

Editor Duberman and Robert F. Durden separately examine the attitudes of the North toward slavery and the Negro. Durden analyzes the early Republican party's inconsistent dislike of slaveholders, slavery, and Negroes. Duberman demonstrates the failure of abolitionists to direct northern public opinion, showing that the radical solution—such as abolitionism presented—is usually rejected in this land of moderation. Instead, “non-extension” was accepted by most as the sensible path which would presumably result in the “natural” death of slavery in the Old South. Duberman also marshalls evidence in defense of abolitionist leadership by demonstrating the stability and good sense shown by most abolitionists. His rationalist point of view precludes behaviorist interpretations.

Howard Zinn contributes the final essay, a zestful attack on past historical writings on abolitionism. His muscular defenses of the necessity of “extremism,” personal involvement, and emotionalism—which “intensifies the forms of already existent behavior” (p. 426)—are quite provocative.

By emphasizing the relevance of the crusade against slavery to the present crusade for civil liberty, these essays will surely invoke endorsement and rebuttal from other historians. If a dialogue results, centered on this historical relationship, then this collection will have served its avowed purpose.

Purdue University, Calumet Campus

Norman L. Trusty

The Politics of Reconstruction, 1863-1867. By David Donald. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965. Pp. xviii, 105. Notes, tables, charts, appendices. \$4.00.)

When so distinguished a student of Reconstruction as Professor Donald publishes even a small book on the subject, any serious student in the field will be eager to discover its contents. The present volume consists of the three lectures delivered in the annual series of Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History at Louisiana State University. This fact alone places the study in good company, for a long list of outstanding contributors to an understanding of Southern history has formerly appeared as Fleming lecturers. These essays are suggestive, informative, and quite possibly provocative of more detailed investigation, although no pretensions are made to sweeping or revolutionary alterations of the Reconstruction account.

The central theme is that Radicals and Moderates in the Republican contingent in Congress between 1863 and 1867 probably cannot be distinguished from each other by sets of characteristics other than political ones. It is suggested that they were much more alike than would be supposed from accounts emphasizing their contests in Congress. The proposition is that all of the Republicans would very probably have agreed on a somewhat Radical position regarding Reconstruction had they been free to vote as they pleased. The difference between Radicals and Moderates is attributed largely to their presumed desire to be reelected and hence to their calculations concerning how much Radicalism their constituents could be persuaded to swallow. Closely contested

congressional districts tended to send congressmen who had to be Moderates in order not to lose their margins of victory, while safe Republican districts could release their representatives from such constraint so that they could vote their true convictions.

Appendices conveniently provide the roll-call tabulations used to distinguish Radicals from Moderates or from other segments of the House of Representatives; similar roll-call data for ten key votes on Reconstruction measures in 1866-1867 leading to the passage of the Military Reconstruction Act of March 1867; and the percentages of the popular vote received by each Republican congressman in the three elections of the period under study. The reader may, therefore, pursue the author's path of analysis with the raw materials he employed.

After laying this groundwork for estimating the practical difference between Republican factions in the House, the author traces the progress of the Congressional Reconstruction plan through Congress by employing a detailed and well-illustrated image of a pendulum, passing through several swings before coming to rest on the precise legislation accepted by both House and Senate in March of 1867. This he describes as the simple arithmetic of politics.

It is freely admitted that no gross manipulation of the data produced a convincing behavioral-science type proof of the general thesis and that correlation between Radicalism and safeness of seat is about zero for the House taken as a whole. But by scrutinizing the local distinctions between states and even districts, the author offers further evidence in support of his thesis—employing, one might add, a fairly familiar type of traditional historical method.

Even if a reader should find the approach or the conclusions limited or questionable, he will find all of the cards on the table, face up. And it is difficult to read anything from David Donald's pen without profiting from his perceptiveness, his adroitness in eluding doctrinaire self-shackling, and above all his clarity and grace in presentation.

University of Alabama

Thomas B. Alexander

After Slavery: The Negro in South Carolina During Reconstruction, 1861-1877. By Joel Williamson. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1965. Pp. ix, 442. Notes, bibliography, index. \$7.50.)

Many of the individual state studies of Reconstruction derive from the Dunning school, although there have been important revisionist works, especially Francis Butler Simkins' and Robert H. Woody's *South Carolina During Reconstruction*. Professor Williamson's work is, as he admits in his preface, a revision of that "classic in revisionism"; but it is more than simply that. It displays both the strengths and weaknesses of the revisionist approach. Williamson believes that "it is possible that we have passed onto a new plateau . . . where slavery and Reconstruction fall beneath the horizon . . . and perspective rises a measure above personal passion" (p. vii). Thus the contemporary historian of Reconstruction approaches his materials "with new viewpoints." He asks "new questions" and ceases "to ask all of the old."