

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."

Based on exhaustive research in the extensive manuscript sources—many of which had not been fully utilized before—Williamson's book presents a detailed and complete account of the role of the Negro in South Carolina during Reconstruction. Indeed, in *After Slavery* Williamson has given us a thorough reworking of the traditional story of the Negro in the Reconstruction history of South Carolina. He presents massive factual evidence and persuasive arguments to support his interpretation of the South Carolina Negro as an intelligent, responsible voter (p. 341) and an effective, sensible politician (pp. 345, 378), not simply an illiterate field hand raised by circumstances to political prominence and power (p. 376). Moreover, Williamson produces considerable information to indicate that the corruption of the radical government was not nearly so extravagant as many redeemers maintained (p. 417). He also credits the Republicans with much of the reform work that effectively put a stop to the worst corruption before the redeemers came to power (p. 397) and condemns the redeemers for their failure to deal "viciously" with the corruptionists (p. 416).

Not all of this is by any means new; but much of it tends to suggest that the experiences of the Negro in South Carolina during Reconstruction deviated, in many respects, from the traditional view of the role of the Negro in the Reconstruction South. In at least one particular, however, Williamson seems to press for a conclusion that is more, perhaps, than is warranted. He challenges the widespread notion that the separation of the races and the establishment of a rigid code of segregation was a development of the late nineteenth century. Williamson feels that the separation of the races "was the most revolutionary change in relations between the whites and Negroes in South Carolina during Reconstruction" (p. 274). He also asserts that "well before the end of Reconstruction, this mental pattern was fixed; the heartland of racial exclusiveness remained inviolate; and South Carolina had become, in reality, two communities—one white and the other Negro" (p. 299). While this argument is not without merit and is supported by numerous examples which Williamson cites, it seemingly undervalues the rather obvious fact that Reconstruction was a period of fluidity in race relations and that many elements, old as well as new, were involved in the determination of the emerging pattern of race relations. One can doubt that by the end of Reconstruction conditions were so settled, even in South Carolina, as to produce two exclusive societies, one white and one black.

Without question there is much that is substantial and stimulating in this solidly researched, carefully written work. Not least among its virtues is its comprehensiveness and its integration of the Negro into the general story of Reconstruction in South Carolina. The period of Reconstruction remains one that is much debated among historians. There are still wide areas of disagreement. Williamson has enriched the quality of this debate and has increased the measure of our understanding not only of the South Carolina Negro during Reconstruction; but, in many ways, of most Reconstruction developments.

Colorado State University

John A. Jenkins