

a contemporary white until sent to Baltimore while still a young man; he taught himself literacy skills with some assistance at first, but then when it was pointed out that this might make him rebellious, the assistance stopped; he learned the caulker's trade in the shipyards, but experienced discrimination from fellow workers; and he ran away to the North with the assistance of a free black named Anna, whom he later married, and then became the show-case lecturer for the Garrisonian abolitionists.

Douglass was a remarkable man, and is presented in these pages as such. He became a touring lecturer who condemned slavery with his words and with his presence. He traveled in Europe for the cause, and for his personal safety and security from recapture. He was accepted as an equal there much more than in the North, where he often experienced segregation in public accommodations. During the American Civil War he became an advocate of President Abraham Lincoln's declaring the end of slavery as a goal, and of the use of black troops to fight for their freedom and for the freedom of other blacks. Douglass always believed in the self-made concept and thought that slaves deserved the right to earn their own freedom on the battlefield instead of having it won for them by white soldiers in blue uniforms.

Douglass's passion for the equality of women of all races receives considerable space in these pages. His relations with individual women is less precise. Miller states that he was never unfaithful to Anna, who remained illiterate, but suggests that apart from rearing their children they had little in common. He apparently did have opportunities to be unfaithful at least, but Miller does not want us to believe they were actualized. After Anna's death he married Helen Pitts, his white secretary.

Because of his race and accomplishments, Douglass had access to Lincoln's office, and Miller believes that Douglass did influence policy in the Lincoln administration. Many Lincoln scholars would minimize this. He was insulted by President Andrew Johnson and ignored by President Ulysses Grant, but did receive appointments from Presidents R. B. Hayes and Benjamin Harrison, including an unhappy stint as a minister to Haiti.

Miller includes a lengthy and critical bibliographic essay on sources that lists and evaluates more complete biographies and monographs. Scholars will want to consult them for materials that could not be included in this brief account. But this is a good introduction to the subject for its target market.

Stephen F. Austin State University

Archie P. McDonald

Keith L. Bryant, Jr. and Henry C. Dethloff. *A History of American Business*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1990. Second edition. Pp. xiii, 384. Paper, \$28.67.

I reviewed the earlier first edition of C. Joseph Pusateri's *A History of American Business* in this journal in 1985 (Spring, x, 1). At that time I chose to review, in addition, all the other basic texts that had appeared in response to a growing interest in American business history. One of those was the first edition of Bryant and Dethloff's *A History of American Business*, published in 1983, and which I had used in my own upper-level undergraduate/graduate course in American business history.

At that time I wrote that "this text (the first edition) is much better for undergraduate use, but breaks from the chronological tradition to follow a topical outline." On the whole, I felt, and still do, that students experienced some difficulties following the text if, as I do, the instructor utilizes a shorter chronological approach interspersed with cases. I believed then, and I do now, that unless the instructor takes care, the student will not see the constant interplay of business and society over time. That fact is supported by the catchy title . . . rather it would have been "business in American history" or "American business history."

Now, as to the current second edition, I guess I have the feeling that a second edition published some seven years after the first should show the effects of recent scholarship, changes in the environment, and the general forces that have been affecting American business in that period. I really can find little more than a glancing attempt to appreciably change this text.

The preface contains some new language and a suggestion that something has seriously affected the American business community in a negative manner, i.e. increasing debt and a troubled financial sector. However, the section on "Banking in the Modern Era" in the chapter on "Banking and

Finance" leaves much to be desired. Even the chapter's suggested readings are lacking in current citations; the "Notes" show no references after 1982.

If this is truly a second edition, then I would have expected that the authors would have made every attempt to extend the chapters that deal most specifically with current problems with a paragraph or two—not so. The only evidence that I can find that that was really done was in the chapter on "Multinational Corporations" where the one-half page cut of the Volkswagen plant at Westmoreland, Pennsylvania, has been replaced with a full-page rendering of the new Toyota plant in Georgetown, Kentucky. But even the added comments fall short of what one might expect given the explosive history of the Japanese economy since 1983.

On the whole, I find that this second edition is not what is implied by the phrase as I might define same. It is essentially the original volume with slight cosmetic changes that suggest something different, but isn't. On the other hand, I would still recommend the use of this text in the classroom. It is well-written, but covers the waterfront too loosely. I would have appreciated a true second edition of a text in a field that is becoming more and more popular. The publication of this edition suggests less control by the authors and more concern by the publisher in marketing something a second time around for increased profit rather than increased understanding and greater scholarship.

Northeastern University

Paul H. Tedesco

Altina L. Waller. *Feud: Hatfields, McCoys, and Social Change in Appalachia, 1860-1900*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1988. Pp. xiii, 313. Cloth, \$32.50; paper, \$12.50.

As Altina Waller notes in her introduction, for most Americans the Hatfield-McCoy feud conjures up "images of bearded mountaineers brandishing rifles and jugs of moonshine as they defend illegal stills from federal 'revenuers,' enforce 'shotgun' weddings, and lawlessly perpetuate inherited family grudges." Historians have generally reinforced this view, explaining this late nineteenth-century dispute as the natural product of premodern Appalachian culture, where irrational family loyalties, rampant lawlessness, and routine violence were the norm.

But in *Feud* Altina Waller brilliantly rescues the feudists and their world from popular stereotypes and historical misinterpretation. Instead of caricatures, Waller provides detailed and sympathetic treatments of protagonists such as "Old Ranel" McCoy, "Bad Frank" Phillips, and "Devil Anse" Hatfield. More than this, Waller *explains* the dispute. She convincingly argues that there were two distinct phases to the feud. Feud I (1878-82) was strictly a local affair. Here Waller demolishes much of the standard interpretation, making clear that: kinship was not the controlling variable, as economic ties and other factors resulted in McCoys on the Hatfield side, and vice-versa; the disputants (in keeping with their Appalachian neighbors) went to great lengths to secure legal remedies for their problems; and the violence that did occur (five killings in five years) was an aberration in Appalachian culture.

More important is Waller's discussion of Feud II (1887-1890). As the author demonstrates, this second phase was not primarily a local affair. In the 1880s the forces of industrial capitalism turned their attention to the rich resources of Appalachia. Seeking to hasten capitalist advance, local commercial elites and the governor of Kentucky committed themselves to making "eastern Kentucky 'safe' for development." As part of this program, and spurred on by a few grudge-nursing McCoy partisans (including one with connections to the governor's office), in 1887 the state of Kentucky offered rewards for capture of the Hatfields. The result was a revival of the dispute, but at a much more violent level, with house-burnings, bounty hunters, extralegal posses, and pitched battles. This intensified violence was initiated not by "primitive" and "uncivilized" mountaineers, but by invading modernizers. The latter were the winners of this famous feud, not the Hatfields nor even the McCoys (despite Kentucky's execution of one Hatfield supporter, and imprisonment of others). As Waller observes, the modernizers used the violence they created as an argument for further interventions and "drastic alterations in Appalachian culture." And the interventions and alterations came. In effect, the Hatfield-McCoy feud was just another episode in the "capitalist transformation" of the region, a transformation, Waller sadly concludes, that "inexorably has been accompanied by economic, social, and cultural exploitation" of the Appalachian people.