

A POEM BY LEWIS HAMILTON

WE DID OUR PART

We did our part.  
The equipment in which they died  
Was the most expensive we could buy.  
But they are dead,  
And we are alive.  
So we hired the best artists to design their memorials  
And chisel in stone the lists of their names,  
And reading them is like reading a telephone book  
In any American city. But we will not let them alone.  
We fire salutes to remind them how they died.

In lands their fathers left to build a new life--  
To assure prosperity and tranquility for their children.  
But the blood they sought to save drained  
And mingles now with their ancients  
In ground long accustomed to receiving the battle fallen.  
The land their fathers left has claimed them,  
And they become a part of it.

They are now immortal, and this is our envy.  
A thousand generations  
And their spirits will haunt the classrooms of a thousand cities  
Casting a spell on the school boy  
Who studies the battles they fought,  
And he will sigh that he did not live in the time of heroes.

The equipment in which they died  
Was the most expensive we could buy.  
We hired the best artists and built their memorials.  
We did our part.

Glenn Wilcox. Early American Folk Hymns. Pacific, Missouri: Mel Bay Publications, 1996.

Early American Folk Hymns is a delightful mating of folk tunes with hymn poems, chiefly of known authorship. Dr. Glenn Wilcox, editor of this journal from its inception, published widely on American hymnody for better than forty years, chiefly in scholarly journals and books. Only months before his death in November, 1995, one of the most popular publishers of collections of American music began systematically to issue anthologies from Dr. Wilcox's lifetime of collecting. Early American Christmas Music was reviewed here in the 1996 commemorative issue dedicated to Dr. Wilcox.

This newest volume, then, is the second in a series of book-length manuscripts for which the Bay Company had signed before the author's death. Dr. Wilcox has supplied vocal and keyboard harmony for fifty-five songs that are principally gapped scale. While some of these hymn poems date from the Elizabethan Age, most come from the past two centuries--much as their tunes do.

The provenance of many of the tunes is popular secular music. The reader may recall that "O Happy Day" derives from the tune of the early nineteenth English drinking song "How Dry I Am" or that "The Lily of the Valley" shares the same Old English air with "The Little Old Sod Shanty" and several other American folksongs.

Musicologist Wilcox ascribes to the "Great Awakening" many of these secular-sacred weddings of worldly tunes to evangelical song poems. John Wesley, evangelizing along the southeastern seaboard of this country, employed his brother Charles as the revival movement's first song leader-music director. As many of their successors have, the Wesleys saw to it that the devil did not have all the good tunes. (Five Charles Wesley hymn poems are here.) Wave after wave of revivalism that required "doctrinally sound" verses begged for camp meeting fervor and improvisation of tune settings. Secular tunes were turned to religious purposes in shotgun weddings of the profane to the sacred. Poetic licence made even mismatches "legal." Earlier Calvinists from France and England expatriated to Switzerland and Holland had left high church "chunes" and formal liturgy for greater emotional abandonment in worship.

Around 180 years ago a few writers-composers began as compilers and publishers to issue their hard-cover oblong songbooks: William Walker's Southern Harmony (1854); Benjamin F. White and E. J. King's The Sacred Harp (1860); Funk, Ruebush-Kieffer, their Kentucky Harmony (1816) et al-- all in shape notes. These geometrically individualized notes, as opposed to round notes, helped the otherwise musically illiterate to read musical notation chiefly through itinerant singing school teachers' classes on the frontier. Scorned by musical sophisticates, these singing school-distributed compilations prepared the way for commercial gospel music "convention books" in the last third of the nineteenth century.

Writes Dr. Wilcox on this particularly German-American offspring of revivalism and syncopation: "'Saints Bound for Heaven'...Both lyrics and air have indications of camp meeting origin, and if performed slightly uptempo, one can hear elements of the coming ragtime-influenced gospel song."

Dr. Wilcox has included "some alterations in tune for modern use, i.e...[keys changed to] a more singable range...new harmonizations and accompaniments...[and] some metrical alignments of poetic and musical accents."

This volume not only indexes first lines, writers and composers and table of contents, but also offers a two-page bibliography, eight pages of the author's notes and two pages of introduction.

Whether the singer grew up with Dr. Wilcox fa-sol-la-ing from the Southern Harmony at Benton, Kentucky's Big Singin' or with the reviewer, cutting his teeth on the family's 1871 Temple Star in the Missouri Ozarks, here in Early American Folk Hymns is God's plenty: the familiar valedictories "The Parting Hand" and "Never Part Again," almost as well-used as the later "God Be With You ('Till We Meet Again)"; Abraham Lincoln's favorite hymn, "I Am Bound for the Promised Land" ("On Jordan's Stormy Banks I Stand") carried by William Walker's unique melody in "Sweet Prospect," "[There Is a] Happy Land"; the metrics and some of the diction of Woodward's "The Old Oaken Bucket" in "Family Bible"; "How Tedious and Tasteless" in John Newton's "Green Fields"; Robert Robinson's "Come Thou Fount" as "Olney" in Chapin's lesser known musical setting.

This is a volume equally in place at home, in the school or public library. The late editor of the Journal of this Society thanks Mrs. Helen Wilcox, for "scholarly work and achievements...[as] my co-laborer in this and other projects....Her Knowledge, patience, and skill have expedited and contributed immeasurably to this compilation."

Consumers of this feast of folk hymns will also be grateful.

Walter D. Haden  
Department of English  
The University of Tennessee at Martin

Larry J. Daniel. Shiloh: The Battle That Changed the Civil War. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997, 430 pp.

Civil War historians and buffs often overlook Shiloh, focusing more attention on larger and seemingly more important battles in the Civil War's eastern theater. But as Larry Daniel demonstrates in his fine new study, Shiloh: The Battle That Changed the Civil War, this engagement in southwestern Tennessee had great political and military significance. The two-day battle in early April 1862 marked dramatic turning points for major Civil War figures like Ulysses S. Grant, William T. Sherman, P.G.T. Beauregard and Braxton Bragg. It cost the life of the controversial Albert Sidney Johnston and contributed to the Confederacy's loss of the Mississippi and the Tennessee River Valley. It was a battle, Daniel argues, the Confederacy could ill afford to lose, but lose they did.

Other historians have examined Shiloh before, but Daniel is the first to place the battle in its broadest military and political context. He begins his book by shifting from Richmond to Washington, D.C., reminding readers of larger political issues that directly affected the battle's strategy, leaders and outcome. Nine days after Shiloh the Confederacy initiated its first draft. And when a wave of criticism rose against U.S. Grant, Abraham Lincoln pointed to the general's performance at Shiloh and Fort Donelson to declare: "I can't spare this man; He fights" (quoted on p. 308).

Daniel has his own interpretations to offer that differ from those of other students of the battle. He argues that there were eight Confederate attacks made at the Hornet's Nest, not eleven or fourteen; that Ruggle's massive artillery barrage did not have as great an effect on the Union line as is often thought, and that perhaps Lew Wallace's late arrival on the battlefield on April 6 was due to his misguided belief that he could take a different route and dramatically destroy the Confederate army. Daniel disagrees with those who argue that the Confederates could have amassed a successful final attack late on April 6; nor does he believe that the loss of Johnston weakened the South's chances for victory.

Daniel is critical of most of Shiloh's major players. He blasts Grant for his post-battle exaggerations and "half-truths," Sherman for his refusal to admit that he was caught entirely by surprise on April 6; Johnston for his irresponsibility, insecurities and personal recklessness; Beauregard for his egotism, faulty battle plan and loss of nerve; and Bragg for his stubborn faith in costly frontal attacks. He faults Confederate leaders for wasting the element of surprise, over-committing troops on the left, and losing precious time and men in the fight for the Hornet's Nest. He blames the petty jealousies and tender egos of Federal commanders for seriously affecting troop movement and coordination. But Daniel also praises Grant and Sherman for their poise and courage on the battlefield, and Grant's

determination to counterattack on April 7. He credits the ailing Beauregard for ensuring a safe evacuation of Confederate troops from Columbus, Kentucky, and successfully concentrating Southern forces at Corinth. Only Albert Sidney Johnston emerges from the book with little or no praise from the author.

Although Daniel primarily focuses on generals, he does intersperse his narrative with the words of privates and small unit commanders. He concludes that the lesser known soldiers were Shiloh's heroes; men like Illinois Captain Allen Waterhouse, who fought gallantly to protect his battery; Colonel Henry Allen, who personally led his Louisiana regiment within fifty feet of the Union line; and Colonel David Stuart, who struggled to hold the extreme left of the Union line.

Shiloh's 23,000 casualties surpassed American losses in all previous wars combined, including the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812 and the Mexican War. Northerners and Southerners were stunned. Yet, as Larry Daniel writes: "Shiloh would soon be eclipsed by more horrific battles, but at Shiloh the Nation had taken its first gasp" (p. 317). Daniel's well-written, solidly researched and dramatic narrative shows us why.

Lesley J. Gordon  
Murray State University

David Herbert Donald. Lincoln. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995. \$35.00

To many Abraham Lincoln followers, the assassinated President has become almost a saint. To some historians the "Lincoln Cult" has become "almost an American religion." Roy P. Basler, who has compiled the Lincoln papers, believes that as time passes, Lincoln "becomes more and more a national mythos. The certainty with which this mythos will continue to live depends on how much Lincoln is able to stand reinterpretation."

Even though this prediction was made over fifty years ago, the evidence indicates that the Lincoln legend will always be with us. Basler's conclusion is more than supported by David H. Donald's Lincoln, which is reaching a wide reading audience and has received superlative reviews by many historians such as James M. McPherson.

In writing this book, Donald states that he is not writing a general history of the United States during the mid-nineteenth century but strictly a history of Lincoln himself, with most of it concentrated on the war years, years upon which his greatness depends. In focusing closely on what Lincoln knew, "when he knew it, and why he made his decisions, I have, I think, produced a portrait rather different from that of other biographers." Donald gives attention to Lincoln's high ambitions, Lincoln's early years, his brain-numbing law practice, his tempestuous married life, and his many defeats in politics and other endeavors. Donald points out how often chance, or accident, played a determining role in Lincoln's life. He emphasizes Lincoln's enormous capacity for growth. More importantly, this biography highlights a basic trait of character evident throughout Lincoln's life--the essential passivity of his nature. Lincoln reacted to events rather than initiating them. From Lincoln's earliest days, he believed that his destiny was controlled by some Higher Power, i.e., if something happened, it was supposed to happen.

Lincoln's essential passivity may be questioned. For example, in his Freeport, Illinois debate with Senator Stephen A. Douglas, he made Douglas admit that the Dred Scott decision of 1857 meant nothing in practice--that slavery could be kept out of any territory. This went a long way toward splitting the Democratic Party along North-South lines. This is not a reaction to something Douglas said. Lincoln was initiating something that aided greatly in his nomination for the Presidency by the Republican Party in 1860.

Another example of Lincoln the activist is his position on the slavery question. In 1861 Lincoln attempted to protect the Union by assuring the South that he had no intention of ending slavery. Even after eleven Southern states left the Union, Lincoln continued to talk this way to loyal border states that were slave-holding. He needed to keep Missouri, Kentucky, and Maryland in the Union.

However, after the Battle of Antietam, Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation. He was initiating action to end a system of labor that had existed since the earliest Colonial period. This position was a part of his radical activism.

Donald also maintains that Lincoln straddled the issue of racial equality and favored colonization as the remedy for race relations in this country. He favored colonization as Henry Clay did, but on racial equality Lincoln minced few words. For example, in his debates with Senator Douglas, Lincoln flatly stated that he favored the white race as the superior race--that he did not favor social or political equality for the black man. Also in a White House meeting in August of 1862, Lincoln told a group of free black leaders that he favored free blacks' colonizing outside the United States. Going further, he told them that there was not a single black man that was equal to a single white man in this country.

Donald's Lincoln contains a wealth of detail on every aspect of Lincoln's life and especially on the four years and one month of his administration. It took great ability to keep the diverse elements of the North together during the greatest trial through which this nation has gone. Lincoln was a superb Commander-in-Chief, and he did lead the Union to victory. This work is highly recommended for all libraries and especially to Lincoln and Civil War scholars.

Dr. Lonnie Maness  
The Department of History and Political Science  
The University of Tennessee at Martin

John J. Robinson. Born In Blood: The Lost Secrets of Freemasonry. New York: M. Evans and Company, 1989, 376 pp.

The recent revival of anti-Masonic literature, telecasts and investigations has stirred up interest in this centuries-old fraternity. Who are these over four-million men who are called Freemasons? Are they a religious sect? Why the secrecy of their meetings? Most books and articles written to answer these questions have been biased pro or con, depending upon the membership status of the writer. This book offers a more balanced view and new theories about the origin and traditions of the lodges.

When Mr. Robinson researched the subject and wrote this work, he was not a Mason. He became a member before his death in September, 1993, after having been favorably impressed by the history of the Freemasons' fight for freedom of conscience. He had not set out to write about them at all, but in his research on the Wat Tyler Rebellion or Peasants' Revolt of 1381, he found references to a "Great Society" which seemed to underlie the uprising. Further study convinced him that this group was comprised of forerunners of the Masonic lodges.

The fourteenth century was a time of unbelievable hardship for the common people of Europe. The Bubonic Plague destroyed thirty-five to forty percent of the population. Corruption in church and state was raging as popes and kings demanded more taxes to support their wars.

The Knights Templars order of soldier-monks, organized during the Crusades, had become wealthy and powerful through numerous large donations and by providing banking and security in the transfer of funds. In fact, they introduced paper money. King Phillip IV of France had borrowed large sums from the Templars which he did not care to repay. He conspired with Pope Clement V to have the Templars arrested and their vast properties confiscated.

On Friday, October 13, 1307, some 15,000 of the Templars were arrested, chained in dungeons and cruelly tortured until most of them confessed heresy and other crimes and perversions. Later, when Grand Master Jaques DeMolay recanted his confession and pleaded the innocence of the order, he was burned at the stake.

Pope Clement ordered King Edward II of England to arrest the English Templars, but the English monarch "drug his feet" for three months, and by the time of the arrests in early 1308, there were few Templars to be found. They had gone "underground."

Robinson believed that these underground Templars were to emerge some 400 years later in 1717 as the lodges of Freemasonry. In the meantime, they had devised secret words, phrases, and signs and symbols for self-preservation and for the protection of other fugitives from the unspeakable tortures which awaited anyone who dared to differ with pope or king.



Much current criticism of Freemasonry has to do with the "Bloody Oaths" which the initiates are required to take. The author points out that such extreme pledges were necessary in that terrible period of time because any betrayal would have resulted in those gory penalties having been executed, not by the lodge, but by those officials who had dissenters beheaded, drawn and quartered, or burned at the stake.

To other moderns who accuse the Masons of being a cult, the author correctly states that Masonry teaches no plan of salvation, but encourages each member to worship God according to his own conscience. Belief in the Supreme Being has always been a prerequisite for membership as the Templars, or early Masons, would not entrust their safety to a non-believer.

As evidence for this theory of the origin of Freemasonry, Robinson cited many Masonic words and phrases not used in modern English but which would have been spoken and understood by the French-speaking Templars of the fourteenth century. He explained that the commonly accepted account of Freemasonry's emergence from the stonemasons' guilds may have been a cover story developed to hide their true origin.

Robinson contended that during their underground period, the Freemasons provided safe havens and support for many dissenters who were working toward religious freedom and that they "surfaced" in 1717 shortly after England was finally governed by a parliament instead of a king.

The author calls attention to the many early American patriots who were Freemasons and gives them credit for helping to establish freedom of religion in our country. He reminds that the lodges have usually been outlawed by dictators, and that we are indebted to them for their stand for freedom and tolerance. He suggests that the Masons could do much better than they have of informing the public about their philosophy and their charities. He envisions the Freemasons as being instrumental in promoting peace in the Middle East with their concept of a completed or restored Solomon's Temple as a place of worship for Christian, Jew and Moslem.

Joe Bone  
Rutherford, Tennessee

Ronald L. Barlett and James B. Steele. America: Who Stole the Dream? Kansas City, Missouri: Andrews & McNeel, 1996.

In a brief and articulate manner, the authors of America: Who Stole the Dream? have successfully "debunked" the prevalent social-political ideology of "free trade, free markets, deregulation, less government, lower taxes, and open borders" that is promoted by the American economic elite, in general accord with the political leadership and the mass media of America. Here is a strong indictment of this ideology in theory and practice from the perspective of the American middle-class--or the working-class American majority--whose incomes and general economic well-being have been in decline since the early 1970s. The authors illustrate how these policies also work to create fewer "have-mores" than "have-lesses." The rich are getting richer and the poor, as well as the rest of the population, are getting poorer. This erosion of income is caused by the elitist and class policies that are based on a morally faulty ideology.

The authors point out these policies in areas of trade, immigration, deindustrialization, regulation and retraining. Because of the undermining of the economic wellbeing of the American middle-class, many social problems have accelerated in such diverse areas as race relations, corruption of the political process, and dissolution of families. In brief, the quality of life for most Americans has worsened:

First, "Free Trade" has forced American workers to compete with low-paid Third World workers for employment. This policy has encouraged the export of many manufacturing jobs overseas. Many workers have been forced into low-paying service jobs. Second, deregulation of business has permitted many takeovers, buyouts, and mergers which promote monopoly and result in job losses for many Americans: blue-collar, white-collar, and professional. Third, lower taxes on the wealthy and the multinational corporations have created an ever-widening gap between the rich and the rest of American society. Fourth, the economic elite have used the shrinking employment picture to undermine and destroy labor unions, dismantle worker health and safety laws, and generally reduce wages for workers. Fifth, "open borders" immigration policies have increased and encouraged serious competition for jobs in an already shrinking pool of available employment.

Sixth, job retraining programs designed to help workers displaced by these policies are generally useless or have very limited success. The jobs that they are "retained" for generally are lower paying than the employment lost. Seventh, these economic policies have reduced the funding available to address America's many social needs in a humane fashion. Private charities cannot alone be expected to fill the gap created by these policies.

The authors give excellent descriptions of how these policies have been implemented over the past thirty-plus years. Barlett and Steele describe the clever and thoroughly dishonest way in which the elite's lobbyists and much of the mass media have framed issues falsely in an either-or method as these proponents have sought to put their policies into place in American society. For example, one can have an overburdening system of government regulation of business and industry, or an essentially unregulated one, but no middle ground on the issue. The same cynical method has been used repeatedly in pushing this ideology's political and economic agenda on to American society.

The financial means by which these programs have been forced through the U.S. Congress and U.S. Senate have greatly undermined the nation's representative democratic form of government by means of large campaign donations and high-powered lobbying--even as this elite has sought to enrich themselves and increase their power.

The final chapter of America: Who Stole the Dream? admits there is economic growth in America, but because of the concentrated nature of much of this wealth, such prosperity means little to most American. The authors suggest a number of reforms to help make America more equitable and economically democratic. These include reform in trade immigration, global wages, taxes and trade regulation. In addition, Social Security and Medicare benefits should be limited to the lower and middle classes, not the wealthy who are financially capable of paying their own medical bills and certainly need no social security payments. Retraining programs should actually assist displaced workers. Executive salaries of large corporations should not be allowed to write off excessively high salaries as deductions. Government statistics should honestly reflect the economic picture for all people. The current system does not do so. Finally, regulations on congressional lobbying and in campaign financing are desperately needed if our government is truly to represent the interest of all the people.

The authors conclude their book by comparing America today with the America of the 1890s. Will America again take the route of reform to make government the servant of all the people, or will the present socially regressive trends continue and government remain the servant of the elite used to control and dominate the lives of the rest of the American people?

America: Who Stole the Dream? is written in popular language from the perspective of the American working-class majority. I greatly appreciated the author's use of personal stories of Americans whose economic dreams have been stolen by economic policies of the past thirty years. A book like this one clearly does not get the attention it deserves. This book illustrates what class oppression is about. I feel it is time to start looking at Liberation theology in the light of classism--oppression based on economic-social class--in American society. Barlett and Steele's book is a good place to begin that consideration.

Robert Hayes  
Memphis, Tennessee