

sets diverse aspects of city life in the late 1860s in the context of racial and economic power structures. Although he finds that conservatives had much influence and blacks had little, he shows that "Reconstruction" patterns continued in city politics until after 1890.

Chesson identifies transportation changes of the 1870s, which reduced Richmond from a terminus to a junction, as a decisive economic setback. He recognizes, though, the irrationality of the older pattern of nonconnecting railroads that contributed to "terminus" status. Chesson describes the apparent rapid modernization of the 1880s but argues that it was illusory. Richmond pioneered in electric streetcars, he explains, because a mood of uncritical optimism led the mossback city council to approve a proposal by atypically progressive entrepreneurs. After the innovation proved successful, conventional businessmen quickly built an irrational congeries of independent lines. Chesson considers the flowering of Richmond as a "Lost Cause" pilgrimage center to be proof of traditionalist ideological dominance rather than an example of urban "boosterism."

Chesson, a native of Richmond, evidently has some scores to settle with the city's traditions and leadership. He concludes that it "inherited the worst of both the Old and the New South" (p. 210). He even applies to it quotations about apocalyptic "Babylon," the biblical "mother of harlots and abominations in the earth" (Revelation 17:5). Other passages (especially a prefatory quotation from Ellen Glasgow) nevertheless acknowledge affection for the Virginia capital.

University of Oregon

JACK P. MADDEX, JR.

*Race and Politics in North Carolina, 1872-1901: The Black Second.* By Eric Anderson. (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, c. 1981. Pp. xiv, 372. Paper, \$12.95; cloth, \$30.00.)

In *The Origins of the New South* and *The Strange Career of Jim Crow* C. Vann Woodward suggested that the years between Reconstruction and the imposition of Jim Crow and disfranchisement laws around the turn of the century harbored "forgotten alternatives" in politics and race relations. No golden age, this was a paradoxical, transitional era in which corruption, intimidation, and brutality coexisted with instances of interracial cooperation, black assertiveness, and white accommodation. In this revised University of Chicago doctoral dissertation on the Second Congressional District in North Carolina, the creation of an 1872 Democratic gerrymander aimed at concentrating the Republican vote so as to maximize the number of safe Democratic seats in the national Congress, Eric Anderson primarily deepens, rather than revises notions of the era's politics. Recounting the prenomination and election campaigns for Congress over nearly three decades, as well as detailing local struggle for office in the counties that made up the district, Anderson puts somewhat more stress than Woodward did on the power of black politicians and the success of their "awkward yet viable" partnership (p. x) with white Republicans, but generally confirms Woodward's thesis. Well written and thoroughly researched in newspapers and manuscript collections, usually careful in its

THARSHEET FROM JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY

VOL. 48 , NO. 1 , FEB 1982

judgments, offering as full pictures as we are likely to get of numerous local politicians of both races, Anderson's is a solid work which, along with other scholarly investigations, should help to bury the outmoded notions that a "solid South," a white Republican betrayal of blacks, and Negro passivity immediately succeeded Hayes's election.

During what Anderson terms the years of "Bourbon equilibrium" in the "Black Second" after 1876 most Democrats accepted blacks as permanent voters and officeholders. Though they never ceased appealing to white racism or stuffing ballot boxes, they did generally refrain from violence, and they wheeled and dealt incessantly with black and white Republican politicians (pp. 145, 254). Up to 2,000 whites voted the Republican ticket (p. 240), and black and white Republicans were fairly regularly elected to local, state, and national office. Even the later mastermind of the 1898 white-supremacy campaign, Furnifold Simmons, sought to conciliate black voters in this era (pp. 137-38).

In 1888 the Democrats, fearing the newly organized Farmers' Alliance and facing a stronger statewide threat from the Republicans than in previous years, ran a straight-out racist campaign in the Second, increased their fabricated vote totals, fairly systematically refused to back or approve the bonds of Republicans elected to local offices, and when the 1889 legislative session met passed a registration law that made it possible for partisan registrars to damp down Republican totals (pp. 145, 160, 162-67). This comparatively moderate precursor of the Democrats' furious actions of 1898 to 1900 and even a reduction in the Second's potential black majority in the 1891 reapportionment failed not only to eliminate, but even to reduce black political power in the nineties (pp. 186, 219). The Populist-Republican fusion legislature allowed local voters to elect more of their own county officials and replaced the 1889 registration law with one that offered blacks more protection, and the complicated three-party competition during the 1894-1898 fusion era provided blacks with increased opportunities to bargain for power, places, and favorable policies (pp. 227-51). A new generation of better-educated, more sophisticated post-Reconstruction black Republicans, led by Congressman George H. White, became postmasters, magistrates, and legislators. Black officeholders were suddenly more visible to whites, if not much more powerful, than they had been since Reconstruction (pp. 245, 251). Negro progress in economics, education, and politics threatened white and Democratic supremacy and therefore, paradoxically, helped bring on disfranchisement and Jim Crow (pp. 332-35).

While he is surely correct in calling for "more study" of southern white Republicans (p. 336), Anderson himself provides few insights into the motives or social character of these dissenters. Why did some whites in this black majority area affiliate with the Populists or the party of the freedmen, while others stuck with the Democrats? Why did some, such as later disfranchisement leader Francis D. Winston, join the GOP as young men, only to defect even before the black upsurge and well before the white Democratic pressure for racial conformity became overwhelming? Were upper-, middle-, or lower-class whites, Yankee- or Carolina-born men, professionals or farmers or artisans more likely to rebel against the racial

consensus? Perhaps those scholars who are inspired by Anderson's interesting book to conduct similarly detailed studies of post-Reconstruction southern politics will take up these questions, as well as the ones he raises more directly.

California Institute of Technology

J. MORGAN KOUSSER

*Warren Akin Candler: The Conservative as Idealist.* By Mark K. Bauman. (Metuchen, N. J., and London: Scarecrow Press, 1981. Pp. x, 278. \$16.00.)

Warren Akin Candler is the type of southerner about whom we need additional biographical studies: a widely influential nonpolitical leader of southern institutional life. Because he was not an intellectual or a systematic thinker, it is difficult to produce for contemporary readers a credible picture of his world view. However, Mark K. Bauman has made a useful contribution to southern studies in this effort.

Winner of the Jesse Lee Prize offered by the Commission on Archives and History of the United Methodist Church, Bauman's *Candler* will replace Alfred M. Pierce's *Giant Against the Sky* (1948) as the most useful biography of the Methodist educator, editor, and bishop. Written by a friend of Candler's, *Giant Against the Sky* was too laudatory and lacked a critical historical perspective. By contrast, Bauman came to his subject as a professing "secular, 'Yankee-liberal'" (p. ix). But he came away from it a grudging admirer of the Southern Methodist bishop.

On the face of it, one wonders what Bauman found in Candler to admire. The son of a relatively secure small-town Georgia family, Candler studied for the ministry at Emory College, where he came under the influence of Atticus G. Haygood. After serving churches at Covington, Atlanta, and Augusta, he became assistant editor of the Nashville *Christian Advocate* before returning to Oxford, Georgia, as president of Emory in 1888. Ten years later he was elected to the Southern Methodist episcopacy. There is nothing remarkable in this career pattern except in its success. Beyond that, however, Candler was an active and successful builder of institutions: Emory University, Paine College, hospitals, churches, and foreign-mission stations. Yet he remained, in Bauman's words, "a racist, in many ways an elitist, certainly one very conscious of a person's 'place,' and an individual much taken with the 'sins' of others" (p. ix).

Basic to Candler's world view, according to Bauman, were the institutions of family, church, and state, the three pillars of civilization. Primary among them was the family, the socializer and civilizer of human life. As society became more complex, some of the family's functions were taken up by the church and the state. Cooperating together in hierarchical harmony the three institutions served as guarantors of order in society. But, according to Bauman, that orderly nineteenth-century world view came under serious attack after 1918, and the bishop spent the last two decades of his life fighting rearguard actions: against moral flux that undermined the family, against spiritual malaise that threatened the church, and against both radicalism and state paternalism that challenged his Jefferson-