Critical Bibliography

Primary Sources

Election, Census, and Tax Records

County-level general election statistics for presidential and gubernatorial elections from 1880 to 1910 were supplied in machine-readable form by the Historical Archives of the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research at Ann Arbor, Michigan. The data provided was in partially proofed form, and the Consortium bears no responsibility for either the analyses or interpretations presented here. Computer analyses of the data were performed at Yale and Caltech. For a discussion of the methodology involved in the most important calculations and references to the methodological literature, see my article “Ecological Regression and the Analysis of Past Politics,” in Journal of Interdisciplinary History 4 (1973): 237–262.

State-level presidential returns were taken from Walter Dean Burnham, Presidential Ballots, 1836–1892 and Edgar E. Robinson, The Presidential Vote, 1896–1932. State-level gubernatorial and congressional returns were taken from contemporary almanacs—The New York Tribune Almanac (New York: Tribune Company, annually) and The Chicago Daily News Almanac (Chicago: Chicago Daily News Company, annually). Primary and referenda returns and registration statistics came from a variety of sources too lengthy to list here. For detailed citations, see my dissertation, “The Shaping of Southern Politics: Suffrage Restriction and the Establishment of the One-Party South” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1971), pp. 427–429. Percentage figures for each election were calculated on the basis of straight-line interpolations from population data from the 1880–1910 censuses. From 1890 on, the census gave the numbers of adult males by race. The 1880 census did not give separate totals for white and black males over 21, so for that census I assumed the proportions were the same as the overall proportions of blacks and whites of all ages and of both sexes in each county.

County boundary changes often cut down the numbers of county units used as a basis for calculating the regression and correlation coefficients. Every Southern state created new counties during this period. To get correct turnout figures, I therefore had to consolidate population totals from the new counties with those from the old counties from which the new ones were drawn. Texas presented particular difficulties, since much of it was only
barely settled during this period. Many of the western counties had very small populations. To weight these counties equally with the more densely populated counties when computing voting estimates (as unweighted regression, in effect, would do) would make the estimates unreliable. To compute weighted regression coefficients or add together all the tiny counties would have increased by about a month the time it took to figure the Texas estimates. I therefore eliminated from the Texas calculations any country with an adult-male population under 500 in 1910. Since the resulting total number of Texas county-units used in the calculations after consolidations and deletions amounted to 195, the estimates based on them are probably very close to those I would have gotten had I included every tiny county and weighted the figures.

Statistics of taxes paid and assessed valuations of property were taken from published state documents. State librarians and archivists in ten of the eleven states were kind enough to supply me with copies of relevant tables, since I could not afford to travel to each state to examine the documents myself. I calculated regression values for each of the ten states, although I did not present all the data in the text. For the precise locations of the tax and wealth data, see my dissertation, pp. 431–432.

_Statistical and Constitutional Convention Journals and Transcripts of Debates_

The state legislative and convention journals are absolutely essential to a study of suffrage restriction, but often exasperating to use. Essentially they record bills introduced, motions made, and most important, roll calls on the motions. They may include petitions, biographical information, election returns, and complete texts of bills. Most are fairly well indexed. But it is obviously necessary to consider them in conjunction with contemporary newspapers to understand what each motion really meant, what caucuses or important politicians did behind the scenes, etc. The transcripts of debates are fuller and simpler to employ.

All the journals, records of debates, and compilations of statutes for each legislative session are available at the Sterling Library at Yale or at the Yale Law School Library, except the 1887 and 1889 Florida House and Senate journals, which I used at the Connecticut State Library, Hartford. Since they are generally available in the states of publication, in many state archives, and in large university libraries, I will not give exact citations for all the legislative journals and collections of laws. The somewhat less widely distributed stenographic records of constitutional convention debates which I used included: Seth Shepard McKay, ed., _Debates in the Texas Constitutional Convention of 1875_; Samuel W. Small, ed., _A Stenographic Re-

The journals and other documents described in this section are cited in abbreviated form in the footnotes.

Newspapers

During the nineteenth century, the newspapers covered state politics and the state legislatures in more depth than is usual today, although the extent and usefulness of the coverage varied widely from paper to paper. I made no attempt to read all the major Southern newspapers for the entire period but focused instead on a few newspapers during important sessions of legislatures and constitutional conventions.

The Birmingham Age-Herald, November 1892–March 1893, and October–November 1894, contained more information on the passage and effect of the Sayre law than did the Mobile Daily Register. The Montgomery Daily Advertiser, January–December 1902, was helpful for understanding the motives behind adoption of the white primary in Alabama. I supplemented the rather sparse treatment of the Arkansas secret ballot and poll tax acts in the Little Rock Arkansas Gazette with the biased, but informative Pine Bluff Weekly Commercial. The Jacksonville Florida Times-Union, November 1884, through August 1885, October–November 1886, and April–May 1887, had fair coverage of the 1885 and 1887 legislative sessions and the 1885 constitutional convention in Florida. The Atlanta (Georgia) Constitution, August–September 1906, covering the last days of the Smith–Howell campaign for the governorship, showed how racist the "conservative" Howell was, and helped me appreciate the importance of Tom Hardwick in the campaign for disfranchisement and, conversely, the relative unimportance of Tom Watson.

The Baton Rouge (Louisiana) Daily Advocate, January–July 1896, and November 1897–January 1898, provided complete and zestful comments on the 1896 Louisiana governor's race, the passage of the registration and secret ballot act, and the 1898 referendum on calling the constitutional convention. The most partisan of newspapers, it reflected the view of Governor Murphy J. Foster and the state Democratic machine. The New Orleans Daily Picayune, May–July 1894, January–July 1896, November 1897–April 1898, covered the legislative sessions and the gubernatorial, senatorial, and constitutional convention campaigns in great depth. It reflected the
views of the city reformer-conservatives, who wanted to disfranchise the entire lower class.

The Raleigh (North Carolina) News and Observer, January–April 1899, gave insightful and openly partisan coverage of the passage of the registration and multiple-box laws and the suffrage amendment in North Carolina. Edited by future "Progressive" Josephus Daniels, the paper spoke for the then-united Democratic party of Governor Charles B. Aycock and Senator Furnifold Simmons. The Charleston (South Carolina) News and Courier, November 1880–February 1882, and October–November 1894, reported the eight-box law and the referendum on the constitutional convention in South Carolina adequately. A "conservative" paper, it strongly favored the eight-box law, but weakly opposed the later constitutional convention on the grounds that the Tillmanites would control it. Though just as strongly Democratic, the Columbia Daily Register, which I also consulted for the 1880–1882 session, was frightened that the eight-box law would invite Northern intervention. Its coverage of the legislature was perhaps slightly better than the News and Courier's.

The Memphis (Tennessee) Daily Appeal and the Memphis Daily Avalanche had the best reports on the passage and effect of the Dortch law and the 1888 frauds in West Tennessee. Rabidly racist, these papers openly exposed the motives of the disfranchisers; whereas, the partisan Democratic Nashville Daily American attempted to clothe the secret ballot and poll tax in bland "reform" togs. The politically neutral Nashville Daily Banner and the staunchly Republican Knoxville Daily Journal offered less complete, but more pro-Republican coverage. The Journal was perhaps more sympathetic toward Negroes in the early nineties than any other major white newspaper in the South. The Dallas (Texas) Morning News, January–March 1891, March–April 1892, January–February 1901, and October–November 1902, proved very sketchy on the Texas poll tax, as did the Austin (Texas) Daily Statesman for the same dates.

Published and Unpublished Secondary Works and Contemporary Magazine Articles

Southern History from Reconstruction to the First World War

The literature on Southern history from the 1870s through the first decade of the twentieth century is large and diverse. The reader who wishes more comprehensive bibliographies of secondary sources should consult the

1. I include contemporary magazine articles under this rubric for the convenience of readers who may wish to use this bibliography as a guide to further study.
bibliography in C. Vann Woodward, *Origins of the New South, 1877–1913*; the historiographical essays by Paul M. Gaston, George B. Tindall, Allen J. Going, and Dewey W. Grantham, Jr., in Arthur S. Link and Rembert W. Patrick, eds., *Writing Southern History*; and, on Negroes, many of the sections in James M. McPherson, Laurence B. Holland, James M. Banner, Nancy J. Weiss, and Michael B. Bell, *Blacks in America, Bibliographical Essays*.

The starting points for any student of post-Reconstruction politics must be the works of C. Vann Woodward and V. O. Key, Jr., most notably Woodward’s *Origins of the New South* and *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*, and Key’s *Southern Politics in State and Nation*. Writing before the publication of many of the secondary accounts listed in this bibliography, Key tentatively put forth an argument—what I refer to in the text as the “fait accompli thesis”—which later and deeper research has shown to be essentially incorrect. In both *Origins* and *Jim Crow*, Woodward exaggerated the support which the Redeemers or “paternalists” gave to black suffrage. I have examined in detail the evidence Woodward and others have offered for this point of view in sections of my dissertation (pp. 35–43) not presented here. For short restatements of some of Woodward’s views, see his “The Negro in American Life, 1865–1918,” in John A. Garraty, *Interpreting American History* 2: 43–68; and “The Ghost of Populism Walks Again,” *New York Times Magazine* (June 4, 1972). My disagreements with Woodward and Key have not diminished my respect for their tremendous scholarly achievements, a respect which has grown with every re-reading.

Of the general histories of the South, I found Francis Butler Simkins, *A History of the South*, most helpful. Thomas B. Clark and Albert D. Kirwan, *The South since Appomattox*; John Samuel Ezell, *The South since 1865*; and Monroe Lee Billington, *The American South* are occasionally misleading or contradictory on political changes. Two contemporary travellers’ analyses reveal a good deal about the South in this period: “Studies in the South,” written by Jonathan Baxter Harrison, but published anonymously, which appeared in several installments in *The Atlantic Monthly* 49 and 50 (1882), and Ray Stannard Baker’s *Following the Colour Line*. The reader should be wary of the class bias resulting from most travelers’ tendency to interview chiefly the articulate.

Paul M. Gaston found the era’s ideology full of paradoxes and contradictions in his well-written *The New South Creed* by almost invariably taking his subjects’ rhetoric seriously. On the issue of the New South’s support for Negro voting, for instance, he counted as equally sincere statements made to rally support for the Democrats in local campaigns and those designed to reassure Yankees that they could, in good conscience, leave the Negro in white Southern hands. Like Woodward, Gaston read too much into the
remarks of Wade Hampton, Alexander Stephens, and L. Q. C. Lamar in James G. Blaine, *et. al.*, “Ought the Negro to be Disfranchised? Ought He to Have Been Enfranchised?” *North American Review* 128 (1879): 225–283, a crucial symposium, in which all of these ex-rebels carefully avoided approving widespread Negro suffrage. Although George M. Frederickson, in his thoughtful *The Black Image in the White Mind*, was somewhat harsher than Gaston toward the paternalists and the “racist accommodationists” (his rubric for a subgroup of the Southern Progressives), I believe even he was too generous. My disagreements with these two scholars and others who follow the same interpretative line result from differences of approach rather than biases. Both Gaston and Frederickson concentrated on the ideas of the paternalists and Progressives, while I try to test rhetoric against actions. Moreover, they related the ideas of these groups primarily to Negro rights, while I am concerned, as well, with their attitudes toward the rights of lower-class whites. For example, Frederickson saw Edgar Gardner Murphy as a racial moderate because he opposed the escape clauses for whites in the Southern constitutions; whereas I see Murphy as a reactionary on the general question of suffrage rights, because he favored disfranchisement of a large number of whites, along with virtually all the blacks.

Repelled by the uninformed Yankee view of white Southerners as either firebrand Klansmen or julep-sipping aristocrats, a group of Southern historians set out to prove that the South was just as liberal, just as “American” as the North. Applying this theme to the Progressive Era, they discovered a spirit of social, economic, and especially political reform which indicated, in the words of Arthur S. Link, the great power of the Southern “masses.” Representative works of this school are Link, “The Progressive Movement in the South, 1870–1914,” *North Carolina Historical Review* 23 (1946): 173–195; Dewey W. Grantham, Jr., *The Democratic South*, and “An American Politics for the South,” in Charles Grier Sellers, Jr., ed., *The Southerner As American*, pp. 148–179; and Hugh C. Bailey, *Liberalism in the New South: Southern Social Reformers and the Progressive Movement*. It is now apparent that Link and Grantham seriously exaggerated the liberality—even for most white people—of the reforms they noted. Moreover, more recent events such as the Northern response to racial integration and studies such as I. A. Newby’s *Jim Crow’s Defense, Anti-Negro Thought in America, 1900–1930* have turned the question of Southern uniqueness upside down. To oversimplify a bit, it is beginning to seem that America has been Southern—basically racist, violent, and reactionary—rather than vice versa.

Of the works dealing with disfranchisement in the South as a whole, Paul Lewinson’s *Race, Class and Party* has less than 40 pages devoted to the period from 1876 to 1908. In those pages, he telescoped events up to thirty
years apart, thereby confusing the timing of the laws, the various means of restriction, and the motives of the disfranchisers and their opponents. Misled by the biased and propagandistic monographs which dominated the secondary literature in 1932, Lewinson, while certainly no bigot himself, perpetuated several of the New South’s myths about itself—for example, the illusion of white unity on suffrage restriction and the false conception that poor white leaders were the chief proponents of restriction.

William Alexander Mabry’s “The Disfranchisement of the Negro in the South” (Ph.D. thesis, Duke Univ., 1933) is a much more solid piece of work based on extensive research in newspapers and other primary documents. Although Mabry’s analysis of the events he covered was often prescient and comprehensive, he did not pay sufficient attention to the preconvention restrictions, to the issue of white disfranchisement, or to partisanship as a motivating force. And he did not generalize enough about the means of limitation, the motives of the disfranchisers, and the consequences of restriction. He also excluded from his analysis those states which did not enact broad, constitutional suffrage provisions. Some of his chapters have been published as “Disfranchisement of the Negro in Mississippi,” *Journal of Southern History* 4 (1938): 318–333; “Ben Tillman Disfranchised the Negro,” *South Atlantic Quarterly* 27 (1938): 170–183; and “Negro Suffrage and Fusion Rule in North Carolina,” *North Carolina Historical Quarterly* 12 (1935): 79–102.


The growth of segregation in thought and practice is the subject of Franklin Johnson, *The Development of State Legislation Concerning the Free Negro*, which has little material on disfranchisement; Claude H. Nolen, *The Negro’s Image in the South*; I. A. Newby, *The Development of Segregationist Thought*, a compendium of primary source readings; and two articles by Guion Griffis

The bibliographies in Nolen, Negro’s Image, and Newby, Jim Crow’s Defense list contemporary articles and books which constituted the white South’s propaganda on race and suffrage.


To put the issue of Populist race relations in proper perspective, one must consult general works on Populism and party politics such as John D. Hicks’ The Populist Revolt, and Theodore Saloutos’ Farmer Movements in the South, 1865–1933 which stressed economic conditions as an explanation for farmer agitation; and Robert F. Durden’s The Climax of Populism, and Stanley L. Jones’ The Presidential Election of 1896, which treated the difficulty of the decision to fuse or not to fuse with the Bryan Democrats. Daniel M. Robison defended the rural progressives from many attacks in his stimulating “From Tillman to Long: Some Striking Leaders of the Rural South,” Journal of Southern History 3 (1937): 289–310.

Political Science

The general literature on political participation, party systems, and electoral laws is too vast to consider here, although much of it is relevant to the present work. For recent summaries and bibliographies, see Lester W.


American historians have devoted some attention to the effects of electoral laws on politics in other periods and other areas. These works show that suffrage restriction was not limited to the South, and that electoral laws were often, probably almost always, framed for the purposes of partisan advantage. On the early nineteenth century, see Chilton Williamson, American Suffrage from Property to Democracy, 1760–1860; Roger W. Shugg, “Negro Voting in the Ante-Bellum South,” Journal of Negro History 21(1936): 357–364; John L. Stanley, “Majority Tyranny in Tocqueville’s America: The Failure of Negro Suffrage in 1846,” Political Science Quarterly 84 (1969): 412–435; and V. Jacque Voegeli, Free But Not Equal. Literacy and property tests outside the South are listed, but not studied in depth, in George H.

Interesting also as comparisons with turn-of-the-century conditions are two works on attitudes toward Negro voting in the present-day South and the consequences of Negro re-enfranchisement. See Charles Francis Cnudde, “Consensus, Rules of the Game, and Democratic Politics: The Case of Race Politics in the South” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1967); and William R. Keech, The Impact of Negro Voting.


Northern Attitudes

Northern Republican, Democratic, and Mugwump attitudes and actions
provided boundary lines within which the Southern Democrats had to work. The ex-rebels could not openly disfranchise blacks and other oppositionists until they felt sure the national GOP would not intervene in the South. Conversely, the growth of pro-Southern, racist, and elitist feelings in the North encouraged and justified antidemocratic actions in Dixie. The best single source for studying Northern Republican and Democratic attitudes on these topics in this period is the debate on the Lodge Fair Elections Bill in the Congressional Record, 51st Congress, and the debate on the Crumpacker and Olmstead Apportionment Bills in the 56th Congress. The most important published secondary works are Vincent P. DeSantis, Republicans Face the Southern Question; Stanley P. Hirshson, Farewell to the Bloody Shirt; and Rayford W. Logan, The Betrayal of the Negro, from Rutherford B. Hayes to Woodrow Wilson. Their excessive hostility to the Republicans made it difficult for these three writers to explain the change in the GOP attitude toward the South after 1892. For a guide to further books, articles, and unpublished theses on the subject as of 1962, see the bibliography in Hirshson’s Farewell to the Bloody Shirt.

Of works since 1962, Daniel W. Crofts’ “The Blair Bill and the Elections Bill: The Congressional Aftermath to Reconstruction” (Ph.D., diss., Yale Univ., 1968), and Richard E. Welch, Jr.’s “The Federal Elections Bill of 1890: Postscripts and Prelude,” Journal of American History 52 (1965): 511–526, are good analyses, less hostile to the Republicans than DeSantis’s and Hirshson’s. In his insightful and scrupulously objective biography of one of the most important humanitarian Republicans, George Frisbie Hoar and the Half-Breed Republicans, Welch attempted unsuccessfully to carry the 1880 division of Republicans into “Stalwart” and “Half-Breed” factions through the next two decades. That fascinating scoundrel John J. Ingalls, an anti-reform, but “bloody shirt” Republican, fails to emerge very clearly in Burton J. Williams’s Senator John James Ingalls, Kansas’ Iridescent Republican (Lawrence, Kans.: Univ. Press of Kansas, 1972). Neither Harry J. Sievers’s Benjamin Harrison, Hoosier President (Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1968) nor Kenneth E. Davison’s The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1972), has much new information on their heroes’ Southern policies.

A Northern group whose attitudes are often mistakenly represented as Republican received deserved treatment in John G. Sproat’s “The Best Men.” William B. Hixson, Jr., failed to explain sufficiently the reasons for the changes in one of the most complex liberals, Moorfield Storey, probably because of inadequacies in Storey’s papers. A protégé of Charles Sumner, Storey turned into a fellow traveller of racists and then back into an anti-

For the period after 1897, David W. Southern’s *The Malignant Heritage* is thin, but Horace S. and Marion G. Merrill’s *The Republican Command, 1897–1913* is a balanced and thorough account. For further works on the era after 1900, see the Merrills’ bibliography.

**Blacks and Politics**


Critical Bibliography


**STATE POLITICS AND SUFFRAGE RESTRICTION**

The analyst of Southern suffrage restriction must delve deeply into articles and monographs on each state’s politics. The best way to group these works so as to provide an easy guide for future students is simply state by state. Such a division is not meant to imply that each commonwealth should be viewed altogether as a separate entity. On the contrary, comparisons of the politics and processes of restriction in several states ought to lead one to notice facts which might seem unimportant in a single state, and to formulate new general explanations of political events.

**Alabama**

Students looking into post-Reconstruction Southern political history often start with Alabama for more than alphabetic reasons. Well-kept document collections, several newspapers which covered politics thoroughly and from a variety of viewpoints, and starkly-drawn lines of cleavage among the whites between the black belt and the urban industrialists on the one hand, and hill country farmers on the other, have attracted numerous historians. Yet the very simplicity of its apparent structure and availability of primary source material have led students to base too many generalizations for the region as a whole primarily on the Alabama experience. The demography of other states was more complex, their political lineups less clear-cut. Alabama is closer to being an “ideal-type” of Southern politics during this period than it is to representing the average state.

A person new to Alabama history should probably start with Albert B. Moore, *History of Alabama and Her People*, a careful and detailed narrative, fairly objective for the time it was written. Next, the student should turn to two newer works, Malcom Cook McMillan, *Constitutional Development in Alabama, 1798–1901*, and F. Sheldon Hackney, *Populism to Progressivism in Alabama*. McMillan’s monograph covers much broader ground than its title suggests. Thorough and prescient, McMillan’s work has had considerable influence on my own. Hackney’s well-written and original book deserves the attention it has gotten from the profession. Nonetheless, I disagree with his unfavorable treatment of the Populists, whom he deplored because they lost, and his charity toward the self-interested moderates called Progressives, whom he complimented because they won, even as he recognized that their victories further submerged rather than uplifted the masses of Alabamians. Moreover, Hackney rested his overall thesis on a peculiar
analysis of roll calls in the 1901 constitutional convention. The analysis is unusual, in that it does not adopt one of the standard procedures for determining clusters of issues or delegates, and faulty, in that it weighs all issues equally, when we know the delegates put much more emphasis on some subjects than others. As a consequence, Hackney got such anomalous results as placing former Governors Thomas G. Jones and William C. Oates in his "Progressive" bloc. If these black belt Gold Democrats were Progressives, then Alabama surrendered to Progressivism in 1890, rather than 1906, and the contemporaries and historians who almost unanimously considered Jones and Oates reactionaries must have been blind.

Other works on this period include William Warren Rogers' The One-Gallused Rebellion, which is thoroughly researched and full of information, but lacks on overarching synthesis of Alabama politics. David A. Harris’s "Racists and Reformers: A Study of Progressivism in Alabama, 1896–1911" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of North Carolina, 1967), mostly overlapped the superior monographs already cited. Horace Mann Bond's Negro Education in Alabama is brilliant and broader than its title, but sometimes careless about facts and contradictory. Allen Johnston Going’s Bourbon Democracy in Alabama, 1874–1890 is workmanlike, if now somewhat outmoded in its central theme. John B. Clark's Populism in Alabama has been rendered obsolescent by more recent works. Joseph Matt Brittain’s “Negro Suffrage in Alabama since 1870” (Ph.D. thesis, Indiana Univ., 1958) is sketchy and rather unreliable.

franchised?” The Outlook 79 (1905): 1047–1049, dealt with early attempts in Alabama to challenge the 1901 constitution in the courts. Smith, a Northern Negro lawyer, was employed by Booker T. Washington. Charles W. Smith, Jr., in The Electorate in an Alabama Community, demonstrated the effect of the poll tax and racial discrimination in the registration process in Tuscaloosa during the 1930s. Hallie Farmer’s Legislative Apportionment showed how the 1901 constitution enhorned the black belt and left politics entirely in the hands of the governor and local elites.

Arkansas

Arkansas history during this period is a largely untillied but potentially fertile field. Home of the strongest independent farmers’ political movement during the 1880s, this state also contained some of the most militant and articulate Negro political leaders in the South, who were able as late as 1912 to provide significant opposition to a proposed literacy test. The secondary literature on political events, however, is disappointingly thin.


Jr., "Arkansas Politics: A Study of a One-Party System" (Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Chicago, 1957) concentrated on the period after 1930 and offered few insights into the structure or reasons for development or continuation of the one-party system.

**Florida**

Although the Sunshine State has suffered less from neglect than Arkansas, we still badly need modern studies of the Populists and Progressives, adequate biographical articles on several key figures, and a study of the Negro leadership, particularly in Jacksonville. J. E. Dovell's *Florida: Historic, Dramatic, Contemporary*, 4 vols., sketched the political narrative as did Kathryn Trimmer Abbey, *Florida: Land of Change*. Both were pro-Democratic and did not depart from the traditional interpretations of contemporary newspapers. Charlton W. Tebeau's *A History of Florida* is an adequate narrative, more sympathetic than Dovell or Abbey toward Negroes, but weak on analysis.


Georgia

Few corners of Georgia’s political history in this period remain unexplored. Elisabeth Studley Nathans’ Losing the Peace revised the picture of Georgia Reconstruction and her well-researched book largely superseded such earlier works as Alan Conway’s The Reconstruction of Georgia and John Allen Meader, Jr.’s, “The Decline of the Two-Party System in Georgia” (M.A. thesis, Emory Univ., 1959), which dealt with the same period. Nevertheless, Nathans’ moderate political viewpoint made her too anxious to condemn the Negro and white radicals for not compromising with the rich ex-Whig planters, and too willing to overlook violence, intimidation, and the imposition of the poll tax as key factors in stunting the growth of the Republicans.


The Georgia Populists fared well at the hands of Alex Matthews Arnett, in The Populist Movement in Georgia, one of the best studies of Southern Populism. Where Arnett saw Populism as merely the farmer’s natural response to poor economic conditions, C. Vann Woodward discovered a complex pattern of economics, politics, and psychology in his Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel. Woodward’s interpretation of Watson, and his and the Populist Movement’s relationships with blacks has recently been stridently attacked in Charles Crowe’s “Tom Watson, Populists and Blacks Reconsidered,” Journal of Negro History 55 (1970): 99–116, which I read only after
forming most of my own views on the subject. Although too concerned with toppling idols—he came close to making the absurd charge that Woodward was a racist in 1938—Crowe did make a case for viewing Watson’s whole career from the vantage point of his post-Populist rather than his Populist activities. For a much shriller attack, based less on hard evidence than on crude psychologizing, see Lawrence J. Friedman, *The White Savage, Racial Fantasies in the Postbellum South*, pp. 77–98.

Post-1900 reform politics and the 1908 suffrage amendment are covered in Woodward’s *Watson* and in Dewey W. Grantham, Jr.’s *Hoke Smith and the Politics of the New South*; “Georgia Politics and the Disfranchisement of the Negro,” *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 32 (1948): 1–21; and “Some Letters from Thomas W. Hardwick to Tom Watson Concerning the Georgia Gubernatorial Campaign of 1906,” in ibid. 34 (1950): 328–340. Seeing the period essentially through Hoke Smith’s eyes, Grantham found somewhat more to admire about Smith and his ilk and more to distinguish the “Progressives” from the “conservatives” than I do. Alton D. Jones accepted what the middle-class reformers said about themselves in his “Progressivism in Georgia, 1898–1918” (Ph.D. thesis, Emory Univ., 1963).


**Louisiana**

Historians of Louisiana politics tend to focus on the revolts against the establishment—Populism, the New Orleans reformers, and Huey Long—instead of on the conservative establishment itself. But looking for faultlines draws attention away from more stable features of the geology. Thus, the best study of Louisiana politics in this period, William Ivy Hair’s thorough and biting *Bourbonism and Agrarian Protest* saw the “Bourbons” only in the
reflected glare of the farmer radicals. Hair’s book superseded such earlier works as Melvin J. White’s “Populism in Louisiana During the Nineties,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 5 (1918): 3–19; and Lucia E. Daniel’s “The Louisiana People’s Party,” in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* 26 (1943): 1055–1149. Hair’s account of the important 1892 and 1896 elections may be supplemented by two good articles—Henry C. Dethloff’s “The Alliance and the Lottery: Farmers Try for the Sweepstakes,” *Louisiana History* 6 (1965): 141–159; and Philip D. Uzee’s “The Republican Party in the Louisiana Election of 1896,” in ibid. 2 (1961): 332–344. Dethloff’s interpretation of Louisiana politics offered in his “Populism and Reform in Louisiana” (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Missouri, 1964), is almost entirely vitiated by his decision to consider all who claimed to be “reformers” as a unit. They had in common only an enemy, which was enough to unify them for a few short months, after which the widely divergent interests of sugar planters, urban businessmen and professionals, and upcountry Populists reemerged and shattered their temporary coalition. The Lottery Company, the chief issue in 1892, is covered in more detail in Berthold C. Alwes’ “The History of the Louisiana State Lottery Company,” in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* 27 (1944): 946–1118. The horrifying story of the convict leasing system and the feeble attempts to end or reform it are detailed in Mark T. Carleton’s excellent *Politics and Punishment: The History of the Louisiana Penal System* (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1971.)


Politics in the South’s only real metropolis in this period is the subject of two complementary works, Joy J. Jackson’s *New Orleans in the Gilded Age*, and George M. Reynolds’ *Machine Politics in New Orleans, 1897–1926*.
Critical Bibliography

Unfortunately, neither provides a very satisfactory explanation of the reasons why the reformers, victorious in 1896, lost out so quickly thereafter, or why the extremely competitive politics of the eighties and nineties gave way to an uninterrupted string of machine successes from 1898 on. Paul A. Kunkel, “Modifications in Louisiana Negro Legal Status under Louisiana Constitutions, 1812–1957,” *Journal of Negro History* 54 (1959): 1–25, gives some information on the 1921 effort to insure that Louisiana Negroes remained voteless.

Mississippi

When they think of the South, too many Americans automatically think of Mississippi. It is hardly a typical state. More rural, less wealthy, and less industrialized than any other Southern state, it ranked second only to South Carolina in the proportion of Negroes in the late nineteenth century. Since 1874 it has had a stronger tradition of violence, especially racial violence, and a weaker political structure than any other Southern state. In the twentieth century, William Faulkner’s novels and the media attention that violence brings have kept Mississippi in the spotlight. Students of disfranchisement and of post-Reconstruction Southern politics have over-emphasized Mississippi because of the plethora of excellent secondary works on the subject. The two best works. Vernon Lane Wharton’s *The Negro in Mississippi, 1865–1890*, and Albert D. Kirwin’s *Revolt of the Rednecks*, need no further praise from me. James Sharbrough Ferguson’s “Agrarianism in Mississippi, 1871–1900: A Study in Nonconformity” (Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of North Carolina, 1952) supplements Kirwin on some subjects.

On the Independent movement and its effect on the Democratic and Republican parties, see Willie D. Halsell’s three articles, “Democratic Dissensions in Mississippi, 1878–1882,” *Journal of Mississippi History* 2 (1940): 123–136; “Republican Factionalism in Mississippi, 1882–1884,” *Journal of Southern History* 7 (1941): 84–101; and “James R. Chalmers and ‘Mahoneism’ in Mississippi,” ibid. 10 (1944): 37–58. Disregarding Halsell’s warning that her articles were based primarily on the letters of white Republicans and did not attempt to present the views of Negro Republicans or conservative Democrats, many historians have made too much of her charges of collusion between the blacks and the “Bourbons,” using it to support a general hypothesis that upper-class Southern politicians endorsed black suffrage because they found it easy to form alliances with Negroes. But white Republicans hunting federal patronage could be expected to accuse the dominant black faction of party disloyalty. Proof of a black—“Bourbon” entente awaits the discovery of public or private understandings of the part of Negroes and conservative Democrats and closer examinations of local election returns.
Interesting information on the 1890 constitutional convention and the effect of various provisions of the suffrage article appears in three contemporary articles and a pamphlet: Frank Johnston’s “Suffrage and Reconstruction in Mississippi,” in *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society* 6 (1902): 141–244, and “The Public Services of Senator James Z. George,” in ibid. 8 (1904): 201–226; J. S. McNeilly’s “History of the Measures Submitted to the Committee on Elective Franchise, Apportionment, and Elections in the Constitutional Convention of 1890,” in ibid. 6 (1902): 129–140; and the *Proceedings of a Reunion of the Surviving Members of the Constitutional Convention of 1890, Held November 1, 1927* (Jackson, Mississippi: Premier Printing Co., 1928), a pamphlet in the Sterling Library at Yale. There is not much material on the years after 1877 in the biography of the chief Republican who attended the 1890 convention, Lillian A. Pereyra’s *James Lusk Alcorn, Persistent Whig*.


*North Carolina*

North Carolina’s historians have assiduously uncovered the facts of that state’s political history, but have been less successful in arranging them into patterns which advance our understanding of Southern history or institutions. Thus, Joseph Flake Steelman’s massive “The Progressive Era in North Carolina, 1884–1917” (Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of North Carolina, 1955) seems authoritative on practically every major incident. Steelman, however, neglected broad analysis in favor of description, and failed to suggest overarching themes or even to justify treating the years he covered as an “era.” And although the most complete published analysis of politics in the eighteen-nineties, Helen G. Edmonds’ *The Negro and Fusion Politics in North Carolina, 1894–1901*, abounds in interesting data, too much of it undigested.

Neither William A. Mabry’s *The Negro in North Carolina Politics Since Reconstruction*, nor Frenise A. Logan’s more liberal and detailed *The Negro in North Carolina, 1876–1894* is really about black people. Both, instead,
largely describe white attitudes and actions towards the blacks. James A. Padgett’s “From Slavery to Prominence in North Carolina,” *Journal of Negro History* 22 (1937): 433–487, has some information about black state legislators.

The events of the nineties, from the point of view of the extremely racist and heatedly partisan Democratic editor of the *Raleigh News and Observer*, appear in Josephus Daniels’ autobiographical volumes, *Tar Heel Editor* and *Editor in Politics*; and in the worshipful biography by Joseph L. Morrison, *Josephus Daniels Says . . . .* Daniels’ inside account is often revealing, if not entirely trustworthy. Simeon Alexander Delap’s “The Populist Party in North Carolina,” in Trinity College Historical Society *Historical Papers*, series xiv, pp. 40–74, has been outmoded by more recent scholarship, but J. G. deRoulhac Hamilton’s *North Carolina since 1860* is still worth consulting despite Hamilton’s pro-Democratic and mildly racist biases.


If I were to recommend a single document to someone who wanted insights into Southern “Progressivism,” it would be Governor Charles Brantley Aycock’s inaugural address, contained in North Carolina Legislature, *Public Documents, 1901 Session* (Raleigh, North Carolina: n.p., n.d.), vol. I, Document la. Flaunting a rhetorical and empty paternalism toward black people, Aycock also openly avowed his firm disbelief in manhood suffrage and embraced violent revolution as a means of denying power to those he felt were enemies of his race, class, and party. Oliver H. Orr, Jr., idolized Aycock and berated the governor’s critics in *Charles Brantley Aycock*, perhaps partly because Orr seems to have shared Aycock’s racism (see p. 148 of Orr’s book). For the period after disfranchisement, see David Charles Roller’s “The Republican Party of North Carolina: 1900–1916” (Ph.D. thesis, Duke Univ. 1965). Although Roller set out to prove that the North Carolina GOP was more than a pack of patronage-hungry politicos in this period, he spent most of his time chronicling patronage squabbles.
White South Carolinians’ well-known consciousness of history may explain why the quality of historians’ writings about the Palmetto State in this period has been so high. David Duncan Wallace’s *The History of South Carolina* ranks with Moore’s volume on Alabama as the best of the Southern state histories. Despite his obvious biases, Wallace asked a great many important questions and knew his subject thoroughly enough that most of his answers have survived more recent scholarship. Ernest McPherson Lander, Jr.’s short *History of South Carolina, 1865–1960* summarized later research.

Hampton M. Jarrell’s *Wade Hampton and the Negro* represented Hampton as one who favored the intimidation rather than the outright slaughter of Negroes in the 1870s and 1880s, and lauded him for this racial liberalism. Hampton’s later antagonist, Ben Tillman, found a marvelous biographer, but no unthinking apologist, in Francis Butler Simkins, whose *Pitchfork Ben Tillman, South Carolinian* destroyed many myths about his subject. On the other hand, John D. Stark’s *Damned Upcountryman*, is an uncritical view of a reactionary opponent of Tillman.

Several good studies focus more broadly on the post-Reconstruction period. George Brown Tindall’s *South Carolina Negroes, 1877–1900* is comparable in content and quality with Wharton’s *Negro in Mississippi*, though I believe that the Conservatives’ racial policies were less well-intentioned than Tindall did. James Welch Patton has an excellent essay on “The Republican Party in South Carolina, 1876–1895,” in Green, ed., *Essays in Southern History*, pp. 91–111. On that party after disfranchisement, see Willard B. Gatewood, “Theodore Roosevelt and Southern Republicans: The Case of South Carolina, 1901–1904,” *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 70 (1969): 251–266, which also appears in Gatewood’s *Theodore Roosevelt and the Art of Controversy*. Francis B. Simkins reviewed the state’s laws on race in “Race Legislation in South Carolina since 1865,” *South Atlantic Quarterly* 20 (1921): 165–177. In *The Conservative Regime* William J. Cooper, Jr., tried to picture the post-1865 “Bourbons” not as savvy operators willing to accommodate and eager to emulate their Yankee conquerors, but as romantics who not only fashioned the myth of an edenic antebellum South and a noble and united struggle against aggressive invaders during the Civil War and Reconstruction, but wholeheartedly believed their own fictions. Cooper’s data does not support his generalizations.

Among the works absolutely crucial to an understanding of the theory and mechanics of suffrage restriction in the South are three speeches published in pamphlet form by the Southern Mugwump and chief author of the 1881 registration and eight-box law, Edward McCrady, Jr.: “The Registration of

On the campaign which led up to the 1895 constitutional convention, see George B. Tindall, “The Campaign for the Disfranchisement of Negroes in South Carolina,” Journal of Southern History 15 (1949): 212–234. On the convention itself and the document it drafted, consult Tindall’s South Carolina Negroes, Simkins’ Tillman, and David Duncan Wallace’s propagandistic, but still informative The South Carolina Constitution of 1895. Okon Edet Uya, From Slavery to Public Service contains all the available, but unfortunately scanty information on a leading South Carolina Negro politician.

Tennessee

There is as yet no adequate guide to the exceedingly complex politics of Tennessee during this period. Philip M. Harner’s Tennessee, A History, 1673–1932, is very sketchy on political affairs since 1870. Stanley Folmsbee, Robert E. Corlew, and Enoch L. Mitchell, History of Tennessee eschewed analysis and misrepresented the purpose of the secret ballot and poll tax acts. The pattern which Daniel Merritt Robison attempted to impose on the shifting coalitions within the Democratic party in his Bob Taylor and Agrarian Revolt in Tennessee falls apart on close examination. Robison barely mentioned suffrage restriction and had little to say about the potent Republican minority.


On the 1870 constitutional convention which authorized the poll tax, and

**Texas**

Much of Texas was a frontier area in the late nineteenth century, and much of late nineteenth century Texas history is still a frontier. We finally have an adequate narrative of post-Reconstruction politics in Chester Alwyn Barr, Jr., *Reconstruction to Reform*. Frank W. Johnson, *A History of Texas and Texans*, ed. by Eugene C. Barker, with chapters on the period after statehood written by Ernest William Winkler, also provides some information. Winkler, the state librarian at the time, also edited *Platforms of Political Parties in Texas*, a book useful in identifying the multiferous parties and recording issue shifts and party splits. Seth Shepard McKay made the 1875 constitutional convention one of the best documented events in Texas history after the Republic with his earlier cited *Debates*, and his two studies *Making the Texas Constitution of 1876* and *Seven Decades of the Texas Constitution of 1876*.

On the period after 1876, Roscoe C. Martin’s *The People’s Party in Texas* was in many ways an exemplary state study of Populism. The other principal study of Texas politics before 1920 is James Aubrey Tinsley’s well-researched “The Progressive Movement in Texas” (Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Wisconsin, 1953). Although he illuminated many topics, Tinsley tended to take Progressive rhetoric too much at face value. For instance, he seems to have put some credence in the disfranchisers’ claims that they acted only in the interest of “purity and honesty in elections.” Lawrence C. Goodwyn showed how much an imaginative historian can do with oral history in “Populist Dreams and Negro Rights: East Texas as a Case Study,” *American Historical Review* 76 (1971): 1435–1456. Paul Casdorph’s *A History of the Republican Party in Texas, 1865–1965*, is uninformative on this period. Ben H. Proctor failed to puncture the surface of a complex and interesting figure in *Not Without Honor*. Robert C. Cotner’s adulatory *James Stephen Hogg, A Biography* has disappointingly little material on the poll tax or other election laws. Neither
does George Portal Huckaby’s apologetic “Oscar Branch Colquitt: A Political Biography” (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Texas, 1946), a study of a conservative Texas governor.


Virginia

The student of post-Reconstruction Virginia politics can choose among pro- and anti-Democratic accounts, pro- and anti-Progressive interpretations, racist and anti-racist versions of history. Biographies of even minor figures abound. Monographs on politics do not slight economic or social factors. In the Old Dominion, the analyst of Southern politics enjoys the rare luxury of having to decide which of several well-argued views of the period is correct.

Allen W. Moger’s Virginia, Bourbonism to Byrd, 1870–1925 provides a good overview of the whole period and an especially revealing look at covert corporate machinations. On the 1870s and 1880s, both Charles Chilton Pearson’s The Readjuster Movement in Virginia and Nelson M. Blake’s William Mahone of Virginia, Soldier and Political Insurgent are thorough studies. Pearson’s slight hostility to Mahoneism was more than balanced by Blake’s admiration for his subject. Jack P. Maddex, Jr., painted the pre-1879 Conservatives as young, Whiggish, and pro-business in his well-written The Virginia Conservatives, 1867–1879: A Study in Reconstruction Politics, one of several recent works demonstrating the inappropriateness of the title “Bourbon” for the post-Reconstruction Democrats. Robert R. Jones attempted a


Virginia scholars seem readier than historians of other Southern states to question the traditional view of the Progressives as simply altruistic liberal reformers. Even the most pro-Progressive studies, such as William E. Larsen’s *Montague of Virginia*, turned up little to differentiate the "independent" reformers from the "machine" conservatives. In *Old Virginia Restored*, Raymond H. Pulley saw the Progressives as men who sought to impose controls on what they perceived as the social and political chaos of Reconstruction, Readjusterism, and Populism, and thereby to return the state to an idealized, aristocratic past. Pulley’s analysis rested on a series of recent biographies of Virginia political figures, of which three were important to a study of suffrage restriction. Richard Burke Doss, "John Warwick Daniel, A Study in the Virginia Democracy" (Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Virginia, 1955) deals with a politician outstanding even in his profession for his vacuous magniloquence. Harry Edward Poindexter gave ample proof in "From Copy Desk to Congress: The Pre-Congressional Career of Carter Glass" (Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Virginia, 1966) that his subject was an unblemished reactionary. On the other hand, in "Henry De La Warr Flood: A Case Study of Organization
Politics in an Era of Reform” (Ph.D. thesis, Rice Univ. 1966) Burton Ira Kaufman depicted a conservative machine politician as a man who often at least sounded like a liberal reformer.


The consequences of the narrowing of the suffrage and the perfecting of the Democratic organization were detailed in Herman L. Horn’s “The Growth and Development of the Democratic Party in Virginia since 1890” (Ph.D. thesis, Duke Univ., 1949), a fine thesis which also stressed the partisan motives for disfranchisement. In “The Political Career of C. Bascom Slemp” (Ph.D. thesis, Duke Univ., 1950), Guy B. Hathorn treated the chief Southern Republican after 1900, a dull racist millionaire who had as little in common with the party of Radical Reconstruction as more recent Southern Republicans do.