BOOK REVIEWS


This is a reprint of the Charles Adolphus Sterne Diary first deposited in manuscript form in the State Library in five volumes, which diary was first edited by Harriet Smither and published in the Southwestern Historical Quarterly beginning in October, 1926, and running through January, 1935. There is omitted from this volume the first manuscript volume running from 1838 to September, 1840.

This volume for the first time places in one handy usable book Sterne’s comments on the daily life of East Texas, as well as pertinent observations on the happenings in the Republic of Texas and State of Texas as they impinged on the life of the diarist, as well as on other lives in the community of Nacogdoches.

Adolphus Sterne speaks his mind in this diary as to the good and the bad. A careful reading will give the reader an excellent and interesting picture of the social and business lives of East Texans during this time. To any person interested in the history of Nacogdoches and the area at that time, or in the genealogy of the period, this volume should be both helpful and interesting. The pithy remarks about the citizens, the preachers and the politicians are of much interest and throw considerable light on to the thinking of that era.

It is unfortunate that the title states that the diary begins in 1838. It actually begins in September, 1840. The original manuscript and the Smither publication, each of which covered the period from 1838 to 1840, are diaries of one Ogilvey, for whose estate Sterne was the administrator. Ogilvey did leave a diary covering much of interest in this period, but it was probably omitted from this volume due to lack of space. Also it is feared that some of the footnotes were hurriedly done or not carefully researched. Despite these errors it is almost a “must” reading for anyone interested in the East Texas area and its history.

It is somewhat disappointing too that a bit more of the history and the legend of Adolphus Sterne was not included.

F. J. Tucker
Nacogdoches, Texas


*The Marlin Compound* tells the story of 100 years (1844-1945) in the development of Marlin, Falls County, Texas, through the letters and journals of Zenas Bartlett (author Oltorf’s great-grandfather), and his seemingly endless list of relatives and friends. Not surprisingly, the development theme becomes secondary to the interplay of personalities and
relationships within a normal—and thoroughly delightful—family. Sparsely documented periods are bolstered by newspaper clippings and verbal accounts handed down through the family. The major faults of the book lie in the one-sided nature of the narrative (we know what is written, but not the reply), and an occasional lack of cohesiveness.

Zenas Bartlett, a native of Maine, travels from his New England home to Alabama, the California gold fields, and, finally, to Texas. The accounts of the California years, related to the remainder of the correspondence only in the establishment of the character of their writer, reveal a man of vision who retains the ability to keep his feet firmly planted in reality.

Churchill Jones of Alabama, Bartlett’s father-in-law, is all practicality. He concerns himself with such mundane business matters as the price of cotton and the proper medicinal dosages for sick slaves.

The most interesting letters are those written between October, 1862, and May, 1865, by John W. Watkins to his wife Irene. Watkins served in Company B of the Fifth Cavalry Regiment of Jo Sibley’s Brigade. His letters give a soldier’s viewpoint of the Civil War in Louisiana. As the war lengthens, their general tone changes from cheerful confidence to loneliness and frustration. At the end he is unbelieving, bitter, and resentful.

The post-war years are viewed through the eyes of Bartlett’s daughter, niece, and daughter-in-law. The three women present a study in contrast: the daughter, well-educated and allowed an unusual amount of freedom; the niece, a country school teacher; and the daughter-in-law, a teenager at school in the East who refuses to allow homesickness to overcome her naturally high spirits and love of life.

The author is a former member of the Texas House of Representatives. At present he heads a family-owned corporation, the Falls Cattle Company. An obvious love for a good story and a justifiable pride in his family encouraged him to gather the family manuscripts together and put them into what is an interesting and entertaining story.

Sybil C. Shilling
Center, Texas


As a boy growing up on the Texas coastal plains, few things were more exciting to me than to hear, “Get dressed, we’re goin’ to Houston!” The excitement of a visit to the Big City (it was then less than half of its present self) was bathed in the glamour of adolescent romance, but honesty would compel the confession that the heart still beats a little faster when an opportunity for a visit is presented. And going in on the freeways still produces a quickening of the spirit that is undaunted by the gaudy skyline breaking through the industrial and automotive exhaust haze. A brief two-year residence in Houston failed to really pale the appreciation for it; indeed, familiarity in this case breeds more awe than contempt. Like women, Houston makes some love her, some not love her, and most take
her for granted. Some people would disagree—would argue that no one could take Houston for granted—but the impression remains that the majority of Houston's residents simply live there, without really being aware that much is going on, or having become inured to its constant change by overexposure.

David G. McComb's *Houston, The Bayou City,* is a good history of the city. It would be too bad a pun to say that, in his completeness, he covers the waterfront. He does give full credit to the mighty port as the first justification for Houston's success, but he also acknowledges that the black gold that flows through its refineries and pipelines is what has made it prosperous in the modern period. McComb traces Houston from a speculative frontier outpost when the Allens, plat in hand, sought to promote their vested interests at the expense and for the benefit of Texas. The "life" of Houston is charted through the years to its present status as Space City, with a widely diversified economy and a unique cultural mixture of growth and conservatism. McComb pulls no punches. He talks about the disease and polluted water supply of the historic city, but he also points out the present situation of polluted water and air, of inadequate medical care in the public hospitals, virtually in the shadow of the famous Texas Medical Center. He discusses Houston's politics, her crime, and other problems of the modern city. He does a very good job of placing Houston in the context of other contemporary American cities, yet keeping it closely wedded to his own past. It is a businessman's town, he says, and he has written a book essentially of Houston's business. He does so with none of George Fuermann's involvement. Indeed, sometimes he is almost too detached. But in the concluding chapter his own kind of involvement can be seen in his discussion of Houston's contemporary problems.

For anyone who wishes to read a good, solid history of Houston, this book is highly recommended.

Archie P. McDonald
Stephen F. Austin State University


This book, which treats one of the most complex periods in the history of France, as well as perhaps her darkest hour, is the best I have read in a long time. Mr. Warner has done a very rare thing—he has written an exciting political biography, and has done it well, in good, scholarly style.

The amount of research this book represents is staggering. The author has utilized the best of the secondary works, and has delved deeply into the original sources. The result is a work of astonishing breadth and depth, treating Laval from his first tentative beginnings in French politics through his various levels of development from socialist to what might be called a gentle fascist, if that were not a contradiction in terms.
Nevertheless, there are one or two items that someone should have caught—such as the date 1843 for the Treaty of Verdun by which the Carolingian Empire was divided between Charles the Great's grandsons (p. 215).

More serious than this, though, is the fact that from Mr. Warner's pages a sharply defined Laval does not emerge. He is still a fuzzy character. Was he solely motivated by a desire not to see France raped? Did he really believe he could play the role of a balancer between Il Duce and der Fuehrer? If he honestly abhorred war, how could he have urged, in sincerity, that Hitler should allow France a full partnership in the war against England? What was his idea of a socialist society somewhere between National Socialism and Bolshevism, but with an authoritarian base?

These are questions Mr. Warner leaves unanswered, but he realizes it and does not try to avoid them nor his inability to answer them. Perhaps the reason is because with Laval's death so many answers died also. I suspect that in the heat of anger and the frustration of pride the French Court, which tried and passed sentence on this unfortunate man whose fate was to be intelligent but politically stupid, destroyed with him the answers to the questions. Others, perhaps just as guilty, who escaped did not and will not tell the story. Until they do, if they do, this will remain a standard work on the death throes of the Third Republic and a cornerstone in the history of Vichy.

Ert J. Gum
University of Nebraska at Omaha


In a day when at least a portion of the American people are concerned by the threat of a breakdown in law and order, it is refreshing to look down the long avenue of history and there to realize that the United States always has been pocked by the illegal actions of men who lived—and died—by the gun. Arrayed against rustlers, gun-slingers, horse thieves, and others who preyed upon purse, property, and person were, among others, the county sheriff and the town marshal. Too few studies have been written of those who wore the star.

Mr. Metz, known for several contributions concerning lawlessness in the West, now presents an interpretative biography of Dallas Stoudenmire, for many years marshal of El Paso, Texas. Although Stoudenmire was appointed in 1881, he did not serve continuously, for he not only drank to excess but also quarreled with members of the city council. In addition, his relations with the Texas Rangers, to say the least, were strained. In 1882, he resigned, but not before telling the city council that "I can straddle every God-damn alderman in this council." (p. 107.) Not too long after Stoudenmire resigned, he was appointed a Deputy United States Marshal for the western district of Texas, with headquarters in El Paso.
Unfortunately, as Mr. Metz makes abundantly clear, Stoudenmire behaved no better as a federal officer than he did as a local one. He continued to drink, to quarrel, and finally, in a feud fight, to be shot to death. His career as a peace officer was no better or worse than were the lives of other marshals, for, unfortunately the handmaidens of the law frequently were individuals who never should have been appointed. The value of Mr. Metz’s carefully researched and well-written study, marked by both objectivity and compassion, is the fact that it not only delineates the activities of a lawman of Stoudenmire’s ilk but also makes available a sort of case study for those scholars and buffs of western history who persist in the romantic notion that peace officers always were true to their badge. Mr. Metz’s biography corrects such nonsense. It should be a welcome addition to the libraries of those who concern themselves with the history of the West and with the development of law’s due process.

Philip D. Jordan
Iowa Wesleyan College


Although this book is fascinating reading for the non-professional historian, nevertheless it is factual and based upon sound research.

John Edward Weems weaves into his narrative the careers of James Wilkinson, Philip Nolan and Ellis P. Bean, all products of America’s tumultuous 18th Century.

Wilkinson, born in 1757, was an officer in the American Revolution and was George Washington’s old Quartermaster. He died in Mexico City in 1825, impoverished and alone, still following the mirage of Spanish riches. Philip Nolan, “so well known for his athletic exertions and dexterity in capturing wild horses” was of uncertain antecedents—always a man of mystery. He came to his untimely end in March, 1801, while filibustering in what was then Spanish Texas. Ellis P. Bean died at the hacienda of his Mexican wife near Jalapa, Mexico, in 1846, the first year of the war of the United States with Mexico. Thus the lives of these three men span the period from English Colonization and the American Revolution to the final wrestling away from Mexico of the American Southwest and the extension of our western borders to the Pacific. In a less sophisticated time we called it “Manifest Destiny.”

Nolan, the central figure in the book, was a protege of General Wilkinson. Bean was Nolan’s teen-age follower on Nolan’s fatal expedition into Spanish Texas. The true motives of Nolan in mapping, trading and exploring Spanish Territory will probably never be known. His sponsor, Wilkinson, while Commanding General of the American Army was, incredibly, a secret agent and pensioner of Spain. That both Nolan and Wilkinson were at times double agents for the United States and Spain cannot be doubted. How Wilkinson won and retained the confidence of Thomas Jefferson in the face of persistent rumors of Wilkinson’s “villaine-
ous connection,” as Wilkinson himself once put it in his secret correspondence with the Spaniards, is still one of the enigmas of American history.

It is as difficult to get at the truth of Wilkinson’s connection with Nolan as it is to get at the truth of Wilkinson’s connection with Aaron Burr. The whole trouble is that there are just too many liars.

Research by American scholars into Spanish archives long after Wilkinson’s death proved him to be unquestionably a traitor to the United States; “a mammoth of iniquity, rotten from the bark to the very core,” as John Randolph, foreman of the jury, put it at the conclusion of the trial of Aaron Burr. Although there is no doubt that Nolan knew of the General’s connection with Spain, it is impossible to say whether he may not have believed the General to be playing only the role of the double agent with his true loyalty to the United States.

Of the three men, Bean’s life, though his personality seemed unsuited for the role, was the real tragedy. Caught up in the inexorable struggle between the United States and Mexico in the contest for the American Southwest, he was captured by the Spaniards in 1801 in what is now Hill County, Texas, at the time Nolan met his death. When given his freedom after nine years of imprisonment in Mexico, Bean rose to Colonel in the Mexican Forces warring for independence from Spain. Exiled from Mexico in 1816 during a lull in the Revolution he returned to Tennessee and tried again to take up the life of the frontier American into which he had been born. However, he could not forget Mexico, nor, perhaps his Mexican wife. With his wife Candace to whom he was married in Tennessee he returned to Mexican Texas. There he lived for twenty-five years, torn between his conflicting loyalties to the United States and Mexico, and between his Mexican wife and his American wife.

Weems, in this well written and well informed book, captures many facets of life in frontier America. For example, as said by William Seale, well known authority on Texas River Boats, the vibrant touch of Weems’ writing on keelboating surpasses even that of the classic account of L. D. Baldwin’s “The Keelboat Age on Western Waters.” This reviewer knows of no book that so fully captures the spirit of an age and of a time.

Bennett Lay
Houston, Texas


Barbarous Mexico endeavors to expose the tyranny and the cruelty of the regime of Porfirio Diaz, which was overthrown by Francisco I. Madero in the 1910 Mexican Revolution. Turner, a muckraking reporter, wrote a series of articles which appeared in the American Magazine in 1909 and are here gathered for republication. These articles exposed a vicious slavery system carried on by the Diaz government in order to provide laborers for the hemp plantations in the Yucatan Peninsula and the
tobacco growers of the Valle National. Turner's accusations aroused such a furor in the American press that after several months the *American Magazine* discontinued the articles. Turner then publicized the fact that some of the highest officials in the land had business interests in Mexico that they were trying to protect. Pressure was brought on most of the large newspapers in the United States to hush up the scandal.

Sinclair Snow introduces the exposé with a short biography of Turner and an epilogue which explains the effect that these articles had in causing the Mexican Revolution of 1910. Snow reveals that Turner first became aware of the Diaz atrocities through an interview of several Mexican liberals who were arrested in Los Angeles for planning an invasion of Mexico from the United States. The author gathered his evidence during two fact-finding tours to Mexico in 1908 and 1909. Turner posed as an American entrepreneur who wished to invest in Mexican land and agriculture. During the course of his investigation, he witnessed the inhumane treatment of the Mexican and Indian slaves and interviewed their masters. His tour convinced him that the Diaz government was responsible for the brutal murder of slaves, political prisoners, and laborers who dared to leave their jobs. In the case of the Yaqui Indians, thousands of men, women, and children were enslaved so that the government could confiscate their lands and possessions for distribution among favorites and for sale to foreign investors. Any resistance from the Indians gave the Diaz government an excuse to announce to the world a Yaqui "revolt."

In *Barbarous Mexico* Turner criticized the United States for supporting this cruel tyrant. Many acts unworthy of a democratic nation were committed by the United States and cited. Border officials even helped capture and return fleeing liberals who faced death and imprisonment in their own country. This book was written in a brutally frank manner, and the accusations made by the author seem incredible. He mentioned many names and percentage figures (death rates, numbers of slaves, and imprisonment, etc.) but there is not a single footnote to confirm them. It would be advisable, therefore, to use other reliable sources to verify Turner's exposé. Since there were so many references made to specific geographic locations, a map would have been very helpful in locating "the scenes of the crimes."

Carla K. Dial
Nacogdoches, Texas


The American Indian is a predominant and important figure in American history but he has been largely misunderstood by the white man. In *Custer Died for Your Sins*, Vine Deloria attempts to bring the modern Indian into clearer and more accurate focus and to dispel the classic stereotype. Deloria, who is a Standing Rock Sioux and a former Executive Director of the National Congress of American Indians, bitterly attacks not only the past policies of the United States Government but also the current activities of government agencies, churches, religious organiza-
tations and anthropologists. He stresses that Indians do not wish to be assimilated into the great American melting pot but wish to retain their cultures, tribal organizations and rich heritages.

Deloria builds an excellent case against the United States Government for its conduct of Indian affairs. In the past, Indian treaties were broken repeatedly, Indian lands and rights were violated and the Indian subjected to poverty, disease and extermination. Even today, the Indians are threatened by a policy of "termination" which, in the name of economy in government, endeavors to remove federal services such as health and economic protection from the tribes, abolish the reservations and absorb the Indians into the mainstream of American life, regardless of the desires or needs of the tribes.

This absorbing book points out that Indians today are no longer the scalp-hunting warriors of the frontier. For white bureaucrats, politicians and private citizens to continue to think of them as such is not only ridiculous, it is dangerous for the Indians as well as the white man. That Indians are remarkably complex individuals is best shown by the chapter on Indian humor which provides great insight into the Indian mind and does much to destroy the stereotype of the American Indian. Although Deloria does not specifically describe what the Indians are like, he does describe what they are not like and what they do not wish to become. For this reason, if no other, the book is a valuable and important contribution to the understanding of a group of Americans.

Janet Jelen
Nacogdoches, Texas


Sherrill's book deals with politics in the Deep South by using a biographical approach to numerous current Southern politicians such as Leander Perez, James Eastland, Lester Maddox, George Smathers and George Wallace, with occasionally digressions into such things as Bob Jones University and big money. The biographical sketches are not narrowly constructed, however, since each gives considerable background in the politics of the state or area in which each of these Southern politicians operates. The amount of time and space devoted to this background is, at times, extensive. For example: In the part of the work devoted to George Wallace much space is devoted to the questions of area distribution of issues, the history of black-white politics and to Big Jim Folsom. When writing of Smathers in Florida much space is devoted to the politics of fragmentation, to money and to Claude Pepper. In speaking of Thurmond and South Carolina, Olin Johnston and James Byrnes come in for their share of treatment. Coverage, therefore, is broader than a glance at the table of contents would indicate.

The primary theme—indeed at times the only theme—is the politics of racial demagoguery. Sherrill is fully aware that this is an old theme in Southern politics, but he points out that this type of politics has in recent years taken on a higher intensity. The communist scare of the late 1940's
and early 1950's brought about the beginning of this new intensity even before the decision in the Brown v. Topeka Board of Education case in 1954. The reaction of Southerners, and particularly of Southern politicians, to that decision made the politics of race very productive in gaining elective office and turned racial unrest into racial upheaval. The South, always defiant, became rebellious as it was spurred on by both the politicians and the wealthy; the latter wishing to obscure economic issues of exploitation and supporting the former in order to keep favorable business conditions and their traditional control of their respective states.

The author seems to believe that there are certain turning points in recent Southern political history. One of the first is the Smathers-Pepper senate race in 1950. This race, with its red-baiting and its racial overtones gave the demagogic politician new openings to practice his art. Money power came to the weight against the liberal Pepper. The economic powers including DuPont, in the person of a DuPont brother-in-law, Ed Ball, had decided to get Pepper for his liberal New Deal stand on economic issues and replace him with a reliable hack, George Smathers. That campaign, Sherrill says, would set the pattern of things to come.

Another turning point in the political drama of the South was when Orval Faubus, perhaps inspired by Texas' Governor Allan Shiver's actions at Mansfield, attempted to bar the door of Central High School at Little Rock in 1957. This action, Sherrill says, made Faubus a successful failure, and assured him of a long political career in Arkansas. This set a pattern for other Southern defiance of federal law and inspired later politicians. Sherrill contends that the open defiance of federal authority at the integration of the University of Mississippi where Ross Barnett gave his inept dramatic performance and at the University of Alabama, which as corny as it was, probably saved the lagging career of Governor George Wallace, stemmed from the Little Rock confrontation.

The rise of George Wallace, mentioned above, is another turning point. Wallace, by appealing to the race question, sometimes clothed in states-rights or constitutionalism, was able to rise to considerable political stature. For a time during the 1968 presidential campaign he became, in a negative sort of way, the dominant political figure in the nation. But the Wallace meteor burned itself out by November, and he became again, Sherrill believes, a primarily sectional leader. Sherrill devotes more time to Wallace than any other person in the book. To him Wallace is the supreme bigot—vengeful, vicious and more than a little unbalanced. He is the evil genius.

Curiously, there is a turning point cited other places, which is slighted by this author. That is the Dixiecrat rebellion of 1948. Just why this event is largely ignored is something of a mystery. Perhaps it is because the attempts to resurrect the party failed; or perhaps because J. Strom Thurmond lost the senate race to Olin Johnston in 1950. It could be argued that even though the party died the coalition remained very much alive, a point that Sherrill admits.

The strength of these racist-right wing politicians comes from the two ends of the white socio-economic spectrum. They are financed by the
wealthy, the powerful corporations, many of them not based in the South, and the lesser businessmen. The purpose of the support coming from the top is to assure the maintenance of privilege and economic and political dominance. The broad base of support comes from the lower and economic underprivileged classes who wish to keep the Negro below them on the socio-economic scale. Sherrill says these politicians and their powerful supporters mislead the South. But later he says that the politicians are the perfect representatives of that section. In their personalities are "caught up all of the moon phases of Dixie's personality—the love-hate response to the black man, the patriot-subversive response to the federal government, the rebel-slave response to authority, the pitying-sadistic response to the underdog, the populist-planter response to economic needs."

There is another aspect to these Southern, race oriented politicians. Because of the seniority system in Congress, and because of the structure of Southern politics, which returns members to Congress election after election, Southerners have a disproportionate share of the national power through congressional and senatorial committees and through their connections built up over their years in Washington. Even when the Southerners lose in Congress they often get something in return. For example: When Thurgood Marshall's appointment to the United States Supreme Court was before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, James Eastland, the chairman, managed to get a Southern district court judge to his liking in trade for Marshall. He told Robert Kennedy, "Tell your brother that if he will give me Harold Cox I will give him the nigger." Sherrill regards this power in the hands of such a minority as both undemocratic and dangerous.

Sherrill believes that this type of politics is underpinned by some basic tendencies or characteristics of the South. First is the hatred and fear of the Negro. Second is a pervasive fundamentalism in everything from politics to religion. Third is a political system which is essentially corrupt and full of dishonest men. Wealth and power have supported all of this in order to gain their own ends. Sherrill's solution to the situation is obvious. It consists of massive federal intervention, both legal and economic. There is, he says, no other way to protect the citizens of the South from the rampant racism and the ruthless politicians. The only current solution, in short, is a forced solution. The long range solution, he believes, will require time for Southern politics and society to readjust itself and for the traditional patterns of the black-white dichotomy to die out. On both counts Sherrill is probably right.

Mr. Sherrill's book is one that is difficult for a scholar to evaluate. There is nothing really new about what he says; nor are his solutions and opinions very startling. He is prone to use some of the techniques of propaganda which, to say the least, is detracting from a book that is otherwise sound in structure. He is inclined to such things as "it is said that . . .," or " . . . and it has not been denied." In short, the research is rather slip-shod. The shortage of supporting evidence or the failure to cite sources seems to be the result of laziness on the part of the author rather than the unavai-
ability of source materials. This is the weakest part of the work. It is well written and interesting. And I would recommend it to anyone interested in either the material or in an entertaining book on politics.

Carl L. Davis
Oklahoma State University


The author's avowed aim was to do a tribute to the American fighting man, from Colonial militiaman to Viet Nam draftees. He opens his work by correcting some prevailing misconceptions that war is not a way of life in America, is not ordinarily a part of human activity; he documents his proof that Sweden, Switzerland, Belgium, all presently regarded as "neutral" have their military histories, and only in this century have any of them avoided war, and Belgium has been involved in two World Wars within the last half-century. In the United States, a "peace-loving" nation, only two of our presidents have completed their terms without having ordered military forces into action; forty-eight of the fifty years immediately following the Spanish-American War, which denoted America's emergence as a major power, saw United States Marines in action. From Lord Cornwallis in 1776 to Hitler in 1942, with few exceptions, Europeans have downgraded American fighting men, reasoning that a mongrelized body of immigrants could never be brought into frictionless unity nor develop a true love of fatherland within a few generations. Americans are prone to think of Mexico in 1846 and Spain in 1898 as "pushovers" or minor adversaries. This is a natural outsome of our troops having won each and every separate engagement of the two wars; but in each case European military experts were well nigh unanimous in predicting dire disaster for the American Nation; each opponent had a much larger regular military establishment, and European training was considered—by the experts—far superior to the informal methods of the Americans.

Despite dire predictions of friend and foe alike, the American has been able to stand toe to toe with the world's best professionals and to slug his way to victory, proving himself equal to the best in morale, patriotism, discipline, endurance, cunning and general fighting ability. His motivation has not been always easily discerned or explained, and has varied from the frontiersman in his own homestead, the only defense between Indian and loved one, to the Tennessee lad who in 1836 severed all family and community ties in a hurry because he had to rush to Texas to fight for his rights before the war was over. Perhaps the underlying source of morale is the deep conviction among most all Americans that our experiment in government is "something special" that we're free, and it's up to the fighting man to keep it that way.
The author has succeeded admirably in his declared purpose of doing a tribute to the American fighting man; he has produced a splendid tribute without hiding the man's faults or foibles; he has told it like it was—and is—and he has told it in a most interesting manner; it is good reading all the way.

Lt. Col. (Ret.) W. W. Spurlock
Nacogdoches, Texas