

2011

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.

Recommended Citation

Society, Florida Historical (2011) "Book Reviews," *Florida Historical Quarterly*. Vol. 90: No. 3, Article 9.
Available at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/fhq/vol90/iss3/9>

Book Reviews

Daniel Murphree, Book Review Editor

Mosquito Empires: Ecology and War in the Greater Caribbean, 1620-1914. By J.R. McNeill. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Acknowledgements, maps, bibliography, index. Pp. xviii, 371. \$95 cloth, \$24.99, paper.)

Back in 1972, Alfred Crosby's *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492* popularized the idea that the European conquest of the Americas owed less to superior weapons and more to superior immune systems. Over the last four decades, scholars have expanded on Crosby's work, and we are now familiar with the role old world epidemic diseases played in decimating Native American populations. Less well understood, though, is why this process of European conquest stopped, and then reversed. First, weak, impoverished Spanish colonies populated largely by *indios*, *negros*, and *creoles* fought off an ambitious British Empire during the seventeenth and eighteenth century. Then in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Americans of all colors declared their independence from European empires, and defeated their former rulers' attempts to re-conquer them. In his latest work, environmental historian J.R. McNeill advances the ironic thesis that some of the very diseases old world colonists used to conquer the Americas worked to restore the independence of the two continents.

Malaria, yellow fever, and the mosquitoes that hosted and spread them came across the Atlantic on the slave ships from tropical West Africa and found a congenial home in the heat and humidity of the Caribbean. Colonization aided their spread as the

water barrels, gutters, sugar pots, and other receptacles introduced by Europeans and Africans building sugar plantations and tropical ports proved the perfect breeding ground for *Aedes aegypti*, the carrier of yellow fever. Europeans had no answer to the diseases they had imported from the old world. Early modern physicians' techniques of bleeding, blistering, and powerful emetics usually did more harm than good. By the eighteenth century, tropical fevers had entrenched themselves in the American tropics, and Europeans feared the region as a death trap.

Tropical diseases did not hit everyone in the Caribbean equally, though—a fact McNeill calls “differential immunity.” People who survived exposure to yellow fever acquired lifelong immunity, while malaria-sufferers built up resistance through repeated bouts with the disease. People born and raised in the Caribbean were much less susceptible, as were those brought as slaves from West Africa, where malaria and yellow fever were endemic. Recent arrivals from Europe suffered the most, leading to people in the southern colonies talking about the “seasoning” new immigrants had to survive, and Caribbean colonists to refer to various tropical fevers as the “stranger’s disease.” Europeans in the tropics could get some protection if they came in small numbers and blended into large native populations—what McNeill refers to as “herd immunity.” Mosquitoes could not find enough non-resistant humans to bite to turn isolated infections into an epidemic. This kind of immunity did not apply when large numbers of Europeans arrived together, occasionally as colonists—but most often as invading armies.

This distinction is the crux of McNeill’s argument. Again and again, European states sent large expeditions to the American tropics only to see the tropical fevers tear through their crowded ships and camps. Spain was able to fend off British aggression during the 18th-century with “seasoned” troops and native-born or mixed race militias, hunkering down behind siege walls and waiting for half the redcoats to die and the other half to give up and leave. This strategy was turned against European imperialists later in the 1700s as native populations rose up in search of independence, and forces sent from Europe to subdue them fell victim to the fevers themselves. McNeill notes the way Cornwallis’s troops struggled with malaria during 1780-1781, finally surrendering at Yorktown when they were unable to muster enough healthy men to defend their lines. Between 1793 and 1804, the slave rebels of Haiti conducted guerrilla operations from the mountains while waiting

for first British, and then French troops in the port towns to fall to the ravages of yellow fever. Native-born *caudillo* independence fighters hid in the malarial swamps and savannas of Venezuela and Columbia to outlast Spanish troops during the 1810s. Unfortunately, McNeill has little to say about Florida beyond noting that the Seminoles were able to resist defeat and removal well into the 1840s because of the unwillingness of American commanders to send troops down the peninsula during the fever-ridden summers. Only the wide-spread use of quinine (and a willingness to accept high casualties from malaria) enabled the U.S. Army to finally conquer Florida.

McNeill's thesis is a bold, far-reaching one, and his thorough research in English, Spanish, and French sources and a sophisticated understanding of epidemiology helps him deflect charges of being an environmental determinist. Poor early modern medical understanding and spotty records limit some of his argument to educated guesses, especially when it comes to malaria. But yellow fever's distinctive symptoms make it much easier to diagnose from early modern sources, and its staggering death tolls are hard to discount. That new world military commanders like Toussaint L'Overture, Simon Bolivar, and Winfield Scott explicitly built their strategies around their understanding of tropical fever adds weight to McNeill's case. *Mosquito Empires* gives a valuable new framework for understanding the biology of colonization and independence in the Americas. Epidemic disease remained a key factor in American geopolitics long after the European conquest.

Lynn A. Nelson

Middle Tennessee State University

Colonial Georgia and the Creeks: Anglo-Indian Diplomacy on the Southern Frontier, 1733-1763. By John T. Juricek. (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2010. Maps, notes, bibliography, index. Pp. xii, 303. \$49.95 cloth.)

John T. Juricek is perhaps best known to scholars of early America as the editor of two volumes of treaties in the *Early American Indian Documents* (1979-2004) series, both of which quickly became indispensable. Denizens of the small world of southeastern Native American history are probably aware that he has also written important articles on the Westos and the Hernando de Soto expe-

dition. In *Colonial Georgia and the Creeks*, Juricek has produced a fine study of English diplomacy in Georgia's early years.

The book progresses chronologically from the 1733 establishment of English Georgia to the 1763 settlement at the end of the Seven Years' War. Creeks and English parlayed concerning a variety of issues, including trade, and Creek relations with the Spanish and French, but the most pressing matters were those related to land. Each of the chapters is packed with detailed information, and the book should prove a valuable reference work. The book's middle chapters are the most valuable and best written: the discussion of the Bosomworth controversy positively crackles, and Juricek's prodigious talents as a researcher and writer are on display here.

Coosaponakeesa, later Mary Musgrove, and later still Mary Matthews and Mary Bosomworth, lived in two worlds. A native of the Creek town at Coweta and daughter of an English trader, she spoke Muskogee and could read and write in English. She ran a trading house, served as an intermediary between the Lower Creeks and the English, and fought a decades-long battle to gain English-style title to lands granted her by Creeks. Though not fully successful in this quest, she did manage to hold on to St. Catherine's Island until her death in 1767. Juricek skillfully weaves Coosaponakeesa's story through several chapters, and uses the fascinating case to illuminate the difficulties in reconciling English and Creek ways. The controversy also presents a different side of James Oglethorpe. Usually lauded for his negotiating skills, Oglethorpe made a serious error when he gave tacit approval to the Creek grant of land to Mary Musgrove. Like all good colonizers, he knew that Indian nations were not capable of such acts, at least from the English legal perspective, and Georgia's relations with the neighboring Creeks went through a series of crises as a result.

Central to Juricek's work is the notion that English and Indians understood territorial sovereignty differently. And while we come to understand English notions like the crucial distinction between territorial sovereignty (which was the king's) and possession and the associated rituals quite well, our understanding of Creek notions of land tenure remains murky. Perhaps this reflects the dearth of source material on such matters, and it is patently unfair to criticize Juricek for the book he did not write. Still, the Creeks that inhabit the book seem unmoored from their cultural context in a way that the English do not. *Colonial Georgia and the Creeks* succeeds because of its author's insistence on the full, frail humanity of English and

Creek negotiators, and their ability to wrest concessions, threaten, demur and compromise, but the cultural basis the Creeks' ideas about diplomacy could have played a larger role in the book.

Juricek has a keen eye for the subtleties of diplomacy, and a rare ability to present multiple interpretations of the same event right next to one another without diluting what he believes to be the most likely scenario. His extensive work with the documents of early Georgia, most notably the treaties, certainly pays dividends in *Colonial Georgia and the Creeks*, and his high level of respect for the documents shines through in each chapter. At times, however, Juricek seems reluctant to speculate beyond the sources: we learn that a delegation of Creeks "granted Mary lands as an Indian, but not by Indian land tenure" (209). Does this indicate the demise of a Creek way of understanding land tenure? Is it recognition that Mary's case was unique? Might it demonstrate that Creek forms were adaptable to a variety of colonial realities? Some readers may view this as simply careful scholarship, while others may see a missed opportunity.

The labels Juricek applies to the biracial people of the Southeast are unsatisfying, and the author admits as much when he references Theda Perdue's *"Mixed Blood" Indians* (2003) to note that so-called "mixed-bloods" were "essentially Indian" (19). The narrative uses a variety of terms in addition to "mixed-bloods": Euroindian, mustee, mestizo, half-Creek, and half-Indian. The search for appropriate terminology continues, and Juricek is honest enough to allow that no term fully captures the multivalent role that biracial people played in the early colonial Southeast.

In recent years, several works have added key pieces to our understanding of the Southeast, and to Anglo-Creek relations in particular: Steven Hahn's *Invention of the Creek Nation* (2004) and Julie Anne Sweet's *Negotiating for Georgia* (2005) offer the most immediate comparison, but Joshua Piker's *Okfuskee* (2004), Robbie Ethridge's *Creek Country* (2003), Claudio Saunt's *A New Order of Things* (1999) and Andrew Frank's *Creeks and Southerners* (2005) are not to be missed either. Taken together, the works portray a Southeast that is diverse, complicated, and confusing, but also one rooted in ancient traditions. *Colonial Georgia and the Creeks* offers a nuanced perspective on one aspect of the English-Creek relationship, accessible enough to assign for advanced undergraduates, but with enough detail to satisfy specialists as well.

Matthew H. Jennings

Macon State College

Sweet Cane: The Architecture of the Sugar Works of East Florida. By Lucy B. Wayne. (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2010. Acknowledgements, illustrations, references cited, index. Pp xiii, 155. \$45 cloth, \$22.50, paper).

Lucy Wayne offers a guided tour through the ruins of the East Florida sugar plantations in *Sweet Cane: The Architecture of the Sugar Works of East Florida*. As a journey to eight publicly-accessible sites, the book is informed and insightful for the historical archaeology of the early 19th-century vernacular industrial architecture. The book is well-organized and an engaging and interesting read. The scholarly contribution is the description of the sugar works, with Wayne organizing the local histories and excavations to reveal the patterns from the architectural remains. A larger audience will appreciate how detailed architectural and historical materials are made accessible for an important industry that is commemorated in state parks. Some might use the book while touring the ruins, others can compare other sugar plantations sites to these or contrast the failure of the East Florida industry to sugar's success elsewhere, but in all cases the contextual study of archaeological details is important for building up scholarly knowledge on the historical political economy of Florida.

While the ruins are readily accessible, Wayne points out their misidentification as the remains of ancient Spanish missions. The correct identification as remains of sugar works is less romantic but more significant for remembering a failed industry. The amnesia is not surprising; as Wayne implies sugar's historic imprint on the northeast corner of Florida's cultural landscape was light.

Since Sidney Mintz published *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (1986), anthropologists have expanded on the history and social implications of the ubiquitous modern commodity. Wayne notes that sugar came to British Florida after 150 years of production in the Caribbean, and the East Florida sugar works were similar to those of the Caribbean but also influenced by those in coastal Georgia and South Carolina. But it was the American Territorial Period that witnessed increasing attempts at sugar production, expansion that the Seminole wars quickly ended for East Florida. Sugar moved to northwest Florida and the Manatee River but the Civil War ended those attempts at large-scale production. Only in the late 19th century was the Everglades sugar industry developed, far from those previous centers of production.

As a study of Florida's past, Chapter 4 opens with the question: "Was sugar lucrative in East Florida?" The quick answer is no and Wayne points to dislocations, wars, and hopeful opportunities unmet. The first part of the book gives a concise historical context for the sugar industry; the second part is devoted to the architecture of the sugar works of the East Florida plantations.

The bulk of the second part of the book focuses on the sugar works found for the case studies. The examples are situated within the types of sugar works used across the Caribbean, with the main focus going to the trains; in this industry, trains are the series of kettles used for boiling the juice. The two major types are Spanish trains, where each kettle has its own furnace, and the French or Jamaica trains that use a single furnace for all the kettles. The details on trains are important because they are the only material remains from the earliest plantations whose buildings were made of wood.

The eight sites are placed into three chronological categories. The first category consists of plantations with Spanish Trains: Oswald/Yonge Three Chimneys and McHardy. The second is labeled as adaptive: Dummett and Spring Garden. And the third, dated to the 1820s to 1830s, is the ultimate form: Bulow, Macrae, Crugan-DePeyster, and Dunlawton. The descriptions are concise and engaging profiles of the plantations. The photographs and drawings are informative and are effective in bringing the reader a sense of these places.

The images and information in this volume offer a comparative basis for studies of other Florida sugar plantation ruins. There is an impressive number of them across the state, many of which are accessible to the public such as the Yulee Sugar Mill Ruins Historic State Park in Homosassa (in operation from 1851 to 1864) and the Gamble Sugar Mill Ruins in Ellenton (in operation from 1842 to 1864). A similar analysis for those sugar works, following Wayne's framework, would be welcomed.

The archaeology of sugar plantations is a vigorous field that has two main groupings. One seeks the broad themes from analysis of the built environment, artifacts, archives, and peoples of plantations and the other focuses on fine-grained studies of individual plantation development and activities. *Sweet Cane*, as an example of the latter, recognizes the owners of the sugar plantations and the engineers for specific sugar works, with important, well-organized details on the production of sugar and the contingencies of the East Florida industry. Where there are material remains, the book

notes slave cabins and other structures but the reader should not expect details on daily life for the plantations. Similarly, while the number of slaves is listed for several plantations, labor is muted in this study. A more nuanced engagement with the enslaved labor and the brutality of sugar production would have been useful. But this book will be a key resource to build anthropological studies of plantation social life. As an architectural study, *Sweet Cane* is a contribution to the history of Florida's landscape that the scholar can employ for understanding the built environment and regional economic change and the tourist can enjoy for site visits.

Uzi Baram

New College of Florida

Lowcountry Time and Tide: The Fall of the South Carolina Rice Kingdom. By James H. Tuten. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010. Acknowledgements, illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. Pp. xii, 200. \$34.95 cloth.)

The rice industry of the Atlantic South has often been regarded as one of the most striking casualties of the American Civil War. Indeed, after the war agricultural production on the rice plantations that stretched from Cape Fear, North Carolina, to the St. John's River in Florida never returned to its antebellum heights. But as James Tuten reminds us in this economically written and highly readable monograph, the collapse of the lowcountry rice industry was no foregone conclusion in 1865. Planters and laborers alike maintained sufficient hope in the economic potential of rice growing to keep the industry alive into the twentieth century. Perhaps more important, as Tuten argues, lowcountry communities had a significant cultural investment in the industry, a form of capital that sustained rice growers even as profits eluded them.

Antebellum rice growing was a peculiar institution within the peculiar institution. Limited by climate, topography, and tied to a thin strip of land at the edge of the southern Atlantic coastal plain, commercial rice growing lacked the mobility of its cash crop cousin, cotton. Tidal rice culture, relying on daily freshwater floods, required a complex system of dikes, ditches, and banks that took years to build. The environmental limitations and capital requirements of the culture kept the ruling class of the rice kingdom small—there were approximately 250 rice planters in South Caro-

lina in 1860—but the majority of lowcountry residents were slaves, and most of these African American workers toiled in the rice fields. In 1865, despite emancipation and damage done through war and neglect, there remained tremendous human, engineering, environmental, and cultural investment in the growing of rice in the lowcountry.

Tuten opens his work with a brief overview of Atlantic rice culture from its beginnings around 1685, but his story really begins in the 1870s, as planters and laborers worked to adapt their knowledge and the surviving infrastructure of rice production to postwar circumstances. The narrative arc of the first half of the book is familiar; Atlantic rice growers were besieged by an onslaught of economic and environmental problems, from new sources of domestic and foreign competition to the devastating Hurricane of 1893. The strength here is the author's ability to revise the traditional narrative of slow decline into a study of the fits and starts of a postbellum agricultural system that lasted for half a century despite enormous obstacles. Rice production declined sharply between 1859 and 1869 but rose between 1869 and 1879. Earnings never fully recovered, but Tuten emphasizes that future promise rather than current profits motivated growers. In the 1870s and 1880s, the prospect of success was never sufficiently dim to warrant total abandonment.

In its second half the book hits its analytical stride, embarking on a study of the changing agricultural practices of lowcountry rice production. Here the reader is more thoroughly introduced to the last generation of rice planters—those who came of age after the Civil War and inherited rice plantations. Their story is one of adaptation. Rice planters in the 1870s and 1880s attempted to capitalize on the possibilities of postbellum agriculture; the lowcountry was not immune to the New South world of expanding possibilities. Tuten argues convincingly that these planters were “far from the conservative caretakers of ancient methods that they have been presumed to be” but rather were “dynamic adapters” (7). Adaptation came with a price. Planters' new grain drills, mechanical threshers, and conveyor belts saved on labor costs, but such advancements also worked against lowcountry planters by assisting new rice growers in Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas, whose higher, drier lands facilitated mechanization. Rice planters looked for new sources of income—phosphate mining on rice plantations became common in 1870s—but the most successful ventures relocated planters to cities, making rice production increasingly peripheral to their economic endeavors.

Tuten engages with Peter Coclanis' *Shadow of a Dream* (1989), an economic history of the rise and decline of lowcountry rice production, not arguing against the centrality of economics in agriculture but instead offering a broader understanding of the postbellum rice kingdom. As Tuten correctly asserts, "Agriculture is always a cultural activity," and in this work culture is key (5). After over a century as the economic mainstay of the South Carolina lowcountry, rice production was inscribed into the cultural practices and foodways of the black and white population. Tuten works with ideas similar to those in Sidney Mintz' cultural analysis of the Atlantic sugar trade, *Sweetness and Power* (1985). Lowcountry rice production lasted as long as it did because lowcountry actors could not make economic decisions independent of their cultural context.

Answering the question of "when the rice culture ended?" ultimately depends on the definition of "culture" used. *Rice culture* as agriculture lingered into the 1920s when the last lowcountry grower died, but *rice culture* as the symbols, patterns, and products associated with the rice-growing lowcountry endured the fall of the rice kingdom. In a bit of a twist, Tuten demonstrates how rice culture (through its second definition) persists in the lowcountry, sustained through the nostalgic writings of early twentieth-century rice growers, plantation tourism, and the continued presence of rice as a staple of the lowcountry diet.

This work shines a valuable light on the complex history of the postbellum rice industry, but its more important contribution may be in what it offers to our growing understanding of the ways in which the plantation maintained its cultural importance even as its economic relevance waned. Tuten provides useful insights into the impact of African Americans on postbellum rice culture, but here he could go further. Considering the complex and extensive hydraulic workings of rice plantations, sharecropping had limited potential on rice plantations, necessitating a continuation of centralized plantation operations and the task system. To what extent did the maintenance of a centralized agricultural system encourage black laborers to maintain their intimate connections to rice cultivation? How did black rice growers engage with rice as a cultural symbol? In raising questions like these, Tuten opens up avenues for important further study.

Philip Mills Herrington

University of Virginia

Reconstructing Appalachia: The Civil War's Aftermath. Edited by Andrew L. Slap. (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2010. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. Pp. ix, 379. \$40 cloth).

In his introduction to this volume, veteran Appalachian historian Gordon B. McKinney notes correctly that the post-Civil War era in Appalachia constituted a period of contrasts—"decline and growth, confusion and organization, poverty and riches"—and that fortunately "our understanding of this complex period is deepening" (1). It is a measure of how far the field of Appalachian history has come in recent decades that major historical assessments now exist for the southern states' mountain regions, including *Civil War in Appalachia: Collected Essays* (1997), edited by Kenneth W. Noe and Shannon H. Wilson, and now Andrew L. Slap's anthology.

Slap and twelve other historians provide deeply researched and generally well-argued topical chapters that offer important revisionist insights into Reconstruction-era Appalachia's cultural, economic, political, and social history. The essays focus more on Appalachia as a region undergoing transition than on traditional understandings of Reconstruction as a political period in American history. They range throughout the Appalachian region (extending north into Pennsylvania) and span chronologically well past 1877. Many of the essays cover topics hitherto unexplored by historians, thereby broadening traditional definitions of Reconstruction and Appalachia. Because several of the authors reach differing conclusions, *Reconstructing Appalachia* provides a primer of sorts for debates among scholars over such proverbial topics as Appalachian exceptionalism, isolationism, modernization, poverty, the region's alleged preindustrial and colonial qualities, violence, and Appalachia's contested identity as a sub-region within the South.

Slap notes correctly that the essays resist simple generalizations about the Civil War's aftermath in the trans-Appalachian mountain region. "They suggest that in some places, Appalachia was more integrated with the rest of the nation than was previously thought; in other areas, Appalachia was more isolated than the conventional wisdom has had it. There were places where people sought outside capital, and places where they resisted development." This variance, Slap explains, "reflects the chaos and

upheaval of Reconstruction, one of the most difficult periods of American history; it may also demonstrate the difficulty of defining Appalachia" (43).

Four of the essays examine among the most common of Appalachian research subjects—the nexus of mountain violence and politics. Keith S. Hébert argues that longstanding questions of local autonomy, not Reconstruction per se or race, spirited Ku Klux Klan violence in northeast Georgia. T.R.C. Hutton identifies a different scenario in eastern Kentucky where residual Civil War sectional and racial questions—not local conflicts—sparked guerrilla fighting and left the area decidedly “unreconstructed.” Steven E. Nash maintains that following Appomattox, bitter conflicts in western North Carolina between former moderate Unionists and Conservatives convinced the former to support Radical Reconstruction and to align with the national Republican party. As this shift unfolded, a mountain politician observed with much prescience that “the other war was but the beginning” of what would follow (107). Paul Yandle underscores the connection between Ku Klux Klan violence in western North Carolina and the legislative efforts by former Klansmen in North Carolina’s General Assembly. Both played essential roles in undoing Reconstruction in the Tar Heel State.

Kyle Osborn charts the metamorphosis of the influential and irascible East Tennessee editor and governor William “Parson” Brownlow from an antebellum defender of slavery to a champion of free labor and black suffrage during Reconstruction. John Hamilton Morgan, the subject of Mary Ella Engel’s article, was a zealous missionary who came to northwest Georgia in 1876 to establish a Mormon enclave in the southern mountains. Morgan later established a home among Georgians in the Colorado colony of Manassa—their new Mormon Zion.

Examining West Virginia’s Reconstruction experience, Randall S. Gooden explains the complications posed by ex-Confederates in the young state. Eventually bipartisan coalitions emerged between Republicans and Conservative Democrats who found common ground on intrastate sectional concerns as well as on questions pertaining to railroad regulation, land policy, and economic development. In his essay on the changing geography and political economy of party strength in West Virginia from 1863 through the early twentieth century, Ken Fones-Wolf emphasizes the state’s borderland mentalité. Robert M. Sandow expands the reach of

Reconstructing Appalachia into the mountains of Pennsylvania, arguing that many residents there violently opposed the war, especially conscription and emancipation, associating them and Lincoln's government with encroaching extractive and exploitative industries and the on-going loss of local sovereignty.

The final three chapters of Slap's collection treat fascinating aspects of post-Civil War Appalachia in myth, historical memory, and regional identification. They constitute the book's most original and compelling essays.

Tom Lee examines the longstanding "mythologizing process" by East Tennesseans who, during and after Reconstruction, drew on the region's history to construct an identity as independent Unionists and sketched a narrative of heroism and victimization (314). Ignoring Confederate sympathies in the region, as well as divisions within Unionist ranks, East Tennesseans capitalized on the Unionist myth to speed reconciliation and to attract northern investors to the region.

Like Lee, John C. Inscoe also probes the construction of Civil War loyalties during what he terms the "Age of Appalachian Discovery, 1900-1921." According to Inscoe, after 1900, as highland South writers sought aid for and investment in their region, they fashioned a history of Appalachian participation in the Civil War that celebrated pioneer independence and isolation, Anglo-Saxon heritage and, above all, Unionism. Most interesting, Inscoe concludes that Appalachians generally avoided or downplayed the region's role in the war. To have done otherwise, would have "entailed far more inconvenient truths that did not always lend themselves to the image of mountain people these writers worked so hard to create and convey" (343).

Anne E. Marshall uses debates over Confederate symbols in present-day eastern Kentucky to complicate the so-called late nineteenth-century "Unionist Civil War narrative" on the one hand, and the argument of modern scholars that demographics aside, "Appalachia shares a heritage of slavery, racial violence, and oppression with the rest of the South" (351, 363). Along with the other essays in Slap's excellent book, Marshall raises essential questions about Appalachian exceptionalism, especially regarding race and class, and its impact on the region's experiences, identity, and meaning during Reconstruction and beyond.

John David Smith

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Troubled Ground: A Tale of Murder, Lynching, and Reckoning in the New South. By Claude A. Clegg III. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2010. Acknowledgements, appendix, notes, bibliography, index. Pp. xviii, 248, \$80.00 cloth. \$27.00 paper).

We are in the midst of something of a golden age for lynching scholarship. Amongst broader studies of lynching and spectacle, the roles of women, and the deep historical roots of the practice have been a number of good studies of particular lynchings published in the last few years. Claude Clegg, a historian of African American life who has written on Liberia and the Nation of Islam, has produced one of the best of these case studies, examining the lynching of three black men in Salisbury, North Carolina, in 1906. *Troubled Ground* opens with background information about Salisbury and racial violence in the area. Salisbury, the county seat of Rowan County, sits midway between Charlotte and Greensboro in North Carolina's Piedmont. It differs from half a dozen similarly situated towns only perhaps in the fact that it was the site of a Confederate prison during the Civil War and by the location of the Southern Railway's main repair shops at Spencer, just outside Salisbury. Clegg gives a very clear and concise summary of lynching, which sits comfortably in the framework formulated by Michael Pfeifer: the practice was a response by traditional-minded localists, mostly rural and working-class, who opposed the modernization of the judicial system, with its emphasis on due process. North Carolina actually had an anti-lynching law since 1893, though it had not been used. Clegg spends some time discussing the geography of lynching in North Carolina, noting that Rowan County was near the top of the list of most lynch-prone North Carolina counties. There was quite a history of racial violence against African Americans in Rowan County, most notoriously the lynching of two boys in 1902 for the alleged murder of a white woman.

In July 1906, a white farmer and his wife and two children were murdered as they slept. Within a day, six of their African American neighbors had been arrested. Nease Gillespie worked for the victim, Isaac Lyerly, and he was arrested, along with two of his sons, John and Henry. Jack and Della Dillingham also worked for the Lyerly family. George Irwin just happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time and was swept up as well. The suspects were spirited out of town just ahead of a mob attack on the Salisbury jail and brought back in early August for indictment. This time, though,

the mob was successful. Weak and uncoordinated resistance by the sheriff and the local militia was not able to prevent Nease Gillespie, John Gillespie, and Jack Dillingham from being dragged to a baseball field (the same site as the 1902 lynching) and hanged from a large oak tree.

What makes the 1906 lynching in Salisbury different from many others and very worth evaluating in print is what it reveals about the relationship between the state and lynching. We are accustomed to think of lynching as something that happened with either the connivance of the state or, at best, its ineffectual objection after the fact. In North Carolina, however, this was changing in the first decade of the twentieth century. Democrats had used blatant racism and violence to shoulder their way back into office in 1898, and once they were in charge, lynching became an attack on state power, which should have been strong enough to secure the racist status quo on its own without the meddling of non-state actors. The governorship of Charles Aycock had seen several lynchings, but also several occasions when the militia was used to prevent lynchings. Governor Robert Glenn, who took office in 1905, was in the process of vigorously investigating and prosecuting those who lynched a white man in nearby Anson County earlier in the summer of 1906 when the Salisbury lynching occurred. Glenn immediately sent several companies of militia to occupy the town, and three men were arrested. One leader of the mob, a bootlegger named George Hall who had no strong connections to Rowan County, was convicted of conspiracy and sentenced to fifteen years, one of the very rare occasions when a white man went to prison for being part of a mob that lynched a black person in the South. Glenn also tightened up the procedures regulating the use of the militia, making it harder for a lackadaisical sheriff to foil the efforts of the militia, as had happened in Salisbury. These early contributions to North Carolina's "progressive mystique" are in marked contrast to the direction of much of the rest of the South, as illustrated by race riots in Atlanta and Brownsville later in the year.

A final point worth mentioning involves the author's connections to the events about which he writes: Clegg was born in Salisbury and lived there in the 1970s and 1980s, yet he had never heard of the lynchings until he saw a photograph in the *Without Sanctuary* collection. Few people he encountered during his research knew much at all about the events of 1906, and there is no memorialization of the lynching in Salisbury. Given this personal

connection to the place, readers might want a bit more extended discussion of the question of why such a big event in the town's history had been forgotten (and it might have been made all the more surprising if Clegg had mentioned that he is African American, since memory of lynching tends to be stronger and more durable among African Americans in the South than among whites). Still, this is a fine book, deeply researched and elegantly written, that tells us some very important things about the relationship between lynching and the modernizing state in the early twentieth century. I am confident it will find a place on bookshelves and syllabi.

Bruce E. Baker

Royal Holloway, University of London

Hands on the Freedom Plow: Personal Accounts by Women in SNCC.

Edited by Faith S. Holsaert, Martha Prescod Norman Noonan, Judy Richardson, Betty Garman Robinson, Jean Smith Young, and Dorothy M. Zellner. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2010. Illustrations, postscript, index. Pp. 656. \$34.95 cloth.)

The Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), a generation of young people who helped to transform the Civil Rights Movement, is in the process of looking back over a half century of their accomplishments. This year marks the 50th anniversary of the Freedom Rides, a form of protest the student group supported after its initiators, the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), were unable to continue after brutal violence in Alabama. The Freedom Rides drew much of their strength from the student sit-ins that spread virally in 1960. In turn, the Freedom Rides fed into the Albany Movement. The 50th anniversaries of the Ole Miss crisis, Birmingham Campaign, Freedom Summer, Selma-to-Montgomery March and myriad other vital events will follow fast. This great generation placed their "hands on the freedom plow," as the title of this vibrant, vital book on the world SNCC made as told by the women who made it, makes clear.

These personal accounts by women in SNCC serve at least three purposes: They provide a reminder of the vital role women played in the movement and especially in the student phase of the movement. They also allow autobiographical interpretations to give us a deeper understanding of the motivations, challenges, and feelings of the women who joined the movement. And the cumula-

tive effect is to tell a history of SNCC through the voices of some of its most compelling figures. The result is not only a powerful book about women's agency and the importance of SNCC in helping to challenge white supremacy, but also a revealing work that provides ample source material for future historians of the movement who will be compelled to return again and again to these powerful voices.

In this stage of the development of our understanding of the Civil Rights Movement there should be no doubt whatsoever as to the centrality of women to the struggle. Nonetheless, *Hands on the Freedom Plow* brings together more than fifty contributors who show through their own biographies and their experiences at the grass-roots that women contributed a unique and valuable perspective in a shared struggle of men and women, young and old, black and white. Some of the contributors will be well known to students of the Civil Rights Movement and the 1960s, but many of the voices will be new and represent welcome reminders that confronting white supremacy required more than a handful of prominent and charismatic individuals. Women faced particular challenges, the dual bonds of race and sex, even within the movement. In the words of Judy Richardson, described as "a shy, African American student from Tarryton New York," (348), "what's now called sexism *could* rear its head in SNCC. But it was usually possible to struggle against it – and even win." (363)

These stories in the aggregate also serve to show the importance of individuals, even during a phase of the movement that tried to diminish the role of the individual charismatic leader for a more mass-based struggle. The proliferation of oral histories over the past couple of decades provides rich source material for historians and serves to remind us that the "masses" are not an undifferentiated mob but rather consist of hundreds, indeed thousands of individuals with their own backgrounds and experiences that they brought to sit-ins and marches and Freedom Rides and mass meetings. This book furthers the process of telling those individual stories while placing them within the larger context.

The editors effectively pull together these many individual stories to tell a history of SNCC through the experiences of its woman participants. One of the best ways to understand the group's history is to understand its component parts, the men and women who created and fueled SNCC's rise to prominence and its epochal work. This book helps to tell the history of an organization and a

movement through the eyes of the women who made it. This is the most immediate history of SNCC that we now have because it consists of the rich voices of so many of its participants.

The compelling stories of these women tell the story of SNCC in a powerful and compelling way that will further serve as rich source material for future historians. The editors, who also provide the introduction, postscript, and contextualizing introductions to each section of the book, have provided an invaluable service for historians and for historiography. This book deserves a wide audience. As we look back over a half century of the work of these brave women and their male colleagues, we should be thankful that we have their stories, in their own words, in this magnificent collection.

Derek Charles Catsam

University of Texas at the Permian Basin

Latin America's Cold War. By Hal Brands. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010. Acknowledgements, illustrations, notes, index. Pp. 385. \$29.95 cloth.)

Latin America's Cold War is a clearly written synthesis for scholarly and educated general audiences. It revolves around two central postulates. First, the complexity of Latin America's Cold War drove its volatility and intensity. Second, dynamic interaction between foreign intervention, internal instability, and ideological extremism was responsible for the period's tumult and violence, not "a 'savage crusade' conducted by the United States and local reactionaries" (7). Nor, as some conservative accounts claim, did the Cold War's outcome in the region reflect the triumph of U.S. diplomacy. Specifically, Brands argues, the violent nature of the Cold War in Latin America resulted from mutually reinforcing, Left and Right radicalisms locked in an escalating spiral of conflict and violence. He also contends "the actions of the military regimes [of the 1970s and 80s] were the logical—if exaggerated—response to the leftist radicalism of the period" (127) and calls for scholars to focus on "the ramifications of East-bloc initiatives" rather than U.S. diplomacy (261).

The author situates the study within the literatures of both U.S.-diplomatic and Latin American history. As he argues, U.S. diplomatic history focuses on the U.S. government's view of Latin American affairs; other literature takes Latin American perspectives into account but is not comprehensive. This book contributes to diplomatic his-

tory by placing Latin America at the center of analysis rather than treating it as mere sideshow of superpower conflict. It highlights the agency of Latin American government vis-à-vis regional counterparts, the U.S., and the Eastern Bloc and recognizes the important intersection of “global trends” and “local dynamics” (130). Brands’ use of Latin American, U.S., and GDR archives is commendable; more research is needed on Eastern-bloc diplomacy in Latin America, and he provides directions for further study. His contribution to our understanding of local dynamics is uneven. The author relies on a well-worn binary paradigm of dueling extremisms to account for the violence and instability of the period in Latin America. By centering his analysis primarily on leftist guerrillas and extremist right-wing militaries, he fails to adequately consider unarmed movements for change (i.e. labor unions, squatter movements, student movements, agrarian reform movements) and their importance to domestic politics and Cold War dynamics. Instead, they appear as little more than undifferentiated masses caught between two fires fueled by dependency theory, Liberation Theology, and National Security Doctrine. As Jeffery Gould pointed out in his 2009 *American Historical Review* article, this dueling-extremisms binary paradigm—sometimes referred to as the “dos diablos” thesis—dates to the 1980s. It “equates the radical left and right and blames them equally for the bloodshed and repression that brought ruin to Latin America in the 1970s and 1980s” and lacks substantial basis in the historical record.

Chile is one example. Brands devotes significant attention to Salvador Allende’s Popular Unity (UP) government (1970-1973) to support the binary model and the corollary argument that violent leftist radicalism “called forth” the right-wing military extremism of the 1970s and 80s (97). He states that Allende “joined Castro as a sponsor of revolutionary violence” (106) and “did not discourage such methods” (107). This is an overstatement at best. The radical Movement of the Revolutionary Left (MIR) was not a member of the UP coalition, as the author erroneously claims (106-7, 110). Allende did not proscribe or seek to destroy the MIR—which is not the same as sponsoring revolutionary violence—and the MIR did not undertake armed actions during his tenure. The Revolutionary Coordinating Council (JCR) to which the MIR belonged was established in August 1973 after one right-wing coup attempt in Chile with another rumored imminent. The JCR entered into action after—and in response to—the September 1973 coup. Tension within the Left, between the “revolution from above” and the “revolution from below,” and its role in politi-

cal instability is well documented in Peter Winn, *Weavers of Revolution: The Yarur Workers and Chile's Road to Socialism* (1989). However, during Allende's presidency counterrevolutionary violence significantly outstripped that of the Left; one of the period's most remarkable aspects was not revolutionary violence but rather the Left's restraint. This was due in part to Allende's insistence on the "Chilean road to socialism"—peaceful revolution in democracy—combined with measures to discourage violence amid escalating right-wing provocation. Brands overlooks the Communist Party—one of the most powerful leftist parties—and the mass movements that played a principal role in local dynamics, including takeovers of factories, agrarian estates, and urban lots. As existing literature demonstrates, these cannot simply be ascribed to the "ultra Left" (110). The Chilean case does not support the argument that the radical Left begat the extremist military violence of the 1970s and 80s, and the binary paradigm undermines the study's claim to multilayered complexity, resulting instead in oversimplification and inaccuracy.

Brands' concluding call for "appreciation of symmetry" in polarization, trauma, and foreign involvement is curious given their clearly asymmetrical nature (263). The author's arguments highlight the asymmetry of foreign involvement: "Washington remained the only outside actor willing to take decisive action in the region," and no foreign power "emerged as a meaningful counterbalance to the United States" (148, 150). Polarization and trauma were also markedly asymmetrical where violence was concerned. Available historical documentation attests that rightist military violence dwarfed that of the Left. While ignoring the Left's role in political polarization is inappropriate, explanatory models based on symmetries without basis in the historical record likewise do little to advance understanding of Latin America's Cold War.

Alison J. Bruey

University of North Florida

We Ain't What We Ought to Be: The Black Freedom Struggle from Emancipation to Obama. By Stephen Tuck. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010. Acknowledgements, illustrations, notes, index. Pp. 419. \$29.95 cloth.)

The amount of scholarship on the history of African Americans has grown exponentially over the last three decades, steadily

dismantling many of the key paradigms that had long defined the study of black activism: politics versus accommodation, integration versus separatism, and non-violence versus self-defense. Demonstrating that the protest strategies embraced by African Americans have been as varied and diverse as the African American population itself, this proliferation of scholarship certainly speaks to the health and vitality of the field. However, it has also made it extraordinarily difficult to craft one coherent narrative about the African American freedom struggle. But in *We Ain't What We Ought to Be: The Black Freedom Struggle from Emancipation to Obama*, Stephen Tuck succeeds in this task in spectacular fashion, creating a narrative that not only synthesizes much of the recent scholarship in African American history, but also puts forward an original interpretation of the African American freedom struggle that will engage general readers, students and specialists alike.

Focusing on the local rather than the national, and privileging diversity over a monolithic black community, Tuck argues that the essence of the African American freedom struggle can be found "at the local level," in communities across the nation, and that "each state, each town, each neighborhood had its own story to tell" (231). While local activists worked to empower their friends and neighbors and transform the racial status quo in their own backyards, "the black press, black organizations, and black family networks connected local activists with the nation and the wider world" (231). Nationally, Tuck finds that these campaigns translated into the most significant gains for African Americans during times of war – from the Emancipation Proclamation during the Civil War, to World War II, or, for example, when "black activists gained new power to fight for equality," to "gain better jobs and housing, to end discrimination in the army, to seek global freedom, and to challenge racial stereotypes" (209). Even though violent backlashes inevitably followed these wartime gains, Tuck argues that these moments crystallize just how prepared a range of African American activists, soldiers, workers, and local people were to seize every opportunity available to push forward the quest to become full citizens of the republic. As he puts it, "what mattered most at any given moment was not a fresh hankering for freedom—the hankering was always there—but a newfound power on the part of activists to demand it" (8). When placed in this larger context, then, the civil rights activism of the 1960s (in the midst of a "cold" rather than a "hot" war) emerges as not the high water

mark of African American protest, but rather, as a distinctly unique moment of African American activism, one where new strategies of nonviolent direct action attracted the attention of the national and international media.

We Ain't What We Ought to Be is an impressive achievement on a variety of levels. Throughout the text, Tuck incorporates recent developments in the field while supplementing gaps in the scholarship with primary research of his own. He gives sustained attention to both the local and the global forces shaping the freedom struggle – whether he is discussing the exploits of African American soldiers during World War I, or placing the civil rights activism of the post World War II era in the context of the Cold War. Tuck reminds his readers that “African Americans fought for freedom in culture as well as politics” (306). And throughout the text, he weaves in analysis of the ways that African American artistic expression and forms of popular culture figured into the larger quest for equality – from the Fisk Jubilee Singers, to working-class cultural icons like Jack Johnson and Bessie Smith, to *Ebony Magazine* (where he notes that Martin Luther King, Jr. published an advice column), the arbiter of elite and aspiring black middle-class society. Finally, Tuck is consistently attentive to the diversity of the African American population, taking into account variations in region, class and gender, and analyzing the impact these differences had on styles of protest. The portrait that emerges is an extraordinary achievement: richly detailed while broad in scope, immensely useful, and destined to serve as the standard survey of African American history for a long time to come.

Erica L. Ball

California State University, Fullerton

Sunshine Paradise: a History of Florida Tourism. By Tracy J. Revels. (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2011. Acknowledgements, notes, selected readings, illustrations, index. Pp. x, 208. \$26.95 Cloth.)

In the Introduction to *Sunshine Paradise*, Tracy Revels invites her readers to better understand and appreciate “the long history” of tourism in Florida, especially in making decisions about the industry’s future (4). In one sense, Revels writes especially for the developers, politicians, and citizens of her native state. Yet her en-

gaging narrative and crisp prose make her book readily accessible to any reader interested in tourism generally, as well as the history of Florida, the South, and the United States. And though she relies heavily on secondary sources, by mining decades of scholarship on Florida tourism that has typically focused on a narrower timeframe, Revels offers a welcome synthesis for serious scholars.

She organizes her book chronologically, covering nearly two hundred years, from 1820 to the present. She divides this long history into eight chapters, with each defined by distinctive characteristics of tourism's role in Florida's development during a particular era. And although each chapter tells an interesting story, it is the change and continuity from era to era that should capture the reader's attention. By taking this long trajectory, Revels effectively uses tourism as a reflection of broader economic, social, and cultural changes at work in the United States and the world.

Her first two chapters discuss the origins of tourism in Florida, when travelers, mostly Yankees, ventured into the state for reasons of health or a wilderness adventure. She effectively captures the tentative nature of tourism before the arrival of railroads and monied entrepreneurs. It was a time when tourists were forced to endure inadequate modes of transportation, crude amenities, and mostly reluctant and inexperienced hosts. At the same time, however, Revels makes clear that Florida's natural attractions and inviting winter weather continued to draw increasing numbers of visitors.

The next section of her book covers the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, when tourism began to play an increasing economic role in Florida's development and Floridians further embraced and exploited the potential rewards of attracting winter travelers. Revels devotes one chapter to the era of Henry Flagler and Henry Plant and their familiar enterprises in developing a winter playground for America's wealthiest men and women. Her fourth chapter, "Tin Can Heaven," touches on issues of class and race in her discussion of the democratization of leisure in the United States during the early-twentieth century, when the automobile and family vacation became increasingly common on the American landscape. She ends this episode with a brief description of Florida's land boom and bust in the 1920s.

The Great Depression and World War II serve as an interlude for Revels, before she turns to the second half of her story. It was in the post-war years that tourism, argues Revels, became "the economic engine of the state" (1). Her description of Florida in the

1950s and 1960s paints a nostalgic picture of small-scale and quirky attractions where opportunities abounded for vacationing families and aspiring entrepreneurs. Everything changed in the 1970s with the opening of Walt Disney World. The reader senses the author's regret as she describes the political influence and economic power wielded by the Disney Corporation and a host of other major theme parks that quickly followed. By the 1980s and 1990s, the scale and sophistication of such new attractions as Epcot, Sea World, and Universal Studios set a standard few developers could compete against, and few politicians could resist. And the changing expectations of the average Florida tourist, argues Revels, began to threaten the traditional lifestyles enjoyed by many of the state's residents.

It is in the last three chapters of her book that Revels writes about a period of Florida's history that she and so many of her potential readers experienced. And while she continues to chronicle both positive and negative aspects of the state's tourist industry, the effects become increasingly relevant to what she sees as persistent political and cultural conflicts. For Revels, recent changes in the tourist industry have led to what she describes as a "cultural disconnect" shared by many native Floridians (4). She asks if tourists continue to visit the authentic Florida, or have developers and tourists alike created a purely imaginary destination? For Revels, the consequences are all too real.

In *Sunshine Paradise*, Revels reminds her readers of tourism's profound impact throughout the history of her beloved state. And though she laments the environmental pressures and precarious economic situation created by the state's reliance on the tourist industry, she insists that at least in the near future, "Floridians must make peace with tourism" (151).

Larry Youngs

Georgia State University