

*The
Florida
Historical
Quarterly*

July 1984

**PUBLISHED BY THE FLORIDA
HISTORICAL SOCIETY**

COVER

Stretching ten miles along the shore of Escambia Bay, Pensacola's Scenic Highway was completed in 1929. In its earlier years, the route offered many opportunities to stop along its high bluffs and admire the view of the Bay. It was a favorite site for picnics and romantic drives. This scene is reproduced from a postcard circa 1930s.

*The
Florida
Historical
Quarterly*



THE FLORIDA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Volume LXIII, Number 1

July 1984

COPYRIGHT 1984

by the Florida Historical Society, Tampa, Florida. Second class postage paid
at Tampa and DeLeon Springs, Florida. Printed by E. O. Painter
Printing Co., DeLeon Springs, Florida.

(ISSN 0015-4113)

THE FLORIDA HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Samuel Proctor, *Editor*

Jeffry Charbonnet, *Editorial Assistant*

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Herbert J. Doherty, Jr.	University of Florida
Michael V. Gannon	University of Florida
John K. Mahon	University of Florida (Emeritus)
Jerrell H. Shofner	University of Central Florida
Charlton W. Tebeau	University of Miami (Emeritus)
J. Leitch Wright, Jr.	Florida State University

Correspondence concerning contributions, books for review, and all editorial matters should be addressed to the Editor, *Florida Historical Quarterly*, Box 14045, University Station, Gainesville, Florida 32604-2045.

The *Quarterly* is interested in articles and documents pertaining to the history of Florida. Sources, style, footnote form, originality of material and interpretation, clarity of thought, and interest of readers are considered. All copy, including footnotes, should be double-spaced. Footnotes are to be numbered consecutively in the text and assembled at the end of the article. Particular attention should be given to following the footnote style of the *Quarterly*. The author should submit an original and retain a carbon for security. The Florida Historical Society and the Editor of the *Florida Historical Quarterly* accept no responsibility for statements made or opinions held by authors. The *Quarterly* reviews books dealing with all aspects of Florida history. Books to be reviewed should be sent to the Editor together with price and information on how they can be ordered.

Table of Contents

“LAYING THE SINS OF THE L & N AT MR. BLOUNT ’S FEET”: WILLIAM ALEXANDER BLOUNT ’S U. S. SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN, 1910-1911	<i>George F. Pearce</i>	1
MIAMI’S METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT : RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT	<i>Raymond A. Mohl</i>	24
GENERAL JOSEPH B. WALL AND LYNCH LAW IN TAMPA	<i>Robert P. Ingalls</i>	51
FLORIDA’S CATTLE-RANCHING FRONTIER: HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY (1860)	<i>John Solomon Otto</i>	71
NOTES AND DOCUMENTS :		
FLORIDA HISTORY IN PERIODICALS, 1983		84
BOOK REVIEWS		90
BOOK NOTES		123
HISTORY NEWS		130

BOOK REVIEWS

THE OLDEST CITY, edited by Jean Parker Waterbury
reviewed by Eugene Lyon

SPANISH ST. AUGUSTINE: THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF A COLONIAL CREOLE COMMUNITY,
By Kathleen Deagan
reviewed by John S. Otto

FORT LAUDERDALE AND BROWARD COUNTY, by Stuart B. McIver
reviewed by Thelma Peters

EDGE OF WILDERNESS: A SETTLEMENT HISTORY OF MANATEE RIVER AND SARASOTA
BAY, by Janet Snyder Matthews
reviewed by Steven F. Lawson

THE PLOT TO STEAL FLORIDA: JAMES MADISON'S PHONY WAR, by Joseph Burk-
holder Smith
reviewed by J. Leitch Wright, Jr.

DOGS OF THE CONQUEST, by John Grier Varner and Jeanette Johnson Varner
reviewed by Amy Turner Bushnell

THE IMPERIAL OSAGES: SPANISH-INDIAN DIPLOMACY IN THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY,
by Gilbert C. Din and Abraham P. Nasatir
reviewed by Helen Hornbeck Tanner

CHEROKEE EDITOR, edited by Theda Perdue
reviewed by John K. Mahon

RENATO BELUCHE, SMUGGLER, PRIVATEER, AND PATRIOT, 1780-1860, by Jane Lucas
De Grummond
reviewed by J. Leitch Wright, Jr.

CORRESPONDENCE OF JAMES K. POLK, VOLUME 6, edited by Wayne Cutler and
Carese M. Parker
reviewed by John Hebron Moore

A CAROLINIAN GOES TO WAR: THE CIVIL WAR NARRATIVE OF ARTHUR MIDDLETON
MANIGAULT, BRIGADIER GENERAL, C. S. A., edited by R. Lockwood Tower
reviewed by Stephen Davis

THE PAPERS OF ANDREW JOHNSON, VOLUME 6, 1862-1864, edited by Leroy P.
Graf and Ralph W. Haskins
reviewed by Richard N. Current

NOTHING BUT FREEDOM: EMANCIPATION AND ITS LEGACY, by Eric Foner
reviewed by Michael Les Benedict

NORTHERNIZING THE SOUTH, by Richard N. Current
reviewed by Lawrence N. Powell

THIS LAND, THIS SOUTH, by Albert E. Cowdry
reviewed by James C. Banner

NOW THAT THE BUFFALO'S GONE: A STUDY OF TODAY'S AMERICAN INDIANS, by
Alvin M. Josephy, Jr.
reviewed by Walter L. Williams

A SOUTHERN REBEL, THE LIFE AND TIMES OF AUBREY WILLIS WILLIAMS, 1890-
1965, by John A. Salmond
reviewed by J. Wayne Flynt

**“LAYING THE SINS OF THE L&N AT
MR. BLOUNT’S FEET”:
WILLIAM ALEXANDER BLOUNT’S
U. S. SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN, 1910-1911**

by GEORGE F. PEARCE

WILLIAM ALEXANDER BLOUNT achieved many milestones during his illustrious career as an attorney in Pensacola, Florida. He began practicing law soon after receiving his degree from the University of Georgia in 1873. His exceptional legal mind, strong dedication to his work, and impeccable character soon won him a statewide reputation in the legal profession and attracted a large clientele. Among his corporate retainers was the Louisville and Nashville Railroad (L&N). In 1909, after thirty-five years of practicing law, Blount opted for a chance at a political career and announced himself as a Democratic candidate for the United States Senate. In keeping with the political climate of the Progressive era, and seemingly his own political convictions, Blount ran on a progressive platform calling for reforms. Victory in his quest for the Senate narrowly eluded him, however, largely because his opponent convinced enough voters that during his long association with the L&N, despite his denials to the contrary, he had become a tool of corporate interests.

This common practice by politicians of conjuring up empty imagery to illustrate that one’s opponent would serve the business interests was often effective at a time when Americans had discovered that corporations, and especially railroad corporations, were corrupting politics and robbing the people through discriminatory and excessively high passenger and freight rates. Many inhabitants of largely rural Florida had enthusiastically welcomed the appearance of railroads that were expected to alleviate their transportation problems and quicken the pace of the state’s economic development. After the railroad companies gained an inordinate influence in state and local politics in the

George F. Pearce is associate professor of history, University of West Florida, Pensacola.

late nineteenth and early twentieth century, however, they were perceived as grasping, evil, corporate interests whose designs were inimical to those of the rank and file. Victory in a political race, then, frequently went to the candidate who could convince the voters that he had the best anti-corporation record.¹

Similar campaigns occurred elsewhere in the South, such as those that produced victories in gubernatorial elections in 1906 for Braxton Bragg Comer in Alabama and Hoke Smith in Georgia. None of the candidates in these elections, however, was a salaried official of a corporation. When attempting to tag their opponents with the pro-corporate label, they usually resorted to magnifying indirect connections such as charging that their opponents had received the endorsement of a pro-corporate newspaper or political machine, or that at one time a corporation had been among their legal clients. But Blount considered his connection with the L&N completely professional and offered no apologies for it. His most formidable problem, therefore, was to find a way to convince the electorate that a corporate official could also be a dedicated reformer.²

Historians have neglected Blount's campaigns in 1910 and 1911. This neglect is understandable for the 1910 election because he dropped out of contention long before the Democratic primary was held. But the 1911 primary, necessitated by the death of the victor in the election the year before, was a heated battle between two progressive candidates vying for the privilege of representing the interests of the people in the United States Senate. With the end of Reconstruction in Florida, the Republican party was no longer a threat to Democratic control. Con-

-
1. Richard L. McCormick, "The Discovery that Business Corrupts Politics: A Reappraisal of the Origins of Progressivism," *American Historical Review*, LXXXVI (April 1981), 247-74.
 2. Sheldon Hackney, *Populism To Progressivism in Alabama* (Princeton, 1969), 255-87; Dewey W. Grantham, Jr., *Hoke Smith and the Politics of the New South* (Baton Rouge, 1958), 131-55. Blount had been attorney for the L&N in Florida since 1884. However, as a delegate to the state constitutional convention in 1885, he supported constitutional provisions (sections 30 and 31, article XVI) which gave the legislature power to prevent railroads from charging excessive rates, and to prohibit them from issuing free passes to members of the legislature or salaried state officials. *Journal of The Proceedings Of The Constitutional Convention Of The State Of Florida Which Convened At The Capitol, At Tallahassee, On Tuesday, June 9, 1885* (Tallahassee, 1885), 621.

sequently, victory in the Democratic primary was tantamount to being elected.³

In July 1909, Blount, in an interview with the *Pensacola Evening News*, revealed that he was seriously considering running in the primary on May 10, 1910, for the Senate seat then held by James P. Taliaferro whose term ended on March 4, 1911. Blount recognized that he was not a politician—his only previous political experience was as a one-term state senator from 1903 to 1905. Nevertheless, he stated emphatically, “If I enter the contest it will be with full determination to wage a vigorous campaign.” The friendly editor believed Blount needed no introduction to most Floridians because they have often “reaped the benefits of his massive intellect whenever he has been called upon to perform a service for the state.”⁴ During the following two months, most Florida newspapers, when commenting on Blount’s announcement, believed he would have formidable opposition from two proven vote getters, Taliaferro and former governor Napoleon Bonaparte Broward of Jacksonville, neither of whom had yet announced their intentions about running. Few questioned Blount’s intellect and integrity, but occasionally some editors wondered aloud if his connection with the L&N would make him unacceptable to the masses in a progressive period when voters were demanding reform legislation and regulation of corporations, particularly railroads.

Returning from a vacation in Tate Springs, Tennessee, in the middle of September 1909, Blount reported that he had carefully thought through the matter of his candidacy and had concluded to enter the race. He acknowledged that some of his friends in various sections of the state had urged him to become a candidate, but that his decision was not based on their solicitation but rather on his “ambition to represent the people of my state in the United States Senate.”⁵

If Blount were a political novice it was not evident in the preparations for getting his campaign underway from the Pensa-

3. For an account of the 1910 primary, see Samuel Proctor, *Napoleon Bonaparte Broward: Florida's Fighting Democrat* (Gainesville, 1950), 296-304. Only one sentence is devoted to the 1911 primary in Charlton W. Tebeau, *A History of Florida* (Coral Gables, 1971), 334, and in William T. Cash, *History of the Democratic Party In Florida* (Tallahassee, 1936), 118.

4. *Pensacola Evening News*, July 17, 1909.

5. *Ibid.*, September 18, 1909.

cola law offices of Blount, Blount, and Carter. From September 28 through October 7, hundreds of letters were mailed to voters in 113 cities and towns in Florida soliciting their support and influence. Many of these went to lawyers and judges whom Blount knew professionally, to present and former state senators and representatives with whom he had served, to those who had worked with him in the Constitutional Convention in 1885 and on the revision committee of the statutes of the state of Florida (1889-1891), and to influential politicians recommended by others. Desiring to add the names of others to his mailing list, Blount wrote the secretary of state requesting "a copy of your last report showing the various county officers."⁶

His plan for a grassroots organization was revealed in a letter to W. W. Clarke in Milton. Blount hoped to get Clarke, or some person or persons selected by him, "to visit each precinct [in Santa Rosa County] and ascertain some one or two of the strongest men supporting me, willing to undertake the task of persuading others to do likewise." Blount indicated to Clarke that he planned to do this in each county in the state, and that "disbursements for reasonable expenses of persons organizing precincts will be paid by me."⁷

One discerns in some of Blount's correspondence that he may have succumbed to the belief, usually expressed by his friends and local editors, that his superior intellect and impeccable character made him especially well-qualified for a Senate seat. As he put it, "My friends are . . . taking the position that I ought to be elected because of my special fitness for the place, and the recognition of that fitness by the people in the state."⁸ Few would contest the fact that he had solid credentials for the office. Blount had long enjoyed wealth, social standing in the community, and high recognition within the legal profession, both statewide and nationally. During the three decades he practiced law, however, his contacts with the general public were narrowly circumscribed. His clientele was largely confined to corporate and business in-

6. Carbon copies of these letters are in the Blount Family Papers, Special Collections 67-1, John C. Pace Library, University of West Florida, Pensacola; William Alexander Blount to H. Clay Crawford, October 7, 1909, box 2, Blount Family Papers.

7. Blount to W. W. Clarke, October 6, 1909, *ibid.*

8. Blount to P. W. Meldrin, September 30, 1909, *ibid.*

terests, and his friendships were for the most part in the upper social strata.

Although Blount was a virtuous and compassionate person who did have the interests of the people at heart, his personality was viewed differently. He had an aristocratic demeanor; mixing with people beneath his station and soliciting their votes caused him embarrassment. He did not quite understand why he needed to go among the rank and file to solicit support when, in his own estimation and that of others, he was by far the most qualified candidate. This attitude is reflected in a letter to his close friend Peter O. Knight in Tampa. Early in October 1909, when Blount was planning a campaign trip to east and south Florida, Knight advised him to stay at a hotel where he would be more accessible and visible. Blount responded that he preferred to stay with Knight, but agreed with his friend's suggestion. However, Blount added, "I . . . hate to let them [the public] dictate a course which is not in accordance with my inclinations, but I suppose I will have to do it at times." Blount was convinced that he would receive the votes of the "better element" and the "sound men."⁹

During a preliminary campaign tour early in October, Blount found considerable sentiment against "Jacksonville hogging it all" (both of Florida's senators, Taliaferro and Duncan U. Fletcher, were from Jacksonville).¹⁰ He was also elated with the large number of unsolicited promises of support that he received. Upon his return to Pensacola Blount expressed great satisfaction with his reception during his tour—DeFuniak Springs, Jacksonville, Gainesville, Ocala, Tampa, Fort Myers, Arcadia, and Bartow. The jaunt had reinforced his determination "to wage a thorough and vigorous campaign."¹¹

Buoyed by the enthusiasm in south Florida, Blount took steps to increase further his support in that section by calling upon some traditionally conservative interests for support. On October 22, he wrote S. B. Adams in Savannah, Georgia, requesting that he write Joe Hall "who owns large phosphate interests in South Florida, . . . and suggest to him that he use his influence with the persons in his employ in those mines in the interest of my candidacy."¹² Blount wrote banker A. C. Clewis in Tampa asking that

9. Blount to Peter O. Knight, October 2, 1909, *ibid.*

10. *Pensacola Journal*, October 13, 1909, quoting the *Tampa Tribune*.

11. *Pensacola Evening News*, October 18, 1909.

12. Blount to S. B. Adams, October 22, 1909, box 2, Blount Family Papers.

he send him a list of the bank presidents and cashiers of all the banks in south Florida so that he might solicit their support.¹³

The *Punta Gorda Herald* editorialized about Blount's energetic campaign and the encouragement he was receiving, but it pointed out two serious handicaps: "His dignified reserve, which prevents him from being a good mixer, and his connection as attorney with a railroad company." The editor maintained that the L&N had "defied the Florida Railroad Commission and public sentiment" by maintaining high passenger rates. The L&N's success in resisting rate reductions, the editor reasoned, was due to "Blount's brains and ability."¹⁴

On October 21, 1909, Blount released an address— his platform— to the Democratic voters of the state, giving his position on some of the important issues of the day and on other matters dealing with the campaign. He took a strict constructionist attitude toward the Constitution of the United States; considered a protective tariff "as not only oppressive, but unconstitutional"; supported the proposed Sixteenth Amendment that would give the federal government power to levy an income tax; favored a graduated state inheritance tax and regulation of interstate railroads through the Interstate Commerce Commission; opposed the over-capitalization of corporations, which caused the public "to pay prices and rates based upon fictitious values"; and supported laws which would regulate but not destroy legitimate trusts. He believed the federal government "should inaugurate and maintain a system of interstate hardroads," provide liberal appropriations for "the improvement of rivers and harbors," and stimulate the development of an intercoastal waterway.

Blount believed a solid Democratic South was a necessity "so long as there remains such a percentage of ignorant negro voters as by any possibility constitute a balance of power between parties of equal strength." If the two major parties were to become equally strong, Blount concluded, "the control of our state, county and municipal officers would be in the hands of that party securing the negro vote, by purchase or prejudice, and the negro would then be the dominating factor."

Concerning the senatorial race itself, Blount emphasized that

13. Blount to A. C. Clewis, October 22, 1909, *ibid.*

14. *Pensacola Evening News*, October 22, 1909, quoting the *Punta Gorda Herald*.

he would wage “a clear, fair campaign,” that there would “be no purchase, direct or indirect, of voters,” and that while he would level “just criticism” toward the public records of his opponents, “their private characters are not to be assailed.” Blount also addressed his position as attorney for the L&N in Florida. Some people, he admitted, might not support him because of this corporate connection. However, he continued, “I have no regrets because of it nor apologize for it. My connection with it has . . . been entirely professional, and concerned in no wise with its policies.” While the pay he received from the company was only a “small part” of his annual income from his practice, Blount promised that “if elected he would resign as attorney for the L&N.”¹⁵ Blount’s position on most major issues of the time was similar to other progressive-minded candidates for state and national offices.¹⁶

The *Starke Telegraph* lauded Blount’s message, saying that it was “one of the ablest and most dignified documents . . . ever issued in the state.”¹⁷ Aware that a platform alone did not provide a political victory, Blount continued to campaign actively in late October and November. As a relative newcomer to politics, his strategy was to make himself known to the voters before other, better-known candidates entered the race.

Taliaferro’s long-awaited announcement came on December 2, 1909 (the Jacksonville *Metropolis* had dubbed him the political Sphinx). “I shall be a candidate for reelection,” he stated, “and, with the loyal support that my friends have always given me, I expect to be elected by a flattering majority.” However, he did not intend immediately to issue a platform or begin an active campaign. He objected to a long campaign because it

15. *Pensacola Evening News*, October 21, 1909.

16. Despite the comprehensive nature of the Progressive movement, the plight of the Negro was beyond the pale of its proposed reforms. Dewey W. Grantham, Jr., “The Progressive Movement and the Negro,” *South Atlantic Quarterly*, LIV (October 1955), 461-77. Proctor, *Napoleon Bonaparte Broward*, 174, observes, “When Florida liberals thundered for railroad-corporation regulation, antitrust legislation, and a wider participation in government by the common people, their program did not envision racial tolerance or political equality for the Negro in the state.”

17. *Starke Telegraph*, October 29, 1909. Blount also received the endorsement of a member of the Republican administration in Washington. In a letter to Blount, George W. Wickersham said, “I hope . . . your candidacy for the United States Senate will . . . [result] in your election.” Wickersham to Blount, November 13, 1909, box 5, Blount Family Papers.

“disturbs the public mind and interferes with the business interests of the state.” Congressional responsibilities would restrict his campaign appearances in the state, Taliaferro said, but he was confident that he could rely on his friends to help him.¹⁸ Taliaferro, the avowed leader of the conservative wing of the Democratic party in Florida, had been senator since 1899. Some considered him the heir to William D. Chipley, who had been active in Florida politics and had managed the L&N properties in Florida, as spokesman for railroad and corporate interests.¹⁹

Taliaferro’s announcement probably came as a disappointment to Blount. In October a rumor had been circulating that the Senator was inclined not to run again, and the delay in making his intentions known tended to support it. If Taliaferro withdrew, Blount possibly believed that, of the probable candidates, he would fall heir to the votes of the Senator’s conservative supporters. Obviously pleased with the rumor, Blount wrote Charles Parkhill, saying, “I shall endeavor to follow your suggestion, and see if we cannot persuade him [Taliaferro] to remain out.”²⁰

Through December 1909 Blount maintained the grinding pace he was establishing for himself in the campaign. His correspondence remained extremely heavy, and he continued visiting communities throughout west and north Florida. Writing to Pleasant A. Holt in Jacksonville on December 9, Blount stated that he was following Holt’s advice “by going to as many places as possible, especially the smaller towns and villages, and seeing as many people as I can.” Blount told Holt that he expected to “begin a tour of the East Coast . . . sometime in January.”²¹

Then suddenly, without any prior warning, Blount announced on Christmas Day that he had “concluded to discontinue the race for the United States senatorship from Florida.” Recalling his vigorous campaigning since October, he said, “During nearly all of that time I have been suffering with rheumatism of the muscles of the shoulder and back and inflammation of the throat and chest, and twice have had to come home because of suffering from these ailments and fever, and to these have been

18. Jacksonville *Florida Times-Union*, December 2, 1909.

19. Edward C. Williamson, “William D. Chipley, West Florida’s Mr. Railroad,” *Florida Historical Quarterly*, XXV (April 1947), 333-55.

20. Blount to Charles Parkhill, October 22, 1909, box 2, Blount Family Papers.

21. Blount to Pleasant A. Holt, December 2, 1909, *ibid.*

added in the last week neuralgia and grippe." He blamed these ailments on his busy campaign schedule and to continue with it could possibly permanently impair his health.

Blount gave another reason for his decision which he said was "less tangible, but to me no less real— my repugnance to the personal solicitation of votes either by a direct request of the voters, or by an exhibition of myself to him for the sole purpose of a tacit solicitation. I foresaw hesitancy on my part to do this, but I thought that a short practice would make it a thing first endured and then embraced, but I find that the disinclination grows greater day by day. Of course, I would have strength enough to endure this during a campaign, . . . but I do not feel that the prize is worth the constant self-humiliation and the total subversion of my habits of life and thought. Besides, even if I am elected, the same course, though to a lesser extent, would have to be continued by me to secure a re-election. While there are other men of a different mould . . . to whom politics might be a pleasure, to me it would be an unending pain." His brief entry into politics had its reward, Blount explained, because it had brought him the "cordiality of hosts of friends."²²

For the most part, the press accepted Blount's explanation at face value and regretted his decision. However, the Baker County Standard, commenting on Blount's abhorrence to soliciting votes, said, "Florida does not need a senator, no matter how smart a man, who does not feel free to mingle with the people he would represent." Several editorials which commented on Blount's withdrawal were critical of Florida's primary elections. The Primary Act of 1901 provided for the nomination in Democratic primaries of all county, state, and federal officials and required that a second primary be held for those offices in which candidates had not received a majority of the vote. United States Senators were thereafter nominated by the voters and elected by the state legislature until the Seventeenth Amendment to the Constitution provided for their direct election. Prior to 1901, United States senatorial candidates in Florida were selected by state conventions. The *Levy Times Democrat* called Blount "a clean, able man who shrank from entering a mud fight, alias a Democratic primary." Displaying a similar attitude, the *Palatka News* believed "Florida has a dozen . . . men, any of whom would

22. *Pensacola Journal*, December 25, 1909.

be a real power in the Senate of the United States, but who would never consent to seek office by a house to house canvass for votes."²³ Writing to Blount on April 18, 1908, Peter O. Knight had hoped that the state primaries could be "abolished so that we can again be in a position where businessmen can, with self respect, take some interest in politics."²⁴ Soliciting votes from the electorate was obviously personally repugnant to Blount, but he did not criticize the direct primary system. Indeed, the Primary Act of 1901 had come under sharp criticism in the legislature in 1903 when Blount was a senator. However, a reading of the *Senate Journal* (1903) reveals that Blount was not among its detractors.

On January 19, 1910, Blount wrote Senator Taliaferro pledging his unqualified support.²⁵ Throwing his support to the conservative Taliaferro may seem a surprising move, in light of Blount's alleged liberalism and progressive platform; some might question the sincerity of Blount's commitment to reform. However, he had a motive behind this action. In a subsequent letter, Blount entreated Taliaferro to persuade influential Republican senators, who were friends and who shared his conservatism, to approach President Taft about the possibility of appointing a Southerner to the United States Supreme Court. "If he [Taft] would seriously entertain the idea," Blount wrote, "I could, I think, procure from a very large number of lawyers, judges and businessmen in the Southern States, testimonials which might satisfy him as to my fitness to fill the office. Of course I am a Democrat, but you know me well enough to be able to say to your [Republican] friends . . . what may be necessary as to my politics." Blount seems not to have been averse to being labelled a political conservative in order to achieve his goal.

Early in February 1910, Governor Broward also officially became a candidate. His liberal credentials extended back to the early 1890s when he was a member of the "Straightouts" in Duval County. He endorsed Populist principles in that county, and participated in the liberal Democratic movement in Florida whose aim was to oust the Bourbons, or conservative Democrats,

23. Macclenny *Baker County Standard*, December 31, 1909; Bronson *Levy Times Democrat*, January 6, 1910; *Palatka News*, December 31, 1909.

24. Knight to Blount, April 18, 1908, box 5, Blount Family Papers.

25. Blount to James P. Taliaferro, January 19, 1910, box 2, *ibid*.

26. Blount to Taliaferro, August 3, 1910, box 5, *ibid*.

who supposedly coddled big business interests that subjugated government. The Bourbons had controlled the political fortunes of Florida since the end of Reconstruction. "To Broward and other liberals," his biographer states, "the railroads had come to typify the chief political evils existing in the state and were the cause of corruption in the Democratic party."²⁷ His victory in the gubernatorial race in 1904 broke the conservative Democratic stranglehold on the state government, thereby permitting Broward and his liberal followers to usher in an era of reform in Florida politics.

With the withdrawal of Blount and Judge Lucius J. Reeves, also from Pensacola, because of health problems, three senatorial aspirants remained—Taliaferro, Broward, and Claude L'Engle, the former muckracking editor of the *Jacksonville Sun*. After a low-keyed campaign, the first primary was held on May 10, 1910. The official returns gave Broward sixty-nine more votes than Taliaferro. L'Engle ran a poor third. However, the closeness of the race necessitated a second primary set for June 7. The campaigning of the rivals became more heated during the runoff, with Taliaferro charging that Broward's political record was replete with broken promises and Broward taking Taliaferro to task over his corporation connections. When the official tally was released on June 22, Broward emerged the victor by 2,587 votes. With Broward's election, Florida would have two progressives in the United States Senate—Broward and Duncan U. Fletcher, who had defeated Broward in the Senate race two years earlier. However, late in September Broward became gravely ill from a gallstone attack and died on October 1. On October 5, the day after Broward's funeral, William A. Blount announced that he had decided to enter the race for the Senate to succeed Senator Taliaferro. The previous night Nathan P. Bryan had announced his candidacy, and a few days later John N. C. Stockton, of Jacksonville, also entered the race.

Stockton, a political crony of Broward, had served in the state legislature and had been an unsuccessful candidate for the United States Senate in 1904 and governor in 1907. The Florida legislature established a state railroad commission in 1887, but, largely due to corporation influence, it was dissolved in 1891. When Stockton became a member of the Florida House of Repre-

27. Proctor, *Napoleon Bonaparte Broward*, 62.

sentatives in 1897, he immediately introduced a bill providing for the reestablishment of the railroad commission. Despite opposition from the corporation forces, Stockton and other commission advocates secured its passage into law on May 8, 1897. The new commission was given extensive authority to remedy railroad abuses, and Stockton's efforts were considered a major progressive achievement.

Nathan P. Bryan, a cousin of Broward and the brother of former United States Senator William James Bryan, had long been a power in the liberal wing of the state Democratic party. When Senator Bryan died in office, Governor Broward had offered the appointment to Nathan but he refused it. More recently, he had managed Broward's successful senatorial campaign. Needless to say, both Stockton and Bryan had solid liberal credentials which would make them attractive to the Browardites. The Jacksonville *Florida Times-Union* strongly endorsed Blount's candidacy saying, "No man is better equipped to ably represent the state in the United States Senate than is William A. Blount." The *Southern Argus* called him "one of the brainiest men in the state and one of the wisest and most progressive statesmen, . . . devoted to the best interests of the people." However, the *Apalachicola Times* asked, "If Mr. Blount could not mix with the plain people before how can he condescend to mix with them today." The *Miami Morning Metropolis* thought it necessary that Blount "explain why . . . he is now willing to make a canvass of individual voters when . . . he found it distasteful [before]."²⁸

In response to these charges, Blount wrote his earlier supporters explaining the intent of his statement of withdrawal from the previous race. Writing to Frank Clark, Blount quoted the provocative sentence about his repugnance to the personal solicitation of votes. The least intelligent person, Blount continued, could not interpret the statement to mean "that there was any repugnance to mixing with the voters socially, or otherwise, but can only mean that it was distasteful to me to ask for favors."²⁹ Blount assured H. H. McCreary on October 11 that he would

28. Jacksonville *Florida Times-Union*, October 5, 1910; Brooksville *Southern Argus*, October 6, 1910; *Apalachicola Times*, October 8, 1910; *Miami Morning Metropolis*, October 5, 1910.

29. Blount to Frank Clark, October 11, 1910, box 2, Blount Family Papers.

“take pains in the early future to let the voters know exactly what I said, and explain to them what was meant.”³⁰ In the week following his announcement, Blount wrote to previous supporters and to those who had urged him to run again. The thrust of this correspondence was that his first candidacy was entirely of his own initiation, whereas now it had resulted from strong solicitations from friends.

In a letter to P. W. White approximately two weeks after he announced his candidacy, Blount revealed that he preferred an appointment to the United States Supreme Court over becoming a Senator, but he believed that “a favor of that kind will probably not come to a man living in the extreme south for a generation yet.”³¹ This remark, together with Blount’s earlier letter to Taliaferro, suggests that the legal talents of Blount, as Senator, would provide the sort of national recognition which would enhance the probability of his appointment to the court if the Democrats recaptured the White House.

The state Democratic Executive Committee slated the first primary for January 10, 1911, and the runoff primary for January 31. During the ensuing three months after he jumped back into the senatorial race, Blount appealed to various special interest groups on behalf of his candidacy. He asked an official of the American Naval Stores Company, New Orleans, to contact friends in the Florida turpentine business and persuade “them to vote for me and to assist me with their support.”³² In a paid ad, Blount told cotton growers in Clay County that he favored “a tariff upon cotton, so as to protect the producers of the state.”³³ H. H. Hunt, of Boston, wrote to each of his managers in the office of the Pensacola Electric Company in the interest of Blount’s candidacy.³⁴ Blount promised, if elected, to fight vigorously to keep strong naval facilities at both Key West and Pensacola, since naval expenditures over the years had figured prominently in the economy of both communities.³⁵ Appealing to labor in progressive language, Blount said he had always been

30. Blount to H. H. McCreary, October 11, 1910, *ibid.*

31. Blount to P. W. White, October 21, 1910, box 3, *ibid.*

32. Blount to Carl Moller, October 14, 1910, *ibid.*

33. Green Cove Springs *Clay County Times*, December 2, 1910.

34. Kate Radcliffe to C. E. Jones, December 13, 1910, box 3, Blount Family Papers.

35. Blount to Jefferson B. Brown, December 27, 1910, *ibid.*

a friend of the working man and, if elected, would "help organized labor to get a square deal."³⁶ A November 1910 article in the *Journal of the Knights of Labor* added credence to Blount's pro-labor statements. In endorsing him, the paper characterized Blount as "a natural born leader of men, and a friend of the poor and downtrodden. . . . He is a special friend of the working men and women, not only of this state, but of the entire country."³⁷ This support was especially important to Blount since he had been the attorney for the Pensacola Street Railway Company when, in 1908, it was unsuccessfully struck by its workers. Union workers in Pensacola— at that time the second most unionized city, behind Tampa, in Florida— deserted the Democratic party after the strike, largely because Governor Broward sent in troops to enforce a curfew. Thereafter the labor vote in Pensacola was fragmented among splinter parties. Still, there was concern among Blount's backers that labor might unite again to support one of his opponents.

Writing to a member of the Railroad Brotherhood in Jacksonville, in response to an inquiry about his position on railroad matters, Blount promised a number of reforms if elected. He would support the passage of a bill "for the proper inspection of boilers, so as to protect the lives and limbs of employees [of the railroads]; safe and sufficient clearings between structures located on or over road-ways on interstate traffic lines: prohibit the reduction of a crew to less than that sufficient for the protection of the crew and those persons committed to their care; limit the hours of service, so that there should be no over-work and over strain . . . [and enact] an anti-injunction bill, insuring the protection of personal rights at all times, so that the rights of the

36. Blount to E. B. Bevier, December 22, 1910, *ibid.*

37. *Pensacola Evening News*, November 2, 1910, quoting the *Journal of the Knights of Labor*, November 1910. In support of its endorsement the *Journal* stated, "He [Blount] was a member of the arbitration board that had to do with the great strike in the logging and lumbering territory of Florida and Alabama, and numbering many thousands of working men. He, it is true, represented the employing interests, but his selection as arbitrator was unanimously approved by the executive officers who represented the strikers, and by the strikers themselves. Having implicit confidence in his ability to deal with the intricate questions which were involved in the controversy and his fairness and impartiality in deciding the points at issue, caused them to hail with delight his selection as arbitrator."

employer and employee should be duly and equitably protected."³⁸

To keep in touch with the progress of the campaign in each county, Blount took six-month subscriptions to eighty-three Florida newspapers. He also sent each of them a picture or a halftone cut with the message that he would be pleased to have them printed sometime during the campaign. Thousands of these pictures, along with circulars entitled "First Campaign Falsehood" and "Corporation Cry," and a fourteen-page pamphlet containing Blount's "Platform and a Statement as to My Life," were distributed to his county campaign managers.

Blount's tour into south Florida in late November and early December was disappointing. If newspaper accounts describing the attendance at his speeches in Titusville, Fort Pierce, and Leesburg are accurate, there was little voter enthusiasm. The *Gainesville Sun* observed, "Never has a campaign been conducted in Florida where so little interest was manifested." The *De Soto News* concluded that the people of that county were "too busy getting off the orange crop . . . , sawing lumber, gathering pine gum, . . . to give thought to politics."³⁹

As the campaigning became more heated, there was increased personal invective. Aware that the political climate in Florida reflected a liberal trend, both candidates appealed to the Browardites for support. In a speech in Miami, Blount, despite his promise not to attack the character of his opponents, claimed that 100 people had told him that Bryan did not possess the qualifications nor the ability to become a senator. Blount agreed with this assessment, and further charged that Bryan, by calling attention to his relationship to Broward, was attempting to "ride into office" on the tide of grief over Broward's death.⁴⁰ In responding to these allegations, Bryan challenged Blount to supply the names of those who said he was not qualified. He charged that his opponent was never a Broward supporter, "and opposed the policies which activated him in public office, and now after Governor Broward's death eulogizes him for the sole purpose of

38. Blount to S. M. Campbell, November 9, 1910, box 3, Blount Family Papers.

39. *Gainesville Sun*, December 11, 1910; *Arcadia De Soto News*, December 8, 1910.

40. *Miami Metropolis*, November 30, 1910.

catching a few votes."⁴¹ Stockton was seldom mentioned in this heated rhetoric; Blount and Bryan concentrated on aiming their political barbs at each other. Blount never publicly announced his earlier endorsement of Taliaferro, who also remained silent on the matter for fear that Bryan would use it to question further the sincerity of Blount's "liberalism."

Bryan pounded away in his speeches about Blount's position since 1884 as an attorney for the L&N. As Blount's stenographer, Kate Radcliffe, later put it, he was "Laying the sins of the L&N at Mr. Blount's feet."⁴² Galling to the Blount camp were Bryan's insinuations that Blount was largely responsible for the four-cent-a-mile passenger rate. Blount's standard reply to this allegation was that the president and general manager of the L&N did not come to Florida to ask him, a mere local attorney, what rate it should charge on its line of railroad. In response to the charge that he was a tool of the corporations, Blount challenged his opponent to examine his legislative record and find anything that would substantiate the claim. "At no time," Blount stated, "has the L&N ever asked me to appear for it before a legislative committee or to lobby for it . . . and no man can state any occasion when I have engaged in politics for the L&N." Blount reemphasized that he only represented the line in its legal business.⁴³ But the opposition countered by saying that on April 28, 1905, while the legislature was in session, Blount had obtained a leave of absence to argue a case in which L&N sought an injunction against the State Railroad Commission's order reducing rates. Thus, the argument went, Blount had obtained an injunction against the interests of the people while claiming to represent them in the legislature.

The squabble continued in the press. The *Florida Times-Union* charged that Bryan, too, had represented corporations, and that "this corporation cry is only a plea to the unreasoning ignorant Democrat." And the *Apalachicola Times*, an opponent of the L&N and its friends, such as Blount, claimed that railroad influence in Washington was designed to prevent the development of ports that might compete with Pensacola. "As long as

41. Jacksonville *Florida Times-Union*, December 5, 1910.

42. Radcliffe to Charles E. Jones, December 31, 1910, box 3, Blount Family Papers.

43. *Mayo Free Press*, January 5, 1911.

Apalachicola, Carabelle, and St. Andrews Bay can be kept down to the shallow port basis," the editor charged, "the traffic, perforce will have to seek outlet at Pensacola."⁴⁴

For his part, Blount charged that Bryan had violated the spirit of the primary law and that he and a few others had met in Jacksonville immediately after Governor Broward's funeral to parcel out offices. It was during this meeting, according to Blount, that Bryan was selected as the senatorial candidate. Seven hundred telegrams, signed by four participants in the meeting, were later sent throughout the state asking people to approve their selection. Bryan could not deny, Blount insisted, that a deal had been made between himself, three prospective candidates for state offices, and an incumbent state official. This was done, Blount charged, "before Governor Broward's grave was dry, before the sound of the clods on his coffin had ceased to resound in the ears of those who attended his funeral." The purpose, of course, Blount argued was to seize upon Broward's great popularity in the hope that Bryan would succeed to his mantle.⁴⁵ Some of Blount's friends suggested that he issue a campaign pamphlet attacking the "pallbearer's" caucus. Blount's son and others, however, believed that the use of such language would be unbecoming; the quality of Blount's campaign literature should continue as it had been and should not in any way resort "to cheap catch-penny phrases for political purposes."⁴⁶

The racial sentiments of the time were also exploited. Bryan charged that Blount, while serving in the Florida senate in 1905, had offered amendments to House Bill No. 11, a "Jim Crow" bill, and that because of one of these amendments, the state supreme court had declared the bill unconstitutional. State law then called for the separation of the races on railroad cars but not on streetcars. In 1905, John Campbell Avery, representative from Escambia County, introduced a bill in the house for the separa-

44. Jacksonville *Florida Times-Union*, December 20, 1910; *Apalachicola Times*, December 10, 1910.

45. Those allegedly participating in the "pallbearer's" caucus were: "W. H. Milton, a prospective candidate for governor; Hayes Lewis, a prospective candidate for Congress; A. J. Angle, a candidate for speaker of the [state] House of Representatives; and H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state, and a standing candidate for that position." *Miami Metropolis*, November 30, 1910.

46. William Alexander Blount, Jr., to Jones, December 6, 1910, box 3, Blount Family Papers.

tion of blacks and whites on public transportation. Blount said Avery's bill would bankrupt the companies because they would have to increase the number of their cars. Blount's amendments to Avery's bill proposed a method of separation that had existed for years in Pensacola, Jacksonville, and other southern cities—assigning a portion of each car to whites and a different section to blacks. The amended bill passed, but was subsequently struck down as unconstitutional by the Florida Supreme Court because it exempted Negro nurses who had the care of white children or sick persons. Thus, it violated the Fourteenth Amendment by giving Negro nurses privileges denied other blacks. Bryan charged that Blount deliberately pushed for the amendments because he was attorney for the Pensacola Electric Company that controlled the streetcars in Pensacola and it would have been financially harmed by the law. Blount denied he had acted solely in the interest of the Pensacola Electric Company, and pointed out that it was Bryan's late brother who had defended the bill before the supreme court.⁴⁷

In late December 1910, Kate Radcliffe, Blount's secretary, wrote to him in Jacksonville. One sentence in the letter read: "I am going to mail your new annual pass to you at Jacksonville, so it will be there ready for you when you want to come over the L&N to Pensacola." For some unexplained reason this letter did not reach Blount. Instead, it reached some Bryan supporters who spread the word that Blount, the corporation man, was receiving free fare on the L&N and other railroads. Some three weeks later the letter was returned. While there is no evidence that Bryan was

47. *Pensacola Evening News*, January 9, 1911. Blount's amendment to section 7 of the bill made one exception to this mode of separation: "That the provisions of this act shall not apply to colored nurses having the care of white children or sick white persons." Blount's amendment had merely made a slight change in the wording of section 7 in Avery's bill which said: "That the provisions of this act shall not apply to colored female nurses on such cars or divisions of cars having the care of white children or sick persons." *Ocala Daily Banner*, January 10, 1911, quoting *Pensacola Journal*. The court ruled that section 7 violated the part of section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution which states, "No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States." Its argument was that it gave Negro nurses "rights and immunities denied to other colored people." *Senate Journal* (1905), 776-78; *State v. Patterson* 50 Fla. 127, 39 So. 398. William J. Bryan defended the bill because he was county solicitor of Duval County when Andrew Patterson brought suit against the state after being arrested in Jacksonville and held in custody for violating the law.

involved in the campaign use of the letter, Radcliffe was not convinced of Bryan's innocence. "The making use of this personal letter by Mr. Bryan and his friends," she wrote J. R. Blocker, "is on a par with the rest of their work."⁴⁸

Each candidate, as required by law, submitted his expenses ten days before the primary to the secretary of state. Blount's amounted to \$11,164.81, with no contributions from outside sources. Bryan's expenses were \$7220.78, with \$945.00 in contributions. Stockton's expenses were \$7,451.41, with \$3,125.80 in contributions. Since the annual salary for a United States Senator in 1911 was \$7,500, the *Suwannee Democrat* remarked that "no poor man, no matter how eminently fitted he may be, need aspire to be . . . Senator from Florida unless he throws himself upon the charity of his friends and asks them to foot the bills."⁴⁹

On the eve of the first primary, Blount's supporters arranged a big rally to be held at the Opera House in Pensacola. As Blount rose to speak to a large partisan audience, "he was greeted with a thunderous applause."⁵⁰ Apparently this reaction was an accurate gauge of the political climate; when the counting was completed the following day in Pensacola, Blount had received 1,894 votes, Bryan ninety-four, and Stockton sixty-four. In Escambia County Blount received 2,502 votes, Bryan 186, and Stockton 112. The official count in the state gave Blount 13,803 votes, Bryan 9,749, and Stockton 7,462.⁵¹ With a plurality of 4,059 votes, Blount faced Bryan in the second primary. Blount was well aware that the combined vote of his opponents, who had most likely split the Browardite vote, was considerably greater than his own. Consequently, strategy for the remaining three weeks of the campaign was determined.

Before leaving Pensacola to campaign in south Florida, where both Bryan and Stockton had run well, Blount received a letter from Governor Albert W. Gilchrist, congratulating him on the results of the first primary, but reminding him "that the battle is not yet won." Gilchrist recommended that Blount establish a finance committee to raise funds for the second primary. "I do not think it should be incumbent upon you," Gilchrist wrote, "to

48. Radcliffe to J. R. Blocker, January 21, 1911, box 4, Blount Family Papers.

49. Live Oak *Suwannee Democrat*, January 13, 1911.

50. *Pensacola Evening News*, January 9, 1911.

51. *Pensacola Journal*, January 10, 13, 19, 1911.

pay all the expenses of this fight . . . It will afford me pleasure to contribute \$100.00 towards this campaign." In his response Blount thanked Gilchrist, but explained that he had not yet decided whether or not to accept any contributions. "Several have been offered lately but I have not accepted them. I shall ever bear in grateful remembrance your offer, and if I conclude to accept any, will receive yours with the greatest pleasure."⁵²

In the final days of the campaign, Blount's opponents continued to hit hard on his corporation connection. On January 24 an advertisement appeared in the *Gainesville Sun* stating that R. Hudson Burr, a member of the Railroad Commission, had verified that on April 29, 1905, Blount, while a member of the state senate, had succeeded in getting an injunction against the Railroad Commission from enforcing the reduction in freight rates that it had ordered on Florida's railroads.⁵³

In a letter to the editor of the *Sun*, W. A. Blount, Jr., complained that Burr inferred the L&N, represented by the law firm of Blount and Blount, was the only contestant of the commission's order when, in fact, attorneys for three other Florida lines had also contested it. "In other words," he said, "there was a concert of action among the railroad companies, for the purpose of testing the reasonableness of freight rates sought to be imposed by the Railroad Commission."⁵⁴

On January 29, two days before the runoff, Bryan ran a political advertisement charging that Blount, who had spent twenty-six years protecting the interests of a corporation, was in the reactionary wing of the Democratic party. Bryan described himself as a progressive Democrat and equated his political views with those held by Woodrow Wilson, the progressive Democrat governor of New Jersey. "The result of this contest will decide," Bryan warned, "whether our politics shall be dominated by re-

52. Albert W. Gilchrist to Blount, January 12, 1911; Blount to Gilchrist, January 15, 1911, box 5, Blount Family Papers. In his message to the legislature in 1911, Gilchrist, referring to the campaign expenditures in the 1910 and 1911 primaries, said, "It is probable that there are numbers of men who contribute toward the campaign of a candidate for governor . . . with a view of securing a lien upon a few loaves and fishes at the disposal of the governor, by appointment. The same would apply to a candidate for United States Senator or for other offices." Cash, *Democratic Party in Florida*, 109.

53. *Gainesville Sun*, January 24, 1911.

54. W. A. Blount, Jr. to H. H. McCreary, January 26, 1911, box 4, Blount Family Papers.

actionary Democrats or progressive Democrats. In other words, whether The Special-Privilege-Seeking Corporations Or The People Shall Control Our Politics.” As on previous occasions, Bryan also attacked Blount’s legislative voting record. He pointed out that Blount had voted against House Bill No. 443 (the Gibbons Anti-Trust Bill), “Senate Bill No. 128, requiring the separation of white and colored passengers in sleeping cars, and against giving the Railroad Commission judicial powers.” Bryan also ridiculed Blount’s assertion that he had worked diligently “for the procurement of another railroad to Pensacola.” Bryan further reminded Pensacolians that they bought tickets at a wretched looking depot and “from the same window with Negroes. Has Mr. Blount used his influence to remedy this condition?”⁵⁵

Blount had answered these charges on previous occasions, but answered them again in an advertisement appearing on January 31, the day of the election. House Bill No. 443 was “to prohibit monopolies of trade, and conspiracies, combinations and agreements in restraint of trade.” Blount recalled that he had voted against it because “it would have prohibited combinations of workmen . . . for legitimate interests.” Indeed, Blount had offered the following amendment to the bill: “Provided that this act shall not affect associations of laboring men or [ship] pilots.” Blount was against giving the Railroad Commission judicial powers on the grounds of his strong belief in the constitutional separation of powers. Blount explained that he had voted against Senate Bill 128 because it “endeavored to make the Pullman Company put on a separate pullman for Negroes riding from one point in Florida to another point in Florida.” It would not, Blount stressed, have had any effect on blacks riding pullmans coming into Florida or on those that were going to points outside of Florida. “Since no man in the senate then, and no man since has, to my knowledge, ever heard of a Negro riding on a sleeper from one point in Florida to another point in Florida, the bill was merely political claptrap.” Blount reiterated that many citizens of the community would attest to his efforts to procure another railroad to serve Pensacola, that as legal counsel for the L&N he had nothing to do with the construction of depots, that

55. *Pensacola Journal*, January 29, 1911.

people in Pensacola did not buy tickets at the L&N depot from the same window as blacks, and that he thought it strange that Bryan, who frequently charged that he could not associate with a poor man, now "charges that I am willing to have my family and myself sleep in a sleeping car with Negroes."⁵⁶

When the vote was tallied, it was apparent that Bryan's last-minute appeal had not been successful in Escambia County. Blount carried the county by a vote of 2,832 to 259. Results were different elsewhere in Florida, however. Incomplete returns indicated that it was going to be a close race, and when the official returns were released on February 9 they showed that Bryan had won by 610 votes, 19,991 to 19,381.⁵⁷ The total vote in the second primary was 8,353 greater than in the first primary. Apparently, interest in the outcome of the race had heightened during the three weeks before the second primary; nevertheless, 9,601 fewer votes were cast than in the Taliaferro-Broward runoff primary the previous year. Charges of irregularities and fraud in the election surfaced almost immediately. Blount sent a written protest to the state Democratic Executive Committee about the manner in which the election was held, and requested that the committee submit his protest to the legislature when Bryan's certificate of nomination was presented to that body. The committee voted against Blount's request and declared Bryan nominated.

If one can surmise that most of the Stockton vote went to Bryan, Blount received approximately three-fifths of the additional vote in the runoff primary. Moreover, when it is realized that Bryan had long been identified with the liberal wing of the Democratic party, and that Broward's mantle had most likely fallen to him, Blount had run a surprisingly strong race. Blount was obviously more attractive to the conservatives, but he had also seriously challenged Bryan for the liberal vote. Nevertheless, many remained convinced that Blount's liberal record was overshadowed by his railroad connection. Thus, Bryan, a liberal who in their thinking could be trusted, was elected.

Writing to Peter O. Knight in Tampa on February 10, Blount told of his disappointment with the result of the election. Blount confided to his friend that if he had won the election using tactics

56. *Ibid.*, January 31, 1911; see also Senate Bill No. 128 and House Bill No. 443, *Senate Journal* (1903), 716-17, 1,558.

57. *Pensacola Journal*, February 9, 1911.

similar to Bryan's, he could not have held the office with a clear conscience. "I can say to you, sincerely, that I had rather come out defeated and clean, as I am, than to be Senator as Mr. Bryan is."⁵⁸

Since the Florida legislature was not then in session, Governor Gilchrist appointed Nathan P. Bryan interim United States Senator beginning on March 4, 1911. When the legislature next met in regular session, it would formally elect him to that office. Bryan was the last Florida politician elected to the United States Senate by a political process soon to become the victim of another progressive reform measure, the Seventeenth Amendment, which provided for the direct election of Senators.

Few Floridians doubted Blount's superior intelligence, his personal integrity, and his high standing in the legal profession. Still, his innate intelligence, coupled with an aristocratic demeanor, apparently made him suspect to a segment of the voters. What contributed most to his defeat, however, was Nathan Bryan's success in convincing voters that Blount was a corporation man who, if elected, would support the interests of business over those of the people. Although rebuffed by the electorate in Florida, Blount's popularity in the legal profession did not wane. His peers elected him president of the Florida Bar Association, and, in 1920, he became the first Floridian to be elected president of the American Bar Association. Upon his death the following year while holding that office, the Supreme Court of the United States adjourned in his honor. Nothing would have pleased Blount more.⁵⁹

58. Blount to Knight, February 10, 1911, box 4, Blount Family Papers.

59. For brief accounts of Blount's life, see Herbert U. Feibelman, "William Alexander Blount, 'Florida's Greatest Lawyer,' native of Alabama," *Alabama Lawyer*, XVII (April 1956), 157-60, and *Makers of America: An Historical and Biographical Work By An Able Corp of Writers*, 3 vols., Florida Edition (Atlanta, 1909), I, 312-13.

MIAMI'S METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT: RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

by RAYMOND A. MOHL

IN the past several years, the Miami metropolitan area has experienced fast-paced, almost frantic, urban change. The Liberty City and Overtown race riots of 1980 and 1982, Haitian-Cuban refugee problems, high rates of violent crime and murder, and a lucrative drug smuggling trade have all kept Miami in the national news. A new and dynamic urban economy based on international banking, foreign investment, and a prosperous Latin American-Caribbean trade has insulated Miami from the national economic recession. Indeed, during the past decade, Miami has been transformed into the trade and cultural capital of the Caribbean basin. New skyscraper construction in downtown Miami and mushrooming residential development all across the urban periphery symbolize the rising star of Miami in the Sunbelt constellation.¹ Passing virtually unnoticed amidst the rapid growth and change of the early 1980s was the twenty-fifth anniversary of Miami's innovative metropolitan government.

In July 1957, a county-wide metropolitan government began functioning in Dade County. The nation's first metropolitan government, "Metro" was the result of an organized campaign by "good government" reformers dating back to 1945. Although buffeted by localist opponents for two and one-half decades,

Raymond A. Mohl is professor of history, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida.

1. On recent developments in Miami, see Manning Marable, "The Fire This Time: The Miami Rebellion, May, 1980," *The Black Scholar*, XI (July-August 1980), 2-18; Robert L. Bach, "The New Cuban Immigrants: Their Background and Prospects," *Monthly Labor Review*, CIII (October 1980), 39-46; Thomas D. Boswell, "In the Eye of the Storm: The Context of Haitian Migration to Miami, Florida," *Southeastern Geographer*, XXIII (November 1983), 57-77; Raymond A. Mohl, "Changing Economic Patterns in the Miami Metropolitan Area, 1940-1980," *Tequesta*, XLII (1982), 63-73; Joel Garreau, *The Nine Nations of North America* (Boston, 1981), 167-206; Jim Kelly, "Trouble in Paradise," *Time* (November 23, 1981), 22-32; Andrew Neil, "America's Latin Beat: A Survey of South Florida," *The Economist*, CCLXXXV (October 16, 1982), 1-26.

Miami's Metro government gradually expanded its power and functions at the expense of the county's twenty-seven fragmented municipalities (see Table 1). By the 1980s, however, the emergence of divisive ethnic politics in Dade County had begun to raise new questions about the structure and representativeness of Metro.

The idea of a consolidated urban government for Dade County grew out of the conditions of the 1930s and 1940s. Until the mid-twenties, the city of Miami expanded its boundaries rapidly, encompassing some forty-three square miles of land by 1925. However, Miami's last annexation took place in 1925 during the height of the great real estate boom. During that period of expansion and speculative development, Miami incurred a high level of bonded indebtedness for roads, bridges, schools, utilities, drainage facilities, and other services. Collapse of the boom, soon followed by the Great Depression, brought financial disaster to Miami's municipal finances. By the early thirties, debt service was costing the city thirty-one per cent of its total budget, and in July 1932 the city defaulted on interest payments. Unable to carry through its ambitious program of urban development, Miami de-annexed some territory in 1931, reducing the city's size to thirty-four square miles of land. Services were cut back and programs of municipal development abandoned. Property assessments rose somewhat in the late thirties, providing additional city income and permitting a reduction of Miami's bonded indebtedness, but the city's financial position remained relatively weak.²

As a result of financial weakness, Miami's city government faced severe problems in sustaining services and improvements within its own boundaries. Even as late as the 1950s, according to one economist, Miami's city government continued to experience severe financial constraints: "The city was unable to cope with the growing needs for hospital facilities, to modernize its waterfront, to alleviate the unbearable traffic blocks at the river crossings by new bridges or water tunnels, to expand its fire protection system, build adequate facilities for police and courts, provide for intra-city transit and create public parking facilities. Its attempts at slum clearance and urban renewal were almost

2. Reinhold P. Wolff, *Miami Metro: The Road to Urban Unity* (Coral Gables, 1960), 411-54.

TABLE 1
POPULATION OF MIAMI SMSA, 1940-1980

Municipality	Date Incorporated	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980
Miami	1896	172,172	249,276	291,688	334,859	346,931
Homestead	1913	3,154	4,573	9,152	13,674	20,668
Florida City	1914	752	1,547	4,114	5,133	6,174
Miami Beach	1915	28,012	46,282	63,145	87,072	96,298
Coral Gables	1925	8,294	19,837	34,793	42,494	43,241
Hialeah	1925	3,958	19,676	66,972	102,452	145,254
Opa-locka	1926	497	5,271	9,810	11,902	14,460
Miami Springs	1926	898	5,108	11,229	13,279	12,350
South Miami	1926	2,408	4,809	9,846	11,780	10,884
North Miami	1927	1,973	10,734	28,708	34,767	42,566
Golden Beach	1928	83	156	413	849	612
North Miami Beach	1931	871	2,129	21,405	30,544	36,481
Miami Shores	1931	1,956	5,086	8,865	9,425	9,244
Biscayne Park	1932	500	2,009	2,911	2,717	3,088
Surfside	1935	295	1,852	3,157	3,614	3,763
El Portal	1937	365	1,371	2,079	2,068	1,819
Indian Creek Village	1939		44	60	82	103
Sweetwater	1941		230	645	3,357	8,251
North Bay Village	1945		198	2,006	4,831	4,920
Bal Harbour	1946		224	727	2,038	2,575
Bay Harbor Islands	1946		296	3,249	4,619	4,869
West Miami	1947		4,043	5,296	5,494	6,076
Virginia Gardens	1947		235	2,159	2,524	1,742
Hialeah Gardens	1948			172	492	2,700
Medley	1949		106	112	351	537
Pennsuco	1949		133	117	74	15

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Municipality	Date Incorporated	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980
Islandia Unincorporated	1961	41,551	109,859	352,217	537,293 ⁸	800,346 ¹²
Total Miami SMSA (Dade County)		267,739	495,084	935,047	1,267,792	1,625,979

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Population, I, Number of Inhabitants* (Washington, 1942), 224-25; U.S. Bureau of Census, *Census of Population: 1950, I, Number of Inhabitants* (Washington, 1952), Section 10, 14-15; U.S. Bureau of Census, *Census of Population: 1970, I, Characteristics of the Population, Part 11, Florida, Section 1* (Washington, 1973), 15-16, 21, 28; U.S. Bureau of Census, *1980 Census of Population and Housing, Advance Reports, PHC80-V-11, Florida, Final Population and Housing Unit Counts* (Washington, 1981), 5-6, 14-18.

complete failures. Only a small part of the city was provided with sanitary and storm sewers.³ Financially insecure, Miami could not afford to expand its boundaries or extend municipal services.

Meanwhile, the population of Dade County was growing at an unprecedented pace— 87.3 per cent during the 1930s, 84.9 per cent during the 1940s, and 88.9 per cent during the 1950s (Table 2). This vast population growth over just a few decades brought consequent demands for municipal services which Miami found difficulty in providing even within its own municipal boundaries. As one Miami lawyer put it in 1958, “each year it became increasingly obvious that something had to be done to meet problems attending this great growth in population other than awaiting solution by a legislature five hundred miles distant, sitting only sixty days every other year, and controlled by legislators elected from counties still predominantly rural in character.”⁴ Under the circumstances, the existing county government began to provide a greater level of services, particularly in the rapidly expanding unincorporated area of Dade County. Indeed, as early as the 1930s, Miami’s central city status had begun to wither, and local power was drifting from city to county.

This trend accelerated during World War II and in the immediate post-war years when a number of functional consolidations took place. In 1943, for instance, a county-wide public health department was created; in 1945, the Dade County Port Authority was established, bringing area airports and the principal seaport in Miami under county control. In the same year, state legislation consolidated ten separate Dade school districts into a single county-wide school system. In 1949, the city transferred Jackson Memorial Hospital, the area’s major public health care facility, to Dade County. Nevertheless, because of the fragmented municipal structure of the county, most governmental functions and services, if provided at all, were administered by the twenty-six separate cities in the metropolitan area.⁵

3. *Ibid.*, 53.

4. Franklin Parson, *The Story of the First Metropolitan Government in the United States* (Winter Park, 1958), 1.

5. Gustave Serino, *Miami’s Metropolitan Experiment* (Gainesville, 1958), 6-7; Edward Sofen, *The Miami Metropolitan Experiment* (New York, 1966), 17-26; James F. Horan and G. Thomas Taylor, Jr., *Experiments in Metropolitan Government* (New York, 1977), 91-92; Wolff, *Miami Metro*, 103-26.

TABLE 2
POPULATION DISTRIBUTION IN MIAMI SMSA,
CENTRAL CITY AND SUBURBAN FRINGE, 1940-1980

	1940		1950			1960			1970			1980		
	Popula- tion	% of Total SMSA	Popula- tion	% of Total SMSA	% of In- crease	Popula- tion	% of Total SMSA	% of In- crease	Popula- tion	% of Total SMSA	% of In- crease	Popula- tion	% of Total SMSA	% of In- crease
Miami	172,172	64.3	249,276	50.3	44.8	291,688	31.2	17.0	334,859	26.4	14.8	346,931	21.3	3.6
Suburban Municipalities	54,016	20.3	135,949	27.5	151.7	291,142	31.1	114.2	395,640	31.2	35.9	478,702	29.5	21.0
Unincorporated Areas	41,551	15.5	109,859	22.2	164.4	352,217	37.7	220.6	537,293	42.4	52.5	800,346	49.2	48.9
Total Dade County	267,739	100.0	495,084	100.0	84.9	935,047	100.0	88.9	1,267,792	100.0	35.6	1,625,979	100.0	28.3

Sources: Same as for Table 1.

The functional consolidations of the 1940s created an awareness among local political reformers that county government might serve as the vehicle for a consolidated metropolitan government. The growing sentiment for such a government led in post-war years to three major efforts to merge various municipalities with Dade County. In 1945, a plan proposed by Miami Mayor Leonard K. Thompson to merge Miami and its suburban municipalities into a single county-wide metropolitan government died in the Florida legislature.⁶ In another consolidation effort in 1948, Dade County voters rejected a plan to merge the county with Miami and four small municipalities.⁷ A 1953 referendum on a proposal to abolish the city of Miami and transfer its functions to the county failed by a very small margin.⁸ Political battle lines hardened during each of these consolidation efforts, with opponents seeking to protect local power and control, and supporters asserting the efficiency and economy of a consolidated metropolitan government.

The narrow loss in the 1953 referendum encouraged supporters of consolidation to push ahead. Supported by the local press, civic groups, and the Miami Chamber of Commerce, the Miami City Commission created a twenty-member Metropolitan Miami Municipal Board (3M Board) to study the feasibility of consolidation. The 3M Board, in turn, hired a Chicago consulting firm, the Public Administration Service (PAS), to research and report on the issue.⁹ The report essentially recommended a two-tiered metropolitan government—a federated structure in which existing municipalities retained certain local services and a new metropolitan government took over designated area-wide functions such as planning, mass transit, recreation, water and sewage, and health and welfare.¹⁰ The 3M Board accepted the PAS recommendations, then successfully guided a Dade County

6. *Miami Herald*, March 4, 6, 11, 16, April 5, 1945.

7. Horan and Taylor, *Experiments in Metropolitan Government*, 92-93; Sofen, *Miami Metropolitan Experiment*, 29-32.

8. *Miami Herald*, March 14, June 1, 8, 11, July 2, 1953; "Miamians to Vote on Abolishing City," *National Municipal Review*, XLII (June 1953), 290; "Miami Voters Reject Merger with County," *National Municipal Review*, XLII (July 1953), 347.

9. Serino, *Miami's Metropolitan Experiment*, 9-11; Sofen, *Miami Metropolitan Experiment*, 36-41.

10. Public Administration Service, *The Government of Metropolitan Miami* (Chicago, 1954), 87-111.

home-rule provision through the state legislature and a state-wide referendum. The legislature also established a Metropolitan Charter Board to draft a new county charter. In May 1957, by a narrow margin, county voters ratified the plan.¹¹

The new charter built upon the recommendations of the PAS report. It established the two-tier governmental system which conferred broad powers on the new county-wide metropolitan government and left a number of local functions to the individual municipalities. The powers of Dade's Metro government included mass transit and expressway building, health and welfare programs, parks and recreation, housing and urban renewal, air pollution control, beach erosion control, flood and drainage control, industrial promotion, water supply regulation, sewage and solid waste disposal regulation, libraries, uniform building codes, assessing and collecting taxes, comprehensive development plans, service provision in the unincorporated areas, and the setting of minimum standards for all governmental units in the county. The individual municipalities retained fire and police protection, regulation of taxes and alcoholic beverage sale, and the ability to exceed minimum county standards in zoning. No municipalities could be created, nor could existing municipalities make new annexations, without county approval. The new Metro government was headed by an eleven-member, non-partisan board of commissioners, some elected at-large and others by district for four-year terms (the commission was later expanded to thirteen and then reduced in 1963 to nine members elected at-large). One of the commissioners served as a figurehead mayor, but the chief administrator was a county manager, who served at the pleasure of the commission.¹² In July 1957, when the new charter went into effect, Miami acquired the nation's first metropolitan government.

-
11. "Dade County Home Rule Bill Approved," *National Municipal Review*, XLIV (July 1955), 374-75; Wendell G. Schaeffer, "Miami Looks at the Problems of Metropolitan Government," *Public Administration Review*, XV (Winter 1955), 35-38; "Greater Miami Gets Chance to Pioneer Area-wide Government," *Business Week* (November 17, 1956), 176-81; Harry T. Toulmin, "Charter Ratified in Dade County," *National Municipal Review*, XLVI (June 1957), 305-07; "Dade County and Miami Try Metropolitan Government," *Metropolitan Area Problems*, I (October-November 1957), 2.
 12. Harry T. Toulmin, "First Metropolitan Government Created," *Public Management*, XXXIX (July 1957), 151-53; Don Larsen, "Planning in Metropolitan Government," in *Planning 1958: Selected Papers from the*

In some ways, Dade's new Metro government represented a compromise between the "consolidationists" and the "localists." Consolidationists promoted abolition of the separate municipalities and the creation of a single super-government. By contrast, the localists sought to retain power at the municipal level, opposed the Metro idea, and fought to destroy it once it became a reality.

Good government reformers who supported Metro included Miami business and professional leaders, civic groups like the League of Women Voters, the *Miami Herald* and the *Miami News*, and the Dade County legislative delegation. Given the earlier failures to achieve consolidation, pro-Metro advocates pushed the federated, two-tiered approach as the only realistic means of getting an area-wide government for the Miami metropolitan region. They focused on the inadequacies of the existing municipal structure and emphasized the efficiency, tax savings, and better service which metropolitan government would bring. Although not the single, centralized super-government many consolidationists wanted, Metro government possessed broad and sweeping powers which cut across municipal boundaries and permitted a unified approach to area-wide problems.¹³

Defeated in the crucial 1957 referendum, the localists immediately began a sustained attack on the Metro government. Political scientist Edward Sofen identified the localists as the officials and employees of the individual municipalities (who feared loss of power and jobs), the Dade County League of Municipalities, several suburban newspapers, and various business and citizens groups in the smaller cities.¹⁴

National Planning Conference, Washington, D. C., May 18-22, 1958 (Chicago, 1958), 158-62; Gladys M. Kammerer, *The Changing Urban County* (Gainesville, 1963), 10-13; Aileen Lotz, "Metropolitan Dade County," in *Regional Governance: Promise and Performance* (Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Substate Regionalism and the Federal Government*, 5 vols., Washington, 1973), II, 6-16.

13. Sofen, *Miami Metropolitan Experiment*, 9-10, 74-91; O. W. Campbell, "Progress Report on Metropolitan Miami," *Public Management*, XLI (April 1959), 85-89; Harry T. Toulmin, "Metro and the Voters," in *Planning 1959: Selected Papers from the 25th Anniversary National Planning Conference, Minneapolis, May 10-14, 1959* (Chicago, 1959), 63-69. For a comparative study of metropolitan government campaigns in Miami, Cleveland, and St. Louis, see Scott Greer, *Metropolitics: A Study of Political Culture* (New York, 1963), and Jon C. Teaford, *City and Suburb: The Political Fragmentation of Metropolitan America, 1850-1970* (Baltimore, 1979), 175-82.
14. Sofen, *Miami Metropolitan Experiment*, 8; "Metro Faces Severe Test in

The attack on Metro took several forms. Many of the municipalities refused to cooperate with the new county government, and local political conflict became the order of the day. The localists also resorted to the courts, and by 1961 they had filed some 600 law suits challenging Metro authority. Miami Beach, for instance, took its case for retaining a separate traffic court all the way to the United States Supreme Court, but lost. As a result of its hostility to the new system, Miami Beach, along with the neighboring municipalities of Surfside, Golden Beach, Bal Harbour, and North Bay Village, tried to secede from Dade County in 1960, but without success. Miami Beach, which had adequate tax revenues and excellent municipal services, "resisted Metro to the bitter end."¹⁵

Localists also fought Metro by trying to dilute or undermine its power through amendments to the county charter. One such proposed amendment in 1958 would have restored autonomy to the municipalities, effectively nullifying metropolitan government. This autonomy amendment lost in a county-wide referendum, but the localists did not give up.¹⁶ Another serious anti-Metro challenge occurred in 1961, when a proposed amendment would have introduced thirty-seven changes in the charter, including abolition of the council-manager form of government and termination of Metro control of such county-wide functions as water supply, sewage, transportation, and planning. Dade voters also rejected this amendment, but in later years passed others curbing the county manager's broad powers.¹⁷

Dade County," *Metropolitan Area Problems*, I (December 1957-January 1958), 1, 4.

15. "Dade County Vote Pending Supreme Court Decision," *Metropolitan Area Problems*, I (February-March 1958), 5; *Miami Herald*, October 27, 1960; "Reprieve for Metro," *The Economist*, CCI (October 28, 1961), 336-38; Joseph Metzger, "Metro and Its Judicial History," *University of Miami Law Review*, XV (Spring 1961), 283-93; Sofen, *Miami Metropolitan Experiment*, 173-74.
16. "Dade County Referendum Upholds Miami Metro," *Metropolitan Area Problems*, I (September-October 1958), 1, 5; "Dade Co. Metro Charter Upheld," *National Municipal Review*, XLVII (November 1958), 515-16.
17. Thomas J. Wood, "Dade Charter Survives Test," *National Civic Review*, L (December 1961), 609-11; Irving G. McNayr, "All Pulling Together," *National Civic Review*, LI (March 1962), 135-38; Thomas J. Wood, "Basic Revisions in Dade Charter," *National Civic Review*, LIII (January 1964), 39-41; "New York, Florida Voters Pass Amendments," *Metropolitan Area Problems*, VI (November-December 1963), 1-2; John C. Bollens and Henry J. Schmandt, *The Metropolis: Its People, Politics, and Economic Life* (New York, 1965), 463-66.

Even some Metro advocates eventually became unhappy with what they had created. By the late 1960s, good government reformers began circulating petitions for a charter amendment eliminating the council-manager plan in favor of the strong mayor system. In 1970, John DeGrove published a report supporting stronger mayoral powers, hoping "to marry the best features of the strong mayor and council-manager plans."¹⁸ A charter revision commission in 1971 recommended a strong mayor plan, but voters rejected the idea in a 1972 referendum. In 1981, another charter revision commission revived the strong mayor plan in modified form.¹⁹

Political controversy has surrounded Miami's Metro government from the very beginning. Some supporters pushed for the unification of the county's twenty-seven cities and the unincorporated area into a single city. Others urged that all unincorporated territory be annexed to the ten or so major municipalities. Still others sought to merge the city of Miami with Metro.²⁰ Metro's first two county managers were forced out of office: one for pursuing consolidation too aggressively, and the other for being too conciliatory toward the municipalities.²¹ The expected tax savings promised by Metro advocates never materialized, and increased property tax assessments to pay for expanded services alienated many county voters. The tax matter was especially important, since the expectation of lower taxes, perhaps more than any other issue, helped swing Dade County voters in favor of the 1957 Metro charter. Throughout the 1960s and after, taxa-

-
18. John DeGrove, "Metropolitan Dade County: The Unfinished Experiment," *Florida Planning and Development*, XXI (July-August 1970), 5-6.
 19. For the 1971 charter revision effort, see Metropolitan Dade County, *Report and Recommendations of the Dade County Metropolitan Study Commission* (Miami, 1971); "Dade Co. Voters Reject Amendment," *National Civic Review*, LXI (May 1972), 254; "Strong Mayor Plan Defeated in Dade," *National Civic Review*, XLI (June 1972), 303. On the 1982 charter revision debate, see Dade County Charter Review Commission, *Interim Report* (Miami, 1982); "Dade County Reviews Charter," *National Civic Review*, VII (May 1982), 265-66.
 20. Irving G. McNayr, "Recommendations for Unified Government in Dade County," in Joseph F. Zimmerman, ed., *Government of the Metropolis* (New York, 1968), 191-99; DeGrove, "Metropolitan Dade County," 5.
 21. "Another Crisis for Metro," *Business Week* (February 18, 1961), 102; "Blow at Miami's Metro," *Business Week* (September 1, 1962), 92; Thomas J. Wood, "Dade Commission Dismisses a Manager," *National Civic Review*, LIII (October 1964), 498-99; Sofen, *Miami Metropolitan Experiment*, 243-52.

tion, planning, land use, and development policies stirred great controversy.²²

Localists continued the attack on Metro through the 1960s. Typically, in a statement before the National Commission on Urban Problems in 1967, former North Miami Mayor Arthur Snyder criticized the Metro idea as an undemocratic usurpation of local autonomy. "You are taking away government by the people on its lowest grass-roots level," Snyder contended, and thus Miami's Metro was "doomed to failure." Metro manager Porter Homer countered Snyder at the commission hearings, defending the Metro experiment as a regional approach to urban problems: "There can be no solution to the urban problem without a complete and heavy involvement of suburbia. . . . Without a governmental apparatus and structure which mandates the involvement of the suburban areas in our urban problems we are bound to fail."²³ Ten years after the introduction of Metro, controversy continued to impede the development of metropolitan government in Miami. As one study noted, "Miami Metro provides an example of how metropolitan government can breed extended conflict, even where it is successfully implemented."²⁴

But while political conflict between Metro and the municipalities continued, Metro consolidated its powers and began to provide indispensable services. As early as 1965, for instance, Dan Paul, a Miami attorney who had played a key role in writing the Metro charter, expressed surprise "that so much has been accomplished" despite localist opposition. He emphasized especially Metro's achievements in expressway building and mass transit improvements, modernized law enforcement procedures, countywide development and land use planning, a uniform building code, strict pollution controls, efficient budgetary practices, vastly improved social services, and the streamlined administration of urban government.²⁵ Metro had lost some battles,

22. Lotz, "Metropolitan Dade County," 11-12; Robert L. Bish, *The Public Economy of Metropolitan Areas* (Chicago, 1971), 94-103; Richard D. Gustely, "The Allocation and Distributional Impacts of Governmental Consolidation: The Dade County Experience," *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, XII (March 1977), 349-64.

23. *Hearings Before the National Commission on Urban Problems*, 5 vols. (Washington, July-August 1967), III, 297-304.

24. Horan and Taylor, *Experiments in Metropolitan Government*, 99.

25. D. P. S. Paul, "Metropolitan Dade County Government: A Review of Accomplishments," in Zimmerman, ed., *Government of the Metropolis*, 200-07.

one writer suggested in 1965, "but it seems to have won the war."²⁶ By the end of the 1970s, according to a recent analysis, Metro enjoyed "general acceptance, or at least tolerance, both in the cities and in the unincorporated area." Proposed changes in the Metro charter are no longer "challenges to the supremacy of countywide government," but rather "adaptations to the times."²⁷

The Miami metropolitan area has changed considerably since the initiation of Metro government, particularly in the racial and ethnic composition of the population (Table 3). With the civil rights movement and the large-scale registration of black voters, Miami's blacks became an important political force in the late 1960s and 1970s. The arrival of several hundred thousand Cuban refugees after 1959 has also brought irreversible change to Dade County. At first most Cuban newcomers hoped to return to their homeland, but by the 1970s most had given up that dream and pursued success in America instead. As the Cubans became American citizens, they too began to acquire and exercise political power. By 1984, even the Haitians— the most recent newcomers— had begun to register as voters and to organize politically.²⁸

Finally, the continued rapid population growth of the Miami metropolitan area, particularly on the unincorporated fringes of the county, resulted in new political realities. In 1950, only twenty-two per cent of Dade County's population resided in unincorporated territory, but by 1980 some 800,000 people, or just about half of the county's population, lived outside of any municipality (Table 2). For these Miamians, Metro is the only local government, and the unincorporated portion of Dade County is larger than any city in Florida.

These changes have altered significantly the balance of metropolitan political power. Black and Cuban voters have begun to play a decisive role in some local elections, often determining the outcome. Cubans are politically powerful in Miami, Hialeah, and such small cities as Sweetwater and West Miami. Blacks control the government of Opalocka and have had a decisive impact in Miami city elections in 1981 and 1983.²⁹

26. Edward C. Banfield, *Big City Politics* (New York, 1965), 106.

27. Juanita Greene, "Dade Metro: Turbulent History, Uncertain Future," *Planning*, XLV (February 1979), 16.

28. *Miami Herald*, January 31, 1984.

29. On Cubans in Miami politics, see Paul S. Salter and Robert C. Mings,

TABLE 3
COMPOSITION OF POPULATION OF MIAMI SMSA,
1940-1980

	1940		1950		1960		1970		1980	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Total Population	267,739	100.0	495,084	100.0	935,047	100.0	1,267,792	100.0	1,625,979	100.0
White	217,909	81.4	429,692	86.8	796,054	85.0	1,071,662	84.5	1,262,518	77.7
Black	49,518	18.5	64,947	13.1	137,299	14.7	189,666	15.0	280,379	17.2
Hispanic*	NA	-	20,000	4.0	50,000	5.3	299,217	23.6	581,030	35.7
Other Races	312	.1	445	.1	1,694	.2	6,464	.5	83,082	5.1

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Population, II, Characteristics of the Population*, Part 2 (Washington, 1943), 50; U.S. Bureau of Census, *Census of Population: 1950, II, Characteristics of the Population*, Part 10, *Florida* (Washington, 1952), 56; U.S. Bureau of Census, *Census of Population: 1960, I, Characteristics of the Population*, Part 11, *Florida* (Washington, 1963), 106; U.S. Bureau of Census, *Census of Population: 1970, I, Characteristics of the Population*, Part 11, *Florida*, Section 1 (Washington, 1973), 78; U.S. Bureau of Census, *Census of Population: 1970, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Final Report PC (1)-C11, Florida* (Washington, 1972), 335; U.S. Bureau of Census, *1980 Census of Population and Housing, Advance Reports, PHC80-V-11, Florida, Final Population and Housing Unit Counts* (Washington, 1981), 5. Hispanic totals for 1950 and 1960 are estimates taken from "Housing Plan, Miami Metropolitan Area" (Metropolitan Dade County Planning Department, March 1978), 6.

*Hispanic is not a race category. Totals for Hispanic are included in white and black categories.

Yet because the Metro Commission is elected by county-wide vote, the power of the ethnic blocs is considerably diluted. As of 1984, blacks have been able to fill through election only one seat on the commission; Hispanics elected their first commissioner in 1982. Spokesmen in both the black and Hispanic communities are challenging the existing structural arrangements which have long made Metro government the exclusive domain of Miami's white power elite.

Similarly, the rising population of the unincorporated area has eclipsed the power of the existing cities and municipalities. Earlier conflicts over Metro government pitted the reformer-consolidationists against the localist politicians and the small cities which resisted county-wide government. In the 1970s and 1980s, the political conflict has taken on new and somewhat different dimensions. Consolidationists and Metro supporters are now fighting off local interest groups such as the Kendall Federation of Homeowners Associations, the New City Political Action Committee, and the Spanish-American League Against Discrimination— groups which generally accept the idea of metropolitan government but want a larger share or a redistribution of decision-making power. These local interest groups are often organized by race or ethnicity or neighborhood. The central city-suburban conflicts of the 1950s and 1960s have yielded in the 1970s and 1980s to a new kind of spatial politics— an urban territoriality in which municipal boundaries have little importance.³⁰ Indeed, the 1980s promise to be a decade of ethnic and spatial politics in Miami and in metropolitan areas throughout the United States. Recent conflicts in the Miami area, particularly over the issue of Metro charter revision, have revealed the essential outlines of these politics of the future.

"The Projected Impact of Cuban Settlement on Voting Patterns in Metropolitan Miami, Florida," *Professional Geographer*, XXIV (May 1972), 123-31, and Kathy A. Darasz, "Cuban Refugees in Miami: Patterns of Economic and Political Adjustment" (master's thesis, Florida Atlantic University, 1982). On black voting power, see *Miami News*, February 9, 1981; *Miami Herald*, September 12, 1982; *Miami Times*, November 12, 1981, November 17, 1983.

30. For an analysis of this pattern nationwide, see Carl Abbott, *The New Urban America: Growth and Politics in Sunbelt Cities* (Chapel Hill, 1981), 13-14, 182-240. Also suggestive are Kevin Phillips, "The Balkanization of America," *Harper's*, CCLVI (May 1978), 37-47, and Theodore H. White, "New Powers, New Politics," *New York Times Magazine* (February 5, 1984), 2-28, 32-34, 50-51.

One of the persistently controversial Metro issues has been the number and method of election of the Metro commissioners. According to Franklin Parson, one of the drafters of the Metro charter, "A great amount of time was consumed [by the original Metropolitan Charter Board] deciding whether . . . the commission should be elected at large or by districts." In addition, Parson has noted, the size of the commission "was deliberated with great intensity." On both issues, "the final decision was a compromise."³¹ As noted earlier, the original charter called for eleven commissioners: five elected at large, five elected from districts, and one from each city of over 60,000 population. At first, only Miami qualified for a commissioner on the basis of population. But after the 1960 census, both Miami Beach and Hialeah qualified and selected Metro commissioners, thus increasing the commission's size to thirteen.

The controversy over the Metro Commission continued into the 1960s. A 1962 Charter Review Board recommended a charter amendment reducing the Metro Commission to nine members elected at-large. The commission rejected this recommendation, but in 1963 permitted a county referendum on a slightly different amendment— a nine-member commission, eight residing in newly-established districts and the ninth, the mayor, who might reside anywhere in the county. All nine commissioners would be elected at-large. The voters approved this charter change, and the new commission took office in February 1964.³²

The debate over the make-up and method of election of the commission reflects one of the classic controversies in local government. Supporters of the district method of election contend that this procedure permits a greater degree of representativeness, that it gives the voters a greater sense of participating in their government, and that it is more democratic. At the same time, depending on the size of the individual districts, it makes possible the election of candidates from ethnic and minority groups which tend to be residentially concentrated in certain sections of the metropolitan area.

Advocates of the at-large method of election, by contrast, argue that the district system encourages a kind of particularistic politics in which elected representatives look out for their local

31. Parson, *Story of the First Metropolitan Government*, 5.

32. Sofen, *Miami Metropolitan Experiment*, 194-97, 202-07.

constituents, but tend to disregard the interests of the whole community. At-large proponents prefer smaller elected councils with a city-wide outlook as a more efficient and decisive body less influenced by the shifting tides of local politics. These kinds of conflicts began to emerge during the municipal reform campaigns of the Progressive Era.³³ Clearly, they are still with us today. The original Metro charter was a compromise between the two opposing positions, but the 1963 charter amendment represented a victory for the at-large method and, according to most analysts, for the consolidationists who sought to undermine the political clout of localist opponents.³⁴

Although victorious in 1963, the supporters of the at-large election system have been fighting a rear-guard action ever since. A second Charter Revision Commission, which deliberated during 1970 and 1971, confronted the at-large or district issue, among others. In 1971, the commission urged the establishment of a strong mayor system, which would have eliminated the Metro manager as the county's chief executive officer. It also recommended other changes, including the creation of "service districts" to provide a true two-tier government in the unincorporated areas. But the most significant recommendation was to scrap the at-large election system. Instead, the Charter Review Commission wanted the Metro Commission increased to fourteen members, eleven elected from separate districts and three at-large. Election by districts, the commission contended, "makes local legislators more responsive and more accessible to the people they represent and is, therefore, more democratic." In addition, this election method more accurately represented "minority group interests." The mayor and the vice-mayor, the latter a new position, were not members of the Metro Commission under this plan, which would have introduced a sharp separation between legislative and executive functions.³⁵

33. On Progressive Era municipal reform, see Samuel P. Hays, "The Politics of Reform in Municipal Government in the Progressive Era," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, LV (October 1964), 157-69; Martin J. Schiesl, *The Politics of Efficiency: Municipal Administration and Reform in America, 1880-1920* (Berkeley, 1977), 133-48, 189-98; Bradley R. Rice, *Progressive Cities: The Commission Government Movement in America, 1901-1920* (Austin, 1977), 77-83; Ernest S. Griffith, *A History of American City Government: The Progressive Years and Their Aftermath, 1900-1920* (New York, 1974), 50-66, 130-31.

34. Sofen, *Miami Metropolitan Experiment*, 204.

35. Metropolitan Dade County, *Report and Recommendations of the Dade*

A referendum in March 1972 rejected all of the proposed amendments of the 1971 Charter Revision Commission.³⁶ Clearly, the consolidationists still held the upper hand. The voting power of the black community had not yet been fully organized, and the Cubans were only beginning to achieve citizenship and voting rights. Moreover, most Cubans still resided in the city of Miami; their attention was generally riveted on Miami politics rather than on Metro issues. Ethnic and neighborhood politics was still somewhat diffuse and no match for the powerful political and business groups which opposed any move toward decentralized government, local autonomy, and a more widely shared decision-making.

In January 1982, a third Charter Review Commission presented yet another analysis of Metro government. Headed by Dan Paul, who had helped write the original Metro charter, this latest study group grappled with many of the same issues which had plagued earlier review commissions. The commission's final report, however, did little to satisfy those seeking a greater measure of local autonomy or local representation. This latest commission proposed that Dade County be re-named Miami County, recommended the retention of the commission-manager system, and supported a "modified strong-mayor plan." Like the 1971 charter revision board, this new commission sought to strengthen the two-tier concept of local government through the creation of "limited purpose municipal units" (LPMUs) in the unincorporated areas. These LPMUs would provide local service in the same way that Dade County's twenty-seven cities provided municipal government for their citizens.³⁷

The big issue, once again, was the size and method of electing the Metro Commission. This issue, stimulating "lively debate," generated the most discussion at Charter Review Commission meetings. However, with two members dissenting, the commission ultimately urged the retention of the existing at-large system without change. The commission made this recommendation despite the overwhelming support of citizens' groups for the adop-

County Metropolitan Study Commission (Miami, 1971), 6. DeGrove, "Metropolitan Dade County," 6, recommended a twenty-member Metro Commission, fifteen elected from districts and five elected at-large.

36. *Miami Herald*, March 15, 1972.

37. Charter Review Commission, *Interim Report*, 1-4, 22, 33-34.

tion of a district system or a combination of district and at-large seats. In hearings before the commission, groups as diverse as the League of Women Voters, Common Cause, New City Political Action Committee, Kendall Federation of Homeowners Associations, and the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce advocated the combined district and at-large electoral method. The Dade County League of Cities, long the opponent of Metro's centralized government, also supported the combined election system, as well as a true two-tier system of local government. The NAACP and the Florida State Committee on Hispanic Affairs, among other organizations, advanced the district election system.³⁸

The local press and some political leaders also entered the fray, calling for an end to at-large commission elections. The *Miami Herald* editorialized in favor of combined elections: "In a community so geographically large and of such diverse population, it is . . . unwise to cling rigidly to the practice of countywide election of all commissioners."³⁹ Similarly, the *Miami News* asserted "the need for more direct representation within the government of Metropolitan Dade County."⁴⁰ Barbara Carey, the Metro Commission's only black member, supported an eleven-member commission, ten elected from districts and a mayor elected county-wide. Under the existing at-large system, Carey argued, "it's almost impossible for a minority candidate to win a countywide election unless that person is an incumbent or has very high visibility."⁴¹ Muddying the waters a bit, Mitchell Wolfson of the original Metro charter board and William Frates who chaired the 1971 charter revision study both advocated a change to the district election system. "In view of the present fragmented ethnic and economic nature of the various municipalities," Wolfson wrote in November 1981, "I feel it would be best to have county commissioners elected by district."⁴²

Opposition to the Charter Review Commission position mounted quickly, and there was a strong ethnic dimension to this opposition. Two members of the review commission-Albert C. Ferguson, a black member, and Maria Elena Torano, a Hispanic

35. *Ibid.*, 23-31, 131-34; *Miami News*, July 17, September 4, 16, 1981.

39. *Miami Herald*, December 18,

40. *Miami News*, October 5, 1981.

41. *Ibid.*, June 28, 1982; *Miami Times*, July 1, 1982.

42. Charter Review Commission, *Interim Report*, 134; *Miami Herald*, November 12, 1981.

member—filed a minority report on the issue. Ferguson advocated a fifteen-member commission, with the mayor and six others elected at-large and eight from districts. Torano wanted a fourteen-member commission, half elected county-wide and half by district. The minority report noted that “various segments of this tri-ethnic community feel that they have no direct participation in County affairs.” The district system would be fairer for the county’s ethnic and minority groups, whose representatives often lacked visibility and funds to campaign effectively on a county-wide basis. “This cannot be taken lightly,” the minority report concluded.⁴³

Most of the Metro commissioners, however, came out against the idea of district elections or a combination of district and at-large elections. The general view of the commission was that district elections would, as one commissioner noted, “polarize the community.” Even George Valdes, the commission’s lone Hispanic member, advocated retention of at-large elections. “I sincerely believe county business is countywide business,” Valdes said. The majority of the commissioners also opposed the establishment of LPMUs because more municipalities would be created. To decentralize further in this way, commissioner Clara Oesterle contended, would be “regressing instead of moving ahead.”⁴⁴

Similarly, Metro manager Merrett Stierheim opposed the LPMU concept and the single-member district system of election. Speaking before the Charter Revision Commission, he asserted that the district system was “contrary to the concept of Metro government,” and that it would “balkanize” Dade County politics. An advocate of consolidated political authority, Stierheim was clearly uncomfortable with the idea of relinquishing power through decentralizing structural changes in the Metro charter.⁴⁵ The stated views of Metro commissioners and of the Metro manager against district elections presaged the outcome of the charter review process.

43. Charter Review Commission, *Interim Report*, 124-29; *Miami News*, December 19, 1981. See also Albert K. Karnig, “Black Representation on City Councils: The Impact of District Elections and Socioeconomic Factors,” *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, XII (December 1976), 223-42.

44. *Miami News*, February 18, June 28, 1982.

45. Charter Review Commission, *Interim Report*, 134; *Miami News*, October 2, 1981.

The method by which the Charter Review Commission was selected provides some insight into the nature of Metro politics and partially explains the unwillingness of the review board to initiate structural change. In December 1980, the Metro Commission implemented the five-year review requirement of the Dade County charter (a provision added to the charter in a 1976 referendum), voting to create the Charter Review Commission. The resolution permitted each commissioner to select one member of the review panel. As the *Miami News* pointed out, it was a procedure which smacked of "politics as usual." Each individual appointment tended to reflect the position of the commissioner making the selection. Not surprisingly, given the method, the ethnic and racial makeup of the Charter Review Commission duplicated the Metro Commission, each body having one black and one Hispanic member. Clearly, the Anglo majority on the charter review board began its work with a predilection against decentralizing structural changes in Metro government. As early as October 1981, the *Miami News* reported that the review board was "receiving go-slow signals from some Metro commissioners." All of this suggested that there was little chance that the revision process would lead to district elections or other decentralizing structural change.⁴⁶

In the spring of 1982, as it became clear that the Metro Commission would reject the district election amendment, a new organization made its appearance—Citizens for Accountable Metro. Spearheaded by the Kendall Federation of Homeowners Associations, the new localist coalition of seventeen groups sought to force the Metro Commission to permit a referendum on the district election question. Citizens for Accountable Metro advocated an eleven-member commission, seven elected by district and four county-wide, including the mayor. "District elections are essential in a diverse community such as Dade," the group's leaders argued in an article in the *Miami Herald*; this was the only electoral method by which black and Hispanic voters could obtain "fair representation." But despite intense lobbying by citizens groups, in July 1982 the Metro Commission voted six to three against submitting the election question to the voters in November. As the *Miami News* editorialized after the vote, the Metro

46. "Dade Voters Approve Charter Amendments," *National Civic Review*, LXV (December 1976), 570-71; *Miami News*, May 26, October 5, 1981.

Commission responded to "the pressure of established political power brokers" and appeared "more concerned with protecting its own interests than with responding to citizens' needs."⁴⁷ A last-minute petition drive to obtain 70,000 signatures and place the issue on the November 1982 ballot failed.

Interestingly, as the controversy over ethnic representation on the Metro Commission heated up, a different sort of ethnic issue emerged in Miami. Perhaps not coincidentally, charter revision debates developed in 1982 in Miami, where Mayor Maurice Ferre has been seeking structural changes in city government. Ferre appointed an advisory charter revision panel, headed by the same Dan Paul who had chaired the Metro charter revision board. Ferre is particularly interested in creating a strong mayor system, enlarging the Miami City Commission from five to seven or nine, and switching from the at-large to the district or combined system of electing city commissioners. Reflecting Miami's large Cuban population—almost fifty-six per cent in 1980 (Table 4)—the current five-member Miami City Commission, all elected at-large, is dominated by three Hispanics. Ferre, of Puerto Rican descent, is afraid that the continued growth of the Cuban population will result in an all-Cuban city commission in the near future. "It's important to have a balanced commission," Ferre noted recently. "There will be a much better government if different ethnic groups are represented." The district system, Ferre argues, will maintain minority representation on the city commission for Miami's blacks and Anglos (or non-Hispanic whites).⁴⁸ Suggesting the surge of Cuban voting power, Ferre himself barely survived electoral challenges from Cubans Manolo Rebozo and Xavier Suárez in the 1981 and 1983 city elections.

Despite Ferre's stand against the at-large system, the proposed charter changes were rejected by the voters in 1982.⁴⁹ Ironically,

47. *Miami News*, June 28, July 7, 8, 1982; *Miami Herald*, July 5, 7, 1982; *Miami Times*, July 8, 1982.

48. *Miami Herald*, May 9, June 10, 1982; *Miami News*, May 19, 20, July 20, 22, 24, 1982.

49. *Miami News*, November 2, 1982. Interestingly, in January 1984, Ferre may have begun laying the groundwork for a wider political base. In a speech to a group of journalists, he outlined a number of structural changes for the Metro government. Metro was not working effectively in its present form, Ferre argued, and "should be junked like a 25-year-old car." Echoing the charter revision debates of earlier years, Ferre rec-

TABLE 4
COMPOSITION OF POPULATION IN THE TEN LARGEST MIAMI SMSA
MUNICIPALITIES AND IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA, 1980

	Total Population	White	% White	Black	% Black	Hispanic	% Hispanic
Miami	346,931	231,069	66.6	87,110	25.1	194,087	55.9
Hialeah	145,254	131,164	90.3	2,143	1.5	107,908	74.3
Miami Beach	96,298	93,170	96.8	894	.9	21,408	22.2
Coral Gables	43,241	40,202	93.0	1,770	4.1	12,794	29.6
North Miami	42,566	39,240	92.2	1,597	3.8	6,252	14.7
North Miami Beach	36,481	33,697	92.4	1,845	5.1	3,521	9.7
Homestead	20,668	14,003	67.8	5,278	25.5	3,315	16.0
Opa-locka	14,460	4,576	31.6	9,182	63.5	2,449	16.9
Miami Springs	12,350	11,947	96.7	68	.5	2,607	21.1
South Miami	10,884	7,340	67.4	3,254	29.9	1,596	14.7
Unincorporated Area	800,346	605,900	75.7	162,909	20.4	209,365	26.2

Source: US. Bureau of Census, *1980 Census of Population and Housing, Advance Reports, PHC80-V-11, Florida, Final Population and Housing Unit Counts* (Washington, 1981), 5, 14-18.

the at-large election system works against Hispanics at the Metro level, but works in their favor in Miami where they are a majority of the population. Equally ironical, the traditional white power elite opposes district elections for Dade County as yielding too much power to black and Hispanic minorities, but sees the same sort of districting as a means of maintaining access to political power for themselves in the city of Miami.

The charter revision controversy in Metropolitan Dade County reflects the emergence of a new ethnic and spatial politics. Black and Hispanic organizations, as well as white neighborhood groups, have begun to challenge Metro government as distant, unresponsive, and unrepresentative. For these groups, the at-large election of Metro commissioners symbolized all that was wrong with metropolitan government. The push to obtain district elections became a sort of panacea for those who thought themselves disfranchised by the existing structure of Metro government. The charter revision debates built upon a series of ethnic and territorial issues which have come to dominate recent urban politics in the Miami metropolitan area. Three separate but nevertheless connected controversies illuminate this pattern of contemporary urban politics.

One such territorial controversy emerged in the wake of the Liberty City race riot of May 1980. Much of the Liberty City black ghetto lies in unincorporated Dade County and is thus serviced by Metro. Liberty City blacks have long complained about bad housing, police brutality, inadequate schools and recreational facilities, and poor transit and other municipal services in the ghetto.⁵⁰ One black member serves on the Metro Commission, but blacks clearly have insufficient political clout at the Metro level to obtain improvements in delivery of services. Thus, some Liberty City community leaders have been seeking

ommended that the county's twenty-seven municipalities be abolished and replaced by five to seven service districts. Under his plan, the existing Metro Commission would be replaced by a full-time county legislature of seventeen or nineteen members, all elected by district. Finally, the appointed county manager would be replaced by an elected chief executive. With perhaps a bit of sarcasm, *Miami Herald* political writer Geoffrey Tomb noted that Ferre "made no proposals as to who the new county boss should be." *Miami Herald*, January 20, 1984.

50. United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Confronting Racial Isolation in Miami* (Washington, 1982).

to create through incorporation a new fifteen-square-mile municipality with a population of just over 100,000.

Black supporters of the plan view this so-called "New City" as a means of acquiring local political power, a community-controlled police force, and a higher level of municipal services. "The bottom line is self determination for Black folks," contended one leader of the New City Political Action Committee. New City, he asserted, "would provide better services because the people who live in the area would be in charge of it. The [Metro] commissioners in charge of the area now live in Miami Beach and North Miami and they take care of those areas."⁵¹ Another supporter, also noting the inadequate provision of services by Metro, envisioned New City as a positive step forward in representative government: "The New City will mean that the people of this area will have some economic and political power for the first time in [their] lives."⁵²

New City opponents focused on the weak fiscal base of the Liberty City area and the new and higher property taxes that would have to be levied to provide an adequate level of municipal services. But despite strong support for New City in some quarters, in September 1981 the Metro Commission voted against submitting the plan to the voters in a referendum. Clearly, the New City controversy reflected the new territorial and spatial politics of the 1980s. Miami blacks sought decentralized local government for the Liberty City community, while the Metro Commission rejected this challenge to metropolitan government.⁵³

A second territorial conflict revolved around the Metro decision to build low-income public housing in an affluent white neighborhood in West Kendall, an unincorporated area in south-west Dade County. The so-called "Hammocks" project had its origins in 1975, when a Canadian developer was given permission to build 8,000 single-family homes if he also allocated twenty-six acres for 120 units of publicly-supported, low-income housing. As the first thirty-six units of the public housing were about to be started, white neighborhood groups in the Kendall area began pressuring the Metro Commission to halt the project. White

51. *Miami Times*, July 30, 1981.

52. *Ibid.*, July 23, 1981.

53. *Miami Herald*, September 18, 24, 1981; *Miami News*, September 21, 22, 24, 25, 1981.

homeowners did not want blacks moving into public housing in their community. In July 1981, bowing to the political opposition mounted by the Kendall Federation of Homeowners Associations and other neighborhood groups, the Metro Commission reversed its earlier decision and abandoned the public housing project in the Hammocks. Blacks were outraged and West Kendall residents pleased, but the controversy reminded both sides that local neighborhood and minority group interests were often hostage to Metro decision-making.⁵⁴

The recent conflict over bilingualism in Dade County also illustrates the emerging pattern of local politics in the Miami area. In 1973, reflecting the demographic changes in the Miami metropolitan area, the Metro Commission officially made Dade County bilingual.⁵⁵ As a result, most Metro agencies hired Hispanics, official documents were published in English and Spanish, informational signs were made bilingual, and some bilingual programs were introduced into the public schools.

However, by 1980, and particularly after the arrival of 125,000 new Cuban refugees in the Mariel boatlift, a ground swell of Anglo opposition to bilingualism had begun to emerge. Using the petition process, an Anglo group, Citizens of Dade United, forced a county-wide referendum on a proposed anti-bilingualism ordinance. The key section of the ordinance proposed that "the expenditure of county funds for the purpose of utilizing any language other than English, or promoting any culture other than that of the United States, is prohibited. All county government meetings, hearings, and publications shall be in the English language only."⁵⁶

The attack on bilingualism mobilized the Hispanic community as never before. The Spanish American League Against Discrimination led the opposition to the anti-bilingualism ordinance, but without success. In November 1980, in what the *Miami Herald* described as an "ethnic-line vote," Dade County voters approved the ordinance by a substantial majority. Some political analysts suggested that the bilingualism issue reflected a new sort of ethnic polarization in Miami. It also suggested that

54. *Miami Herald*, July 15, 19, 1981; *Miami News*, July 22, 23, 1981; *Miami Times*, July 23, 30, 1981.

55. *New York Times*, April 18, 1973.

56. *Miami Herald*, August 3, September 30, October 7, 26, 1980; *Miami Diario Las Americas*, July 25, August 10, October 23, November 7, 1980.

the existing structural framework of metropolitan government was unable to contain or accommodate the increasingly divisive ethnic and territorial politics of the 1980s.⁵⁷

As these three separate controversies suggest, urban politics in the Miami metropolitan area has taken on new dimensions in recent years. Citizens have been lobbying and organizing to defend their perceived ethnic interests and to protect their territorial space. Metro government, with its wider regional vision of urban problems, generally has been identified as the *bête noire* in this new pattern of ethnic and spatial politics. The recent charter revision debate, and particularly the question of substituting district for at-large elections, reflects this new political reality in metropolitan Miami. It is no coincidence that the district election plan was supported strongly by the New City Political Action Committee, the Kendall Federation of Homeowners Association, and the Spanish American League Against Discrimination.

In some respects, the localist-consolidationist battle of Metro's early days has been replicated, but in new and different ways. A new set of political actors representing neighborhood and ethnic groups has replaced the formerly outspoken defenders of the municipalities; indeed, the rising issues of the 1980s seem to have little relationship to existing municipal boundaries. Urban space, particularly in Dade County's huge unincorporated area, now has been divided according to ethnicity, race, and economic class.⁵⁸ Superseding earlier dissension between central city interests and the small suburban municipalities, these new divisions have become the stuff of urban politics in the Miami area. Metro has grown and prospered and delivered increasingly effective government during its quarter century of existence. But two decades of dramatic demographic change is beginning to have a telling effect on the socio-politics of the Miami metropolitan area. It seems unlikely that Metro will survive the new urban politics of the 1980s without fundamental structural revision.

57. *Miami Herald*, November 5, 1980.

58. Suggestive on this issue is Morton D. Winsberg, "Ethnic Competition for Residential Space in Miami, Florida, 1970-80," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, XIII (July 1983), 305-14.

GENERAL JOSEPH B. WALL AND LYNCH LAW IN TAMPA

by ROBERT P. INGALLS

ON Monday morning, March 6, 1882, the news spread quickly through Tampa, a normally sleepy community of some 1,000 people. During the previous night a man had broken into the home of a prominent family living just outside town. After stealing several small items, the intruder had assaulted a young woman of the family. According to subsequent press reports, the attacker had fled before actually raping the victim, but clues to his identity, including a knife left at the scene, put Sheriff D. Isaac Craft and a posse on his trail the following morning.¹ With Tampans gripped by feelings of shock and outrage, the sheriff returned at about one o'clock that afternoon with the alleged attacker, Charles D. Owens, a white transient of about thirty who had worked at odd jobs around town.²

The expeditious arrest and imprisonment of the suspect did not satisfy many Tampans, a number of whom began to gather immediately on a street near the jail. Within an hour the angry crowd grew to over 100 people, and cries rang out to hang the prisoner. Someone called for a vote, and all those in favor were asked to step forward. Nearly everyone did. A group of about twenty men went to Sheriff Craft's home where they forced him to turn over the keys to the jail. The mob then marched on the

Robert P. Ingalls is associate professor of history, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida.

1. Tampa *Sunland Tribune*, March 9, 1882; Tallahassee *Weekly Floridian*, March 14, 1882. Neither the victim nor her family was identified by name in the Tampa newspaper accounts or the court records, but a Bartow newspaper revealed in passing that the victim was "a very estimable young lady—Miss McCarty—sister to Mrs. John McKay." This apparently referred to Ada McCarty, the twenty-five-year-old daughter of Mitchell McCarty, one of Tampa's leading businessmen who had died in 1858. *Bartow Informant*, March 11, 1882.
2. All the court records generated by this case identify the attacker as "one John," but all newspaper accounts refer to him as Charles D. Owens. Several initial reports also identified him as a recent immigrant from England. *Bartow Informant*, March 11, 1882; Tallahassee *Weekly Floridian*, March 14, 1882.

jail, seized the prisoner, and carried him to a large oak tree across the street from the courthouse. While the terrified man pleaded for mercy, a noose was placed around his neck, and he was put on a cart drawn up under the tree. When the cart was pulled out, the rope slipped, and the screaming victim fell harmlessly to the ground. Six men immediately grabbed the other end of the rope and pulled Owens up to his death. The crowd slowly dispersed, but the body was left hanging until sunset.³ An observer called the lynching, "one of the most awful tragedies that I have ever witnessed, and the like of which had not occurred in the United States in the past twenty-four years."⁴

In fact, mob violence was common in late nineteenth-century America. During Reconstruction lynch law claimed the lives of many victims, and despite some temporary improvement in the South due to a federal crackdown, lynching remained a national problem, especially in southern and western states.⁵ In 1882, Charles Owens was one of 113 people known to have been lynched, and the annual total rose to a peak of 230 by 1892.⁶ Although details of many of these extralegal executions are unknown, evidence indicates that lynching was usually a purposeful, organized action, often involving community leaders, rather than an uncontrolled outburst by unthinking rabble.⁷ Since lynch mobs usually enjoyed local support, their members were rarely prosecuted for the crimes they committed.⁸ As a result, it is difficult to document the makeup of such groups, especially those that organized to stage a single execution.⁹ The 1882 lynching of

-
3. Tampa *Sunland Tribune*, March 9, 1882; *Savannah Morning News*, March 14, 1882; Tallahassee *Weekly Floridian*, March 14, 1882; *Ex Parte Wall*, 107 U.S. 265 (1882). These sources contain almost identical eye-witness accounts of the lynching.
 4. Tallahassee *Weekly Floridian*, March 14, 1882.
 5. Allen W. Trelease, *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction* (New York, 1971), passim; James Elbert Cutler, *Lynch-Law: An Investigation into the History of Lynching in the United States* (New York, 1905; reprint ed., Montclair, N.J., 1969), 137-92.
 6. Robert L. Zangrando, *The NAACP Crusade Against Lynching, 1909-1950* (Philadelphia, 1980), 6.
 7. The most insightful analysis of the literature on lynching and its meaning is Jacquelyn Dowd Hall, *Revolt Against Chivalry: Jessie Daniel Ames and the Women's Campaign Against Lynching* (New York, 1979), 129-57.
 8. Cutler, *Lynch-Law*, 12-136, 276; Richard Maxwell Brown, *Strain of Violence: Historical Studies of American Violence and Vigilantism* (New York, 1975), 95-103.
 9. For study of a single Florida lynching, see James R. McGovern, *Anatomy of a Lynching: The Killing of Claude Neal* (Baton Rouge, 1982).

Charles Owens in Tampa provides a means of testing various theories about the nature of lynching because it was highly publicized and it produced a court case that led to a United States Supreme Court decision related to the incident.

Although superseding local law enforcement authorities, the Tampa mob that lynched Charles Owens operated with impunity, displaying no fear of possible punishment. The local response proved that the lynchers had little reason to take any precautions. Despite the fact that the hanging occurred in the center of town at about 2:30 in the afternoon, surviving newspaper accounts give the impression that members of the mob were faceless and nameless. The columns of Tampa's *Sunland Tribune* were largely devoted to a defense of lynch law. The state circuit court, which had jurisdiction over criminal cases and was in session in Tampa at the time, took no notice of the lynching.¹⁰ On the contrary, the grand jury included in its final report at the end of the month a statement congratulating the people of Hillsborough County on "the marked absence of crime in our midst."¹¹

However, another court was also in session in Tampa on the day of the lynching, and it took prompt action against a leader of the mob. Exercising both district and circuit court jurisdiction, the United States Court for the Southern District of Florida was meeting under the presiding judge, James W. Locke, who had held the position for ten years. Locke later reported that when he recessed his court for lunch at approximately one o'clock on March 6, he noticed a prisoner being brought to jail. Upon returning about an hour later, he found the dead body of the same man hanging from a tree in front of the courthouse. Later that afternoon, reliable witnesses informed Judge Locke that a leading Tampan, General Joseph Baisden Wall, had actively participated in the lynching.¹² Wall, a resident of Tampa since 1872, was a thirty-five-year-old practicing lawyer who had held the position of state attorney from 1874 to 1878. He had

10. Although lynching, or participation in mob violence, was not a crime under either common law or Florida statutes, anyone who took part in a lynching presumably could have been charged with related criminal offenses, such as kidnapping or murder. James Harmon Chadborn, *Lynching and the Law* (Chapel Hill, 1933), 29; Cutler, *Lynch-Law*, 227-52.

11. Tampa *Sunland Tribune*, April 6, 1882.

12. *Ex Parte Wall*, 107 U.S. 269.

recently been promoted to the rank of brigadier general in the state militia and was commonly referred to by this title.¹³

As a federal court judge, James Locke lacked jurisdiction over a lynching, but he used another means of disciplining General Wall. On Tuesday morning, March 7, 1882, the judge issued an order directing Wall to show cause within twenty-four hours why he should not be barred from practicing in federal court as a result of "his advising and encouraging" the lynch mob in which he had participated. General Wall immediately went into federal court, accompanied by his counsel, Stephen M. Sparkman, who also happened to hold the position of state attorney and who would be in charge of prosecuting any criminal indictment resulting from the lynching. Indeed, Wall and his attorney filed a motion for continuance of the federal show cause order until the local grand jury of the state court had met. Judge Locke took the motion under advisement.¹⁴

The following morning, March 8, Wall and his attorney reappeared in federal court. First, they withdrew their motion for a continuance, and then they directly challenged Judge Locke's show cause order. In a written statement Wall contended that the federal court had neither proof of his involvement in the lynching nor jurisdiction since the alleged crime was not a federal offense. Judge Locke immediately overruled the challenge to his court's authority, and in order to establish Wall's role in the mob, he called to the witness stand United States Marshal Peter A. Williams, who testified to what he had seen on the day of the hanging. According to Williams, he had observed Wall go into the sheriff's house with a group of unidentified men at about 2 p.m. When the group emerged, the marshal had followed them to the jail where he "saw Mr. Wall coming from the jail with the prisoner." Williams claimed that due to his excitement he did not notice who else was in the lynch mob. Nevertheless, he seemed certain about Wall's prominent role. "When going from the jail to the tree, Mr. Wall, I think, had hold of the prisoner; he was beside him," Williams testified. However, at the time of the hanging, members of the mob had their backs to the marshal, who did not see the faces of the people who actually pulled the

13. *National Cyclopedia of American Biography*, 62 vols. (New York, 1929), VI, 147.

14. *Ex Parte Wall*, 107 U.S. 266, 269.

rope stringing up Owens. "I did not see [Wall] afterwards until the hanging was over," Williams told the court; "then the crowd had increased, perhaps to 200 persons." Thus, the marshal placed Wall at the head of the mob just before the lynching and as part of the crowd immediately afterwards.¹⁵

General Wall turned down the opportunity to rebut this damaging testimony, declaring that he had nothing further to say. Instead, he chose to stand on his written response to the show cause order in which he denied "counseling, advising, encouraging or assisting an unlawful, tumultuous and riotous gathering or mob, in taking one John from the jail of Hillsborough County and causing his death by hanging, in contempt and defiance of the law." This apparent denial was seriously qualified by the fact that it not only failed to refer to the victim by his proper name, but it also was an unsworn statement.¹⁶

Judge Locke ended the hearing without calling any other witnesses. He later defended his action by stating that Sheriff Craft and Mayor George Bascom Sparkman were the only persons who had publicly protested the lynching and they were out of town at the time of the federal court hearing. Furthermore, Judge Locke contended, "On account of the excited state of feeling existing at the time, the timidity of many, from the influential position of some of those engaged in the hanging, and the sympathy of others with the lynchers, it was not advisable to attempt to compel any resident of said City of Tampa who was found to have personal knowledge of the matter, to testify against said J. B. Wall."¹⁷

On March 10, 1882, two days after taking testimony, Judge Locke formally issued an order prohibiting Joseph Wall from practicing as an attorney before the federal courts of the Southern District of Florida. In a scathing indictment of lynching, Judge Locke declared, "Lynch law, stripped of all the sophistries with which it is surrounded by the ingenuity of its supporters, is, in its plain, naked self, not only a violation of the law, but an attack upon, and a flaunting insult to, its courts and officers."¹⁸ Whatever "possible excuse might be offered for mob or lynch

15. *Ibid.*, 267-68.

16. *Ibid.*, 267.

17. *Ibid.*, 270.

18. *In re Wall*, 13 F. 814 (1882), 818.

law by a layman or ordinary citizen, there can be none for one in the position of an attorney," the judge argued. "Nothing, in my opinion, could seem more abhorrent to a lawyer, . . . than engaging in any such lawless outrage."¹⁹ Taking note of General Wall's denial that he had encouraged or advised the lynch mob, Judge Locke contended that due to Wall's "influence in this community [...] . . . his presence would be ample encouragement to others on such an occasion."²⁰ On the question of the federal court's authority to discipline an attorney for misconduct in the absence of any formal criminal charges, Judge Locke rejected the view that his court was "helpless as against the local inactivity, neglect, or prejudice of the prosecuting officers or jurors of any one county."²¹ Therefore, given the "direct and positive" evidence of Wall's "participation in this act of lawless violence," Judge Locke disbarred him.²² This decision, of course, did not prevent Wall from continuing to practice in state and local courts. Nevertheless, the attorney sought to reinstate himself in federal court by appealing Judge Locke's ruling.²³

Although General Wall made no public statement, he had an outspoken defender in the editor of Tampa's *Sunland Tribune*, who was his half brother, Dr. John Perry Wall. One of Tampa's leading citizens, John P. Wall was a practicing physician who had edited the weekly *Sunland Tribune* since its founding in 1876. He had also served a term as Tampa mayor from 1878 to 1880. His newspaper writing earned him a reputation as a blistering critic and Democratic partisan, both of which figured prominently in his reaction to the decision barring his brother from federal court.²⁴ Reminding his readers that Judge Locke, a Republican, was "one of the thieving carpetbag crew who hied to this state at the conclusion of the civil war and was an active agent and participant in all infamies of the reconstruction era." Dr. Wall declared that in "this whole [Wall] affair Judge Locke has managed to win the soubriquet of Judge Pecksniff, as well as

19. *Ibid.*, 819.

20. *Ibid.*, 818.

21. *Ibid.*, 817.

22. *Ibid.*, 820.

23. Tampa *Sunland Tribune*, March 30, 1882.

24. *National Cyclopedia of American Biography*, IV (New York, 1902), 94; Donald B. McKay, *Pioneer Florida*, 3 vols. (Tampa, 1959), II, 435-36.

the contempt of all good citizens of this community."²⁵ In less polite language, the editor dismissed Judge Locke as "an ignoramus" and a "judicial imbecile."²⁶ Dr. Wall contended that "the U.S. Court for the Southern District of Florida, is at present nothing more nor less than a political engine working at full capacity." This, according to Wall, explained the federal judge's action which was allegedly part of the court's "strenuous efforts to have numerous prominent Democrats in this and adjoining counties indicted on technical charges for the purpose of holding them over their heads to coerce them into the Republican ranks."²⁷

Other Floridians also criticized Judge Locke. The publisher of the *Tribune*, Tampa businessman Thomas K. Spencer, contended that "if General Wall had promised to keep still in this county during the [1882] election, . . . the Judge would not have struck him from the roll." However, Spencer declared, "General Wall is too much of a Democrat to compromise with them, and hence had to go."²⁸ Judge Locke's action aroused the ire of other Democratic papers in the state, such as the *Monticello Constitution* which argued that the judge had "arbitrarily and illegally striken Gen J.B. Wall's name from the roll of attorneys in his court."²⁹ In defense of Judge Locke, a Republican paper, the *Tampa Guardian*, asserted that "*politics* had nothing to do whatever, in any shape or form, in the unfortunate affairs, which took place last week."³⁰

This partisan debate was fueled by Judge Locke's background. Born in Wilmington, Vermont, James Locke had briefly practiced law in New Hampshire before entering the United States Navy as a paymaster in 1861. Stationed at Key West for much of the Civil War, he decided to remain there when mustered out of the service at the end of the war. Taking up the practice of law in Key West, Locke became active in Republican party politics and held the positions of county superintendent of education, clerk of the United States court, United States com-

25. *Tampa Sunland Tribune*, March 23, 1882.

26. *Ibid.*, March 23, April 13, 1882.

27. *Ibid.*, March 23, 1882.

28. Tallahassee *Weekly Floridian*, March 21, 1882.

29. *Tampa Sunland Tribune*, March 1882, quoting *Monticello Constitution*.

30. *Tampa Sunland Tribune*, March 23, 1882, quoting *Tampa Guardian*.

missioner, county judge, and state senator. In 1872 he was appointed to the federal bench.³¹

Although Locke had resided in Florida for twenty years by the time he responded to the Tampa lynching, neither he nor his critics could forget his background. Unfriendly newspaper reports charged that Judge Locke had publicly associated the lynching of Charles Owens with "the *Rebel* spirit."³² The *Key West Democrat* claimed that Locke had "injured himself and outraged Southern people" by stating "that 'this act was the same spirit that fostered and encouraged the Rebellion,' or words to that effect."³³ No transcript of the court hearing survives, but Judge Locke's decision disbaring General Wall had sternly lectured Tampans about the illegality and immorality of lynch law. The judge, according to the *Sunland Tribune*, "Took occasion under cover of the ermine while here, to slander the people of Tampa, and assume the airs of great virtue and a superior civilization (?)."³⁴ James T. Magbee, the Republican editor of the *Tampa Guardian*, stoked the sectional fires by condemning lynching as a "relic of barbarism" that was a peculiarly southern phenomenon.

The *Sunland Tribune* tried to discredit this assertion by citing contemporary examples of lynchings in other parts of the country, especially in frontier areas. The week following the Tampa hanging, the *Tribune's* editor pointed to newspaper accounts of recent lynchings in Colorado and New Mexico, and he emphasized that "the crime charged in one case was of no higher grade than cattle stealing." After reprinting details of these mob actions, Dr. Wall observed, "Now, it is well known that lynching is no uncommon thing in all new States and territories in the west, and as the population of these is derived principally from the older States of the North, it is somewhat ludicrous to see the carpet bag Radical from the same section putting on airs of a superior civilization and condemning the southern people for similar acts for much more grave and dastardly crimes."³⁶

31. *Makers of America: Florida Edition*, 3 vols. (Atlanta, 1909), I, 281-83; *Who Was Who in America*, 7 vols. (Chicago, 1942), I, 739.

32. *Tampa Sunland Tribune*, April 13, 1882.

33. *Ibid.*, March 30, 1882, quoting *Key West Democrat*.

34. *Tampa Sunland Tribune*, March 23, 1882.

35. *Ibid.*, March 15, 1882, quoting *Tampa Guardian*.

36. *Tampa Sunland Tribune*, March 16, 1882.

In some ways Tampa resembled a frontier town in 1882. Its rough physical appearance featured unpaved, sandy streets and unpainted, wooden buildings.³⁷ One contemporary visitor described Tampa as “quaint and old-fashioned in appearance.”³⁸ A more critical observer called it “a sleepy, shabby Southern town.”³⁹ With no rail connection to the outside world, Tampa was also somewhat isolated. From the north it could only be reached by stagecoach over rough trails from Gainesville, or by steamer in a twenty-four-hour overnight trip from Cedar Key. The town had three small hotels, two saloons, and a number of merchants, but no bank. Indeed, it did not yet have a single brick building, nor any organized means of fighting fires.⁴⁰ However, after several decades of actual decline in population, Tampa was beginning to expand by 1882, and it may have already grown to 1,000 inhabitants since the 1880 census had reported 720 residents.⁴¹ The town’s port was becoming increasingly active in the shipment of cattle and citrus from the hinterland, and reports circulated of numerous land sales in the area.⁴² “Tampa is on the eve of a business boom,” the editor of the *Sunland Tribune* observed optimistically in late 1881.⁴³

Despite its small size and somewhat primitive conditions, Tampa had already advanced beyond the stage of a simple frontier town, particularly in its system of criminal justice. The circuit court for Florida’s sixth judicial circuit, which had charge of criminal prosecutions, served Hillsborough and several neighboring counties, but its chief officers, Judge Henry L. Mitchell and State Attorney Stephen M. Sparkman, were Tampa residents, and each had held his position for over four years. When the

37. Silvia Sunshine (Abbie M. Brooks), *Petals Plucked from Sunny Climes* (Nashville, 1880; facsimile ed., Gainesville, 1976), 288-89; Tampa *Sunland Tribune*, October 29, 1881.

38. George M. Barbour, *Florida for Tourists, Invalids, and Settlers* (New York, 1882), 61.

39. Irving A. Leonard, ed., *The Florida Adventures of Kirk Munroe* (Chuluota, 1975), 62.

40. Tampa *Sunland Tribune*, October 8, December 3, 1881, January 26, 1882; Leonard, ed., *Kirk Munroe*, 61.

41. Several contemporary writers reported in 1882 that Tampa had a population of 1,500. But despite evidence of growth, there is little reason to believe that the town’s population had doubled since the 1880 census. United States Department of Interior, Census Office, *Compendium of the Tenth Census, Pt. 1* (Washington, 1883), 83; Barbour, *Florida for Tourists*, 61; Tampa *Sunland Tribune*, January 26, 1882.

42. Tampa *Sunland Tribune*, December 3, 1881, June 1, 22, 1882.

43. *Ibid.*, November 26, 1881.

lynching of Charles Owens occurred, the circuit court was scarcely overburdened with criminal cases in Hillsborough County. During all of 1881, the grand jury had handed down only one criminal indictment for the entire county of some 6,000 people.⁴⁴ Indeed, at the fall 1881 session of the court, the grand jurors stated in their report, "For several years past crime has been steadily on the decrease in the County."⁴⁵ Thus, the resort to lynch law in Tampa was not a reaction to any general crime wave. Furthermore, it was not due to the unavailability of constituted authorities. At the time of the lynching the circuit court was meeting in the county seat of Tampa, and it could have dealt promptly with the charges against Owens had local citizens so desired.

Contemporary observers had no difficulty explaining why it was necessary for Tampanians to take the law into their own hands. It was not the absence of effective law enforcement machinery, but rather the nature of the crime that supposedly dictated the resort to lynch law. "The public sentiment of this county may be relied on to protect the honor and defend the helplessness of the fairer sex from insult and outrage," Dr. Wall declared in a *Sunland Tribune* editorial three days after the lynching. In what would become a common defense of lynch law, the newspaper editor emphasized that the honor of women precluded any reliance on the criminal justice system in cases of rape or attempted rape. Dr. Wall urged his readers, "Let any man who thinks the lynching last Monday was wrong . . . contemplate his wife, sister or daughter in court reciting the filthy details of such an outrage in public under the gaze of a curious and to some extent indifferent public."⁴⁶

A letter to the editor of the *Sunland Tribune*, signed "VOX POPULI," also stressed the inability of the courts to deal effectively with such crimes. "The people have every confidence that Judge Mitchell, the State attorney and all the officers of the

44. Ibid.

45. Ibid., October 15, 1881. Wilbur J. Cash, *The Mind of the South* (New York, 1941), 120, among others, has noted that the "threshold of violence was lowered in the Reconstruction period." Hillsborough County, however, escaped the wave of violence that swept much of Florida, especially the more populated areas in the northern part of the state. Ralph L. Peek, "Lawlessness and the Restoration of Order in Florida, 1868-1871" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Florida, 1964), 218, and passim.

46. Tampa *Sunland Tribune*, March 9, 1882.

Court will do their whole duty in the future as they have ever done in the past," the writer declared; "what they do lack confidence in is the adequacy of the law, when enforced to its utmost extent to treat such cases as that of Owens." Claiming to speak for Tampans, the letter writer proceeded to assert the people's belief in a higher law based on the right to defend family and home. "Holding the protection of their loved ones and the sanctity of their homes to be above and beyond all law, they are determined to so deal with such outrages, that every wretch who may be capable of committing them shall feel and know that retribution, swift and terrible, hangs like the sword of Damocles, suspended over his head by a single hair."⁴⁷

This defense of lynching as both expeditious and a deterrent found support around the state. Due to the "heinousness" of the crime, the Jacksonville *Union* argued that the public would accept "the righteousness" of the punishment. "There are some crimes dastardly and revolting as to fatigue public indignation," the paper observed, "and it is hardly surprising that in this instance the people of Tampa felt that the law's delay would be an unmerited luxury to the villain." In a more direct comment, the *Monticello Constitution* declared: "Served him right. Hurrah for the citizens of Tampa."⁴⁸

These justifications of the Tampa lynching, invoking higher law and righteousness, strongly suggest that this act of mob violence was a planned response by the community at large, rather than the crazed outburst of an unruly mob bent on vengeance. Initial news reports of the hanging stressed that it was well organized and even followed certain procedures, including a vote by the crowd to hang Owens before any attempt was made to seize him. The *Sunland Tribune* observed in its first report of the lynching that "in this all similar instances we approve of Lynch law being executed in the most open and fearless manner." Furthermore, the *Tribune* attempted to legitimize the lynching by noting that the large and determined crowd was "led by some of our most prominent citizens." Only the sheriff and mayor protested the mob's action, but as the *Tribune* observed offhandedly, Sheriff Craft was simply doing "his duty." Lest anyone doubt that Owens deserved his fate, the *Tribune* claimed

47. *Ibid.*, March 23, 1882.

48. *Ibid.*, March 15, 1882, quoting *Monticello Constitution*.

that he had "acknowledged his guilt" just before being strung up.⁴⁹ In addition, news reports gave Owens the appearance of evil by emphasizing his remarkable resemblance to Charles J. Guiteau, who had assassinated President James A. Garfield the previous year.⁵⁰

The defense of the lynching in terms of honor and the sanctity of the family and "the fairer sex" reflected a commitment to white southern values that frequently led to violence. Although honor certainly does not explain all southern violence, it undoubtedly sparked some of the most explosive outbursts, especially the practice of lynching as an accepted punishment for certain offenses. The journalist Wilbur J. Cash suggested the connection between honor and lynching over forty years ago in his study, *The Mind of the South*.⁵¹ More recently, Bertram Wyatt-Brown has examined the relationship in greater depth, contending that Southerners believed in "communal forms of justice," shaped by an ethic that sanctioned statutory law and lynch law.⁵² "When regular procedures seemed inappropriate or inadequate, the community . . . acted through lynch law," according to Wyatt-Brown. In fact, many Southerners did not view lynching as a lawless act, especially when it was used to punish particular kinds of wrongdoing which dishonored a man or his family.⁵³ The rape, or attempted rape, of a white woman became a question of honor because the crime brought both physical and emotional injury to the victim and disgrace to the family. The resulting shame in the eyes of the local community demanded swift, public elimination of the attacker, whether he was black or white. This sometimes led to a lynching.⁵⁴

49. Tampa *Sunland Tribune*, March 9, 1882.

50. Tallahassee *Weekly Floridian*, March 14, 1882.

51. Cash, *Mind of the South*, 73.

52. Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York, 1982), 369.

53. *Ibid.*, 370. A similar acceptance of lynching under certain conditions could be found in other parts of the country, even among lawyers and jurists, during the nineteenth century. Brown, *Strain of Violence*, 144-79.

54. Cash, *Mind of the South*, 43-44, 85-87; Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 388. Discussions of the history of rape in the South focus largely on white fears about the supposed threat posed by black men. Although Charles Owens was white, the fact that approximately forty per cent of Tampa's population was black may have figured in the desire of whites to deal summarily with a man accused of attempted rape. However, none of the surviving defenses of the Owens lynching makes any reference to white fears of blacks. For southern attitudes toward rape, see Emilio C.

In 1882, antebellum southern customs were very much alive in Tampa, especially among the town's elite. Classic southern romanticism was expressed in the staging of Ring Tournaments, a southern tradition which gave leading Tampanans an opportunity to dress as medieval knights and test their skill as horsemen by trying to spear rings with their lances. Organized by the exclusive Knights of Hillsborough in the 1870s, the annual Ring Tournament gave the winner the honor of choosing the "Queen of Love and Beauty," who reigned over a ball which capped the festival.⁵⁵ Another popular ritual was the charivari, an ancient custom that persisted in the South. Although charivaris took a variety of forms and served a number of purposes, Tampa's Donald B. McKay remembered them as a means "of greeting newly-weds whose marriage involved unusual features, such as the use of a shotgun as a persuader by a male member of the bride's family, unsavory reputation of either or both parties to the ceremony, great disparity in the ages of the bride and groom—and sometimes without any excuse."⁵⁶ The charivari involved a crowd of men drawing local attention to such a marriage by creating a deafening ruckus, with every imaginable noise-making device, on the wedding night. McKay recalled participating in one such party, apparently in the 1880s, when Judge H. L. Mitchell joined a mob which gathered in front of a room occupied by newlyweds in Tampa's Orange Grove Hotel and "set up a din which could be heard a mile away."⁵⁷ Another Tampa pastime associated with the old South was gambling. Once again D. B. McKay remembered that during the 1870s and 1880s prominent Tampanans frequently engaged in betting on horse races and cockfights.⁵⁸ Although certainly not unique to antebellum southern society, medieval festivals, charivaris, and gam-

Viano, "Rape and the Law in the United States: An Historical and Sociological Analysis," *International Journal of Criminology and Penology*, II (November 1974), 320-23; Susan Brownmiller, *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape* (New York, 1975), 126-31, 153-73.

55. Esther J. Crooks and Ruth W. Crooks, *The Ring Tournament in the United States* (Richmond, 1936), 1-10; Karl H. Grismer, *Tampa: A History of the City of Tampa and the Tampa Bay Region of Florida* (St. Petersburg, 1950), 167-68; McKay, *Pioneer Florida*, I, 51.

56. McKay, *Pioneer Florida*, I, 48.

57. *Ibid.*, 49.

58. *Ibid.*, 14-15, 19.

bling were some of the customs that made the old South distinctive.⁵⁹

The continued strength of antebellum traditions in Tampa is largely explained by the fact that the community was still dominated by Southerners during the postwar period. The 1880 census indicated that over ninety per cent of Hillsborough County's population was born in the South.⁶⁰ Although the origins of the 442 whites living in Tampa was somewhat more diverse than the county as a whole, four out of five white Tampans were southern-born. The ten per cent of the town's white population from the North was slightly outnumbered by a heterogeneous mixture of foreign-born whites. The vast majority of Tampa's southern-born whites (seventy-eight per cent) were Florida natives, with the remainder largely from the southeastern states of Georgia (seven per cent), Alabama (five per cent), and South Carolina (five per cent).⁶¹ More significantly, the town's leaders, including General Wall and his defenders, were Southerners by birth and training, with their roots in antebellum society.

Joseph Wall and his half brother John were the sons of Perry G. Wall, a Georgia native, who had migrated to territorial Florida as a young pioneer in the 1820s. Staking out homesteads, first in Hamilton County and then in Hernando County, Perry Wall became a large landowner and a prominent officeholder. After the Civil War, he relocated in Tampa, where he held the position of probate judge and subsequently the office of postmaster. Born in 1836, John P. Wall received a degree from the Medical College of South Carolina shortly before the outbreak of the Civil War in which he served as an army surgeon.⁶² His brother Joseph also volunteered for the Confederate Army, but

59. Rollin G. Osterweis, *Romanticism and Nationalism in the Old South* (New Haven, 1949), 41-53, 96-102; Clement Eaton, *The Growth of Southern Civilization, 1790-1860* (New York, 1961), 17, 190-91; Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 339-50, 440-50..

60. U.S. Census Office, *Compendium of the Tenth Census*, Pt. 1, 495.

61. Information on Tampa's population was derived from manuscript census returns, Tenth Census of the United States, 1880, Hillsborough County, Florida, Population Schedules, National Archives Microfilm Series T-9, roll 128, at the University of South Florida Library, Tampa.

62. Charles E. Harrison, *Genealogical Records of the Pioneers of Tampa and of Some Who Came After Them* (Tampa, 1915), 24-28; James M. Ingram, "John Perry Wall: A Man for All Seasons," *Sunland Tribune*, II (October 1975), 9-19.

he waited until 1865, when he reached the age of eighteen. Following his military service, Joseph studied at the University of Virginia, receiving a law degree in 1869. After briefly practicing in Brooksville, he joined his father and brother in Tampa, entering a law partnership with Henry L. Mitchell. J. B. Wall soon built a profitable law practice that included clients such as the Jacksonville, Tampa and Key West Railway.⁶³

The status of John and Joseph Wall was secured not only by their family background and professional degrees from southern institutions but also by marriages into local families of even higher standing. Dr. Wall took as his second wife, Matilda McKay, the daughter of Captain James McKay, Sr., one of Tampa's earliest and richest residents. After his first wife died in 1873, Joseph Wall also married into one of the area's wealthiest families, taking as his bride, Frederica Lykes, whose brother, Howell T. Lykes, was one of Florida's "cattle kings."⁶⁴

Joseph Wall's colleagues in Tampa's small legal fraternity had similar backgrounds. His first law partner, Henry Mitchell, was born in Alabama, but he came to Hillsborough County with his parents as a teenager in the 1840s. Soon after his admission to the bar, Mitchell served as state attorney, a position he resigned in 1861 to volunteer for the army. With the end of Reconstruction, Mitchell was appointed judge of the circuit court for Florida's sixth judicial circuit. At that time, his former law partner, Joseph Wall, held the position of state attorney for the district.⁶⁵ Wall was replaced in 1878 by Stephen M. Sparkman, who had studied law in the office of Henry Mitchell. However, Wall regularly rode the circuit with his friends, Judge Mitchell and State Attorney Sparkman, and on the day Charles Owens was lynched, all three men were in Tampa for the opening of the regularly scheduled session of the circuit court for Hillsborough County.⁶⁶

63. Tampa *Sunland Tribune*, October 10, 1881; Harrison, *Genealogical Records*, 28-30; *National Cyclopedia of American Biography*, VI, 147.

64. The wives of John P. Wall and Howell T. Lykes were sisters. Grismer, *Tampa*, 319, 330, 331; McKay, *Pioneer Florida*, III, 3-5; Tampa *Sunland Tribune*, May 4, 1882.

65. *National Cyclopedia of American Biography*, XI (New York, 1909), 383; Harrison, *Genealogical Records*, 19-20; Grismer, *Tampa*, 317-18.

66. Harrison, *Genealogical Records*, 57; *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1961* (Washington, 1961), 1,635; Tampa *Sunland Tribune*, November 26, 1881, April 6, 1882. Stephen Sparkman was a cousin of Tampa's mayor, George B. Sparkman. Grismer, *Tampa*, 316.

The common background and status of these men, combined with close personal and professional relationships, accounts for the lack of any criminal proceedings against General Wall for his participation in the lynching. These Southerners had grown up on the Florida frontier in the antebellum period, and all, except for Sparkman who was too young, had demonstrated their commitment to southern cultural norms by volunteering to defend them during the Civil War. As lawyers, Confederate veterans, and public officeholders, these men became leading members of Tampa's small elite after the war. According to deep-seated southern traditions, the high status of these Tampans was reflected in the titles, such as "Judge" and "State Attorney," by which they were commonly addressed.⁶⁷ Their status as prominent lawyers and guardians of traditions of justice was reinforced, or in some cases superseded, by military titles that carried even greater honor in the South. In 1882, Joseph Wall proudly carried his militia title of "General," and his private counsel, State Attorney Sparkman, was frequently referred to as "Colonel," the rank he held in the Florida militia.⁶⁸ Southern honor and its continued influence among Tampans help explain not only why Charles Owens was lynched but also why the local community failed to take any action against leaders of the mob. As Wyatt-Brown has observed, lynch law "represented the voice of the community."⁶⁹

The strength of southern honor in the antebellum period was that it was sanctioned by local white communities and outside forces rarely intervened, but Reconstruction marked a turning point with the attempted imposition of competing norms of behavior. In Tampa the resulting conflict could be seen in reactions to the 1882 lynching. Judge Locke not only condemned lynch law as a criminal act, but he also rejected any suggestion that honor could justify taking the law into one's own hands. Citing an 1829 Tennessee case where an attorney had been disbarred for killing someone in a duel, Locke approvingly quoted the earlier decision's conclusion that such an act constituted "wicked and willful murder," rather than "an honorable homi-

67. For a discussion of the significance of titles in the old South, see Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 157-58.

68. See, for example, Tampa *Sunland Tribune*, March 23, April 13, 1882.

69. Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 397.

cide.⁷⁰ Indeed, Judge Locke argued that “the honor of this court and the [legal] profession” demanded that General Wall be disbarred for participating in a lynching.⁷¹ The Republican judge from New England represented an ethic that many Tampans apparently did not understand, and significantly he took the only official action against any member of the lynch mob. If this outsider had not happened to be present in Tampa on the day of the lynching, the entire incident undoubtedly would have generated little more than the initial newspaper reports which simply recounted the actions of anonymous citizens and concluded that justice had been done.

Ironically, in the wake of Judge Locke’s ruling that prohibited him from practicing in federal court, General Wall further undermined local autonomy by appealing the decision to the United States Supreme Court. General Wall’s petition to the high court asked for a writ of mandamus directing Judge Locke to withdraw his order. The appeal simply argued that Judge Locke did not have the authority to disbar an attorney for an act that was under the jurisdiction of another court. Indeed, Wall’s petition went so far as to ask hypothetically, “Had he committed murder himself, instead of having mingled with the lynching party, far away from the presence of the court, will any lawyer say that such an act would have given the court jurisdiction to disbar him of his rights as an attorney?”⁷²

In April 1883, the United States Supreme Court ruled on Wall’s appeal. In a split decision the court upheld Judge Locke’s jurisdiction, and in the process the country’s highest tribunal used modern, more “civilized,” standards to condemn the practice of lynching. Speaking for the majority, Justice Joseph P. Bradley, who came from New Jersey where lynch law rarely occurred, referred to the charge against General Wall as “a very heinous offense.”⁷³ Justice Bradley claimed that Judge Locke had understandably responded quickly, issuing a show order without first securing an affidavit stating the charge, because reliable information made Wall’s participation in the lynching a “notori-

70. *In re Wall*, 13 F. 820. The Tennessee case was *Smith v. State*, 1 Yeager 228 (1829).

71. *In re Wall*, 13 F. 820.

72. *Ex Parte Wall*, 107 U.S. 265.

73. *Ibid.*, 271. According to Richard Maxwell Brown, *Strain of Violence*, 170, New Jersey was an “Eastern non-vigilante state.”

ous" fact.⁷⁴ According to the majority decision, the initial court order against Wall, "though not strictly regular," did not violate any of his rights, and the nature of his offense dictated that Judge Locke take prompt action.⁷⁵

In an extended discourse on the crime of lynching, Justice Bradley drew on a moral code that clearly conflicted with that of General Wall and his defenders. The Supreme Court justice called lynching "the prostration of all law and government: a defiance of the laws; a resort to the methods of those who recognize no law, no society, no government." Disposing of the usual defense of lynch law, Justice Bradley contended, "Whatever excuse may ever exist for the execution of lynch law in savage or sparsely settled districts, in order to oppose the ruffian elements which the ordinary administration of law is powerless to control, it certainly has no excuse in a community where the laws are duly and regularly administered." He emphasized that in this particular instance the resort to lynch law occurred, "with audacious effrontery, in the virtual presence of the court!"⁷⁶

On the question of the federal court's power to disbar a lawyer who was not first indicted or convicted of a crime, Justice Bradley cited a list of precedents that he contended upheld the lower court's authority. In "removing grossly improper persons from participation in the administration of the laws," the purpose was not to punish a lawyer but to preserve courts from persons unfit to practice.⁷⁷ The decision concluded that General Wall's act of misconduct, which "was as clear of all doubt as if [he] had expressly admitted his participation," justified his removal from federal court practice.⁷⁸ "Of all classes and professions, the lawyer is most sacredly bound to uphold the laws," the opinion declared. "He is their sworn servant; and for him, of all men in the world, to repudiate and override the laws, to trample them under foot and to ignore the very bands of society, argues recreancy to his position and office and sets a pernicious example to the insubordinate and dangerous elements of the body politic."⁷⁹

74. *Ex Parte Wall*, 107 U.S. 271.

75. *Ibid.*, 272.

76. *Ibid.*

77. *Ibid.*, 288.

78. *Ibid.*, 275.

79. *Ibid.*, 274.

In a dissenting opinion, Justice Stephen J. Field challenged both Judge Locke's authority and his procedure, but the jurist also spoke out forcefully against lynch law. Referring to "the lawless proceedings of the mob," he called the usurpation of law "the greatest of crimes, for which the actors should be held amenable to the violated laws of the State."⁸⁰ Justice Field also dismissed the contention of General Wall's counsel that the resort to violence was somehow explained by the allegation that the lynch victim had attempted to rape a young woman.⁸¹

The rebuke by federal courts did not adversely affect General Wall's local reputation. Within weeks after the lynching and his disbarment, there were reports that Wall might be a candidate for Congress. Support for the possibility came from several newspapers, including the *Bartow Informant* which observed that there could be little question about Wall's fitness for the position.⁸² Although Wall did not run for Congress, he was elected to the state senate in 1886, and after reelection he served as senate president during the 1889 session. Meanwhile, he became the first president of the Florida State Bar Association in 1887. During the 1890s, he held a number of positions in the criminal justice system, including another appointment as state attorney before rising to become judge of the circuit court for Florida's sixth judicial circuit.⁸³ In 1900, the *Tampa Morning Tribune* called Judge Wall "perhaps the best known lawyer in Florida" and "a gentleman highly esteemed by all. Generosity and charity have been his predominating characteristics, and no deserving individual ever appealed to him in vain," the *Tribune* observed in a reference that undoubtedly excluded Charles Owens, whose appeal for mercy had gone unheeded eighteen years earlier.⁸⁴

Any lingering doubts about General Wall's role in the 1882 lynching were erased decades later by the reminiscences of an eyewitness. Donald B. McKay, who subsequently became editor and publisher of the *Tampa Times* and a four-term mayor of Tampa, was a thirteen-year-old Tampan in 1882. He later re-

80. *Ibid.*, 290.

81. *Ibid.*, 291.

82. *Tampa Sunland Tribune*, April 6, 20, 1882; *Bartow Informant*, April 15, 1882.

83. Allen Morris, *The People of Lawmaking in Florida, 1822-1983* (Tallahassee, 1982); *National Cyclopedia of American Biography*, VI, 147.

84. *Tampa Morning Tribune*, January 2, 1900.

called: "It wasn't until 1952 that I learned that Judge Joseph B. Wall was disbarred from practice in the federal courts, presumably on account of his participation in a lynching. . . . The victim, a white man, was seized from the sheriff who was taking him to jail, and hanged from a limb of an oak tree which stood in Lafayette [S]treet, directly in front of the court house. Circuit court was in session at the time and Judge Wall was state's attorney. He left the court room, joined the mob and tied the 'hangman's knot,' as no other man in the crowd knew how. I witnessed the lynching." McKay added, "The disbarment apparently did not become a matter of public knowledge, as Judge Wall continued in practice and was elected to public offices subsequently." In fact, of course, Joseph Wall's exclusion from federal court was highly publicized, but as D. B. McKay correctly remembered, "His standing in public esteem did not suffer."⁸⁵

In 1882, participation in a lynching did not violate either Florida law or the mores of most Tampans. Indeed, white respect for honor, home, and family demanded that an assault on a prominent white woman, even by a white man, be punished by an immediate public execution even if local courts were in session. The large lynch mob that hanged Charles Owens for attempted rape operated openly, making no effort to conceal the identity of its leaders, such as General Joseph Wall. Justifications of the hanging invoked higher law and the need to defend the honor of women. Despite the presence of the sheriff and mayor who dutifully protested the hanging, no local official subsequently took action against any members of the lynch mob. The only response came from a federal judge from New England who represented a competing ethic that abhorred lynch law and considered it a crime. Support for this view from United States Supreme Court justices showed the degree to which southern traditions conflicted with certain national norms. The question remained how long the South in general and Tampa in particular could retain an ethic which sanctioned lynch law.

85. McKay, *Pioneer Florida*, II, 439-40. McKay's aunt was John P. Wall's second wife. Grismer, *Tampa*, 319, 332.

FLORIDA'S CATTLE-RANCHING FRONTIER: HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY (1860)

by JOHN SOLOMON OTTO

IN 1860, the southern edge of settlement— which delimited the “settled” areas with more than two persons per square mile from the “frontier” areas with fewer than two inhabitants per square mile— stood in central Florida. With the exception of a settled enclave about eastern Tampa Bay, the southern half of the Florida peninsula was a true frontier. It was the largest remaining frontier east of the Mississippi River. By 1860, the bulk of the south Florida frontier fell within the boundaries of five counties— Hillsborough, Manatee, Monroe, Brevard, and Dade whose total population was only 7,077.¹

Hillsborough in 1860 contained the largest population— 2,417 free and 564 slave inhabitants— and the largest number of cattle of any south Florida county. In fact, Hillsborough ranked first in cattle among Florida’s thirty-seven counties.²

Hillsborough occupied an area approximating 3,000 square miles, incorporating all of modern Hillsborough and Pinellas counties and most of Polk County.³ Within Hillsborough’s

John Solomon Otto is research associate, Center for American Archeology, Kampsville, Illinois. He wishes to thank Kyle VanLandingham of Okeechobee and Seth Alderman of Hillsborough County for their assistance. The research for his article was funded by an NEH “State, Local, and Regional Studies” grant.

1. F. J. Marchner, “Land Use and Its Patterns in the United States,” *U. S. Department of Agriculture, Handbook No. 153* (Washington, 1959), Figure 9; Rodney E. Dillon, Jr., “South Florida in 1860,” *Florida Historical Quarterly*, LX (April 1982), 440-41.
2. U. S. Bureau of Census, *Population of the United States in 1860* (Washington, 1864), 54; U. S. Bureau of Census, *Agriculture of the United States in 1860* (Washington, 1864), 18. The total number of cattle in Hillsborough County (1860) was determined by adding those listed as “milch cows,” “working oxen,” and “other cattle.”
3. In 1855, the southern half of Hillsborough County was detached to form Manatee County. In 1861, the eastern half of Hillsborough was incorporated into Polk County. And in 1911, the Pinellas peninsula was detached from Hillsborough to create Pinellas County. Geo. B. Utley, “Origin of the County Names in Florida,” *Florida Historical Quarterly*, I (October 1908), 33; Karl H. Grismer, *History of St. Petersburg* (St. Petersburg, 1924), 93.

boundaries were 6,682 acres (10.4 square miles) of improved land, a category which included cultivated fields, fallow, and cleared pasture. The remainder was unimproved land that served as open-range for cattle and other livestock.⁴

Florida law required planters and farmers to fence only their cultivated fields to protect crops from wandering livestock. All unfenced land was regarded as common grazing land or open-range. After marking and branding their animals, the herders turned them out on the open-range to search for forage.⁵

In Hillsborough County, most of the open-range was pine flatwoods, an ecological community characterized by low relief, sandy soils, an underlying hardpan, and a vegetational cover of scattered pine trees with an understory of saw palmettos, shrubs, and grasses. During the rainy summers, the underlying hardpan hindered drainage and promoted flooding; during the dry winters, the flatwoods became susceptible to fires. The fires burnt back the invading hardwoods, curbed the growth of shrubs, and thus preserved the open pine woods. Due to poor drainage and sandy soils, little flatwoods land was cleared for farming before the Civil War. The seasonal flatwoods grasses, however, provided native forage for cattle, though a single cow needed to roam as much as twenty acres of flatwoods during a year in order to find sufficient forage.⁶

The flatwoods embraced other ecological communities such as the pine-turkey oak hills— sandy ridges which supported little more than longleaf pine trees and scrub oaks. The pine hill soils were well-drained and proved most productive when liberally manured. Grasses and palmettos, nevertheless, were less abundant

-
4. U. S. Bureau of Census, *Agriculture, 1860*, 18. Improved and unimproved lands are defined in U. S. Bureau of Census, *The Seventh Census of the United States: 1850* (Washington, 1853), xxiii.
 5. Leslie A. Thompson, *A Manual or Digest of the Statute Law of the State of Florida* (Boston, 1847), 134, 419-20; William Theodore Mealor, Jr., "The Open-Range Ranch in South Florida and Its Contemporary Successors" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Georgia, 1972), 20-21, 34-38.
 6. Joe Allen Edmisten, "The Ecology of the Florida Pine Flatwoods" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Florida, 1963), 1-4, 6, 13, 18, 94; John H. Davis, Jr., "The Natural Features of Southern Florida, especially the Vegetation and the Everglades," *Florida Geological Survey, Bulletin No. 25* (Tallahassee, 1943), 160-65; D. Ewart, "Florida," *De Bow's Review*, XXX (May-June 1866), 640; William Theodore Mealor, Jr., and Merle C. Prunty, "Open-Range Ranching in Southern Florida," *Annals, Association of American Geographers*, LXVI (September 1976), 364.

in pine hills than in flatwoods, so a single cow needed to traverse as much as 100 acres during a year in order to find enough forage.⁷

The flatwoods also contained numerous ponds and rivers which sheltered marshes and swamps. Since periodic floods deposited silt and "vegetable debris," swamp lands contained the richest and most durable soils. Yet, flooded swamp lands could be cultivated only after expensive clearing and draining.⁸ The river swamps were often bordered by strips of lowland hardwood forests, colloquially called "low hammocks." Since the moist low hammocks escaped the periodic fires that swept the flatwoods, they contained dense hardwood stands, denoting deep, humic soils. After clearing and some ditching to improve drainage, the low hammocks offered ideal soils for cash crops such as sugar cane.⁹

The most versatile hammock lands were the "high hammocks" – slightly elevated areas that escaped seasonal fires and supported mixed pine and hardwood forests. Though difficult to clear, the well-drained high hammocks required no ditching, and the humic soils were suitable for sugar, cotton, corn, and other crops. Hammocks even offered shelter and browse for cattle during the winter months.¹⁰

Hammocks possessed the greatest agricultural potential and were most highly prized by cash crop planters, but Hillsborough County contained relatively little of such acreage. Tracts of hammock could be found along the Hillsborough, Alafia, and Pease rivers and about Lake Thonotosassa; yet, most of Hillsborough was pine flatwoods and pine-turkey oak hills— lands which antebellum observers regarded as "third-rate."¹¹

-
7. Davis, "Natural Features of Southern Florida," 156-60; Mealor and Prunty, "Open-Range Ranching," 361.
 8. Davis, "Natural Features of Southern Florida," 175-77, 185-86, 197-98; L. D. Stickney, "Florida Soil, Climate, and Productions," *Report of the U. S. Department of Agriculture for 1862* (Washington, 1863), 63.
 9. Davis, "Natural Features of Southern Florida," 166-67; Stickney, "Florida Soil," 63.
 10. "Florida, as Compared with Texas," *De Bow's Review*, XXVIII (May 1860), 603; Stickney, "Florida Soil," 63-64; Paul D. Camp, "Methods of Managing Range Cattle in Alachua County, Florida" (master's thesis, University of Florida, 1932), 62.
 11. John Lee Williams, *The Territory of Florida: or Sketches of the Topography, Civil and Natural History* (New York, 1837; facsimile ed., Gainesville, 1962), 12; Karl H. Grismer, *Tampa: A History of the City of Tampa and the Tampa Bay Region of Florida* (St. Petersburg, 1950), 131; U. S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, "Gen-

Given the limited amount of hammock land, cash crop farming played only a minor role in Hillsborough's agricultural economy. In 1860, Hillsborough County processed only forty-seven hogsheads (47,000 lbs.) of cane sugar, ranking twelfth among Florida's thirty-seven counties, and ginned only eighty-eight bales of long-staple cotton, placing twenty-eighth among Florida's counties. If three hogsheads of sugar was the average yield on hammock land, and if one bale of long-staple cotton was the typical yield per acre, then little more than 100 acres of Hillsborough's cropland was devoted to cash crops.¹²

Hillsborough County also contained few large slaveholders. The mean slaveholding in the county was 4.7 slaves; and only one Hillsborough slaveholder, Edmund Jones, owned more than twenty slaves. In contrast, the mean slaveholding in the state of Florida was twelve; and one-sixth of all Florida slaveholders owned more than twenty slaves— the minimum definition for a planter.¹³ By 1860, Jones owned twenty-six slaves and 1,880 acres of land, of which 250 acres were improved. Only a tiny fraction was planted in sugar cane and cotton. His slaves cropped four hogsheads of sugar and five bales of long-staple cotton. Most of Jones's land was cleared pasture for his 300 sheep— he was Hillsborough's largest sheep-owner— or was cropland planted in corn and sweet potatoes.¹⁴

Of Hillsborough's remaining 119 slaveholders, most owned fewer than five slaves, and of her 276 farm operators, only seventy-four, or twenty-seven per cent, held any slaves at all. Thus, the majority of Hillsborough's farm operators raised crops and live-

eral Map of Ecological Communities: State of Florida" (Fort Worth, 1981); Stickney, "Florida Soil," 62.

12. U. S. Bureau of Census, *Agriculture, 1860*, 19, 21; "Florida, as Compared with Texas," 604; A Wild Man of the Woods, "The Peninsula of Florida," *Southern Cultivator*, XVIII (August 1860), 234. The long growing season in south Florida permitted the successful cropping of long-staple cotton—a delicate variety that brought higher prices than the short-staple cotton grown over most of the Old South. Jerrell H. Shofner and William W. Rogers, "Sea Island Cotton in Ante-Bellum Florida," *Florida Historical Quarterly*, XL (April 1962), 373-80.
13. U. S. Bureau of Census, *Agriculture, 1860*, 225.
14. Manuscript returns of the Eighth U. S. Census, 1860, Schedule I, Free Inhabitants, Schedule 2, Slave Inhabitants, and Schedule 4, Agriculture, Hillsborough County, Florida, on microfilm at the National Archives, Washington, D. C., and the Robert Manning Strozier Library, Florida State University, Tallahassee. Hereafter these manuscript returns on microfilm will be cited as Eighth Census, 1860, with appropriate schedule numbers.

stock with the aid of their families and neighbors. Since they owned few if any slaves, Hillsborough's agriculturalists devoted most of their improved acreage to corn and sweet potatoes— crops which required little labor and equipment and which could be consumed by both humans and livestock.¹⁵

In 1860, Hillsborough County produced 43,501 bushels of corn, ranking fifteenth among Florida's counties, and raised 55,814 bushels of sweet and Irish potatoes, standing eighth among the counties. If the average corn yield in Florida was twelve and one-half bushels per acre, and if the typical potato yield was 400 bushels per acre, then at least 3,480 acres in Hillsborough were devoted to corn and at least 140 acres to potatoes. Corn and potatoes, therefore, claimed over half of the county's 6,682 improved acres.¹⁶

High hammocks offered the best soils for corn in Hillsborough County, but they were difficult to clear. Trees had to be felled, tangled undergrowth removed, and the roots grubbed up; it could take a month to clear only one acre. Consequently, many of Hillsborough's agriculturalists planted their corn and potatoes in old "cowpens" that were cleared from the pine-turkey oak hills. Cattle-owners cleared a few acres of pineland and built a cowpen or corral of pine poles. Calves remained in the cowpen during the day, while cows foraged on the open-range. When the cows returned to the cowpen, their manure enriched even the sandiest soils. After a few months, herders moved the cowpen to a new location, and they planted the well-manured old cowpen in potatoes, corn, and other crops.¹⁷

By 1860, Hillsborough farmers were raising enough corn and potatoes to feed all the county's residents as well as the work stock— horses, mules, and oxen.¹⁸ Any additional corn and po-

15. Eighth Census, 1860, Schedule 2 and 4; Sam Bowers Hilliard, *Hog Meat and Hoecake: Food Supply in the Old South, 1840-1860* (Carbondale, Ill., 1972), 151, 174-75.

16. U. S. Bureau of Census, *Agriculture, 1860*, 19; Stickney, "Florida Soil," 61. Hillsborough's remaining improved acreage was planted in minor crops or was cleared pasture.

17. Grismer, *Tampa*, 101; E. I. Wiggins, *A History of the Mt. Enon Association* (Tampa, 1921), 4; M. F. Hetherington, *History of Polk County Florida* (St. Augustine, 1928), 14; interview with Seth Alderman, August 28, 1982. Mr. Alderman is the descendant of James Alderman, a farm operator in antebellum Hillsborough County.

18. The writer used a modification of Hilliard's formula for determining

tatoes could have been used to fatten hogs for home slaughter. Hillsborough contained as many as 7,584 hogs which foraged on the open-range for most of the year, subsisting on acorns, palmetto berries, and sprouts.¹⁹ Despite this sizable hog population, the county failed to meet its pork needs in 1860, and the deficiency was presumably made up by slaughtering range-fed beef cattle.²⁰ If the average range-fed steer yielded 300 pounds of beef, the county would have needed only 497 range steers to meet its beef requirements in 1860.²¹ This would have represented a mere handful of Hillsborough's 37,820 cattle.

Since pine flatwoods dominated Hillsborough's landscape, and since flatwoods offered little more than grazing for cattle, this extensive range supported about thirteen cattle for each person in the county. This was one of the highest cattle-to-people

$$\text{self-sufficiency in corn, } C = \frac{\text{Corn production in bushels}}{(13 \text{ bu.} \times \text{Number of people}) + (7.5 \text{ bu.} \times \text{Number of horses and mules}) + (1 \text{ bu.} \times \text{Number of oxen})}$$

Self-sufficiency occurred when C was greater than 1.00. In Hillsborough County in 1860, 43,501 bu.

$$C = \frac{(13 \text{ bu.} \times 2,981 \text{ people}) + (7.5 \text{ bu.} \times 356 \text{ horses and mules}) + (1 \text{ bu.} \times 99 \text{ oxen})}{41,522 \text{ bu.}} = 1.05;$$

and Hillsborough would have achieved bare self-sufficiency in corn. But converting Hillsborough's sweet and Irish potatoes (55,814 bu.) to their corn equivalents (1 bu. of potatoes = $\frac{1}{4}$ bu. of corn) would have furnished an additional 13,954 bu. of corn equivalents. Adding these, C would have been $\frac{57,455 \text{ bu.}}{41,522 \text{ bu.}} = 1.38$; and Hillsborough would have produced a surplus of foodstuffs and fodder in 1860. Hilliard, *Hog Meat and Hoecake*, 157-58; Raymond C. Battalio and John Kagel, "The Structure of Antebellum Southern Agriculture: South Carolina, a Case Study," *Agricultural History*, XLIV (January 1970), 28; U. S. Bureau of Census, *Agriculture, 1860*, 18-19; U. S. Bureau of Census, *Population, 1860*, 54.

19. U. S. Bureau of Census, *Agriculture, 1860*, 19; "Climate, Soil, and Productions of Florida," *De Bow's Review*, XI (October 1851), 411.
20. Assuming that each adult consumed the equivalent of 2.2 hogs a year, and children consumed half that amount, the number of Hillsborough's human pork consumers in 1860 would have been the number of adults (1,561) plus the number of children under fifteen ($1,420/2$) = 2,271. They would have required the equivalent of $2,271 \times 2.2$ hogs = 4,996 hogs. If one-half of Hillsborough's 7,584 hogs were slaughtered in that year, and the remainder were spared for breeding, this would have provided only 3,792 hogs, resulting in a deficiency of at least 1,204 hogs. Hilliard, *Hog Meat and Hoecake*, 260-61; U. S. Bureau of Census, *Population, 1860*, 50-53.
21. Hilliard, *Hog Meat and Hoeceke*, 129-30.

ratios of any community in the Old South. In the state of Florida as a whole, there were only three cattle for each person.²²

Geographers have noted that any antebellum county with at least three cattle per person could have produced a surplus of beef cattle. Thus, a family of six who owned as few as eighteen cattle could have sold several surplus beef steers each year. Eighteen cattle would have furnished a family with a work ox, a bull, two milk cows, six breeding cows, and eight steers for home slaughter or for sale. Using eighteen cattle as the minimum definition of a cattle-rancher— a herder who produced beef cattle for sale— then at least sixty-one per cent of Hillsborough's farm operators in 1860 could be regarded as ranchers.²³

Hillsborough's cattle-ranchers probably called themselves "cowmen" and not ranchers, but they owned ninety-nine per cent of the county's cattle. If they routinely marketed ten per cent of their 37,289 cattle in 1860, and if the average steer was worth \$15.00, then the estimated value of their marketable beeves was \$55,935.²⁴ This far surpassed the estimated value of Hillsborough's sugar and cotton crops in 1860. If each hogshead of sugar and each bale of long-staple cotton fetched about \$100, then Hillsborough's forty-seven hogsheads and eighty-eight bales were worth only \$13,500.²⁵

By the eve of the Civil War, the cattle industry dominated the economy of Hillsborough County and the south Florida frontier. Tampa's deputy port collector estimated that the counties of the Tampa Bay region exported \$168,540 worth of goods in 1859. Of this total, 7,211 live cattle, each worth about \$15.00, accounted for \$108,165, or sixty-four per cent of the total. Of the cattle exported from the Tampa Bay region, the majority, about 4,800 steers, were driven to the "Atlantic ports." The rest,

22. *Ibid.*, 113-14; U. S. Bureau of Census, *Agriculture, 1860*, 18; U. S. Bureau of Census, *Population*, 54.

23. Kenneth D. Israel, "A Geographical Analysis of the Cattle Industry in Southeastern Mississippi from Its Beginnings to 1860" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1970), 78; Eighth Census, 1860, Schedule 4.

24. Interview with Seth Alderman; Eighth Census, 1860, Schedule 4; Mealor, "Open-Range Ranch," 40; "List of Produce &c. Shipped from the Port of Tampa, during the Past Season," *Tampa Florida Peninsular*, December 3, 1859.

25. "List of Produce"; U. S. Bureau of Census, *Agriculture, 1860*, 19, 21.

an estimated 2,411 head, were shipped by boat to overseas markets such as Havana, Cuba.²⁶

South Florida cowmen had traditionally driven their beef cattle to coastal cities like Savannah, or to the railhead at Baldwin, near Jacksonville. This pattern began to change in the late 1850s with the opening of the Cuban cattle trade.²⁷ James McKay, the Scottish-born Tampa merchant, has been credited with opening this market in 1858 when he chartered a ship to export cattle on a bi-monthly basis. During his first year of operation, McKay shipped a total of only 1,000 beeves to Havana, but by early 1860, he was exporting 400 cattle per month to Cuba.²⁸

To facilitate his trade with Cuba, McKay purchased a propeller steamer, *The Salvor*, and a brig, *The Huntress*. In addition, he constructed holding pens for cattle at Tampa and leased lightering vessels to haul animals to ships anchored in Tampa Bay. He also established commercial contracts with south Florida cowmen to supply his burgeoning cattle trade. Jacob Summerlin, a Hillsborough cowman who owned 220 cattle in 1860, played a major role in McKay's trade, touring the backcountry, purchasing steers at cowpens, and driving them to the holding pens at Tampa. McKay also purchased steers from backcountry cowmen such as Joseph Howell and J. P. McMullen. He paid cash on delivery and usually in Spanish gold from Havana.²⁹

South Florida's lucrative cattle trade with Cuba rested on the scrawny shoulders of an unassuming animal known as the "Florida scrub cow." The Florida scrub traced its ancestry to *criollo* cattle introduced by the Spanish colonists and to the cattle brought in by the Anglo-American settlers of Florida after 1821. Left to fend for themselves, the scrubs evolved into hardy beasts which could survive on native forage throughout the year. The

26. "List of Produce."

27. D. B. McKay, "Pioneer Florida: Story of Mrs. Blount Recalls Rugged Days," Tampa *Sunday Tribune*, September 26, 1948; Dillon, "South Florida in 1860" 451.

28. Joe A. Akerman, Jr., *Florida Cowman, A History of Florida Cattle Raising* (Kissimmee, 1976), 100; "A New Era in the History of Tampa," Tampa *Florida Peninsular*, July 28, 1860.

29. "New Era"; Akerman, *Florida Cowman*, 100; James McKay, "MS Receipt Book of Capt. James McKay of Tampa" (1850-1868), Box 3, Miscellaneous Manuscripts, No. 59, Florida Historical Society Library, University of South Florida, Tampa; Eighth Census, 1860, Schedule 4; D. B. McKay, "Pioneer Florida: How McKay Family Came to Tampa and Aided South in War," Tampa *Sunday Tribune*, July 28, 1946.

scrubs also developed a high degree of immunity to endemic stock diseases such as tick-borne fevers. Though remarkably robust, scrubs were rather small in size, gaining weight during the wet, warm months when forage was plentiful and losing weight during the winter months when forage was scarce. When a scrub steer reached market size, it would weigh about 600 pounds, yielding perhaps 300 pounds of beef. The meat from scrub steers may have been tough by today's standards, but range-fed beef possessed a flavor resembling that of venison. In any case, Florida beef was much in demand for use in highly-spiced Cuban cuisine.³⁰

Since scrub cattle foraged on the open-range and required no supplementary feed or veterinary care, they received little attention from their owners during most of the year. Cowmen, however, hunted the wolves that preyed on their cattle, and they burned the flatwoods range in late winter to reduce the undergrowth, fertilize a new growth of grass, and curb parasites such as cattle ticks. And during the fall, cowmen collected the scrub cattle, branded and marked the new calves to determine ownership, and selected the beef steers for market. Requiring little labor to raise, scrub cattle proved to be the ideal cash crop for families who owned few if any slave laborers.³¹

James Alderman, for example, was one of Hillsborough's leading cowmen, claiming 1,770 cattle and 240 acres of land in 1860. Yet, he owned no slaves. Alderman's household included his wife, Roxie Ann, several daughters, and two sons, Townsend and William. But in spite of the dearth of laborers within his household, James could call on a wider network for aid in agricultural work. His neighbors included his married sons, Matthew, Mitchell, Timothy, and Michael Alderman, as well as his sons-in-law, M. P. Lyons and William B. Moody. James Alderman, moreover, could call on other members of the Alafia settlement, the dispersed rural neighborhood that had grown up around Alderman's Ford on the Alafia River. James Alderman himself

-
30. John E. Rouse, *The Criollo: Spanish Cattle in the Americas* (Norman, 1977), 76, 186, 234; Akerman, *Florida Cowman*, 54; interview with Seth Alderman; Hilliard, *Hog Meat and Hoecake*, 129; Stetson Kennedy, *Palmetto Country* (New York, 1942), 214.
31. William L. Straub, *History of Pinellas County, Florida* (St. Augustine, 1929), 36; interview with Seth Alderman; Hetherington, *History of Polk County*, 183-84; A Wild Man of the Woods, "The Peninsula of Florida," *Southern Cultivator*, XVIII (September 1860), 270.

had founded the Alafia settlement before 1850, when he and his family had migrated from Thomas County, Georgia, to the Alafia River valley in Hillsborough County.³²

James Alderman was not an isolated example but was typical of Hillsborough's cowmen, who owned, on the average, fewer than two slaves per household. Cowmen generally relied on their neighbors for casual labor in collecting cattle and driving steers to market.³³ And in many cases, their neighbors were also their kinsmen. Such widely-shared surnames as Alderman, Platt, Dur-rance, Hendry, Raulerson, Summeralls, Hollingsworth, Lanier, Hamilton, Knight, Collins, Underhill, Hancock, Whidden, Blount, and Sloan appear repeatedly in any listing of Hillsborough's cowmen.³⁴

Kinship was truly the major organizing force among the south Florida cowmen. They typically migrated to Hillsborough County from the southeastern states, traveling as extended families— parents and their married children and their slaves, if they possessed any. Arriving in Hillsborough, such extended families dispersed across the landscape, obtaining small farmsteads and using the intervening woods as range for their cattle. Though dispersed across several square miles, the scattered farmsteads constituted a rural neighborhood of kinsmen, affines, and friends, who could call on each other for aid in handling cattle, clearing land, building houses, and defending their homesteads against Seminole Indian forays.³⁵

Such rural neighborhoods or settlements could be found about Tampa Bay and along the Hillsborough and Alafia rivers, as well as along the west bank of Pease Creek. But as late as

32. Eighth Census, 1860, Schedules 1, 2, and 4; Kyle S. VanLandingham, "James Alderman 1801-1880," *South Florida Pioneers*, No. 14 (October 1977), 15-16; interview with Seth Alderman.

33. Eighth Census, 1860, Schedules 2 and 4; Mealor and Prunty, "Open-Range Ranching in Southern Florida," 363.

34. For detailed genealogical studies of antebellum Hillsborough families, see Richard M. Livingston, ed., *South Florida Pioneers* (Fort Ogden, 1974-1984).

35. "Old Letter from B. F. Blount Gives Data on Early History of Polk," *Bartow Polk County Record*, January 26, 1940; Hetherington, *History of Polk County*, 14-15; Quintilla Bruton and David E. Bailey, Jr., *Plant City: Its Origin and History* (St. Petersburg, 1977), 35, 38; Louise Frisbie, *Yesterday's Polk County* (Miami, 1976), 16; Wiggins, *Mt. Enon Association*, 4-5; James Dallas Tillis, "An Indian Attack of 1856 on the Home of Willoughby Tillis," *Florida Historical Quarterly*, VIII (April 1930),

1855, there were no settlements east of Pease Creek, for this land ostensibly lay within the Seminole Indian reservation.³⁶

At the close of the Second Seminole War in 1842, the surviving Seminoles had been allowed to remain within a reservation that was bounded on the west by Pease Creek, on the north by Lake Istokpoga, and on the east by the Kissimmee River. The United States Army, nevertheless, continued to send armed patrols into the Seminole Indian reservation, and in December 1855, when a patrol under Lieutenant Hartsuff desecrated Chief Billy Bowlegs's garden, a third and final war with the Seminoles (1855-1858) began. But with the surrender and deportation of Billy Bowlegs and most of his followers in 1858, Hillsborough's cowmen were free to expand their settlements into the old Seminole reservation, moving eastward to the Kissimmee River and southward to the Caloosahatchee River by 1860.³⁷

Despite their dispersal across hundreds of square miles of sparsely-settled south Florida frontier, the cowmen maintained their commercial links with Tampa—the county seat of Hillsborough County and south Florida's second largest town with 885 inhabitants. South Florida cowmen continued to drive scrub steers to the Tampa merchants for shipment to Cuba.³⁸ The economic interdependence of the backcountry cowmen and the Tampa merchants is closely reflected in Hillsborough politics, for these two groups dominated the county commission in 1860.³⁹ Of the four commission seats, the cowmen claimed two and the Tampa merchants claimed two.

By 1860, the cowmen and the members of their households

-
36. J. C. Ives, "Military Map of the Peninsula of Florida South of Tampa Bay" (Washington, 1856), on file at the P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History, University of Florida, Gainesville.
 37. John K. Mahon, *History of the Second Seminole War 1835-1842* (Gainesville, 1967), 315-16; Florence Fritz, *Unknown Florida* (Coral Gables, 1963), 62-66; Kyle S. VanLandingham, *Pioneer Families of the Kissimmee River Valley* (privately printed, 1976), 4-5; Jean Plowden, *History of Hardee County* (Wauchula, 1929), 16; Joe G. Warner, *Biscuits and Taters: A History of Cattle Ranching in Manatee County* (St. Petersburg, 1980), 6-8.
 38. Grismer, *Tampa*, 131; Dillon, "South Florida in 1860," 444; Bruton and Bailey, *Plant City*, 42; G. W. Hendry, "Fort Meade the Ancient: Brief Sketch of the City's Earliest Industrial History," *Fort Meade Leader*, May 1, 1913; Georgiana Kjerulff, *Tales of Old Brevard* (Melbourne, 1972), 29.
 39. For a list of Hillsborough County officers (1860) who were elected in October 1859, see notices in the *Tampa Florida Peninsular*, October 8 and December 31, 1859.

comprised forty-three per cent of Hillsborough's free population. In addition to their numerical importance, Hillsborough's cowmen owned ninety-two per cent of the county's wealth in livestock, seventy-two per cent of the wealth in farmland, and forty-seven per cent of the county's slaves. They also elected two of their members to the county commission— Joseph Mizell and J. P. McMullen. Commissioner Mizell possessed 575 cattle, 342 acres of farmland, and only one slave. Commissioner McMullen, a Georgia native as was Mizell, owned 165 cattle, forty-three acres, and no slaves.⁴⁰

Hillsborough's cowmen may have produced the county's most valuable commodity— scrub steers— but Tampa merchants exported the steers to Cuba and imported the consumer goods which the cowmen purchased. Possessing a spacious harbor, Tampa had become one of Florida's busiest ports. By 1860, three steamers and one brig, including James McKay's *Salvor* and *Huntress*, were engaged in the Cuban cattle trade. In addition, schooners from New York, as well as mail steamers and schooners from New Orleans, regularly called to deliver dry goods and groceries to Tampa's merchants. They in turn furnished goods to the backcountry merchants such as Riley Blount, who operated a small store on Pease Creek. Journeying to the backcountry stores or to Tampa, Hillsborough's cowmen obtained such necessities and luxuries as textiles, brogans, salt, ammunition, coffee, soda, flour, and tobacco. Storekeepers typically offered no credit, exchanging consumer goods only for country produce or cash. Spanish gold, acquired in the Cuban cattle trade, was the most common form of cash circulating in antebellum Hillsborough County.⁴¹

Given their control of county trade, Tampa merchants were able to place two members on the county commission— John Darling and L. G. Covacevich. Darling, a native of Vermont and the owner of five slaves, was one of Tampa's several northern-born merchants. Covacevich, born in Trieste in the Austrian

40. Eighth Census, 1860, Schedules 1, 2, and 4.

41. "New Era"; "List of Produce"; Hetherington, *History of Polk County*, 14-15, 20; various advertisements in the Tampa *Florida Peninsular*, 1858-1860; Straub, *History of Pinellas County*, 37; Akerman, *Florida Cowman*, 101.

empire, was a well-to-do merchant who owned nine slaves. Neither commissioner owned cattle or farmland.⁴²

Tampans also won the remaining county offices: judge of probate court, Simon Turman, Jr.; clerk of the circuit court, J. M. Hayman; sheriff and tax collector, William S. Spencer; coroner, George W. Edwards; and surveyor, John Jackson. Turman, the son of Hillsborough's judge of probate in 1845, was a native of Indiana, the owner of one slave, and the editor of the local newspaper, the *Florida Peninsular*. The Georgia-born Hayman was a Baptist preacher who owned no slaves. Spencer, another Georgia native, owned one slave and listed his primary occupation as sheriff. The New Hampshire-born Edwards was a painter who owned no slaves. Jackson, a native of Ireland, was a professional surveyor who had acquired one slave. Again, none of the five Tampans owned cattle or farmland.⁴³

Although Tampans claimed five offices and two commission seats in Hillsborough's county government, the cowmen of the backcountry represented a sizable voting bloc which became apparent in the 1860 election for Hillsborough's delegate to the state legislature. Joseph Howell, William Turner, and S. B. Todd stood for election. Howell was a South Carolina-born cowman who owned 1,230 cattle, 240 acres, and three slaves. Turner, a Virginia-born farmer, owned 880 acres of land as well as sixteen slaves who cropped nine bales of long-staple cotton. Todd was a New York-born doctor residing in Tampa, who owned no cattle, land, or slaves. In the county-wide election held in October, Howell won with 183 votes, Turner placed second with 152 votes, and Todd finished a distant third with twenty votes. Joseph Howell, a veteran cowman who had lived in Hillsborough since the early 1840s and who had lost his first wife in a Seminole Indian raid, was a most appropriate choice to send to Tallahassee, representing the interests of Hillsborough County— a community located in Florida's cattle-ranching frontier.⁴⁴

42. Eighth Census, 1860, Schedules 1, 2, and 4; Seventh Census, 1850, Schedule 1.

43. Eighth Census, 1860, Schedules 1, 2, and 4.

44. Election returns in Tampa *Florida Peninsular*, October 27, 1860; Eighth Census, 1860, Schedules 1, 2, and 4; D. B. McKay, "Pioneer Florida: Joseph Howell Lost Wife and Baby to Indian Scalpers. . . ." Tampa *Sunday Tribune*, November 28, 1954.

FLORIDA HISTORY IN PERIODICALS

This selected bibliography includes scholarly articles in the fields of Florida history, archeology, geography, and anthropology published in state, regional, and national periodicals in 1983. Articles, notes, and documents which have appeared in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* are NOT included in this listing since they appear in the annual index of each volume. The present listing also includes articles appearing in journals not published on schedule and which were not included in the list published in the July 1983 issue of the *Quarterly*.

- AUSTIN, ROBERT J., "The Cypress Creek Site: Lithic Analysis and Site Function," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (September-December 1983), 124-39.
- BASH, EVELYN C., "Profiles of Early Settlers on the Pinellas Peninsula," *Tampa Bay History*, V (Spring/Summer 1983), 82-93.
- BEAUCHAMP, LOUISE, "Zora Neale Hurston and the Mural of Florida History," *Apalachee* [Tallahassee Historical Society], IX (1980-1983), 5-12.
- BLAINE, MICHAEL, comp., "Eight-by-Ten: South Florida's History in the Movies," *Marquee* [South Florida Magazine of the Arts and Entertainment, Miami] (August/September 1982), 17-25.
- , "A History of South Florida in the Movies," *Marquee* (August/September 1983), 38-42.
- BLAKEY, B. HIRAM, "Naval Aviator #24 [Albert C. Read] Flies the Atlantic," *Update* [Historical Association of Southern Florida], X (November 1983), 3-8.
- BOSWELL, THOMAS D., "In the Eye of the Storm: The Context of Haitian Migration to Miami, Florida," *Southeastern Geographer*, XXIII (November 1983), 63-73.
- CAFARO, JOSEPH J., "Tallahassee: Revolution and Red Scare [1917-1920]," *Apalachee*, IX (1980-1983), 13-28.
- CANCIO, LEOPOLDO, "Two Documents Relating to Governor Gonzalo Méndez De Canzo (1596-1603)," *El Escribano* [St. Augustine Historical Society], XX (1983), 45-50.

- CARBONE, VICTOR A., "Late Quarternary Environments in Florida and the Southeast," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (March-June 1983), 3-17.
- CARR, ARCHIE, "All the Way Down Upon the Suwannee River," *Audubon*, LXXXV (March 1983), 78-101.
- CARROLL, CAROLYN, "Early Postcard Fad Immortalizes City," *Jacksonville*, XX (March-April 1983), 25-29.
- COURTWRIGHT, DAVID T., "The Hidden Epidemic: Opiate Addiction and Cocaine Use in the South [including Jacksonville], 1860-1920," *Journal of Southern History*, XLIX (February 1983), 57-72.
- CLAYTON, DANNY H., "Unusual Marks Found on Giant Land Tortoise Remains in Hillsborough River," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (March-June 1983), 101-04.
- COOMES, CHARLES S., "The Basilica-Cathedral of St. Augustine, St. Augustine, Florida and Its History," *El Escribano*, XX (1983), 3244.
- DANIEL, RANDY, and MICHAEL WISENBAKER, "A Preliminary Report on the Excavations at Harney Flats, Hillsborough County," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (March-June 1983), 67-80.
- DEAN, JAMES, "Shipwrecks of Broward County," Broward Legacy [Broward County Historical Society], VI (Winter/Spring 1983), 11-26.
- DENHAM, JAMES M., "An Upper Class Institution: Dueling in Territorial Middle Florida During the Early 1830s," *Apalachee*, IX (1980-1983), 29-40.
- DILLON, RODNEY E., JR., "Fort Lauderdale's Brickell Avenue," *New River News* [Fort Lauderdale Historical Society], XXII (Summer 1983), 4-13.
- , "They Served at Fort Lauderdale, Civil War Generals in the Seminole Wars," *New River News*, XXI (Winter 1983), 4-12.
- DUNBAR, JAMES S., and BEN I. WALLER, "A Distribution Analysis of the Clovis/Suwannee Paleo-Indian Sites of Florida— A Geographic Approach," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (March-June 1983), 18-30.
- FLEMING, ROGER, and RON COLE, "Lawyers and the Law in Early Fort Lauderdale," *New River News*, XXII (Fall 1983), 412.

- FRIEDMANN, PEGGY, "Multitalented Black [James Weldon Johnson], Our Greatest Man?" *Jacksonville*, XX (November-December 1983), 9-16.
- FRISBIE, LOUISE K., "'Come In and Be Our Guests,' Historic Hotels Along the Suncoast," *Tampa Bay History*, V (Spring/Summer 1983), 42-55.
- GOODYEAR, ALBERT C., SAM B. UPCHURCH, MARK J. BROOKS, and NANCY N. GOODYEAR, "Paleo-Indian Manifestations in the Tampa Bay Region, Florida," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (March-June 1983), 40-66.
- GRAVES, WILLIAM H., "Apache Indians and North Florida," *Apalachee*, IX (1980-1983), 41-53.
- HAMBURGER, SUSAN, "The 1968 Tallahassee Riots following the Assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.," *Apalachee*, IX (1980-1983), 57-66.
- HARVEY, EDNA MORRIS, "My Life in South Florida," *Tequesta*, XLIII (1983), 25-49.
- HAY, ROBERT P., "John Fitzgerald [Florida newspaper editor]: Presidential Imagemaker for Andrew Jackson in 1923," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, XLII (Summer 1983), 138-50.
- HAZELTINE, DAN, "A Late Paleo-Indian Site, Cape Haze Peninsula, Charlotte County, Florida," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (March-June 1983), 98-100.
- HOFFMAN, CHARLES A., "A Mammoth Kill Site in the Silver Springs Run," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (March-June 1983), 83-87.
- HOFFMAN, LORRAINE C., "Indian Key," *Tropical Trails* [Dade County Park and Recreation Department] (December-January, 1983), 2-8.
- HOFFMAN, PAUL E., "Legend, Religious Idealism, and Colonies: The Point of Santa Elena in History, 1552-1566," *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, LXXXIV (April 1983), 59-71.
- HOLMES, JACK D. L., "Charting Mobile Bay and River [early 18th century]" *Alabama Historical Quarterly*, XLV (Fall/Winter 1983), 143-70.
- , "Spanish Interest in Tampa Bay during the 18th Century," *Tampa Bay History*, V (Spring/Summer 1983), 5-23.
- , "The Value of the Arpent [measurement of land] in

Spanish Louisiana and West Florida," *Louisiana History*, XXIV (Summer 1983), 314-20.

- IRWIN, RUTH S., intro., "Weathering the Storms: The Floyd Wilder Family and the Great Hurricanes of the 1920s," *Tampa Bay History*, V (Spring/Summer 1983), 56-70.
- ISCAN, M. YASAR, "Skeletal Biology of the Margate-Blount Population," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (September-December 1983), 154-66.
- , and PATRICIA MILLER-SHAIVITZ, "A Review of Physical Anthropology in *The Florida Anthropologist*," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (September-December 1983), 114-23.
- KENNEDY, THOMAS S., "An Autobiography by a Country Doctor, Part One," *Broward Legacy*, VI (Winter/Spring 1983), 31-44.
- , "An Autobiography by a Country Doctor, Part Two," *Broward Legacy*, VI (Summer/Fall 1983), 17-21, 28-47.
- KNETSCH, JOE, "Could They Have Known?: Lessons Ignored from the July 1926 Hurricane," *Broward Legacy*, VI (Summer/Fall 1983), 22-27.
- KNIGHT, VERNON J., JR., and SHERÉE L. ADAMS, "A Voyage to the Mobile and Tomeh [Indians of the northern Gulf coast] in 1700, with Notes on the Interior of Alabama," *Ethnohistory*, XXVII (Spring 1981), 179-94.
- LANGLEY, WRIGHT, and ARVA MOORE PARKS, eds., "Diary of an Unidentified Land Official, 1855, Key West to Miami," *Tequesta*, XLIII (1983), 5-23.
- LIEN, PAUL M., "Amino Acid Racemization Dates from Paleo-Indian Sites in Florida," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (March-June 1983), 106-07.
- MANUCY, ALBERT, "Building Materials in 16-century St. Augustine," *El Escribano*, XX (1983), 51-71.
- MARTINEZ, RAFAEL, and CHARLES V. WETLI, "Brujeria: Manifestations of Palo Mayombe in South Florida," *Journal of the Florida Medical Association*, LXX (August 1983), 629-34.
- MIKELL, GWENDOLYN, "When Horses Talk: Reflections on Zora Neale Hurston's Haitian Anthropology," *Phylon*, XLIII (September 1982), 218-30.
- MILTON, SANDE, "Participation in Local School Board Elections

- [Florida, 1964-1974]: A Reappraisal," *Social Science Quarterly*, LXIV (September 1983), 647-54.
- MORISON, ELTING E., "What Went Wrong With Disney's World's Fair [Epcot Center in historical perspective]," *American Heritage*, XXXV (January 1983), 71-79.
- MUELLER, EDWARD A., "The Plant Steamship Line," *Steamboat Bill* [Steamship Historical Society of America], XL (Fall 1983), 165-72.
- MYERS, RUBY ANDREWS, "Newspaper Pioneering on the Florida East Coast, 1891-1895," *Tequesta*, XLIII (1983), 51-62.
- PEARCE, GEORGE F., "He Did Not Curry Favor [Henry C. Mustin and Pensacola Naval Air Station]," *Aerospace Historian*, XXX (Fall/September 1983), 193-99.
- QUINN, JANE, "Nuns in Ybor City: The Sisters of St. Joseph and the Immigrant Community," *Tampa Bay History*, V (Spring/Summer 1983), 24-41.
- RASICO, PHILIP D., "The Spanish and Minorcan Linguistic Heritage of St. Augustine, Florida," *El Escribano*, XX (1983), 1-25.
- REYNOLDS, CYNTHIA FURLONG, "Memories of a Moving Day Fifty Years Ago," *University of Tampa Magazine*, I (September 1983), 2-5.
- RHODES, MARY MARGARET PICHARD, "From Mission Bells to Cathedral Chimes [Catholic Church in Apalachee region]," *Apalachee*, IX (1980-1983), 67-88.
- ROGERS, WILLIAM WARREN, "The Way They Went: Death in Leon County in 1860," *Apalachee*, IX (1980-1983), 89-95.
- SANDOVAL, MERCEDES S., "Santeria," *Journal of the Florida Medical Association*, LXX (August 1983), 620-28.
- SCHEICK, WILLIAM J., "Telling a Wonder: Dialectic in the Writings [Florida Journal] of John Bartram," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, CVII (April 1983), 235-48.
- SEARCY, MARTHA CONDRAY, "1779: The First Year of the British Occupation of Georgia [East Florida troops]," *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, LXVII (Summer 1983), 168-88.
- SELLARDS, E. H., "An Engraved Mammoth Tusk from Vero Beach," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (March-June 1983), 105.
- SERBOUSEK, DON, "Explorations of a Paleo-Indian Site on the

- Aucilla River," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (March-June 1983), 88-97.
- SHERLOCK, VIVIAN M., "Medical Practices in the Port of Apalachicola, 1830-1850," *Apalachee*, IX (1980-1983), 97-104.
- STRAIGHT, WILLIAM M., "Throw Downs, Fixin, Rooting and Hexing," *Journal of the Florida Medical Association*, LXX (August 1983), 635-41.
- TEBEAU, CHARLTON W., ed., "Life in Palm Beach County, Florida, 1918-1928, Part I: Engineering and Farming," from *Grandpop's Book* by Noah Kellum Williams, *Tequesta*, XLIII (1983), 51-62.
- VAN HORNE, JOHN C., "Andrew Ellicott's Mission to Natchez [West Florida] (1796-1798)," *Journal of Mississippi History*, XLV (August 1983), 160-85.
- VICKERS, ELIZABETH D., "F. Elisabeth Crowell: Pensacola's Pioneer Nurse," *Journal of the Florida Medical Association*, LXX (August 1983), 642-45.
- WATLINGTON, FRANK, "The First American Wine [Santa Elena, 1566-1568]," *Eastern Grape Grower and Winery News*, IX (October-November 1983), 50-52.
- WAYNE, LUCY B., "The Bailey House [Gainesville]: Interpretation of Trash Disposal at an Urban Site," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (September-December 1983), 177-85.
- WEBB, S. DAVID, JERALD T. MILANICH, ROGER ALEXON, and JAMES DUNBAR, "An Extinct *Bison* Kill Site, Jefferson County, Florida," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (March-June 1983), 81-82.
- WILLIAMS, WILMA B., "Bridge to the Past: Excavations at the Margate-Blount Site," *Florida Anthropologist*, XXXVI (September-December 1983), 142-53.
- WILSON, MARGARET F., "Zora Neale Hurston: Author and Folklorist," *Negro History Bulletin*, XLV (no. 4, 1982), 109-10.
- WINSBERG, MORTON D., "Ethnic Competition for Residential Space in Miami, Florida, 1970-80," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, XLII (July 1983), 305-14.
- WRONG, CHARLES, trans., "A Frenchman [Edmond Johanet] in Brooksville [1890]," *Tampa Bay History*, V (Spring/Summer 1983), 71-81.
- YATES, STEVE, "Marjory Stoneman Douglas and the Glades Crusade," *Audubon*, LXXXV (March 1983), 112-27.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Oldest City. Edited by Jean Parker Waterbury. (St. Augustine: St. Augustine Historical Society, 1983. xi, 262 pp. Preface, maps, illustrations, photographs, major sources, index. \$25.00, \$8.95, paper.)

The St. Augustine Historical Society is distinguished for its past tradition, its activity in the present, and for its publications. *The Oldest City* is a worthy successor to the Society's other printed works. In commissioning this history of St. Augustine, the Society chose eight authors to present and analyze the story of the First City from the close of the Ice Age until today.

The book begins with John Griffin's provocative essay, "The Men who met Menéndez," in which the reader glimpses aboriginal Florida and then sees the invading Europeans through Indian eyes. This excellent ethnohistorical summary outlines Indo-European contact in Florida and the irrevocable changes it brought in its train. In "The Noble and Loyal City: 1565-1668," Amy Bushnell very ably delineates the stressful years after Menéndez's founding of St. Augustine, through the Drake raid and into the expansion and contraction of Spanish Florida through the middle seventeenth century. The last years paralleled those of Spain's decline, in which rival nations planted colonies in North America.

Jean Parker Waterbury edited the volume and also wrote the excellent chapter "The Castillo Years, 1668-1763." In this time, the great Castillo de San Marcos was built and St. Augustine suffered invasion from the English colonies. An international power exchange led to Florida's loss in 1763, and St. Augustine became an English town. Daniel L. Schafer's chapter "Not so gay a town as this" is a penetrating analysis of British East Florida. Sizable land grants and English settlement led to dynamic economic activity as roads were built to unite St. Augustine with New Smyrna and Cowford. Despite some of the tensions that had led to the American Revolution, East Florida prospered and remained loyal to the crown.

Florida was returned to Spain after the American Revolution,

and Patricia C. Griffin has well described the time which followed as "The People-Mix Period." East Florida, peopled with a rich admixture of races and nationalities, experienced border wars, disputes over escaped slaves, and outlaw raids. Meanwhile, there waited in the wings that lusty new polity, the United States. Mrs. Griffin furnishes lively particulars of everyday existence in cosmopolitan St. Augustine. St. Augustine left its colonial times behind when, on July 10, 1821, it passed under United States sovereignty. George E. Buker here clearly describes "The Americanization of St. Augustine, 1821-1865." The city began to assume its classic architectural and demographic form as black, Minorcan, and Hispanic elements were assimilated into an American polity. The city survived yellow fever, freezes, and Indian and Civil war.

Thomas Graham has well designated that time in St. Augustine's life from 1865 to 1913 as "The Flagler Era." As Florida revived after the Civil War, St. Augustine found itself outside the railroad or steamer routes, and tourism developed slowly until Henry M. Flagler, co-founder of the Standard Oil Company, came in 1884. Soon Flagler's railroad arrived and three Flagler hotels graced St. Augustine. It had now become a modern city. "Yesterday and the Day Before," vividly written by Robert N. Dow, portrays the impact of the twentieth century upon St. Augustine. The advent of the automobile, the Great War, boom and depression stressed but never broke the social fabric of the Ancient City. At last, she has come full circle with her colonial past. Mr. Dow traces the restoration movement from 1924 until the present.

In sum: this useful work should become a standard.

University of Florida

EUGENE LYON

Spanish St. Augustine: The Archaeology of a Colonial Creole Community. By Kathleen Deagan. (New York: Academic Press, 1983. xxii, 317 pp. Preface, maps, photographs, illustrations, tables, appendices, references, index. \$39.50.)

To anthropologist Melville Herskovits, the New World offered a "laboratory" to study the process of cultural interchange that occurred as free Europeans and African slaves settled among

Native Americans after 1492. Unfortunately, the early centuries of this cultural interchange in the New World were poorly documented in the written record. The masses of Native Americans and Africans were unlettered, and even most European settlers were illiterate. Thus, only a few literate Europeans left incomplete and biased accounts of the lifeways of their fellow illiterate New World inhabitants.

Although the written record of cultural interchange among New World inhabitants may be sparse, the archeological record of this process may be exceedingly rich. Such is the case at St. Augustine, Florida, which was a *presidio*, or garrison, of the Spanish empire from 1565 to 1763 and again from 1783 to 1821. During this time, St. Augustine's inhabitants included Spanish-born Europeans, or *peninsulares*; American-born Europeans, or *criollos*; mixed European-Native Americans, or *mestizos*; Native Americans; and, lastly, Africans. The presence of these various ethnic groups and the cultural interchange which occurred among them is revealed in the archeological record of houses, household artifacts, and food remains at St. Augustine sites dating from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries.

During the past decade, Dr. Kathleen Deagan, an historical archeologist with the Florida State Museum, has been systematically excavating house sites in St. Augustine that were occupied by families of differing ethnic backgrounds. The results of this impressive research have been published in *Spanish St. Augustine*, a book that focuses on the eighteenth century first Spanish period (1702-1763).

Though a surprising number of documents have survived from this period, most are official letters and reports which deal with military, political, and ecclesiastical affairs. These documents rarely describe the everyday lives of St. Augustine's occupants. The testamentary proceedings such as wills, inventories, and deeds, which could have illuminated the lifeways of St. Augustine's people, have been lost. Fortunately, the parish records, which contain information about the ethnicity, occupation, and family background of St. Augustine's inhabitants, have survived, as have several property maps which list the owners of eighteenth-century house sites. Armed with the parish records and property maps, Deagan successfully identified the names, ethnicity, and socioeconomic standing of inhabitants at a variety

of first Spanish period house sites in St. Augustine. And by excavating house sites which were occupied by people of known ethnicity and socioeconomic status, Deagan found archeological evidence of the cultural differences existing among the *presidio*'s inhabitants and abundant evidence of cultural interchange in Spanish St. Augustine.

Two St. Augustine house sites best illustrate this process of cultural interchange: the de Hita site, which was occupied by a *criollo* or American-born Spanish family; and the de la Cruz site, which was occupied by a *mestizo* or mixed Spanish-Native American family. At both the *criollo* and *mestizo* sites, excavators found evidence of Native American cultural influences in the form of locally-made Native American earthenwares, or San Marcos pottery. Yet, the *criollo* site yielded much higher percentages of imported Spanish tin-glazed earthenwares, or majolica, than the *mestizo* site. At both sites, excavators found the bones of Spanish barnyard animals as well as the bones of local game and fish. Yet, the *criollo* family ate far more meat from Spanish domestic animals than the *mestizo* family who relied more heavily on local game and fish. Thus, the cultural interchange which occurred among Spanish and Native Americans was indeed apparent in the household ceramics and food remains at both sites, but the Spanish heritage of the *criollo* family and the Native American background of the *mestizo* family was still apparent in their ceramics and diets.

Chapters 5, 6, 8, and 10 of *Spanish St. Augustine* are devoted to a comparative analysis of the housing, artifacts, and foodways from selected *criollo* and *mestizo* sites dating to the period from 1702 to 1763. These excellent chapters form the core of a highly-successful work. Yet, there are some minor problems. One wishes the author had included chapters on the *peninsulares* and the Africans in order to complete the comparison of ethnic groups in Spanish St. Augustine. In addition, Chapter 7, which deals with a seventeenth-century Native American village, and Chapter 9, which deals with Spanish and British burials at a church dating from 1599 to 1783, could have been deleted, since these sections deal with material that falls outside the focus of the remaining chapters. Despite these cavils, Deagan's *Spanish St. Augustine* remains the finest achievement in Hispanic-American archeology, and perhaps the finest achievement in the discipline

of historical archeology. The book should prove indispensable to Florida historians as well as to anthropologists and archeologists.

*Center for American Archeology,
Kampsville, Illinois*

JOHN S. OTTO

Fort Lauderdale and Broward County. By Stuart B. McIver.
(Woodland Hills, Calif.: Windsor Publications, 1983. 232 pp.
Photographs, illustrations, bibliography, index. \$24.95.)

Where do the college kids flock for their vernal rites? To Fort Lauderdale of course. Stuart B. McIver, journalist, historian, producer of documentary films— a fifteen-year-resident of Fort Lauderdale— tells the history of this glamorous wedge of the Gold Coast in a narrative as crisp and entertaining as it is informative. He unrolls a backdrop of a sparsely-populated watery jungle— the nineteenth century— as contrast before which to display the achievements in recent decades of Florida's fastest growing county.

The first fact to keep in mind is geographical— until the 1890s south Florida was accessible only by boat. The first venturesome transients and settlers lived along rivers and bays. New River, which cut through some high hammocks and pine ridges near the coast, was a natural drain for the Everglades, long an important artery for the Indians in their canoes. During the second Spanish period some Bahamians, including the Charles Lewis family, settled on New River. In 1824, after Florida was a territory, William Cooley, originally from Maryland, and his family moved to New River and established a sizable commercial mill producing starch from the plentiful wild coontie roots, a product he sold in Key West. One day on the eve of the Second Seminole War while Cooley was away, the Indians massacred his family. That ended the settlement. During the long war that followed Major William Lauderdale and his men built a small fort near New River, but it was only there temporarily.

In 1870 Dade County, which then stretched all the way from Jupiter to the Keys, had a population of only eighty-five, not counting Indians. Only a few were at New River. In 1890 the census taker found only one person to record in that area—

Washington Jenkins, keeper of the House of Refuge on the beach, an installation of the United States Life Saving Service.

Changes began with the first county road in 1892 which required a ferry at New River. Frank Stranahan ran the ferry, a tent hotel for the hackline travellers, and a trading post which were to become the nucleus for an agricultural community after the railroad arrived in 1896. For the first time farmers had a way to get their tender vegetables to market.

The New River area began to attract farmers looking for land. Germans started a community north of Fort Lauderdale called Dresden; it became Pompano. Several miles south of New River a colony of Danes founded Modello, named for Henry Flagler's Model Land Company, and later it became Dania. Nearby was Hallandale, established by Swedes. As the building of the Panama Canal wound down workers from that project moved to newly-drained Everglades land west of Dania and established Zona— today know as Davie.

A theme than runs through the history of Broward County is water: how to get up out of it (the Venice-plan was noteworthy), how to control it, and how to utilize it. The draining of the Everglades was promoted by Napoleon Bonaparte Broward, governor from 1905-1909. In the light of what is known about the Everglades today the thinking then was simplistic— dig enough canals, the water runs off, the land is dry. The first canal which was to connect Fort Lauderdale and Lake Okeechobee was begun in 1906. Millions of acres of new land did appear— and so did the land speculators, a few of them swindlers. Some land purchasers never found their land. And the New River area began to grow. In 1915 it cut away from Dade County to become Broward County, honoring the promoter of drainage in the process.

The boom of the 1920s brought a rising interest in tourism and beach development. Hollywood-by-the-Sea was laid out on a grand scale and so well funded that by 1926 it had grown to surpass Fort Lauderdale. By that date, however, the boom was beginning to falter and, in September, the worst hurricane to hit the lower Florida east coast in a century, gave the *coup de grace*. Unfinished skeletons were left unfinished, there were foreclosures, bank failures, unemployment, bread lines, people on the run, even suicides. One thing that grew out of the boom-bust, how-

ever, was the conversion of Bay Mabel into Port Everglades, though the payoff was slow in being realized.

In recent years Broward County has been on an incredible roll. Some of its twenty-nine incorporated cities— like Pembroke Pines and Coral Springs with populations 40,000 and 37,347, respectively— in 1980 had grown up out of bean and tomato fields in only a few years. The total population of Broward County in 1980 was 1,108,200— up 1,108,199 from 1890! This has to be a success story!

Fort Lauderdale and Broward County is embellished by a feast of early photographs, some of them in color from early post-cards, almost all supplied by the Fort Lauderdale Historical Society. The book includes a section called “Partners in Progress,” a history of the institutions and companies of Broward County, also with excellent accompanying photographs. This part of the book was the work of Bill Luening.

Coral Gables, Florida

THELMA PETERS

Edge of Wilderness: A Settlement History of Manatee River and Sarasota Bay. By Janet Snyder Matthews. (Tulsa: Caprine Press, 1983. 464 pp. Preface, illustrations, maps, photographs, household lists, notes, bibliography, index. \$21.50.)

Janet Snyder Matthews has written a detailed history of the Manatee River-Sarasota Bay region from prehistoric times through the late nineteenth century. In presenting this chronicle, she is very conscious of the contrasting people, styles, and cultures that have contributed to the development of settlements on Florida's west central Gulf coast. The author recounts the efforts of a diverse group of pioneers to tame the wild but bountiful frontier land south of Tampa Bay, north of Charlotte Harbor, east of the Gulf of Mexico, and west of Lake Okeechobee. The pages of this book are filled with tales of native aboriginals and conquistadors, aristocratic planters and “Cracker” cowboys, white masters and black slaves, military commanders and Indian warriors, and law-abiding citizens and murderous vigilantes. Whether treating the Spanish or English, the rich or poor, the educated or illiterate, Matthews finds the settlers drawn to this

region mainly for two reasons: wealth and health. Undaunted by wars, epidemics, and hurricanes, pioneer men and women migrated to forge new lives in the wilderness.

Matthews paints many vivid portraits throughout this work. She does a good job in sketching the central characters in their own words or those of their contemporaries. To this end, she has mined a rich lode of historical documentation in letters, diaries, wills, and government reports. In addition to her impressive research in archival sources both in Florida and Washington, D.C., the author has read the available newspapers and published materials pertaining to her subject. She has digested this wealth of information to construct a readable narrative. In particular, she is at her best in discussing the role the Gamble family played in clearing the land and setting up a flourishing sugar refining business. Furthermore, her accounts of Judah P. Benjamin's daring escape through Manatee County at the close of the Civil War and the exploits of the Sarasota Assassination Society in the 1880s are compelling for their drama.

Although this book has merit as a fact-filled reference volume, it has less appeal as interpretive history. Too often the narrative bogs down in a swamp of names, places, and itemized lists (for instance, De Soto's funeral provisions), and it is difficult to discern what significant point the author is trying to make. Besides some obvious conclusions about the resiliency of the pioneer spirit, it is not clear that the author has a thesis around which to shape her abundant and interesting information. This is especially noticeable in her account of vigilantism. Although devoting two chapters to the murder in 1884 of Charles Abbe, a prominent Sarasota resident, she never makes clear what were the underlying social, political, and economic forces that spawned the extra-legal violence perpetrated by an organized gang of killers. Without a conceptual framework to explain the function and operation of frontier vigilantism, the reader does not know what to make of this incident or how to judge its historical significance. Nevertheless, for anyone interested in a straightforward and informative history of Manatee-Sarasota counties and their environs, this book is the place to start. The ample supply of photographs accompanying the text makes it particularly attractive.

The Plot to Steal Florida: James Madison's Phony War. By Joseph Burkholder Smith. (New York: Arbor House, 1983. 314 pp. Acknowledgments, prologue, epilogue, bibliography, index. \$16.95.)

An employee of the CIA for twenty-three years, James Burkholder Smith has written two books. His first recounts his CIA experiences, and this second work deals with the early nineteenth-century American resolve to acquire Spanish Florida.

There were two Spanish Floridas— East and West— and between 1795-1810 a large part of West Florida already had come into American hands. President Madison during the War of 1812 era attempted to take the remainder, and, until his death, George Mathews, the semi-literate former governor of Georgia, was the central figure, Madison's primary agent provocateur. With the president's unofficial approval, seventy-two-year-old Mathews went to the St. Marys River in 1811, and, recruiting Anglos both in Georgia and East Florida, began to assemble a Patriot army. Mathews expected the small United States regular army detachment and American gunboats on the scene also to cooperate. These forces, by direct assault, internal revolution, or mere bravado would first seize Fernandina, a small Spanish outpost on Amelia Island, and then the massive Castillo de San Marcos in St. Augustine.

It was a frustrating time for Mathews. United States Army Major Jacint Laval did not think Mathews had sufficient written authorization from Madison to commit the regular troops, and Commodore Hugh Campbell, the American naval commander, began to have similar doubts. Nevertheless the Patriot army, which from the Spanish perspective was backed up by American gunboats, captured, with little difficulty, Fernandina. Then abruptly, Madison disavowed Mathews and the Patriots. Mathews was furious, though the president reassured Mathews that only reasons of state had forced a public disavowal, and shortly before his death in August 1812, Mathews seemed reconciled.

During the next two years Madison at one moment repudiated any design on East Florida, and at the next ordered the army, navy, and militia to occupy the province. With 10,000 British soldiers bound for the Gulf of Mexico in 1814 and troubles enough, Madison again withdrew support for the Patriot

army. A few years later, however, Andrew Jackson and President Monroe succeeded where Mathews and President Madison had failed.

In the events and intrigues concerned with Mathews and American attempts to liberate East Florida, Smith sees the origins of every post-World War II covert operation, including the Bay of Pigs, Vietnam, Chile, the Kennedy assassination, the Pentagon papers, and others. These digressions and those relating to Dolley Madison's coiffure, dress, or lack thereof, and moral turpitude make the reader stray from the St. Marys River, Fernandina, St. Augustine, and Alachua.

Smith has availed himself of sources not available to Rembert Patrick who, in 1954, published a detailed scholarly work dealing with the Patriots. In many respects, however, especially for the post-Mathews years, Patrick's work remains the standard. In his conclusion Patrick argued that what happened in 1811-1814 was an anomaly, and Americans could take pride in their country's record of expansion by negotiation and treaty rather than force. Smith strongly disagrees, and one does not have to dwell on his epilogue castigating Nixon and Kissinger to realize in this instance that Smith is on the mark.

Florida State University

J. LEITCH WRIGHT, JR.

Dogs of the Conquest. By John Grier Varner and Jeanette Johnson Varner. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983. xvii, 238 pp. Preface, acknowledgments, maps, illustrations, epilogue, glossary, notes, bibliography, index. \$19.95.)

We of the machine age, who no longer think of animals as working partners, forget the extent to which any European of account once lived in the company of mastiffs, greyhounds, and other useful breeds of dogs. In peacetime, they were his companions on the hunt and guarded and defended his property. In time of war they used the same skills to find food on the march and to track down, capture, and sometimes attack the enemy. The use of dogs in warfare was common in sixteenth-century Europe; indeed, modern armies and police forces still have their canine corps.

Dogs of the Conquest addresses the long-neglected subject of dogs as auxiliaries in the Spanish conquest of America, a multi-fronted war in which, as a surprise military weapon, the ferocious, iron-collared wardogs carried the same shock value as horses and were as lethal as firearms.

It is fitting that the volume should have been published by the University of Oklahoma Press, which in 1949 reprinted R. B. Cunninghame Graham's delightful *The Horses of the Conquest* (London, 1930). Despite the similar titles the two books are, however, quite different. Graham was a gentleman adventurer, gracing his pages with a first-hand knowledge of Latin American horsemanship. Indubitably well-read, he supplied only the airiest of documentation.

John Grier Varner and Jeanette Johnson Varner's academic credentials, on the other hand, are unexceptionable. She is an able translator and linguist and an indefatigable researcher; he, a professor of English, with a limpid prose and a warmly humanist approach toward learning. Varner and Varner collaborated on a definitive edition of *The Florida of the Inca* (Austin, 1951), and again on the thoroughly readable *El Inca: The Life and Times of Garcilaso de la Vega* (Austin, 1968).

Dogs of the Conquest is not as successful as either one of the Varners' previous books although it, too, was exhaustively researched. The fifteen-page "Select Bibliography" could serve as a scholar's guide to sources and commentaries on the conquest, listing as it does the documentary collections, reference works, sixteenth-century chroniclers, and historians from that day to this. In that wide sweep, no incident in which a wardog was involved is likely to have been missed. The book is also copiously illustrated with what seems to be every European engraving of the New World and every Indian *lienzo* painting in which a dog appears.

What is lacking in *Dogs of the Conquest* is the sound historical judgment which characterizes the Varners' earlier work. This latest book is an undigested assortment of disparate tales, arranged according to region and presented without critical examination. Concocted atrocity stories that were relished and reprinted in the propaganda campaigns of Spain's worst enemies, the exaggerations and calumnies of the fiery reformer Bartolomé de las Casas, legends of heroic prowess, and the sober accounts of

credible eyewitnesses are all thrown into the same pile as though they were of equal validity. It would have been preferable to present such stories frankly under their references and let the reader judge for himself than to have connected them with a weak narrative line and left the impression that they were alike true and typical. It does not help matters that the Varners took for illustrations many of Theodore de Bry's seventeenth-century propaganda engravings, showing Spaniards engaged in every species of inhumanity and torture.

Dogs of the Conquest contains virtually nothing about the breeding of the animals, their training, or their uses in warfare anywhere beyond the confines of America. The authors' stated purpose was to "relate the incidents in which dogs played a significant part in the conquest, as recorded by sixteenth-century chroniclers . . . and as revealed in legal, military, and literary-historical documents of the period" (xiii). Their book is exactly what they say it is, a narrated compilation of incidents.

A balanced book on the dogs of the conquest is still to be written. Perhaps someone will use the Varners' lovingly assembled material to write one.

*Historic St. Augustine
Preservation Board*

AMY TURNER BUSHNELL

The Imperial Osages: Spanish-Indian Diplomacy in the Mississippi Valley. By Gilbert C. Din and Abraham P. Nasatir. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983. XV, 432 pp. Preface, illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. \$39.95.)

Spanish officials in Louisiana and West Florida wrestled with a constant problem in dealing with the Osage who menaced the entire northwestern frontier of Louisiana during the period of Spanish occupation, 1770-1804. The dilemma of the Spanish administration arose from the fact that the Osage, most populous tribe in upper Louisiana, accounted for half the fur trade coming into St. Louis and thus constituted an important economic interest for local merchants. At the same time, the Osage were a persistent threat to population advance in the Spanish province. War parties stole horses and carried out destructive raids on both

Indian and Euro-American settlements in present Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana.

The trend of these frontier encounters has long been a part of regional history. But Nasatir has painstakingly accumulated the documents to give a detailed account of Spanish efforts to contain the Osage, an endeavor not particularly successful as long as officials did not agree concerning tactics. Open warfare was not a sensible undertaking for Spanish troops and militia outnumbered by Osage warriors. In 1794, the Spanish government finally granted a monopoly of the Osage trade to Auguste Chouteau, enabling him gradually to assert some control over the tribal people. This decision was a belated recognition of the success Spanish administrators had achieved in dealing with East and West Florida tribes by assigning a trade monopoly to Panton, Leslie and Co. beginning in 1784.

This Osage volume adds to the impressive list of publications on the Spanish Borderlands contributed by Nasatir and his collaborators. Basic source for the study of Spanish-Osage diplomacy is Nasatir's previously assembled documentary review that amounts to more than a thousand pages of manuscript. The pattern of Spanish-Osage relations displays a repetitive series of incidents. Osage leaders received presents in St. Louis, dealt illegally with questionable characters near the Arkansas Post, and made their most damaging attacks in the Red River country north of Natchitoches, Louisiana. Ultimate orders for handling the Osage were issued in Spain through the governor of Louisiana in New Orleans, but Osage warfare also impinged upon the separate Spanish province of Texas.

Details of the discussion of Osage diplomacy reveal the close relationship existing among the Spanish provinces bordering American territory in the post-Revolutionary War era. For example, Manuel Lisa, foremost Spanish trader on the Upper Missouri in the late colonial years, was the son of a St. Augustine native, Maria Rodriguez. Lieutenant Colonel Carlos Howard, sent to combat Jacobin influence in the St. Louis district in 1796, began his administrative career in St. Augustine in 1784 as secretary to Governor Zéspedes. And the advent of American rule in Louisiana in 1804 released troops to bolster the wavering Spanish domination of West Florida.

Despite their high scholarly attainments, Nasatir and Din

will surely confuse readers on two specific matters of geography and tribal identification. The authors use the term "Spanish Illinois," common in Spanish correspondence, to refer to territory west of the Mississippi River in present Missouri even as far west as the Osage River region. Students of American history are not accustomed to thinking of St. Louis as an Illinois town. References to Osage raids into "Illinois" are citing attacks on communities along the west bank of the Mississippi River, and often further beyond. At times the geographical and administrative district of Upper Louisiana appears to be indistinguishable from "Spanish Illinois."

The matter of tribal identity is more serious. Among the Indian groups marshalled by the Spanish commandant in St. Louis to fight the Osage were immigrant tribes from American territory who had sought Spanish protection. These included Shawnee, Delaware, Miami, and Cherokee who had diligently opposed American advance into Ohio and Indiana. Within this group of allies, the Delawares are called "Loups" in contemporary Spanish documents, a term that Nasatir and Din erroneously translate as "Abenaki," the name of a tribe with major settlements south of the St. Lawrence River near Montreal, Canada. In Maine, the term "Loup" might mean Abenaki, but not in Missouri. Where the authors have quoted previously published Spanish documents, the term "Loup" is correctly interpreted as "Delaware," but sometimes the Loup designation appears without further explanation. These inconsistencies create the inaccurate impression that Indian opposition to the Osage included three tribes, "Loups," Delawares, and "Abenakis," when the single identification "Delaware" is the only suitable common identification.

Aside from such problems, Nasatir and Din have prepared a conscientiously annotated treatment of a typical frontier problem. The objectives of Indian traders and white settlers demanded conflicting diplomatic policies, a challenge for governments of Spain as well as France, Great Britain, and the United States.

Newberry Library
Chicago, Illinois

HELEN HORNBECK TANNER

Cherokee Editor. Edited by Theda Perdue. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983. viii, 243. Preface, introduction, notes, index. \$18.95.)

Theda Perdue leads the reader into this set of documents via a thirty-five-page introduction about the life of the author of the documents and his place in Cherokee history, particularly the tragic removal of the 1830s. She also provides instructive notes that contain citations to most of the important writings about the Cherokees. She has performed her task as editor well.

Elias Boudinot is an ill-fated and little-known figure in American history. True, there is a brief essay on him in the *Dictionary of American Biography*, but his name does not appear in the indices of any two-volume college texts in my possession nor in books on the history of the American Indians in general. One source of the tragedy of his life was his early enrollment in Christian missionary schools. These taught him to think of his forbears as savages, at the same time that they taught him to write the to-us stilted English prose, the written voice of educated Americans at that time. Perdue does not say whether or not her subject had white blood, nor does his biographer, Ralph Henry Gabriel. Most of the Cherokee leadership was of mixed blood, and the frontispiece picture of Boudinot is of a man who could have passed for a white gentleman if he wanted to.

He was farther set apart from the Cherokee culture when, in 1820, he was converted to Christianity. Thereafter his writing is full of pious expressions such as "the meek and lowly Jesus" (p. 14). He rejoiced that most of the Cherokees had risen from "the worst kind of paganism to the knowledge of the true God" (p. 141). Small wonder that he was bewildered when the race that had converted him treated him and his people in a brutal and unfeeling way. This was impressed upon him when he married a white woman in Connecticut and was burned with his wife in effigy. He could not grasp the racism practiced by Christian white persons.

One of the documents printed in this book is an address he gave before a white congregation in Philadelphia to raise money for the purchase of a printing press. Through his efforts the money came in, and the press was used to print the first North American Indian newspaper, about one-third of which was ex-

pressed in the only written Indian language in this continent. Boudinot's influence came largely through the *Cherokee Phoenix*, begun in 1824, of which he was the first and virtually the only editor. In the *Phoenix* he inveighed against the monstrous injustices done his people by Georgians and the Jackson administration; inveighed in the cultured prose which took the fire out of much that he said. He used "Sir" often as if addressing a deliberative body, and relieved that sometimes with "Gentlemen." Like white writers, he relied heavily on rhetorical questions, and, like them, frequently said, "I have taken the liberty," or, "allow me the liberty," and other standard phrases of polite communication. As a result, he is not nearly as eloquent as certain "savage" Indian leaders who spoke free of white rhetoric. He presented impeccable logic when the Georgians and Andrew Jackson cared nothing for logic; they wanted the Cherokee's land!

After he was treated as an outcast by the people he had tried to emulate (p. 10) at the time of his wedding, he championed Cherokee separateness from white polity. He never deviated from this position; expressing it at first as resistance to removal from Georgia. Early in the 1830s he began to view removal to the West as inevitable—given white power—and he supported it in order to preserve the Cherokee nation. For this stance he was ousted as editor of the *Phoenix*, and he resigned in 1832. Most of the Cherokees opposed removal, and some marked him as a traitor. When he was only thirty-five, certain of the latter murdered him, as they did other leaders who had championed removal. In American history there is probably no person so thoroughly honorable and so devoutly Christian who was as fully ruined and betrayed by white indoctrination as Elias Boudinot.

Renato Beluche, Smuggler, Privateer, and Patriot, 1780-1860. By Jane Lucas De Grummond. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1983. xiii, 300 pp. Acknowledgments, illustrations, maps, photographs, bibliography, index. \$27.50.)

Born in New Orleans in 1780, and buried in Venezuela in 1860, Renato Beluche lived in an era when the Gulf-Caribbean world was in tumult. At the time of Beluche's birth, the Spanish governor of New Orleans was directing his forces in successful campaigns against British West Florida; in the 1790s bloody slave insurrections swept over Haiti, and Louisiana felt their repercussions; in 1814-1815 Britain dispatched 10,000 men to the Gulf of Mexico to seize New Orleans and much more territory; for two decades after 1810 Spain's mainland colonies struggled to win independence; and in the ensuing years the new republics experienced revolutions and coups. As a Baratarian smuggler, legitimate ship captain, privateer, pirate, and Spanish-American patriot, this was part of Beluche's world.

Joining Jean Lafitte and other Baratarians, Beluche manned Jackson's artillery at New Orleans, and the devastating fire from Baratarian cannons more than any single factor explained Old Hickory's remarkable victory over the British. Trading and privateering ventures took Beluche to Haiti, Jamaica, Yucatan, northern South America, and virtually every corner of the Gulf and Caribbean. Around 1815 he enlisted in Bolívar's insurgent forces, and in time he became a leading, and by some considered the best, naval commander who served in forces of Gran Columbia.

It was at this period, in the years after 1821, that Beluche emerged from the shadowy world of smuggling, privateering, and relative insignificance. He commanded part of José Padilla's fleet which in 1823 successfully defeated the royalists defending Lake Maracaibo, and soon afterward Beluche's squadron helped capture Puerto Cabello, the last royalist bastion in the Republic of Gran Columbia. At the request of Bolívar, in 1829 Beluche commenced a 12,000-mile voyage with two ships, setting out from Puerto Cabello, sailing around Cape Horn, and finally arriving at Guayaquil in Ecuador. Ecuador, like Venezuela, at least for the moment, was part of Bolívar's Gran Columbia. As it

turned out there was no immediate naval threat, and Beluche made his way back to Venezuela via Panama.

Because he supported anti-José Antonio Páez forces in an internal revolution after Venezuela had separated from Gran Columbia, Beluche was forced to go into exile from 1836 to 1845. He eventually returned to Puerto Cabello where in 1860 he died, and in 1962 his remains were reinterred in the Panteón Nacional in Caracas.

For several decades Professor de Grummond has meticulously researched Beluche's career, examining archives in the United States and Latin America, interviewing Beluche's descendants, and, from New Orleans to Jamaica, Panama, and Venezuela, retracing his steps. Her indefatigable research and mature judgments have allowed her skillfully to recreate and analyze conditions in the Gulf and Caribbean.

But she has not recreated Beluche, partly because of the nature of the sources which leave great gaps in Beluche's career. Even so, for long periods the author unnecessarily loses sight of her subject. In Jackson's New Orleans campaign, Bolívar's liberation of Gran Columbia, and similar major developments, the reader often must wonder where Beluche was and what he was up to. This concerns the problem of not clearly focusing on her subject. One would like to experience the dramatic events of Beluche's lifetime from his perspective: to smell the acrid smoke belching from his cannons at New Orleans or to hear him order grappling hooks thrown over his ship's side when engaging a potential Spanish prize.

Beluche's career, bound up with the liberation of Spanish America, discloses something about the activities of Luis Aury, the Spanish American revolutionist who in 1817 briefly occupied Amelia Island. But for the author, as for Beluche and Spanish authorities in New Orleans, Florida meant not East Florida but Baton Rouge, Mobile, and Pensacola in Spanish West Florida. Despite shortcomings as a biographical work, Professor de Grummond's study adroitly illustrates conditions in, and to an extent the unity of, the Gulf-Caribbean world during a prolonged revolutionary era, and from the latter standpoint her book has much to offer.

Correspondence of James K. Polk, Volume 6. Edited by Wayne Cutler and Carese M. Parker. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1983. xxxvi, 726 pp. Preface, chronology, calendar, index. \$30.00.)

Volume 6 of the *Correspondence of James K. Polk* is the second of the series to be edited by Wayne Cutler, and it exhibits the same high level of scholarship displayed in Volume 5. In his well-written preface, Cutler succinctly analyzed the political situation in Tennessee during 1842-1843 when the Democratic party was out of power on both the state and national levels. In this period, Polk, as leader of the Tennessee Democracy and as an important southern ally of Martin Van Buren, carried the dual responsibility of rescuing the state from the Whigs and reuniting the divided southern wing of the national Democratic party under the banner of the former president.

Polk, having lost his race for re-election as governor of Tennessee in 1841 to his Whig opponent, James C. Jones, was out of office during this two-year period. Ostensibly Polk retired to private life and the practice of law, while actually he was planning the state party's strategy for winning the state elections of 1843. At this time Polk resisted the temptation to obtain a seat in the United States Senate by striking a bargain with the Tennessee Whig leaders to break a deadlock in the state senate between the Whigs and Democrats by pairing his candidacy with that of John Bell, or some other prominent Whig politician. Instead, Polk determined to run once again for the governorship, believing that the Democrats would have a better chance to recapture the state government under his leadership than any other possible candidate, and that his victory would assure that the southern Democrats would rally around Van Buren in the forthcoming national election. If he succeeded in gaining the governorship, Polk confidently expected to receive the nomination of his party for the vice presidency on a Van Buren-Polk ticket.

Prior to the gubernatorial race, Polk occupied his time with reorganizing the machinery of the Tennessee Democratic party and with raising funds for the coming campaign. As in his recent campaigns, Polk stressed national rather than local issues, attacking Henry Clay and his American System. During his campaign against Jones, who was running for reelection, he emphasized

that a victory for Jones would promote the founding of a third national bank and lead to higher tariffs and internal taxes, while expanding the powers of the central government. During a long series of debates by Polk and Jones held throughout the state, Jones's humorous speeches contrasted sharply with Polk's stern lectures on political morality. When the votes were counted, it was found that the frontier humorist had gained the support of a majority of Tennessee's fun-loving electorate. Ironically, had Polk triumphed over Jones, he probably would have lost his chance at the presidency, much as a victory by Lincoln over Douglas in 1858 might have cost him the nation's highest office.

The nature of the correspondence published in this volume reflects Polk's roles in state and national politics. Letters exchanged between Polk and state political leaders made up the bulk of the correspondence, but important letters from Polk to Van Buren and other national leaders are also included. As in previous volumes, an extensive correspondence between Polk and his wife, Sarah, reveals that he relied heavily upon her for advice as well as for assistance in managing the family's business affairs. Agricultural historians will especially regret that virtually no correspondence relating to the management of Polk's plantations was published in this or earlier volumes.

Anticipating that funds to complete the publication of Polk's political correspondence might not be forthcoming, Cutler decided to include a calendar of Polk's correspondence between 1816 and 1843, a useful addition that occupied approximately one-third of the volume. If Cutler's forebodings prove to be justified, the termination of the project before the correspondence of Polk's years in the White House are published will be a major loss for future historians of this period.

Florida State University

JOHN HEBRON MOORE

A *Carolinian Goes to War: The Civil War Narrative of Arthur Middleton Manigault, Brigadier General, C. S. A.* Edited by R. Lockwood Tower. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1983. xvi, 344 pp. Foreword, introduction, prologue, photographs, maps, notes, bibliography, appendix, index. \$24.95.)

Shortly after the Civil War, Confederate General Arthur Manigault wrote a long account of his war service. He intended it not for publication, but for the private use of his family. Now, more than a century later, a descendant has permitted printing of the general's narrative. It is a story worth telling. With a distinguished family name (pronounced by Charlestonians as MAN-i-GO) and some Mexican War experience, the young Carolinian supervised the building of batteries around Fort Sumter, then witnessed the famous bombardment. Soon he became colonel of the Tenth South Carolina Infantry, and with it transferred to the western theater in the spring of 1862. Thus he participated in the invasion of Kentucky, after which he was nominated for brigadier general. He also fought at Murfreesboro, Chickamauga, Missionary Ridge, in the defense of Atlanta, and in Hood's campaign into Tennessee. There, at Franklin on November 30, 1864, Manigault was wounded so severely that he never returned to active service.

Writing between 1866 and 1868, the general was candid in his opinions about the Confederacy's western army. Manigault liked Braxton Bragg, but thought Hood was "incompetent" and unfit for command of an army. The removal of Johnston was therefore "one of those hasty and ill-judged steps on the part of Mr. Davis" which led to Confederate defeat (p. 200). Then, too, Manigault occasionally provides glimpses of life at the front, as when he explains how men in the rifle pits dodged enemy fire to fill their canteens. We also see how Manigault exercised command. Though most officers preferred marksmen to musicians ("shooters before tooters," as one put it), Manigault relates his own practice during a battle of using band members as hospital orderlies—musicians, so important for morale, were too valuable to become casualties.

On the whole, however, these colorful remarks are too infrequent to rescue the general's narrative from a regrettable dreari-

ness. Manigault's style is almost Latinate in its complicated phrasing, and his wordiness sometimes leads to run-on sentences of remarkable length. Despite this prolixity, Manigault's writing has a curious obliqueness. The result is that sometimes the reader has difficulty envisioning the action being described. For instance, Manigault's brigade was on Longstreet's left during the great breakthrough of the enemy line at Chickamauga, but nowhere does the narrative relate the exciting battlefield sweep.

A more important criticism pertains to the narrative as historiographical document. Though Manigault claims that in his writing he had to rely almost entirely upon memory, one quickly sees that the minutiae which he provides could not have been derived from recollection. Eventually we learn that he had access to important reports of both Union and Confederate officers. But because Manigault only rarely acknowledges these documents, we are left to guess his sources, and perhaps even wonder about the usefulness of the narrative to the modern researcher.

The editor, R. Lockwood Tower, has punctuated Manigault's text with an unusually large number of corroborative and explanatory footnotes. Many of these relate data from the *Official Records*, and consequently enrich the general's observations. Unfortunately, Tower's eagerness to provide information approaches self-indulgence. Frequently his annotation is excessive, especially when it interrupts Manigault's text to identify incidental personalities. Furthermore, his extensive prefaces give the impression of trying to overshadow the general's chapters, as when Tower describes at length the movement to have Bragg relieved of command, though Manigault never mentions the controversy.

A Carolinian Goes to War thus is uneven in the quality of narrative and its editing. At the same time, this is an important complement to histories of the Army of Tennessee. We are indebted to the Manigault family for its publication.

Atlanta, Georgia

STEPHEN DAVIS

The Papers of Andrew Johnson, Volume 6, 1862-1864. Edited by Leroy P. Graf and Ralph W. Haskins. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983. xciv, 797 pp. Introduction, acknowledgments, chronology, photographs, appendix, index. \$27.50.)

In what amounted to an acceptance speech, Andrew Johnson noted, in Nashville on June 9, 1864, that the Union (Republican) party had chosen a man from "one of the rebellious States" as its vice-presidential candidate. "Thus," Johnson went on, "the Union party declared its belief that the rebellious States are still in the Union, and that their loyal citizens are still citizens of the United States." But Tennessee was only a territory and not a state at all in the opinion of the Radical Republican Pennsylvania Congressman Thaddeus Stevens, who was sarcastic about the party's nominating a man from one of the "rebel provinces." Already the politicians, Johnson prominent among them, were foreshadowing in their wartime utterances the postwar conflict between president and Congress.

Glimpses such as this, of a president in the making, are among the chief rewards to be gained from the sixth volume of the Johnson papers, as also from its predecessors. Like the papers of Abraham Lincoln, however, those of Johnson throw no light on the much debated question whether Lincoln secretly maneuvered to get Johnson nominated as the southern and Democratic half of a "Union" ticket. Nor do these sources give evidence of Johnson's politicking for high office—except for such evidence as may be read between the lines. And they contain little about his personal and family life. The volume includes 130 letters from and about four times as many to him, besides speeches and miscellaneous documents of his. Only a few of his letters are addressed to his son Robert, only one to his wife, Eliza, and none at all to his son Charles, who died in 1863.

But if the materials reveal less than one would like to know about the private Johnson, they tell a good deal about the public man, not only the president-to-be but, even more, the military governor in actuality. The volume begins with him environed by difficulties and dangers in beleaguered Nashville; it ends with Tennessee definitely saved for the Union and with his own political prospects bright. The intervening pages show him defining as well as performing the duties of a military governor

and meanwhile transforming himself from a proslavery advocate to an emancipationist, though never to a proponent of equal rights for blacks. These pages also richly document the various aspects of wartime life in Tennessee: the disintegration of slavery, the problem of determining loyalty, the plight of refugees and war prisoners, and the effort to reestablish civilian government.

The editing continues to display the high qualities that have won it universal praise in the past. Informative but not excessive, the notes identify persons, correct errors, and clarify allusions. The full biographical introductions provide an admirable setting for the items reproduced. Indeed, when the series is completed, the volume introductions, taken together, may be expected to constitute the best Johnson biography yet published.

*University of North Carolina
at Greensboro*

RICHARD N. CURRENT

Nothing But Freedom: Emancipation and Its Legacy. By Eric Foner. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1983. xii, 142 pp. Acknowledgments, introduction, maps, notes, index. \$14.95.)

The three essays in this volume were originally presented in 1982 as the Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures at Louisiana State University. In them Columbia history professor Eric Foner carries forward the interpretation of southern Reconstruction after the Civil War that he posited in his essay "Reconstruction and the Crisis of Free Labor," which appeared in his *Politics and Ideology in the Age of the Civil War* (New York, 1980), and extends the powerful, sophisticated Marxist interpretation of Reconstruction articulated since the 1930s by such scholars as W. E. B. Dubois, Horace Mann Bond, David Montgomery, and Armstead Robinson.

Foner goes beyond traditional approaches by comparing the American Reconstruction experience with labor adjustment in the plantation societies of the West Indies after emancipation and southern and eastern Africa during the colonization era of the late nineteenth century. His assessments of the West Indian and African experience are based upon secondary sources; his

general discussion of "The Politics of Reconstruction" is based on both primary and secondary sources, while his final chapter, on the bitter strikes of 1876 in the Georgia and South Carolina rice-growing region, is based almost entirely on primary materials.

Foner concludes that everywhere the adjustment of labor relations involved bitter conflict over how resources would be distributed among economic classes. Plantation systems require coercive labor systems, he finds. This necessitates planter control of regional legal and political machinery, not only to sustain the authority of employers but to arrange the legal and economic system to preclude the potential labor force from pursuing alternative means of securing a living. Thus, in each region, planters sought to control the institutions of the state in order to maintain the plantation system, while laborers struggled to force the creation of an alternative in which they could exercise economic and social autonomy. In the end planters got pretty much their own way in most, but not all, the regions Foner discusses; but everywhere they had to concede something to their workers.

Viewed in a comparative context, southern Reconstruction appears a remarkably radical effort to restructure society. Nowhere else were workers given direct political power; nowhere else were they able to secure a dominant voice, even temporarily, in government; nowhere else, therefore, were they able to use the power of government to promote their own notions of economic relations, through direct legislation and, perhaps more important, through sympathetic administration of laws at the local level.

In his introduction Foner concedes the importance of race in the Reconstruction conflict, writing only that he does not intend to pursue it in these essays. In plantation societies, he writes, race and class are too closely entwined to give one precedence over another as organizing themes. But nonetheless from Foner's Marxist perspective it is plain that "the struggle over the labor of the emancipated slave [w]as the crucial issue of Reconstruction" (p. 5). It is that perception that has determined Foner's theses and directed his research. It is clear that in his present investigation of Reconstruction, he is developing the most thorough and sophisticated assessment of the labor-relations aspect of Reconstruction that we yet have. One need not be a Marxist to find

his evidence and insights compelling, even if one questions the conviction that economic class relations were the central issue of post-war southern life.

Deftly written in appropriately scholarly style, but unfortunately lacking a bibliography, this volume is "must reading" not only for students of the Civil War era, but all who cover that period as part of their teaching responsibilities.

Ohio State University

MICHAEL LES BENEDICT

Northernizing the South. By Richard N. Current. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1983. x, 147 pp. Foreword, preface, introduction, notes, bibliography, index. \$12.50.)

This published version of Richard N. Current's Lamar Memorial Lectures at Mercer University addresses the subject of northern efforts to Yankeeify the South and southern efforts to resist the same. Insofar as there is a thesis, it is that self-conscious southernism has developed largely in response to perceived fears of northernization. Having lived in the South now for over twenty years, Current no longer believes the cultural roots of southern distinctiveness reach very deep.

Northernizing the South covers a lot of historical ground, from the founding of the Republic down to the present time. Current understandably dwells most on the period of sectional conflict: the territorial crisis over slavery, the Civil War, and the first Reconstruction. He nicely recounts how competing sectional stereotypes fed on one another. Mounting southern fears of northernization intensified self-conscious southernism, which in turn stimulated anew the northernization impulse, chiefly on the part of Republicans. Northern Democrats were indifferent, if not hostile, to attempts at Yankeeifying the South.

The apogee of this spiralling sectionalism came during the Civil War and Reconstruction. Now southern resistance to northernization took the form of separate nationhood. In response Yankeeification escalated into emancipation, and then radical Reconstruction. But save for the abolition of slavery, the institutional barriers within the South to northernization were left intact— the plantation system. Northernizers settled for a program

of black suffrage and northern immigration. But Yankee settlers who stayed the course usually became avid converts to southernism. And planter resistance to black political equality was so fierce as to cause Yankeeifiers to abandon the field for nearly seventy-five years. (Or did they merely forsake their political methods for economic ones, a possibility Current overlooks?)

The last of Current's three chapters puzzles over the fate of southernism since Reconstruction. Among other things, he discusses the convergence of southernism with the jingoistic Americanism of the early Jim Crow era, the reaction of the Agrarians to northern cultural condescension, and the recent efforts by some southern historians to fashion an ethnic identity for their compatriots.

Lucidly written, *Northernizing the South* is perhaps too brief to do full justice to its vast subject.

Tulane University

LAWRENCE N. POWELL

This Land, This South. By Albert E. Cowdry. (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1983. xii, 236 pp. Editor's preface, acknowledgments, introduction, illustrations, notes, bibliographical note, index. \$23.00.)

This is the story of the long interaction between man, land, and climate in the American South. More appropriately it is a study of the encounter between a particular subculture and a particular environment. It is not only a tale of soil erosion and depletion of such basic resources as forests and wildlife but, through its many endemic diseases, human energy as well. It also includes a wide consideration of the more enchanting search for wisdom and knowledge to combat these many-faceted ills.

Ancient and geological forces created the South's landscape, but human forces have been reshaping it since long before historical times. The author maintains that the southern Indians were by no means the natural ecologists of myth; they changed their environment by such practices as woods-burning, which helped to create the long leaf pine forests. European immigrants, particularly those from England, accelerated such patterns. Considering the environment a commodity, they exercised through

greed and ignorance a great toll on the land and on future generations. Beginning as early as the sixteenth century there was a decline in the quantity and the quality of soil, water, forests, and wildlife. Likewise diseases brought from Europe and Africa found a warm and hospitable reception in the South with disastrous consequences to white settlers, their slaves, and the Indians. Malaria, yellow fever, and hookworm eroded human energy and shortened the life span. Mortality of early settlers in Louisiana was equal to that of Jamestown.

The author maintains that the southern crop which wrought most damage to the soil was not cotton but the more abundant crop, corn. At the same time industrial impacts on the section's environment were of small account. In 1890, for example, the South's entire industrial production was worth less than one-half that of New York. Yet the agricultural, forest, and extractive industries were another matter. He points out that the era of "triumphant monoculture" and the flowering of the Cotton Kingdom occurred during the Gilded Age rather than in the period of the Old South. It was in the twentieth century that more effective efforts were begun to repair the damage done by human folly, to conserve forests, soil, and wildlife, and to improve medicine and to inaugurate scientific flood control. This happier phase of his story hopefully has not yet ended.

Forestry has been called "the center-piece" of the region's environmental history during the Gilded Age when efforts moved from the reservation of forest lands to their exploitation, and finally to the beginnings of scientific forestry in the United States. With the last came a change in the human perception of the forest from commodity to renewable resource.

Reclamation and flood control began in the Mississippi alluvial valley as a necessary solution to a local problem. By 1879 it had become a federal commitment, but engineers could not agree on how it should be done. The construction of levees proved not to be the solution proclaimed for it, for cutting off the river's normal flood plain caused flood heights to rise accordingly.

Just as the South learned to restrain the Mississippi, it learned also to restrain the boll weevil but not to destroy it completely. The rampage of the parasite was more of a regional calamity than any other event in the South's economic history. The combina-

tion of weevil with erosion on the hilly land of the Piedmont was catastrophic in its results. Yet the Cotton Kingdom managed to survive and to grow until New Deal programs helped to achieve a revolution in the nature of southern farming. This revolution exacted grave costs in suffering from the poorest workers in the land, but it brought forth new successor crops such as the soybean.

After World War II mechanization came slowly to the South's farms. The section's endemic diseases went into practical oblivion as hookworm and pellagra became curiosities. Diet became richer and more varied. The deer and the beaver returned to their old habitats, and in some communities are now considered as nuisances. The South's sophistication in forestry is probably unsurpassed anywhere else in the world.

The evidence which the author uses in constructing this fascinating story is both abundant and sometimes spotty. The nature of the narrative also presumes some degree of speculation, particularly when one treats the landscape as an historical document and recites the history of certain species of animals. However, as a study which explores man's cumulative impact on the southern landscape and the latter's impact on man it probably has no parallel. Despite a few long and involved sentences, the book is beautifully written and easily read. It should be on every historian's bookshelf.

Lockerly Arboretum Foundation
Milledgeville, Georgia

JAMES C. BONNER

Now That The Buffalo's Gone: A Study of Today's American Indians. By Alvin M. Josephy, Jr. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982. xv, 300 pp. Preface, photographs, bibliography, index. \$15.95.)

While much attention has been given to Indians of the frontier era, Alvin M. Josephy attempts to rectify this situation by this book on recent Native Americans. Each chapter examines a different theme, using a particular tribe as a case study. Josephy writes well, and his interpretations are well argued. Nevertheless, the first third of the book hardly touches on the twentieth cen-

tury. In a book about “today’s” Indians, too much space is devoted to the colonial era.

In the first chapter, for example, Josephy examines the Seminoles to demonstrate the longstanding Indian will to endure. He writes movingly of the Florida Indians’ aboriginal cultures and their resistance to the Spanish, and also argues that there is a significant connection between pre-Columbian Florida natives and the later immigrants who became the Seminoles. This is a good summary of early Florida Indian history, but there are only three pages on the post-1800 period. The author ignores the works of scholars like Harry Kersey, which do show the Seminoles’ will to endure over the last century.

Even stranger is the chapter on the theme of white racial stereotypes about Indians. Rather than use any number of examples of stereotyping from recent eras, this chapter bogs down in a detailed account of the 1637 Pequot War. While not disagreeing with Josephy’s conclusions, one wonders why he included this chapter instead of devoting more space to New England Indians in the twentieth century.

Chapter three analyzes the deep spiritual basis of Indian culture, by focusing on the Pueblos. After an excellent beginning on the destructive impact of Christian missionaries, Josephy again lapses into an account of the 1680 Pueblo revolt that needs condensing. But once he gets past 1900, the narrative becomes fascinating. The author demonstrates the intense spiritual basis of Taos Pueblo attachment to Blue Lake, showing that this firm grounding kept them fighting for sixty years, against great odds, to get their sacred lands finally returned to them. By chapter four, Josephy is firmly within the scope of his topic, writing on recent Indians’ struggle to retain their lands. With a focus on the Seneca resistance to the flooding of their reservation by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, he shows that even though they lost, the Kinzua Dam controversy sparked numerous other tribes to resist. Likewise, Josephy uses the Paiute effort to save Pyramid Lake as an indicator of increasing Indian resistance. The federal government diverted most of the Paiutes’ water to neighboring whites, and shamelessly abdicated its responsibility to protect Indian interests. Only after the Paiutes sought outside legal help and began their own court battles did they manage to protect their water rights.

Josephy next analyzes the reassertion of native fishing and hunting rights by attention to the 1960s protests of Washington state Indians. This chapter effectively shows the tangled twists and turns of protracted court battles which have become so important to twentieth-century Indians.

Finally, Josephy uses the Sioux as a case study of the colonial relationship that tribal governments exist in today. He offers a scathing critique of the governments set up under the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act. By establishing unfamiliar white-type governments that in some cases undercut continuing traditional forms of government, and by retaining real decision-making power in the Interior Department, such governments ensured white control of reservation resources. Many Indians refused to participate in such shams, thus further factionalizing tribes and creating power-politics cliques. He correctly notes that grassroots protests like the 1973 Wounded Knee occupation were revolts against these oppressive non-representative governments.

For the reader who sticks with this book, the case studies are excellently presented. But the first third of the book needs severe condensing, so that more attention could be paid to issues like allotment, ethnic persistence with acculturation, and Maine and Alaska native land claims.

University of Cincinnati

WALTER L. WILLIAMS

A Southern Rebel, The Life and Times of Aubrey Willis Williams, 1890-1965. By John A. Salmond. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983. xii, 337 pp. Acknowledgments, photographs, notes, bibliography, index. \$25.00.)

Aubrey Williams grew up poor in Birmingham, Alabama, and he never forgot his roots. His father's alcoholism and irresponsibility was balanced by his mother's dreams and willingness to sacrifice. She bequeathed him a strong religious faith which was one source of his abiding liberalism. In time the Presbyterian ministerial student became a Unitarian social worker, but he carried the ethical principles of Jesus throughout his life.

He made his major contribution to the quality of American life during the 1930s. As Harry Hopkins's chief administrative

aide, he helped chart New Deal relief policy. As relief administrator for the Southwest, Williams demonstrated a strong populist commitment, but he also proved to be a capable administrator who worked hard to eliminate petty state and local politics from the administration of relief. His belief in work relief rather than the dole corresponded to the view of Hopkins, and reinforced the New Deal preference for indirect relief. As the deputy administrator of the WPA, and later as director of the NYA, Williams sought to involve blacks fully not only in the benefits of government programs, but in their administration as well.

Unfortunately, Williams's Presbyterian heritage did not serve him so well in some ways. His moral commitments led not only to courageous stands for civil rights and civil liberties, but also caused him to eschew compromise and to judge his allies by a harsh standard. In time he condemned Ralph McGill, Lillian Smith, Martin Luther King, Jr., and John F. Kennedy for their moral compromises. Although the author attributes Williams's growing isolation to the red-baiting and smears of the McCarthy era, one suspects that his friends deserted Williams at least partly because of his dogmatism and his sense of moral superiority.

In many ways this is a very sad book. Williams, whose career after 1945 was devoted primarily to the cause of civil rights, saw many of his dreams of a biracial society disappear. And he could not accept that many liberals as committed as he was could nonetheless disagree honorably with him on strategy. He also suffered the fate of many another southern racial liberal, when congressmen who had been his allies in the dark days of the relief programs in the early 1930s later viciously attacked his racial iconoclasm and denied him the directorship of first the WPA and later the REA. An even worse fate awaited him in the early 1950s when he was investigated by Senator Eastland's Internal Security Committee and accused of being a Communist. This smear destroyed his Montgomery printing business and nearly ended his marriage because of his wife's desperate desire to leave Montgomery. Ultimately, the pressure and ostracism became too great, and he left Alabama for Washington, D. C., where he ended his days in misery and bitterness.

Relieving this tragic story of a prophet without honor in his own land is Williams's courage and the support of so many like-minded Southerners. People such as Virginia and Clifford Durr,

Gould Beech, Florida's liberal Senator Claude Pepper, Alabama's Lister Hill, and especially Lyndon Johnson gave him unwavering support. The relationship with Johnson somewhat balances Robert Caro's devastating biography of L.B.J. by showing that Johnson could prove a loyal friend to those he really cared for, ignoring red-baiting and smears which frightened other liberals.

Salmond's biography sinks into excessive detail and occasional repetition. But it is impressively researched and balanced in judgment. Any American who wants to understand how painful and slow has been the nation's progress toward justice would do well to read this book.

Auburn University

J. WAYNE FLYNT

BOOK NOTES

Clermont: Gem of the Hills, a History of Clermont, Florida, and Its Neighboring Communities, was written by Miriam Johnson and Rosemary Young to help celebrate Clermont's centennial. The first permanent settler in the part of South Lake County called "the Clermont area" was James Anderson from Georgia, who located near Kirkland Lake in 1853. Others soon followed, arriving by horse and wagon. However, in the 1880s it became possible to travel by steamboat from Jacksonville via the St. Johns and Oklawaha rivers to Leesburg and Yalaha, and then by oxcart or horse and wagon overland to Minneola. Minneola and Mohawa are two of the neighboring communities described in the book. Clermont was incorporated in 1891. Until a city hall was completed, the law offices of William A. House at the corner of Seventh and Minneola Avenue served as the meeting place for the aldermen and city officials. *Clermont: Gem of the Hills*, includes information about pioneer settlers, schools, businesses, recreational facilities, churches, newspapers, hotels, social and civic organizations, railroads, cultural institutions, and government activities. Nine chapters trace the chronological history of Clermont; another deals with the history of the black community and its leaders. Pictures and statistical data from early census records make a good reference for genealogists. Order from Miriam Johnson, 1459 Bowman Street, Clermont, FL 32711; the price is \$15.00, plus \$1.00 for mailing.

Bolles is one of the best known private schools in Jacksonville and the South. It was named for Richard J. Bolles, a wealthy silver miner who came to Florida in 1907 upon the invitation of Governor Napoleon B. Broward, and began purchasing Everglades swamp land at \$2.00 an acre. After his death in 1917, care of his estate went to Agnes Cain, his secretary. In 1926, at the time of the Florida boom, the San Jose Hotel opened in Jacksonville on the south side of the river. Agnes held the mortgage on the property and the following year she purchased it at a foreclosure sale. It operated for three years as the Florida Military Academy, and then, in 1932, the Bolles School was established. It was a military school under the supervision of Roger Painter

(Agnes's husband). Education has always been the main emphasis. It has also maintained a record of excellence in athletics. Some of the leading business and political leaders of Jacksonville and the state are graduates of Bolles. It now admits both male and female students, many of whom have graduated as Merit Scholars. *Bolles, The Standard-Bearer* is by George W. Hallam, professor of English at Jacksonville University. His earlier book was *Riverside Remembered*. William P. Massey, a member of the Bolles faculty, was graphics director for *Bolles, The Standard-Bearer*. It sells for \$15.00 and may be ordered from Bolles, 7400 San Jose Boulevard, Jacksonville 32217.

Atlas of Florida is a collection of sectional maps of each county reproduced by Charles Rickenbach of Melbourne from an original map dating to 1925. Land surveys, roads, railroads, canals, and drainage are among the data included. The volume sells for \$15.95, order from Living Pictures, Inc., 2910 South Riverview Drive, Melbourne, FL 32901.

Revolutionary America, 1763-1789 is a two-volume bibliography published by the Library of Congress. The work contains 14,810 numbered entries listing more than 20,000 titles in the Library's collections on the American Revolutionary era. The volumes are organized into twelve topicochronological chapters. Chapter one lists research aids, including bibliographies, guides to eighteenth-century imprints and manuscript collections, maps, atlases, and geographical aids. Chapter two includes general studies of the period. Other chapters deal with Great Britain and the Empire, pre-Revolutionary events, frontier and early developments in the West, the War for Independence, Loyalists in the colonies and in exile, the drafting and ratification of the Constitution, and economic, social, and intellectual life in Revolutionary America. Chapter twelve lists works by and about 2,138 participants in the Revolution. There are a number of Florida references throughout. Approximately forty per cent of the entries are annotated. There is an extensive index, approximately 100,000 references to persons and places. There is also an essay by Ronald M. Gephart, the compiler, on the preservation and publication of documentary sources on the Revolution. *Revolutionary America, 1763-1789* may be ordered from the

Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402 (Stock #030-000-00125-7); the price is \$38.00.

The Ku Klux Klan, A Bibliography was compiled by Lenwood G. Davis and Janet L. Sims-Wood, with the assistance of Marsha L. Moore, and was published by Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut. In his foreword, Earl E. Throp describes the volume as "the most comprehensive bibliography ever compiled on one of the most vicious organizations in the world." This compilation differs from William H. Fisher's, *The Invisible Empire: A Bibliography of the Ku Klux Klan*, published in 1980. It includes more items and approximately seventy-five per cent of the citations are from newspapers. A selected list of books, pamphlets, general works, dissertations, theses, KKK materials, government documents, elected officials' speeches, and articles from *The Courier*, the Klan magazine, are included. Florida is represented with 189 citations under general works. Cited are articles which were published in the *New York Times*, *Pittsburgh Courier*, *Chicago Defender*, *Newsweek*, and other newspapers and periodicals. The authors' index and the statistical data are helpful. In a *Washington Post* article (November 2, 1930) the membership of the KKK for 1925 was detailed for each state. It showed Florida with 391,040 members. Only Texas (450,000) had a larger membership. The price of *The Ku Klux Klan: A Bibliography* is \$49.50.

The Plantation Mistress by Catherine Clinton is a study of the role, responsibilities, and position of white women in the South living on plantations which had twenty or more slaves. The study includes Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, but not Florida. The period is 1780-1834. Dr. Clinton collected facts and feelings from household inventories, female academy records, commonplace books, physicians' records, wills, diaries and memoirs, court cases, legislative petitions, census data, and other legal documents. The relationship of white men to their wives and to women other than their wives, both black and white, is one of the topics discussed. A woman had major responsibilities within the household on the plantation, both for her own family and

for the slaves. She was doctor, nurse, supervisor of household cleaning and food preparation, disciplinarian, and religious mentor; she was wife, mother, and hostess; and she played an important role in the social, educational, and religious life in the antebellum South. *Plantation Mistress, Women's World in the Old South* is a Pantheon Book, New York, publication, and it sells for \$7.95.

The first modern edition of *Journal of a Residence on a Georgia Plantation in 1838-1839* was published in 1961. It has now been republished by University of Georgia Press in its Brown Thrasher Books Series. Fanny Kemble's journal is a classic study of life and the living conditions of both owners and slaves on a Georgia plantation in the Old South. She was an English actress who came to New York with her company in 1832. Two years later she married Pierce Mease Butler whose family owned a Georgia plantation and upwards of 700 slaves. It was one of the most productive farming operations in Georgia. Fanny was a woman with strong anti-slavery sympathies and when she persuaded her husband to allow her to journey to Georgia she saw slavery firsthand. She was appalled, and revealed her feelings both publicly and in her journal. Her attitudes toward the South, slavery, and her husband's way of life eventually led to a divorce and her resettlement in England. *The Journal* was published in 1863, first in London and then in New York. This new publication was edited by John Anthony Scott, who also edited the 1961 edition. His original introduction and a new one for this edition are included. The price is \$9.95.

In 1734 the Protestants expelled from Salzburg, Germany, came to Georgia and established a colony which they called Ebenezer. In the next few years three additional transports arrived with German settlers. George Fenwick Jones has researched the colonial records of Georgia and the Missionary Archives of the Francke Foundation in Halle, East Germany, to get details on these colonists. His story of *The Salzburger Saga: Religious Exiles and Other Germans Along the Savannah* lists the inhabitants of Ebenezer and its dependencies which should be of value to genealogists. *The Salzburger Saga* is a Brown Thrasher

original, published by the University of Georgia Press, Athens. The price is \$18.00.

The seventh annual Chancellor's Symposium, held in 1981 at the University of Mississippi, focused on the important scholarship of Professor Emory M. Thomas, one of the South's leading historians. The papers presented at that conference were edited for publication by Harry P. Owens and James J. Cooke, under the title *The Old South in the Crucible of War*. The essays are by Emory M. Thomas, Paul D. Escott, Lawrence N. Powell and Michael S. Wayne, Leon F. Litwack, Michael Barton, and Thomas B. Alexander. The paperback volume sells for \$7.50, and may be ordered from the University Press of Mississippi, Jackson.

In 1982 the Department of History and the Center for the Study of Southern Culture at the University of Mississippi sponsored its eighth annual Chancellor's Symposium. The topic, *Sex, Race, and the Role of the Woman in the South*, is the title of the volume, edited by Joanne Lee Hawks and Sheila L. Skemp and published by University Press of Mississippi. It includes the essays of Jean E. Friedman, Dolores Janiewski, Martha H. Swain, Sharon Harley, Anne Goodwyn Jones, and Anne Firor Scott. Their papers relate to "Women's History and the Revision of Southern History," "Southern Working Women," "The Public Role of Southern Working Women," "Black Women," and "The Ways in which Southern Literary Women have Portrayed Life in the South." The paperback sells for \$8.95.

The Seminole Seed, by Robert Newton Peck, is the story of Kirby Tree, son of a Seminole girl who died in childbirth. Kirby was raised by his Indian grandfather and his uncle, Little Man Tree. The world of the white man encroaches upon the life of the Seminole when construction of a country club begins near the swamp where the Indians live. Kirby becomes obsessed by tennis, and the club pro realizes that he can train him to become a champion. The climax of the book centers on the last day of the tournament. *Seminole Seed* was published by Pineapple Press, Box 314, Englewood, FL 33533, and it sells for \$16.95.

Another novel utilizing a Florida background is *Midnight Water*, by Geoffrey Norman. The action takes place in the Florida Panhandle. It was published by Dutton, New York, and sells for \$13.95.

The Atlanta Exposition Cookbook, compiled by Mrs. Henry Lumpkin Wilson, was first published in 1895 under the title *Tested Recipe Cook Book*. The Cotton States and International Exposition was held in Atlanta between September 18 and December 31, 1895, and women's activities were included. They featured exhibits, lectures, meetings of women's organizations from around the state and nation, and a demonstration kitchen, school, and kindergarden. This cookbook was also published. Darlene R. Roth, who has written the introduction to this new edition, notes that it is more than a cookbook; it is also a "document in social history." The recipes are from white kitchens, and the food was eaten in white homes, although the cooking was likely the work of black servants. Presumably, the stoves they used were wood-fired. The ice box was a common item at the time, but little else that the modern housewife uses was available. The women whose recipes are included were representatives of the "New Women" of the time. They were affluent and active in the social, philanthropic, religious, and political organizations in Atlanta and Georgia. *The Atlanta Exposition Cookbook* has been reprinted by the University of Georgia Press, Athens, GA, in its Brown Thrasher Books Series, and it sells for \$12.00.

A Guide to the History of Louisiana, edited by Light Townsend Cummins and Glen Jeansonne, is the first in a series of reference guides to state history and research. There will be a volume on Florida. Two types of articles are included in this Louisiana volume: historiographical essays which provide an overview of each chronological period from colonial times to the present, and descriptions of major archival and manuscript repositories in Louisiana. The volume is designed as a general reference for all interested in the history of Louisiana, especially those contemplating new research projects. Included is a description of the literature relating to blacks and women, oral history, urban New Orleans, and quantifications. Published by

Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, *A Guide to the History of Louisiana* sells for \$35.00.

The Other Side of the River, by Betsy Zeiss, was reviewed in the Book Notes section of the *Florida Historical Quarterly*, April 1984. The book sells for \$18.95, plus tax, and \$1.00 for mailing and handling. The correct mailing address is 4707 S.E. 5th Avenue, Cape Coral, FL 33904.

HISTORY NEWS

Pizarro Conference

In 1977 at the Cathedral of Lima in Peru a crypt was opened which revealed a lead box with an inscription indicating that it contained the head of Francisco Pizarro, the sixteenth-century Spanish conquistador. In a wooden box also in the crypt were a skeleton without a skull, and relatively complete skeletons of an adult male and female and of two children. Until this discovery, it was accepted that a mummy in a glass-sided coffin in the Cathedral contained Pizarro's remains.

Dr. Hugo Ludeña of the National Institute of Culture of Peru was in charge of the project to identify and preserve the remains in the crypt. Peruvian scientists working with Professor Ludeña were Drs. Oscar Soto, Ludis Delpine de Soto, and Pedro Weiss. Students of anthropology and archeology of the University of San Marcos at Lima assisted on the project. Drs. Robert Benfer and Samuel Stout, of the University of Missouri were also involved.

The Florida State Museum, University of Florida, became associated with the Pizarro project in 1984 with the technical assistance of Dr. William R. Maples, curator of physical anthropology at the Museum. Dr. Maples has microscopically examined and photographed each bone of the Pizarro skeleton, and his study reconstructed the events of the assassination and the details of the injuries received by Pizarro.

In May 1984, Dr. Maples returned to Lima, accompanied by Dr. William M. Goza, adjunct curator of development of the Museum, and Robert Leavy, preparator in the Department of Interpretation. Although the investigation is not complete, Dr. Maples indicated that the scientists working on the project agree that the remains are those of Pizarro. Identification of the mummy will be a matter for a future investigation.

On September 26, 1984, a Conference on the Remains of Pizarro organized by the Florida State Museum will be held at the University of Florida. The individuals named in this article will take part in the program. Ms. Betty Pat Gatliff, of SKULL-

pture, Inc., has prepared a facial reconstruction on a cast of the Pizarro skull, and it will be shown.

The visitors will also visit St. Augustine as guests of the Historic St. Augustine Preservation Board. For information on the conference write to Dr. Goza, Florida State Museum, Gainesville, FL 32611.

Florida History Fair

Final competition for the third annual Florida History Fair was held May 4-5, 1984, in conjunction with the meeting of the Florida Historical Society in Fort Myers. The finalists brought their projects to be exhibited at the meeting. First prize winner was Laurie Snowden of Workmen Middle School, Pensacola. Her project was "A Circus Community," and her teacher was Sandra Mayne. Jimmy and Tommy Pace, Belleview Middle School, Pensacola, shared the second prize. Their teacher was Jane Flowers, and their project was "Fort Pickens." Other winners were Lisa Stevenson, Griffin Middle School, Tallahassee (Mrs. Rice, teacher); Frankie Robertson, Westridge Junior High, Orlando (John English, teacher); Gino Perlangeli, Jackson Heights Middle School, Oviedo (Jean Rumsey, teacher); Becky Higginbotham, Evans High School, Orlando (Mrs. Warner, teacher); and Brian Kerr, Raa Junior High, Tallahassee (Mrs. G. Byrd, teacher).

The first and second winners were entered in the national History Fair which was held in Washington, D.C., on June 14. The Florida History Fair was sponsored by the Florida Historical Society with support from Gerald W. McSwiggan of Miami. Dr. Jane Dysart, University of West Florida, is state chairman of the Florida History Fair.

National Register of Historic Places

The Florida Department of State, Division of Archives, History and Records Management, reports that the following Florida sites were added to the National Register during the year 1983: Palm Beach County— Gulf Street Hotel (Lake Worth), U.S. Post Office (Palm Beach); Santa Rosa County— Ollinger-Cobb House (Milton); Nassau County— Marrick-Simmons House (Fernandina Beach); Orange County— Comstock-Harris House (Winter Park);

Lake County— William Kimbrough Pendleton House “The Palms” (Eustis), Howey House (Howey-in-the-Hills); Manatee County— Powel Crosley, Jr., House “Seagate” (Sarasota vicinity), Braden Castle Park Historic District (Bradenton); Polk County— Lake Mirror Promenade (Lakeland); Volusia County— DeLand Hall (DeLand), S. H. Kress and Co. Building (Daytona Beach); Pinellas County— Bay Pines Site (Bay Pines); Monroe County— Key West Historic District (extension) (Key West); Duval County— 310 West Church Street Apartments (Ambassador Hotel) (Jacksonville), Old Stanton High School (Jacksonville); Hillsborough County— S. H. Kress and Co. Building (Tampa), West Tampa Historic District (Tampa); Escambia County— North Hill Preservation District (Pensacola), Crystal Ice Company Building (Pensacola), Mirador Apartments (Pensacola); Dade County— Opa-Locka Bank (Opa-Locka), J. W. Warner House (Miami), U.S. Post Office and Courthouse (Miami); Hamilton County— Old Hamilton County Jail (Jasper); Jackson County— Joseph W. Russ, Jr., House (Marianna); St. Johns County— Model Land Company Historic District (St. Augustine), Abbott Tract Historic District (St. Augustine); Alachua County — Micanopy Historic District (Micanopy); Washington County— Moss Hill Church (Vernon vicinity); Marion County— McIntosh Historic District (McIntosh); Putnam County— Palatka North Historic District (Palatka), Palatka South Historic District (Palatka); Gulf County— U.S. Snagboat *Montgomery* (White City vicinity); and Gadsden County— Willoughby Gregory House (Quincy).

Grants

The Florida Historical Society at the annual meeting in Fort Myers received a check for \$1,000 from the Wentworth Foundation, Inc. This presentation is made annually for the *Florida Historical Quarterly* by William M. Goza, former president of the Society and executive director of the Wentworth Foundation. The Wentworth Foundation has supported many of the Society's activities over the years including the establishment of a revolving publication fund. It also supports other historical, anthropological, and cultural organizations in Florida, including the Florida State Museum and the P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History, University of Florida. It was an initial grant from the

Foundation that made possible the Yonge Library's project of calendaring its Spanish and Borderland documents and manuscripts. In recent months it has supported the Florida State Museum's research projects in Haiti and Peru. The Foundation also provides scholarships for graduate and undergraduate students at a number of Florida colleges and universities. The recipients are known as Wentworth Scholars.

Gerald W. McSwiggan of Miami, a member of the board of directors of the Florida Historical Society, presented his check for \$1,000 to help support the State History Fair program. Mr. McSwiggan has supported the History Fair program from its inauguration, and for several years he has served as a member of the state selection committee. He attended the national competition in Washington, D.C. on June 14, and made the arrangements that enabled the Florida prize winners and their teachers to meet United States Senator Paula Hawkins. Dr. Jane Dysart, recording secretary of the Florida Historical Society, is Florida History Fair coordinator.

Awards and Recognition

Dr. William R. Gillaspie of Memphis State University received the Arthur W. Thompson Memorial Prize for 1983-1984 for his article, "Survival of a Frontier Presidio: St. Augustine and the Subsidy and Private Contract Systems, 1680-1702," which appeared in the January 1984 issue of the *Florida Historical Quarterly*. The prize is given annually for the best article appearing in the *Quarterly*, and it is presented at the annual meeting of the Florida Historical Society. The judges for this year's award were Dr. Daniel L. Schafer, University of North Florida; Dr. George F. Pearce, University of West Florida; and Dr. Edward F. Keuchel, Florida State University. The prize was made possible by an endowment established by Professor Irene Thompson of Gainesville in memory of her husband, the distinguished historian of the South and a long-time member of the history faculty at the University of Florida.

The Rembert W. Patrick Book Award was presented to James Robertson Ward, Jacksonville, Florida, for his book, *Old*

Hickory's Town: An Illustrated History of Jacksonville. Dena E. Snodgrass, former president of the Florida Historical Society and research historian, Jacksonville Historical Society, was associated with Mr. Ward in the writing of this volume. It was published by the Florida Publishing Company of Jacksonville. The judges were Dr. David R. Colburn, University of Florida; James A. Servies, University of West Florida; and Dr. James P. Jones, Florida State University.

The Charlton W. Tebeau Junior Book Award for 1983 was presented to Jean Craighead George of Chappaqua, New York, for her book, *The Talking Earth*, published by Harper & Row. The award honors Charlton W. Tebeau, Emeritus Professor, University of Miami, editor of *Tequesta*, and former president of the Florida Historical Society. It is given annually to the author of the best book for young readers on a Florida subject. The judges were Dorothy Lyon, Vero Beach; Jacqueline B. Fretwell, St. Augustine Historical Society; and Samuel J. Boldrick, Miami-Dade Public Library.

Norman Simons, curator of the Pensacola Historical Museum, was presented with the Pensacola Historical Society's Heritage Award in March. It recognized his outstanding work as historian, preservationist, archivist, and archeologist for the Pensacola Historical Society and for his distinguished services as curator of the Pensacola Historical Museum. The presentation was made by the Society president, J. Earle Bowden at the annual banquet in Pensacola.

Linda Ellsworth, former secretary of the Florida Historical Society, co-author of *Pensacola: The Deep Water City*, and research historian for the Historic Pensacola Preservation Board, was named the Outstanding Woman of the Year in Pensacola by the Intown Businesswomen's Club. The announcement was made in April. Mrs. Ellsworth was also honored this year by the Pensacola North Hill Preservation Association for her outstanding contributions to the field of preservation.

The Peace River Valley Historical Society presented its annual Florida History Award to Dr. Thaddeus M. Moseley. The

presentation was made by Dr. Gordon H. McSwiggan at a banquet at the Arcadia Country Club, May 29, 1984. The Award recognizes outstanding contributions to the preservation, study, and interpretation of Florida and local history.

Announcements and Activities

The East Hillsborough Historical Society has announced publication of the centennial edition of *Plant City: Its Origins and History* by Quintella Geer Burton and D. E. Bailey, Jr. It will be released in September to help launch the beginning of the thirteen-month celebration of Plant City's centennial. This printing is a reprint of the first edition which was published in 1977. It will be printed on archival paper, and an index has been added. It will sell for \$30.00; prepublication orders may be placed through August 31 at a cost of \$25.00. Make checks payable to the East Hillsborough Society, mark them "for book," and mail to MacIntrie Hooper, Box B, Plant City, FL 33566.

A bust of Andrew Jackson was dedicated in Plaza Ferdinand VII in Pensacola, on May 19. It is the work of the noted Spanish sculptor, Eduardo Andievas Bezanllia, whose bust of Bernardo de Gálvez stands in Pensacola's Fort George Park. Andrew Jackson was governor of Florida at the time of its acquisition by the United States in 1821, and he accepted the territory from Spanish officials in Pensacola on July 17, 1821. The project was sponsored by the Pensacola Historic Preservation Society, and support came from private foundations, corporations, businesses, and local citizens.

The Pensacola Historical Society, in cooperation with the Gulf Islands National Seashore, is issuing a medal to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the construction of Fort Pickens on Santa Rosa Island. A celebration at Fort Pickens is planned for August.

The restored Stranahan House, the oldest existing structure in Fort Lauderdale, was officially dedicated in March. The Fort Lauderdale Historical Society and the Fort Lauderdale Area Board of Realtors were in charge of the project. The house began

as a trading post and later became the home of Frank and Ivy Stranahan. It is located off East Las Olas Boulevard at Southeast Sixth Avenue on the north bank of the New River.

A journal kept by Kingsley B. Gibbs, owner of the Kingsley Plantation on Fort George Island, covering the period January 1840 through June 1843, has been donated to the Florida Park Service. The journal records matters relating to agriculture and business and personal news. The manuscript is being prepared for publication by Jacqueline Bearden Fretwell in the St. Augustine Historical Society's *El Escribano*.

Miami Beach has designated two of its oldest Mediterranean-style buildings as its first local landmarks. The buildings were selected by the Miami Beach Historic Preservation Board. They are the Old City Hall, designed by Martin Luther Hampton in 1926, and the Twenty-first Street Community Center, designed in 1916 by August Geiger.

The fourth Citadel Conference on the South will be held in Charleston April 11-13, 1985. It will feature approximately fifteen panel sessions dealing with aspects of southern history from the colonial period to the present. Conference directors are Winfred B. Moore, Jr., Lyon G. Tyler, and Joseph F. Tripp, Department of History, The Citadel, Charleston, South Carolina 29409. Persons interested in presenting papers are invited to submit titles, an outline of their proposals, and their vitas by October 1, 1984. Those interested in participating as commentators should also submit a vita by that date.

The *Journal of Popular Culture* is soliciting articles for a special issue that will be devoted to popular culture in Florida. Essays may be based on history, geography, philosophy, music, folklore, literature, sociology, and/or religion. Send articles to be considered for publication to Dr. Jerome Stern before November 1, 1984. His address is Department of English, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306.

The Southeastern American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies invites submissions for its annual competition. An award

of \$250 will be given for the best article on an eighteenth-century subject published in a scholarly journal, annual, or collection between September 1, 1983, and August 31, 1984, by a member of SEASECS or a person living or working in the Southeast. The interdisciplinary appeal of the article will be considered. Individuals may submit their own work or the work of others. Articles must be submitted in triplicate no later than November 15, 1984, to Charles M. Carroll, Department of Music, St. Petersburg Junior College, P. O. Box 13489, St. Petersburg, FL 33733.

The Thronateeska Heritage Foundation, Albany, Georgia, has published the first issue of *The Journal of Southwest Georgia History*. It contains articles on Wiregrass, Georgia; Dougherty County; Cordele, Georgia; and Charles Wessolowsky, a nineteenth-century Jewish peddler who lived in Georgia. Inquiries about manuscript submission should be sent to Dr. Lee W. Formalt, Department of History and Political Science, Albany State College, Albany, GA 31705. Advertisement information is available from Claudia Parker, 1014 North McKinley, Albany, GA 31701.

GREAT EXPECTATIONS.

1984

Sept. 6-8	Florida Trust for Historic Preservation	Sarasota, FL
Sept. 18-21	American Association for State and Local History	Louisville, KY
Sept. 20-23	Oral History Association	Lexington, KY
Sept. 26	Pizarro Conference	Gainesville, FL
Oct. 24-28	National Trust for Historic Preservation	Baltimore, MD
Oct. 31-Nov. 3	Southern Historical Association	Louisville, KY
Nov. 3-5	Southern Jewish Historical Society	Richmond, VA
Nov. 8-10	Florida Genealogical Society	Palatka, FL
Dec. 26-29	American Historical Association	Chicago, IL

1985

May	Florida Historical Confederation	Tallahassee, FL
-----	-------------------------------------	-----------------

FLORIDA
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY- 83rd
MEETING

A GIFT OF HISTORY

A MEMBERSHIP IN THE FLORIDA HISTORICAL SOCIETY IS AN EXCELLENT GIFT IDEA FOR BIRTHDAYS, GRADUATION, OR FOR ANYONE INTERESTED IN THE RICH AND COLORFUL STORY OF FLORIDA'S PAST.

A one-year membership costs only \$15.00, and it includes four issues of *the Florida Historical Quarterly*, *the Florida History Newsletter*, as well as all other privileges of membership. A personal letter from the Executive Secretary of the Society will notify the recipient of your gift of your generosity and consideration. Convey your respect for that special person's dignity and uniqueness. What better way to express your faith in the lessons of the past and to celebrate old friendships?

Detach Along This Line

Send to: Florida Historical Society
University of South Florida Library
Tampa, Florida 33620

Please send as a special gift:

- Annual membership- \$15
- Family membership- \$20
- Contributing membership- \$50
- Student membership- \$10
- Check or money order enclosed
- Cash enclosed

TO

FROM

THE FLORIDA HISTORICAL SOCIETY
THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF FLORIDA, 1856
THE FLORIDA HISTORICAL SOCIETY, successor, 1902
THE FLORIDA HISTORICAL SOCIETY, incorporated, 1905

OFFICERS

RANDY F. NIMNIGHT, *president*
LUCIUS F. ELLSWORTH, *president-elect*
PAUL S. GEORGE, *vice-president*
LINDA K. WILLIAMS, *recording secretary*
PAUL EUGEN CAMP, *executive secretary and librarian*
SAMUEL PROCTOR, *editor, The Quarterly*

DIRECTORS

RICHARD BROOKE, JR. <i>Jacksonville</i>	GEORGE F. PEARCE <i>Pensacola</i>
HAMPTON DUNN <i>Tampa</i>	OLIVE D. PETERSON, <i>ex-officio</i> <i>Fort Pierce</i>
ALVA L. JONES <i>Clearwater</i>	LARRY E. RIVERS <i>Tallahassee</i>
MARCIA KANNER <i>Coral Gables</i>	DANIEL L. SCHAFER <i>Jacksonville</i>
MARY C. LINEHAN <i>Lantana</i>	MIKE SLICKER <i>St. Petersburg</i>
GERALD W. MCSWIGGAN <i>Miami</i>	BETTYE D. SMITH <i>Sanford</i>
L. ROSS MORRELL <i>Tallahassee</i>	WILLIAM M. STRAIGHT <i>Miami</i>
OWEN NORTH <i>Clearwater</i>	KYLE S. VANLANDINGHAM <i>Okeechobee</i>

The Florida Historical Society supplies the *Quarterly* to its members. Annual membership is \$15; family membership is \$20; a contributing membership is \$50. In addition, a student membership is \$10, but proof of current status must be furnished.

All correspondence relating to membership and subscriptions should be addressed to Paul Eugen Camp, Executive Secretary, Florida Historical Society, University of South Florida Library, Tampa, Florida 33620. Inquiries concerning back numbers of the *Quarterly* should be directed also to Mr. Camp.

