

The outbreak of war changed everything, and, from that moment onward, the chasm separating Lincoln and the abolitionists progressively narrowed. Abolitionists who had earlier favored disunion now enthusiastically supported the war, believing that northern victory would inevitably topple the South's peculiar institution. Although Lincoln consistently frustrated them by how slowly he arrived at the same conclusion, Lincoln nevertheless ultimately embraced the twin strategies of emancipation and the military recruitment of freedmen that the abolitionists had been urging from the start. After Lincoln's assassination, William Lloyd Garrison's assessment was fairly typical of abolitionist opinion. Like most white Americans, Garrison observed, Lincoln had long been plagued by moral blindness with regard to slavery, but he had been resolute in adhering to the right as he understood it, and, whenever he changed his position during the war, it was always a step toward the enlargement of human freedom.

*Lincoln and the Abolitionists* is deeply researched, and Stanley Harrold has constructed a succinct, informative starting point for anyone interested in his topic. Unfortunately, the author's treatment is wholly descriptive and avoids the "so what?" question. Readers will have to ponder for themselves what Harrold's study says about how we are to remember Lincoln or the larger meaning of the Civil War. Given our own polarized political climate—not wholly dissimilar from that of the 1850s—readers may also wish that Harrold had explored more pointedly the relative merits in the public square of the moral dogmatism and political pragmatism that his subjects so vividly embodied.

ROBERT TRACY MCKENZIE is Professor of History and holds the Arthur Holmes Chair of Faith and Learning at Wheaton College. He is the author, among other works, of *Lincolnites and Rebels: A Divided Town in the American Civil War* (2006).

***Two Charlestonians at War: The Civil War Odysseys of a Lowcountry Aristocrat and a Black Abolitionist.*** By Barbara A. Bellows. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2018. Pp. xi, 330, illustrations, notes, index. Cloth, \$38.00.)

In this dual biography, historian Barbara Bellows tells the story of slavery, the Civil War, and Reconstruction through the experiences of two native Charlestonians: white enslaver Thomas Pinkney and free person of color Joseph Barquet. Pinkney and Barquet, who met briefly during the war, represent for Bellows "a symbolic allegory of the long-fraught, yet interdependent, relationship between the races on Charleston's narrow peninsula" (p. 5). In this respect, Bellows offers *The Two Charlestonians at War* as a sort of vehicle for racial reconciliation—a reckoning with our country's past and a plea that "their moment of comity could

not somehow have been translated into future race relations" (p. 272). Although primarily focused on telling Pinkney's and Barquet's divergent stories, Bellows gives this focus on a tragic missed opportunity in race relations as the organizing rationale for the work.

Bellows finds a reluctant secessionist in Pinkney, an enslaver descended from an elite South Carolina family of statesmen who was more interested in running his family's rice plantations than in political or martial glory. In this respect, Pinkney is an atypical subject for a wartime biography, and his aversion to battlefield heroics, as well as his desire to remain close to home, helps give a more realistic depiction of typical attitudes towards the war than many works in the genre. Indeed, Bellows paints a comical picture of Pinkney's troops joining forces with General Wade Hampton's hardened veterans in Virginia. Pinkney was, in short, an unlikely hero and represents a welcome addition to the literature. His war is also of interest because he was captured and imprisoned for such a substantial and consequential portion of the conflict. It is during his confinement as a prisoner of war on Coffin Island, just outside Charleston, that Pinkney meets Barquet, the book's other protagonist.

Bellows' research on Barquet is laudable. She uses scant resources, such as census and probate records, urban geography, newspapers, and even contemporaries' observations to piece together an impressive biography of Barquet, who grew up in a stable, middle class home in Charleston in the 1830s. Barquet left for the Mexican-American War and, rather than returning home to oppressive restrictions on free people of color, moved first to New York and then around the country stumping and organizing for abolition and equality. Barquet eventually joined the famed Fifty-Fourth Massachusetts and, although he escaped the battle at Fort Wagner unscathed, Bellows suggests that the experience left him broken. Barquet's struggles with racism and alcoholism in Reconstruction Illinois comprise Bellows' most compelling portion of the postwar period and represents a clear area where the field could further expand.

Although exhaustively researched and artfully written, Bellows' work is not without its problems, especially for scholarly readers. Her analysis of the war repeats many Lost Cause tropes that cast Confederates in the most positive light and their U.S. army counterparts as selfish opportunists. A good example of this consistent trend may be found in her treatment of the spoils of war. Bellows decries the "plundering Yankees" guilty of "stealing" enslaver wealth (p. 211), while she repeatedly qualifies Confederate grave-robbers as "desperate," driven to the act by the U.S. blockade. Perhaps the most disturbing example of this binary depiction of pilfering is Bellows' imagined account of rebels stripping the corpse of Colonel Robert Shaw, the famed commander of the Fifty-Fourth Massachusetts. What begins with "Confederates scavenging" (p. 170) for valuables

through piles of Union dead in the dark, still hours after the fateful assault on Fort Wagner culminates in the person of Shaw. “In a frenzy of grabbing, pulling, and tearing,” she imagines, “the desperate men would have snatched [Shaw’s] jeweled ring from his finger, yanked his gold watch from its chain, and tugged his supple boots from his legs. Next, off went the fine breeches; their pockets ransacked for cash” (p. 170). Bellows fails to extend this sympathetic interpretation of plunder beyond Confederates. When the men and women Pinkney had enslaved seized clothes, furniture, and jewelry from his estate, for example, these were for Bellows “antics” that “reduced in ungainly ways” a plantation that had previously been “a symbol of order and harmony in the New World” (p. 212). In short, even Confederate graverobbing comes across as more reasonable than enslaved people seizing the product of their labor.

Bellows’ analysis of Reconstruction likewise treats white southerners as sympathetic victims. In a turn of phrase reminiscent of Dunningite scholarship, Bellows chastises “turncoat scalawags from the South” (p. 224) for siding with northerners and formerly-enslaved southerners to temporarily dethrone South Carolina’s antebellum elites. For Bellows, the “boot of the federal government was standing on the neck of South Carolina, insisting that black men and women must be able to control their own destinies” (p. 236). While it was indeed hypocritical, as she notes, for Congress to demand equality for black southerners while maintaining overt white supremacy in the North, one wonders what Bellows’ point is here. She circles back in the epilogue, asking “what if economic reforms rather than political revolution had been the first postwar priority or civil rights for all black Americans instead of just the newly freed had been their goal?” (p. 272). But of course, northerners did indeed leave southerners to work out their own “economic reforms”—the notorious Black Codes of 1865–66. And, while she laments that Reconstruction reforms set the races in conflict, this was because white southerners—and indeed white Americans more broadly—refused to accept African Americans as their equals.

WILLIAM HORNE is an Arthur J. Ennis Postdoctoral Fellow at Villanova University who writes about the relationship of race to labor, freedom, and capitalism in post-Civil War Louisiana. He holds a Ph.D. in history from The George Washington University and is co-founder and Editor of *The Activist History Review*.

***Interrupted Odyssey: Ulysses S. Grant and the American Indians.*** By Mary Stockwell. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2018. Pp. ix, 256, illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. Cloth, \$34.50.)

Since retiring in 2013 as a professor of history at Lourdes University in Ohio, an overarching theme in Mary Stockwell’s writing has been the shifting contours

Reproduced with permission of copyright owner.  
Further reproduction prohibited without permission.