

papers at the time Jefferson was elected vice-president. Scared by the leveling forces that were daily becoming more evident and convinced that Jefferson was calling up these forces to serve his own demagogic purposes, they lashed him with the vehemence of the threatened. His attempts to counter their influence by encouraging the founding of Republican papers met with only limited success, in part because his choice of editor was sometimes not of the best. He found firmer ground in his determined opposition to the Sedition Act and eventually won the presidency with the aid of that issue.

Though the Jeffersonian Republicans captured the seat of government in 1801, the Federalists continued for some time to be a majority on the editorial page. As their sense of frustration mounted with each more decisive defeat at the polls, they waxed more and more bitter, reaching a level of scurrility in their personal attacks on Jefferson which Mott believes has never been equaled in American annals. These years constituted the real test of Jefferson's loyalty to the principles of a free press, and he withstood his trial by canard with unchanging ideals. Private letters, however, reveal that he writhed painfully under the newspaper attacks, turning repeatedly to Plato, Horace, and Tacitus for refuge. It was not until after he had ceased to be President that the rise of western municipalities created a Republican press equal to that of the Federalists.

Author and publisher are to be complimented for their restraint in limiting the size of the book to the subject, even though that meant a volume of only sixty-five pages. The value of this study would have been enhanced, however, by one addition—that of a selected bibliography.

Cedric Cummins

*George Fitzhugh: Propagandist of the Old South.* By Harvey Wish. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943, pp. ix, 360. \$3.00.)

Who spoke for the slaveholding South, to defend human bondage, repudiate the social compact and free contract from Locke to Jefferson, and denounce industrial capitalism? George Fitzhugh, a kindly man whose only formal education was reading for the law, a Virginian who caricatured the North without ever travelling outside the Old Dominion ex-

cept to debate with Wendell Phillips at New Haven. Fitzhugh upheld slavery by debasing freedom in his two books, *Sociology for the South; or, The Failure of Free Society* (1854) and *Cannibals All! or, Slaves Without Masters* (1857), both curiosities in the literature of the American reaction to industrialism. He repeated himself in scores of unsigned editorials for the Richmond *Examiner* (1854-1856) and *Enquirer* (1855-1857), and in more than a hundred articles for *De Bow's Review* (1855-1867). Fitzhugh was not only more prolific in his writings but more extreme in his economic and social views than Calhoun, Hammond, Grayson, Rhett, and Yancey. William Lloyd Garrison, who knew whereof he spoke, called him "crack-brained," "a moral lunatic." In this uncompromising advocate of slavery, the Abolitionist met his match.

Fitzhugh was often quoted by Abolitionists, in Congress, Horace Greeley's *Tribune*, and throughout the North, as he helped to make the conflict between the sections irreconcilable. Lincoln was well acquainted with his *Sociology* and came to regard his editorials in the *Enquirer*, which he attributed to its editor rather than to Fitzhugh, as representative of the Southern mind. The seed of Lincoln's house-divided speech and of Seward's proclamation of irrepressible conflict was to be found in Fitzhugh's editorials (pp. 150-54). Peace and union were shattered when the South mistook all Yankees for Garrison, and the North all Southerners for Fitzhugh, although neither spoke what his section thought.

While Fitzhugh's romantic neo-feudalism, which, like Carlyle, he believed the best security for the Negro, later became contaminated with the racial prejudice of Gobineau, Nott, and Van Evrie, it was not the political gospel of a Secessionist. In politics Fitzhugh was a mild nationalist, an opponent of free trade like the Careys and List, and no follower of the legalistic Calhoun. His propaganda was inspired by the need of the South to defend slavery as a positive good on ethical and economic grounds. The best defense for him was an unlimited offensive against liberalism and industrialism. He ridiculed the Declaration of Independence, grounded himself in Aristotle rather than Plato, copied Carlyle, borrowed from Marx, and drew heavily upon the conservative British quarterlies. The future of the capitalistic North he described in terms of the misery of con-

temporary England. The only reason, in his opinion, that the North had escaped the worst consequences of its "agrarian, communistic, free-love, anarchical and leveling doctrines" was the safety valve of Western land. But "free society was a failure"; the natural condition of man, white or black, was servitude to capital, appetite, and the whip; liberty was a fraud, democracy a fiction, the class struggle a result of wage slavery. Only by alliance with the South could "Northern Conservatism . . . turn back the tide of Radicalism and Agrarianism," and he pleaded tactlessly for the factory-owner and slaveholder to stand together.

In this searching biography of a mind, for Fitzhugh lived only in what he thought, Dr. Wish of De Paul University has rescued a great American Tory from the oblivion of his own writings. He has added an important chapter to the history of American conservative thought, so much less known than our liberal and radical traditions. Thanks to the author, no one can read his book without seeing its relation to the struggle between liberty and authority in the present century. This reader would question only one statement: "Lincoln's own Virginia heritage explains in part his sympathetic attitude to certain contentions of the South" (p. 156). And if more could be asked of a reflective book, which even those who dislike the abstract will find exciting, for my part it would be a more thorough exploration of the European sources of Fitzhugh's ideas. The transit of ideas across the Atlantic is the kind of immigration which Americans are prone to overlook or else to feel strongly about without much comprehension.

Roger W. Shugg

*Ohio in the Twentieth Century, 1900-1938.* Planned and compiled by Harlow Lindley. Volume VI, *The History of the State of Ohio*, edited by Carl F. Wittke. (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1942, pp. xiii, 563. \$25.00 per set.)

This volume is a cooperative and topical treatment of Ohio history in the twentieth century. As such it differs from the other volumes which are coordinated accounts by individual authors. In it fifteen authors treat sixteen topics in seventeen chapters. It exhibits the virtues and the defects of cooperative writing. The chapters are written by