

second Reconstruction—was the Supreme Court prompted, in *U.S. v. Price* and *U.S. v. Guest*, to rule in favor of prosecuting citizens who had violated the Fourteenth Amendment rights of other citizens. No new laws were necessary; the Court simply changed its mind. The judiciary and the political branches, Kato argues, worked interdependently. The courts reacted to the political climate, accommodating federal inaction when there was a lack of political will and allowing for it when the public demanded it.

Kato's point that the federal government could have intervened even without the passage of anti-lynching legislation is an important one. But his explanation of why it did not act—that otherwise sympathetic political leaders capitulated to public sentiment or acted out of political pragmatism, that the judiciary responded to the politics of the time—is not as surprising, nor is this argument as novel as he claims. Its strength lies in the legal and political analysis Kato uses to support it. Potentially more compelling is the thesis alluded to in the title of the book. Kato posits that lynchings did not represent an “aberration” of American liberalism; rather, they “constitute the very basis by which American liberalism operates” (14). Constitutional anarchy did not simply allow for lynch mobs to act with impunity, but liberalism and racial violence, Kato claims, worked in unison. Unfortunately, this claim is never explicitly or convincingly developed. It is one thing to say that liberalism allowed for illiberal spaces; it is quite another to argue that liberalism depended on these “anomalous zones,” particularly as elsewhere Kato suggests that the liberal state expanded in the United States through federal efforts to protect African American rights.

This short book is a revised dissertation and still bears that imprint. Nevertheless, Kato has offered an intelligent and thorough explication of the legal basis through which the federal government could have intervened to stop lynching and why it did not.

LEFLOURIA, TALITHA L. *Chained in Silence: Black Women and Convict Labor in the New South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015. 280 pp. \$24.95 (paper), ISBN 978-1469630007.

REVIEWED BY BRANDI C. BRIMMER, Morgan State University
doi:10.1017/S1537781416000293

The publication of Talitha L. LeFlouria's *Chained in Silence: Black Women and Convict Labor in the New South* marks an important milestone in our understanding of how the work performed by incarcerated black females contributed to Georgia's New South identity. As the industrial headquarters of the New South, Georgia's significance cannot be understated. Black female convicts labored in many of the industries that proliferated in the aftermath of the Civil War: brickyards, mines, sawmills, railroads, and industrial farms. Drawing on a wide array of sources, including court records, clemency applications, prison registers, and monthly reports of punishments, LeFlouria brilliantly reconstructs imprisoned black women's lives and traces how private industry and the state ordered the lives and labors of this clandestine population of industrial workers.

Chained in Silence joins works by scholars such as L. Mara Dodge and Mary Curtin in understanding and analyzing the life and labors of black female prisoners, including the extent to which these inmates had to contend with sexual violation. Curtin showed that black female felons were forced to live with men, cultivated bonds with male inmates, and resisted brutal treatment while imprisoned. What sets LeFlouria's work apart is her ability to make explicit links between the rise of Georgia's convict lease system, the output of female prisoners, and the growth and expansion of the industrial South. In Alabama, imprisoned black female laborers overwhelmingly

performed gender-specific tasks. Not so in Georgia's system, where black female convicts participated in all facets of prison labor.¹

Black women convicts' cheap labor essentially allowed for whites to try out new business ventures without "the requisite investment." Georgia's new economy both moved black women into the prison system and capitalized on their labor once they were there. The devaluation of black women's labor in the postwar open market pushed black females into marginal public spaces and unsafe situations that oftentimes led to their arrest (15–16). Violent crimes, including murder, manslaughter, infanticide, attempted murder, poisoning, arson and assault accounted for 18 percent of all black female arrests (37). The inability to pay related fines oftentimes led to their imprisonment and subsequent leasing to an expanding group of industries (67). In railroad camps, female convicts graded surfaces for railroads, drove carts, and shoveled dirt just like their male counterparts (70). Whipping bosses unleashed naked and seminude floggings to maintain order. At the same time, LeFlouria demonstrates that in some cases "prison was an important conduit by which manufactured goods produced by black women made it to the open market" (108). Broom making, for example, was a gender exclusive enclave that built on training from previous industries (In the agricultural sector, "training" came from their enslavement). Though broom making did not translate into long-term employment, it did allow for deviation from the everyday monotonous labor tasks (107–8).

Presenting incarcerated black women as producers as well as objects of exploitation in the New South's economy, LeFlouria makes a nuanced and compelling case for the centrality of black women's labor "in the cultivation and expansion of the state prison farm" (141). Billed as a humanitarian alternative in Georgia's prison system, these entities functioned "like private lease camps, structured as a for profit-carceral entity" (141). Race and gender assumptions about black women's "hyperproductivity" led state officials to believe that black female prisoners were uniquely qualified for field labor (155). In state farms, black women served in many capacities, including labor substitutes for a handful of white female convicts who were exempted from back-breaking agricultural work (142). For a few, like the resilient Mattie Crawford, who was convicted of murder and profiled in the *Atlanta Constitution* in 1903, Georgia's state prison farm offered the opportunity to put her blacksmith skills to work and cultivate her reputation as a "trusty" inmate and—perhaps—gain preferential treatment and an improved livelihood (159). Yet, reminiscent of enslavement, gender convention did not protect black female prisoners. They worked from "sun up to sun down" and addressed the medical needs of unhealthy male prisoners. In all of these ways, black female convict labor contributed to the advancement of the Georgia's penal state.

Georgia's carceral state had its critics. Black and white women reformers forged separate crusades attacking Georgia's system of convict leasing. Mary Church Terrell mobilized black female activists from across the country to address the maltreatment of female prisoners in southern states, while Rebecca Felton publicly called for the extinction of the system in hopes of stopping the spread of race mixing (144–45). Free labor advocates argued that convict leasing disrupted the marketplace with cheap labor. These criticisms resulted in the public prison farm, which was believed to be more humane.

State lawmakers abolished Georgia's convict lease system in 1908. Buttressed by farmers interested in "good roads" to transport their goods directly to market (which allowed them to bypass the railways), the good road movement came into being at a time when an economic shift away from railroads, turpentine, and mill work left private firms on the hook for providing for their laborers but no sources of work for them to engage. The state used individuals convicted of misdemeanor crimes to pave the roads of Georgia; cities such as Savannah and Atlanta profited the most from this system. Between 1908 and 1936, some 2,100 black women worked the public roads on chain gangs thus contributing to the modernization of the New South. Thus, while the convict lease system benefited private enterprise, LeFlouria shows how state-run chain gangs also played an important role in building infrastructure.

How did women earn clemency from prison? Sadly, only when their bodies and minds became so broken down that they became an economic burden to Georgia's prison system. Pregnant women might be assigned to domestic work, but for the most part and as in the case of private convict leasing and state prison farms, black women on the chain gangs performed the same tasks as men and boys and were subject to the same punishments. We are left wondering what happened to the women when they returned to their communities. For the few women who did outlive the terms of their sentences, it was all but impossible to adapt the skills they acquired to the open market.

By centering her attention on black women's confinement, *Chained in Silence* adds a significant dimension to historians' understanding of the social, economic, and political forces at play in the convict lease system and black women's labor history. LeFlouria's unflinching analysis of the emotional toll and dysfunction caused by the constant threat of sexual exploitation will surely inspire important conversations about the extent to which female confinement in post-Civil War America amounted to "slavery by another name." With the publication of this important study, students and scholars alike have the opportunity to contemplate the relationship between industrial development and the long history of black women's incarceration in the United States.

NOTE

¹Mary Ellen Curtin, *Black Prisoners and Their World, Alabama, 1865–1900* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2000); L. Mara Dodge, "One Female Prisoner Is More Trouble than Twenty Males: Women Convicts in Illinois Prisons, 1835–1896," *Journal of Social History* 32:4 (Summer 1999): 907–30.

The World the Civil War Made. Edited by GREGORY P. DOWNS and KATE MASUR. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015. xii + 378 pp. \$29.95 (paper), ISBN 978-1-4696-2418-1.

REVIEWED BY MICHAEL S. GREEN, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
doi:10.1017/S153778141600030X

In a doctoral exam shortly after the publication of Eric Foner's *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863–1877*, a professor asked, "What are the beginning and ending dates of Reconstruction?" The student, hoping to make a good impression, replied that the logical ending date seemed to be 1877, although that obviously could be debated, but that the process of Reconstruction really had begun at the moment the Union was no longer intact, during the secession winter. The query and response speak to an important issue of American history: naming and determining eras and periods. Slavery was, as Abraham Lincoln said, "somehow" the cause of the Civil War, whether on moral or political or economic or legal or sociocultural or racially ideological grounds, and the Thirteenth Amendment ended the institution as it was then known. But the issue, in all of its permutations, remained unresolved—and remains so now, if the racial components of opposition to President Barack Obama and the existence of the hashtag #blacklivesmatter are any indication.

Gregory Downs and Kate Masur have brought together a group of scholars to assess different ways of considering, as the book is entitled, *The World the Civil War Made*. The book is a set of fourteen essays rooted in a conference on new directions of Reconstruction at the George and Ann Richards Center at Penn State. It is a tribute to the editors, the authors, and the other organizers of the conference that perhaps the major point of their discussion was whether what they call "the period formerly known as Reconstruction" actually existed—or, more to the point, whether thinking of the Civil War as flowing into Reconstruction and of the era as ending in 1877 is intellectually