

though tempted to accept Albert's recognition of Godfrey's primacy among the crusading leaders, Professor Andressohn correctly rejects this interpretation in view of Godfrey's third place among the leaders named in a letter to Pope Urban II. Nevertheless, with the siege of Arcas and the reaction against Raymond, "attempts were made to wrest the active control of the crusading operations from Raymond and place it in the hands of Godfrey" (p. 93). Raymond declined the crown of Jerusalem, the author believes, because he "hoped for a more lucrative conquest, a coastal stretch, probably in the region of Tripoli" (p. 104).

Professor Andressohn brings keen critical appraisal to bear upon the traditional concepts of Godfrey's character and competence. The duke's "conduct toward church property was by no means exemplary. Like many other lay princes he profited by the confusion and the turmoil of the Investiture Struggle" (p. 48). Piety did not impel Godfrey to go on the Crusade; "Rather than unusual religious fervor, it was the example of the princes of Northern France that stirred in him the spirit of adventure, the willingness to give up the 'certain for the uncertain'" (pp. 48-49). Yet despite the brevity of his regime and the multitude of difficulties he encountered as the first head of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, Godfrey "had transformed Palestine from a doubtful asset to a coveted prize" (p. 124).

No student of the Crusades, or of Medieval History in general, can overlook Professor Andressohn's study. In clear, straightforward style, the narrative is presented with careful attention to balance and perspective. Controversial issues are faced four-square, with the author's interpretations bolstered with appropriate citations and often excerpts from the relevant sources. The appearance of such a study under direct auspices of Indiana University is additional cause for gratification among scholars who will look forward to the appearance of other volumes in the *Series* with great interest.

Louisiana State University

Charles Edward Smith.

The South during Reconstruction, 1865-1877. By E. Merton Coulter. Volume VIII, *A History of the South*, edited by Wendell H. Stephenson and E. Merton Coulter. (Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 1947, pp. xii, 426. Illustrations, bibliography, and index. \$5.00).

For the past quarter of a century Southern historians and historians of the South have made rapid strides in collecting materials and in writing and rewriting the history of that region. Their labors have borne good fruit in the generally objective and critical studies which they have produced. This volume, by one of the more productive Southern writers, is the first published of the ten-volume comprehensive history of the South.

The author begins his volume with the remark that "The Civil War was not worth its cost. . . . What good the war produced would have come with time in an orderly way; the bad would not have come at all." Undoubtedly, the costs to the South were great: a billion or more dollars in slaves ("the most stupendous act of sequestration in the history of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence"—Beard); two-thirds of her railroads destroyed or crippled; a skipped generation of young men with five per cent of the total white population not returning from the fields of battle; burned cities and devastated countrysides; a banking system destroyed; insurance investments canceled; empty sleeves and trouser legs; and a people who had made living an art as effectively wiped out as the nobility of the Old Regime. To this partial listing of injuries, one should add the "insults" of the Treasury agents, the withdrawal of all pensions from Confederates who had earlier served in the wars of the United States, and the "iniquitous and unequal taxes." The South was able in time to repair the property and spirit, damage to which was in large measure incident to the war and conquest and not to the malice of the invading armies. Reconstruction, however, was another matter.

There was common agreement that both North and South had honorably laid down their arms, and war memories quickly began to fade—four years was not enough to hallow the Confederacy. The North helped little in the rehabilitation of the South, but the South readily accepted the Lincoln and Johnson plans of Reconstruction. In the eyes of a small group the South had not suffered sufficiently, for only through a different type of reconstruction could the radicals perpetuate themselves in power and enable their economic allies to continue to exploit the resources of the country. Thus, in 1867, the Southern territorial units—which were states for the purpose of ratifying amendments—were subjected to Reconstruction Acts written "not with a pen but a sword."

Radical reconstruction, however, failed to accomplish its first aim when the "intelligent, the honest, the steadfast were lumped together and declared evil," and the Southern Republican party was made up of Negroes, carpetbaggers, and scalawags. The programs for the Negroes were based in idealism, not reality. Slavery had left the Negro untrained for freedom; he desired land but was given the vote—the implications of the revolutionary confiscation idea were too dangerous to be toyed with; the South had to bear responsibility for the Negro's presence, but was allowed no freedom in solving the riddle. Coulter describes well the various injustices to the Negroes, and it seems clear that they needed to be "saved from their friends."

Military occupation, corruption, waste, excessive taxation, election frauds, profiteering, and other seamy features of the Radical Reconstruction era are treated with objectivity and freshness of approach. During this period, it is worth noting, resentment toward the Negro was intensified, especially among the poor whites, and generally the abuses of Reconstruction seemed to endanger the principle of white supremacy. When one realizes that what people believe to be the fact is often more important than the fact itself, some of the devices used by the Southerners against Radical Reconstruction can be better appreciated. In this connection, it should not be overlooked that the Ku Klux Klan became so obnoxious that early members and leaders made an effort to disband it.

The Republicans' use of every possible device to hold their hybrid Southern organization together was matched by the Democrats (Conservatives) in their efforts to destroy it. The realization by the Negro that the Democrat was to play a much larger role than the Republican in his economic existence, splits between the carpetbaggers and the scalawags, plus the inexperience, ignorance, and exploitation of Republican officials gave the final victory to the South which had regained much of its spirit and was not to be cheated of its soul after 1867.

Approximately two-fifths of the text of this volume is devoted to a discussion of agricultural reorganization, transportation, new economic horizons, cities and factories, cultural developments, fashions and recreation, and schools and churches. These chapters, dealing with positive accomplishments and advances, are more pleasant to read than the others, and the subjects have been treated with competence and reasonable brevity.

Coulter feels that both North and South failed to recognize the psychological factors in reconstruction, and that the South was too prone to feel that she alone had suffered. Radical Reconstruction did accomplish what four years of war had failed to do: the unification of the Southern people. The aims of the radicals, however, were not fulfilled, and political reconstruction was an "utter failure." The total effects might be summed up in one of the author's statements: "North might or might not be North, as it pleased; but the South would be South" (p. 183).

This volume bears evidence of discerning and discriminating use of extensive sources, but there seems to be an excessive emphasis on the newspapers of Georgia. The states of the upper South have been treated rather summarily since this is the story of the South *during* reconstruction, not reconstruction *in* the South. These shortcomings are minor. The style of the narrative is easy and clear; the well-known wit and humor of the author is sometimes transferred to the printed page through the medium of tongue-in-the-cheek remarks; the bibliography is selective and critical; the index is good; and the text is remarkably free from errors. The Louisiana State University Press is to be congratulated on an excellent job of bookmaking. The ten-volume history is well launched.

Indiana University

Chase C. Mooney

The First Presbyterian Church of Franklin, Indiana. By Herriott C. Palmer. (Greenfield, Indiana, Wm. Mitchell Printing Co., 1946, pp. xvi, 515. Illustrations, bibliography, and index. \$5.00.)

Franklin, Indiana, located about twenty miles south of Indianapolis, is the seat of Johnson County, and also the home of Franklin College, a liberal arts college sponsored by the Baptist church. The First Presbyterian Church of the community is one of unusual strength and influence considering the size of the city and the prestige of competing denominations. The author of the history, Miss Herriott C. Palmer, was for a number of years a professor of history at Franklin College, but a member of the Presbyterian Church and the daughter of a Presbyterian minister. It was fortunate that she was prevailed upon to write the history of her church.