

# The Story of Tom Jackson

*I RODE WITH STONEWALL. The War Experiences of the Youngest Member of Jackson's Staff. By Henry Kyd Douglas. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1940. 401 pp. \$3.*

Reviewed by ALLAN NEVINS

THIS is a book of rare quality. Its primary distinction lies in the intimacy, frankness, and discernment with which it treats Stonewall Jackson, substituting a series of graphic undress photographs for the usual portrait in oils. The great commander had become conventionalized. Everybody has thought of him as a grim Covenanter type, harsh with his subordinates, unrelenting in pursuit of duty, tight-lipped and rather intolerant, but pure of soul and gifted with a genius for war. This author, who knew Jackson from Bull Run to the tragic end at Appomattox, makes him human, likable, and understandable. What impressed young Douglas, riding, eating, sleeping, and fighting at Jackson's side, was not any erratic and abnormal traits—for he had none. It was first of all his intellectual power; next, the elevation and nobility of this quiet Christian gentleman; and finally, his general normality of temperament and tastes. He was sensible, liberal, kindly, and quick-witted. He was habitually stern only with himself, though his rigorous sense of public duty made him a strict disciplinarian. Never dogmatic or intolerant, he could relax most genially. His military feats were the result not of inspiration, but of prolonged meditation and forethought, and his "craziest" acts always turned out to have a wondrous sagacity behind them.

All this Henry Kyd Douglas, the young lawyer who impetuously left St. Louis in 1861 to fight for his native Virginia, not only says but illustrates in the best Boswellian style. His book is the fullest collection of anecdotes about Jackson and utterances by him that we possess. We see the general, in the exultation of victory after Front Royal, crying out to his men: "Very good! Now let's holler!" We see him taking a glass of sweetened whiskey-and-water, and confessing to D. H. Hill that "I am the fondest man of liquor in this army"—though he added that he almost never tasted drink. We see him climbing a persimmon-tree, and needing assistance to get down. We see him in one interval of leisure asking for a book, and when he got a sensational yellow-back novel (the only volume in camp) bravely ploughing through it to the end. We see him



From an old print.  
Stonewall Jackson

asleep on his horse, still plodding forward, as he and his army continue their forced march far into the night. We see him at table, selecting one or two dishes for his meal, and eating of them abundantly—sometimes berries, milk, and bread. We get glimpses of his unostentatious piety.

It is these humanizing touches which impart to the book its special value. Douglas tells us a good deal about Jackson's relations with other commanders—Ashby, A. P. Hill, Longstreet, Stuart, and of course Lee; but other writers can do this. He describes the great battles; but Gordon, Alexan-

der, and the other Confederate memoirists have done the same. Where he is unique is in showing Jackson out blackberrying, and beating a hasty retreat as the balls fall thickly, with the remark that he has always had a nervous dread of being wounded in the back; Jackson sucking a lemon as he watches the fighting at Cold Harbor; Jackson rebuked by an old farmer for leading his men across a plowed field, and taking the reprimand meekly; and Jackson in a Richmond church beset by admiring ladies. We learn how he dressed, slept, and walked; we are told that he rarely spoke of war to his staff, for he disliked talking shop.

When Jackson departs the scene—Douglas attended his funeral in Richmond, of which he gives a feeling description—the book declines in interest and value. Yet it contains a stirring account of Gettysburg, where the author was wounded in charging Culp's Hill, and some interesting pages on prison life at Johnson's Island in Lake Erie. Douglas was exchanged in time to fight with Early, and to be present at Appomattox. Immediately after the war, in 1866, he wrote his book, and then more than thirty years later rewrote it to soften its sectional acerbity. It is a remarkable bit of fortune which, after all these years, gives us such fresh and illuminating recollections of one of the greatest of American military leaders, and one of the most arresting of American personalities. We could better spare some heavy shelves of formal history than this.

## From Lincoln to FDR

*PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS FROM ABRAHAM LINCOLN TO FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT. By Cortez A. M. Ewing. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press. 1940. 218 pp. \$2.50.*

Reviewed by JOHN K. M. TIBBY

IF you are one of those persons who wish your college history textbooks had given you a little sharper picture of American voting history—in addition to the customary social and economic interpretations—you will find the picture in Mr. Ewing's new study.

Basing his distinctions primarily on the division of the Republican and Democratic vote, Mr. Ewing finds four major voting periods: (1) the reconstruction era from 1864 to 1876, when the Republicans won every Presidential test by substantial margins and when the Democrats (in 1872) once failed to nominate a Presidential candidate altogether; (2) the "fifty-fifty" period from 1880 to 1892, when the Democrats fought back to something like equal

party stature under Cleveland and Hancock; (3) the period of "rampant Republicanism" from 1896 to 1916, and (4) the period of landslide elections from 1920 to 1936. One of the most interesting sections of Mr. Ewing's book is his analysis of the voting characteristics of various sections of the country, which leaves the reader with the inescapable conclusion that sectional differences have been far more pronounced in American elections than is casually realized.

There is an appreciative study of the role of minor parties in American election history, and Mr. Ewing finds the chief function of these parties in testing the political market for ideas—generally progressive in tone—which major parties hesitate to approach.

Interesting charts and salty interpretation make Mr. Ewing's book more than a dry rehash of old political box scores and election headlines.

*John K. M. Tibby is on the staff of the American Institute of Public Opinion.*

# Will Appeasement Work for Us?

A REVIEW BY ELMER DAVIS

*THE ECONOMICS OF FORCE.* By Frank Munk. New York: George W. Stewart. 1940. 254 pp. \$2.

HERE is a book that all of our big-business appeasers ought to be compelled to read before they open their mouths again. For it seems probable that most of these gentry are merely stupid (though unfortunately not dumb); that they would not consciously and deliberately further their personal profit at the expense of the security of the nation—not, at any rate, if they could be made to realize that even their personal profit would not be served for long, that their thirty pieces of silver would be paid in blocked marks.

Dr. Munk, an exiled Czech economist now teaching at Reed College in Oregon, has seen the Nazi economic system in operation on its home grounds, and has also watched its systematic looting of his own country. He is a somewhat better authority on Nazi economics than those American business men who know nothing about it except that it promises them big profits as soon as England has been knocked out; and to the study of American economy he brings a fresh perception which often picks out points that have escaped the notice of the native. These two systems are (as Hitler candidly reminded us in his speech of December 10th) two opposing worlds, one or the other of which must break in pieces. Ours is the "economy of welfare" aiming at the creation of a higher standard of living (or, as Hitler prefers to put it, at the satisfaction of the egoism of the individual); and Dr. Munk reminds us that it has been pretty successful in accomplishing its purpose. But though capitalism has greatly increased the standard of living

one thing has increased even more rapidly—the expectation of an even higher standard of living. . . . Physical suffering and starvation during the recent economic crisis have probably been smaller than in past crises; on the other hand, psychological suffering has increased. . . . The real problem of the present epoch is not economic but psychological. Great masses of the population have discounted the promises of a rising standard of living, and become immediately disillusioned when the promises fail to materialize.

Accordingly they become easy victims for a fresh set of promises, which also

fail to materialize; but by that time there is a Gestapo to discourage manifestations of disillusionment.

For an economic system subject to governmental control is a means, not an end; "socialism is merely a tool, a mode of procedure; it can be given any meaning, and can be turned to any use decided upon by the government of the moment." The communist (the real communist at least, if perhaps not Mr. Stalin) thinks like the conservative capitalist in economic terms; but "the economics of force is based upon a new type of man, a man who places economic well being far below other values—namely, power, prestige, domination." German agents talk to American business men in the language American business men understand, but "the totalitarian powers are not interested in economic advantages as such. They are interested in economic advantages only as they can be made subservient to their political, and in the last analysis, military objectives."

What the Nazis have done to German economy has often been told, but seldom so lucidly as you will find it set down here. Communism, observes Dr. Munk, was founded by Marx in the days when ownership was still the same thing as control, and thanks to a mental lag has established government control of the national economy by "the rude and primitive method of expropriating property. Fascism has taken a lesson from the modern corporation. It has found out that it is

unnecessary to take away the fiction of ownership if you can get hold of the actual control." Thus the property owner who may still think of himself as a capitalist becomes actually "a non-salaried servant of the state." If our big-business appeasers want to know how that feels, let them hunt up Mr. Fritz Thyssen in his exile, and ask him.

And not merely big business, but little business which furnished so much of Hitler's popular support. Consumption is rationed in Nazi Germany not merely as a temporary military necessity, but because "a contented, well-fed, well-housed and well-amused population would be unwilling to fight wars of aggression. . . . It must be the aim of every totalitarian state to feed the population well enough to keep up its fighting and working strength, but not well enough to make it happy and complacent." And, with rationed consumption, "trade has lost most of its functions; all it does is to put over the counter the merchandise that the government has thought fit to sell, and collect the money for that same government."

To which our appeasers may (and indeed do) reply: what of it? What do we care what happened in Germany? It can't happen here. We can do a good business with Germany direct as soon as the British come to their senses and make peace; and in South America we can divide things up with the Germans; there is business enough for all. . . . Well, we know how the Germans have done business in the Balkans and were beginning to do it in South America—business directed to other than economic ends. It used to be the rule, Dr. Munk observes, that trade follows the flag; "under the economy of force the flag follows trade, or rather the trade is only the pretext that justifies the raising of the flag of revolution." See the recent history of any small nation in eastern Europe: "when these countries realized that it was not possible to make a distinction between economic and political relations in dealing with the system of force, it was too late. Germany had acquired an economic monopoly, which was soon to become a political monopoly as well." And if the totalitarians win, "South America is destined to become the Balkans of the western hemisphere." Economic pressure will

(Continued on page 16)



Dr. Frank Munk gives American business something to think about.