Constitution of 1787, in securing its ratification, and in establishing the new government. He fails to give a truly satisfying explanation of Madison's shifts from a stand of strong nationalism in 1780-1781 to a stand of state rights in 1798-1800, and then back to a stand of strong nationalism late in life. Critical readers will find additional points to take exception to. In the first five chapters, which bring Madison down to his election to the Continental Congress in 1780, too many assertions are qualified by "may have," "must have," "probably," "likely," or "we may imagine." The references to James and Dolley Madison, after their marriage in 1794, as "the Madisons" are so frequent as to be tiresome; this chatty and coloquial way of speaking of a husband and wife is applied to other couples also and is even carried to the grotesque extreme of referring to the Spanish Marques de Casa Yrujo and his marquesa as "the Yrujos." Dolley Madison and her "social triumphs" seem to fascinate Professor Ketcham– they run on for countless pages. There are *gauche* phrases and mutilated infinitives (e.g., pp. 496, 520, 542, 547, 600, 613, 633, 641, 664) that more careful editing would have eliminated. It is bad enough to find all the notes buried away at the back of the book, but it is worse to encounter only one "backnote" number per paragraph of text and to find five or six citations lumped together in that one "backnote."

JAMES RABUN

*Emory University*

*Joshua R. Giddings and the Tactics of Radical Politics.* By James B. Stewart. (Cleveland: The Press of Case Western Reserve

University, 1970. xiv, 318 pp. Preface, abbreviations, bibliography, index. $8.50.)

James B. Stewart's biographical study of Joshua Giddings is a worthy addition to a growing series of "counter-revisionist" studies of leading anti-slavery spokesmen. Earlier scholarly efforts to assess Giddings's career (in unpublished doctoral dissertations authored by Richard Ludlum and Richard Solberg) reflected, as Stewart remarked, the once fashionable revisionist assumption that "one had to be mentally disturbed to oppose slavery." Stewart, sharing earlier writers' preoccupation with the psychological roots of the anti-slavery persuasion, makes careful note of Giddings's frequent bouts with "melancholia," but regards his political activism and his commitment to social reform as essentially healthy responses to inner psychological promptings. (In proof of Giddings's mental health the author feels compelled to cite his exemplary relations with his children. This apparent need to prove the sanity of nineteenth-century foes of racism offers a curious commentary on the biases of the last generation of historians.)

Stewart, in common with a number of recent students of antebellum reform, places heavy emphasis on the role of religious conviction as a motivating factor in the anti-slavery movement. Giddings's anti-slavery career, Stewart concludes, paralleled his inner spiritual history. Hence, Giddings's own religious conversion in the mid-1830s was instrumental in launching him upon a career as an anti-slavery politician, and his subsequent disaffection with orthodox Christianity and his growing interest in spiritualism and Swedenborgianism at least partly explains Giddings's preoccupation with "utopian pleas for worldwide reformation" in the 1850s.

In his assessment of Giddings's political career, Stewart gives the Ohio radical high marks as a highly principled spokesman for political anti-slavery and concludes that both Giddings's sincerity and his integrity were beyond question. (Noting that earlier scholars who described Giddings as an abolitionist misunderstood his actual position, Stewart explains that Giddings called for "denationalization" of slavery through repeal of all federal legislation protecting the South's peculiar institution, but did not until the very eve of the Civil War advocate

abolitionism. Indeed, for many years both the Liberty League and the followers of Garrison regarded Giddings with deep suspicion, and on occasion he found it necessary to fight abolitionists as well as Democratic candidates for re-election to Congress.) But Stewart appears somewhat critical of Giddings's reluctance to commit himself to outright abolitionism, regarding Giddings's as politically naive, if not obtuse, in his belief that Whig, Free Soil, and Republican platforms could be interpreted as moral indictments of slavery. Time and time again, Stewart notes, Giddings was led astray by his romantic optimism and credulous faith in the efficacy of moral persuasion. His efforts to commit his party to his own version of humane reform and social perfection more than once led to censure by the party's leaders. Hence, Stewart's judgments on Giddings's political sagacity are rather unfavorable, and at times he adopts a mocking tone in describing some of his subject's more fanciful misconceptions about Whig and Republican party politics. Nonetheless, Stewart declares that Giddings's efforts were not entirely in vain, for the Ohio congressman "bad met the moral questions of his day courageously, and by serving his conscience he had quickened the sensitivities of his generation." Stewart concludes that by virtue of his unfailing integrity in an age of opportunism and bigotry, Giddings's "achievements must border on the heroic."

This is a fine book, thoroughly researched, well written, and insightful in its assessments both of the man and the age. Stewart's work thus admirably meets the long standing need for an adequate biography of Joshua Giddings.

ALFRED A. CAVE

*University of Utah*

*The Last Foray, The South Carolina Planters of 1860: A Sociological Study*. By Chalmers G. Davidson. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1971. x, 275 pp. Acknowledgments, introduction, bibliographical sources, biographical sketches, index. $6.95.)

In this small volume Professor Chalmers G. Davidson at-

tempts to assess the contributions which large planters made to the development of society in South Carolina in the fields of education, public service, religion, and culture. While pursuing his investigation, in which he utilized the techniques of sociologists as well as historians, Dr. Davidson focused his attention upon persons listed in the census of 1860 who owned 100 slaves or more in a single district or parish, and he excluded slaveowners with property in two or more districts or states. By employing this singular criterion. Dr. Davidson obtained a list of 440 slaveowners who may or may not have been typical of large planters of South Carolina in particular or of the South in general. Obviously, many of the wealthier South Carolinians were omitted from his sample, as were persons owning between seventy-five and 100 slaves who are usually considered by historians to be members of the large planter category. Thus Dr. Davidson's planters are a group situated midway between the wealthier and the less affluent portions of the large planter class of South Carolina.

However representative Dr. Davidson's sample may have been with respect to the large planters of South Carolina, he discovered that it was composed of men with many characteristics in common. Most of his slaveowners were descended from South Carolina families who had enjoyed wealth for several generations, and many of them were related to one another by blood or marriage. Nearly all of these owners of 100 slaves were highly educated by standards of the time, and some of them collected large libraries. Despite these educational advantages, however, they contributed very little to southern literature on any subject other than agriculture. A large majority of them were affiliated with one of the Protestant churches, to which they usually gave strong financial support. Although few of the outstanding political leaders of antebellum South Carolina were included in Dr. Davidson's list, a large majority of the planters he investigated were active in local government. Some of them held high state offices, and several were elected to congress.

Historians of the Old South will find nothing revolutionary or even new in Dr. Davidson's evaluation of the large planter class. Persons interested in South Caroliniana will, however, be pleased by brief biographical sketches of the planters on his list which comprise a substantial portion of his book. In the

opinion of the reviewer, Dr. Davidson's volume would have been more significant both to historians and genealogists had he brought all of the large slaveowners of South Carolina within the scope of his study.

JOHN HEBRON MOORE

*Florida State University*

*The Confederacy as a Revolutionary Experience.* By Emory M. Thomas. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971. x, 150 pp. Preface, selected bibliography, index. $5.95.)

Southern and Civil War historians will welcome and read with profit Emory M. Thomas's brief, provocative treatise treating the rebellion as a revolutionary experience for Southerners. Thomas's thesis– that while southern leaders were attending to preserve their section's distinctive social, political, and economic institutions, all were perceptively altered in the crucible of the Civil War– has frequently been acknowledged by historians. The scope and nature of the revolution has not been so sharply defined, however, nor has it been so clear that at such an early stage the initial leaders of secession lost control of the movement to less radical leaders who were willing to sacrifice state rights and slavery in order to forge a nation. He contends that changes evident in the post-war South were primarily the result of Confederate policies rather than Union army devastation and Reconstruction policies.

The book is based upon the numerous published works concerning the South and the nation during the middle nineteenth century. Unfortunately, the author has seen fit to footnote very sparingly. Thus, unless the reader is thoroughly conversant with all the sources, it is difficult to know where to find the numerous quotes used to illustrate his points, or the authority for statistics used.

Thomas has attempted too much in a brief volume. Consequently, he consistently overstates and oversimplifies. His insistence that southern states seceded primarily because of adherence to state rights underrates the importance of racial slavery in the attempt to create a southern nation. While few

would deny that Americans, North and South, held state rights in high regard, secession was largely an effort to perpetuate slavery and create a new nation. Conscription, invocation of martial law, and interference in the economy were characteristic of both the Union and Confederate governments. In neither instance did these wartime measures destroy the concept of state rights. The viability of this concept is amply illustrated in the controversy surrounding Reconstruction. Thomas is on firmer ground in discussing the social and economic revolution that took place in the South during the Civil War, although characteristically he finds more than there probably was. Thomas's insistence that the racial patterns of the South after the Civil War differed little from what it would have been if the CSA had been successful is questionable. It is difficult to believe that southern blacks would have been able even to challenge their subsequent repression without the constitutional guarantees provided by he thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments.

ROGER D. BRIDGES

*Illinois State Historical Library*

*Editors Make War: Southern Newspapers in the Secession Crisis.* By Donald E. Reynolds. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1970. xii, 304 pp. Preface, introduction, appendix, notes, bibliography, index. $10.00.)

Why did the South secede in 1861? The communications media of the day, the newspapers, explain in a rather earthy fashion the answer to this question. Newspapers have always been a prime reference source for historians. Further, they, as a rule, are extremely sensitive to public opinion. Editors at times have in a major fashion influenced that opinion. To have researched the holdings of nearly 200 newspapers was a formidable task. To then come up with a readable interesting story is very much to the author's credit.

Considering the business relations between North and South in the 1850s, family ties, common language, congress, it is amazing that the two sections so misunderstood each other. In the campaign of 1860, at least in the beginning, the majority of southern

newspapers regarded secession as a last resort. A large number of Unionist papers were being published in the South. Most of these supported John Bell, the Constitutional Unionist or opposition party candidate. The remainder, except for two Republican journals in Virginia, advocated Stephen Douglas the Northern Democratic candidate for President. The majority of southern papers emphasized states rights and the candidacy of Southern Democrat John C. Breckenridge. Public opinion, the initiative, the passions, emotions, and enthusiasm of the South sided with these southern-rights papers. The logic and foresight of the Unionist papers were no match for the extreme partisanship of the southern-righters. Though in the spring of 1860 most southern newspapers gave lip service to the preservation of the Union, the free soil doctrine and general image of the Republican party made compromise from the standpoint of even the Southern Unionist highly improbable.

Most southern papers gave limited space to Lincoln and the Republican party. Only an occasional article reiterated that the Black Republicans would abolish slavery and establish black equality when they gained control of the national government. The strategy of the Unionist editors was to seek the middle ground, making the Breckinridge southern-rights editors appear to be extremists. A pro-Bell paper, the Nashville *Patriot* charged a plot by William L. Yancey and fellow conspirators. First they split the Democratic party at Charleston, then they ran their own candidate, and lastly they preached secession in the event of Lincoln's election. It was the thesis of pro-Douglas papers that southern public opinion would rebuke the fire-eaters for disrupting the Democratic party. The closed southern society doomed the Unionist editors' efforts to failure. Lincoln's decision to resupply Fort Sumter united a South that already had decided to be united. The story of the alleged slave insurrection in Texas is illustrative of the high emotional pitch of the South on the eve of the Civil War.

The author tells his story in a moderate objective fashion. He enlivens it with quotes from editors such as the fiery Unionist Parson Brownlow. His breakdown of southern newspapers as to candidate in an appendix is valuable both to students of political history and the Civil War. His reliance on the research of Roy Nichols, Allan Nevins, and Avery Craven gives evidence of

careful scholarship. There is sufficient information on Florida newspapers as to be of interest to Floridians. The book contributes measureably to a most interesting year in United States history. One error should be corrected: Stephen Douglas's second running mate was Herschel V. Johnson, not Alexander H. Stevens.

EDWARD C. WILLIAMSON

*Auburn University*

*The Higher Realism of Woodrow Wilson and Other Essays.* By Arthur S. Link. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1971. xxii, 425 pp. Preface, foreword, illustration, index. $12.95.)

All of us carry in our minds sharply etched little vignettes from our childhood. Mostly they seem to have but a faint relation to anything else, and often they concern persons or episodes we have not tried to remember. However, there they are. In my memory there is such a picture of Woodrow Wilson. When I saw him he was governor of New Jersey. It must have been 1911, and I must have been ten years old. Wearing a cap, pince-nez glasses, and a belted grey suit, he rode in a Pierce Arrow along the race track in front of the grandstand at the Great Mount Holly Fair, Mount Holly, New Jersey.

My mother nudged me saying, "He will be our next president."

It must have been an effort for her to say that because she was an ardent supporter of Teddy Roosevelt. Even then it must have been evident that the split among Republicans between Roosevelt and Taft would put Wilson into the White House.

It is hard to assess Wilson's place in history, just as it is hard to assess the importance of this book about him. If our pantheon of presidents classifies itself into Great, Near-Great, Good, Fair, and Poor, then I suppose Wilson should be in the Near-Great, following behind such great presidents as Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. However, he does belong near the top not because of his ability, knowledge, or felicitous use of English, but because at a critical period he steered the country wisely and because he played a major role in designing the framework of the League

of Nations, even though he did not succeed in getting the congress to approve the treaty of the League.

As to the importance of this book about him, I am of two minds. It is a collection of twenty-four essays, each one of which is interesting. Twelve concern themselves directly with Wilson's life and work, six are concerned with the times of Wilson, two have a peripheral relation, two have only a remote relation, and two have no relation at all.

An essay has its own structure, just as a book has. Each is complete in itself. In this book, there are twenty-four essays—each good, each complete in itself, some relating to Wilson, some not. Therefore, one can hardly review the book as a book; one can only review a series of essays. One can honestly say that each essay is good, that a person sitting at an historical society meeting listening to it, would applaud. But good books are not made by collections of essays. Books are for a total immersion, for the long breath; essays are for a partial immersion, for the short breath. It is, of course, obvious that Arthur Link could and has written excellent books about Wilson, his favorite and chosen topic. But in this book he has simply put together essays not previously included in books, and the effect is not one of unity and coherence but of diffuseness.

Therefore, a reviewer is puzzled. Is the book worth reading? Yes, because the individual essays are good. Does the book make a lasting impression? No, because it has no central structure. Was it worth publishing? Yes, because the individual essays are worthy of being reprinted from journals and put inside hard covers. However, the book, as a book, could have been greatly improved by some restructuring and by a severe pruning of the material not bearing *directly* on the main subject, Woodrow Wilson.

BYRON S. HOLLINSHEAD

*New Smyrna Beach*

*The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements.* By Hazel W. Hertzberg. (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1971. ix, 362 pp. Preface, acknowledgments, illustrations, notes to the chapters, bibliographical essay, index. $12.00.)

Hazel W. Hertzberg contributes the first major work to this subject. It is produced in a large part from primary sources and represents an immense effort by the author to survey the entire field of pan-Indianism. The writing style is lively and well-suited to the material being discussed. The wide experience and deep knowledge of the author is quite evident in her handling of the subject.

The author discusses the leading figures with sympathy and understanding, yet at times she can be critical in a mature way. The book is well-organized, with thirteen distinct chapters which are well integrated. The footnotes are extremely useful to the researching scholar, but they might be more valuable at the bottom of the page rather than lumped at the end of the book. Perhaps this is the complaint of one who is intensely interested in each source. The bibliographical essay (eight pages in length) is excellent. In Category VII of that essay, the author says that personal interviews were used. This approach might have been employed more extensively, particularly since the documentary sources cited are largely in the eastern United States, while the Indians are in the trans-Mississippi West.

In a time when there is a revival of interest in the study of American Indians, not as anthropology or sociology, but as history, this book is indeed important. With Native American Studies or American Indian Studies being founded in colleges and universities across the nation, this variety of work is indispensable in dignifying and bolstering these programs.

FLOYD A. O'NEIL

*Center for Studies of the American West*
*University of Utah*

*Cry from the Cotton: The Southern Tenant Farmers' Union and the New Deal.* By Donald H. Grubbs. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1971. xvi, 218 pp. Foreword, preface, introduction, acknowledgments, illustrations, bibliography, index. $8.50.)

Agrarian radicalism as the traditional source of American indigenous revolt receives yet another substantial documentation

in Professor Grubbs's work on the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union. In that respect it joins Conrad's book on the *Forgotten Farmer*, Cantor's work on the Missouri sharecroppers, and material on the Farmers Holiday Association in detailing the grave discontent arising out of the Great Depression years.

*Cry from the Cotton* recounts the sad consequences of the Agricultural Adjustment Act on the landless peasants– sharecroppers– of the cotton belt. The AAA was structured in favor of the cotton planters– through the congressmen who represented them– and the owners promptly evicted many share tenants so they might collect the cash benefit payments themselves.

The Arkansas Delta was the first breeding-ground of sharecropper desperation and the formation of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union. Professor Grubbs argues very convincingly that, although the Union was aided by the Socialists in its infancy, native Populist traditions supplied the sustenance for its expansion and growth. The Union had a friend at court in Gardner Jackson of the AAA, who was instrumental in alerting President Roosevelt to the abuses of cotton tenancy. The liberals in the Department of Agriculture, however, were fired for their pains through the irresistible political pressures of key southern congressmen.

The vicious assaults visited upon the black and white membership of the SFTU by plantation owners and their nightriders brought national publicity to bear on the tenancy problem. After the 1936 election, the Union's plight and its gritty determination aided the efforts to ameliorate the savage plight of farm tenants. The influence of the SFTU, direct or indirect, has been amazingly widespread. The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act, the Farm Security Administration, and the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee all owed some measure of their existence to the SFTU. And the embattled union also demonstrated with its "salt and pepper" membership that blacks and whites could overcome racism in striving for mutual economic goals.

Professor Grubbs has exhaustively mined the union's papers and interviewed dozens of its survivors to bring us this impassioned but strongly substantiated account of Depression discontent.

*Old Dominion University* RALPH F. DE BEDTS

*The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1930.* By Anne F. Scott. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971. xv, 247 pp. Preface, acknowledgments, bibliographical essay, index. $5.95.)

For too long history has been written by men and about men. It is refreshing to find a woman historian writing about women and developing a thesis long ignored: that the antebellum southern lady's pedestal was not only culturally contrived, but that the lady squirmed on her pedestal because of the wide gap which existed between the image of Lady and the harsh realities of life.

Charm and beauty aside, the real mark of a southern lady was submissiveness. Submissiveness in women was underscored in theology and long associated with medieval chivalry. If the Lady image was stronger in the South than elsewhere in America it was, the author claims, because the South had a traditional landowning aristocracy, based on slavery, and clung to a patriarchal family structure. Southern mores required a girl to marry young, bear numerous children, and regard her husband as lord and master.

That southern women had an easy life is myth. Women, in addition to the endless child bearing, had to manage large households and supervise numerous slaves– train, discipline, and doctor them. If her husband was away or if she was widowed she might have to supervise the plantation also. Many women saw a parallel between their situation and that of slaves. While a few southern women were active abolitionists, the Grimké sisters, for example, the author believes that most southern women were privately against slavery.

Part Two of the book deals with the struggle of southern women to throw off the "myth" and gain a place in society's mainstream. In this they were helped by the Civil War and Reconstruction which changed life patterns and gave women new options. From necessity at first, then with a sense of expanding horizons, women sought jobs outside the home. They began to group, to overcome their shyness about speaking out. The first groups were missionary societies. Then came women's clubs with programs attacking social ills. Finally women came to the political arena. The author acknowledges that the southern

suffragette was little different from other American suffragettes except that southern women never lost the outward forms of ladylike behavior. They were always charmingly feminine and attractive and never forgot their white gloves.

The book spans a century but does not reach to the present. The present women's liberation movement is an extension of what this book is all about. Modern leaders should find it heartening for the progress shown.

Anne Scott is an associate professor at Duke University, editor of *Democracy and Social Ethics*, and a contributor to various scholarly journals. In her research she used many contemporary diaries, letters, and various printed materials, including novels which portrayed southern ladies. The biographical essay is an important adjunct to the book and suggests rich fields for additional detailed studies of the women's emancipation movement.

THELMA PETERS

*Miami-Dade Junior College*

*The History of Georgetown County, South Carolina.* By George C. Rogers, Jr. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970. xvi, 565 pp. Acknowledgments, list of abbreviations, illustrations, maps, appendices, index. $12.50.)

One of the most neglected areas in American historical writing is that of local history– the story of states, counties, and cities, where so much material exists about the actual day-by-day lives of the people who lived there. This work by Professor Rogers, who teaches at the University of South Carolina, is a happy exception to the rule. In tracing the history of Georgetown County– which has been termed by some as perhaps the most aristocratic region of the nation– Dr. Rogers begins with a description of the geography of the county, moves on to discuss the Indian tribes who originally inhabited the area, and then ultimately brings his account to the present.

Overall, it is the story of the emergence of Georgetown, its effort to preserve itself by participating in the secession movement, its eventual defeat, and then the "invasion" of Yankee

entrepreneurs in the post-Civil War period. Antebellum Georgetown was an exceptional case of a society composed of a relative few, enormously rich white families living in plantation splendor on the labor of hundreds of Negro slaves. Above all else, the society and the economy were based on one staple– rice, which the author terms "Georgetown's contribution to Western civilization" (p. 341). He describes in great detail every aspect of rice cultivation, from the planting to the marketing, and points out that Georgetown was the principal rice-growing area in the nation, producing in 1840 nearly one-half of the total crop of the United States.

But then in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century occurred a sudden and dramatic collapse of the rice industry in the county. Partly the decline was caused by the changed pattern of labor supply produced by emancipation, partly from increased competition in the lower Mississippi valley, and party from the ravages of nature. One result was that a large number of former rice plantations were purchased by outsiders, beginning in the 1890s and continuing on into the 1930s. "In the years after 1900 the rich Yankees came to seek what their fathers had destroyed" (p. 489).

There is, in fact, no aspect of the history of Georgetown County and her people that Professor Rogers neglects. The book has very impressive research, admirable organization, and a highly readable style. The author has done the cause of local history an excellent service.

MARTIN ABBOTT

*Georgia College at Milledgeville*

*The Chickasaws.* By Arrell Gibson. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1971. xv, 312 pp. Dedicatory, acknowledgments, illustrations, maps, sources, index. $8.95.)

While most of the major Indian groups who once held the southeastern United States have been the subjects of one or more historical and anthropological accounts, including the Cherokees, Choctaws, Creeks, Seminoles, and even the Catawbas, de Chickasaws alone have been neglected. Both anthropologists and

historians specializing in the Indians of the Southeast will be pleased that a book-length historical study of the Chickasaws has at last been published.

Arrell Gibson's account begins with a brief ethnohistoric sketch of the Chickasaws and their basic religious beliefs and social institutions. He then traces the history of the Chickasaws, beginning with their brilliant attack on Hernando de Soto's expedition, and their equally effective military stand against the French a century and a half to two centuries later. The account continues with the development of the fur trade and the increasing dependence of the Chickasaws on British trade goods in the eighteenth century; with their role in the rivalry between Spain and the United States; and with increasing pressure from Mississippi and Alabama in the early decades of the nineteenth century, eventually forcing their removal to Oklahoma in 1837.

The chapter on removal itself is one of the most interesting in the book. Although the Chickasaws suffered fewer horrors during removal than did the Cherokees and other Southeastern Indians, their experience was harsh enough, with deaths from both smallpox and starvation. Gibson skillfully documents how they were cheated of their resources during removal through collusion between businessmen who contracted to transport them to the West and shadowy government officials. The account goes on to describe their founding a new Chickasaw Nation in Oklahoma, their surprisingly strong alliance with the South (the same people who exerted pressure for removal just thirty years earlier) in the Civil War, and the series of Federal actions between 1893 and 1906 which ended the existence of the Chickasaw Nation as a semi-autonomous Indian republic.

What the book covers, it covers very well. Documentation is extensive, even exhaustive. What many readers will miss is a sympathetic portrayal of the aboriginal culture of the Chickasaws, an account of their traditional social structure, and a feeling for what they were like as a people in their "natural state," to use Gibson's phrase. In all fairness it should be said that this kind of account was not one of Gibson's objectives, but in this reviewer's mind it needs to be done, and our understanding of the Chickasaws will remain deficient until it is.

*University of Georgia* CHARLES HUDSON