

makes several conclusions of varying significance. Among them are the following: landownership was rather widespread; the vast majority of slaveholders were small operators; the slaveholders did *not* drive the nonslaveholders from the good lands; and in 1860 slaveowners were producing less cotton and more corn than in 1850.

The ground of Professor Mooney is less sure and his conclusions are open to more serious question when he moves from the census reports and enters the realm of the humane and personal aspects of the institution of slavery. With little difficulty he moves from the role of scientific investigator to that of apologist. Consequently he needs no data on which to base the assertion that Southern slaves were far more secure than many of the free laborers of the North. This invidious comparison was made after arbitrarily excluding the issue of freedom as a consideration! From that point Professor Mooney glided rather easily into typical, unfounded Phillipsian assertions about slaves and slavery, such as "The Negro was quite sociable by nature" (p. 90), "By no means. . . was it a general rule that the Tennessee slave was denied the rudiments of education" (p. 95), and "If no higher motive was present, self-interest was a sufficient incentive to most masters to treat their slaves kindly" (p. 98).

There is a chapter on "Some Tennessee Planters" that seeks to give some idea of the fortunes and problems of individual planters in a state that yields few records of this kind. They are avowedly exceptional by any standards since they were large slaveholders and since Professor Mooney argues with success that there were few large planters in the state. At any rate they add to our general knowledge of slavery in the ante-bellum South. One would have been pleased to see a more extensive discussion of the economics of the institution of slavery and the role of slavery in the political life of the state. Without these the picture of slavery portrayed here is tentative and incomplete.

Brooklyn College

John Hope Franklin

Grant and Lee. Second edition. By Major-General J. F. C. Fuller. Civil War Centennial Series. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957. Pp. 323. Maps, appendix, index. \$5.00.)

Having lost the war after four years of stubborn and exhausting resistance, the South set about making it into a legend, an epic of rugged gray heroes and fiery ladies who could still be lovely in the moonlight and magnolias. For this romance, it had a ready hero in the knightly Robert E. Lee, a truly admirable military leader whose greatness grew with the telling of it. His bearing in defeat was so noble that even historians of the North accepted the estimate of Lee as the outstanding soldier of the war.

A turn of the tide was inevitable and it became the fashion to disparage Lee's performance, particularly on the part of those writers who discovered the genius of Grant, the general who, after all, was the victor. The British General Fuller was among the early ones who seem to feel, curiously enough, that Grant's reputation could be enhanced by showing that the man he had beaten was really not so very much.

To this task General Fuller brings his own analysis of the elements of military leadership, both personal and professional. He essays a comparison of the personalities of Grant and Lee and of their generalship. He finds Grant an enigma, inscrutably simple, a silent man whose strangeness is evidence that he was a deep one who belonged to the age of Titans. Lee, on the contrary, was the chivalrous, pious man whose very nobility of mind was his undoing, and rendered him no match for Grant. Lee is charged with having a parochial mind and so preoccupying himself with Virginia alone; with too great submissiveness to civilian control so as to fail largely as a quartermaster. Fuller suggests Lee should have remedied this last by seizing the government as a dictator, and winning the war by surrendering what he was fighting for (States Rights, etc.). Further, Fuller finds Lee's strategy under a false spell cast by the Federal capitol. History does record Lee's strategic use of the politicians' panicky fears for the safety of Washington, and of Grant's campaign for the capture of the Confederate capitol.

Strangest of all, Fuller attempts to charge Lee with reckless loss of his men in defense of Grant against just such a charge. This he does by presenting a table of battle losses calculated on the basis of the percentages the losses were of the strength of the total army. This table is favorable to Grant. But a better index of a general's handling of his troops is to be derived from the ratio of the enemy's losses to his own effective strength, while the ratio of his own losses to the total effective strength of the enemy is the best measure of his conserving the lives of his men. Such figures are heavily in Lee's favor.

Comparisons of generals, even those who contend against each other, are seldom conclusive. A most interesting speculation for another General Fuller might be found in an imaginative exchange, whereby Lee would be given Grant's army with all its greater strength and resources, and Grant given the army of Lee with its lack of reserves, equipment and supplies, and then to try to forecast what each might have accomplished. In this way the factor of generalship might be isolated. But, of course, such speculation is idle.

In spite of what is written above, this book belongs on the shelf of anyone who finds the Civil War interesting and who studies leadership as it may be found anywhere. Such a reader will not be bothered by a few slight errors, and for example will recognize General "C." E. Pickett as Virginia's George Pickett. The Indiana University Press, which has reprinted the work (first published in 1932) as part of its "Civil War Centennial Series," has been of good service to today's Civil War enthusiast.

University of Illinois

Robert B. Browne

Mirage in the West: A History of the French Image of American Society to 1815. By Durand Echeverria. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957. Pp. vii, 300. Bibliographical note, index. \$5.00.)

Durand Echeverria has attempted in this exceedingly interesting volume to trace the historical origins of the principal French conceptions and misconceptions of America from 1767 to 1815, for, as Gilbert