

REVIEW ARTICLE

Reconstruction Historiography and African American Agrarianism in Lowcountry South Carolina (再建期研究とアフリカン・ アメリカン・アグレーリアニズム)

Akiko Ochiai*

SUMMARY IN JAPANESE: アメリカ合衆国の南北戦争及びそれに続く再建期の変革の中で、奴隷の身から解放された多くのアフリカン・アメリカンは、土地保有を通じて市民としての自由を追求した。これはアグレーリアニズム(農本主義)と呼ばれるにふさわしく、南部の広範囲に渡った動きであったにも拘わらず、再建期研究の中では単なる土地願望として長い間扱われてきた。1960年代以降のリヴィジョニズム、ポスト・リヴィジョニズムを経て、エリック・フォナーに代表される最近の研究において、アフリカン・アメリカン・アグレーリアニズムはようやく正当な評価を受けつつある。本稿は、特に土地獲得の可能性が最も高かったサウスカロライナ州ロウカントリー地域に注目し、現在に至る再建期研究の中でアフリカン・アメリカン・アグレーリアニズムがどのように捉えられてきたのかを概観し、新たな視点の提起を試みるものである。

* Teaching at the Kobe University of Commerce, Kobe, Japan.

Introduction

The Civil War drastically transformed the whole society of the United States, by emancipating four million African American slaves, by accelerating industrialization and urbanization, and by forcing the integration of new national political, economic, and cultural structures. The Reconstruction following the war was a revolutionary era not only politically and economically, but culturally and even psychologically.

Over the past century, the topic of the Reconstruction has attracted the attention of numerous historians, who have debated not only about the meaning of the period but about historical events themselves. Therefore, the study of Reconstruction historiography reveals the dialectics and complexities of the period itself as well as the significant changes in historical perspectives since then.¹

Often-quoted symbolically as "Forty Acres and a Mule," the desire to possess land was the most general and persistent theme of the African American struggle in the South during the Reconstruction. For ex-slaves, land ownership was almost synonymous with freedom and independence. As free citizens, they yearned to cultivate their own land without fear of whipping and family separation. As a result, African Americans showed a fierce determination to define their freedom in terms of agricultural self-sufficiency, which we may call African American agrarianism.

This paper is a survey of how historians over the past century have interpreted African American desires for land and an examination of its ideological implications. Like other aspects of the Reconstruction, African American agrarianism has been the subject of vigorous controversies in historical scholarship over the century. In order both to trace the historiography of African American agrarian dreams and to find new perspectives on it, this study focuses especially on lowcountry South Carolina. Lowcountry South Carolina was at once the place where land distribution for landless African Americans seemed most probable and where the struggle for land was most conspicuous. Therefore, lowcountry South Carolina best reveals the revolutionary potential of agrarianism shared by four million other African Americans.

Although some scholars have already called African American yearning for landownership among freedpeople "African American agrarianism," some explanation of the use of the term agrarianism may be in order here.² In the

1930's, historians at Vanderbilt University and several other southern writers contrasted the traditionally stable, religious, and agrarian southern life with the hurried, corrupted, and industrialized urban life. Their movement and thought is also called agrarianism. However, this article refers to agrarianism as what Louis H. Douglas calls "classical agrarianism," an ideology based upon an ideal that agriculture is the basis of human virtues as well as wealth and economic activities, and that representative democracy should consist of landowning small farmers.³

In the early period of the United States, agrarianism did not refer only to landless farmers' revolts or movements to acquire land. It was rather a political creed (sometimes called Jeffersonian agrarianism or Republican agrarianism) which regards land ownership as the basis of franchise and independence. Land ownership was naturally the ultimate dream of people living in an agricultural society, for land was the basis not only of economic and political power but also of social power. This paper will use the term agrarianism to include its philosophical and psychological underpinnings, arguing that African American desires for land embodied their broad idea of independence as free citizens in the United States.

A Century of Historiography

The earliest interpretations of the Reconstruction have come to be named the Dunning School, after William A. Dunning, who gave them scholarly legitimacy at the turn of the century. The Dunning School held that evil radical Republicans overturned the generous policies of Presidents Abraham Lincoln and Andrew Johnson. The Republicans established corrupt, ostensibly African American districts in the defeated South, which led to the period of chaotic misrule that ensued. The scene was dominated by the images of "wicked" carpetbaggers and scalawags, and of "ignorant" freedpeople incapable of properly exercising the political power that had become theirs. At the mass level, these anti-Reconstruction sentiments with their derogatory images of African Americans and white Republicans were popularized by D. W. Griffith's film "Birth of a Nation" (1915) and Claude G. Bower's *The Tragic Era* (1929).⁴

Reflecting the social atmosphere of those days when segregationist ideology dominated the racial consciousness of the American people, the Dunning School

either completely ignored or ridiculed the ways that freedpeople tried to give meaning to their newly gained freedom. For example, the Dunning School rarely considered African Americans' concern with the land issue, or dismissed it as a nonsensical and groundless dream, caricaturing their desire as an expectation that they could receive land for free.⁵

Some African American scholars, whom John Hope Franklin calls the "black dissenters," challenged the Dunning School.⁶ In *Black Reconstruction in America* (1935), W. E. B. Du Bois reevaluated and reinterpreted the Reconstruction from an African American perspective. Du Bois emphasized the constructive achievements of Radical Reconstruction such as the protection of constitutional rights and the improvement of public school and social welfare systems. In so doing, he highlighted the roles of African American leaders, and denounced the racial attitudes both of contemporary white scholars as well as those of whites during the Reconstruction. Alrutheus A. Taylor closely examined the individual states of South Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee, finding that African Americans during the Reconstruction were far from the "ignorant dupes" of "wicked" carpetbaggers and scalawags, but that African Americans' power was too limited to "blacken" state politics.⁷

Although these preceding works attracted little attention at the time, they established a basis for subsequent revisionist historians. Primarily concerned to criticize the contemporary white interpretations, and having limited access to original African American materials, their arguments rarely extended beyond the general affirmation that land distribution was "absolutely fundamental and essential" for African American freedpeople to redirect their lives as free citizens. They blamed the failure of land redistribution mainly on the limitations of federal policies rather than on the lack of effort on the part of African Americans.⁸

Du Bois' perspective, however, was not only African American, but Marxist-oriented. He interpreted the African American struggle as a proletarian labor movement, and their land struggle as part of the class conflict between the landless proletariat and landed planters. Marxist historians like James S. Allen and Herbert Aptheker further advanced Du Bois' argument. Allen, for example, argued that northern capitalist industry overthrew the feudal southern planters, and they in turn would ultimately be smashed by the proletariat through class struggle.⁹

During the 1930's and 1940's, even some white historians tried to develop a

“New View of Southern Reconstruction” against the widely accepted Dunning School interpretations. In *South Carolina during the Reconstruction* (1932), for example, Francis B. Simkins and Robert H. Woody acknowledged the competence and intelligence of African American leaders, offering a favorable if occasionally stereotyped evaluation of the Reconstruction.¹⁰ In regard to the land question, however, they viewed the temporary allotment of lands to African Americans in the coastal area of South Carolina and Georgia as a temporary wartime necessity, and argued that permanent confiscation of plantations contradicted the American tradition of protecting individual property. They left unchallenged the traditional critical interpretation of freedpeople’s capacities, holding that even with land distribution, they would have been unable to manage the land as independent yeomen.¹¹

While varied in quality, aim, and scope, 1960’s revisionists like Eric McKittrick and John and La Wanda Cox emphasized the positive achievements of federal and state governments and the progress of African Americans during the Reconstruction. They placed African American leaders and idealistic Radical Republicans at the center of their stage. Influenced by the rise of the new social history, not only revisionists’ constructive interpretation of the Reconstruction, but also their incorporation of long ignored materials, such as collective and individual biographies and African American sources, represented a drastic departure from the traditional school. For example, in *After Slavery* (1965), Joel Williamson used African American records such as slave narratives and WPA (Works Projects Administration) interviews to indicate the viable lives of newly-freed slaves and their progress in politics, economics, and society in general.¹² Although narrative rather than analytical, these revisionist works illuminated the African American desire for land in the context of history, not dismissing it as a “groundless dream.” In *The Struggle for Equality* (1964), James M. McPherson exposed the controversial wartime land policies of the federal government and African Americans’ readiness to make the most of the advantages offered to them.¹³ By the late 1960’s, traditional interpretations had completely lost their ground in the face of new evidence.

The revisionist emphasis on the positive aspects of the Reconstruction inevitably gave rise to the troubling questions: why did “villainous” southern white Redeemers finally reverse the Reconstruction, and why were African Americans left at their mercy? The more the revisionists advanced their study, the more keenly did they confront the limitations of the Reconstruction. As Eric

Foner says, "if the era was 'tragic,' it was because change did not go far enough. Reconstruction appeared as both a time of real progress, and a golden opportunity lost for the South and the nation."¹⁴

During the 1970's, a new post-revisionist school of scholars criticized the "conservative" character of the Reconstruction, pointing out the racism pervasive in the North as well as the South, and the failures of land distributions to the landless freedpeople. According to post-revisionist scholarship, which presented overall a pessimistic interpretation, the socio-economic continuities between the Antebellum and Postbellum society overrode the "superficial" changes during the Reconstruction. For example, Louis S. Gerteis cynically asserted that nothing but wartime necessity determined federal policies toward African Americans who had moved step by step from slaves to contrabands to freedpeople. And Leon Litwack illuminated the wide range of African Americans' reactions to emancipation, in contrast to both southern and northern whites' indifference to African American aspirations.¹⁵

Yet a serious problem lurked within this post-revisionist view. The post-revisionists tended to downplay the substantial changes in the Reconstruction era. In terms of the land question, while paying much attention to criticizing conservative racist federal policies, post-revisionists unwittingly created an image of helpless and passive African Americans. In fact, those who had lived through the period felt that it had been a time of tremendous upheaval and opportunity to pursue their autonomy as free citizens. Thomas Long, a corporal of the First South Carolina Volunteers during the Civil War, affirmed that "now tings can never go back, because we have showed our energy & our courage & our naturally manhood."¹⁶

The Recent Wave of Scholarship and Its Contributions

Challenging the impasse of post-revisionism, the latest wave of scholarship on the Reconstruction since the 1980's emphasizes the sweeping impact of its changes on national as well as southern life, and the roles as well as the limitations of African American leaders. The leading representative of this latest wave is Eric Foner, whose extensive recounting of the Reconstruction portrays the Reconstruction as part of a prolonged struggle over new political relations, race relations and labor relations, and tries to "synthesize the social, political,

and economic aspects of the period.” He uses the vantage point of African Americans in particular to reveal the revolutionary changes of the Reconstruction and support his interpretation of the Reconstruction as an “unfinished Revolution.”¹⁷

Reemphasis on the legacy of revolutionary elements in the dialectics of continuity and change has led recent historians to devote more attention to the initiatives and consciousness of the people, i.e., the basis of their ideology. Moreover, African American historiography has been particularly enriched by a vast amount of material newly uncovered or authenticated since the 1960's. Historians are now researching what African Americans thought and how they acted during that great transitional era.

In this connection, the reality of freedpeople's desire for land has come to receive growing attention. Numerous recent scholars specifically examine freedpeople's aspirations from broader perspectives. As a result, not only the details of African American struggles for land but also their intricate connections with politics, economics and social phenomena, and the differences between time periods, regions, and social groups are being newly discovered.¹⁸

As noted above, lowcountry South Carolina evidenced the greatest potentials for African American landownership and the most vigorous struggles over land. As one of the places which has attracted the most historians, it is consequently one of the most thoroughly surveyed. With the accumulation of recent scholarship, there are at least four interrelated interpretations about African Americans in lowcountry South Carolina.

The first reevaluates slave experiences in the Antebellum as constituting the core of African American agrarianism in the following years. It is almost a quarter of century since John W. Blassingame made it clear that slaves developed a viable culture within their slave community that prevented them from becoming totally dependent and childlike “Sambos,” and helped them develop their own identities. While Clarence E. Walker and others criticize Blassingame and his followers for romanticizing the slave community and ignoring its traumatic and frustratingly impotent aspects, John S. Strickland and Julie Saville articulate what lowcountry African Americans gained through their slave experiences and how they struggled for their autonomy during the Civil War and Reconstruction.¹⁹

For over a century and a half, along the coastal lowcountry of South Carolina and Georgia, African American slaves had enjoyed large stable plantation com-

munities with absentee proprietorship and slave family continuity, all of which allowed them an unusual degree of autonomy. They gained a relatively great amount of control over their own labor from the allotment of garden plots and the task system which allowed them to cultivate their own plots and acquire personal property such as horses and mules. So lowcountry African Americans developed an informal "slaves' economy."²⁰

Saville points out that the viable African American communities and their Antebellum control of labor were as important as the wartime federal policies in advancing local movements of grassroots reconstruction: the reconstruction of family and community with which they pursued economic independence within the larger movement for their autonomy.²¹ Strickland further advances the discussion, applying the moral economy theory to the African American struggle at that time. The moral economy, first theorized by E. P. Thompson, is the idea that each social group has ethically correct economic responsibilities which are ethically assigned depending on the overall structure of that society's norms and obligations. According to Strickland, lowcountry African Americans developed a moral economy through their control of labor and communal solidarity in the Antebellum, and depended on this moral economy when they tried to reshape their lives in the great transformation.²²

The second characteristic of recent scholarship is the recognition that the course of the war greatly influenced African Americans' struggle: "the character of the war helped determine who would be free, how they would become free, and what freedom would mean." The best accounts of wartime transformation of American society as well as of freedpeople may be found in the vast documentary series *Freedom* (1982-), edited by Ira Berlin et al.²³

The historiographic periodization of the Reconstruction itself reflects this recent scholarship. Traditional interpretations of the Reconstruction began with the establishment of the Freedmen's Bureau at the end of the Civil War in March 1865, and ended with the election of 1876, when the southern planter class regained its legitimacy. However, with the increasing interest in the dynamic changes of wartime, especially the changing status of African Americans from slaves to freed citizens, historians have come to pay more attention to wartime circumstances.

Particularly in the Sea Island area of lowcountry South Carolina, the federal occupation and subsequent events critically influenced the African American pursuit of freedom. Following the federal occupation of November 1861, the

Sea Island African Americans became wage laborers under the Port Royal Experiment. This benevolent assistance by the federal government and northern volunteer missionaries was intended to help African American transition from slaves to free citizens. In 1863 and 1864, the federal government mandated sweeping land sales for unpaid federal taxes in this region. At the very end of the War, General William T. Sherman issued Special Field Order No. 15, which set aside the coastal area exclusively for African American homesteaders, giving them temporary "possessory titles." Along with other federal policies such as the Confiscation Acts, the Emancipation Proclamation, and the Thirteenth Amendment, all these events contributed to African American achievement of freedom in lowcountry South Carolina.

The third characteristic is that recent scholarship articulates African Americans' understanding of wartime circumstances and their tireless efforts to achieve autonomy. The transitional wartime circumstances created great opportunities for African Americans, and they showed their readiness to avail themselves of every opportunity from the very beginning of the war. Regarding the Civil War as "moments of revolutionary transformation" that "thrust common folk into prominence," Ira Berlin argues that "[o]nly in the upheaval of accustomed routine can the lower orders give voice to the assumptions that guide their world as it is and as they wish it to be."²⁵

As mentioned above, General Sherman issued the Special Field Order No. 15 in January of 1865. Freedpeople wasted no time to settle on the Sherman Reservation, and at the peak, about 40,000 African Americans received possessory titles. With the help of the newly-founded Freedmen's Bureau, they not only established schools and churches but also local civil governments to make their communities more stable and viable. However, in the following summer the order was nullified by President Andrew Johnson's restoration policy. African Americans vigorously protested against restoration, by sending petitions, by collective bargaining with planters and Freedmen's Bureau agents, and even by arming themselves.²⁶ Although their agrarian dreams were only partly fulfilled, and only some fortunate African Americans acquired small tracts, they clearly understood that it was time to "speak up." The revisionism of the 1960's rediscovered a significant number of voices of African Americans themselves, and recent scholars rely particularly upon African Americans not only as active participants in the political process, but also for their eyewitness accounts of the era.²⁷

Finally, recent studies of "free blacks" (who either were born free or gained freedom before the War) reveal the diversity of African Americans. The economic and social advantages of free urban African Americans led them to take different positions from freed slaves, greatly influencing the course of the Reconstruction.²⁸

Immediately after the War, southern whites determined to oppose all attempts at progress by African Americans. At the same time, the conservative Reconstruction policies of Andrew Johnson infuriated Republicans and the northern public, resulting in the radical Reconstruction thereafter. Seventy African American delegates enjoyed the majority in the South Carolina Constitutional Convention of 1868. Thomas Holt's painstaking analysis proves that 44 percent of those seventy African American delegates had obtained their freedom before the war. They tended to be privileged in their educations, occupations, and property holding. These African Americans' economic and socio-cultural backgrounds critically influenced their voting behavior in the legislature. While conceding that "outright confiscation was no longer a tenable alternative for a new regime unsure of its tenure," Holt regrets that many of the free African American delegates did not reflect the freedpeople's aspirations for land at the convention.²⁹

In Further Search of African American Agrarianism

From the above discussion, we cannot help but realize how far Reconstruction historiography has come since the 1960's. African Americans and their struggle for land are now considered an indispensable part of Reconstruction historiography. However, even recent scholarship fails to articulate fully an African American agrarianism, as Loren Schweniger laments the lack of "a comprehensive picture of black economic Reconstruction in the South."

One problem is that some scholars anchor their analyses in theoretical abstractions and . . . either ignore changes over time or treat a particular historical situation as if it had been static. Other historians offer broad generalizations from investigations of specific locations.³⁰

Schweniger's criticism seems very persuasive, as it focuses on two points that

are related in effect: the necessity of more intensive specific research on particular regions, and of more synthetic comparative research between regions. Although further studies comparing lowcountry agrarianism to that of other southern African Americans or to that of peasants abroad are needed, more intensive and specific research of lowcountry South Carolina remains crucial in order to elucidate the society which lowcountry African Americans tried to achieve.

In spite of this vast amount of scholarship, few scholars have interpreted African American agrarianism in lowcountry South Carolina as an evolutionary movement, presenting its characteristics in each phase and analyzing the continuity in the course of its development. In other words, what is most striking and still not fully analyzed is that in each transitional phase of the Civil War and Reconstruction, African Americans marshalled their resources and tactics, demonstrating a tremendous ability to adjust themselves to ongoing circumstances, and tirelessly pursuing their agrarian dreams in a sophisticated manner.

Emphasizing the importance of the Antebellum slave experience, Saville argues that lowcountry African Americans' demand for land during the Reconstruction stemmed from their "wide array of localized idiosyncratic customs" such as the task system. Around 1868, however, when it became evident that land distribution was unlikely to be realized, they geared their resources and tactics as wage laborers to the struggle against landowners in order to expand their control of labor in domestic production.³¹ Although Saville's argument is limited to a relatively short time span, her research is very suggestive of the evolution of African American agrarianism as a coherent movement across a long time span.

It is important to recognize that this development of African American agrarianism was not merely a temporary whim, but was grounded on a deeply rooted ideology and world view that moved African Americans toward their goal. African American agrarianism was rather an ideological ideal, under which they struggled for autonomy not only economically and politically but also socially. In other words, "Forty Acres and a Mule" meant to African Americans what Jeffersonian agrarianism had meant to white yeomen in the early Republic, and what free labor ideology meant to northern white farmers on the eve of the Civil War.

In *Branches without Roots* (1986), Gerald D. Jaynes traces the emergence of

African American mass labor and their organized agrarian movement. He points out that a type of cooperation within competition often worked as a strategy when African Americans tried to buy land collectively within the capitalistic and individualistic market economy.³² This strategy can be interpreted as one uniquely African American expression of agrarianism.

Similarly, a long African American tradition of social ambivalence seems to uniquely characterize African American agrarianism. While desiring to be integrated in the dominant American society, African Americans have sought to be independent of it.³³ From the beginning of the Federal occupation in 1861, lowcountry African Americans repeatedly affirmed their preference of subsistence farming to commercial farming. In the face of America's growing capitalist economy, their adherence to subsistence farming was vulnerable and sometimes criticized as an "anachronism." However, we should take into account that dominant white market mechanisms, like other American institutions, did not function fairly for African Americans. Their reluctance to sell their souls to the principles of commercial crop farming was closely related to their attitude of self-segregation from whites. They saw the white-dominated system as an ongoing menace to their community.³⁴

On the other hand, lowcountry African Americans did pursue their political and economic independence within the realm of the dominant American institutions. In order to legalize their desire for land, their delegates actively participated in state politics. Rank and file freedpeople repeatedly affirmed that they were ready to purchase the lands and follow the due process of law, if only the government gave them temporary assistance.³⁵ Thus, African American agrarianism really must be examined in the context of African American's ambivalent tradition.

Conclusion

Over the past century, historians developed rigorous scholarship on the Reconstruction, reflected in their interpretations of African American agrarianism. The Dunning School either ignored or derogatorily depicted African American desires for land. Although some Marxist and African American scholars protested against the Dunning School, it was not until the 1960's that revisionism became widely accepted, and African American agrarianism was inte-

grated into Reconstruction history. As a wealth of relevant materials was found or rediscovered, post-revisionist historians began to emphasize the conservatism of the period, as in the limitations of the federal land policies. This post-revisionism unwittingly underplayed the active participation of African Americans and denied the revolutionary elements of the period. Eric Foner and historians since the 1980's have challenged post-revisionism, acclaiming the revolutionary character of the Reconstruction and the significant role of African American initiatives in that era.

Reflecting this latest interpretation, African American agrarianism in lowcountry South Carolina has begun to receive much attention. This recent scholarship has revealed the role of Antebellum slave life as a basis for later African American movements and their initiatives; the tremendous effects of wartime transformation; the African Americans' keen understanding of the war as a great opportunity; and the diversity in political and social orientations as well as economic ones among African Americans.

While paying due recognition to the many recent advances in Reconstruction research, much remains to be done. Lowcountry agrarianism needs to be reevaluated as an evolution of the continual efforts of African Americans to achieve autonomy through landownership. Their agrarianism must be analyzed as an ideology that moved them not only economically and politically but also socially toward their goal. At the same time, we must be cognizant that the African American ambivalence about integration into and independence from mainstream white society lies at the core of the African American tradition and deserves careful consideration at every stage.

Even in lowcountry South Carolina, the ultimate objective of African American agrarianism—acquisition of land and independence—was never fully realized. With the end of the Reconstruction, African Americans gradually lost political power, and their standard of living fell far below the white average. Because of this decline in African American endeavor, and the long neglect of their history, historians are still in search of their voices, in order to recapture the potentials of their African American agrarianism and to reinterpret them in the larger context of American history.

Notes

- 1 The following works constitute the main scholarship of Reconstruction historiography in chronological order: Alrutheus A. Taylor, "Historians of Reconstruction," *Journal of Negro History* 23 (1938): 16-34; Francis B. Simkins, "New Viewpoints of Southern Reconstruction," *Journal of Southern History* 5 (1939): 49-61; Howard K. Beale, "On Rewriting Reconstruction History," *American Historical Review* 45 (1939-40): 807-27; T. Harry Williams, "An Analysis of Some Reconstruction Attitudes," *Journal of Southern History* 12 (1946): 469-86; John Hope Franklin, "Whither Reconstruction Historiography?" *Journal of Negro Education* 17 (1948): 446-61; Bernard A. Weisberger, "The Dark and Bloody Ground of Reconstruction Historiography," *Journal of Southern History* 25 (1959): 427-47; Vernon L. Wharton, "Reconstruction," in *Writing Southern History: Essays in Historiography in Honor of Fletcher M. Green*, ed. Arthur S. Link, and Rembert W. Patrick (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1965), pp. 295-315; Thomas J. Pressly, "Racial Attitudes, Scholarship, and Reconstruction: A Review Essay," *Journal of Southern History* 32 (1966): 88-93; Richard O. Curry, "The Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861-1877: A Critical Overview of Recent Trends and Interpretations," *Civil War History* 20 (1974): 215-28; Franklin, "Mirror for Americans: A Century of Reconstruction History," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 384-439; Armstead L. Robinson, "Beyond the Realm of Social Consensus: New Meanings of Reconstruction for American History," *Journal of American History* 68 (1981): 276-97; Eric Foner, "Reconstruction Revisited," *Reviews in American History* 10 (1982): 82-100; Foner, "Slavery, the Civil War, and Reconstruction," in *The New American History*, ed. Foner (Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press, 1990), pp. 73-92; and Eric Anderson and Alfred A. Moss, Jr., eds., *The Facts of Reconstruction: Essays in Honor of John Hope Franklin* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1991).
- 2 Gerald D. Jaynes, *Branches without Roots: Genesis of the Black Working Class in the American South 1862-1882* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1986).
- 3 On American agrarianism in general, see Solon J. Buck, *The Agrarian Crusade* (Northford, CT: Elliotts Books, 1920); and A. Whitney Griswold, *Farming and Democracy* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1948). Louis H. Douglas edits a number of documents with lucid explanations in *Agrarianism in American History* (Lexington: D.C. Heath and Co., 1969).
- 4 William A. Dunning, *Reconstruction, Political and Economic 1865-1877* (New York: Harper, 1907). The best examples of the works of Dunning's students are: Claude G. Bowers, *The Tragic Era: The Revolution after Lincoln* (New York: Cambridge Houghton Mufflin, 1929); Walter L. Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1905); and Joseph G. de Roulhac Hamilton, *Reconstruction in North Carolina* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1914).
- 5 Dunning, pp. 45-47.
- 6 Franklin, "Mirror for Americans," p. 389.
- 7 W. E. B. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction in America* (New York: Antheneum, 1935); Taylor, *The Negro in South Carolina during the Reconstruction* (Washington: Association for the Study of Negro Life and History [ASNLH], 1924); Taylor, *The Negro in Tennessee, 1865-1880* (Washington: ASNLH, 1941); and Taylor, *The Negro in the Reconstruction of Virginia* (Washington: ASNLH, 1926).
- 8 Du Bois, p. 601.

- 9 James S. Allen, *Reconstruction: The Battle for Democracy* (New York: International Publishers, 1937), pp. 17-22. See also, Allen, "The Struggle for Land during the Reconstruction Period," *Science & Society* 1 (1936-37): 378-401; and Herbert Aptheker, "Mississippi Reconstruction and the Negro Leader, Charles Caldwell," *Ibid.* 11 (1947): 340-71.
- 10 Simkins, "New Viewpoints of Southern Reconstruction," pp. 49-61; and Simkins and Robert H. Woody, *South Carolina during Reconstruction* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1932).
- 11 *Ibid.*, pp. 231-32. See also, E. Merton Coulter, *The South during Reconstruction, 1865-1877* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1947), p. 111. Coulter suggested that thoughtless freedpeople failed to take advantage of land sales offered by impoverished planters.
- 12 Major influential revisionist works are: W. R. Brock, *An American Crisis: Congress and Reconstruction, 1865-1867* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963); John and La Wanda Cox, *Politics, Principle, and Prejudice 1865-1866* (New York: Free Press, 1963); Eric L. McKittrick, *Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1960); James M. McPherson, *The Struggle for Equality: Abolitionists and the Negro in the Civil War and Reconstruction* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1964); Kenneth M. Stampp, *The Era of Reconstruction, 1865-1877* (New York: Knopf, 1965); Hans L. Trefousse, *The Radical Republicans: Lincoln's Vanguard for Racial Justice* (New York: Knopf, 1969); and Joel Williamson, *After Slavery: The Negro in South Carolina during Reconstruction, 1861-1877* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1965).
- 13 McPherson, pp. 246-59.
- 14 Foner, "Reconstruction Revisited," p. 83.
- 15 Major works of post-revisionism are: Michael Les Benedict, *A Compromise of Principle: Congressional Republicans and Reconstruction 1863-1869* (New York: Norton, 1974); Louis S. Gerteis, *From Contraband to Freedman: Federal Policy toward Southern Blacks, 1861-1865* (Westport: Greenwood, 1973); Harold M. Hyman, *A More Perfect Union: The Impact of the Civil War and Reconstruction on the Constitution* (New York: Knopf, 1973); Leon F. Litwack, *Been in the Storm So Long: The Aftermath of Slavery* (New York: Random House, 1979); William F. McFeely, *Yankee Stepfather: General O. O. Howard and the Freedmen* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1968); Donald G. Neiman, *To Set the Law in Motion: The Freedmen's Bureau and the Legal Rights of Blacks, 1865-1868* (Milwood, NY: KTO Press, 1979); and Michael Perman, *Reunion Without Compromise: The South and Reconstruction 1865-1868* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1973).
- 16 Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Journal, 24 March 1864, as quoted in McPherson, ed., *The Negro's Civil War: How American Blacks Felt and Acted During the War for the Union* (1965; rpt. New York: Ballantine, 1991), p. 217.
- 17 Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution 1863-1877* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988), p. xxiv. Major works of recent scholarship are found in the bibliographical essay of Foner, and Olivia Mahoney, *America's Reconstruction: People and Politics after the Civil War* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1995), pp. 139-43. The following are the major works after Foner's *Reconstruction*: Steven V. Ash, *Middle Tennessee Society Transformed 1860-1870: War and Peace in the Upper South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1988); Catherine Clinton, and Nina Silber, eds., *Divided Houses: Gender and the Civil War* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992); Richard N. Current, *Those Terrible Carpetbaggers: A Reinterpretation* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1988); Edmund L. Drago, *Black Politicians and Reconstruction in Georgia:*

REVIEW ARTICLE

- A Splendid Failure*, 2nd ed. (Athens: Univ. of Georgia Press, 1992); Michael W. Fitzgerald, *The Union League Movement in the Deep South: Politics and Agricultural Change during Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1989); Richard G. Lowe, *Republicans and Reconstruction in Virginia, 1856-70* (Charlottesville: Univ. Press of Virginia, 1991); Stuart McConnell, *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1992); Silber, *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1993); Brooks D. Simpson, *Let Us Have Peace: Ulysses S. Grant and the Politics of War and Reconstruction* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1992); and Trefousse, *Andrew Johnson: A Biography* (New York: Norton, 1989).
- 18 The following studies are some of the recent studies of African American agrarianism and their struggle for autonomy in other regions. Paul A. Cimbala, "The Freedmen's Bureau, the Freedmen, and Sherman's Grant in Reconstruction Georgia, 1865-1867," *Journal of Southern History* 55 (1989): 597-632; Nancy Cohen-Lack, "A Struggle for Sovereignty: National Consolidation, Emancipation, and Free Labor in Texas, 1865," *Ibid.* 58 (1992): 57-98; James T. Currie, "Benjamin Montgomery and the Davis Bend Colony," *Prologue* 25th Anniversary Issue (1994): 72-85; and Sharon A. Holt, "Making Freedom Pay: Freedpeople Working for Themselves, North Carolina, 1865-1900," *Journal of Southern History* 60 (1994): 229-62. See also, Berlin, et al., eds., *Freedom: A Documentary History of Emancipation* (New York, 1982-), ser. I, 3 vols. and ser. II. Numerous documents in the *Freedom* series reveal African Americans' persistent desire to work for themselves as well as their diverse wartime experiences and its consequences.
 - 19 John W. Blassingame, *The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the South* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1979); Clarence E. Walker, *Deromanticizing Black History: Critical Essays and Reappraisals* (Knoxville: Univ. of Tennessee Press, 1991), esp. pp. xi-xviii. John S. Strickland, "'No More Mud Work': The Struggle for the Control of Labor and Production in Low Country South Carolina, 1863-1880," in *The Southern Enigma: Essays on Race, Class, and Folk Culture*, ed. Walter J. Fraser, Jr. and Winfred B. Moore, Jr. (Westport: Greenwood, 1983), pp. 43-62; Strickland, "Traditional Culture and Moral Economy: Social and Economic Change in the South Carolina Low Country, 1865-1910," in *The Countryside in the Age of Capitalist Transformation: Essays in the Social History of Rural America*, ed. Steven Hahn and Jonathan Prude (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1985), pp. 141-78; Julie Saville, "Grassroots Reconstruction: Agricultural Labour and Collective Action in South Carolina, 1860-1868," *Slavery and Abolition* 12 (1991): 173-82; and Saville, *The Work of Reconstruction: From Slave to Wage Laborer in South Carolina, 1860-1870* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994). See also, Leslie A. Schualm, "The Meaning of Freedom: African-American Women and Their Transition from Slavery to Freedom in Lowcountry South Carolina," Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Wisconsin, 1991.
 - 20 Philip D. Morgan, "The Ownership of Property by Slaves in the Mid-Nineteenth-Century Low Country," *Journal of Southern History* 49 (1983): 399-420; and Morgan, "Work and Culture: The Task System and the World of Lowcountry Blacks, 1770 to 1880," *William and Mary Quarterly* 39 (1982): 563-99. About the slaves' economy elsewhere, see, Berlin and Morgan, eds., *The Slaves' Economy: Independent Production by Slaves in the Americas* (London: First Class Publications, 1991).
 - 21 Saville, "Grassroots Reconstruction," pp. 173-74.
 - 22 E. P. Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," *Past and Present* 50

- (1971): 76-136; and Strickland, "Traditional Culture and Moral Economy," pp. 143-44.
- 23 Berlin, et al., "Writing Freedom's History: The Destruction of Slavery," *Prologue* 17 (1985): 213, and Berlin, *Freedom*.
 - 24 Willie Lee Rose traces the Experiment in *Rehearsal for Reconstruction: The Port Royal Experiment* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1964). On the land issues and African Americans, see Edward Magdol, *A Right to the Land: Essays in the Freedmen's Community* (Westport: Greenwood, 1977); and Claude F. Oubré, *Forty Acres and a Mule: The Freedmen's Bureau and Black Land Ownership* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1978); and Gerteis.
 - 25 Berlin, "Writing Freedom's History," p. 213.
 - 26 See esp. Magdol, pp. 139-174; and Oubré, pp. 46-71.
 - 27 Berlin, et al., *Slaves No More: Three Essays on Emancipation and the Civil War* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992).
 - 28 Important research on free blacks includes: Berlin, *Slaves without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South* (New York: Pantheon, 1974); Leonard P. Curry, *The Free Black in Urban America, 1800-1850: The Shadow of the Dream* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1981); Michael P. Johnson and James L. Roark, *Black Masters: A Free Family of Color in the Old South* (New York: Norton, 1984); Johnson and Roark, eds., *No Chariot Let Down: Charleston's Free People of Color on the Eve of the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1984); and Marina Wikramanayake, *A World in Shadow: The Free Black in Antebellum South Carolina* (Columbia, SC: Univ. of South Carolina Press, 1973).
 - 29 Thomas Holt, *Black over White: Negro Political Leadership in South Carolina during Reconstruction* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1977), pp. 36-37, 128.
 - 30 Loren Schweniger, "Black Economic Reconstruction in the South," in Anderson and Moss, p. 176.
 - 31 Saville, *The Work of Reconstruction*, pp. 60-70.
 - 32 Jaynes, pp. 282-84.
 - 33 The best account of this ambivalent African American tradition may be found in the introduction of Patricia Gurin, et al., *Hope and Independence: Blacks' Response to Electoral and Party Politics* (New York: Russell Sage, 1990), pp. 1-15.
 - 34 One of the most famous accounts of African American self-segregation may be found in the meeting of 20 African American leaders with Secretary of War Edwin Stanton in Savanna in January 1865, after which General Sherman issued Special Field Order No. 15. See, Berlin, *Freedom*, ser. I, vol. III, pp. 334-35.
 - 35 *Philadelphia Press*, 31 May 1864, and Don Carlos Butler, Letter to President Lincoln, 29 May 1864, both quoted in McPherson, *The Negro's Civil War*, pp. 301-303.

