

Taft refused to commit to a promise of independence. Even as Roosevelt came to view the Philippines as a regional liability, the secretary of war spoke boldly and openly about retaining the islands “permanently” (83). The revised tariffs during his presidency, meanwhile, sought to tether the islands to the United States through trade (92). Taft later marshaled his reputation as “the nation’s expert on the Philippines” to criticize his Democratic successor’s moves toward gradual independence (chapter six). In all, Taft thoroughly deserved the moniker bestowed on him by William Jennings Bryan a decade earlier: when it came to Philippine independence, Taft was “the Great Postponer” (80).

Burns’s narrow focus on Taft allows him to mine through private correspondence and public speeches while allowing ample primary source quotations to immerse the reader in the period. But this focus may be a source of frustration to those engaged with post-colonial scholarship. Taft’s need to hear that Filipinos awaited his return with “love” (84) and his characterization of the Philippines as a “first love” (95), for instance, merit consideration of Taft as a gendered and raced figure with the power to frame himself as a neutral expert. One also wonders how the tensions of collaboration with educated and landed elites shaped the policy of attraction. Readers might also question Burns’s contention that Taft’s blueprint failed. Though the Philippines may not be an American dominion, the economic and labor migration policies of the colonial period bound the Philippines to the United States throughout the twentieth century—just perhaps not in a manner the Great Postponer would have understood.

Race, God, and Freedom in the Postemancipation South

Jemison, Elizabeth L. *Christian Citizens: Reading the Bible in Black and White in the Postemancipation South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2020. 242 pp. \$29.95 (paperback), ISBN 978-1469659695.

Malcolm B. Foley

Baylor University, Waco, TX, USA

doi:10.1017/S1537781421000505

Elizabeth Jemison’s *Christian Citizens* expertly shows how proslavery ideas morphed and were redeployed alongside Christian theology to justify white—and particularly male—supremacy in the decades after the Civil War. In considering the social, political, and theological struggles of Black and white Christians from 1863 to 1900, Jemison tells a story that historians of the period have heard before in varying and perhaps piecemeal ways, but her thesis is meticulously and brutally articulated. Jemison drives home the resilience of white supremacy, especially in white spaces, and shows how the ideological foundations of white supremacy were mobilized to justify and innovate forms of racial and political violence throughout the period.

Proceeding chronologically, Jemison's five chapters cover emancipation, Reconstruction, redemption, the reforming of Southern histories, and segregation. While the time spans of most of these topics are well-known, the work within these chapters elevates the experiences of Black and white men and women as they articulated and fought for their understandings of Christianity and citizenship. For Black men and women, as the terms changed, the battles changed as well. Contrary to the assumption of hegemonic whiteness that religious liberation and political freedom were distinct phenomena, during the period of emancipation, Black men and women hoped that the language of citizenship would be seen as deeply compatible with Christianity. After emancipation, the terms and stakes had shifted. White southerners doubled down on their understanding of Christian citizenship being reserved only for them. Jemison precisely narrates these thoughts and words while also clearly delineating the inherent incongruities and contradictions that went unnoticed by those who spoke them. For example, in considering arguments about white Christian citizenship in the 1870s, Jemison notes the absurdity of a population claiming to defend stability and order while simultaneously instigating the violent overthrow of democratically elected governments, as during Mississippi's 1875 local elections. Such contradictions were many, and Jemison does not miss a beat in exposing them. But such a story does not end in 1900, and the longevity of patriarchal proslavery ideology is signaled well in the conclusion.

But the scholar of lynching knows these things. What, then, is Jemison's addition to the public and scholarly discourse? Frankly, Jemison's significant contribution lies not only in the genealogy that she gives readers access to but also in the intentionality of her methods. Firstly, within this text, the reader is treated to an expert weaving of race, class, and gender—a necessary work considering the mobilization of race in late nineteenth-century America. While the plight of poor whites takes up little space in this book, Jemison outlines starkly and consistently the ways in which Southern elite white men and women mobilized their faith, resources, and social power to maintain hegemonic whiteness. Secondly, this book is a strong and coherent reminder that white supremacy is not dead. It is not even past. To the contrary, racial narratives are resilient precisely because of their social construction. What binds the chapters of *Christian Citizens* together is that racial paternalism rearticulates itself in different terms in different periods in order to maintain particular power structures. Northern white Christians are taken to task for their racial paternalism along with Southern white Christians, and Jemison pierces the narratives that they each formed to distinguish themselves from one another. Fundamentally, this is a helpful work in parsing the extent and diverse manifestations of white supremacy in this period. But it is Jemison's third major contribution that is the book's greatest asset.

At its core, this is a work of just scholarship, scholarship that seeks to holistically give its subjects their due. Such a commitment is clear in Jemison's work with sources. She notes the relative paucity of Black sources during this period, but she is nevertheless relentless in listening to each of her sources for the Black voices. It is the focus on Black men and women that enables Jemison to be so incisive and holistic in her analysis. She is doing the just work of the historian: allowing past actors to speak for themselves but also not allowing those actors' self-perception to be uncritically normative. To be more precise, the scarcity of Black sources could lead the historian to center whiteness and white actors purely because of the assumption that that is all the historian has access to. Jemison shatters that assumption. She listens and sees behind the words and bodies of white women and men to hear and see the voices and bodies of Black women and men. In so doing, she affirms that the lack of sources does not indicate that Black men and women were silent. Rather, they were silenced.

In the framing of an American political order, Black and white men and women had radically different assumptions. In recovering and interrogating those assumptions, Jemison reminds the reader that the work of silencing was not entirely successful.

James Garfield, Racial Justice, and Republican Party Politics

Arrington, Benjamin T. *The Last Lincoln Republican: The Presidential Election of 1880*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2020. 232 pp. \$39.95 (cloth), ISBN 978-0700629824.

Colin McConarty

Boston College, Boston, MA, USA

doi:10.1017/S1537781421000517

Benjamin T. Arrington's *The Last Lincoln Republican: The Presidential Election of 1880* offers an intriguing study of race and politics in the United States through an analysis of James A. Garfield and the 1880 presidential election. Arrington argues that "Garfield was the last true 'Lincoln Republican' to occupy the White House." Garfield, he writes, "represented the Republican Party's origins as a party dedicated to equal opportunities for all Americans" (4). The book, an engaging 186 pages, begins with an overview of the 1876 presidential election. It then offers a biographical look at Garfield, including two chapters on the 1880 Republican National Convention, and looks at the Democratic National Convention and that year's third-party candidates. The book closes with chapters on the 1880 election and Garfield's short-lived presidency. Arrington concludes that, when Garfield was assassinated in 1881, Lincoln's brand of equality-minded Republicanism was extinguished. "That vision," Arrington contends, "to some extent, died with him" (4).

Arrington's spotlight is on Garfield. His chief opponent in the 1880 election—the former U.S. general Winfield Scott Hancock—and the Democratic Party more generally play relatively minor roles in Arrington's narrative. While such a focus should, given the author's expertise, hardly come as a surprise, Arrington justifies his focus: Garfield was a more interesting and important political figure than Hancock. To make his argument, Arrington emphasizes Garfield's support for racial justice. The book addresses many issues that were central to U.S. politics in the 1876 and 1880 elections—such as civil service reform or monetary policy—but its true focus is clear. With an abundant use of Garfield's diary, Arrington convincingly proves that Garfield carried forward the Republican Party's founding commitment to racial justice into his presidency. Arrington's second chapter, for instance, demonstrates that opposition to slavery drew Garfield into politics in the 1850s and that the Ohioan remained an advocate of the rights of Black Americans as a U.S. congressman during and after the Civil War. The final two chapters