late 1960s is not). His consistent attention to the social science literature is similarly informing. Of great significance is Rable's conclusion that the violence associated with the elections of 1874 in the South amounted to a testing of the effectiveness of violence as a political strategy. The failure of southern Republicans and the national government to counteract it convinced white southerners to employ violence systematically in the 1875 and 1876 campaigns that overthrew Republican governments in Mississippi, Florida, South Carolina, and Louisiana. Finally, Rable notes the implications of his study for historians' arguments about the radicalism of Reconstruction. Refuting those historians who stress the conservatism of Republican Reconstruction policy, Rable points out that it was its radicalism that led to a white counterrevolution. He joins Herman Belz in dismissing the possibility of any further radical effort in the face of such widespread and bitter white southern resistance.

Altogether Rable has made a significant contribution to the historical understanding of Reconstruction. Written primarily for scholars, but accessible to a more general intellectual audience, the book is an important resource for those with a serious, scholarly interest in the problems of post-Civil War America.

The Ohio State University, Columbus Michael Les Benedict

Southern Progressivism: The Reconciliation of Programs and Tradition. By Dewey W. Grantham. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983. pp. xxii, 468. Notes, tables, maps, illustrations, bibliographical essay, index. Clothbound, $34.95; paperbound, $16.95.)

In 1946 Arthur S. Link published an article, "The Progressive Movement in the South," which challenged the vague northeastern orthodoxy that southerners had not actually participated in the Progressive Era. Since that time Link has been joined by numerous other scholars urging this "revisionist" perspective on the early twentieth-century South, and one of the most influential of these is Dewey W. Grantham. In *Southern Progressivism,* Grantham delivers an encyclopedic treatment of the subject—a product of some twenty-five years of inquiry. The reader emerges from the work not only convinced, once and for all, that there was indeed a Progressive Era in the South but that it had some of the overarching characteristics of a movement.

Grantham perceives southern progressivism as in many ways an extension of the New South creed. One of the chief characteristics of the New South mind of the late nineteenth century was

its determination to embrace modernity without rejecting that "vital nexus" with traditional social values of the antebellum era. Likewise, Grantham views progressive leaders of the South as constantly seeking some blend, "balance" (p. 418), or "reconciliation" (p. 410) between progress and tradition. As with New Southerners of the 1890s, many progressives had more than a subconscious experience with this problem. Analytical and articulate, many southern reformers, for example, sought to expand educational opportunities in ways that appealed to many segments of the southern population yet did not transgress sacred social traditions. Ultimately, therefore, progressivism in the South was conservative—much as it was nationwide. What probably made it more conservative in Dixie than in other places, besides the noted factor of race, was the southerners' historic stake in the notion of section. Defensive and aggressive about their subculture, southern progressives sought reforms that would enhance their traditional sense of sectional community and virtue while still advancing social progress and the cause of North-South reconciliation. Less shackled by the past, progressives from other sections felt more at ease than southerners in advancing reforms not in precise harmony with nineteenth-century values.

On the other hand, Grantham's story of southern progressivism also emphasizes certain commonalities with the national reform experience. He clarifies the stages of southern reform by showing how progressivism changed from an initial process of revealing particular problems, e.g. railroad abuses, to formulating institutionalized (usually governmental) solutions to these problems. As on the national scene, southern reformers called on local and state offices first, then turned to the national political and governmental arena. Akin to Robert Wiebe's progressives "searching for order," many of these southern reformers also moved from individualistic, moralistic solutions to collective, bureaucratic, "scientific" initiatives (p. 227).

Thus, Grantham gives the impression that progressivism in the South represented more than an era; it had signs of being a movement. Despite its variegated interest groups and inner stresses, southern progressivism had cohesiveness and momentum that prevailed to some degree even into the 1920s. The understanding of this movement would perhaps be clearer if the author had kept the New South strain in his plot line more visible. Yet Grantham's powerful display of scholarship—history blending the inferential insights of the humanities with those of the social sciences and written with flowing, often poetic sentences—stands as a major contribution to the literature of American reform and of the South.

University of Alabama, Birmingham Tennant S. McWilliams