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THE FREE NEGRO IN FLORIDA BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR

by RUSSELL GARVIN

FREEDOM FOR NEGROES in a society where race was the only qualification for slavery was at best an anomaly and at worst an illusion. In either case though, freedom survived alongside slavery. Florida first acquired free Negroes early in the seventeenth century. In 1704 the Spanish governor, Zuniga, opened the territory to fugitive slaves from British plantations to the North. Thus established, potential liberty across the border tempted Carolina blacks and tormented their white owners. It was hoped that the colonization of Georgia would serve as a buffer region to prevent the escape of slaves to Florida. Carolina benefited, but Georgia, once slaves had been imported, found the runaway problem its biggest nuisance, and it remained for Georgia a continuous problem. Spanish correspondence of the period reveals a regular flow of Negroes into Florida. Once in the region the blacks lived as free subjects of the Bourbon king. They were soon numerous enough to be formed into companies to aid in the defense of the territory. A refuge for the Negroes, Gracia Real de Santa Teresa de Mose, was established three miles north of St. Augustine by the accommodating Spanish authorities in 1739.

2. Eugene P. Southall, “Negroes in Florida Prior to the Civil War,” Journal of Negro History, XIX (January 1934), 79.
4. Joshua R. Giddings, The Exiles of Florida (Columbus, 1858), 2. See also facsimile edition with introduction by Arthur W. Thompson (Gainesville, 1964). Throughout his life Joshua Giddings was ardent in his defense of Negro rights. His stand on slavery, which he develops extensively in The Exiles of Florida, has been the subject of much controversy and disagreement. His fundamental thesis, however, has stood the test of time, as well as the scrutiny of recent historians. See Kenneth W. Porter, “The Episode of Osceola’s Wife: Fact of Fiction?” Florida Historical Quarterly, XXVI (July 1947), 93; Edwin L. Williams, Jr., “Negro Slavery in Florida,” Florida Historical Quarterly, XXVIII (October 1949), 104; and Edwin L. Williams, Jr., “Florida in the Union, 1845-1861” (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1951), 116.
Provisions were made for military and religious instruction, and food was to be supplied by the government until a crop could be harvested. But there was no harvest. In the summer of 1740, James Oglethorpe led a group of British colonists into Florida. They attacked St. Augustine and drove the Negroes from their fort, which was destroyed. In the city the blacks found safety, and there they remained until 1763, when they were transferred to Cuba.

At the same time, in the western parts of Florida, Negroes were immigrating along with those factious Creek Indians called Seminoles. Spanish law extended its protection over them and gave them the right of land ownership. The Negroes associated with the Indians can be separated roughly into two groups: those who were legally slaves, and those who were free and who served as allies.

The Indians had obtained slaves as gifts from the British government or had purchased them in imitation of slave-owning whites. What to do with them once the novelty wore off posed an insuperable problem for the Seminoles. The Negroes were allowed to build their own farms, paying a moderate rent in kind to their Indian masters. A type of democratic vassalage was created completely devoid of feelings of racial superiority. Intermarriage was common. Some who possessed a knowledge of English and Spanish became useful interpreters. The most astute gained the confidence of the Indians and served as valued councilors of much influence. When necessary the males willingly fought alongside the braves for the protection of their homes and independence.

Many a slave longed to exchange his position for this kind of servitude. When Georgia settlements were attacked by the Creeks, Negro escapes were given further encouragement. The seventeenth century slave owners could do little more than fume and

complain to the government. After the Revolution, a few abortive expeditions were launched to capture runaways, but these were singularly unsuccessful. The power of the Creeks effectively stood in the way of attempts to return Negroes to their owners, and the blacks worked harmoniously near the Indians. They settled on good land along the Apalachicola and Suwannee rivers and many owned large flocks and herds. 11

Tranquility could not last forever, however, and beginning in 1811 American raids into Florida increased. Indian and Negro property was destroyed, including two or three Indian towns, but neither the Seminoles nor Florida was conquered. 12

Active participation in the American-British war came in 1814 when two English ships landed Lieutenant Colonel Edward Nicholls, his regular troops, Negro and Indian allies, and about 100 Negro slaves in Apalachicola Bay. At a point on the east bank of the Apalachicola, some fifteen miles upstream, the English constructed a military stronghold. Eight cannons were placed in it. From the fort, the British could control river commerce and operate against the Georgia-Alabama frontier. They also used it as headquarters to confer with the Red Stick Indians, the Seminoles, and refugee Negroes. The troops stayed through the winter, but with spring they withdrew at the request of a disapproving British ministry. The fort was left stocked with arms, ammunition, and artillery. 13 The residents of Georgia and Alabama looked upon the fort with little equanimity. It housed 300 Negroes, including women and children, and it became known as Negro Fort. Perhaps another thousand Negroes settled “under the guns of the fort” in the surrounding area. Opposition increased until finally in July 1816, after the Spanish governor at Pensacola indicated that he could do little to stop the fort’s activities, General Andrew Jackson ordered the destruction of the fort. On July 20 an attack was launched under the command of Colonel Duncan L. Clinch. Seven days later, on the morning of July 27, a battery of American vessels attacked the fort, and a hot shell found its target, exploding the fort’s central magazine.

12. Ibid., 29-31.
resulting explosion reportedly was heard all the way to Pensacola. One observer estimated that 270 men, women, and children were killed, and nearly all the rest were mortally wounded. Only three persons escaped injury. The Americans and friendly Indians confiscated all of the fort’s remaining contents, the Indians receiving the greater part of the booty. Many refugee Negroes had already sought protection in the Seminole Indian villages when they learned of Clinch’s movement down the river. The others were captured and returned to the Spaniards and Americans who claimed them. On August 2 the campaign against the Negro Fort officially ended.

Runaways, however, continued to filter into Florida, and in time Indians and Negroes reoccupied many of the farms, and their settlements again served as resting places for slaves fleeing South. There were Negro villages scattered across Florida almost to St. Augustine. Contemporary accounts give estimates of well over 1,000 free Negroes in Florida in the two decades following the destruction of Negro Fort. They lived in log and palmetto huts surrounded by fields up to twenty acres in size. The greatest numbers were found on the islands of the Great Wahoo Swamp, along the Withlacoochee River, in the Big Cypress Swamp, in the St. Johns River, and on the Suwannee where their Old Town was located.

Since Indian raids and slave escapes persisted along the Georgia-Alabama frontier, General Jackson in March 1818 led Regulars and Georgia militia into Florida. He moved against the Indians and Negroes living along the east side of the Appachicola River, and several small villages in the area, inhabited almost entirely by blacks, were destroyed. For the next several days Jackson pursued the Indians. Finally, a skirmish was fought at Old Town on the Suwannee. Very few Indians were captured and no Negroes. Jackson could not follow the remainder into more southerly parts of the territory and withdrew. In May 1818, he declared the war at an end.

for the most part settled around Tampa Bay or moved south to Cape Florida where many were carried by Bahama wreckers to remote islands. 17 With the end of fighting the Indians and Negroes tried hard to return to pre-1816 conditions, but raids and immigration by whites prevented this.

That part of the First Seminole War which had aimed at quelling the Indians and capturing Negroes had been a failure for the United States. Apart from those wounded at Negro Fort in 1816, few slaves had been captured. Many Negroes thus remained at liberty, increasing in numbers as they were joined by escapees from Georgia and Alabama. Their presence was tempting to whites, who ventured into Indian lands intent on capturing slaves and fugitives. The incursions were especially bad along the Apalachicola River, and probably few had escaped the Georgia raiders by the late 1830s. 18

Penetration of the wilderness by farmers also served to thwart a reversion of the Indians and Negroes to former modes of living. White husbandry pushed the Indians deeper and deeper into the peninsula. In 1832, some of the tribal chiefs signed a treaty providing for emigration to western lands where the Creeks were already settled. Orders to move came three years later, but dissenting Indians and Negroes began warfare anew. 19 They hoped first of all to persuade the government to grant them lands not coveted by white settlers, but if forced to move West, they wanted a treaty which would allow the Negroes to move with them. The Negroes for their part were farmers, and they were not averse to settling the land west of the Mississippi if guarantees for their freedom could be secured. The only way each group could secure its goals was to wear down the government until it made a reasonable offer. 20

Negroes played an important role in the resistance, and many participated in the actual fighting. According to some interpreters, they excelled the Indians as warriors. They exercised superior caution and attended to many important details. 21

---

were they in the Second Seminole War, that General Jesup, commanding general in Florida, in 1836 wrote the war department that the “negroes rule the Indians.” 22 In another letter he elaborated: “This, you may be assured, is a negro, not an Indian war; and if it be not speedily put down, the South will feel the effects of it on their slave population before the end of the next season.” 23

The part played by Negro leaders in the Second Seminole War was hardly mentioned at all except by contemporary Indians. Part of the reason for this was the reluctance of a Seminole Negro, who was legally a slave, to give information to a white questioner. But more of the reason was found in the southern mind; the Negroes were considered as a body which threatened the existence of slavery in Florida and adjacent states. To picture the Negroes as individuals with human emotions could evoke sympathy in many quarters, so whenever mention was made of a Negro, particularly one who was a leader, it was usually kept brief and unfavorable. 24

There were some free Negroes not associated with the Indians who also participated in the Seminole War. Even though they had less to gain and more to lose than either slaves or Indian Negroes, they fought in the field and worked behind the line. Some operated as spies and secret agents to obtain recruits, supplies, and information. The general atmosphere of discontent and brooding hostility produced by all these operations kept a large part of the militia at home to guard against any sudden outbreak, thus relieving pressure on the Indians and Negroes in the field and contributing to the prevention of their utter defeat. 25

The Seminole War was nearing its end, and by 1841 it was believed that nearly all the Negroes that had cooperated with the Indians had been moved to the West. One observer estimates that 500 persons had been “seized and enslaved” during the war. 26 Many Negroes had intermarried with the Indians and half-breeds,

and others had been enslaved by the Indians. Whatever the relationship, these Negroes left with the Indians. 27 But by no means did all free Negroes live with the Indians. It is believed that there were a number of others living in Florida, but information about them is scarce.

Comparatively few free Negroes lived among the white citizens of ante-bellum Florida, and those living with the Indians were ignored by census takers. 28 While Florida’s population quadrupled in the four federal censuses taken before the Civil War, the number of free Negroes remained nearly static: 844 Negroes, making up 2.4 percent of the population in 1830; 817, or 1.5 percent in 1840; 932, 1.1 percent in 1850; and 932, or 0.6 percent in 1860. 29 Compared with other states on the number of non-slave blacks, Florida ranked near the bottom throughout the ante-bellum period.

The average Florida free Negro, as shown by the following statistics from the population census of 1860 was decidedly older than either slaves or whites:

### Average Age in Florida

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Free Negro</th>
<th>Slave</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Florida did not differ in this respect from the rest of the United States except that Florida whites were younger than most in the nation. This was due probably to the influx of young settlers. According to census reports literacy was not too low. In 1850, thirty percent of free Negro males and forty percent of the females over twenty years old could read and write, as compared with

28. The Seminole Indian Agent in 1830 attached a report to the census schedules stating that the council of that tribe refused to permit the enumeration of the Negroes residing on Seminole lands. U. S. Census Schedules, 1830, Florida, Sheet 53, p. 105.
seventy-five percent white women and eighty-six percent white men. In the same year sixty-six free Negroes were attending schools in Escambia, Monroe, and St. Johns counties.  

Ten years later only nine free Negroes were in school.

It should be explained that the term free Negro includes mulattoes, who were defined by law as “every person other than a negro, who shall have one fourth part or more of negro blood . . . ”. Beginning with the census of 1850 officials noted this distinction. In that year there were 703 of mixed blood to 229 blacks. When contrasted to the 8:100 ratio of mulatto to Negro among Florida slaves, the disproportion is staggering. Certainly legal freedom for a few blacks seemed to indicate sexual license for some whites. Indeed, it was not uncommon for a black mother to have mulatto children living with her; the census schedules abound with examples.

Only a few areas of the state had free Negroes in any concentration. Two-thirds of them lived in Duval, Escambia, Monroe, and St. Johns counties; most of the others were located in northwest Florida, particularly along the Apalachicola River and in Leon County. Hillsborough County had few free Negroes because of the recency of its settlement and its distance from borders and other Negroes.

While the total number of free Negroes in the state remained fairly constant in the years prior to 1860, this should not be interpreted as meaning life was stable for them. Indeed, it must have been anything but tranquil. While women outnumbered men, the margin fluctuated greatly; in 1830 and 1850 there were almost a hundred more women, yet in each of the subsequent enumerations the difference almost disappeared. The changeableness of
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their lives makes it difficult to follow a name through the censuses. For example, no name appears more than twice in any of the four relevant censuses of St. Johns County—one of the most peaceful regions for free Negroes. Only fifteen out of 200 names are the same in both 1850 and 1860 when the list included all members of a family and not just heads of families.

Why this constant change? Deaths certainly claimed many, but births served to replace the dead. More of an answer lies in the unpopularity the free Negro as a group faced from white sources. When whites chose to make it so, life became difficult in many ways. Movement away from Florida and away from the United States was encouraged and enslavement was always a real possibility. Many free Negroes had already known compulsory servitude in their lives, and they knew how easy it would be to return to this status.

Some of the free Negroes were runaways or descendants of runaways who had chosen to live among the whites or had fate choose it for them. The seventy-five to a hundred free blacks who lived along the banks of the Apalachicola River were probably among this group. However, since most lived in the old Spanish port cities, it is reasonable to assume that they owed much to the liberal Spanish laws which required a master to free any slave offering him $300, and which made children of unmarried black mothers free. Legal immigration and manumission also may be assumed to have played their part in creating the free Negro population.

Immigration of Negroes was exceedingly unpopular with settlers in Florida. An early legislative act made it unlawful for any free Negro to come on his own or to be brought into the Florida Territory. A guilty offender had to put up a $500 recognizance that he would leave within ten days, and if the bond could not be paid the Negro was to be sold out for one year’s service to the highest bidder. According to an 1828 enactment sailors on foreign or American vessels in territorial waters around Florida were specifically excluded.

39. Ibid., 7th Session, November 21, 1828, 186-87.
So important was this issue that the Constitutional Convention of 1838 could not overlook it. The drafting committee for the document which became effective with statehood in 1845 wanted to make it the "duty" of the legislature to prevent free Negro immigration. The full delegation found it too extreme to charge the General Assembly with this specific task, but it still gave the legislature "power" to pass such laws. or the remainder of the pre-Civil War period immigration was illegal. The law of 1827 was reenacted on February 10, 1832, and that date, a decade later, was made the legal cut-off time, for the movement of free Negroes and mulattoes into Florida. All free Negroes brought into the territory after that time were to be sent out by the sheriff, and any culprit who refused to leave could then be sold into slavery for a period of ninety-nine years. That this penalty was too harsh was immediately perceived, and in 1846, at the next session of the legislature, it was repealed. The old act of 1832 remained on the books, however. Yet even in this attenuated degree, enforcement was light enough for the legislature in 1855 to pass the following act: "Whereas, Doubts have been expressed as to whether the act approved February 10, 1852 [sic, 1832], entitled an act to prevent the future migration of free negroes or mulattoes into this State, and for other purposes is in force; Therefore, Section 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Florida in General Assembly convened, That the said act . . . be and the same is hereby declared to be in full force, operation and effect, and applies to the migration and importation of the persons therein mentioned since the date of the approval of said act." These anti-immigration laws did serve to keep new free Negroes for the most part out of Florida, but they were not completely effective. Their success can be shown if the age of the Negroes born outside of the state was decidedly greater than those born in Florida; those born in other places would have entered the
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state in the years before enactment of the law, while Florida residents would include all born since. Thus the latter’s age would be lower. Statistics computed from census reports show that this was the case. In 1850, the average Negro born in Florida was 17.2 years old as compared to 42.0 years for non-state births. In 1860, the figures were 18.4 and 41.6 respectively. The laws against entry were not totally successful. If they had been, the average age of out-of-state Negroes would be increasing, but this was not the case. Positive proof of lax enforcement is contained also in the census schedules. In 1850, there were thirty-six free Negroes under twenty-one that had been born outside Florida, and the number increased to thirty-eight ten years later.

In addition to prohibiting movement in, the legislature tried to limit manumission, but like the former law, this was also only partially successful. The first regulations on the matter allowed emancipation of any sane and healthy adult slave so long as he was younger than forty-five, which was an unlikely event. 46 Evidently this was not improbable enough; later legislation required a $200 forfeiture for each slave freed. 47 But even with these restrictions, manumission did occur, and in 1850, twenty-two are recorded, and in 1860, seventeen. 48 While these are small numbers, they do represent two percent of the total free Negroes living in Florida at the time.

Little can be definitely said about the relation of the Negroes and whites. Only a couple of specific examples come down to us. Free Negroes living in Pensacola seemed to have had the greatest amount of security. Called “creoles” because of their large portion of Spanish blood, they formed an active property-owning class, served on city juries with whites, and held a respected place in the community. 49 When many of them left the United States in 1857 because of the growing restrictions on their life, the Pensacola Gazette expressed a common sentiment: “It was a painful sight to see them parting from their friends and their native country to seek homes in a foreign land. They take with them the sympathy of all our citizens on account of the causes which have
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led them to leave us, and also their best wishes for their future happiness and prosperity in their new home.” 50 Pensacola was an exception to the general rule, however. Whites and free Negroes did not get along so cordially elsewhere in Florida. Even Key West, another old Spanish port city, complained about the lax enforcement of the anti-immigration laws in a Grand Jury “List of Grievances,” announced December 5, 1834. 51

A unique insight into the life of another class of Negroes is given by the following annotation on the last page of the 1860 census schedules for Calhoun County: “The Free Negroes in this County are mixed blooded almost white and have intermarried with a low class of whites-Have no trade, occupation or profession. They live in a Settlement or Town of their own, their personal property consists of cattle and hogs. They make no produce except Corn Peas and Potatoes and very little of that. They are a lazy, indolent, smooth afs [sic] race.” 52

More balance can be presented by adding up the estimates of wealth the census takers made. Negroes throughout Florida owned property - $36,480 worth in 1850 ($25,900 in Escambia County), and $56,500 worth in 1860 ($19,750 in Escambia, $12,250 in Monroe). Martha Baxter, a Duval County Negro farm owner, had $5,000 real estate and a personal estate estimated at $52,000. When this is added to that of other free Negroes in the state in 1860, the total personal estate figures were $97,985 ($10,865 in Monroe, $7,800 in Escambia).

Occupations of the free Negroes tended to be unskilled and semi-skilled jobs like farmers, servants, seamstresses, and laundresses. But there were also carpenters, dressmakers, barbers, musicians, overseers, shoemakers, tavern keepers, bakers, cabinet makers, brickmasons, fishermen, mariners, merchants, raftmen, midwives, teamsters, mechanics, cooks, and clerks.

Florida law continued to be harsh on the free Negro. The white legislators wasted no time in modifying the liberal Spanish law which governed the early days of the new American terri-
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Free Negro Before Civil War

the action of the Legislative Council placed the new state on a road of strict regulation.

The specter of slave revolt obsessed Florida no less than it did the rest of the South. Free Negroes were regarded as a source of discontent for Negro slaves and as a means whereby abolitionist propaganda could be spread. To some extent the free blacks were even held responsible for the number of runaways among slaves. On this subject, a Tallahassee paper in 1851 quoted the Alabama Journal: “The opinion in Alabama is quite equivalent, that the free negro population is the most dangerous incendiary element to our existing institution of society. Their example is prejudicial on the slaves, and the opinion is very general that the steps adopted by Virginia, to remove them, would be the best policy which could be pursued here.”

Fear of rebellion prompted a law which made illegal “riots, routs, and unlawful assemblies, quarrels, fighting, trespasses and seditious speeches by free Negroes and Mulattoes, or slave or slaves.” Black gatherings to hear preaching or “exhorting” were illegal unless they were worship services held in white churches. Patrols had authority to enter any establishment where such activity was going on and disperse the “illegal assembly.” Control was easier when Negroes attended the same churches as whites; closer check could be kept on what went on before and after the service. In this instance, integration provided a better means of control than segregation. Certain restraints were also placed on Negro commerce. Intoxicating liquors could not be sold to slaves by free Negroes, and nothing at all could be vended on Sundays.

In 1853 free Negroes were brought under the temperance law, and alcoholic beverages could not be given them in any quantity. Weapons, of course, were under careful legal superintendence. An early law prohibited any free Negro from “hunting by firelight
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outside of his inclosure.”

There could be no good reason it was argued, for blacks to be stalking around at night. A couple of years later no free Negro or mulatto, except in St. Augustine and Pensacola, could carry any firearm without a license from a local justice of the peace. The inevitable was not far behind. In 1833 it became unlawful for any Negro to keep in his house any firearms whatsoever. After this no Negro was permitted to be armed except for his own defense, and then under white supervision.

Still another way of controlling free Negroes was to place them in an inferior legal and political position. From the very beginning there was no question of political equality with white citizens. Legislation setting up the qualifications for suffrage in the Florida Territory excluded mention of all Negroes. Jury duty was also prohibited to free colored persons; the congressional act setting up the territorial government saw to it, and the Legislative Council wasted no time incorporating the debarment into the statutes. A Negro, mulatto, or Indian could give evidence in a trial only where no whites were involved. Where they could testify, any Negro who perjured himself was to have his ears nailed to posts, and he would be forced to stand like that for one hour, then his or her back was to be bared and thirty-nine lashes applied. Feelings ran strong on the issue of Negroes being witnesses against whites, since that tacitly implied equality. In 1845, State Representative W. H. Brockenbrough was accused of supporting a bill which would have allowed Negroes to testify against whites. In his rebuttal, he claimed he was falsely accused, and he called the idea “shocking and absurd.”
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One of the few rights free Negroes did have was property ownership. An 1828 letter from the commissioner of the General Land Office to the secretary of the treasury reports that one free person of color had had his claim to preemption suspended because of race. Feeling that this was unjust, the commissioner wrote, “I know of no law of the U . States which prohibits a free negro from purchasing lands, unless there be some express law of the Territory by which they are excluded from purchasing. I perceive no reason why a patent should not be issued.” 71 The law did not forbid property ownership and it was relatively widespread.

Of more concern and less certainty was the Negro’s right to own himself. Whenever a free Negro was apprehended as a slave, the burden of proof of his liberty rested with him; he was presumed slave. 72 Indiscriminate seizure was not allowed though, and if anyone should be convicted of stealing or selling a free person, he was to suffer death without benefit of clergy. 73 The law was later reconsidered and the penalty lightened; the maximum punishment became a $500 fine and standing in the pillory for not more than three hours. 74 Anyone sold into slavery, though, could appeal to the governor for pardon. Freedom was actually achieved by this method in 1842, and again ten years later. 75

Debt further jeopardized the Negro’s liberty; his person served as ultimate security. A lender could get a court to issue a writ of capias ad satisfaciendum against a defaulting Negro for the money and all costs thereon attached. If the judgement was not paid, the officer issuing such a writ would “advertise the sale of the services of such defendant or defendants, to any such person who will pay or discharge such execution . . . for the shortest space of time . . .” at public auction. The Negro could then be sold and held as a slave subject to the same penalties, treatment, and duties which could be exacted from slaves. Should the Negro try to escape, his time would be doubled and continued to be doubled at every instance of attempted runaway. 76 Continuous residents since
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transference from Spain were exempted. The same procedure could be used when fines for misdemeanors had been levied against free Negroes.

The black man had to be kept in his place. Florida law prohibited mixed marriage; any such marriage was null and void and any children were “regarded as bastards and incapable of . . . receiving any estate . . . by inheritance.” Any white man fornicating with Negroes was to be fined up to $1,000, and he was disqualified from exercising any office of profit or trust in the territory, serving as a juror, or giving evidence in any case against whites. No black could use “abusive and provoking language to, or lift his hand in opposition to” a white person except in cases where the offender was “wantonly assailed and lifted his hand in his or her own defense.” Punishment was up to thirty-nine lashes. After 1855, whites and Negroes were prohibited by law from playing card or dice games with each other.

Free Negroes were subject to head taxes. At first they were brought under the general twenty-five cent head tax for all males in the state, but in 1832, this was raised to a punitive level of $5.00 on all free persons of color over fifteen years of age. Seven crimes were made capital offenses in the first laws of the territory: arson, burglary, manslaughter, poisoning, murder, rebellion, and rape. Later on, even the attempt of that most “heinous of crimes” against white femininity would doom a Negro to be “cropped, branded, or suffer death.” In 1848, punishment was compounded on free Negroes convicted of a felony when they were required either to pay the expense of prosecution or to be sold temporarily into service for that purpose.

In 1842, it was stipulated that guardians were to be placed over all free colored persons who were not living in the territory prior to its cession to the United States. The judge of the county court was to issue a certificate, at a fee of one dollar a head, to
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“proper and discreet” guardians who would enjoy full privileges of master except regarding property. The entire slave code would be applicable except again in the matter of property ownership. Although the act was repealed the next year, a similar statute was enacted in 1848. Even more strenuous efforts to enforce the law came after 1856. Negroes without a guardian were to be fined not less than $10.00. Anyone convicted of buying or selling to a free Negro without the written consent of his guardian could be fined $100 to $500.

There was only one more step to be taken. An act of 1859 provided that a free person of color over the age of fourteen could choose his own master or mistress and become a slave. To make the loss of liberty more attractive, such a master would be prohibited from selling the slave, and he could not allow him to be taken for debts or judgements against his property. Any free Negro found by a judge of probate to be “of idle and dissolute habits” could be sold for a term of years to the highest bidder.

The guardian requirements struck Pensacola’s free Negroes most harshly. Sympathetic white friends offered to become guardians as a legal formality. Many followed this course, but others found even this too degrading. Some free Negroes, believing that they would never be able to improve their position, sailed for Mexico in April 1857. They left behind many others to face the trials of war and the uncertain triumph of victory.

This then is what is known about the free Negro in pre-Civil War Florida. It is a precious little. We see through the past darkly a group without a face. Outlines of the visage appear, but time has clouded the details. That freedom was thought worth a struggle is evident from the life they lived among the perils of the Florida swamps and in the jungles of the white man’s law. That many gained much against great odds is signaled by the century-old census registers. But that unobtrusiveness was the key to survival shows up in their anonymity. That most were kept from living a whole life is shouted by the silence of history.
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"OLDSMAR FOR HEALTH, WEALTH, HAPPINESS"

by GLENN A. NIEMEYER

The Florida real estate boom of the mid-1920s brought unparalleled publicity to Florida. From Jacksonville to Key West city streets were clogged with cars and trucks bearing northern license plates. Swamps were drained and lots on "Venetian canals" were offered for public sale at fantastic prices. Elaborate advertising campaigns, boasting such names as William Jennings Bryan, attempted to lure the Northerner away from snow and ice and into the "Sunshine State." According to Frederick Lewis Allen, it was "the most delirious fever of real-estate speculation which had attacked the United States in ninety years." 1

In 1924 and 1925 the real estate mania reached its peak; the whole of tropical Miami seemed to have become one "frenzied real-estate exchange," and throughout the state this scene was repeated several times over. But the tide was short-lived; just when deflation was inevitable, two West Indian hurricanes struck Florida. The first hit the Gold Coast on September 19, 1926, dashing the water from Biscayne Bay into Miami homes and dampening the hopes and enthusiasm of buyer and promoter alike. 2 However, by then fortunes had been made and lost in land speculation. Some had purchased wisely, timed their investment perfectly, and profited handsomely; others had miscalculated, antedated popular frenzy, and lost considerable sums of money. Ransom E. Olds, the successful manufacturer of the Oldsmobile and Reo automobiles, was one of the latter.

Since the 1890s Olds had vacationed each year at his winter home in Daytona Beach. As an annual visitor he was impressed with the gradual but marked growth of Florida and the possibilities offered by the state's climate and soil. On several occasions he had investigated tracts of land with a view towards buying them as a speculative investment. 3 While Olds' interest in Florida

1. Frederick Lewis Allen, Only Yesterday (New York, 1944), 191-92.
was primarily speculative, as evidenced by his earlier inquiries into land investment, he envisioned the establishment of an agricultural and industrial settlement which would attract people of ordinary means. On several occasions he had indicated his desire to make life more comfortable for people with a modest income, particularly those who worked for him. In this, Olds was echoing the view of many American businessmen of the time. They believed that with the cooperation and assistance of the captains of industry, life for the common people could be made more orderly, and the unrest generated by the organization of labor and the activities of radical groups could be seriously curtailed. For Ransom Olds, all of these objectives, speculative investment, social experimentation, and benevolent capitalism would be combined into one venture, his design for a planned community in Florida.

Olds acquired the site for his projected community in 1916 through an exchange of property. Richard G. Peters, who owned 37,541 acres of undeveloped land on Tampa Bay, proposed to trade his property to Olds for cash and for an apartment building in Chicago. After some negotiation, Olds, on December 17, 1915, notified Peters that pending a trip South to investigate the land, he was offering $75,000 in bonds; $200,000 in cash, and the apartment building valued at $125,000 in exchange for the Florida acreage. His offer was accepted ten days later, and by March 1916 final arrangements for acquisition of the property had been concluded.

To Olds, the Peters’ property seemed to be an ideal location for his anticipated settlement. Located in Hillsborough and Pinellas counties, it was proximate to the west coast towns of Tampa, Clearwater, St. Petersburg, and Tarpon Springs and was located on the Tampa and Gulf Coast division of the Seaboard Air Line Railway System. Besides the advantages it had for cattle, dairy, and general farming, the pine lumber and timber resources on the property were thought sufficient to make it a safe

investment and an opportunity for large profits, particularly at the low price of approximately $10.65 per acre. When asked by Douglas F. Conley, Olds’ agent, for his opinion of the site, A. C. Clewis, president of the First Savings and Trust Company of Tampa, offered the following appraisal: “It has great advantages over any other large tract in this State, because of its water frontage on Old Tampa Bay, the hard surface County Roads and railroads through it, and the fact that on the West, North and East sides are settled and rapidly developing property. In my opinion, these lands will for many years continue to rapidly enhance in value and the purchaser should reap very large and satisfactory profits from his investment, when its resources and possibilities are developed.”

Only a month after acquiring the tract, Olds formed the administrative machinery to handle its development. The Reo Farms Company, a name soon changed to Reolds Farms Company, was organized in April 1916, and capitalized at $1,000,000. Olds became board chairman, and Fred E. Cook of Glass, Cook, and Atkinson, a general insurance and real estate firm in Detroit, was named president. The other officers were S. S. Glass, vice president; E. T. Larson, secretary; Charles E. Ecker, Olds’ private secretary and counselor, treasurer; and William E. Balles, sales manager. Reolds-On-The-Bay was the first name chosen for the community, but it was then changed to Oldsmar.

Plans for the new town were drafted by architects and city designers, and workmen were hired to construct a luxurious hotel with private bathing beach, boat houses, and gardens. Dock facilities were built along ten miles of waterfront, while “choice bungalow sites,” selling for $1,000 to $1,500, occupied the rest of the land facing Old Tampa Bay. “Town lots” could be purchased, varying from $500 to $2,000 depending on size and location. Contractual terms were set at fifteen percent down, ten percent to be paid on the balance each year, and the mortgage to carry six percent interest. There was also a bank, post office, electric light plant, saw mill, artificial ice factory, garage, railroad depot and freight house, churches, schools, and stores. Communal improvements included street lights, telephones, a

waterworks system, and transportation facilities. Sidewalks and curving drives, bordered by rows of palms and flowering oleanders, were laid out, and several hundred acres were set aside for golf courses and recreation areas.

Tracts, usually twenty or forty acres in size and suitable for farming, fruit-growing, and cattle and poultry raising, were laid out beyond the residential area for a community of “little farm dwellers.” Prices were established according to the following schedule: wild lands satisfactory for fruit or vegetable farming, $25.00 per acre; uncleared farm lands adjacent to the town, $50.00 per acre; uncleared farm lands fronting on the Tampa-Oldsmar-Clearwater highway, $75.00 to $100 per acre; uncleared properties fronting on the shore of Old Tampa Bay, $100 to $300 per acre; and uncleared properties opposite the Seaboard Air Line Railroad station, $300 per acre. The company would clear any piece of land and prepare it for cultivation, build a residence and other buildings to meet the wishes of each purchaser, build fences and dig ditches, drill a well, furnish machinery, and supply livestock from Elbamar Farms, Olds’ ranch near Grosse Ile, Michigan. The cost of clearing land ranged from $30.00 to $50.00 per acre, and an average forty acre tract could be cleared and equipped with new buildings for approximately $7,000. Payment could be made on terms; the first installment was twenty-five percent of the total contract, with ten percent to be paid each year on the balance which carried an interest rate of six percent per annum.

“On forty acres properly handled,” the company advertised, “a man should be able to make better than $3,000 a year with less work and worry than in the North on 120 acres.” To prove the truth of their claims and to demonstrate agricultural possibilities, the company built a model farm. It included a large herd of cattle, some blooded bulls, horses, mules, swine, tractors, farm machinery, and agricultural implements. Experimental plots were planted with Irish potatoes, turnips, cabbages, rutabagas, lettuce, beets, celery, and citrus fruits to determine yield. “It is hard to see,” the literature stated, “how anyone can fail to make money at Oldsmar if he is an earnest worker and attends

to business.” Company cooperation would come in the form of a creamery, packing house, and stock yards. “Oldsmar for Health, Wealth, Happiness” was the company’s favorite caption in their broadsides, and in planning the town, none of the three, seemingly, was neglected.

An extensive publicity campaign aimed at enticing Northerners was initiated after the essential work had been completed. Advertisements describing Oldsmar as a “veritable garden spot for all kinds of fruits and vegetables” were placed in Detroit and other Michigan newspapers, and a network of agents, each with his own territory, was organized. Brochures were mailed upon request to persons planning a trip to Florida; special excursion trains with through Pullmans were chartered from Detroit to Oldsmar for anyone interested in purchasing a farm site or a lot. Commenting on the first year of operations, Fred Cook wrote: “The Reolds Farms Co. and its customers have spent and are spending large amounts of money to help make Oldsmar a popular winter resort, as well as a prosperous farming and fruit-growing center. As a result, Oldsmar is making more progress in one year, than some other places make in ten. The right kind of people are going there, that’s why.”

Providing work for the residents was important to the success of Oldsmar. Some attention had been given to this matter by Olds when he planned to establish a saw mill, planing mill, tannery, and brush factory. Another opportunity to bring industry to Oldsmar was presented to him in December 1916. Henry and John Kardell, agents for the Reo automobile in St. Louis, had perfected a small tractor which they wanted to market, and they approached Olds with the idea of accepting the presidency of a $1,500,000 corporation they intended to organize. Olds informed them of his interest but said that he would be unwilling to become an officer unless they would establish their plant at Oldsmar. The advantages of this location were several: its proximity to Alabama, one of the largest iron-producing states; money could be saved in heating costs; and there was the oppor-

Oldsmar for Health, Wealth, Happiness

tunity to use the tractors every day, "while at a northern point they would be froze up six months of the year." Olds also called their attention to the labor situation, ordinarily labor down there can be had for about $1.65 per day as against $3.00 per day in the North." The Kardells were interested, and agreed to go "to Tampa in the near future and look the situation over." They were evidently impressed with what they saw, and after several delays, they came to Olds in October 1917, with the offer to locate at Oldsmar if he would take a "fair sized interest with them." Their proposal was accepted and Fred Cook was sent to St. Louis where final arrangements were made for the move of Kardell Tractor and Truck Company to Oldsmar. A plot of ground was reserved for the plant, and construction of the factory buildings was started. One newspaper commented on the move: "This is really an innovation for the state of Florida and may be the beginning of a new era for that state, putting it in the manufacturing column."  

Olds was anxious for the tractor company to locate in Oldsmar because of the difficulty he was having clearing out the pine stumps and scrub or saw palmetto; he hoped the company would help him solve this problem. Stumps and troublesome roots had been removed by hand, but this method was slow and expensive. In 1915, W. S. Vincent, owner of the Pensacola Seed and Nursery Company, had invented a power stump puller which he wanted to manufacture, and he had turned to Olds for financial assistance. Olds found that Vincent simply had a "hoisting device on wheels," and that there was nothing very new about his invention. Olds, however, utilized Vincent's idea, and less than six months after the tractor company had located in Oldsmar, he announced that he had a gigantic machine that would pick out the "big stumps as though they were bushes" and pile them up in "great windrows to be burned." Further soil preparation was done by a "wheel root thresher" that Olds had invented and patented. This machine could pick up about twelve inches of top soil, elevate and screen it free from small roots,

15. Olds to F. L. Cook, October 17, 1917, ibid.
18. Olds to Vincent, October 19, 1915, ibid.
sift it, and then drop the soil ready for planting. Olds planned to manufacture the two machines as soon as experimental tests were completed. Some urgency was attached to this ambition; Olds realized the success of his community depended on the attraction of residents. If he was unable to provide work, either in manufacturing or farming, the community would suffer. Thus, the tractor company held the key to the future of Oldsmar. Olds knew that to establish an agricultural-industrial colony and to realize a profit from his investment, the land needed to be cleared and work had to be provided.

When the United States entered World War I in 1917, Olds saw an opportunity to stimulate Oldsmar through publicity. Couching his intentions in patriotic terms, he announced in March 1918 that he was “bending his efforts” toward clearing land quickly and extensively since he thought the world might be “threatened with famine”: “I am doing all in my power to get out 37,000 acres of land around Oldsmar under cultivation as soon as possible, in order to do my bit. I can see no reason why Florida should fail to be the garden spot of the future. It has the climate to produce three or more crops a year on plenty of good land, and Florida should be able to yield food enough to supply many of the northern states as well as some of the foreign countries, and thus help to win the war.”

There is little evidence to dispute the sincerity of Olds’ statement other than the record of his past activities and the stated purposes for initiating the development of Oldsmar. For Olds, this was a business venture with a tinge of social experimentation. Like all of his financial interests, it was measured on the same scale—the ledger sheet—and from all indications the debit column exceeded the credits in the Oldsmar account.

From its inception Oldsmar was anything but promising. Olds’ correspondence reveals no mention of even moderate growth, much less spectacular progress. Despite the money that was pumped into land clearance, site development, and general construction, progress lagged and the number of people who moved to Oldsmar fell far below expectations. Olds’ letters to his manager, Harry J. Person, disclose his increasing concern for trivia and his irritation with Person’s direction, all of which suggests an accumulation of problems.

Communications between Olds and government officials during the spring of 1917, a year after operations had begun, reflected his growing awareness that the Oldsmar enterprise would need a stronger stimulus if it were to succeed. On April 23, 1917, seventeen days after the United States declared war on Germany, Olds addressed a telegram to President Wilson:

Having been solicited by a shipbuilding concern for a location on my lands on the North Shore of Old Tampa Bay, Florida, and having refused to sell nearby timber to parties claiming to be agents of a foreign government, the thought came that at this time our government might desire this for a navy yard. If such a thing is feasible and the government will agree to establish a navy yard there, I will be pleased to donate the land for the yard and the timber on ten thousand acres of virgin Florida forest for use in connection with Government shipbuilding at this yard. 20

The President thanked Olds for his “generous and patriotic offer” and referred the matter to the secretary of the navy. 21 When little encouragement was received from this quarter, Olds turned next to Howard E. Coffin, a former Olds employee who had helped form the Hudson Motor Car Company. Coffin, now with the Council of National Defense, referred Olds’ offer to the Emergency Fleet Corporation of the United States Shipping Board. The assistant general manager of the board, F. A. Evstis, informed Olds that the government had authorized construction of as many wooden cargo-carrying vessels as possible in the near future: “The need for these ships is very great. I feel that if we should fail to get the ships we should pretty certainly have to fight Germany alone.” In the same letter he disclosed that his commission was not erecting government shipbuilding yards; they planned to award contracts only to established private firms. 22

Following this response, Olds received a communication from the navy department in answer to his request for an inspection of the Oldsmar site. Olds did not want to commit himself to his original offer unless he had some assurance that contracts would go to shipbuilding concerns that might be established on his property. 23 Rear Admiral J. M. Helm, in his letter of

20. Olds to Woodrow Wilson, telegram, April 23, 1917, ibid.
22. F. A. Evstis to Olds, April 29, 1917, ibid.
23. Olds to navy department, April 25, 1917, ibid.
April 30, stated that “owing to urgent additional duties assigned to members of this Commission, it is not possible to foresee when it can inspect sites in the vicinity of Tampa.” He advised Olds to forward a map of the land and any available information concerning it, and Olds agreed to have the blueprints of a navy yard site made.

On the same date of his communication to the navy department, May 4, Olds again wrote to the shipping board, noting that he had invited the New York Yacht, Launch & Engine Company, a firm from which in the past he had purchased pleasure craft, to move their plant to Oldsmar. He stated also that “another Company is planning on organizing in the near future” and might “establish themselves near Tampa.” On the basis of these possibilities, he queried, “Am I to understand that you are in a position to award contracts to reputable shipbuilding concerns that might establish themselves on this property?” On May 8, the shipping board advised Olds that specifications for the “proposed wooden fleet” were still unfinished and they were uncertain when their plans would be completed. Faced with this indecision, Olds terminated his attempts to obtain a shipyard for the Oldsmar area. From the outset his proposal at best was a speculative one. His offer to the New York Yacht, Launch & Engine Company was unrealistic and premature, while his plans for a new shipbuilding concern to establish itself were apparent only on paper. Never did his negotiations proceed beyond the point of talk.

Certainly Olds had expected some advantage to accrue from this shipyard scheme. A naval yard or a shipbuilding firm in the area would have enhanced the growth of Oldsmar through the development of industry, attraction of residents, and general economic stimulation. But this did not materialize. Neither did his hopes for the tractor company, which had produced only 2,000 machines in eight years of a less-than-satisfactory operation. Olds then attempted to salvage what remained of his elusive opportunity. He erected a foundry and machine shop, while at the same time completing his earlier plans for a planing mill,
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tannery, and brush factory. He constructed a thirty-room hotel with shops, the Wayside Inn; invested $100,000 in a wildcat oil well; and announced a gift of five dollars to each resident child who would use the money to start a bank account. 28 These improvements and further investments, however, failed to give the sick town the boost it needed. By 1923 Olds had poured $4,500,000 into the community, but, in spite of his endeavors, Oldsmar failed to yield the profits he had hoped for and had been assured were possible. Probably he was misguided, and most certainly his undertaking was ill-timed. The Florida real estate frenzy was still in its infancy, and only the maturity of the 1920s would bring to others the profits he had envisioned. For that error of judgment Olds was to pay handsomely.

Disillusioned by the failure of his town, which in 1923 had an approximate population of only 200 inhabitants, 29 Olds began to dispose of his interests during the business slump of the early 1920s. The first deal that he made was to trade the almost finished Oldsmar race track for the far-from-complete Fort Harrison Hotel in Clearwater. 30 In 1923 he exchanged the unsold platted portions of Oldsmar and a “large amount of cash” for the Bellerive Hotel in Kansas City, which had cost $2,500,000 to erect. 31 The last of his holdings, the tractor company, which included six acres of property, railroad siding, and “other facilities,” was finally sold early in 1926 for $100,000. 32

For Olds the entire Oldsmar venture was a disappointment. His dream of an agricultural-industrial workmen’s colony failed to materialize because it lacked a sense of realism. Few employed people either wanted or could afford to give up their security for an uncertain future. During World War I and the difficult recession period which followed, this was especially true. Only when the land boom of the middle twenties occurred did Florida experience the prosperity and development he had anticipated. Olds foresaw the economic possibilities of land promotion in the
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state, but he erred in his timing. The result of that miscalculation was an accumulated net loss estimated at $3,000,000.  

The same air of misfortune that characterized Olds' efforts has clouded the later history of Oldsmar. The next person to take an interest in developing the town was Harry E. Prettyman, an energetic St. Louis promoter, who constructed a yacht basin, a 1,000-foot pier which jutted out into Old Tampa Bay, and a casino which housed the Chamber of Commerce, a dance hall, showers, club rooms, and an auditorium. Prospective buyers by the bus load were brought to Oldsmar and were entertained at barbecues eaten amid oriental surroundings. The land boom which had been gaining momentum for several years became sensational in 1924, and quick profits were readily realized from rapid sales. But all of this was short-lived. The crash of 1926 that caused Florida real estate values to collapse took its toll in Oldsmar. The bright specter of a rising economy turned out to be nothing more than a falling comet, and once more Oldsmar sank into the doldrums of an earlier period. There it has remained. A city of some 1,500 residents today [1967], its single attraction and revenue source is the race track, Florida Downs, formerly Sunshine Park.

Since its beginning, a lack of foresight and initiative, caused more recently by factionalism, has hindered the progress of Oldsmar. Civic indebtedness which has lingered from the depression of the 1930s, the failure of plans for an industrial park, and the potential surrender of its city franchise to return to unincorporated status, are only a few examples of current problems. Burdened by internal obstacles, Oldsmar, then and now, has been unable to rise above them. This, along with its name, is the legacy left by Olds.
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Within the eastern residential section of Ocala is the site of Fort King. Probably more has been written of this military outpost than of any Florida fortification of its time. Yet long overlooked in official files in Washington is the scarcely known story of its erection - letters which tell of its plan, its buildings, and of problems resulting from the frugality of a government insistent upon a stringent economy of expenditure.  

Florida Territorial Governor William P. DuVal for sometime had been urging the establishment of a military base “on the southern frontier of Alachua” to protect the whites and the Indians from each other. On February 2, 1827, Colonel Duncan L. Clinch, commanding the Fourth Infantry, announced his determination to place an installation within the reservation assigned to the Seminoles “to compel the Indians to remain within their limits, and give protection and security to the citizens of Florida.”  

With Captain James M. Glassell in command, two companies of troops marched southward from Wanton’s (Micanopy) under orders to seek within a few miles of the intersection of the road from this place to Tampa Bay and the north boundary of the Indian Reservation an “eligible site for a military post.” Reaching the area near the previously established Seminole Agency, the troops made camp on March 25 on an elevation one mile to the northeast. Here, flowing from a small spring on the hillside to a

1. Records of the War Department and the Office of the Quartermaster General, Record Group 92, Consolidated Correspondence File, Fort King, Florida, National Archives, Washington, (microfilm copy in the possession of the author). See also Frederick Cubberly, “Fort King,” *Florida Historical Quarterly*, V (January 1927), 139-52.  
pool in a ravine below, was clear, cool water amid a verdant growth of magnolias, hickories, and other hardwoods. Having decided upon this location, the site was named in honor of Colonel William King. First called Cantonment or Camp King, it soon became known as Fort King.

In suggesting the general location, Colonel Clinch was aware of the geographical advantage which had caused the Indian agent, Colonel Gad Humphreys, to place his headquarters in this vicinity—the opportunity for water transportation. Colonel Humphreys in midsummer of 1825 had followed Indian trails far into the interior and had discovered, he elatedly reported, "a large and beautiful spring unknown to the whites" before his coming. From it a deep stream led to the Ocklawaha River and from there to the St. Johns and the ocean, which would make needless the hauling of supplies over the rough route he had followed for more than one hundred miles from Tampa Bay. Humphrey’s spring is the now well-known Silver Springs.

For Camp King the immediate task was the clearing of a space 162 by 152 feet to be enclosed by a barricade of split logs upended in the ground to form walls or pickets. Gates of heavy timber were placed on each of two sides, and on one corner a blockhouse or watch tower, fourteen feet square, was erected. Construction of quarters was begun promptly, but of no less importance was the clearing of the Ocklawaha, so clogged with fallen trees and other obstructions that its navigation was impossible. Supplies were to be shipped in vessels from Charleston, South Carolina, to Palatka where they would be placed in smaller boats and transported by men from the post to a landing at Silver Springs. From here they would be “waggoned” the final three miles to Camp King.

In May twenty-two men were assigned to the river project, and the reduced force continued in the erection of log buildings within the pickets. For the enlisted men a large barracks con-

3. Colonel William King, formerly of the Fourth Infantry. He was appointed by General Andrew Jackson as civil and military governor of the provisional government of West Florida in 1818. Carter, Territorial Papers of the United States, XXII, 286-90, 469 Fn. See also Francis B. Heitman, Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army, 2 vols. (Washington, 1903) 1, 600.

This sketch shows Captain James M. Glassell’s 1827 plan for Fort King. The main gate leads through the picket line (F) which enclosed the entire fort. Below the gate is the centrally located enlisted men’s quarters (E), four large rooms under one roof with passages between each block and piazzas on either end. Flanking these quarters on either side are two magazines (A) and two kitchens (C).

Two sets of officer’s quarters (D) at the other end of the enclosure follow a pattern similar to the enlisted men’s with four rooms under each roof and piazzas on either end. Only the blockhouse (B) on the southeastern corner of the pickets was completed; the dotted lines represent the characteristic overhang of the upper level. The figures on the plan indicate dimensions in feet.
taining four compartments was raised. The rooms, each about twenty-five feet square, were separated by wide hallways, and there were piazzas front and rear. All was under one roof which provided not only protection from the sun, but also overhead storage. For the officers two separate buildings, about twenty by fifty feet, were planned, each with bedrooms and "drawing rooms" for two men. Extra sleeping space was in a loft above. Mess halls, kitchens, and ammunition storage almost filled the remaining area.

Since free circulation of air was deemed necessary in the warm climate, the living quarters were elevated on posts five or more feet above the ground. But planning ahead for cold weather, Captain Glassell requested shipment of materials "absolutely necessary, to render the Quarters comfortable in winter. . . ." These included "window-glass, . . . Bricks & Lime . . . [and] plank for flooring & c, as we cannot saw by hand, all that will be required. . . ." From the office of the quartermaster general came a curt refusal, stating that this post "is altogether 'temporary,' anything more than comfortable huts, for the company, would be improper. The transportation of brick . . . could not be justified by the circumstances of the case. Suitable chimneys, can be readily constructed with logs and clay."  

There existed within the war department a difference of opinion as to the permanence of Fort King, which resulted in a communications delay and in a confusion of orders. In the meantime, Glassell, smarting under criticism, dictated a statement on July 20, 1827, to his quartermaster, Lieutenant F. D. Newcomb, to be forwarded to the quartermaster general, General Thomas S. Jesup: "Before the selection of this position, General Gaines in a conversation with me on that subject, directed that I should build, as compactly as possible, and the work to be enclosed with pickets, and the Quarters not to form any part of the line of defense. I was subsequently ordered by Colonel Clinch to follow
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General Gaines’ plan, and from his instructions was under a
firm belief that the position would be as permanent for two com-
panies as any of our frontier posts . . . . Before the order of May
15th was received, the men’s quarters were raised, and those for
the officers of two companies progressing, so that the plan could
not be altered. A block for the officers of one company only was
then continued . . . .” To this memorandum Newcomb added:
“I am requested by Major Glassell to forward the enclosed extract
from orders rec’d by him from Colonel Clinch and a plan of the
work as at first contemplated from those instructions received.”
Not only had Clinch approved the Gaines’ plan, but he had in-
cluded in his written orders an injunction to “make your command
as comfortable as your situation will allow.”

Glassell, it seems, had made his point, but when brick, win-
dow glass, and planks were not forthcoming, he reported on Sep-
ember 22: “I had laid off the officer quarters to have chimnies of
brick in the centre of each block: I shall however now make
them of logs, and at the ends.” Plaintively he added, “I have . . .
used every exertion to curtail, as much as possible, expence to the
United States, by sawing lumber; in which I have so far succeeded,
as to have a sufficiency for tollerable comfort, altho more is
wanted. . . .” The economy of logs and clay was nearly disastrous,
for a fire was discovered one night smoldering under a hearth,
and it was extinguished with difficulty.

On March 17, 1828, nearly a year after construction began,
an enthusiastic report from Fort King announced that “the Quar-
ters at this post are nearly complete. They are as good quarters as
have ever been built in the South.” No optimistic report could be
given as to the clearing of the Ocklawaha River, however, and
after repeated efforts a road was cut through the woods to Payne’s
Landing some twenty miles away, below the stream’s most narrow
curving course. It was here that boats from Palatka discharged
cargo to be hauled to the post. But construction was hardly
complete when, over the protests of Colonel Clinch, the garrison
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was withdrawn from Fort King on July 3, 1829, and for three years the camp was unoccupied. 9

With the determination of the United States to move the Florida Indians to a reservation in the West, Fort King was reoccupied in June 1832, and on July 18, Lieutenant Joseph W. Harris of the Third Artillery made a detailed report of the condition of its buildings. His careful listing of their size, number, and position further identifies the plan submitted by Captain Glassell as that used in their construction. All were in such need of repair that there “was enough work to be done to call the entire force into incessant and arduous fatigue duty.” Harris estimated that thirty men would be needed for sixty days. Enlisted men were paid fifteen cents a day for extra duty, which with $100 for materials, would bring the cost to $375. 10

With the approach of winter Harris was concerned over heat. The chimneys constructed earlier had crumbled into ruins. The local sand-mixed clay was not durable, and, if utilized, there would be a constant danger of fire. Furthermore, Harris felt some consideration should be given to the men: “The troops have labored well and unceasingly since our arrival here and their comforts are fewer than they are entitled to.” He tried to requisition five cast iron stoves with pipe and elbows, but late in December he received a letter of refusal, advising him to construct “chimneys such as are used by the people of the country.” With a hint of sarcasm, Harris replied that these were familiar to him, he had used them on the smaller buildings, but he felt that they were unsafe for buildings as high as those for the men and the officers. The ridge pole of the former was forty-two feet, the latter thirty feet from the ground. Bitterly disappointed, Harris, however, obeyed orders, but stated that a proper consideration for the preservation of government property impelled him to give warning of its probable destruction. 11

Harris reported the construction of a keel boat, successful as a cargo carrier. It was fifty-five feet long with an eight-foot beam,

9. All dates of occupation and withdrawal are in the Records of the War Department, National Archives, Washington.
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and was capable of carrying 100 barrels in bulk. Operated by a skipper and a crew of eight men, it was propelled by poles except where the waterways were wide enough to permit the use of oars. The round trip to Palatka from Silver Springs took eighteen days—usually four or five down, but the return passage, impeded by the swift current and the narrow hazardous turns of the Ocklawaha, took much longer. The boat was in service several years, but was later discarded as the heavy supply wagons of the military proved of more dependable value.

As the year 1835 approached, it became increasingly apparent that the Indians could not be removed from Florida other than by force. Troops moved in and out of Fort King. A new barracks was built, and the unfinished officers’ quarters were enlarged and completed as a hospital. Five companies were here in the summer, but all except one were withdrawn in preparation for a fall campaign against the Indians. But the Indians now put into effect a strategy of their own, and it was Lieutenant Harris who penned the graphic report of the daring attack by Osceola, almost within sight of the walls of Fort King, in which Agent Wiley Thompson, Lieutenant Constantine Smyth, and three civilians were murdered. On the same day, December 28, 1835, the Indians wiped out the force of Major Francis L. Dade, enroute to Fort King from Fort Brooke. On December 31, troops under Colonel Clinch and warriors led by Osceola fought the first organized engagement of the struggle along the bank of the Withlacoochee River. The Seminole War had begun. 12

Fire set by the blazing torches of the Indians destroyed Fort King in July 1836. Its garrison had been withdrawn in May, and the fort was unoccupied at the time of the attack. The post was reestablished on April 22, 1837, and its rebuilding was started. Ten years had passed since its original group of buildings had been erected, and now a different plan was followed, consisting of one large structure surrounded by high pickets protected by four blockhouses. A number of one-story log cabins were placed outside the fortification; in time of alarm the occupants could take refuge within the defenses. Writing to a friend from Fort

King on September 1837, an army surgeon described the activity—troops removing several hundred yards of hammock growth from around the fort to avert another ambush, and others busily putting up a building for enlisted men and stores, a structure which so nearly filled the enclosure that its eaves overlooked the pickets.  

Meanwhile, the struggle with the Indians continued. From Washington, in the spring of 1839, came Major-General Alexander Macomb to negotiate a settlement, and a temporary arrangement, the Treaty of Fort King, was agreed upon. In the general’s escort was young Lieutenant John T. Sprague, who vividly described in his journal the picturesque appearance of the fortification, its peculiar construction, its park-like surroundings, and the bright colors of its flag contrasting with the green of the forest: “It is a picket work twenty feet high with a block house at each angle. In the center stands a two-story building occupied by the soldiers, on top of which is a Cupola in which is posted a sentinel who announces the approach of man by ringing a huge Cow-bell; which to say the least is very unmilitary, but still very useful. The Commanding Officer’s quarters are outside and many other buildings, & c, such as wash rooms, bake house, guard tent, and some officers tents.”

Hostilities continued but further to the South, and Fort King, was not considered vital to the defense of Florida. From Cedar Key on August 14, 1842, the termination of the war with the Indians was announced. On March 23, the following year, the last occupation troops were withdrawn from the post. A small detachment remained to show possession, and Fort King continued to be a stopping place for military expresses between St. Augustine and Tampa.

Now scores of eager land seekers hastened in, filing for permits under the belatedly effective Armed Occupation Act or by pre-emption for the region lately occupied by the Indians.

13. Records of the War Department, “Fort King Documents; Samuel Forry to J. W. Phelps, September 1, 1837, Letters of Samuel Forry, Surgeon, U. S. Army, 1837-1838,” Florida Historical Quarterly, VI (April 1928), 212. Fort King was reestablished under the direction of General Jesup, and some fifty men were transferred there from Fort Armstrong.

Fort King became a public meeting place and here the settlers gathered to discuss the formation of a new county and the question of admitting the Territory of Florida to statehood. Marion County was created in 1844, with Fort King designated as temporary county seat. Meantime, the small log buildings adjacent to the fort served to house a newly-established post office, a mission organized by Methodist circuit riders, a general store, and other facilities.

Judge Isaac H. Bronson of the United States Court of Eastern Florida sought permission for the use by the county of two or more buildings at Fort King. “One of these,” he wrote, “is large enough for a court room, jury rooms and county offices.” This description identifies it as the one large building at the post, the two-story cupola-topped barracks of the enlisted men, which became Marion County’s first courthouse.

Some five months after Judge Bronson’s request was filed, it was granted in a letter from General W. J. Worth written from his headquarters at St. Augustine on February 9, 1845. The general noted that “the necessity has ceased for further occupation of Fort King as a military station.” He approved the use of several buildings for the courts, and suggested that all the others be sold. “None are of value,” he added, as “they were originally of slight construction of unseasoned materials. . . . they are in ruinous condition and rapid decay, yet will answer a momentary purpose for the use of the courts and afford comfort and encouragement to our new settlers.”

There are frequent references in the Marion County records to the courthouse at Fort King. The first term of circuit court was held there in November 1845, and it continued in use until September 1846 when possession was taken of a new but small and temporary courthouse erected in Ocala, now designated as county seat. The site on which Fort King had stood (the NW 1/4, Sec. 14, T 15 S, R 22 E) had been withdrawn from pre-emption

while in use by the county, but on February 20, 1846, it was
turned over to the General Land Office for civilian acquisition.  

Other than for what might be termed a postscript, the Fort 
King correspondence was ended. In a letter of November 4, 1846, 
Edmund D. Howse, sheriff of Marion County and former custo-
dian of the Fort King property, urged the immediate sale of 
materials from the buildings to those, like himself, desiring to 
build in Ocala. The lumber, though old, was "worth considerable," 
and "the floors," he wrote, "are plank, the doors and window 
shutters plank and the windows are sash glass, all very valuable 
in this country where we have no conveniences (mills) for mak-
ing plank."  

And so the physical remnants of Fort King, whose 
presence had opened up the Ocala area to settlement, were uti-
lized for more peaceful pursuits in the construction of civilization.

19. William L. Maxey, secretary of war, to R. J. Wilson, secretary of the 
20. Records of the General Land Office, Record Group 49, Fort King, 
Abandoned Military Reservation, National Archives.
FIRST CAMPAIGN OF THE SECOND SEMINOLE WAR

by GEORGE C. BITTLE

There was no one basic cause of the Second Seminole War which began in Florida in December 1835. Major General T. S. Jesup, a regular army officer who served in Florida during the war, said that the Indian attacks were primarily the result of white efforts to secure Negroes held by the Seminoles. 1 Senator Thomas Hart Benton of Missouri believed the oppressive and intriguing nature of federal Indian supervision was to blame. Major General Edmund Pendleton Gaines, who served briefly in Florida early in 1836, thought that the Florida conflict was an example of border warfare. 2 Mrs. Ellen Call Long, daughter of Florida Territorial Governor Richard Keith Call, felt that the settlers were partly to blame for stirring up the Indians. 3 Colonel John Sprague, recognized contemporay authority on the Seminole War, believed that the cause rested in the three United States-Seminole treaties, each of which was designed to remove the red men from the advancing white frontier. Mark F. Boyd, prominent Florida historian of the twentieth century, supports Sprague’s thesis. 4 Woodburne Potter, a South Carolina volunteer militiaman who served in Florida, said that he thought an initial strong show of force by the regular army would have cowed the Seminoles from making further attacks on white settlements. 5

The diverse opinions concerning the cause of the Seminole War leads one to believe that it was really a part of the continual

border warfare that took place throughout our nation as white pioneers pushed into Indian habitats. Certainly, the war efforts in Florida seem typical of those experienced on other American frontiers. The general tenor of United States Indian policies in the late 1820s and the 1830s was to send all red men to designated lands west of the Mississippi River.

It is common knowledge that the United States militia system generally failed to provide an adequate defense force for our nation in the first half of the nineteenth century. Such was clearly the case in Florida. On March 14, 1835, Thomas Brown, Florida’s territorial adjutant general, ordered all militia commanders to take a census of their units and report the results “as early as practicable” so that federal requirements for military aid could be met. Federal records show, however, that no return was made by Florida during 1835, which indicates to some degree at least the lack of preparedness of Florida’s militia on the eve of conflict.

Reports circulated among white Floridians during November and December 1835, that the Seminoles were sending their women and children to remote areas. Alachua County frontiersmen began moving to the two towns available for protection. On December 3, the Jacksonville Courier commented on the territory’s serious Indian problem but argued that General Duncan Lamont Clinch, regular army commander in Florida, and his troops could handle the situation. On December 10, the Jacksonville paper printed a presentment of the combined grand juries of Alachua and Hillsborough counties. This document agreed that an Indian war seemed inevitable and admitted that neither county had an organized militia. While comprising a regimental district, no military arms or supplies were readily available to the two counties. Repeated militia elections had been held, but the elected officers had not received their territorial commissions. These facts demonstrated not only a failure on the part of the central territorial
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administration, but they also show that the general citizenry of Florida was giving little more than cursory attention to the vital problem of security for themselves, their families, and their property.

Long before the starting events of the war—the shooting of the Indian agent Wiley Thompson by Seminoles at Fort King, and the attack on Major Francis E. Dade and his force on the Fort King Road—the Florida Militia was already on active duty. Before hostilities began it appeared that the Indian threat was greatest in the eastern part of the Florida Territory. Thus, it was natural that Brigadier General Joseph Hernandez of St. Augustine would be the first militia officer to mobilize his command. Private B. M. Lynch, Second U. S. Dragoons, described the general as “a fine gentlemanly man . . . [and] a good soldier. He is the only field officer I ever saw wear a uniform in this service.”

On October 26, 1835, General Hernandez ordered his East Florida Militia Brigade to prepare for active duty after explaining to Territorial Governor Call that such a move was necessitated by the deteriorating Indian situation. Before mustering all of his troops, Hernandez ordered two St Augustine companies, which left town on November 13 and 14, respectively, to scour both banks of the Halifax River for marauding Indians. Myer M. Cohen, a contemporary observer, described the hastily formed and miserably equipped Florida Militia units as a “melancholy sight.”

Receiving no indication that Governor Call would support his project, General Hernandez, in a letter, November 27, 1835, appealed to the secretary of war for 500 muskets. The regular army, however, found it difficult to provide Hernandez with 120 serviceable weapons, and, in addition, there were no cartridges or usable musket powder available. Actually, the militiamen should have already possessed adequate arms. The first semi-official federal request for Florida troops came in the form of a

letter written by Brigadier General D. L. Clinch to General Hernández on November 30, 1835. Clinch said that while he had no authority to call for volunteers, he did not doubt that federal pay could be secured for young men in the St. Augustine area, if they would form a company and unite with the regulars. Such a unit, he stated, was needed at his headquarters.  

Lieutenant Colonel W. J. Mills had ordered his militia battalion to be ready to be mustered as early as November 10, 1835. However, it was not until December 5 that the order was issued calling for the force to appear in military formation on December 7. This call to active duty was probably in response to General Clinch’s request for 100 mounted volunteers to serve with the regulars on the Alachua frontier. Clinch, recognizing the lack of organization in the militia, announced that he would accept companies as they were formed. Of course, under both territorial and federal law well armed individual units should have been in existence already. Despite the fact that General Hernandez had felt the need to ask for federal arms and had also seized every available local weapon to meet the obvious lack of arms, members of Mill’s battalion were to be court-martialed if they did not have proper weapons and equipment.  

On December 7, Colonel Warren mustered in Mills’ battalion, and the unit marched to join the regulars the following day. Guard details were stationed at Jacksonville and at two other towns. The Jacksonville Courier, on December 10, 1835, reported that every man not on active duty was being enrolled for home protection. According to Colonel Warren, “such as have rifles have taken them. But a great part have been compelled to take their fowling pieces or such guns as they could lay their hands on.” Organizational problems were just as involved as

was the arms question. This is illustrated by Warren’s statement of July 31, 1836, that the East Florida Militia probably would not receive federal pay for the preceding winter’s duty because the activated companies had neither the full complement of officers nor an adequate number of men.  

In December 1835, the Florida Militia was left to defend the eastern part of the territory. General Clinch stated, on December 15, that his only fear was of a possible panic of the white citizens. He argued that the militia should defend the area while the regulars took to the field. Reiterating this plea on January 6, 1836, he stated that the East Florida troops could hold off all the Seminoles if necessary.

An effort was made to carry out the regular army’s faith in the militia when, on December 17, 1835, General Hernandez ordered Colonel Joseph S. Sanchez to assign guard units to outlying plantations. Major Benjamin A. Putnam occupied Rosetta Plantation south of St. Augustine as field headquarters for the East Florida Militia, and on December 28, he moved his headquarters to Bulowville Plantation where it remained until the campaign ended in January 1836. Not all plantation owners welcomed the militia. The owner of Bulowville greeted the occupying force with a blank cannon charge that was intended to scare them off. He was so uncooperative that reportedly he was placed in confinement. The owner of Dunlawton Plantation, who was prepared for the defense of his property, had to be forced into the militia.

General Clinch’s estimate of the East Florida troops apparently was not shared by some of the people this body was supposed to protect.

A description of a typical company and its fighting potential may serve to show why some plantation owners did not welcome the militiamen. On January 17, 1836, Major Putnam took Companies A and B of his command in one boat and two canoes to Dunlawton Plantation to secure food.

21. Ibid., 62-64.
22. Ibid., 64-65.
23. Ibid., 61-62.
sergeant of the Mosquito Roarers, one of the companies on the expedition, described his unit as “an undisciplined rabble, under no command of their officers, not a man had ever before seen a gun fired in anger.” 24 The *Niles Weekly Register* described the St. Augustine Guards, the other company accompanying Major Putnam, as composed of approximately forty of “the generous and spirited young men of St. Augustine.” 25 According to Ormond, when the troops arrived at Dunlawton the buildings were on fire, yet the men went ashore and “chased chickens for awhile.” The soldiers encamped that night near the penned cattle since it was believed that the Seminoles would return for the cows. Shortly after dawn, a single warrior appeared, and the troops opened fire on him. “He was soon a corpse and some of our brutes mutilated it shamefully.” As the troops were hurriedly falling back towards the shelter of the burned house, the Indians began firing from cover. After a half-hour fight, the militia began a general retreat toward the boats. Just then a Negro guide rallied the men with the exclamation, “My God, gentlemem is uno goin [sic] to run from a passel of damned Indians?” The force responded when Major Putnam ordered it back into action. 26

The fight continued for some time before a second retreat was ordered after one militiaman had been killed. In the pell-mell withdrawal to the boats, not only did every soldier’s gun get wet which rendered it useless, but the whaleboat was run hard aground. Two of the Florida men were so scared they would not get into the boats. One swam across the river, but the other fell into Indian hands. The Seminoles refloated the whaleboat and gave chase to the men in the two canoes. Three militiamen were wounded before a musket was put in order. A lucky shot killed a brave, causing the Indians to retire. One of the Florida men who had stayed overboard during the fighting “got shot in the rear end climbing on board.” 27

25. *Niles Weekly Register*, February 6, 1836, 393.
26. Ormond, “Reminiscences,” 15-16. The fact that the Indian corpse was mutilated is supported by a letter published in the St. Augustine *Florida Herald*, January 20, 1836, which said that the first Seminole killed had been scalped and his ears and beads taken by the militiamen.
In the final retreat to the boats, every man either had been wounded or had holes shot in his clothes. According to Major Putnam’s official report, a one-hour pitched battle was fought, followed by an orderly retreat when the militiamen were overcome by superior numbers. Lieutenant Myer Cohen of the South Carolina Militia offers a different version of the battle. He says that Indians were present when the Florida troops appeared and that Major Putnam intended to land some distance from the plantation. However, a lieutenant commanding one boat moved straight toward the buildings and had to be supported. The militia, despite adverse comments, probably put up a good fight. Unaccustomed to military discipline, the men revealed the ability and the courage to rally under fire.

After the battle, Putnam’s force returned to Bulowville Plantation. On January 14, 1836, the Jacksonville Courier reported that many unauthenticated Indian signs had been seen and that the gallant militia had scoured all suspected areas. However, few actual Seminoles were found. Major Putnam and his command were ordered back to St. Augustine on January 23, 1836, and by February 2, the last territorial troops stationed south of that city had been withdrawn. By then the situation had become so desperate that on February 28, free Negroes in East Florida were ordered to be placed on active militia duty as blockhouse builders. Thus ended the first campaign by the Florida Militia in the eastern part of the Florida Territory during the Second Seminole War.

29. Ibid.
LIEUTENANT JOHN T. McLAUGHLIN:
GUILTY OR INNOCENT?

by NELL L. WEIDENBACH

The Florida Squadron, based on Key Biscayne and Indian Key during the Second Seminole War, was a small but highly effective naval group whose part in bringing hostilities to a close has remained in relative obscurity for over a century. Furthermore, the youthful and courageous commander of this squadron, Lieutenant John T. McLaughlin, has been relegated to the fine print of an occasional footnote. The sparse and very brief paragraphs allotted to him all too frequently concentrate on his fiscal extravagances and his drinking excesses, with dark intimations of corruption and cruelty. The paragraphs which follow are designed to bring to light the conclusions reached by the Congressional Committee on Public Expenditures and by the Naval Court of Inquiry of 1846, agencies officially charged with the responsibility of either exonerating or condemning Lieutenant McLaughlin for the manner in which he performed his duties during the years 1838-1842.

Following the conclusion of the Second Seminole War, Congress appointed a Committee on Public Expenditures to audit the vouchers and to evaluate all phases of fiscal responsibility in the conduct of the war. When the members examined the books of the Fourth Auditor, their attention focused on the disproportionately large expenditures of Lieutenant McLaughlin’s Florida Squadron. Whereas Squadron Commanders John Rodgers and C. R. P. Rodgers had spent sums of $46,616.48 and $13,934.60 respectively, a preliminary audit indicated that McLaughlin’s bills were $343,937.76. To this large amount, however, must be added the cost of most abundant outfits and stores of all sorts. What the true total of this additional expenditure was could not be

ascertained, but the committee felt confident that it would have exceeded rather than fallen short of an estimated $100,000. 2

A subcommittee headed by Congressman John R. Reding of New Hampshire thereupon undertook a minute investigation of available records, with a preliminary report being presented to the House on June 14, 1844. 3 The ten points subject to inquiry were: Total expenditures of the Florida Squadron while under the command of Lieutenant McLaughlin; settlement of his accounts in his capacity as acting purser of the squadron; amount of hospital and medical stores purchased before sailing; items and cost of other hospital and medical stores procured by him while acting in the dual capacity of commander and purser of the squadron; number of men under his command and length of their service; amount of money paid by the government for his services as purser or lieutenant commanding, or in any other capacity; whether he presented any account, and to what amount, beyond his pay as lieutenant commanding: the decision thereon, and the amount paid him, if any, besides his regular pay, and by whom allowed; disposition of any charges preferred by the department against McLaughlin and de nature of the charges; and matters relating to the trial by court-martial of Lieutenant Robert Tansill of the U.S. Marine Corps. 4

Vicious and damaging allegations were made on each of these points. Seven detailed exhibits were presented as evidence, and it is from these that we learn of McLaughlin's propensity for liquor, elegant furnishings, and gourmet foods. His flagship the Flirt was elaborately furnished with Brussel's carpeting, hanging lamps, expensive curtains, cut glassware, and silver service. He was accused of having his canoes custom-designed in South Carolina at a cost of $180 each, of fraudulently obtaining captain's pay, and of embezzling rations. A number of vouchers were introduced intimating collusion with an Indian Key merchant. Congressman Reding's report also restated a series of charges which had appeared in an attempted court-martial a year previously. Among other things, these charges had included an accusation that McLaughlin had administered up to seventy lashes in punishments to his men. It seems apparent that the present-day reputation of

3. Ibid., 1-91.
4. Ibid., 1.
McLaughlin rests largely on the basis of this preliminary House report, even though it only contains allegations, opinions, and recommendations.

In answer to these charges, Lieutenant McLaughlin presented a memorial asking that he be given the opportunity of being heard before such committee, and adducing proofs to establish his entire innocence of each and all the allegations exhibited against him. 5

The greatly modified tone of the final report, delivered before the House by Congressman James G. Clinton of New York, suggests that McLaughlin made a full and effective presentation. House Report No. 163, February 25, 1845, the result of nearly eight months of sifting facts and weighing evidence, contains the following conclusions: 1. There should not have been a restatement of the previous court-martial charges, as listed in House Report No. 582. Such statements are subject to misinterpretation by being presented in the record, whereas the charges had, in fact, been dismissed by two secretaries of the navy. One had declared that he saw no reason to question Lieutenant McLaughlin’s conduct; the other stated that there were not sufficient grounds for submitting the charges to court-martial. 2. Although the medical expenses were large, signatures on the vouchers indicated that most of the purchases were made under direction of naval medical officers. It was pointed out “that a young naval officer would, while in active service in the everglades of Florida, have little time to examine into the prices or propriety of medical supplies, prescribed and purchased by the surgeons for the sick or disabled.” 6 3. The expenditure of $17,117.88 for canoes was unquestionably large, “but Lt. McLaughlin was obliged to have them, on account of the nature of the service of his command in the everglades. Time saved in procuring them speedily, and not delaying the operations of the campaign, and a careful regard for the health of his command, should have had more influence upon his mind in such matters, than the cost of a lot of canoes.” 7

“On examining the evidence before the committee, of last session, we cannot find a single case of illegal punishment inflicted upon any one of his command, by the order, or in the presence, or with the knowledge of Lt. McLaughlin. On the contrary, his officers

6. Ibid., 2.
7. Ibid., 3.
The members of the house committee stated that they agreed fully with the report of a portion of the former committee, that "the expenditures of the Florida squadron, while under the command of Lieutenant McLaughlin were unusually and unnecessarily large; still they disagree with the deductions and conclusions in the said report, in attaching so much blame, and personal and official misconduct to the commander of the squadron." 9 Congressmen Perley Brown Johnson of Ohio and Jacob S. Yost of Pennsylvania disagreed with the majority verdict on some of the charges, insisting that evidence was lacking to clear McLaughlin on many counts.

Apparently, in a final effort to ascertain whether the ultimate verdict should rest on as broad a base of facts as possible, the Naval Court of Inquiry was ordered to investigate the squadron's expenditures and to report its findings to the next session of Congress. Special attention, it was stipulated, was to be given to the "propriety of the expenditures made by said McLaughlin; and, particularly, to show the amount of money paid him, and the amount to which he was entitled." 10

The naval court assembled on September 24, 1845, and "after a long and assiduous attention, the examination of many witnesses, and the consideration of a great mass of documentary evidence," 11 Secretary of the Navy George Bancroft filed his report on February 19, 1846. This summation, contained in House Document No. 130, is a model of brevity compared with the wordy statements and interminable exhibits that packed the previous reports. The various charges were dealt with as follows:

First, was McLaughlin wasteful of government funds and stores? "The court is of opinion that Lieutenant McLaughlin did not waste, or, through design, negligence, or inattention, permit any person or persons under his command or control to waste any ammunition, provisions, or other public stores supplied for the vessels and men under his command." 12 In the matter of wines,

---

8. Ibid.
9. Ibid., 1.
10. Ibid., 3.
12. Ibid., 3.
liquors, and similar supplies, the court stated that it was difficult to determine “whether there was or was not a positive waste” because of conflicting testimonies. Evidence suggested “very great extravagance,” however.  

Second, was McLaughlin guilty of fraud, embezzlement, or collusion? “The court is of opinion that the testimony before it does not justify the belief that a partnership or collusion existed between Lieutenant McLaughlin . . . and any person or persons.” The examiners specifically exonerated him of all suspicion of embezzlement or fraudulent actions.

Third, did McLaughlin fail to notify proper authorities of the squadron’s needs, with the result that emergency purchases had to be made at considerable financial disadvantage? “The court is of opinion that Lt. McLaughlin did not make known sufficiently often . . . his necessities for supplies,” although they acquitted him of this charge “under the circumstances.” These exonerating circumstances are not enumerated, although they relate obviously to the primitive aspects of the South Florida area, its communication and transportation difficulties, and related problems.

Fourth, were the hospital buildings on Indian Key necessary and too expensive? In a brief fifty words, the court cleared McLaughlin of this charge.

Fifth, were the canoes that McLaughlin ordered necessary and too high-priced? The court conceded that they were purchased at an extravagant cost, but found that they “were not unnecessarily purchased.”

Sixth, was McLaughlin guilty of improper use of the Indian Key buildings, using them for private citizens or himself? The court made no effort to affirm or to deny the allegations that a store was operated in one building, and that one or more buildings may have been occupied by either McLaughlin’s family or by personal employees. The report did state emphatically that the uses to which he put the buildings were not improper.

Seventh, did McLaughlin maintain rations for the sick on the squadron account when duplicate rations were being main-
tained on the hospital account? The court affirmed his negligence in this regard, but charges could not be preferred because “the Court has no certain data before it from which to calculate the amount of such rations.”

Eighth, was McLaughlin guilty of illegal methods of finance on his own behalf? “The Court is of opinion that the only instance in which it might seem that Lt. McLaughlin may have derived any advantage by exchanging the public money, is in the purchase, at New York, of about three hundred Spanish doubloons, for the payment of purser’s bills in Florida.” The court’s emphatic use of the terminology “may have derived advantage” cannot be interpreted as either proof or an accusation.

Ninth, should McLaughlin have held the rank of captain? “The court is of opinion that the number and size of the vessels commanded by Lieutenant McLaughlin were not, at any time during his command of the expedition in Florida, such as, according to usage or precedent in the navy, entitled him to be considered as a ‘captain in command.’”

Tenth, should McLaughlin’s “captain in command” pay have been retroactive to October 1, 1838? In addition to the court’s belief that he was not entitled to a captaincy, it stated that he should not have been designated as “in command” because “it appears to the court that fourteen months of the time for which Lt. McLaughlin received pay as ‘captain in command,’ he was under the orders of officers senior to himself,” namely Commodore Dallas and Commander Mayo.

The verdict reached by the Naval Court of Inquiry leads to the following inescapable conclusions regarding McLaughlin’s

17. Ibid., 5.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid. Notwithstanding the court’s opinion in this regard, in a letter of September 22, 1843, there is an endorsement to McLaughlin’s petition for captain’s pay signed by Secretary of the Navy David Henshaw. There is no doubt that McLaughlin received the pay of a captain, and that such pay was granted because of the highest possible authorization. See House Report No. 582, 28th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 50.
20. House Document No. 130, 29th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 5. In a letter dated October 9, 1843, Secretary of the Navy David Henshaw issued the following positive authorization: “The principle has been settled that Lieut. McLaughlin is entitled to the pay of captain commanding. Of course, he is entitled to it during the whole time that he commanded the Florida squadron of small vessels, viz: from the 1st October, 1838, to the 3rd August, 1842.” See House Document No. 582, 28th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 52.
guilt or innocence: First, guilty but exonerated in the matter of duplicate rations for the sick; second, guilty of a retroactive captaincy authorized by the secretary of the navy; third, innocent of all other charges, modified only by the admission that evidences of extravagance were found.

Apparently, this report from the navy department was the final word in the case of the Florida Squadron’s controversial young commander. Unfortunately, the vindication offered by the facts has remained concealed behind a facade of colorful, readable half-truths, a comedy of errors compounded by history’s silence regarding the navy’s participation in the Seminole War. Nevertheless, the verdict stands. In the words of Secretary of the Navy Bancroft 120 years ago, “There is no reason to suppose that a more satisfactory result can be arrived at.”

JOSEPH E. BROWN AND FLORIDA’S NEW SOUTH ECONOMY

by DERRELL C. ROBERTS

The present day economy of Florida is rooted in the post-Civil War New South era of American history. The first wealth acquired in the tourist trade and citrus production came to Florida in this period. Governor Joseph E. Brown of Georgia, along with many other Americans North and South, was amassing at this time a sizeable personal fortune in various enterprises that ranged from agriculture and real estate to railroads, banking, and mineral enterprises. On several occasions, he visited Florida, always keenly observing the economy of the state. Governor Brown’s political career was spread over the years from the 1840s to 1890. He served as state senator in the Georgia General Assembly, as superior court judge, governor of Georgia from 1857 to 1865, chief justice of the Georgia Supreme Court, and finally as United States Senator in 1880.

Although Florida was known before the Civil War as something of a tourist state and a place for invalids to recuperate, the federal armies of occupation helped advertise the state’s temperate climate and natural beauties. By 1874 the estimates of the numbers of tourists visiting Florida ranged from some 25,000 in the Jacksonville-Fernandina area to approximately 50,000 at Silver Springs. A South Carolinian estimated that 33,000 people came to Florida in 1875, spending $3,000,000 in hotel accommodations, food, and recreation. 1

Governor Brown made a trip to Florida in April 1876, and he was so impressed with what he saw that he decided to set forth his enthusiastic comments in a letter to the editor of the

1. E. Merton Coulter, The South During Reconstruction (Baton Rouge, 1947), 207, quoting the Greenville, S.C. Enterprise and Mountaineer, April 7, 1875. T. Frederick Davis gives the following estimates of winter visitors to Jacksonville: 1882-83 - 39,810; 1883-84 - 48,869; 1884-85 - 60,011; 1885-86 - 65,193; and 1886-87 - 58,460. Davis, History of Jacksonville and Vicinity, 1513 to 1924 (St. Augustine, 1925), 491. See also facsimile edition with introduction by Richard A. Martin (Gainesville, 1964), and Richard A. Martin, Eternal Spring: Man’s 10,000 Years of History at Florida’s Silver Springs (St. Petersburg, 1966).
Atlanta Constitution. The letter appeared on April 27, 1876. “In twenty-four hours after leaving Atlanta,” he wrote, “we arrived in Jacksonville, the principal city of Florida, very handsomely located on the St. Johns River which is a thrifty enterprising little city, showing quite an activity in business and a good deal of general improvement. Its people are very hospitable and kind, and its hotel accommodations very good and very ample.” “This is the general meeting point of visitors to Florida,” Brown observed, “and I think the city has a very interesting future.” ² From Jacksonville, the party moved by boat along the St. Johns first to Palatka and then on to Mellonville. The latter part of the trip was on a boat owned by the Brock Line. ³ Brown described the company as “particularly accommodating, and its boats very comfortable indeed; no line upon the river is more popular.” ⁴

Brown was particularly interested in the citrus groves of the Indian River area: “The oranges of Indian river are superior to any that comes to the market for size and sweetness. We were struck with this fact in Jacksonville when we went out to buy some oranges to send home to our friends, and found the occupant of every shop we entered, representing his oranges as Indian river oranges, though they might have been grown in the suburbs of Jacksonville.” ⁵ The governor observed that Florida’s citrus industry could “be made very profitable, on account of the fact that it is very nearly below the frost line, and the soil and climate are peculiarly adapted to it.”

The governor and his party visited “a number of fine orange groves along the banks of the river. The most celebrated is what is known as the Dummitt grove, at the head of the river, and near Musquito Lagoon, which was planted by a brother-in-law of the late General Hardee. . . . Another grove of peculiar beauty is the grove owned by Colonel Spratt, formerly of Alabama.

3. For more details of this and other enterprises of Captain Jacob Brock, see Hanna and Cabell, St. Johns, 266.
4. Atlanta Constitution, April 27, 1876.
5. Ibid. Brown’s interest in the citrus industry probably stemmed from his early life as a North Georgia farmer, his continued interest in agriculture, and his pre-occupation with his farm interests in Georgia and Texas.
The colonel is an old time gentleman after the Virginia order, a man of fine sense and intelligence, and of very high toned and honorable bearing. Being broken up by the war, and having lost his wife, he went to Indian river, seven or eight years ago, purchased a piece of land on the river, and has, by his own labor-commencing when he was over sixty five years of age-cleared off the ground and has planted some eight or nine hundred trees. The earliest planting are now in a fine state of bearing, and were loaded when we were there with luscious fruit. He has left the cabbage palmetto trees and some others of the larger growth on the ground, and had left a strip of timber between his ground and the river. It is, therefore, surrounded by timber on every side which keeps off the cool winds, when there are any, and protects the grove. The beauty of the green leaf of the tree, mingled with the yellow fruit, twining among the cabbage trees makes a very picturesque and beautiful scenery. Upon the whole it is probably the most beautiful grove of its size in Florida.” 6

Another interest captured Brown’s attention during his Florida tour. As president of the leasing company that operated Georgia’s state-owned Western and Atlantic Railroad (Atlanta to Chattanooga), and as a substantial investor in other lines including the Texas and Pacific, he noted the lack of rail lines in Florida, particularly in the citrus producing areas. He saw the need of “a narrow gauge railroad from Enterprise on Lake Munroe—the highest point to which the larger boats requiring deep water can run-to Land Point on Indian river about forty miles.” “The country,” he felt, was “favorable for construction of a railroad, there being very little grading and an abundance of pine along the line for cross-ties, making the construction of the road a very cheap one. A three foot gauge of road with a 25 or 30 lb. rail, could be built there for five or six thousand dollars a mile, which would do all the business necessary between Indian river and the deep water of the St. Johns, and would in a few years be made an excellent paying stock. If this were done and a short canal cut, less than a mile in length-connecting the north end of Indian river with Musquito Lagoon - which could be done for a few thousand dollars, so that boats loaded with the production from along the river intended for northern markets, could pass out through Musquito Lagoon to the Atlantic, and the narrow gauge road was

built to St. Johns for the benefit of inland travel and freight." With these advantages, the Indian River, Brown predicted, would become "a sort of earthly paradise in winter, and its banks from one end to the other would soon be dotted with the homes of a thrifty, prosperous and happy people."  

Brown was not altogether complimentary to Florida in his letter to the Constitution, and he said that he "felt compelled" to point out some disadvantages of living in the state in general and the Indian River area in particular: "In summer the mosquitoes and sometimes, though rarely, the sand flies are troublesome; and the hot season is a little too long for comfort, while fever and ague, when you get back into the rich lands some distance from the river, would render it unpleasant. Immediately along the banks of the river there is probably no difficulty about health." But even with these vexations, the governor decided that "upon the whole it is very easy to make a living in the Indian river country with but little labor, and while the orange groves will not turn out to their owners to be the large fortunes that many calculate upon, a grove properly managed is a handsome piece of property, and will afford a good support. But the chief excellence of this section after all is its mild, genial winter climate."  

With all of his enthusiasm for Florida, there is no evidence that Brown invested money in either citrus or any other enterprise in North or Central Florida. He did buy some property on the Gulf coast in the area of Carrabelle, however, and while he spent very little time there, it became a favorite spot for his oldest son, Julius Brown.

Governor Brown was also very familiar with contemporary politics in Florida. During the election controversy of 1876, when Florida's electoral vote became a matter of vital importance to both the Democratic and Republican parties, he was sent to Florida as a "visiting statesman" by the Democratic Executive Committee. Commenting on this political activity, Brown noted in a letter to a friend that he felt "the consciousness of having done at my own expense all that it was in my power to do there to protect the right and avert a calamity." 

7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
Joseph E. Brown was a shrewd business man, and he knew the economic potential of Florida. He kept abreast of what was happening in the state, as was evidenced in 1884 in an interview with a reporter from the Louisville (Kentucky) Courier-Journal. Predicting that “the orange business will astonish you in a few years,” he pointed out that “this is the first season [1884] that oranges in any considerable quantity by the car-load have been shipped directly West over the lines of railroad.” He also noted that “the General Freight Agent of the Western and Atlantic who was here [Washington, D.C.] the other day, informed me that he was now carrying from five to ten car-loads a day of Florida oranges over the road West.”

In view of his knowledge of Florida and his enthusiasm for the state one might wonder why the governor did not become more involved in the economic and political life of the state. Probably it was because he was more concerned with expanding his own political career in Georgia. At the same time, he was building a fortune in real estate and railroads in Georgia, Texas, and in other areas of the country. There was just not enough time, energy, or capital to expand into the “Sunshine State” also.

10. Louisville (Kentucky) Courier-Journal, January 14, 1884. Clipping in the Joseph Emerson Brown Scrapbooks, University of Georgia library, Athens, Georgia.
BOOK REVIEWS

_A Dredgeman of Cape Sable_. By Lawrence E. Will. (St. Petersburg, Florida: Great Outdoors Publishing Company, 1967. 155 pp. Photographs, map. $1.50.)

Admittedly, this reviewer is a pushover for the sawgrass vernacular of that “Cracker Historian of the Everglades,” Lawrence E. Will, who has authored such choice tidbits as _A Cracker History of Okeechobee and Okeechobee Hurricane and the Hoover Dike_, as well as many short articles in various historical quarterlies.

One of these articles, on the Cape Sable Canal, appeared in _Tequesta_ (the journal of the Historical Association of Southern Florida), in 1959, and was made the subject of a column, “Digging the ‘Soup-Doodle Muck’ Canal,” in the _Tampa Tribune_, March 22, 1964. Since this reviewer wrote the column, he feels he may speak freely.

Mr. Will has taken the _Tequesta_ article and has skillfully expanded it into nineteen chapters, with intriguing titles (Fillymingo, Soup Doodle Prairie, Mosquitoes Did I Say, Lake of Grief, The Storm on Labor Day, etc.). Expansion, like uncontrolled overweight, is a dangerous thing. This book still has flashes throughout of the brilliance of the original article, but one gets the feeling that the unexpected chuckles are fewer, and that Mr. Will’s naturally spontaneous humor is sometimes being forced out through the containing slats of names and statistics. The names and statistics are there all right, and in abundance, too, and anyone who has ever read him is bound to recognize the accuracy and the painstaking research concealed beneath the lightness of Lawrence Will.

Let’s take a quick look at “Fillymingo”: “Blondy and I, one Sunday, decided to explore the City of Flamingo. At that time, from where we had started to dig, the dredge had continued two miles west, then made a left turn towards the bay a mile and three quarters ahead, but she still was in the tall mangrove swamp.

“After walking a short piece through the woods we emerged into a beautiful little clearing carpeted with what looked like
Bermuda grass and dotted with a few small trees, a delightful vista after all those miles of dark swamp.

“But where in the heck was the settlement? All we could see was three miserable houses. One high, dismal looking and abandoned building stood half a mile to the westward, which, as we later learned, belonged to Coleman Irwin who had moved to Homestead the year before.

“So this was the town of Flamingo! Three crying houses!”

And this is just a flash of the Willsiana staccato history that we have learned to expect and enjoy. Follow it (as has been done) with four solid pages of encyclopedic data-names, dates, numbers, and dimensions-and you can’t see the type for the figures.

The blurb says: “This is the fifth book turned out by . . . Lawrence E. Will—and in the opinion of his publisher, the best of the series. Followers of . . . Mr. Will have been saying that he would never be able to top his ‘Cracker History of Okeechobee,’ . . . but it appears that he done [sic] just that.”

Sorry, Mr. Publisher, peers like you been breathin’ down his neck. He ain’t!

Baynard Kendrick

Leesburg, Florida

Checkered Sunshine: The Story of Fort Lauderdale, 1793-1955.

By Philip J. Weidling and August Burghard. (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1966. x, 296 pp. Preface, photographs, maps, appendices, bibliography, index. $8.50.)

This volume, sponsored by the Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, is written by two men who have witnessed and participated in the city’s growth, Weidling since 1912, and Burghard since 1925. The authors state in the preface that they “have striven to tell exactly what happened, without attempting to tell why or to analyze.” What they have produced is considerably more than the mere chronological Listing of events that this statement implies. Rather, it is a fast moving narrative account of the ups and downs of a community as it is affected by changes in transportation, depressions, and war and peace. The story is told
largely in terms of the people who made the successes and failures that make up the checkered career of the community. More than 150 illustrations add authenticity and human interest and tell a story of their own.

The story of Fort Lauderdale is largely the story of South Florida in miniature, long and slow doldrums followed by phenomenal growth in the last quarter of a century in which the same generation has witnessed the transition from frontier village to sophisticated metropolis. The first permanent resident, Frank Stranahan, arrived in 1893. His wife, who came there to teach in the first school in 1899 and married him the next year, still reigns as Fort Lauderdale’s first lady. There were temporary residents as early as 1793, when Charles Lewis, whose son and daughter were associated with early Miami, took up land there. The Seminole War depopulated the area early in 1836 and gave it its name when Major William Lauderdale established a fort there in the spring of 1838. In 1876, when the locality had one resident of record, the United States government established a House of Refuge on the beach there, one of five on the desolate and uninhabited South Atlantic coast. In 1891, a post office superseded the barefoot mailman who had begun regular service from Jupiter Inlet to Miami five years earlier. The Florida East Coast Railroad reached the settlement in 1896, it then relieved it of dependence upon water transport, but it did not immediately produce a revolution in its fortunes. There were enough people for a school in 1899. Farming and the Indian trade remained the most important occupations; the age of beach development, tourism, and recreation still lay far in the future. The federal census of 1900 reported fifty-two people in the village and only 143 ten years later. In 1910, a bank replaced Stranahan’s store as the center for all financial transactions, and the next year the town received its charter. Drainage operations early in the century extended the reach of New River by canal all the way to Lake Okeechobee but failed to produce the commercial and agricultural center some had hoped for. The land boom of the early 1920s left “busted” hopes and an impossibly high public debt. The Florida depression of the late twenties and the national depression of the thirties followed. Then, when recovery seemed in sight, the Second World War intervened before the modern city
with a character and problems of its own could emerge. The story is concluded in 1955, interestingly enough with a chapter titled “The Great Clean-Up, 1948-1955,” another milestone in the checkered career of a community reaching maturity.

CHARLTON W. TEBEAU

University of Miami


Historical societies ought to give some kind of special recognition to those devoted and often unsung authors of local histories like Mrs. Eloise Robinson Ott and Mr. Louis Hickman Chazal. For local historians, whatever might be said of the quality or polish in their finished works, have one thing in common. They love the communities of which they write; and their devotion is measured against the truest test of all: a willingness to labor monumentally with very little hope of gain or even satisfactory recognition.

It has always been somewhat of a commentary and a definite irony that Florida, so rich in history, does so little with it, relatively speaking. Thus, this book was researched and written laboriously over a period of many years and finally, brought to publication at the personal expense of the authors. And withal, it is a good book. It is well written, organized coherently, and develops its theme logically. The narrative flows smoothly and dresses its essential facts in a style considerably superior to many local-type histories. There is a good balance as well, in the measure of anecdote and the colorful, personal touches that can be brought to history only by those personally involved with it even though that involvement be but a matter of sensitive feeling for a place-and empathy with its people, past and present.

Marion County is perhaps one of the better publicized regions in Florida because of the location there of Silver Springs. But,
as is the case with so many other vitally interesting and genuinely significant historical areas in the state, its meaningful history is hardly known. Seen in this light, Ocali Country is an impressive contribution to Floridiana. It goes back to the earliest penetrations of the state by white men in the 1500s and touches briefly on ancient Indian cultures that existed in the area centuries before that time.

Ocali, from which the present city of Ocala draws its name, is a derivative of an ancient Indian place name whose meaning has become obscured in time. Even the exact location of the village bearing that name is unknown today, although various historians have advanced theories regarding this. From earliest times the area has figured importantly in Central Florida history and development. It is a fertile, picturesque region of rivers, lakes, springs, and creeks including the Withlacoochee and the splendid Oklawaha, Lake Weir, and Orange Lake, and Rainbow, Juniper, and Silver Springs. Here, many crucial and exciting developments in the Second Seminole War occurred, among them the massacre at Fort King and the earliest development of Silver Springs as a river port used by the military to ship supplies to Fort King and the interior. A great many fascinating characters flit across the pages, caught in the grip of events of helping shape them as Ocala and Marion County were carried from these earliest times through the Civil War, the phosphate boom, the rise and decline of steamboating, and on into the twentieth century with its present promise of new wealth and development in the magnificent horse farms and Cross-Florida Barge Canal now building.

An excellent selection of illustrations-maps, engravings, and photographs-illuminate the history and help recapture the flavor of bygone eras.

Regrettably, traditional methods of annotation were not adopted by the authors, a common failure of local historians. There are many facts and interpretations which prompt curiosity from the reader on sources or bases in fact. But this is not an important criticism, for obviously this book is not written to please historians. Rather, it is written in an attempt to bring together in one place the salient points of history about one of the most ancient and colorful of Florida counties.

Jacksonville, Florida

RICHARD A. MARTIN
By John Ney. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966. 303 pp. Illustrations, acknowledgments. $7.95.)

A carelessly organized effort, this book is largely pretentious trivia-glib vignettes and random observations, interlaced with ponderous expositions of the author’s views on current social trends. He likes to pontificate. A glaring lack of scholarship is evident, and the portions of the book purporting to deal with local history, unhampered by research, are sketchy and inaccurate. The author invents a past to fit his interpretation of the present, substituting fantasy and legend for facts. Rather than a balanced, informative picture of Palm Beach, past and present, which the reader is led to expect, the volume presents a trashy cartoon of the resort aimed at the pocketbook of the boorish, the vulgar, the uninformed and uninitiated. Banalities abound. The author places considerable burden on the reader in delineating between fact and fiction. In the final chapter, he abdicates all responsibility in the matter by stating categorically, “Everything one says about Palm Beach can be - and usually is - contradicted... To the best of my knowledge this is true, and if it conflicts with what you have just read, it is still true.” In effect, tales are told, but there is neither assurance of veracity nor accuracy.

Despite his vaunted sophistication, Mr. Ney plainly stands in awe of the rich and regards them with wonder (and perhaps fear) as a race apart. He takes an adolescent delight in denigrating them - washing their dirty linen in public - as if to surprise and astound the reader with his own discovery that they are just mortals, after all. He acknowledges in passing some normalcy in the population, and has given due credit to the climate and landscape, but seemingly these brief passages are a foil alone, for the balance is irresponsibly tipped to the side of scandal, weakness, and everything base in the human character. It is easier to be negative than positive in any broad evaluation. A bar near the Palm Beach Biltmore, apparently a chief source of the author’s information, is erroneously referred to as a place where “sooner or later you will see almost everyone in Palm Beach.” Actually the bar is a hangout of gossipy domestic help, augmented on occasion by a few lushes-one of whom, a rich
coarse-mouthed old crone, is quoted with great relish by Mr. Ney as representative of the decadent classes.

Mr. Ney exploits the interest value of the Kennedy cult with forty pages of movie magazine prose concerning what he calls the Royal Family, and displays a staggering naivete in describing Kennedy as reluctantly bowing to a popular mandate in accepting the presidency. The reader is subjected to endless nonsensical speculations on the author’s part. His treatment is impertinent and embarrassing. History fares poorly, for pioneer Flagler is pictured first as an exploiter, later as a feeble fool, while Addison Mizner and Paris Singer are a parody team ending in justified poverty. Selectivity of detail is coupled with morality fable form for desired judgment effect. Numerous other pioneer families are passed in silence, major medical and other community institutions of quality are ignored, and worthy charities are sneered at.

Indeed, omission and generality alternate, for there is no genuine historical perspective. Even latter-day history is treated with gossip-like superficiality and paste-pot padding from newspaper columns. It is strange to note that important community representatives go virtually unmentioned, monuments and sites are treated summarily, and names (often misspelled) are dropped indiscriminately. All seems sprung whole like Athena from the head of Zeus, not unlike the author who joined the community a scant few years ago. Mr. Ney’s criticism of Cleveland Amory’s works on Palm Beach appears more accurately descriptive of his own: “. . . if you want a firmer grip on the place, a deeper understanding of its haunted [sic] inhabitants, you will not find it in his work.”

JAMES R. KNOTT
GEORGE L. HERN, JR.

West Palm Beach, Florida


Looking back upon the first ten years of his hometown’s life, remembering what had been and, more importantly, what could
or should have been, the Hollywood, Florida, pioneer’s reaction, in January 1930, was apt to be one of shock and disbelief. Now one among 2,000 citizens, the pioneer recalled the winter season of 1925-1926 - that was the high water mark of the South Florida land boom - when 30,000 people crowded the town; when not a room was to be had and cots rented for $5.00 per night, and when traffic stretched bumper-to-bumper, “tin lizzie” next to elegant limousine, from Jacksonville to Miami on a one-lane cart road because the railroads and buses had not one seat to spare. People came in droves to Florida in those days, magnetized or hypnotized by the lure of untold profits in the land or just the climate itself: prospective land buyers, eager high pressure salesmen, plain and nationally known sightseers, and the not-so-nice, “get-rich-quick binder boys,” who bought and sold land options with ever-increasing speed and at ever-increasing prices. And there was, of course, the man who came to work and to live there, the one who was to make a reality of Hoosier Joseph Young’s vision of Hollywood as a “Dream City.”

But Hollywood had its tomorrows. The real estate bubble burst in the spring of 1926, as the threat of a tax on land gain profits seemed imminent and as Florida began to suffer from national publicity. Land prices crashed, and fortunes raced downhill with them. Installment payments were no longer met, and foreclosures became the rule of the day. As the shockwaves of the land debacle subsided, the great September 1926 hurricane caught the little town without warning, and set it up for the national depression to finish off. The pioneer, in January 1930, could hardly have been optimistic about his town’s future. Hollywood survived, however, and it emerged from the depression of the 1930s, rebuilding itself as it went along, on more solid foundations. When the nation went to war in the 1940s, wartime activities centered in Hollywood brought new residents and new money, injecting a new vitality into its economy and social life.

Journalist-author TenEick has served well the cause of Florida local history with this intimate and warmly written account of her hometown. Her pages are replete with factual details pertaining mainly to Hollywood’s social and economic past. Especially valuable to one interested in Hollywood as a case study of the great growth and sometimes turbulent times which overtook pen-
insular Florida in the period 1920 to 1950, are the inclusion of many photographs and personal interviews with the people who helped make this town’s history. Although this is a publication of the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, and Mrs. TenEick writes about an era in which she was an active participant, she has treated her subject candidly and thoroughly.

**Julian I. Weinkle**

*University of Miami*

---


Although this book was published under a mystery imprint and deals with high adventure, in its true essence it is a documentary. The author explains that it was begun in 1960, as a factual account of what had been going on among Cuban refugees in Florida and in Cuba itself, since Castro betrayed his liberal friends and supporters by turning into a Moscow-dominated dictator. Finally, after the international situation had become even more appallingly complex, and was changing with such feverish rapidity that he couldn’t keep up with it, Baynard Kendrick decided to cast his book in the form of fiction—at which he has been successful for many years. Even so, this book was written as “a composite picture of actual happenings in an authentic setting.” Mr. Kendrick assures us that almost all the story is true.

The setting for the most part is Miami, where the tenacious hopes and persistent fears of the uprooted grow from the quagmire of international intrigue that lies-unrecognized except by the initiate-beneath the smooth surface of wealth and whoopee. *Flight From a Firing Wall* thus becomes a record of what will one day be looked back on as a dramatic and significant period in Florida’s history.

The year is 1965, and the story is told by the protagonist, Dr. Anthony Carrillo, who was born in Cuba, went to prep school in Connecticut, and married a Cuban girl, Milagros. In 1961, they tried to escape. He got away, but she was wounded in
a dockside incident. Carrillo, who is completely bilingual, is now on the staff of the Veterans’ Hospital in Coral Gables. Just after the story opens, his hated father-in-law appears, aboard a luxurious yacht, and tells him that Milagros is still alive in Cuba. From that moment, it is a foregone conclusion that Carrillo will try to get back to Cuba and try to rescue his wife. How he goes about that, and how it turns out, makes an engrossing tale, which ends with a snapper that even the most experienced mystery addict is unlikely to foresee.

Obviously, descriptions of both Florida and Cuba are written from personal knowledge, and the foreword’s list of authoritative individuals and organizations that have contributed “unremitting advice and assistance” in gathering not-too-easily-available information is an impressive one. The continuity moves along swiftly, but the author does not hesitate to clothe its bones in flesh, and for many readers his interpolated comments will form one of the most attractive features. Those comments-usually satiric-may not always be essential to the matter of what happens to Dr. Carrillo, but they are often informative and always amusing. Once in a while, translation of phrases becomes awkward; but in general the difficult problem of presenting dialogue that is sometimes in English, sometimes in Spanish, is handled adroitly.

Baynard Kendrick has written some thirty mysteries, many of them about the blind detective, Duncan McLean, and of course he uses the techniques of involvement and suspense with casual expertness. He has also written numerous factual articles and books, including Florida Trails to Turnpikes, 1914-1964. He is also the author of many novels, of which Lights Out, about a blinded veteran, and The Flames of Time, a Florida story, are probably the most enduring. In certain ways, this Firing Wall is closer to Lights Out than to the mysteries, for the author is speaking of Cuba and the Cubans from a full heart. Though he does not preach, he is telling us a great deal about what this particular brand of totalitarianism is like, and what it means to lose one’s personal liberty.

MARIAN MURRAY

Sarasota, Florida

Before his untimely death in 1965, M. Eugene Sirmans had virtually completed the volume under review. Wesley Frank Craven, who directed Sirmans’ graduate studies, and James Morton Smith, formerly editor of publications at the Institute of Early American History and Culture, worked devotedly in preparing Sirmans’ manuscript for publication. They wisely avoided making debatable revisions, especially where the author’s interpretations were concerned. As Professor Craven justly writes in his foreword: “No other scholar has written a comparably revealing and convincing account of South Carolina’s early political history. The book promises to be the standard study for many years to come. . . .” Sirmans’ subtitle must not be taken too literally. He appreciated the social and economic dimensions of political behavior, and those dimensions are not slighted. Equally important to a study in colonial history, Sirmans was sensitive to the importance of London politics, its impact upon provincial affairs, and the consequent need for influence at Whitehall.

The author divides his subject into three chronological units: the age of the Goose Creek men, 1670-1712; breakdown and recovery, 1712-1743; and the rise of the Commons House of Assembly, 1743-1763. When Governor Charles Craven arrived in 1712, the early political factions had begun to disappear. During his administration they faded altogether. New issues appeared and new factions formed around them. The chief reason for the change, according to Sirmans, was the diminution of religious antagonisms. Anglicans and dissenters minimized their differences, and the colony’s public life entered a new phase, characterized by proprietary neglect, paper money problems, and frontier conflicts with Indian tribes. The appearance of Governor James Glen in 1743, heralded the beginning of a still different era. The cyclical pattern of conflict and compromise was replaced by a remarkable measure of internal harmony. There
were still disputes, of course, but as Sirmans observes, “they concerned only the assembly and did not divide the general public into opposing factions.” Rather the governor, council, and Commons House pushed and tugged at each other in defining the distribution of constitutional authority in the province. The nature of their disputes is excellently related. Chapter ten, treating the colony at mid-century, is a model of its kind in examining the structure of political society in conjunction with the development and functioning of public institutions.

Sirmans made no attempt to conceal his partialities. Where the Goose Creek faction confronts Thomas Nairne and his associates, for example, we are not in doubt about the author’s sympathies. The book is more interesting as a result, and I found myself agreeing with him in most cases. Because he believed that “politics at its best is the art of the possible,” Sirmans most respected those politicians who adjusted conflicts rather than initiated them. His heroes then are John Archdale, Francis Nicholson, Robert Johnson, and William Bull, Sr.; yet they are not enshrined in any pantheon.

The narrative pathway is always clear, no matter how thick the factual underbrush. There are a few minor slips and occasional inconsistencies, but they do not detract from the volume’s great value. The bibliographical essay deserves particular praise for its acute appraisal of the diverse sources. Not surprisingly, references to Spanish Florida recur sporadically throughout the text, especially in connection with Oglethorpe’s unsuccessful invasion in 1740 (p. 210 ff.).

Sirmans’ history is freshest in treating the early (1663-1712) and later (1743-1763) periods. If he overlaps somewhat with sections of Jack P. Greene’s Quest for Power, his work complements perfectly Verner W. Crane’s Southern Frontier, 1670-1732, Robert L. Meriweather’s Expansion of South Carolina, 1729-1765, and especially Richard M. Brown’s The South Carolina Regulators. Sirmans’ bequest to historians belongs deservedly alongside these earlier classics. Like them, Colonial South Carolina will endure, and with it the name of a fine southern scholar: M. Eugene Sirmans.

MICHAEL G. KAMMEN

Cornell University

This important study of parties, party structure, and, in particular, the formation of a new party system during the 1820s and 1830s furnishes student and teacher with information difficult, often impossible, for him to obtain elsewhere. Professor McCormick, obviously an authority on these subjects, stresses the importance of parties as electoral machines organized to win elections, functioning within bounds set by the constitutional and legal environments of their specific historical periods. He shares some of his vast knowledge of parties and party developments in all the states of the union during the period of time covered by his investigation. There is one exception—South Carolina. This information is compressed on the 356 remaining pages of the book, with chapters devoted to New England, Middle States, Old South, and the New States. In each section there is an introduction and a conclusion as well as detailed treatment for each state in the geographical unit. The concluding chapter is a detailed summary.

In his beginning chapter the author states his main thesis: that the Second American Party System developed from presidential contests between the years 1824 and 1840, but he insists that this was the product of new political alignments in local regions rather than in the national administration or in Congress because of regional identification with the respective presidential candidates. By the election of 1840, the nation had produced party systems remarkably free from regional bias. From his central thesis he proceeds to a series of detailed propositions that are treated elaborately, on a regional basis, in the chapters that follow. Although there are few footnotes, the bibliography is complete and should prove useful. It contains a section entitled “Sources of State Election Data.”

This is a learned work for readers familiar with political developments during this important period of our history. To read it from cover to cover is a task for anyone, but the details are of great value, perhaps indispensable for any teacher of United
States political history. The author deplores the absence of a detailed study for so many years and suggests that treatment of parties in all of the states at a particular period is such a formidable task that party history has been abandoned to writers preoccupied with questions of doctrine and composition. He suggests that this “time-honored approach to the study of parties is not only limiting but may also be deceptive.” Although political causation is not minimized by Professor McCormick, I think it only fair to state that other factors are virtually ignored. This will lead to questioning, which the author expects and welcomes. He has presented us with an impressive array of factual material as a basis for argument and has broadened our perspective in the opinion of this reviewer.

Sponsored by the American Association for State and Local History, this work was the recipient of the association’s manuscript award for 1964 - a well earned reward.

MILES S. MALONE

Daytona Beach Junior College


This “informal history” survey portrays the United States cavalry from the Revolutionary War through Pershing’s 1916 Mexican expedition, which is considered to be America’s last major combat use of horse soldiers. To cover this expanse of material, Wormser presents a general interpretive work based on secondary sources. The most extensively used materials are biographies of outstanding American cavalry leaders. This is demonstrated throughout the study which revolves around descriptive vignettes dealing with approximately eighteen major figures. These sketches are then connected into a continuous narrative.

Florida readers will note with dismay that the Seminole War receives only minimal attention and is quickly dismissed because “it seems best to forget” this poor first campaign effort of the
Second Dragoons. It is said that the “swamp-dwelling Seminoles were no target for cavalry.” However, the next page contains the comment that mounted soldiers, “remained non-riders more times than is believable,” throughout most of the cavalry’s history. One cannot help but wonder how these two concepts are to be reconciled.

Throughout the text the words dragoon and cavalry seem to have interchangeable definitions. Perhaps in modern parlance these words no longer hold their classical meanings; but, when they are used without a clear differentiation, some confusion does result. On the positive side, reader interest is stimulated by the use of pictures and maps. In a volume intended for the general reader it is perhaps understandable that extensive primary research has not been conducted. Nevertheless, there is no reason for not consulting the best secondary materials available. In the case of Francis Marion, the 1844 Simms’ biography is cited as being the most helpful. This, despite the fact that in 1959, Robert Bass published a modern authoritative account of the Swamp Fox’s Revolutionary War activities. An even larger oversight seems to have been made in connection with the Seminole War. John Sprague’s old standard account of that fray cannot be replaced by the Florida State Public Records. Also, it appears deficient to devote over two chapters to the dashing character and ability of the great Confederate cavalry leader, J. E. B. Stuart, without mentioning Douglas S. Freeman’s Lee’s Lieutenants. Two of these illustrations serve to show, that in some cases, older works appear to have been given unwarranted precedent over more recent examples of sound historical craftsmanship. Despite this, it can be broadly acknowledged that the author has used some measure of discretion in his background reading choices. The professional reader will be disappointed by the lack of footnotes and other scholarly paraphernalia.

If a person were looking for a light, fast moving, vigorously written history of the cavalry that does not shy away from giving opinions and at the same time breezes by normal scholarly caution, then this is the one to peruse. The author has fulfilled his announced purpose.

GEORGE C. BITTLE

Inter-American University

Not only Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln but many other American leaders - and some non-leaders - come to life on the pages of this book. The theme is evident in the title and subtitle. Nationalistic and sectionalistic tendencies and trends are graphically developed. Background is sketched in the second and third chapters. And the drama of American development is colorful throughout.

Certain characteristics of The House Divides fail to meet academic standards. There is no detailed documentation; footnotes are few and far between, and most of the few are anecdotal. There is no bibliography in the scholarly sense. The “Notes on Bibliography” near the end of the volume are, as the author indicates, for “the general reader.” The reviewer shares Wellman’s enjoyment of Marquis James’ Jackson and Houston biographies and of The Age of Jackson by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., but to praise these works without mentioning Llerena Friend’s Sam Houston: The Great Designer and a number of recent studies of Old Hickory’s presidency, with their provocative interpretations, is to open the library door only a crack. Carl Sandburg’s six Lincoln volumes, we are told, “are written with the fervor of a poet and the careful study of a scholar.” Yet, in fact, Abraham Lincoln: The Prairie Years is distinctly unscholarly. Moreover, Mr. Wellman’s uneven bibliographical remarks are sometimes preceded by comparable errors in his narrative-from the reference to “Harrisburg, Kentucky” (p. 42) to the statement (p. 458) that Lincoln “in his ordinary conversation was careless, almost crude at times.” Let’s face it: Lincoln in his ordinary conversation was crude at times, without the “almost.” And “Harrisburg” is more than a nit, for it suggests ignorance of the importance of Harrodsburg and of James Harrod at one stage of our frontier history.

Considerable critical space might logically be allocated to dependence in 1966, on an assertion of the notorious Augustus C. Buell, or to such a needed addition as “in the North” to “the Republican party became a catch-all for every discontented
segment of citizens.” Far more to the point is the fact that Mr. Wellman tells a very good story. He has an eye for arresting detail, as well as a stylistic skill reminiscent of James, Sandburg, Schlesinger, and Bernard De Voto. Yet this is not to imply that he should be classified as a mere imitator of those men.

Time and again, people - and especially young people - are drawn into history and into an abiding appreciation of the glory and wonder of the American heritage by books like The House Divides. Horizons are widened and curiosity is aroused by the sweep, verve, and vivid pen portraiture of which Mr. Wellman is capable. His success in capturing and then holding readers’ attention is the most consequential truth a reviewer can convey. It is an asset which, in a presentation of this sort, more than compensates for various procedural and evaluative deficiencies.

HOLMAN HAMILTON

University of Kentucky


This book was obviously intended for the general reader rather than the professional historian. It is not documented, quotations sometimes are unidentified, and the research was done entirely in printed sources. It attempts to cover, superficially, the slave trade, development of the slave codes, slave revolts, slavery, abolition, and the Negro in the Civil War. There is little new in the book. Every subject treated by the author is covered in greater detail or in a more scholarly fashion in John Hope Franklin’s From Slavery to Freedom.

Still, The Rattling Chains, is of value. It should be welcomed as an adequately written, popular history for the general reader. Those with just a vague knowledge of Negro history will find it not only interesting but enlightening. Halasz effectively demonstrates that slaves were not all docile and child-like. Many slaves strongly resented their bondage and revolted against insurmountable odds to try to change their status. It was not without justification that the fear of slave insurrections haunted the antebellum white South.
After discussing several slave rebellions, Halasz contends that the number of actual revolts has been magnified. Many of the over two hundred cases recorded in Herbert Aptheker’s *American Negro Slave Revolts*, Halasz says, were simply figments of a feverish and over active southern imagination. Nevertheless, enough insurrections occurred to prove that a substantial number of slaves were willing to chance almost certain death to escape bondage.

**Florida State University**


Professor Posey of Agnes Scott College and Emory University has written the first major survey of religion along the moving southern frontier from the Revolution to the Civil War. Besides summarizing the spread of the Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Disciples of Christ, Cumberland Presbyterian, Protestant Episcopal, and Roman Catholic denominations into the region which now includes Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, and Missouri, the author in his most synthetic chapters has also considered the relation between religion and the Indians, Negroes, education, and the monumental events leading to the Civil War. The volume is at its best in a sympathetic understanding of the two totally American denominations on the frontier, the Cumberland Presbyterian Church and the Disciples of Christ. The author should be commended for the considerable attention he pays to important Roman Catholic developments on the southern frontier, a long neglected field of study.

Posey writes in the grand comprehensive manner of the founder of American church history, William Warren Sweet, and the volume is dedicated to him. With a winsome and felicitous style, Posey has placed frontier religion in the broader framework of all of American church history, but important non-religious factors are largely ignored. Yet Posey has not moved be-
yond his master, while the study of religion in America has taken
giant steps since the days of Sweet. The text attempts a straight
narrative history, with a wealth of external detail but remains
woefully short in analysis of a crucial era for American religion.
The volume is accurate but superficial, largely dependent upon
secondary sources and without the comprehensive documentation
a definitive study should have. Pusey adheres to Sweet’s hypothesis
that American religion can be explained in terms of a successful
Baptist-Methodist response to the challenge of the frontier. And
he continues to accept Sweet’s oddly inconsistent attempt to ex-
plain church growth and ferment on the frontier as a conflict
between Calvinism and Arminianism, while sustaining the argu-
ment not on theological grounds but by a largely external socio-
logical methodology. Posey rarely includes any new material not
available elsewhere in print, but the data has not been collected
in one volume before.

JOHN OPIE

Duquesne University

Yankee Rebel: The Civil War Journal of Edmund DeWitt Pat-
terson. Edited by John G. Barrett. Biographical Essay by
Edmund Brooks Patterson. (Chapel Hill: University of North
Carolina Press, 1966. ix, 256 pp. $6.00.)

Though long withheld, this is one of the better of the Civil
War diaries, written by an Ohioan who served with an Alabama
regiment in Lee’s army. Patterson went South from Lorain
County, on the shores of Lake Erie, to sell books, teach school,
and after residence of less than two years in Waterloo, Alabama,
enlist in the Lauderdale Rifles, which became a part of the
Ninth Alabama of Cadmus M. Wilcox’s Brigade.

He cut home ties for ideological as much as geographical
reasons and believed he was fighting northern “tyranny” and
“fanaticism.” He was wounded on the Peninsula, rejoined before
Fredericksburg, and was captured at Gettysburg. He was im-
prisoned at Fort Delaware - “a respectable hog would have
turned up his nose in disgust at it” - and at Johnson’s Island
in Lake Erie. His family looked on his course as treason and allowed him to suffer near starvation. He was exchanged before Lee’s surrender and walked the 600 miles from Appomattox to Northwestern Alabama. After the war he read law in the office of General Edward O’Neal, before O’Neal became governor; he continued his studies in Baltimore, returned South, married a girl from Savannah, Tennessee, entered a law partnership with her father, and, in later life, became a distinguished lawyer and judge and president of the Bank of Savannah. He never deviated in his devotion to his adopted cause, and after the war his beliefs were never “reconstructed,” though he made it a policy not to discuss the conflict. Decades passed before he consented to a reconciliation with his family in the North.

This diary rarely descends to the humdrum nor does it undertake the flamboyant. With crisp, clear sentences, a sprightly style, and only an occasional drop to cliches, it describes battle actions grippingly. Of equal fascination are experiences behind the lines, including visits to the Confederate Congress. Editing and footnotes add little to the interest, relate at times to matters so well known as to be superfluous, and show some evidence of haste. The seasoned buffs are perhaps the only ones who will value this book, and they are reassured that Sharpsburg is the Confederate name for Antietam. When Patterson refers to Westminster, Maryland, which he reached as a prisoner of war from Gettysburg, the editor’s footnote explains that the town is Westminster, which is incorrect. Patterson spelled it properly in the first instance and should not have been bothered, but he did load in the excess i in a second mention. The footnotes, telling mostly what buffs already know, might have been reduced severely.

When Patterson mentions passing in rear of Pryor’s Brigade at Seven Pines, the editor makes this the occasion to say that Pryor was under Longstreet and that “Longstreet’s mistakes were the primary reason for the failure of the operation.” In addition to being extraneous, this disparagement of Longstreet is factually incorrect. Vacillating General Gustavus W. Smith raised quibbles about Longstreet, but Joseph E. Johnston mentioned him first among the commendations and described his operations as “worthy of the highest praise.” Longstreet’s conduct must have pleased President Davis and General Lee as well. They were on the field
at Seven Pines. Longstreet was shortly elevated to corps command. Patterson reflected the soldier's confidence in Longstreet: "We always like to see Longstreet about. . . . He always knows what he is about, and has won the name of the old 'war horse.' " This entry was made August 30, 1862. It shows that Lee did not impulsively coin the name for Longstreet on the field at Sharpsburg, September 17, 1862, as is often stated. Lee must have repeated what the army was already saying.

The book suffers for want of an index, for which some of the notes might have been sacrificed.

GLENN TUCKER

Fairview, North Carolina.


The sixth and concluding part of the Civil War Naval Chronology is an extremely valuable reference work. First, and most important, it contains an index for the whole chronology, which greatly facilitates pinpointing of desired information. A table listing all illustrations appearing in the six-part chronology and their sources is also included.

Admiral E. M. Eller and his capable staff, having provided this key to a vast storehouse of knowledge, decided to make another contribution by adding to Part VI a series of special studies. The first of these describes dramatic events in and around Washington. Early in the war, the capital was nearly engulfed by a Confederate tide, and the navy's role in the city's defense is told. We also learn of activities centering at the Washington Navy Yard. Of interest to students of Lincoln's assassination is the copy of a letter describing the identification of John Wilkes Booth's body aboard a warship anchored in the Anacostia River. Charles O. Paullin's article, "President Lincoln and the Navy," which appeared first in the American Historical Review in 1909 is reprinted. Many articles and several books have ap-
peared on the subject in the intervening years, yet none have yet equalled Paullin’s terse and moving story of the President as commander-in-chief of the navy during those troubled and vexing years.

The journal of Marine Private Charles Brothers, who served aboard Farragut’s flagship Hartford during the summer of 1864, gives spice to the Chronology. Such a diary, is certain to fire the interest of readers who care little for strategy and statistics. Journals kept by enlisted men aboard the ships are not common, and this one helps make history live. A heretofore unpublished eye-witness account of the battle of Mobile Bay by Harrie Webster should delight the reader. This account is especially timely in view of the recent rediscovery of Tecumseh and the dispute as to who will raise her - the government or private individuals. As we read of the second battle of Mobile Bay, we can fully appreciate Webster’s soul-stirring description of the loss of Tecumseh and her gallant crew.

Civil War buffs will be delighted with the decision to include in the Chronology a dictionary of “Confederate Forces Afloat.” This study, which appeared several years ago as an appendix to Volume II of the Dictionary of American Naval Fighting Ships, contains statistics and histories of over 500 Confederate boats and ships. Scattered at strategic points through the Chronology are four profusely illustrated chapters telling of the navy man’s life afloat, naval sheet music, blockade runners, and ships salvaged or memorialized. It is the first time that a number of these illustrations have appeared in a readily available publication.

The Naval History Division has produced a volume that is a must not only for the researcher and Civil War buff, but also for those with only a casual interest in naval history. Admiral Eller and his staff are to be commended for a well-planned and executed publication program, designed to familiarize the people of our country with the role of the Union and Confederate navies and development of the United States Navy.

EDWIN C. BEARSS

Arlington, Virginia
New Frontiers of the American Reconstruction. Edited by Harold M. Hyman. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1966. x, 156 pp. $4.95.)

Reconstruction lacks the heroic appeal of the Civil War. The problems involved in restoring the Union and granting rights to Afro-Americans produced neither outstanding politician nor great statesman. Although there will be no commemoration of Reconstruction, this period, perhaps the most misinterpreted of any in American history, will be clarified by scholars whose ideas will alter long-held concepts.

The conference held at the University of Illinois in 1965, concentrated on reappraisals of Reconstruction. Five noted historians spoke, and three others commented on the papers presented. The published record of the conference deserves reading and contemplation. Some facts and interpretations are new, others emphasize revision, and altogether they provide a stimulating contribution to Reconstruction literature.

In “Reconstruction and Political-Constitutional Institutions: The Popular Expression,” Professor Hyman states that constitutional concepts underlying Reconstruction were formed soon after the firing on Fort Sumter. Reconstruction planning, therefore, began early as individuals pondered the value of the Constitution, quickly found it adequate for a new order, and relied on it as a guide. He emphasizes the inactivity of the federal government for decades before the war and the change to positive government during the conflict. Hyman concludes that “Constitutional concepts and political attitudes analogous to those of the Civil War and Reconstruction scene are again current.” Alfred H. Kelly believes the radicals of 100 years ago chose constitutional legitimacy and finds a tremendous revival in the 1860s of old nationalist doctrines associated with Hamilton-Marshall interpretations of the Constitution.

John Hope Franklin reviews the historiography of the post-war period in “Reconstruction and the Negro.” He relies on his excellent summary of the era, Reconstruction: After the Civil War, to place the Negro in perspective. Franklin condenses instead of adding information and interpretation. In his comment, August Meier raises questions about what the Negro wanted and calls for studies of Negro acts and aspirations.
Harry Bernstein, “South America Looks at North American Reconstruction,” and W. L. Morton, “Canada and Reconstruction, 1863-79,” investigate the lasting impact of American Reconstruction on Latin America and Canada. Professor Bernstein finds that the assassination of Lincoln overshadowed emancipation and states that the anti-yanqui feeling and antimaterialism of Latin American intellectuals date from April 1865. The masses of Latin Americans had no noticeable awareness of events in the United States, and the educated class continued to rely on Europe for their roots, ideas, and prejudices. Yet the death note of American slavery doomed the institution in the New World. The example of freedom did not take hold in Brazil, for Brazilians were concerned with state rights, centralism, finance, and exploitation. When Latin Americans finally looked at Reconstruction, they did not like what they saw. Professor Morton points out that Canada did not exist in 1860; residents of the provinces saw two possible results of the Civil War. One was southern success resulting in a balance-of-power system in North America; the other was northern success resulting in one overpowering country. Canadians feared either possibility. Some by-products of Civil War and Reconstruction were the formation of a Canadian army, controversies arising from the Fenian agitation which led to the creation of a Dominion police force, and American demands for the annexation of Canada which stimulated Canadian unity. These articles on Latin America and Canada demonstrate the effects of the Civil War more than reaction to Reconstruction.

C. Vann Woodward, “Seeds of Failure in Radical Race Policy,” notes that Republican leaders agreed on who should reconstruct the South and govern the United States, but differed on the rights of the Negro. Since northern congressmen came from a race-conscious and segregated society devoted to white supremacy and Negro inferiority, their purposes were to protect white Northerners from an influx of freedmen. Those interpretations contravene Professor Woodward’s previous ideas, and, by his admission of error, he adds to his stature as a historian. The seeds of failure, he states, were the ambiguous and partisan motives in writing and enforcing Reconstruction laws. The laws, however, outlasted the ambiguity of their origin to make the “Second Reconstruction” of our century profoundly indebted
to the first. In his comment, Russel B. Nye believes the antebellum abolition movement to have been concerned more with slavery than with the slave. Before 1860 slavery was a moral problem; after the Civil War the freedman had become a political problem. Reform before the war was individualistic; after the conflict it became collective. Whereas antebellum reformers gradually coalesced on abolition, after the Civil War they dispersed their work to advocate many reforms, none of which possessed the grand quality of freedom.

Rembert W. Patrick

University of Georgia


The independence movement is a highpoint in the history of Mexico, ranking in interest and importance with the Spanish Conquest, La Reforma, and the Revolution of 1910. But scholarly treatment of the man and the revolt that initiated independence in 1810, has remained incomplete and inadequate in general, and in English, virtually non-existent. Therefore, this impressive study by Professor Hamill is much needed and most welcome. This work is neither a detailed biography of Father Hidalgo nor a minute description of his four-month military campaign. Rather it is a lucid and intelligent analysis of the origin, nature, and course of the famous revolt, viewed as an integral part of the society that spawned it between 1765 and 1811. The author provides a convincing explanation of how the movement developed, why it moved in the direction it did, and why it failed to realize its objectives.

The author begins with a general treatment of the impact of the Enlightenment and Napoleonic policies on the literate populace of colonial New Spain. In examining the response to these influences, he stresses the traditional antagonisms between the dominant Spanish classes, Gachupine and Criollo, against the backdrop of the sullen and occasionally tumultuous resentment
of the Indians and castes. But he adds a new dimension by making a further distinction between “European Criollo” and “American Criollo” and by emphasizing the importance of the unique character of the Bajio region, where the revolt originated, explored, and burned itself out. One of these “American Criollos” of the Bajio was Hidalgo, whose background, education, activities, associations, and aspirations are examined in depth, as are the economic innovations and intellectual ferment he introduced as parish priest in Dolores. The Queretaro conspiracy and the Dolores uprising of September 1810 are analyzed, and the subsequent events are interpreted against the highlights of the Alhondiga massacre, the battle of Monte de las Cruces, the retreat from Mexico City, the defeat at Aculco, the disaster at the bridge of Calderon, and the flight, betrayal, trial, and execution of the rebel leaders in 1811.

Hamill has done extensive research with primary sources in Mexico and the United States, including those in the Archivo General and the Latin American collection of the University of Texas, and has used a wide variety of published primary and secondary materials. The study is well documented, although the publisher’s practice of placing the footnotes in the back of the book will exasperate the reader. The two maps are most useful, and the text is written in a clear, readable style.

The interpretation of this explosive era is sound and convincing, but will undoubtedly prove controversial. As the symbolic father of Mexican independence, Hidalgo is that frustrating combination of man and myth, the object both of historical study and national adoration. Hamill’s portrayal of Hidalgo is an unimpassioned, scholarly appraisal and, as such, does not shrink from the conclusions pointed up by the evidence. I personally would agree with his arguments but expect that others will take issue on many points. He does not hesitate to point out Hidalgo’s failings and his responsibility for some of the worst excesses committed by his horde of undisciplined followers. He considers the failure to attack Mexico City more a symptom of defeat than a cause, and he believes that after his capture Hidalgo did abjure his revolt and regretted his role in it. In conclusion, he astutely observes that in reality there were two overlapping movements – one sparked by the Criollo desire to wrest political con-
trol from the Gachupine; the other ignited by the need of the Indian and caste multitude for social and economic amelioration. These two were antipathetic and their confused intermingling largely explains Hidalgo’s failure to achieve either.

ROBERT A. NAYLOR

_Fairleigh Dickinson University_
The Arthur W. Thompson Memorial Prize in Florida History for 1966-1967 was awarded to Dr. Jerrell Shofner, professor of history and assistant dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Texas Woman’s University, Denton, Texas. The presentation was made at the annual meeting of the Florida Historical Society in Key West by Dr. Samuel Proctor, editor of the *Florida Historical Quarterly*, and it was accepted for Dr. Shofner by Dr. Herbert J. Doherty, Jr., first vice-president of the Society. The prize is given annually for the most scholarly article appearing in the *Quarterly*. Dr. Shofner is a graduate of Florida State University where he was a NDEA fellow. He has taught at Georgia Southern College and Texas Woman’s University, and will be joining the faculty of the Department of Social Sciences, University of Florida, in September 1967. His articles have appeared in *Civil War History, Arkansas Historical Quarterly, Textile History Review,* and the *Florida Historical Quarterly*. His winning essay was a study of “Political Reconstruction in Florida” in the post-Civil War period. The Arthur W. Thompson Memorial Prize in Florida History was established by an endowment to the Florida Historical Society by Mrs. Arthur W. Thompson of Gainesville and Mr. and Mrs. Jacob Siegel of New York City. Professor Thompson was a member of the historical faculty of the University of Florida and wrote many books and articles dealing with Florida and Southern history.

P. K. YONGE LIBRARY OF FLORIDA HISTORY

The P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History has moved to its new quarters on the fourth floor of the Graduate Research Library on the University of Florida campus, Gainesville. At 10:30 a.m., October 7, 1967, the Library will mark its formal opening with a reception to which all the members of the Florida Historical Society are cordially invited to attend.
In May 1967, the Florida State Museum and the St. Johns County Board of Public Instruction inaugurated a new museum program. Supported by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, the multi-county traveling museum will visit schools in St. Johns, Baker, Flagler, Gilchrist, Levy, Marion, and Putnam counties. This first exhibit concerns Florida Indian prehistory. The project’s goal is to awaken children to the importance and reality of history, and Florida history was selected because of its pertinence to the environment of the children served by the project. The exhibits will be reinforced by audio-visual aids. A four-minute film on Indian foods is planned for one exhibit area, and a twenty-minute film, discussing the story of the Florida Indian and the scientific techniques responsible for this knowledge about him, will be shown in a tent attached to the trailer. Plans for the future include an expansion of services, and trailer exhibits on later phases of Florida history, biology, geology, and botany. All topics will relate to the Florida environment.

A valuable collection of Jacksonville and Florida historical material has been deposited in the Jacksonville University Library by the Jacksonville Historical Society. Col. O. Z. Tyler, society president, and Harold Clark, a society director, signed a contract with Jacksonville University which provides for storing the material at the university library. To stimulate interest in local history, the society has acquired books, pictures, papers, letters, and articles relating to the Jacksonville area. Miss Audrey Broward will be in charge of the archives.

A scholarly edition of the papers of Chief Justice John Marshall (1755-1835) is being prepared under the sponsorship of the College of William and Mary and the Institute of Early American History and Culture. While Marshall’s letters, political writings, diplomatic correspondence, and legal papers have long been of interest to American scholars, it was not until grants from the National Historical Publications Commission and the Commonwealth of Virginia were made to the sponsors in the summer of 1966 that this effort could begin in earnest. Because many of Marshall’s papers have been destroyed or scattered it is imperative that meticulous care be exercised in attempting to recover all that
remains of the manuscript and printed record. Information con-
cerning documents written by or addressed to John Marshall or
other records bearing directly upon his life should be directed to
Professor Stephen G. Kurtz, P. O. Box 220, Williamsburg,
Virginia 23185. The University of North Carolina Press will
publish the Papers of John Marshall.

The French Pavilion at the Montreal Expo '67 holds a
special attraction for persons interested in early North American
history and life. A display of 165 documents and objects relates
France's role in exploring and settling the New World from
Acadia to New Orleans, from the time of Jacques Cartier in
1543 to the end of the eighteenth century. Although a pre-
dominant portion of the exhibit, entitled "French-Canadian
Friendship, From Jacques Cartier to Chateaubriand," is geared to
Canada, visitors will find many items dealing with various ex-
peditions throughout the continent. They can go back in time to
as far as the sixteenth century with the magnificent Renaissance
globe from Rouen. Etched in copper, it shows what was known of
the American coast from the explorations of Verrazzano and
Cartier. Original maps and manuscripts depict the wildlife, vege-
tation, and inhabitants of the New World. Detailed illustrations
show various aspects of colonial life, from the style of architecture
to the type of fishing vessels used. The visitor's attention will be
drawn to a number of navigational instruments, as a mariner's
compass dated 1650. Expeditions south to Florida and down the
Mississippi are minutely documented in the exhibit with journals
and maps, including the account of the establishment of Fort
Caroline on the St. Johns River in 1562.

One of the important Florida business firms making valuable
contributions to the cause of local history is Jones Brothers Furni-
ture Company of Jacksonville. One floor of their store has been
redecorated with the depiction of history as its general theme.
Many pictures, including canvases of the Jacksonville fire of 1901
and an early race track, and insignia and gargoyles from razed
buildings are on display. The original portrait of William Augustus
Bowles, painted in England by Thomas Hardy about 1790, is
also displayed. The Jacksonville Historical Society assisted in
research and planning.

The University of Florida Library's Latin American collection,
now numbering some 90,000 volumes, is the outgrowth of con-
certed efforts to acquire Latin American materials that go back to
the establishment of the University’s Institute of Inter-American
Affairs (forerunner of the present Center for Latin American
Studies) in 1930. Because of Florida’s own Hispanic past, a
major impetus toward the development of strong Caribbean hold-
ings, in particular, was given by the establishment of the P. K.
Yonge Library of Florida History during the 1940’s. In 1952 the
University accepted the Farmington Plan, which meant an obliga-
tion to secure available book and research materials currently
published in the Greater and Lesser Antilles and the Guianas.
The Latin American holdings include several important special
collections acquired by gift and purchase. One of the earliest
major acquisitions was the Joseph B. Lockey Library, which in-
cludes the T. H. Reynolds and V. Dale Martin Collections. The
Maury A. Bromsen Medina Collection was a major addition to
library holdings in the fields of Latin American bibliography and
Chilean history, and the Henry Harrisse Collection gave the library
special strength in the historical literature of American discovery
and exploration. Concurrently with the building up of conven-
tional library materials, the University of Florida has developed sig-
nificant holdings of Latin American government documents, espe-
cially from the Caribbean and circum-Caribbean areas. A complete
file of the United States diplomatic and consular correspondence
relating to Latin America that has been microfilmed by the
National Archives is available for researchers. Supplementing its
current acquisition of Latin American newspapers, the library is
building up its back files of newspapers on microfilm for regions
of major research interest at the University. There are also some
manuscript holdings, particularly for Haiti, the British West
Indies, and Central America.

In March 1963 a dig was made at the site of Major Dade’s
battleground. This was the first time soil had been turned here
since June 1842 when the bodies of Dade and his command were
exhumed and taken to St. Augustine. During this dig 315 military
buttons were recovered from the grave of the ninety-six enlisted
men within the reconstruction of their redoubt. Since 1963 three
digs have been carried out in search of the grave of the eight
officers. The last try, made on May 26-27, 1967, simply identi-
fied, like the others, another series of spots where they were
definitely not buried. The guide on these occasions have been the descriptions by contemporaries and therein lies the problem - none of them are specific. Potter, for instance, says: “. . . outside the northeast angle of the work another grave received the bodies of 8 officers. . . .” Others describe it similarly but none say at precisely what angle from the north-east corner, nor how far from the barricade. Cooperating in the latest dig were N. E. “Bill” Miller, director of the Florida Board of Parks and Historic Memorials; William M. Goza, president of the Florida Historical Society and Mrs. Goza; Rolfe Schell, author of the recently published DeSoto Didn’t Land at Tampa and other works on Florida history; Frank Laumer, member of the Board of Editors of the Florida Historical Quarterly; and Valerie Laumer.
A leading Florida educator, author and scholar, Dr. Kathryn Abbey Hanna, died in her Winter Park home in April at the age of seventy-one. The wife of Dr. A. J. Hanna, first vice president of Rollins College, she came to Central Florida in 1941. Earlier she was head of the department of history, geography, and political science at Florida State College for Women, now Florida State University. She served eight years on the Florida State Library Board, six years as chairman, and ten years on the Florida Board of Parks and Historic Memorials. Former Governor LeRoy Collins named her to the board of the Florida Constitutional Advisory Commission in 1955, making her the only woman to serve on that board. She was a member of the Florida Civil War Quadricentennial Commission and secretary of the Florida Citizens Committee on Education. She was commissioned by the University of North Carolina Press to write *Florida, Land of Change*, a one-volume history of Florida. She also wrote three books in collaboration with her husband: *Lake Okeechobee, Wellspring of the Everglades*, one of the volumes in the American Lakes Series; *Florida’s Golden Sands*, a historical study of Florida’s East Coast; and *Confederate Exiles in Venezuela*. She was joint author with Cleo Rainwater of *Our Journey Through Florida*. Dr. Hanna served as president of the Southern Historical Association and contributed articles and book reviews to the *Florida Historical Quarterly*, the *Mississippi Valley Historical Quarterly*, the *Journal of Southern History*, and other scholarly publications.

**DUNCAN LAMONT CLINCH**

Duncan Lamont Clinch, the great grandson of General Duncan L. Clinch for whom Fort Clinch in Fernandina Beach was named, died on June 13, 1967, at his home in Chicago, Illinois. Born December 5, 1892, in Chicago, Mr. Clinch was in the railroad supply business. He was a patron of Florida historical
research, and gave grants for restoration of the Fort Clinch guard house, prison, and draw bridge. He also donated a cannon to the fort. He presented family papers and historical documents relating to his great grandfather to the P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History at the University of Florida. The biography of his great grandfather, *Aristocrat in Uniform: General Duncan L. Clinch*, was written by Rembert W. Patrick. He gave a grant to the Florida Historical Society to begin the society’s book publication program. A longtime member of the Florida Historical Society, he had served as a member of its board of directors. Mr. Clinch maintained a home at Miami Shores,
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