In This Issue

DEREK R. EVERETT offers a full account of the “border war” between Iowa and Missouri from 1839 to 1849, expanding the focus beyond the usual treatment of the laughable events of the “Honey War” in 1839 to illustrate the succession of events that led up to that conflict, its connection to broader movements in regional and national history, and the legal and social consequences of the controversy.

Derek R. Everett teaches history at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

NOAH LAWRENCE tells the story of Edna Griffin and her struggle to desegregate the Katz Drug Store in Des Moines in 1948. His account reveals that Griffin was a radical black activist who was outspoken throughout her life about the need for economic and racial justice, yet her legal strategy during the trial constructed her as a “respectable” middle-class mother rather than as a firebrand activist.

Noah Lawrence is a high school history teacher at Hinsdale Central High School in Hinsdale, Illinois.

Front Cover

Protesters picket outside Katz Drug Store in Des Moines in 1948. Many of the signs connect the struggle for desegregation to the fight against Nazi Germany during World War II. For more on the struggle for desegregation in Des Moines, see Noah Lawrence’s article in this issue. This photograph, submitted as evidence in the Katz trial and folded into the abstract, was provided courtesy of the University of Iowa Law Library, Iowa City. (For a full citation of the abstract, see the first footnote in Lawrence’s article.)

Editorial Consultants

Rebecca Conard, Middle Tennessee State University
Kathleen Neils Conzen, University of Chicago
William Cronon, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Robert R. Dykstra, State University of New York at Albany

R. David Edmunds, University of Texas at Dallas
H. Roger Grant, Clemson University
William C. Pratt, University of Nebraska at Omaha
Glenda Riley, Ball State University
Malcolm J. Rohrbough, University of Iowa
Dorothy Schwieder, Iowa State University
The Annals of Iowa
Third Series, Vol. 67, No. 4
Fall 2008
Marvin Bergman, editor

Contents

269  To Shed Our Blood for Our Beloved Territory: The Iowa-Missouri Borderland
     Derek R. Everett

298  “Since it is my right, I would like to have it”: Edna Griffin and the Katz Drug Store
     Desegregation Movement
     Noah Lawrence

331  Book Reviews and Notices

367  New on the Shelves

371  Index
Book Reviews and Notices

331 Mary Bennett, ET AL., Meskwaki History, by William Green


336 Jay H. Buckley, William Clark, Indian Diplomat, by David Walker

338 Gregory M. Franzwa, The Mormon Trail Revisited
by Loren N. Horton

339 Linzee Kull McCray and Thomas Langdon, Facing East and Facing West: Iowa's Old Capitol Museum, by Wesley I. Shank

340 Robert W. Frizzell, Independent Immigrants: A Settlement of Hanoverian Germans in Western Missouri, by Kristen L. Anderson

341 Jonathan K. Cooper-Wiele, Skim Milk Yankees Fighting: The Battle of Athens Missouri, August 5, 1861, by Kenneth L. Lyftogt

342 John Koblas, Jesse James in Iowa, by Peter Hoehnle

343 Annette Atkins, Creating Minnesota: A History from the Inside Out, by Patrick Nunnally

345 Kate Roberts, Minnesota 150: The People, Places, and Things that Shape Our State, by Kristin Elmquist

346 Richard S. Prosser, Rails to the North Star: A Minnesota Railroad Atlas, by Kevin Byrne

347 John D. Bessler, Legacy of Violence: Lynch Mobs and Executions in Minnesota, by Mark R. Ellis

348 Jeffrey Brandon Morris, Establishing Justice in Middle America: A History of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, by James W. Hewitt

350 David O. Stowell, ed., The Great Strikes of 1877, by Colin J. Davis


355 Barbara W. Sommer, Hard Work and a Good Deal: The Civilian Conservation Corps in Minnesota
by Gregg R. Narber

359 Shelton Stromquist, ed., Labor's Cold War: Local Politics in a Global Context, by Martin Halpern

361 James H. Omvig, The Blindness Revolution: Jernigan in His Own Words, by Douglas C. Baynton

363 Jon E. Taylor, A President, a Church and Trails West: Competing Histories in Independence, Missouri, by Thomas M. Spencer

365 J. Myrick Howard, Buying Time for Heritage: How to Save an Endangered Historic Property, by Paula A. Mohr
To Shed Our Blood for Our Beloved Territory: The Iowa-Missouri Borderland

DEREK R. EVERETT

IN THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY Iowa and Missouri engaged in a “border war” with potentially dangerous consequences. For several decades in the early 1800s, the divide between the two trans-Mississippi states evolved through a process of legal wrangling, political posturing, and even the threat of violence. One Iowan remembered a willingness “to shed our blood for our beloved Territory,” a sentiment shared by those south of the line.1

The feud between Iowa and Missouri has attracted the attention of several scholars over the years.2 More often than not seen as little more than an amusing anecdote, in reality the struggle over the Iowa-Missouri line represented something far more important. This internal division in the American West illustrated the value states placed on their boundaries, and the determination


of people living within them to protect both the property they defined and the identity they provided. This article extends earlier interpretations beyond a focus on the “Honey War” of late 1839 to illustrate the succession of events that led up to that conflict, its connection to broader movements in regional and national history, and the legal and social consequences of the controversy.

One of the most hotly contested border regions in American history, the land later split into Iowa and Missouri came to the United States with the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. Many years passed before a serious dispute developed in the region. The line separating these two political communities emerged first as a boundary for Indian territory in 1808, and became Missouri’s northern border 13 years later. Several contradictory surveys of the line led to disputes over local authority, exacerbated by the end of the 1830s as more settlers established homes and communities in the contested zone. For many, the disputes represented the antebellum debate between states’ rights and federal power. By late 1839 the struggle between Iowa and Missouri erupted into a conflict characterized by two distinct phases. The first, punctuated by bombastic statements from politicians on both sides, was met with amusement by those living in the disputed region. But when this spat threatened to turn violent, the conflict entered its second phase, as borderland residents eventually took matters into their own hands and negotiated a settlement. Although tensions eased along the dividing line as the 1840s began, another decade would pass before the dispute saw a final resolution. Through it all, both Missourians and Iowans demonstrated a devotion to their boundary, which provided an invisible barrier against their competitors on the other side.

FEDERAL INTEREST in the Louisiana Purchase began shortly after the ink dried on the 1803 treaty. The Jefferson administration authorized several exploratory parties in the years that followed, most famously the one led by Meriwether Lewis and William Clark along the Missouri and Columbia rivers. Lewis and Clark’s fame may have “kidnapped” attention to the purchase, but several other teams scouted the Red and Arkansas
river valleys at the same time. Perhaps the least well-known voyage was led by Captain Zebulon M. Pike in late 1805 to determine the source of the Mississippi River. Although numerous expeditions from various nations had explored the upper Mississippi since the seventeenth century, and Indian agents and traders had already moved into the area, federal authorities wanted a more complete survey. In August 1805 Pike and about 20 soldiers and naturalists ascended the river from St. Louis. Their journey led past the future Missouri-Iowa borderland, in particular a feature in the Mississippi that Pike called “the rapids De Moyen,” which would feature prominently in the dispute between the two political communities. The 11-mile-long stretch of rapids, located above the confluence of the Mississippi and Des Moines rivers, complicated travel with a plethora of shoals. For Pike’s company, the rapids marked the start of the unknown, for “although no soul on board had passed them, we commenced ascending them, immediately.”

Three years after Pike and his crew navigated the Des Moines rapids, and only five years after the United States took legal possession of Louisiana, the division between the future states of Missouri and Iowa began to take shape. In 1808 Meriwether Lewis, by then Missouri’s territorial governor, treated with the Osage, a powerful American Indian group on the western frontier, to stabilize relations between the natives and the newcomers in his charge. Governor Lewis explained his desire for the meeting: “The establishment of a boundary has long been desirable, and the want of one, settled by treaty, has never ceased to create doubts, and sometimes embarrassments, of the most serious nature, in our courts of justice.” The Osage agreed to withdraw from all land between the Missouri and Arkansas

4. Zebulon M. Pike, An Account of Expeditions to the Sources of the Mississippi, and through the Western Parts of Louisiana . . . (Philadelphia, 1810), 4. The French explorer Père Jacques Marquette had christened the spot in 1673 by corrupting the name the Illinois used for their settlement near there. See The History of Van Buren County, Iowa (Chicago, 1878), 428–29, 4.
rivers, and the Mississippi River and a geometric line approximately 30 miles east of the present western boundary of Missouri. They also surrendered any claims to land north of the Missouri River up to the present state line, reflecting the wide range of the Osage.\textsuperscript{6} In the years before efficient overland transportation, Lewis and others considered the inaccessible land far from good river access of minor importance, and focused their attention on securing control of the Missouri River valley first.

After the Osage treaty, another eight years passed before the area received significant attention. Following the War of 1812, however, the trans-Mississippi West was poised to experience rapid growth. To accommodate new settlers, the federal government needed to extinguish Indian title to ever more land and carve it up with the geometric policies it had used for several decades. In 1816 a government survey led by John C. Sullivan, in cooperation with the Osage, crafted an official barrier between Indian and American lands. Sullivan’s team started at the confluence of the Missouri and Kansas rivers and proceeded due north for a hundred miles, then turned eastward and drew another line to the Des Moines River.\textsuperscript{7} The Osage had little claim to that land so far from their ancestral home on the Missouri River, but the 1808 treaty gave them the authority to help determine its future. As one of many such boundaries drawn between distant Indian and American territory in the early nineteenth century, the line initially received scant attention. But in the years to come, the work of Sullivan and the Osage would create controversies of both local and national proportions.

AS THE 1810s drew to a close and Missouri’s promotion to statehood engendered fierce debate, the proposed state’s boundaries evolved.\textsuperscript{8} After several proposals for a state both bigger and smaller than the one eventually created, Missourians approved their limits in an 1820 state constitution. The northern line was identified as

\begin{footnotes}
\item[6] Ibid., 1/16/1810, American State Papers 07, Indian Affairs, 1:763.
\end{footnotes}
a meridian line passing through the middle of the mouth of the Kansas river, where the same empties into the Missouri river; thence from the point aforesaid north, along the said meridian line, to the intersection of the parallel of latitude which passes through the rapids of the river Des Moines, making the said line correspond with the Indian boundary line; thence east, from the point of intersection last aforesaid, along the said parallel of latitude, to the middle of the channel of the main fork of the said river Des Moines; thence down and along the middle of the main channel of the said river Des Moines to the mouth of the same, where it empties into the Mississippi River.  

The enforcement of political authority and property rights demanded such thoroughness in boundary definition. Thus when Missouri entered the Union in 1821, Sullivan’s 1816 line marked its northern limit.

Following statehood, another three years passed with little attention to Missouri’s northern boundary. In 1824, however, a new agreement between the federal government and native peoples of the upper Mississippi River valley brought notoriety to the area. The Ioway and the Sac and Fox nations, which dominated the upper Mississippi River near its confluence with the Rock, Des Moines, and Iowa rivers, consented to surrender their claims in Missouri. Separate agreements removed both groups from that state, referencing the Sullivan line once again as an Indian boundary as well as a political one. The Sac and Fox treaty also set aside a small parcel between the Mississippi and Des Moines rivers as a sanctuary for “half-breeds” of that group. Over the course of almost two decades, Missouri’s northern boundary thus emerged primarily through treaties with Indian groups, adopted for the limit of that polity for simplicity’s sake by federal and state politicians.

Shortly after the conclusion of these treaties, Missourians considered alterations to their northern frontier. The pressure to


10. “Treaties with the Ioway, Sac, and Fox Tribes,” 18th Cong., 2nd sess., 12/15/1824, American State Papers 08, Indian Affairs, 2:525. See also “Proposition to Extinguish Indian Title to Lands in Missouri,” 18th Cong., 1st sess., 5/14/1824, American State Papers 08, Indian Affairs, vol. 2.
Annex a triangular parcel between the geometric western line
Map from the 1839 General Land Office report on the Missouri-Iowa Territory boundary dispute. The lines are, from north to south: Missouri’s 1837 claim intersecting the Des Moines River rapids; the 1808 Osage treaty limit as missurveyed in 1816; the Osage line as it should have been marked; and a division intersecting the rapids in the Mississippi River. Note also the Platte Purchase (or “District”) added to northwestern Missouri in 1836. From the U.S. Serial Set, “Boundary between Missouri and Iowa,” 25th Cong., 3rd sess., 1/30/1839, H. Doc. 128, serial 347.
annex a triangular parcel between the geometric western line and the Missouri River called the Platte Purchase was mirrored by interest in settling the northeastern corner of the state. By 1829 Missouri’s legislature had begun petitioning Congress to annex the small “half-breed” tract defined in the 1824 Sac and Fox treaty. Technically, that tract did not belong to any Indian reserve, so Missouri considered it up for grabs. Their request fell on deaf ears. Two years later Missouri politicians offered an aesthetic reasoning for the addition: “It is a wedge in the corner of the State, disfiguring the form, and destroying the compactness, of our territory.” Apparently few Missourians recognized the coincidence of complaining about the northeastern notch when they had done the same to Arkansas through the “bootheel” in the early 1820s. The legislature went so far as to approve a constitutional amendment annexing the “half-breed” tract in 1835. Congress saw no pressing need to add the mixed-ethnicity denizens to the state, however, although they did acquiesce to the northwestern expansion of the Platte Purchase in 1836.

With one of two alterations to their northern boundary approved, Missouri leaders wanted to better define the vaguely understood line. One St. Louis newspaper suggested that the line would intersect the Missouri River near the Council Bluffs, named after a meeting held there between the Lewis and Clark expedition and local American Indians in 1804. The bluffs ac-

11. “Memorial of the Legislature of Missouri, Praying that Improvements May Be Made in the Navigation of the Mississippi River; that an Alteration Be Made in the Northern Boundary Line of that State; and that Certain Indian Lands Be Purchased by the United States,” 20th Cong., 2nd sess., S. Doc. 88, serial 182.
14. See “In the Senate of the United States,” 23rd Cong., 1st sess., 4/8/1834, S. Doc. 263, serial 240, 2; “Northern Boundary of Missouri,” 25th Cong., 2nd sess., 4/6/1838, H. Rep. 768, serial 335. Technically not part of an Indian reserve, the “half-breed” lands were opened to settlement in the late 1830s by both Wisconsin and Iowa territories. See Laws of Iowa, 1st Territorial Assembly, 1/24/1839, 224–25; ibid., 1/25/1839, 225; Burlington Hawk-Eye, 4/16/1846.
15. Missouri Argus, 2/17/1837.
tually stood about 50 miles north of Missouri’s line in the newly organized Wisconsin Territory, which then straddled the Mississippi River and extended into the modern Dakotas. Such uncertainty demanded better knowledge of the line’s true position, particularly as American settlements gradually crept toward that part of the Louisiana Purchase. To that end, Missouri’s legislature authorized a survey of the boundary, and invited the federal government and Wisconsin Territory to take part.\textsuperscript{16} When both declined, Missouri carried out the effort alone. According to the state constitution and several Indian treaties, “the parallel of latitude which passes through the rapids of the river Des Moines” served as the northern boundary, which to Missourians meant a series of shoals in that river. Unlike Sullivan’s 1816 trek, which labored from west to east, the 1837 commission led by Joseph C. Brown started at a series of rapids at the Great Bend of the Des Moines River and proceeded westward. That created a new division anywhere from 10 to 15 miles farther north than Sullivan’s boundary, the result of a surveying error that caused the latter line to run slightly north of east.\textsuperscript{17}

The infant government of Wisconsin Territory disagreed with Missouri’s new interpretation of the line, which carved a large slice of fertile land from its southwestern flank. Meeting in the new capital of Madison, the territorial legislature petitioned Congress to reaffirm the 1816 line. The legislators made the sensible suggestion that, since so little was known of the Des Moines River at the time of the 1808 Osage treaty, the rapids referenced in it must have been located elsewhere. The Wisconsinites suggested that “the lower rapids of the Mississippi, known, from the time of their first discovery by civilized man, as the Des Moines rapids, or rapids of the Des Moines river,” were the proper termination point for the line. Territorial authorities also worried about the loss of free land to the slaveholding state south of the boundary.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{16.} Laws of Missouri, 9th General Assembly, 1st sess., 12/21/1836, 26–28.
\textsuperscript{17.} Missouri Argus, 8/23/1837.
\textsuperscript{18.} “Proceedings of the Legislature of Wisconsin Territory, in Relation to the Boundary between that Territory and the State of Missouri,” 25th Cong., 2nd sess., 1/2/1838, S. Doc. 63, serial 314.
The dispute over which rapids were the ones referenced in treaties and legislation—that in the Mississippi or those in the Des Moines rivers—had simmered since at least 1831, but grew more acute by the end of the decade.\textsuperscript{19} The law passed by Missouri’s General Assembly in 1837 to survey the line specifically mentioned the problem, directing the commissioners to explore the Des Moines River “to ascertain the true location of the rapids” upon which the line hinged.\textsuperscript{20} Wisconsin’s legislature dropped the issue in 1838 when it persuaded Congress to organize a new territory from its land west of the Mississippi River. Wisconsin had become “too large and unwieldy for the perfect administration of prompt justice” and could not manage its rapidly growing western population.\textsuperscript{21} The task of settling the dispute with Missouri fell to the brand-new Iowa Territory and its politicians meeting at Burlington, a small Mississippi River town just north of the contested borderland.

THE NEW LEADERS of the Iowa Territory secured their own survey of the contentious boundary in 1838. Missouri declined to participate in the project, since it had completed one of its own the year before. The expedition, conducted by the General Land Office, eventually produced a detailed report by Albert Miller Lea in early 1839. It asked the essential question: “Where are those rapids?”\textsuperscript{22}

Lea identified four possible lines, all of which had some claim to legitimacy as the proper boundary, but which also all had their faults. Sullivan’s 1816 line, for example, possessed the benefit of seniority over all others, but had been inaccurately surveyed and did not meet the mandated criteria of “a parallel of latitude.” A straight line drawn from the northwest corner of Missouri (before the Platte Purchase), the second candidate for

\textsuperscript{19} “Memorial of the General Assembly of Missouri,” 2/28/1831, 3.
\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Laws of Missouri}, 12/21/1836, 27.
\textsuperscript{22} “Boundary between Missouri and Iowa,” 25th Cong., 3rd sess., 1/30/1839, H. Doc. 128, serial 347, 11–12, 5; \textit{Missouri Courier}, 12/1/1838.
the proper division, did not intersect any rapids on its eastern end. The other two boundaries suggested by Lea crossed through rapids in the Mississippi and Des Moines rivers, respectively, either of which he considered legally permissible considering the vagueness of the phrase “the rapids of the Des Moines river.” Lea included several letters from knowledgeable persons, including lawyers, surveyors, and even explorer/politician/Indian superintendent William Clark, offering contradictory opinions about which rapids the laws and treaties had intended to anchor the line. Instead of clearing up the confusion, Lea’s report only added to it.23

If the region surrounding the boundary between Missouri and Iowa Territory had remained vacant and inconsequential, as the first planners of the Louisiana Purchase boundaries had expected, the controversy might have remained an academic one. But an influx of American settlers to the region in the 1830s complicated matters, and made the need to establish a clear division much more acute. The Black Hawk War of the early 1830s led to the removal of the Sauk and Meskwaki west of the Mississippi River, and the U.S. Army established Fort Des Moines in the “Half-breed Tract” in 1834 to keep the peace between Indians and American settlers.24 Within three years “a torrent of immigration . . . poured into this Western Paradise,” in the words of contemporary booster John Plumbe Jr. Plumbe rhapsodized about the prospects of the upper Mississippi valley, comparing it to “a beauteous and fascinating female, whose transcendant [sic] attractions must be seen, to be appreciated.” By 1839, estimates of Iowa Territory’s population ranged as

---

23. Ibid., 7–10, 16–24. Missouri’s 1837 survey corresponded to the fourth line described by Lea, the one passing through the rapids in the Des Moines River, about a dozen miles north of the other boundaries. The Missouri legislature approved a law in 1839 that reinforced its claim to the 1837 line as the state’s official northern border. See Laws of Missouri, 10th General Assembly, 1st sess., 2/11/1839, 14. See also Territorial Gazette and Burlington Advertiser, 3/2/1839; and Missouri Republican, 3/14/1839.

24. See Robert W. Frazer, Forts of the West: Military Forts and Presidios and Posts Commonly Called Forts West of the Mississippi River to 1898 (Norman, OK, 1972), 48–49; and Missouri Republican, 8/31/1839. For recent narratives of the Black Hawk War, see Kerry A. Trask, Black Hawk: The Battle for the Heart of America (New York, 2006); and Patrick J. Jung, The Black Hawk War of 1832 (Norman, OK, 2007).
high as 30,000, explaining Wisconsin’s willingness to turn the distant region into its own polity.25

Much of the early settlement in Iowa Territory focused along the Mississippi River, but by the late 1830s the lower Des Moines River in the southeastern part of the territory had become a favored destination. The Wisconsin territorial legislature had created the immense Van Buren County, which would figure prominently in the ongoing boundary dispute with Missouri, along the territorial boundary in 1836. In the years to come, Iowa politicians gradually pared down the county named after then Vice President Martin Van Buren. Within the next three years a series of small towns appeared along the banks of the Des Moines, which bisected the county from northwest to southeast. These towns included Bonaparte, Rochester, Vernon, and Watertown, established in 1837; Iowaville, in 1838; and Birmingham, Farmington, Keosauqua, Kilbourne, and Pittsburg, in 1839. Territorial officials asked for money from Washington, D.C., to build a road connecting these new towns in late 1839. The federal government fueled more growth by opening up even more land in southern Iowa Territory in the summer of 1839 for farms, timber works, and stone quarries. A diverse population rapidly moved in, as one resident described for a Missouri newspaper.

The whole Territory is now full of strangers. Our city [Burlington] has become a perfect Gotham—as emigrants from every State and in fact from every civilized country on the Globe are flocking in crowds to our place. Here is the staid and phlegmatic German—the enterprising and industrious New Englander—the ardent and chivalrous Kentuckian—the hospitable and accomplished Virginian, the persevering and energetic Ohion [sic] and Hoosier, all congregating upon our shores and each furnishing his quota of the future character as well as prosperity of our Territory.26

Van Buren County town-builders of the late 1830s encountered a unique group of Americans already living there, a group

26. Ibid., 57, 100; History of Van Buren County, 361–62, 467–509; Laws of Iowa, 2nd Territorial Assembly, 12/31/1839, 150–51; Missouri Argus, 8/13/1839; Missouri Republican, 10/28/1839 (emphasis in original).
that well demonstrated the complexity of life along this border-
land. A squatter society had arrived shortly after the Black Hawk
War in search of “freedom from the restraints imposed by the
morality, the religion, the industrious habits and the taxing pro-
pensities of the old States.” Nicknamed the “Hairy Nation” for
their unkempt appearance, these residents cared little about the
boundary dispute. Instead, laden with ballots and booze, mem-
bers of this hirsute society would “exercise their undoubted and
undisputed right of sovereignty” in Missouri and Wisconsin
and Iowa territories at the same time, and dined in their humble
homes with politicians from both sides. Dwellers in the “Hairy
Nation” also paid no taxes, as they could always claim to an-
swer to the opposing jurisdiction depending on which collector
appeared at their doorstep.27 Still, although some saw the un-
certain authority along the boundary as an opportunity, others
demanded action to clear up the confusion. And the more set-
tlers who moved into the area, the greater the need became to
clarify the boundary for purposes of taxation, suffrage, judicial
authority, and other issues.

Newspapers on both sides of the line spilled ink over the
contentious issue in the summer of 1839. Asserting Missouri’s
rights as an independent republic within the larger Union, the
Missouri Republican of St. Louis argued that neither Congress
nor Iowa’s leadership possessed the authority to alter Missouri’s
boundaries.28 Indeed, in 1839 the Missouri legislature had ap-
proved two laws in that spirit that further complicated matters.
It first created Clark County in the northeastern corner of the
state, at the confluence of the Des Moines and Mississippi rivers.
Carved appropriately enough from the northern reaches of
Lewis County, Clark County by law extended north to the
boundary surveyed in 1837, beyond the 1816 line. The assembly
also approved legislation that reasserted the state’s northern
limit as the one surveyed in 1837. Meanwhile, Iowa’s Territorial
Gazette and Burlington Advertiser pledged that Iowans would
stand firm against any threat to land they claimed as their own,
regardless of their territorial youth. Still, the Burlington news-

27. Western Gazette, 5/13/1854.
28. Missouri Republican, 7/30/1839.
paper worried that “the controversy between this Territory and the State of Missouri is beginning to wear a serious aspect.”

As the press fanned the flames, pressure increased on politicians in Burlington and Jefferson City, the governors in particular. The chief executives of Missouri and Iowa Territory were no strangers to confrontation, and both had recently demonstrated a willingness to use force to get their way. To the south of the line, Governor Lilburn W. Boggs had engaged in a war of extermination against Mormons living in Missouri in 1838. Responding to threats of religious disfranchisement, a faction within the church had attacked non-Mormon settlements; in response Governor Boggs ordered the state militia to kill or run off every Latter-day Saint in the state. His campaign forced the Mormons across the Mississippi River into Illinois, where they reestablished themselves at Nauvoo. Boggs would prove just as willing to defend his state from “foreign” invasion as from religious insurrection.

Boggs’s counterpart to the north, Robert Lucas, had been appointed by President Van Buren in 1838 as the first governor of Iowa Territory. Well experienced for such a role, Governor Lucas had served as the chief executive of Ohio from 1832 to 1836. Late in his Ohio term Lucas had ordered the state militia to the northwestern frontier in a dispute with Michigan Territory over land along the Maumee River. Several hundred troops squared off near the present city of Toledo, Ohio, in 1835, until the federal government intervened. With the help of President Andrew Jackson, a fellow Democrat, Lucas retained the narrow territory called the “Toledo Strip” for his state. Four years later, when faced with a similar situation in Iowa, Lucas also acted in a forceful way. This time, though, as the governor of a young territory challenging the claims of a powerful state, he found himself in a political position opposite to the one he had faced in Ohio.

29. Territorial Gazette and Burlington Advertiser, quoted in Missouri Republican, 5/22/1839 and in Missouri Whig and General Advertiser, 8/10/1839.
30. For a history of Governor Boggs’s extermination campaign, see Stephen C. LeSueur, The 1838 Mormon War in Missouri (Columbia, MO, 1987).
31. See Willard V. Way, The Facts and Historical Events of the Toledo War of 1835 (Toledo, 1869); and Peter S. Onuf, Statehood and Union: A History of the Northwest Ordinance (Bloomington, IN, 1987), 94–108.
THE MOST SERIOUS TENSIONS between Missouri and Iowa over their shared boundary took place in two distinct phases in the second half of 1839. The first consisted primarily of a heated exchange between Governors Boggs and Lucas in the local newspapers. In what one historian aptly calls “the merry war of proclamations,” the two officials traded threats over land they both believed was theirs. Lucas, the man with the most experience in such matters, fired the opening salvo in this semantic struggle. In early August 1839 newspapers printed a statement issued by the governor challenging what he considered Missouri’s attempt to “obtain a surreptitious jurisdiction” over a sliver of his territory. Lucas insisted that only through judicial action could the matter reach a suitable settlement, and he admonished territorial residents not to fraternize with Missouri officials. The governor also noted that, if necessary, he would appeal to President Van Buren for assistance against Missouri’s creeping authority.

Several weeks after Governor Lucas’s proclamation, Governor Boggs shot back with his own. The Missouri executive declared that he would defend his state’s integrity as defined by the 1837 boundary. Boggs also pledged to send the state militia to help Clark County officials compel payment of taxes in the disputed zone. Emphasizing his state’s rights within the federal system, Boggs identified the United States as the real second party to the dispute, since the national government held Iowa Territory in trust until it joined the Union. In doing so, he attempted to reduce Lucas to a nonentity, and place the dispute in the hands of officials in Washington, D.C. The governor also expressed regret that “a people whose language, habits, pursuits and principles are the same, and whose mutual interest prompts them to be neighbors in sentiment as well as locality,” should find themselves in this increasingly resentful situation.

Many Missouri newspapers, such as the Republican of St. Louis,

---

33. “Message from the President of the United States, in Relation to the Disputed Boundary Line between the State of Missouri and Territory of Iowa,” 26th Cong., 1st sess., 12/24/1839, S. Doc. 4, 3–5; Missouri Republican, 8/15/1839.
34. Missouri Whig and General Advertiser, 9/7/1839. See also Missouri Republican, 8/30/1839.
expected the state to rally behind the firm stance of their governor in defense of their claimed territory.  

A month later, Governor Lucas fired off another lengthy missive, referencing several points made by Governor Boggs. Lucas expressed dismay that Boggs had adopted a militaristic attitude, but took the opportunity to adopt just such an attitude himself. Using Boggs’s own logic, Lucas warned that the Missouri militia would not only be trespassing on Iowa Territory but essentially declaring war on the federal government, which retained ultimate jurisdiction north of the state line. The territorial governor also spoke directly to his charges living in the disputed part of Van Buren County, asking them to “be calm and discreet in all your acts.” He went on:  

Look up to the civil authorities of the United States for your protection. Should you even be threatened with extermination by the all powerful arms of Missouri, be not dismayed. You are neither slaves that you should pay tribute to a foreign government, nor passive members of a defenceless community, that you should be taxed without your consent. You occupy the exalted station of free and independent citizens of the United States. . . . [Y]ou may rest assured, that should the President of the United States authorize us to repel force by force, should our territory be invaded, it will be promptly done, regardless of the boasted prowess and superior numbers of the Missouri militia.  

By hinting at the free soil of Iowa Territory as contrasted with slaveholding Missouri, as well as Boggs’s brutality against the Mormons several years earlier, “Headstrong Bob” Lucas added fuel to the fire.  

While the executives traded insults in the popular press, most residents of Missouri and Iowa viewed the dispute as a comic one. The Missouri Republican thought that it “would be well if Governor[s] Boggs and Lucas can arrange this matter by a newspaper war.” The most famous incident of the entire conflict took place during this executive exchange, when a Missourian

---

35. Missouri Republican, 8/31/1839.
36. Ibid., 10/8/1839 (emphasis in original).
37. Ibid., 9/30/1839.
38. Ibid.
cut down several hollow trees used as beehives by settlers who claimed allegiance to Iowa Territory. Tried in absentia, the vandal was fined $1.50.\(^\text{39}\) This story provided a moniker for the entire conflict, the “Honey War.” It also inspired a Missouri wag to pen a satirical poem, poking fun at the governors in particular, and calling for a sensible solution.

\begin{verbatim}
Now in conventions let us meet,
In peace this thing to settle,
Let not the tiger’s war-like words
Now raise too high our metal [sic].
Why shed our brother’s blood in haste,
Because big men require it?
Be not in haste our blood to waste,
No prudent man desires it. . . .
Now if the Governors want to fight,
Just let them meet in person,
For Governor Boggs can Lucas flog,
And teach the brag a lesson. . . .
And then no widows will be made,
No orphans unprotected,
Old Lucas will be nicely flogg’d,
And from our line ejected.\(^\text{40}\)
\end{verbatim}

Not everyone considered the controversy as serious as the leaders in Jefferson City and Burlington did. But an incident in the borderland around the time the poem hit the press transformed the Missouri-Iowa conflict into something much more worrisome to many on both sides of the vague line, and in particular to those living nearest to it.

THE SECOND PHASE of the 1839 boundary dispute began on October 24, when Sheriff Uriah S. Gregory and several militiamen from Clark County, Missouri, met with officials from Van Buren County, Iowa, including its sheriff, Henry Heffleman. Sheriff Gregory insisted on his authority to collect taxes from those living south of the 1837 boundary. The meeting escalated with “several warm speeches on both sides; amounting almost


\(^{40}\) *Missouri Whig and General Advertiser*, 10/26/1839.
to a declaration of war.” When the news reached Jefferson City several days later, Boggs ordered the state militia to support Gregory in carrying out his lawful duties. The *Missouri Argus* cautioned all involved to “consider the advantages of peace over discord,” but the stands taken by the executives of both states in their proclamations promised the use of weapons rather than words.\(^41\)

Two days after the tense exchange between Sheriffs Gregory and Heffleman, residents of the borderland attempted to solve the problem themselves. Delegates from Clark and Van Buren counties—including private citizens and local militia officers—met in Monticello, Missouri, about 40 miles south of the disputed territory. After pledging friendship to their neighbors, the Missourians proposed to share jurisdiction until the federal government could sort out the matter. In response, the Iowans stated that they could not accept concurrent authority, but would generously agree to both sides suspending tax collection for the time being. Upset at the rejection of their proposal, the Missourians drafted a resolution calling for Sheriff Gregory to “proceed to a more energetic discharge of his civil duties” and dismissed their counterparts to the north. Shortly thereafter, the adjutant general of Iowa’s territorial militia reported to Governor Lucas that the conference had only aroused passions on both sides.\(^42\) For reasons of legality and pride, neither side was willing to compromise with the other, from the governors on down to those living in the discordant region.

With the backing of his constituents, Sheriff Gregory proceeded into northern Clark County—or perhaps southern Van Buren County—in mid-October 1839 to collect taxes from the settlers there. Gregory encountered four people, two of whom refused to pay, and he reportedly “molested their property.” Before Sheriff Heffleman could respond, Gregory returned to the safety of the Clark County seat at Waterloo, in undisputed Missouri land. Governor Lucas wrote a letter of support to Hef-


fleman, expecting him to “be as prompt and vigilant in enforcing the laws and protecting the citizens of the United States within this Territory, as those of Missouri possibly can be, in their intrusions upon our neighbors.”

For the next few weeks the situation calmed, though, as both sides considered their next move.

More than a month after his first attempt, Sheriff Gregory returned to tax the borderland on November 19, and Sheriff Heffleman quickly tracked him down. Governor Lucas happily received the news and bestowed on Heffleman “the approbation of every citizen of Iowa.” A local court put Gregory on trial for exercising an illegal jurisdiction and jailed him at the county seat in Farmington. When word of the arrest reached Missouri’s militia officers, they immediately dispatched a brigade to prepare state defenses, and mustered four additional divisions in the northeastern counties. Shortly thereafter, 40 troops headed north, intending to break Gregory out of jail. Rumors of a large force under Heffleman’s command worried the Missourians, though, so the militia officers proceeded to Farmington alone to attempt a negotiated settlement. The Iowans rebuffed them, and the officers returned to Waterloo to await reinforcements. In the meantime Gregory was transferred to another jail farther away from the disputed boundary.

The potential for bloodshed over the boundary dispute increased with each passing day, much to the concern of many people on both sides of the line. As the Missouri Republican observed, “It is every way probable that a collision will ensue, as the excitement is becoming very intense and gradually extending over a much larger portion of the people of the state and territory.” Governor Lucas wrote to Secretary of State John Forsyth, expressing his concern. “I am apprehensive that blood will be shed; and if blood begins to flow, it is impossible to foretell where the matter will end.” Iowa’s territorial legislature memorialized Congress for help, asking protection for “that which
our stronger sister is attempting to wrest from us by force.”47 Neither side wanted to be the first to back down, but both wanted to avoid violence if possible.

The seriousness of the situation contrasted markedly with the appearance of the soldiers marching toward the front lines. Both Missouri and Iowa militiamen struck many observers as a humble, perhaps even laughable, bunch. About 800 Missourians mustered in the camp near Waterloo in every conceivable uniform. Those who did appear resented the state’s expectation that they would supply themselves, and they looted a store in LaGrange for food and blankets. While heading upriver toward Iowa Territory, the Missourians also captured supplies, and even blocked the mail from reaching their enemy.48 With overland transport still a rudimentary process, Missouri’s long riverine frontage enabled it to directly affect Iowa’s ability to make war.

Iowa’s troops, numbering upwards of 600, found conditions much the same as Missouri’s. Farmington struck one observer as “a military camp, and the streets a place for military parade.” Armed with everything from muskets and pitchforks to hoes and spears, from scythes and clubs to “an old fashioned sausage stuffer,” the Iowans also had to fend for themselves logistically, to which they also objected. One militiaman sarcastically remembered, “We were willing to shed our blood for our beloved Territory and, if necessary, to kill a few hundred Missourians, but we were not going to do that and board ourselves besides.” Nonetheless, they raised the rallying cry, “Death to the Invading Pukes!” in reference to Missouri’s nineteenth-century nickname of convoluted origin. But the cold and snow of the coming winter was the worst enemy of the ill-supplied forces of both sides.49

48. Ibid., 15. See also Meyer, Heritage of Missouri, 183; and Kraus, “A Study in Border Controversy,” 93.
49. “Boundary—Iowa and Missouri,” 26th Cong., 1st sess., 2/12/1840, H. Ex. Doc. 97, serial 365, 3; Eric McKinley Erickson, “The Honey War,” Palimpsest 6 (1924), 346–48; Burrows, “Rumors of War,” 72. George Earle Shankle, American Nicknames: Their Origin and Significance (New York, 1937), 355, cites two explanations for the “puke” moniker. The most likely story comes from northern Illinois in the 1820s, when Missourians flocked to the Galena lead mines in such great numbers that “those already there declared the State of Missouri had taken a ‘puke.’”
As 1839 drew to a close, many residents of northern Missouri and southern Iowa concluded that the pseudo-war must stop. At a hastily called mass meeting, Marion County, Missouri, dweller Thomas L. Anderson expressed the sentiments of many as he described the plight of both militias.

Send them home to their families. Send them home to those who at this inclement season need them, and who are watching anxiously for them, and praying for their safe and speedy return. And in the name of the God of Mercy and Justice, gentlemen, let this monumental piece of absurdity, this phenomenal but cruel blundering have an end.⁵⁰

Anderson and other residents of Marion County, seated at Palmyra about 60 miles down the Mississippi River from the borderland, circumvented the military conflict and political posturing in a desperate effort to restore peace. On December 9 the Marion County committee drafted a resolution demanding an immediate end to all hostile actions, and called for a federal solution to the crisis. Three days later officials in Clark County seconded the document, and on December 14 it received the support of the Iowa territorial legislature. In poignant words the assembly unanimously resolved that “if that much to be deplored time should come when we shall be required to shed the blood of each other, we here pledge ourselves collectively and individually to endeavor by every means in our power to allay the horrors and calamities of the civil war.”⁵¹ Incarcerated Sheriff Gregory was released, and territorial courts eventually dropped the charges against him.⁵²

---

⁵⁰. Quoted in Walter B. Stevens, *Centennial History of Missouri (The Center State): One Hundred Years in the Union, 1820–1921* (Chicago, 1921), 65.
⁵¹. *Missouri Whig and General Advertiser*, 12/14/1839, 12/21/1839; *Missouri Republican*, 12/17/1839. See also “Memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Iowa, praying the adjustment of the boundary line between that Territory and the State of Missouri,” 26th Cong., 1st sess., 1/8/1840, S. Doc. 53, serial 355; and *Daily National Intelligencer*, 12/30/1839.
A diverse reaction to this sudden peace came just as swiftly. A committee of concerned Missourians from Lewis County, located between Clark and Marion counties, spoke out strongly against the perceived surrender to Iowa.53 Meanwhile, families criticized both Governors Boggs and Lucas in the press for sending their fathers, brothers, and sons out into the cold for a week to fulfill the bombastic pledges the governors had made months earlier.54 An Iowa Sun reader wrote,

The two governors instead of having the question settled by an amicable suit at law, as two neighbors who had a dispute about the dividing line between their plantations would do, have made all this bustle and incurred this enormous expense on their respective governments. To what strange infatuation is this conduct to be attributed? Are these men in their sober senses? Or have they become so valorous, that nothing but fight will satisfy their stomachs? Mr. Lucas, while governor of Ohio, immortalized himself, by a similar quarrel with the governor of Michigan, and Governor Boggs, has recently won imperishable honors, and never fading laurels in the war with the Mormons. . . . It is therefore perhaps not to be wondered at, that these two renowned chieftains, being placed in command so near each other, should, like two mighty ram goats, feel a desire to knock horns together, and make a noise in the world.55

But the most graphic reaction came from the frostbitten militiamen themselves, as one vividly described.

About the time we got our fires burning, we received information that we would be turned home. . . . However, being determined to have our sport, we retired a short distance outside of the old Colonel’s blazed encampment, taking with us a quarter of venison that we had the good luck to kill on the way, which we severed in two pieces, and hung up, in representation of the two Governors, and fired a few rounds at them, until we consid-
tered them dead! dead!! They were then taken down, and borne off by two men to each Governor, enclosed in a hollow square, with the muffled drum, and marched to the place of interment, where they were interred by the honors of war. We fired over their graves, and then returned to the encampment.\textsuperscript{56}

No group appreciated the end of the farcical conflict more than those who had been expected to fight it out. Although neither Boggs nor Lucas approved of the extralegal decision, and released resolutions expressing their dismay, they no longer enjoyed enough popular support to maintain troops on the boundary.\textsuperscript{57}

WITH THE DAWNING OF THE 1840s, peace at last returned to the Missouri-Iowa borderland. Still, the debate over which line marked the proper boundary between the two demanded settling. Federal politicians, awakened to the matter through reports trickling eastward throughout the latter months of 1839, took up the matter in early 1840. Senator Lewis F. Linn of Missouri spoke in Congress with sympathy for both sides, and asked his colleagues to help resolve the matter. The House of Representatives debated a bill that would reaffirm the 1816 line as the official northern boundary of Missouri, a notion that met with scorn when Missouri newspapers printed it in the late weeks of winter. Whig party newspapers in particular used the bill as an example of the incompetence of Democratic officers, including Senators Linn and Thomas Hart Benton. Although he also disapproved of the bill, Governor Boggs, a fellow Democrat, reminded his constituents that with Iowa’s continually growing population and its expected statehood, the federal government needed to mediate between the two parties sooner rather than later.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{56} Missouri Whig and General Advertiser, 12/21/1839.

\textsuperscript{57} Missouri Whig and General Advertiser, 1/4/1840. See also Missouri Republican, 2/25/1840; and Missouri Whig and General Advertiser, 11/28/1840.

Another issue of concern to both Missouri and Iowa Territory involved their almost-defenders. Members of both militias requested reimbursement for expenses incurred during the several weeks of preparation for war. Missouri’s state legislature made appropriations in early 1841 for the troops sent to the northern frontier as well as for those who took part in the Mormon campaign.59 Because Iowa was a territory, however, its leadership expected the federal government to pay its bills. Secretary of War Joel R. Poinsett stated that, since he had not approved the use of the territorial militia, he saw no reason for Congress to pay for its little adventure. The House of Representatives nonetheless requested Iowa’s muster rolls, which militia officers compiled in the late summer of 1840. Eventually the legislative branch decided not to pay Iowa’s militia for a campaign the War Department had not authorized. The territory and state continued to petition Congress to change its mind for the next 15 years, but were ultimately unsuccessful.60

In the winter of 1840–41, both Missouri and Iowa Territory experienced a change of political leadership. Thomas Reynolds won an election to succeed Governor Boggs in Jefferson City in the waning months of 1840. And in the spring of 1841 a new Whig administration in the White House replaced Democratic Governor Lucas with John Chambers. With both political communities under new management, their approach to the boundary dispute changed as well.61


61. Regardless of the controversies surrounding Governor Lucas’s tenure, the Territorial Gazette and Burlington Advertiser, 4/17/1841, printed a flowery farewell and thanked him profusely for his services as the first territorial executive.
For the first time in four years, Missouri proposed cooperation with federal authorities to “finally and peaceably” mark the line. In a plan drawn up by the legislature in late 1840, surveyors approved by the state senate and Congress would work jointly. In the meantime, county officials would desist from levying taxes on inhabitants of the disputed territory. Iowa demanded its own voice on the project to defend local interests, but Missouri argued that the territory’s needs would be represented by a federal surveyor, and the idea fizzled.

Congress resumed consideration of this festering issue a year later. Of particular concern in 1842 was the perennial debate about which rapids—in or of the Des Moines River—anchored the eastern end of the boundary. Army Corps of Engineers surveys of the Des Moines River in 1840 and 1841 had reported numerous obstacles that could be considered rapids in that flow. Missouri’s secretary of state forwarded more than a dozen letters from individuals affiliated with the 1816 survey and the 1820 constitutional convention, all of which insisted on rapids in the Des Moines River. But members of a House committee assigned to investigate the matter disagreed. They believed that the better-known Des Moines rapids in the Mississippi River must have been the ones intended to shape the line instead of a political division drawn through “an unknown and unbroken forest, inhabited by and belonging to the savage, and on some one of twelve ripples.” The notion that the federal
government might have been vague when defining the limits of future members of the Union did not seem possible to the House in 1842, although history often contradicted that view.

When the House of Representatives debated a bill to define the border in the summer of 1842, member John C. Edwards of Missouri objected on the grounds of states’ rights. He suggested that because Iowa was still a territory he feared that the federal government would try to use its authority to unconstitutionally alter the shape of Missouri. Edwards claimed for his state the approximately 2,600 square miles in dispute. Iowa, he said, “has ample territory, and enough to spare for two more states.” In reply, other congressmen pointed out that Missouri was already the largest member of the Union. Edwards nonetheless continued, “Iowa is encroaching upon us, and grasping part of our territory; and the United States, like all tender mothers, is taking sides with her infant child against the older one, in sustaining her groundless pretensions.” Iowa’s delegate, Augustus C. Dodge, suggested that Edwards used the tricks of his legal training to unjustly portray his own state as the victim. Dodge pointed the finger instead at “gigantic, avaricious, grasping Missouri.” The dispute inspired many politicians to trade accusations, whether across the line itself or across the House chamber.

As the rapidly increasing population of Iowa Territory made statehood ever more likely in the early 1840s, the boundary issue remained a problem forever in need of resolution. Meeting in the new capital of Iowa City in the fall of 1844, delegates discussed defining the southern line as “up the Des Moines to the old Indian Boundary line or North line of Missouri,” which could be interpreted as either the 1816 or 1837 limit. Eventually they settled on a boundary up the Des Moines River “to a point where it is intersected by the old Indian boundary line, or line run by John C. Sullivan in 1816.” When Missouri politicians heard of the proposal, they complained to Washington, D.C., that Iowa was trying to cleave off part of their state.

68. Burlington Hawk-Eye, 10/17/1844; “Memorial of the General Assembly of Missouri, Praying that the Southern Boundary Line of the Proposed State of
Missouri’s reaction kindled fears of a renewed boundary fight. The new territorial governor, Democrat James Clarke, appointed by President James Polk in 1845, informed the Iowa legislature that the borderland remained at peace. Nonetheless, reports of a conflict between the sheriffs of Davis County, Iowa, and Schuyler County, Missouri, threatened to repeat the tensions of 1839. The solons of Jefferson City memorialized Congress that once again the “feelings of the people bordering upon the line have become excited, until a civil war is at any moment liable to be kindled.”

In 1845 and 1846 Iowa politicians and federal officials negotiated the former’s statehood through a series of debates about its boundaries, mostly relating to the northern and western limits of the proposed state. Its southern line received due attention as well. In early 1846 the territorial legislature asked congressional permission to seek a settlement with Missouri in the U.S. Supreme Court, a body often referenced as the proper arbiter of the matter.

Iowa’s constitution as approved by the federal government in the summer of 1846 specified its southern boundary as corresponding with the northern line of Missouri created by its 1820 constitution, with no reference to the surveys of 1816 or the 1830s that had caused such friction. With Iowa’s statehood at last realized, the two members of the Union could finally settle their long-standing dispute as equals.

AFTER YEARS OF BITTER WORDS and near-bloodshed, Missouri and Iowa met in the courtroom rather than on the battlefield in late 1847. Both states filed cross suits with the U.S. Supreme Court and sent lawyers to voice their arguments in its stately Doric room in the U.S. Capitol. Missouri’s representative

Iowa May be Made to Conform to the Northern Boundary Line of the State of Missouri,” 28th Cong., 2nd sess., 2/19/1845, S. Doc. 110, serial 456, 1.


claimed evidence of rapids in the Des Moines River that would support the 1837 survey line. By contrast, the Iowans focused their attention on defining the long-contested rapids, and insisted that only those in the Mississippi River could have been known in 1820 when Missouri’s constitution referenced them. Without identifying which line should divide Missouri from Iowa, Iowa’s lawyer disputed the premise on which his counterpart rested his case.72

The Supreme Court waited more than a year to render its verdict. Associate Justice John Catron delivered the unanimous opinion of his colleagues on February 13, 1849. The justices noted that Missouri’s state boundaries as initially described in its constitution depended on the 1816 Sullivan boundary. It originally represented a separation between state power and American Indian land, held ultimately by the federal government, a condition that changed only semantically when Indian title gave way to territorial status. In addition, all public land surveys in the area relied on Sullivan’s line. The court also mentioned the rapids upon which the line supposedly depended for an eastern terminus. It considered the Mississippi River’s Des Moines rapids as the ones most likely referenced in treaty and law, and since the rapids extended 14 miles up the Mississippi, the line could intersect them anywhere and still be considered legal.73

The final arbitration of the Missouri-Iowa boundary, therefore, marked a victory for the brand new state to the north. Sullivan’s 1816 survey line remains the official division between the two, extending due east from the Missouri River to the original northwest corner of Missouri, and from there slightly north of east to the Des Moines River, making an extreme obtuse angle. But considering the intense competition that had long complicated life in that borderland, the Supreme Court found it necessary to issue a stern reminder to both parties.

And it is further adjudged and decreed, that the State of Missouri be, and she is hereby, perpetually enjoined and restrained from exercising jurisdiction north of the boundary aforesaid dividing

73. Ibid., 666–77.
the States; and that the State of Iowa be, and she hereby is, also
perpetually enjoined and restrained from exercising jurisdiction
south of the dividing boundary established by this decree.\textsuperscript{74}

That statement might seem redundant in any other circumstance,
but the legacy of the dispute demanded a strong message to re-
mind Missouri and Iowa that their border war had come to an
end.

By 1851 another survey marked the line between Missouri
and Iowa, which allowed officials in Van Buren and Clark
counties, among others along the boundary, to assess property
and collect taxes in peace.\textsuperscript{75} Given the rapidly evolving nature
of western American settlement, though, many who had lived
through the 1839 conflict had moved on in the dozen years since.
In particular, one newspaper noted the demise of that examplar
of a borderland community, the “Hairy Nation.” Shortly after
the Supreme Court decision, “the disputed territory soon be-
came thickly settled by industrious and thriving citizens, in the
former places of the Hairy Nation, who gradually left for regions
where there is more freedom and less labor, more whisky and
less tax-paying than the State of Iowa was about to impose up-
on them.”\textsuperscript{76} In this case, the transformation from “borderlands
into bordered lands,” as Jeremy Adelman and Stephen Aron
suggest, proceeded with marked similarity to that of many in-
ternational borders.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., 679.
\textsuperscript{75} See Negus, “Southern Boundary of Iowa,” 789–93. To read about a more
recent survey of the Missouri-Iowa line, see Troy L. Hayes, “Missouri/Iowa
\textsuperscript{76} Western Gazette, 5/13/1854.
\textsuperscript{77} Jeremy Adelman and Stephen Aron, “From Borderlands to Borders: Em-
pires, Nation-States, and the Peoples in Between in North American History,”
\textit{American Historical Review} 104 (1999), 816 (emphasis in original). In 1895 a simi-
lar dispute to the one in 1839 took place along the Iowa-Missouri line, about a
hundred miles west of the “Honey War.” A personal dispute along the line led
an Iowa court to indict a Missourian who was arrested when he supposedly
stepped north of the line. After paying bail he charged the Iowa authorities
with kidnapping, and Missouri authorities arrested the Iowa sheriff, who was
released when a friend from Iowa brandished weapons at the Missourians. A
resurvey of the line settled the spiraling dispute, and transferred a little land
from Iowa to Missouri. See Stevens, \textit{Centennial History of Missouri}, 66; Franklin
K. Van Zandt, \textit{Boundaries of the United States and the Several States} (Washington,
THE FIGHT over the Iowa-Missouri line merits special recognition among boundary disputes in the United States. For more than 40 years in the early nineteenth century, politicians and settlers struggled to establish authority over this contested region. But tax registers and court records were not the only issues up for grabs. More than anything else, this oftentimes ludicrous contest represented the lengths to which trans-Mississippi dwellers would go to protect what they believed was theirs, whether their land or their identity. After the Supreme Court finally adjudicated the boundary, an apocryphal story joked, “An old farmer, so it goes, was delighted to hear that the decision put him in Iowa, not Missouri, ‘cause I heard tell the climate ‘n’ soil of Missouri ain’t fitten ter raise decent crops.’”

Invisible lines could make an otherwise cohesive landscape look quite different to the people who lived near them. Historians have generally interpreted the “Honey War,” when they have interpreted it at all, as little more than an amusing episode in the region’s heritage. In reality, the struggle represented something far more important. The line separating the two polities helped make one group Missourians and the other Iowans. Their willingness to defend that identity with force, “to shed our blood for our beloved Territory,” illustrated the value they both ascribed to their common boundary. It made them not only Pukes and Hawkeyes, but also a part of the broader Union, shaped by similar lines that created such identities all across the United States.

78. Quoted in Clarence M. Conkling, “Look at the State They’re In!,” Saturday Evening Post, 10/20/1951, 194.
"Since it is my right, I would like to have it": Edna Griffin and the Katz Drug Store Desegregation Movement

NOAH LAWRENCE

ON JULY 7, 1948, sometime between 2:30 and 5:00 p.m., Edna Griffin, age 39; her infant daughter, Phyllis; John Bibbs, age 22; and Leonard Hudson, age 32, entered Katz Drug Store at the intersection of 7th and Locust streets in Des Moines. While Hudson went to look for some batteries, Griffin and Bibbs took seats at the lunch counter, and a waitress came shortly to take their order. The two African Americans ordered ice cream sundaes, but as the waitress walked toward the ice cream dispenser, a young white man came and whispered a message into her ear. The waitress returned to Griffin and Bibbs and informed the pair that she was not allowed to serve them, because of their race. By that time Hudson had finished purchasing a set of batteries and rejoined his companions. The three adults asked to see the waitress’s supervisor, and she obliged, summoning the young fountain manager, C. L. Gore, a 22-year-old who had come north from Florida just two years earlier. The tenor of that exchange would later be disputed: Griffin, Bibbs, and Hudson claimed that the conversation was hushed and polite; Gore said that the three black patrons were causing a disturbance. What is

I am grateful to the State Historical Society of Iowa for a 2005–2006 SHSI Research Grant, which supported work on this article.

not disputed is that Griffin and Hudson were unsuccessful in getting any ice cream that day, despite appealing to store manager Maurice Katz.¹ More significantly, Edna Griffin used the incident as the impetus to topple the segregationist policies of the Katz Drug Store chain. Within 18 months, Griffin had mobilized citizens to take action against the chain, launched successful civil and criminal lawsuits against store owner Maurice Katz, and earned vindication when the Katz Drug Store capitulated to African American demands by agreeing to cease all discriminatory policies in December 1949.²

The story of Edna Griffin and the Katz desegregation fight enriches the picture of the national civil rights struggle that African Americans and their allies waged after World War II. It was one of many localized civil rights struggles in the post–World War II decade that coalesced into the great civil rights mobilization of the 1950s and 1960s. African Americans in Des Moines and other locales in Iowa and the Midwest fashioned what historian George Lipsitz termed “oppositional coalitions” to defeat discrimination and segregation in the judicial system, workplaces, labor unions, restaurants, taverns, housing, schools, municipal facilities, and entertainment venues.³

Although the success of the “oppositional coalition” Griffin formed to deter discrimination in Des Moines was not the only example of successful civil rights activism during this time in Iowa, her case merits particular attention. She was unusually outspoken for a black woman at the time. In addition, she employed the traditional strategy of engaging the judicial system to gain equality while also providing an early Iowa example of the subsequently common civil rights strategy of staging sit-ins and holding protests, a method that would gain ascendancy fol-

1. The disagreements were aired during witness testimony at the criminal trial. A complete transcript of the criminal trial is available at the University of Iowa Law Library. See “State of Iowa vs. M. C. Katz: Appellant’s Abstract of Record,” Articles and Abstracts, 241 Iowa 20, June 1949, University of Iowa Law Library, Iowa City. The transcript will be cited frequently in this article, and will hereafter be cited as Articles and Abstracts.

2. Iowa Bystander, 12/9/1949. See also the plaque, “Historic Site: Civil Rights Victory,” at 7th and Locust streets in Des Moines.

3. George Lipsitz, Rainbow at Midnight: Labor and Culture in the 1940s (Urbana and Chicago, 1994).
ollowing the successful desegregation movements spurred by the Greensboro sit-ins of 1960.

Griffin’s efforts to end segregationist policies at Katz Drug Store preceded the efforts of the four young Greensboro students by 12 years, and occurred during a time historian Deborah Gray White describes as marking a turning point in African Americans’ attitudes about how to achieve racial reform. The late 1940s, White argues, saw a transition from upper- and middle-class individuals working toward race progress through high-status social events toward more youth-oriented nonviolent and grassroots movements such as sit-ins and freedom marches. Griffin, though constrained in some ways by her middle-class social status (as the wife of a doctor), was well situated to help usher in this more egalitarian form of social activism.

Griffin conducted her civil rights activities in a complex political landscape for African American middle- and upper middle-class women. While she held firm allegiance to African Americans of all social classes, she also operated within the constraining discourse of what historian Kevin Gaines terms the “politics of respectability.” The middle-class black activists Gaines describes had to present themselves as striving toward middle-class respectability. They accepted middle-class markers of success and aligned themselves with whites who disdained what they interpreted as black flamboyance and excess. Thus, in her attempts to win support from the larger community for her fight against Katz, Griffin and her lawyers constructed an image of her as a respectable black mother rather than as a firebrand activist ready to take to the streets.

What is thus most fascinating about Edna Griffin is that she was a radical black activist, passionate and outspoken about the need for economic and racial justice, yet she was also a savvy enough strategist to recognize that in certain contexts she had to downplay that element of her character. Nowhere was this more evident than in the testimony she provided in the criminal trial the state of Iowa brought against Maurice Katz, and in the argu-

ments she made to her fellow citizens about why Katz’s policy of discriminating against African Americans was contrary to the American ideal.

THE KATZ DRUG STORE CHAIN had been successful in maintaining a policy of de facto segregation for decades, despite a state law that expressly forbade discrimination in public accommodations, including “lunch counters.”6 Several different individuals and organizations had failed in bringing charges against Katz before Griffin ultimately succeeded. The Iowa Bystander detailed an 18-year battle to end segregation at Katz. Criminal prosecutions were brought against the drug store in 1943, 1944, and 1947, but in all three cases owner Maurice Katz was acquitted. In addition, at least 14 civil cases brought against Katz had failed.7

In 1944 V. V. Oak, the editor of The Negro College Quarterly, wrote a letter to Roy Wilkins at the national offices of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) providing evidence that the Katz Drug Store chain had a complicated history of refusing to serve black patrons. Oak’s letter offered a snapshot of race relations in Des Moines in the mid-1940s, evaluating Des Moines as “not a badly prejudiced city,” but one where “there have been many incidents . . . which have proven very annoying.” Oak then described an episode in which a “colored lady” had been denied service at “one

---

6. Katz was charged with violating Section 735.1, Iowa Code of 1946, which provided, “All persons within this state shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, restaurants, chophouses, eating houses, lunch counters, and all other places where refreshments are served, public conveyances, barber shops, bathhouses, theaters, and all other places of amusement.” Section 735.2 states, “Any person who shall violate the provisions of section 735.1 by denying to any person, except for reasons by law applicable to all persons, the full enjoyment of any of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, or privileges enumerated therein, or by aiding or inciting such denial, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor” (emphasis added). Katz’s defense relied on the argument that Griffin, Bibbs, and Hudson were denied service not due to their race but due to their behavior. See Harry Grund, “State v. Katz,” Iowa Reports 251:1949–1950.

of the main Katz’s drug stores.” The woman had filed a lawsuit against the store, which so angered Katz’s management that it “gave orders to all the drug stores to refuse certain services to all Negroes, civilian and military.” Oak lamented that when the woman later dropped her case, the manager “took this as evidence of a lack of solidarity in the Negro race.”

But what most upset Oak were two subsequent episodes: Lieutenant Lenora Robinson, a member of the Women’s Army Auxiliary Corps (WAC) stationed at nearby Fort Des Moines, was denied service at Katz with two of her friends, and a few weeks later several army nurses also stationed at Fort Des Moines were refused service. Oak dejectedly wondered how, in a “city located beyond the Mason-Dixon line,” these women could be “treated as if they are outcastes [sic] by civilians who are piling profits and leading comfortable civilian lives while the WACs and Army nurses are working hard, undergoing great discomforts, and sacrificing their freedom to the routine of military

8. V. V. Oak to Roy Wilkins, 4/13/1944, NAACP Papers (microfilm), part 9, series A, University of Iowa Law Library, Iowa City.
life.” Oak believed that the treatment Katz accorded to Robinson and her colleagues conveyed the message that “Negro WACs and Nurses, even when wearing Uncle Sam’s uniforms, do not belong to the human race.” What was curious about the incident, and tremendously disappointing to Oak, was that Lt. Robinson ultimately refused to press the case against Katz.9

A significant problem that the NAACP encountered in trying to press lawsuits against Katz was the lack of will among members of the black community to challenge the white power structure. Griffin herself was acutely aware of this. During an interview for the documentary film *Blacks in Des Moines*, Griffin recalled, “I did find out that the NAACP undertook one or two occasions to bring into Court violators of the law but their problem was they had no witnesses. And so they quit.”10 Internal documents from the NAACP regarding an attempt to address Katz’s discrimination against blacks in 1944 show that organizations could find few black citizens willing to prosecute or testify against the Katz Drug Company. In correspondence between two high-level African American leaders, James B. Morris, president of the Des Moines branch of the NAACP, explained to Roy Wilkins at the national office, “Our greatest trouble is to get people to file charges against the concerns following the practice and having them appear in court to prosecute the case. We have reminded the people that they cannot expect us to follow a case through unless they are willing to do their part.”11

Katz’s discriminatory practices were so notorious as to warrant communication and activism at the upper echelons of the African American community. However, as Morris articulated in his letter, successful resistance to Katz could not come only

---

9. Ibid. Robinson herself informed Wilkins that Oak’s letter “involves two problems; one civilian, one military. Personally, I agree that the former should be called to the attention to the citizens of Des Moines, for such a condition substantiates Mrs. Roosevelt’s statement that Democracy has not yet reached all the people of the United States. In regard to the latter, I wish to make it clear that I have not forgotten the oath I took upon enlistment, and that at present, doing an efficient job which will help bring active combat to a halt is my chief interest.” Robinson to Roy Wilkins, 4/15/1944, NAACP Papers, part 9, series A.
10. Edna Griffin, interview by Verda Williams, Des Moines, 1986, transcript, Iowa Women’s Archives, University of Iowa Libraries, Iowa City.
11. James B. Morris to Roy Wilkins, 4/29/1944, NAACP Papers, part 9, series A.
from the top down. It would be Edna Griffin—Fisk University graduate, transplanted East Coaster, and new mother—who would be the person “willing to do [her] part” in spearheading the grassroots movement against Katz.

EDNA WILLIAMS was born October 23, 1909, most likely in Carlisle, Kentucky, to Henrietta Williams and her husband Edward Hearst Williams, who was employed mostly as a janitor. Rather little information exists on the early period of her life. Her family moved frequently. Young Edna attended junior high in Walpole, New Hampshire, spent her freshman year of high school at Lenox High School in Lenox, Massachusetts, and ultimately graduated, in 1928, from Pittsfield High School in Pittsfield, Massachusetts. An intelligent young woman, she applied to prestigious Oberlin College and the Eastman School of Music before ultimately deciding to attend Fisk University in Nashville, the gold standard among historically black colleges. Up until that point, she had lived in predominantly white neighborhoods. As she recalled in an interview in 1986, she had not been exposed to the power of the black church until after college.

At Fisk, Edna Williams majored in sociology, met her future husband, Stanley, and earned a B.A. in 1933. She worked cleaning houses to help pay for her education, and she did not have many friends besides Stanley. Edna’s daughter Phyllis recalls that her mother believed that Fisk was too conservative, too

12. U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, collected files on Edna Griffin, 1947–1972, released to the author through a Freedom of Information/Privacy Act request, 8/16/2006. A copy of these files has been donated to the Iowa Women’s Archives. Much of the biographical information on Edna Griffin for this essay was obtained through the security index file the FBI kept on Griffin. A substantial amount of that information was obtained by informants and spies and so should be subject to skepticism. However, the files do shed light on the extent and consistency of Griffin’s activism. The FBI files on Griffin ascribe her birthplace variously to Carlisle, Kentucky; Walpole, New Hampshire; and Massachusetts. A delayed birth certificate indicated that Griffin was born in Kentucky, but at a time when registration of birth was not required. The certificate that is on file was entered in 1942, after Griffin’s uncle and one other acquaintance gave sworn affidavits testifying to her birthplace.

interested in skin color. However, Griffin’s future radicalism first manifested itself at Fisk. There she marched, with Stanley, against Mussolini’s invasion of Ethiopia; was arrested for joining striking teachers on a picket line; and, during her senior year, joined the Communist Party, an affiliation she would keep for more than 24 years.¹⁴

The Griffins may have spent time in Harlem shortly after Edna graduated. If so, Edna would have spent formative years in the ferment of the Harlem Renaissance. Not much is known of this period of Edna Griffin’s life, although she testified during the Katz trial that before coming to Iowa she and Stanley had lived in New York City, Georgia, Tennessee, and Springfield, Massachusetts.

The story of Griffin’s starring role in the Katz saga began when the Griffins came to Des Moines, which by Edna’s own recollection occurred on January 2, 1947. The couple moved to Iowa so that Stanley could attend Still Osteopathic School of Medicine. After years of moving around, the Griffins would make Des Moines their permanent residence. Edna gave birth to the first of three children, Phyllis, in 1947. Despite being a new mother, Edna became an activist in Des Moines almost immediately. Within the next year she had already been appointed to leadership posts as chair of the organizing committee of the Progressive Party for Iowa’s Fifth Congressional District and secretary-treasurer of the Des Moines branch of the Communist Party. She also enrolled as a graduate student at Drake University, taking classes in education and English. Although she was only 5’2” and 125 pounds in 1949, this petite woman would be a thorn in the side of Maurice Katz and many others who wished to maintain the status quo.¹⁵

¹⁴. Phyllis Griffin, interview with author, Chicago, 12/21/2004 (transcript available in the Edna Griffin Papers, Iowa Women’s Archives); Iowa Civil Rights Commission, “The Rosa Parks of Iowa,” www.state.ia.us/government/crc/rosaparksiowa.html, accessed 8/26/2004. According to an FBI report, Griffin admitted her Communist Party affiliation during an interview with an agent. The files suggest that she was upset with the party for “going underground” in the 1950s and apparently did not attempt to conceal her affiliation, except in cases (such as the Katz struggle) where change was contingent on appearing firmly within the mainstream.

¹⁵. Edna Griffin, interview, 1; Outside In, 259; FBI files.
The status quo that Griffin and others worked against consisted of “de facto segregation in public accommodations and de jure segregation in housing and employment.”16 Like much of the nation, Iowa was largely segregated in the late 1940s, and African Americans who returned from the war or who came up from the South to find work often faced discrimination. When they did, they could not, for the most part, depend on the state to protect or defend their rights.

A 1948 editorial in the Iowa Bystander, a newspaper published in Des Moines that served as a voice for black Iowans, described two ways Des Moines failed to meet “the standard of a democratic city”: the systematic effort to ban blacks from skilled trades, and the fact that “eating accommodations down town are miserable and every effort to change them are met with stern opposition of the small as [well as] the large establishments.” Two months later, another editorial detailed the efforts to maintain only inferior hotel accommodations for African Americans, violating the spirit of the Iowa civil rights law.17

As the editorial makes clear, an additional frustration black Iowans faced was their inability to ensure that Iowa’s civil rights statutes were enforced. Despite concerted attempts by legislators to add teeth to the law, it was not effective as a means for obtaining convictions for proprietors who flouted it. Iowa’s first civil rights law, passed in 1884, outlawed discrimination in “inns, public conveyances, barber shops, theaters, and other places of public amusement.” However, since the law did not provide a penalty for violation, it required a grand jury hearing and so was seldom enforced. The law was amended in 1892 to include “restaurants, chophouses, lunch counters and all other places where refreshments are served,” yet contained no practical enforcement mechanism. Over the next 30 years, Iowa’s supreme court determined only three cases based on the civil rights law.18

Thanks to a concerted effort on the part of the Des Moines branch of the NAACP, the law was again amended in 1923 so that violations could be heard by a local magistrate rather than a grand jury. Civil rights advocates believed that this new law would be much more useful in protecting the rights of black Iowans, but despite successful prosecutions of the law in 1923 and 1931, there were no other cases until 1939. From 1939 through 1950, Iowans brought 22 civil rights cases to court. Of those, only three resulted in conviction and fine. One of those was the case against Maurice Katz.

Part of the challenge Griffin and others faced was convincing Iowa’s citizens, and, more important, state prosecutors, that denying civil rights to black citizens was a significant enough problem to merit action. Robert E. Goostree identified widespread antipathy among the state’s 99 county attorneys toward enforcing civil rights statutes, “a nullity” that “for many Iowans . . . ranked in importance with the universally ignored anti-tipping law.” According to Goostree, 83 percent of the African American lawyers in the state thought that discrimination by establishments within the purview of the statute was common, while 87 percent of the county attorneys thought it was not; and 64 percent of the county attorneys thought that the statute was adequately enforced, while only 16 percent of the African American lawyers agreed.

The differing perceptions of white prosecutors and black lawyers point to a key problem civil rights activists such as Griffin faced: convincing white Iowans that a civil rights problem existed and that a solution depended on their help. Ben Stone suggests that “most people in mid-twentieth century Iowa did not feel that discrimination in employment was a problem in their state. Blacks made up less than one percent of the population and many Iowans had rarely seen a black person, let alone refused one a job.” Concerned black Iowans were ever aware of the problems they faced in being accorded unequal treatment, both under the law and by business owners. The thrust of their

challenge was to convince white Iowans that their activism grew not out of individual self-interest, but rather out of a desire to help the state live up to the ideals expressed, but not enforced, in its civil rights statute.

Edna Griffin sought to meet this challenge by winning converts both in the court of law and in the court of public opinion. The legal strategy she developed in consultation with fellow members of the Progressive Party and lawyers for the NAACP was first to press a criminal case against Katz, and then to proceed with civil cases.

PROCEDINGS AGAINST KATZ moved quickly: by July 10, just three days after being denied service, Griffin, Bibbs, and Hudson had filed charges against Katz in Des Moines Municipal Court. Two days later, Katz pleaded not guilty; he was released on bond, and a trial date was set for the September term. The trial was held on October 6.

The trial began with a failed attempt by the defense to file a demurrer on behalf of its clients, C. L. Gore and M. C. Katz. The court summarily rejected the opening gambit, and the trial continued with brief opening statements from Paul C. McDonnell, the assistant county attorney, and Paul Stinson, Katz’s lawyer.

John Bibbs was the first to take the witness stand. He stated that he was 22 years old, single, working in maintenance. On July 7 he had been coming from the headquarters of the Progressive Party, through which he knew Griffin and Hudson. Bibbs was young and ambitious; recently discharged from the navy, he had already been promoted to chair the Progressive Party of Des Moines, even though he had only been a member of the party for three months.

Bibbs recalled that after the waitress took his and Griffin’s order, she was prevented from fulfilling their request; instead she came back and said “we don’t serve colored.” Bibbs testified that they got the same response from C. L. Gore. According to

23. Abstracts and Arguments, 3. Unless otherwise noted, all information in the following section comes from the trial transcript.
Bibbs, Gore explained that he could not serve Bibbs and Griffin because “it is the policy of our store that we don’t serve colored; we don’t have the equipment.” Bibbs claimed that he and Griffin then asked to speak to Mr. Katz, the store manager, who told them, “I cater to a large volume of white trade and don’t have the proper equipment to serve you.” Bibbs repeatedly insisted, in his initial testimony and upon cross-examination, that “there was no disturbance”; the entire incident was orderly and polite. “We walked into the store and sat down at the counter and didn’t say anything to anybody until the girl came up and asked for our orders.” “There was no loud talking on either side,” he stated; both Gore and Katz were “very polite and refused very politely.” He also emphasized that “we went to the Katz Drug Store that day for the purpose of getting something cold to drink,” not at the behest of the Progressive Party or “for the purpose of making a test case under the law.”

Leonard Hudson corroborated Bibb’s testimony. He was 32 and unemployed at the time of the Katz incident, although he had worked as a laborer and was last employed as a truck driver hauling scrap iron. He had previously worked for seven months for the Iowa Packing Company but ceased working there when the packers went on strike. On July 7 he had been called to the Progressive Party headquarters by E. C. Richards, a state representative for the Progressive Party, who wanted to know if Hudson would be able to help organize for the party, possibly by starting up a football team. Hudson declared at the trial that he was not a member of the Progressive Party, although he did take part in protests that Griffin organized outside of the store in the weeks after the incident.

According to Hudson, he met up with Bibbs while at the Progressive Party office, and the pair happened to run into Griffin while walking from the office towards downtown Des Moines. He described what started out as a rather uneventful meeting: “We stood and talked with Mrs. Griffin for a few minutes about

25. For the entire transcript of Bibbs’s testimony, see *Articles and Abstracts*, 6–15.
26. Given the activism of the UPWA, it is possible that this is where Hudson was first introduced to leftist politics. See Bruce Fehn, “The Only Hope We Had”: United Packinghouse Workers Local 46 and the Struggle for Racial Equality in Waterloo, Iowa, 1948–1960,” *Annals of Iowa* 54 (1995), 185–216.
the baby and the weather being hot. We walked up the street and Edna mentioned something about getting an ice cream soda or a cold drink and I said I would be glad to buy you a drink or a soda and she said let’s stop in here and we just walked into Katz Drug Store.” The scene Hudson describes is of three hot and tired individuals, far from being overzealous activists looking for trouble, who just happened to meet on the street one summer afternoon before making the logical decision to get some cold refreshment. And as Bibbs’s testimony had, his description of the interaction between the three friends and Katz management emphasized the cordiality of the discussion. “I did not at any time hear Mr. Bibbs or Mrs. Griffin speak in a loud or boisterous manner,” Hudson testified. “I would say the conversation on both sides was conducted in a very quiet, respectable manner.”

Bibbs and Hudson’s testimony reveals the extent to which the three witnesses for the prosecution attempted to downplay their activism and to play up the spontaneity of their decision to enter Katz Drug Store. Such claims were thought to be necessary to dispute the defense’s contention that the three were “professional agitators” who came to Katz Drug Store specifically “for the purpose of making a test case.”

In the case of Griffin, she most certainly was a dedicated if not, strictly speaking, professional agitator. It is in her testimony during the criminal trial where it is most apparent that the central question being debated was not whether Katz had violated the civil rights statute, but rather whether Griffin, Bibbs, and Hudson were fine upstanding citizens rudely denied their civil rights or outlandish agitators who got what they deserved.

Compared to Hudson and Bibbs, Griffin was older, had seen many different parts of the nation, and was well read in revolutionary and communist literature. Griffin was radical enough to merit concern from the federal government, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation had begun keeping a file on her after Harry Truman had signed executive order 9035, allowing for the establishment of a “security index” of citizens with sympathies or affiliations with communist, anarchist, or revolution-

27. For the transcript of Hudson’s testimony, see Articles and Abstracts, 27–31.
28. See Maurice Katz’s testimony, in Articles and Abstracts, 44.
ary organizations. From 1947 to 1965 the FBI collected more than 400 pages of information on Griffin, and if what informants reported was accurate, then at the time of the Katz incident Griffin was heavily involved in the Communist Party USA, paying monthly dues for her and her husband, subscribing to the *Daily Worker*, and working in the capacity of secretary-treasurer for the Des Moines branch of the party.

Fortunately for Griffin, Katz’s lawyers were not aware of her Communist Party affiliation. Nonetheless, central to their defense was an attempt to paint Griffin as an agitator who premeditated her trip to Katz. Griffin and her lawyers, on the other hand, continued to claim, as had Hudson and Bibbs, that the visit was based on a spontaneous and innocent decision to obtain refreshment.

Q. Will you tell us why you went in to Katz Drug Store?
A. Because I wanted to get something to drink, and that was the primary reason for going.
Q. But you had discussed outside the store whether or not you would be served, hadn’t you?
A. Some one had mentioned something about it.
Q. And that was one of the reasons you went in there was to find out whether that was true?
A. No, the reason we went in, I had particularly wanted something to drink and the fellows agreed to join me. Now we did not know whether Mr. Katz served colored or not, but we said we will go in and see.

And go in they did. Yet, as Hudson and Bibbs had, Griffin repeatedly explained how ordinary and civil their conversations with management were once in the restaurant. She described “the tone of the conversation” with the waitress, after being informed they would not be served, as “just ordinary,” and insisted that after Bibbs asked to see a manager, the waitress “went very politely” to find Gore. As Griffin recalled it, Bibbs asked Gore if he was aware that he was violating Iowa’s civil rights code, and Gore replied “that might be true or not, but anyway, they didn’t serve colored because they didn’t have the equipment. There was no heated discussion and no one was angry.”

29. For a complete transcript of Griffin’s testimony, see *Articles and Abstracts*, 16–26. Griffin actually took the stand second, after Bibbs but before Hudson.
Reflecting on her activism from the safety of 38 years elapsed time, Griffin stated in an interview, “We decided that we will go into Katz’s and if refused service then we will go to Court and I was prepared to be a witness.” In 1986 Griffin could take pride in action that history had judged as righteous, and she made no attempt to pretend that the decision to go to Katz Drug Store was coincidental, but on the witness stand in 1948 Griffin was forced into feigning apathy. The historian must always be on guard against the vagueness of memory, but in this case there is a plethora of other evidence to suggest that Griffin was indeed downplaying her activism while testifying in 1948. Recall that the NAACP had filed unsuccessful civil lawsuits against Katz on behalf of 14 other African American citizens in the five years before Griffin determined to do the same. Thus, when Griffin testified, a short time after expressing to the court how thirsty she was on July 7, that “my directions are very poor,” it seems most plausible that she was intentionally dissembling in order to mask her intelligence, downplay her activism, and thus gain sympathy with the all-white jury. In fact, at the end of her testimony, Griffin seemed to remove her mask a bit, contradicting her earlier statement by remarking, “I have lived in Des Moines for three years and am familiar with the Des Moines streets.” It strains credulity to believe that the activist Griffin would not have known of Katz’s long history of discrimination in Des Moines.

Phyllis Griffin was only one year old when her mother brought her to Katz Drug Store, but she believed that her mother probably was aware of Katz’s history of discrimination.

Oh, I’m sure there were other restaurants that were discriminatory, but I think that Katz was notorious because it had a history of people suing them. I’m sure that my mother was aware of this history. It probably came to her first as hearsay, and she decided to test it. So on a hot July day [laughs] she took me down there, you know, with her to get some ice cream, and found out that the hearsay turned out to be accurate.

---

30. Edna Griffin, interview, 3.
31. Phyllis Griffin, interview, 11.
Although Griffin (along with Bibbs and Hudson) tried to portray their decision to enter Katz on July 7 as an isolated incident, in reality, the confrontation fits a pattern of prolonged effort by the African American community to end segregation in Des Moines. Yet to contribute to that long-term effort, Griffin had to maintain a difficult balance: challenging the law while operating within its confines, and taking part in social activism without appearing to be a radical activist.

That balancing act was further demonstrated during cross-examination, as Griffin attempted to distance herself from the important role she played in helping to organize a picket and boycott of the Katz store in the weeks following the July 7 incident. When asked by the defense lawyers if she had passed out handbills urging people not to shop at Katz, Griffin replied cryptically, “I couldn’t possibly stand asking for a boycott and give out handbills at the same time. I am aware of the handbills, but it is not a question of fact that I passed them out.” Pressed on this point, she relented a bit, nonchalantly remarking, “It is not important to me really, but I don’t believe I did, because really my job was calling for a boycott.” Later still, she admitted, “I don’t remember of giving any handbills, but if it is important to you I would be perfectly willing to say that maybe I did give somebody one in front of the place, but that was not my business.” What explains the back and forth between the defense and Griffin on the question of whether or not Griffin participated in the distribution of handbills? Most likely, the defense realized that its best argument was to try to reframe the debate to one on the character of the prosecuting witnesses. The only feasible defense for Katz would be that denial of service was justified, not because Bibbs, Griffin, and Hudson were African American, but because they were causing a disturbance. In that context, Griffin had to use every means possible to make herself appear as a moderate, quiet, and unassuming citizen.

C. L. Gore did not make that easy. When it was his turn to testify, he recalled being alerted to the presence of Bibbs, Griffin, and Hudson when his “attention was first attracted by loud voices.” Gore said he went to inquire as to what the problem was, and his recollection of the three was that “they were demanding service and they were very rude.” Gore recalled that
the altercation even attracted the attention of other patrons. He concluded his initial testimony by stating firmly, “I am not in the habit of permitting service to be given at the soda fountain to persons who create a disturbance and conduct themselves in the kind of manner that these people were that day.” Gore claimed that the issue of race was immaterial; he was acting to protect the business interests of the Katz chain.  

Maurice Katz’s testimony was consistent with Gore’s. He attempted to link the three prosecution witnesses directly to the Progressive Party, and painted the three African Americans, and Griffin especially, as not only disruptive but even cruel. According to Katz, “He [Bibbs] said, ‘we are members of the Progressive Party and we are going to make a test case out of this.’ I said, ‘a test case out of what?’ And then Mrs. Griffin spoke up and says, ‘you know what we are talking about, don’t act dumb.’” Katz positioned himself as the victim, the honest proprietor seeking to create a peaceful atmosphere for his patrons. As Gore had, he, too, cited the presence of “several people who had stopped to see what the commotion was all about.”

The premise of their argument was that a disturbance had been created. Paul Stinson, attorney for the defense, set up the argument for Katz, asking him, “In a situation of that kind where in your judgment, as manager of the store, someone had created a disturbance, do you, whether that person or those persons are black or white, do you serve them?” “I would not,” answered Katz, and the defense rested.

During cross-examination, Paul McDonnell, assistant county attorney, attempted to demonstrate that the management of Katz Drug Store systematically denied service to African American customers. Curiously, neither Katz nor Gore denied that they had customarily refused to serve black patrons. When McDonnell asked Gore, “Have you ever served colored people in Katz Drug Store?” the young fountain manager admitted that he had not. Later, when Katz was asked the same question, he stated, “I haven’t served any.”

32. For a transcript of Gore’s testimony, see Articles and Abstracts, 35–42.
33. For a transcript of Katz’s testimony, see Articles and Abstracts, 42–49.
34. Ibid., 41, 47.
depending on the sympathy of the all-white jury to enter a verdict in their favor. The jury would have to determine whose story was more believable: Did Griffin, Bibbs, and Hudson come into Katz Drug Store on July 7 to cause trouble, or were they callously denied service by racist managers?

On October 7, 1948, the jury rendered its verdict. After four hours of deliberation, the jurors determined that Maurice Katz and C. L. Gore were guilty of denying service to the three persistent African American patrons. It was the first legal setback ever faced by the Katz Drug Store chain, and a major victory, not only for Griffin, Bibbs, and Hudson, but for the entire African American community in Des Moines.

Yet the fight was far from over. On November 1 Katz filed for an arrest of judgment and a new trial. Three weeks later, Judge Harry Grund denied Katz’s appeal for a new trial and sentenced him to pay a fine of $50 (plus court costs). In response, Katz appealed his case to the Iowa supreme court.

It would be a year before the supreme court heard the case. In the meantime, the battles between the drug store and the civil rights advocates raged on. Griffin kept the pressure on Katz by filing a civil case against the company. The trial in her $10,000 damage suit began on October 10, 1949.

THE ARGUMENTS in the civil trial followed the same tack as they did during the criminal case. Once again, Katz argued that Griffin came to the store on July 7 with specific intent to make a test case. Katz’s lawyers made an even greater effort to tie Griffin to the Progressive Party and Henry Wallace. At one point, defense attorney Richard Wood went so far as to suggest that “Mrs. Griffin is being used as a tool by others who want to further their own political ambitions.”

And once again, Griffin and her lawyers had to deflect the agitator label, and again sought to focus on other aspects of Griffin’s identity. Griffin emphasized her service in the recent

35. Ibid., 69.
36. Ibid., 69–72, 79, 80.
38. Des Moines Register, 10/14/1949.
war and her role as a mother in order to establish her respectability with the jury. In her testimony, she used an argument that would have had great currency at the time: that World War II was a fight for the ideal of democracy against the forces of tyranny. During World War II, many African American women assumed jobs in sectors of the American economy from which they had been previously excluded. Others entered the armed services and, together with black men, left the war determined to defeat segregation at home after helping defeat fascism overseas. Griffin, who observed racism and gained leadership experience as a member of the Women’s Auxiliary Corps during the war, was able to articulate African American grievances and had the confidence to lead whites and blacks from different class and regional backgrounds. At the trial, she appealed to the patriotism of the jury, stating, “I volunteered in the armed forces, knowing full it was a jim crow army, to help establish the equal dignity and equal rights of my people.”

It would be one thing to deny service to someone who was vocally anti-American, but quite another to do so to a war veteran.

Part of being patriotic, at the time, was being a good mother. Historian Maureen Honey suggests that postwar

dominant culture rhetoric created a narrow maternal mission for women . . . foreshadowed in wartime propaganda that identified the homemaker-centered family as synonymous with American democracy, the reason the war was being fought. Coupled with the baby boom and glorification of a suburban postwar ideal, this reductive image of American life fed easily into mass layoffs of women workers during reconversion, who were characterized as “returning to the home” to begin a home-centered, quintessentially American way of life.

Honey further argued that, by and large, black women did not fit this model. However, Griffin and her lawyers understood that emphasizing Griffin’s role as a mother while downplaying her role as an activist might appeal to the sense of duty felt by

39. Iowa Bystander, 10/13/1949. Curiously, FBI records did not reveal any evidence of Griffin’s military service. In a profile of Griffin, a section asking about military service records “none.”

the white female jurors hearing the case. Denying service to a mother, at a time when the ideal of the suburban homemaker was rapidly gaining currency, would be another strike against Katz.

Griffin was aided in making this argument by her lawyer, Charles P. Howard. Howard was one of Iowa’s most prominent black lawyers. In fact, two weeks prior to representing Griffin in the civil case, he had delivered the keynote address at the Progressive Party’s national convention. Griffin’s ability to secure Howard as legal counsel speaks to how well connected she was within the Progressive Party and within Iowa’s activist community. For his part, Howard called Griffin’s case “the most important lawsuit I’ve ever tried.” Griffin and Howard, both long active in the fight to attain civil rights for African Americans, clearly understood the centrality of the fight against Katz to this wider effort.

Howard assisted Griffin in appealing to the jury’s preconceived notions of the role women should play in society. Speaking to the jury, he attempted to divert attention away from race and to other aspects of Griffin’s identity.

Mrs. Griffin has paid the price to have the honor to walk the streets of this community respected. She is a graduate of one of the leading Negro universities in America and was doing graduate work at Drake University at the time. She is the wife of one of the leading doctors in this city—who is a professor at Still College. She is a mother.43

Howard had cleverly reframed the episode at Katz from discrimination against a black person by a white person to discrimination against a well-educated and well-respected member of the community by an unpatriotic storeowner. His further emphasis on Griffin’s role as a mother specifically appealed to the obligation women would have felt to provide for and protect their children.

Understanding Griffin and Howard’s arguments as an appeal to the jury’s sense of gender standards makes it possible to

41. Des Moines Register, 10/12/1949.
42. Iowa Bystander, 10/29/1949.
43. Ibid. (emphasis added).
make sense of what must have been the trial’s most dramatic moment. During rebuttal arguments, Howard pointed at Katz and shouted, “I say to Mr. Katz he had better ask every Negro woman who goes in there [Katz Drug Store] if she is Mrs. Howard, because if you ever insult my wife in there, I will blow your brains out and I will die and go to hell and I mean every word of it.”

Howard’s audacious use of language undermines any presumption that whites at the time had silenced black dissent, and perhaps foreshadows the black nationalist movement, which would not gain ascendancy for another two decades. It is possible that the jury, composed of eight women and four men, viewed Howard’s strong defense of his wife’s honor as a legitimate enough reason to threaten a white man.

Although Griffin herself would never have advocated violence, she surely would have, in other contexts, spoken her mind more freely. Clearly, Griffin did not accede to any traditional model of how she should act. What is most fascinating about Howard’s deference to traditional ideas about gender roles in arguing for Griffin’s righteousness is how much Griffin defied such gender norms. Here the intersection of class, race, and gender is evident: Howard used Griffin’s gender to portray her as a good mother, yet Griffin was a vocal community leader, a rarity for a woman at the time. Howard used Griffin’s status as the wife of a doctor to portray her as a member of the upper class, entitled to all the advantages that carried, yet Griffin, while having financial security, interacted regularly with poor members of the community. Phyllis Griffin recalled coal miners, sharecroppers, and poor farmers who had been invited to the Griffin household as dinner guests. So while Griffin defied traditional modes of behavior expected of women, she defined herself at the trial as one who subscribed to conventional class and gender roles in order to challenge the Katz Drug Store’s racially discriminatory practices.

It was evidently a winning strategy. On October 15, the district court jury decided the case in Griffin’s favor, although they chose to award her only one dollar in damages. Despite the

---

45. Phyllis Griffin, interview, 12.
small reward, Griffin and her lawyers considered the verdict a moral victory. Bibbs and Hudson still had their cases to bring forth, and in the meantime the three would continue their efforts to pressure Katz through social activism.

**EVEN AS THEY PURSUE**d the criminal and civil cases, Griffin and a network of activists were simultaneously waging their battle against Katz in other arenas. Throughout 1948 and 1949 Griffin helped coordinate a series of protests, sit-ins, and boycotts designed to impede Katz’s ability to run his business successfully. The legal fight and the public fight should be understood as equally important elements of a long-term strategy to force proprietors in Des Moines to abide by the civil rights code.

Arguments made at the trials notwithstanding, it was not accidental that Griffin chose Katz Drug Store as the battleground in the fight for civil rights in Iowa. After both trials had ended and Griffin was freed to speak openly, she wrote a letter to the editor of the *Iowa Bystander* to explain why court action alone was not sufficient and why the Katz chain continued to be the primary target of activists. “It is our opinion,” she wrote, “that when Katz is forced to abide by the Civil Rights Code, other places now discriminating against Negroes in public eating places will quickly fall in line. Experience indicates that court action alone has not and cannot stop jim crow because the penalty exacted under the law is not sufficiently heavy.”

Indeed, despite losing both the criminal and civil cases, the Katz Drug Store still refused to serve African Americans. As a result, shortly after her civil trial ended, Griffin formed the Committee-To-End-Jim-Crow-At-Katz-Drugstore. The committee was open to “every Negro and white person who believes in civil rights as a safeguard to democracy” and who sought to force change through economic boycott and through raising awareness, among uninformed white citizens, of Katz’s discriminatory policies.

Although the committee did not form officially until after Griffin’s civil case ended, she initiated the initial pickets against Katz within ten days of the July 7 incident. She planned the first

protest for July 17, 1948, a Saturday. Volunteers met on Saturdays from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m., the store’s busiest time of day, to hold placards, hand out pamphlets, and take turns sitting in at the lunch counter.

As in the criminal and civil trials, Griffin sought to frame her arguments broadly, as a fight against the forces of tyranny rather than as a narrow fight of blacks against whites at one neighborhood drug store. In fact, a flier Griffin distributed to passersby when she was protesting outside Katz (and which was submitted as evidence at the criminal trial) shows how Griffin harkened back to the war in an attempt to frame her fight against Katz in a broad enough swath to arouse even apathetic citizens. The brochure, titled “BILL OF RIGHTS—HITLER FAILED BUT KATZ IS TRYING,” was designed to coax non-blacks into considering the choice of shopping at Katz as a moral choice. The flyer read, in part,

A lawsuit is pending against Katz Drugstore but we want you to know why Jim Crow undermines the rights of every citizen, not just the victims.

The “master race” idea poisons the mind with hate, distrust, and suspicion. This turns the minds of the people from high prices, low wages, and no housing to violence against one another. It happened in Germany, and it can happen here. 47

Through carefully chosen arguments, Griffin and her fellow members of the Progressive Party Club of Des Moines were able to recast their struggle against Katz from a strictly racial problem to a broader appeal to the democratic ideals of their fellow citizens.

Such arguments were also concisely articulated by the placards held by protestors. A photograph of the protestors submitted as evidence in the Katz trial features picketers holding placards that allude directly to the recently fought war. One sign read,

Counter Service for Whites Only
This is Hitler’s Old Baloney
Don’t Buy at Katz

Another read,

47. Articles and Abstracts, 84–85 (emphasis in original).
The Bullets Weren’t for White’s Only
Don’t Buy at Katz

By invoking Hitler, the protestors were appealing to the collective consciousness of the community, and by referencing the sacrifice African American soldiers had made in the war, the picketers also hoped to remind community members of the implicit agreement that service to country in the name of freedom would be rewarded with greater equality extended to African Americans at home. The protests sought to hurt Katz by affecting his profits, but the appeal was aimed at potential shoppers rather than at Katz himself. And the message used to persuade people of the righteousness of the cause was that Katz should be boycotted not because he was violating Iowa’s civil rights statute, but because he, like Hitler, discriminated against people based solely on their ancestral background.

Griffin’s ability to fight a local battle while placing it in a national context is significant. Such a strategy was central to the philosophy of Ella Baker, who would become perhaps the most significant female civil rights advocate as the battle for equality moved to the South. As historian Charles Payne aptly demonstrates in his history of the Mississippi Freedom struggle, “Helping people see the connection between personal troubles and large social issues was a central concern of Miss Baker’s.” Payne also suggests that the success of the civil rights movement owes a great deal to “the efforts of older activists,” such as Baker and Griffin, “who worked in obscurity throughout the 1940s and 1950s.” One legacy this older generation of activists left for the new generation was that “through their efforts they had created networks among activists across the state, networks that could facilitate the work of another generation.”48 Special attention should thus be paid to the methods by which Griffin was able to marshal support for her protest.

Griffin’s ability to organize benefited from the unconventional marital relationship she enjoyed with her husband Stanley. As their daughter Phyllis recalled, “normally, you know, it’s the woman who stands behind the man, that creates the man . . . being great in society. And it was flipped in terms of my mom

and dad. So there was something that was nontraditional. And my father stood behind my mother spiritually, emotionally, and, most importantly, financially.”

49. Both Phyllis and Stanley Griffin Jr. were adamant about the important and largely forgotten role Stanley Griffin Sr. played in advancing civil rights in Iowa.

Stanley Griffin’s work as a doctor who made house calls to many African Americans and Hispanics in the community helped Edna by widening her network of potential activists, raising her status within the community, and providing her the time and financial resources that enabled her to be an organizer.

The Progressive Party of Iowa offered another key network of potential activists to aid in the protest. During the 1940s progressive forces, including organized labor unions, farmers, and African American organizations, were coalescing and pressing for vigorous enforcement of laws and a more equitable distribution of wealth. By 1948, members of the Progressive Party of Iowa were thinking nationally, coalescing behind Henry Wallace, a native Iowan himself, in an effort to bring the struggle to attain civil rights to the attention of the nation.

The Progressive Party platform was aimed to appeal to farmers, workers, and minorities. In fact, Wallace thought that the roots of racism were in labor and class conflicts. Thus, civil rights appeared prominently in the Iowa Progressive Party’s platform. The party pledged “an all-out fight against every manifestation of economic, social, and political discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, sex, national origin, political beliefs or union membership” and promised particularly “to enforce and to strengthen Iowa civil rights laws.”

Griffin undoubtedly knew of this pledge and sought to be part of the fight. Wallace’s run for president may have given her the op-

49. Phyllis Griffin, interview, 5.

50. In a telephone interview with the author, 1/4/2005, Stanley Griffin Jr. explained, “Dad made it possible for her to do what she actually wanted to do.” In an earlier event commemorating the opening of the Edna Griffin Bridge in Des Moines, Stanley gave a speech in which he acknowledged his father’s important role: “Behind every good woman is a good man. Stan Sr. supported Edna through everything.” DVD, Edna Griffin Memorial Bridge (Des Moines, 2004).

portunity to reach out to new groups of people in her efforts to force Katz to change.

Griffin attempted to fuse the new network of people working with the Progressive Party with the more traditional, established activist network: the Des Moines branch of the NAACP, which had played a crucial role in challenging segregationist practices in Des Moines from 1915 to 1930 and achieved “some important successes that paved the way for modern civil rights agitation.” By 1948, it had become apparent that challenging segregationist policies in the court of law would not be enough to force businesses to cease the policy outright. Griffin relied on the NAACP for her legal fight, but she looked for support from her fellow progressives for the more direct action approaches.

Getting both networks of activists to cooperate was not necessarily easy, and there was considerable tension over who should be credited with the eventual victory over Katz. A Bystander article titled “Local NAACP Tells Support Given in Katz Case” cited a Progressive Party handbill that stated, “The NAACP has never officially gone on record in support of our battle, opened by the Progressive Party of Des Moines, July 7, 1949, against the Katz Jim Crow policy.” Charles Howard, a member of both the NAACP and the Progressive Party, disputed the claim. “The above statement is not true. The NAACP not only officially endorsed the legal fight against Katz, but voted two hundred dollars out of its treasury to aid that fight.” As would be true later in the movement, when organizations such as the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee would engage in turf battles over how to end discrimination, the different organizations involved in the civil rights struggle in Iowa in the late 1940s also had an uneasy relationship with each other.

However, what is remarkable about the late 1940s battle against Katz is that, despite the public tensions aired in the Bystander, this particular movement was successful because a constituency of varied interests worked together, as the Bystander’s editorial board itself acknowledged.

The NAACP, some Progressive party members and other interested groups stayed on the job and saw the efforts through to a successful conclusion. . . . With this victory secured, those who did this splendid job should move on to other similar situations, keeping their forces in tact [sic] and refusing to quibble over who did the most and/or best work using their energy in furtherance of a united effort for future activities.53

The NAACP appears to have committed the most resources toward the legal fight, but it was the Committee-To-End-Jim-Crow-At-Katz-Drugstore, an interracial group of liberals, that seems to have applied the economic pressure through boycotts, sit-ins, and picketing that made an eventual agreement with Katz possible.

Griffin formed the committee after her victory in the civil case against Katz on October 15, 1949. The formation of the committee merely formalized the direct action protests that Griffin had initiated and participated in soon after the July 7 incident. Yet the committee was significant in that it represented an early model of the sort of mass mobilizations and direct action that would make future civil rights movements so successful two decades later in the South. Documents pertaining to the committee provide further evidence of Griffin’s desire to cast her efforts against Katz as a small part of a larger battle. In a Bystander article detailing Katz Drug Store’s decision to lift its ban on serving black patrons, Griffin is quoted as saying that she sought specifically to attract members of other political parties to join the Committee-to-End-Jim-Crow-At Katz-Drugstore. Organizers of the group even attended a conference sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews to present handbills to members detailing Katz’s discriminatory practices. This interracial, multireligious, multiparty committee met on Saturdays to send waves of members to sit in at Katz while other members remained outside to protest and hand out bills stating “Katz is More Powerful than Iowa” to passersby.54

The committee also helped those members who were denied service by Katz employees file additional lawsuits against

54. Iowa Bystander, 12/1/1949.
the company to keep the pressure on. Griffin herself filed a second lawsuit against Katz on November 12, 1949, demanding that the district court revoke Katz’s restaurant and cigarette licenses and declare the company a “chronic law violator.” Four other members of the organization brought suits against Katz the same day.55

The pressure on Katz was mounting. Court battles were piling up, and protestors were growing emboldened. Perhaps it was the letter that Griffin wrote (with John Bibbs and Kenny Walker) to the Iowa Bystander, published on December 1, 1949, and inviting “every citizen in Des Moines, both Negro and white, to join us at lunch between the hours of 11:00 a.m. and 2 p.m. each Saturday until the jim crow policy is abandoned” that finally forced Katz to see the writing on the wall. On December 2, Katz settled out of court, agreeing to pay $1,000 and to end the store’s discriminatory practices. As the Bystander reported, Negro patrons entered the store on December 3 and “began receiving courteous service at the Katz Drug store luncheonette.”56 The battle had been won.

AFTER YEARS OF DRIFTING around to various locales, Edna Griffin had planted her roots firmly in Des Moines. She remained there for the rest of her life, a committed activist until her death in 2000. After her successful role in the Katz struggle, she continued to be an advocate for the dispossessed and an irritant to those in power.

While the struggle against Katz continued, Griffin was also pushing for the passage of a bill before the state legislature that would provide for a Fair Employment Practices Committee. That committee would ensure that businesses did not discriminate in their hiring practices. According to FBI internal documents, Griffin gave a speech in July 1949 to an audience of about 120 people at a Methodist church in Des Moines, urging parishioners to support the bill.57

57. FBI files.
She was also very interested in criminal justice, and sought to provide financial, emotional, and organizational support to African Americans in Iowa who may have been falsely convicted of crimes. According to FBI files, Griffin was elected vice-chair of the Iowa Progressive Party in June 1950, and in that capacity she “would stump the state” to raise funds and support for Terry Lee Sims, a Sioux City man who had been convicted of the rape of a white girl. The next year, Griffin appeared as a speaker before the 1951 state convention of the Iowa Farmer’s Union, demonstrating how wide and varied the constituencies she worked with were.\(^58\)

Griffin was also active on a national scale. She sought contributions to send to the national center of the Communist Party USA on behalf of 11 Americans whose Communist affiliation got them in trouble with the law. She also was active in collecting signatures for a petition to outlaw the atomic bomb and to keep American troops out of the Korean War. In the spring of 1951, Griffin helped members of the Midwest Bag and Burlap Company unionize and gave them advice on how to conduct a strike. The next year she joined the campaign to elect Paul Robeson as the Progressive Party’s nominee for president of the United States, despite her fears that white liberals would not support a black president. Three years later, in a letter in the *Des Moines Register*, Griffin analyzed the case against Ethel and Julius Rosenberg and cast doubt on the accusations.\(^59\)

A 1957 FBI report on Griffin cited her as an “active member of the PTA, NAACP, ACLU, League of Women Voters, and other local organizations through which she campaigns for FEPC [Fair Employment Practices Committee] in Iowa.” These alliances hardly amounted to a threat against national security (although her position as a “leading Communist party member in Iowa, outside of the Quad Cities,” certainly concerned federal officials), but they do offer evidence of the variety of methods Griffin used to push for civil rights and social justice. One FBI

---

\(^{58}\) All information in this section comes from the FBI files, except where otherwise noted. For more on the Terry Lee Sims case, see Bruce Fehn, “Race for Justice: The Terry Lee Sims Rape Case in Sioux City, 1949–1952,” *Annals of Iowa* 64 (2005), 311–39.

\(^{59}\) FBI files.
agent assigned to trace Griffin’s activities reported (in a manner that seems quite complimentary in retrospect) that “she should not be underestimated as an individual. She is a very capable and intelligent person. She manages to get along with people and is always fighting for some noble cause.”

One of her noble causes was to push for an end to racial discrimination in housing. In 1958 and 1959, she joined the NAACP, the venerable organization that she once feared took too much credit for civil rights work being done in Iowa, as the chair of the Housing Committee. On January 4, 1959, she was the first person to speak at a city council meeting scheduled to talk specifically about racial discrimination in Des Moines housing.

By the 1960s, civil rights were being discussed in communities throughout the nation, and civil rights activities, in the South particularly, were gaining national attention. Just as in Des Moines, the southern civil rights movements were largely home-grown and led by local leaders. Yet Griffin’s story demonstrated that northern liberals needed to remain vigilant against the discrimination that continued to plague their own communities (while also offering moral support to their brothers and sisters in arms fighting more dangerous battles in the South). Griffin founded Des Moines’s chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) in 1963, and from her post sought to address many issues facing black Iowans. In her communications as the leader of CORE she recorded her first recollections of her involvement in the Katz struggle. In a letter to James McCain at CORE’s national office, she remarked, in response to a proposal to send national leaders to Des Moines to hold a workshop on nonviolence, “We would appreciate very much as we plan to deal with discrimination in eating places which we thought we had straight. Our first sit-in took place here in 1949 under my direction.”

Here, Griffin is taking ownership for coordinating the Katz movement, and her indication of that movement being a “first” suggests that she viewed it, by the 1960s, as a sort of beginning. Her citation of the sit-in in a letter 14 years later to the head of

---

60. Edna Griffin to James T. McCain, 9/14/1963, CORE Papers (microfilm), University of Iowa Law Library, Iowa City.
an organization committed to the principles of nonviolence connects the Katz struggle to the wider civil rights movement.

Like the Americans who participated in the well-known later movements—the Birmingham bus boycott, the Selma march, the Greensboro sit-ins—Griffin demonstrated considerable courage in waging her battle against Katz, even though she was not likely to admit it. In her later recollections about her fight against Katz, Griffin always took pains to point out that her activism was far less dangerous than the work done by civil rights workers in the South in the 1950s and 1960s. In 1989 she told Ben Stone of the Iowa Civil Liberties Union that her efforts against Katz should not be compared with the efforts of civil rights advocates working in the Deep South, since those activists “put their lives on the line to get served” while she and her friends had the support of Iowa civil rights legislation.61 Privately, though, Griffin had been a targeted by white supremacist groups. FBI internal memos reveal that, during her time fighting against Katz, “she received a letter signed ‘KKK’ which

threatened her life.”

Griffin had given the letter to the police, who then gave it to the FBI, but Griffin never publicly revealed the existence of the letter when she began receiving accolades for her activism in the late 1990s, suggesting that she wanted to continue to downplay the risks she faced due to her activism.

Although Martin Luther King Jr. would not have heard of Edna Griffin in 1954 when he rose to prominence as a leader of the Montgomery bus boycott, the particular strategies his movement used and subsequently popularized were the same tactics Griffin used in her struggle against Katz: appeals to the conscience of apathetic whites, use of the courts and economic boycotts, and the cultivation of social networks to spread word of the movement. It was thus only appropriate that Griffin organized a group of Iowans to travel to the March on Washington to hear King’s most famous speech in August 1963, and even more appropriate that she had a refined sense of the historical context of the event: “You would think Dr. King had done most of it by himself,” she protested in an interview in 1986. “That was not true. . . . It was the help of the young people. He wouldn’t have made it without them.”

Having been a grassroots activist herself, Griffin knew how social movements succeeded, and even later in her life sought to correct the top-down emphasis placed on histories of the movements she and thousands of others helped make possible.

Griffin likely felt that her work was never done. She was “able to see the larger movement, and I think that’s what kept her moving forward,” reflected Phyllis Griffin. “She was never interested in stopping, because she saw how much work needed to be done.” The task of extending civil rights to all Americans, Griffin knew, was a work still very much in progress.

That work continues today. The scholar-activist Cornel West has suggested that one way to continue to advocate for social justice is to hold up as models those courageous individuals who lived their lives in a spiritually mature manner.

---

62. FBI files.
63. Edna Griffin, interview, 10.
64. Phyllis Griffin, interview.
Griffin was one such individual, although it took the state of Iowa 50 years to realize it. On July 7, 1998, however, leaders from across the state came back to the intersection of 7th and Locust in Des Moines to hold a ceremony commemorating Edna Griffin, John Bibbs, and Leonard Hudson for the courage they had shown a half-century earlier in forcing the city to live up to its ideals. A plaque was unfurled labeling the spot of the “Civil Rights Victory,” and the building that then stood where Katz Drug Store once stood was renamed the Edna Griffin Building. The woman who was perceived as such a threat to the government that FBI officials followed her for 17 years had proven to be ahead of her time; the rest of the state had finally caught up. The woman who had fought the establishment ultimately earned its begrudging respect.

Thus, in May 2004, several of Iowa’s top lawmakers, including Lieutenant Governor Sally Pederson and U.S. Representative Leonard Boswell, met with Edna Griffin’s three children, a group of elementary school children, representatives of the Iowa Department of Transportation, and several others to inaugurate the Edna Griffin Bridge, a beautiful blue footbridge near the state capitol that allows citizens to safely cross I-235. A bridge is an apt metaphor for Edna Griffin, a woman whose action helped put to rest the segregationist policies of Katz Drug Company, and who, in doing so, helped usher in a new era of civil rights activism marked by mass mobilization and a firm commitment to nonviolent direct action.
Book Reviews and Notices


Reviewer William Green is director of the Logan Museum of Anthropology, Beloit College. He was the State Archaeologist of Iowa from 1988 to 2001.

Electronic media play an ever-growing role in education. Although printed material is still important, digital resources can enhance learning in both formal (classroom) and informal (home or museum) settings. Electronic media allow interactive access to audiovisual resources as well as written material, including archival records, previously published material, and newly created texts. Well-designed digital media supply innovative tools as well as useful content and allow easy navigation to promote exploration and discovery.

The *Meskwaki History* CD does what digital history resources should do. It contains a trove of information in various formats about the Meskwaki Indians from a wide variety of sources, many of them Meskwaki. It also links those materials in ways that encourage further investigation, and it is suited to both formal and informal learning. This CD—a collaborative project of the State Historical Society of Iowa and the Meskwaki Nation—is an authoritative and comprehensive educational and research resource that will be useful to everyone interested in the history and culture of Indians in Iowa and nearby areas.

The Meskwaki, also known as the Fox Indians and federally recognized as the Sac and Fox Indians of the Mississippi in Iowa, have lived in Iowa for more than 200 years. In earlier centuries they resided in Illinois, Wisconsin, and elsewhere in the Great Lakes region. The Meskwaki language belongs to the Algonkian family of languages and is similar to the languages spoken by other Central Algonkian groups with Great Lakes origins such as the Sauk and Kickapoo.

*Meskwaki History* reflects the importance of language to Meskwaki identity and culture. Audio files add a dimension of engagement not possible with written materials alone. Users of the CD can listen to Meskwaki language presentations, learn the proper pronunciation of some Meskwaki words, and read texts in Meskwaki and in English translation.

Video files also provide insightful perspectives on several dimensions of Meskwaki life and culture. Among the most notable resources
on the CD are rare color films from the 1940s that show Meskwaki powwow dances, games, and frybread making. More recent clips from television newscasts are valuable because they reveal as much about outsiders’ views of Indians as they do about the Meskwaki themselves.

In addition to the sound files and movies, *Meskwaki History* contains many visual and written resources that are difficult or impossible to find elsewhere. Users can access more than 1,200 pages of material about Meskwaki history and culture. For material that is not on the CD in scanned or transcribed form, the CD supplies complete references, allowing easy access via your local library.

One fascinating section contains a chronologically ordered compilation of outsiders’ observations about the Meskwaki and tribal members’ own statements as recorded in a wide variety of documents reaching back to the seventeenth century. This is history from the viewpoint of contemporary participants and observers. Other primary source material includes eight censuses of the tribe from 1840 to 1937 as well as a multitude of treaties and historical maps. Consistent with the educational focus of the CD, a detailed lesson plan on the use of primary source documents supplies teachers and students (grades 3–8) with tools to investigate these resources and to develop skills and knowledge that tie into Iowa state standards in history and geography. Educators elsewhere likely will find these lessons relevant to their own state standards. The CD contains ten other useful lesson plans that use various images, documents, media files, and other resources.

Regarding material culture, the CD contains images and descriptions of many nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Meskwaki artifacts, most of which are in the collections of the State Historical Society of Iowa. Notable objects include Wacochachi’s 1830s–1840s pictograph drawing (along with scans of articles about the pictograph) and a beautiful wooden spoon from around 1830, depicted via a short movie. The lesson plan that focuses on Wacochachi’s drawing is especially well designed and thorough.

The Meskwaki have been the subject of anthropological attention for more than a hundred years. Among the earliest and most influential studies were the *Fox Texts* and other ethnographic writings of William Jones. A student of Franz Boas and the first Native American to earn a Ph.D. in anthropology, Jones was of Sac and Fox ancestry. A paper in this CD by Sophilia Keahna assesses Jones’s work and calls attention to its problematic ethics, substance, and implications.

One of the principal values of *Meskwaki History* is that its sections are attributed to specific authors rather than appearing anonymously. Many electronic resources do not name their authors, yet attribution is
important in any serious learning tool. While “wiki”-type online resources have their place, creators of putatively authoritative works must be identified so users can determine the reliability of the product, whether written or digital. Authors Johnathan L. Buffalo, Mary Bennett, and Dawn Suzanne Wanatee (along with Lynn M. Alex, who wrote many of the lesson plans) are knowledgeable and experienced in Meskwaki and Iowa history and are well qualified and trustworthy. Their background does not guarantee that everything in the CD is accurate and complete, but it does make Meskwaki History a much more useful resource than many electronic (especially online) resources.

As an assiduous reviewer often does, I searched for problematic parts of the CD. In terms of content and structure I found very few. My interest in ethnobotany led me to look in some depth at the “Meskwaki Use of Plants for Food” section. The informative text and photos cover cultivated plants (corn, beans, squash) and a wide variety of wild plants. The only content-related problem I found in the CD occurred in this section. The text for hazelnut (filbert) lists the genus and species as “Filia americana L.,” but the correct name is Corylus americana. The incorrect name may stem from use of an accompanying illustration of basswood or linden rather than American hazel. Basswood’s genus and species is Tilia americana, and the handwritten tag on the illustration (a herbarium specimen collected by Bohumil Shimek in 1894) was misread as “Filia america.” A clear photo of an American hazel (C. americana) shrub and nuts should replace the photo of the basswood leaves and flowers.

The CD is fairly easy to navigate using standard web browsers. Bars and tabs allow direct access to the key sections, which open in new tabs on the browser. Arrows move the user to the next or previous page. A site map outlines the complete CD and supplies direct access to every page. I found no universal search capability or index, however, so it is not possible to locate or access every occurrence of, say, “spoon” or “necklace.” The ability to enter such search terms and view their occurrences would be a nice addition to the resource. I have used the CD on Mac (OS 10.4.11) and PC platforms (Windows XP Professional) and encountered no compatibility problems or crashes.

In summary, Meskwaki History is an electronic treasure trove, a digital gold mine of information about the Meskwaki people past and present. Reflecting a cooperative effort among state and tribal historians, it conveys both insiders’ and outsiders’ viewpoints on the Meskwaki. The prevailing point of view, though, is Meskwaki. Tribal members—past and present—speak for themselves. Their perspectives and the copious amount of documentation this CD contains ensure that Mes-
kwaki History will serve not only as a standard, authoritative resource on the tribe but also as a model for collaborative historical documentation projects. National recognition of this achievement already has come through the American Association for State and Local History’s naming of the State Historical Society of Iowa and the Meskwaki Nation Historical Preservation Office as recipients of its 2007 Award of Merit for Leadership in History. Buy this CD and use it.


Reviewer John P. Bowes is assistant professor of history at Eastern Kentucky University. He is the author of Black Hawk and the War of 1832: Removal in the North (2007) and Exiles and Pioneers: Eastern Indians in the Trans-Mississippi West (2007).

This book is clearly not the first to discuss the Lewis and Clark expedition. Nor is it the first to examine the Corps of Discovery from a Native perspective. However, Lewis and Clark and the Indian Country makes a strong case for being the first to present a comprehensive analysis of the expedition and its impact from the time prior to the expedition to the present day. And although it is principally a collection of primary source documents, it presents a complex and critical perspective on Lewis and Clark that provides thoughtful conclusions even as it leaves room for readers to make inferences of their own.

Lewis and Clark and the Indian Country is an edited volume that contains a vast array of sources, many of which come from a Newberry Library exhibit showcasing new scholarship on the expedition and Indian Country. Excerpts from the Corps of Discovery journals appear next to previously published essays, interviews with Native peoples, and government documents. All of this is put together with a stated purpose of tackling head-on the legend constructed over the course of two centuries—the legend of Lewis and Clark and their courageous expedition successfully overcoming both wilderness and hostile Native tribes to open the West to their fellow Americans. In collaboration with five Native consultants, Fred Hoxie and Jay Nelson have put together a volume that pointedly illustrates the ways in which the Lewis and Clark expedition was not such a singular event but a “part of a historical process that was ongoing and whose effects could be witnessed” in present-day Indian Country (11).
The collection is organized into four distinct sections. The first of these, titled “The Indian Country,” presents the histories and cultures of the people and places prior to the arrival of the Corps of Discovery. “Crossing the Indian Country” introduces readers to multiple aspects of the actual expedition. Most of the sources in this segment focus on the relations between the American explorers and the Native peoples they encountered; accounts written by Meriwether Lewis and William Clark share space with the perspectives of Hidatsa, Nez Perce, and Blackfeet Indians. This section provides intriguing insights into the expedition but might appear fragmented to anyone not already familiar with the basics of the Lewis and Clark expedition. The second half of the book examines the impact of the expedition on the land and the peoples along the route in the decades and centuries that followed. “A New Nation Comes to the Indian Country” traces the effects of settlers, ranchers, miners, and government policy during the nineteenth century as the United States and its citizens sought to impose its will and beliefs on the land. Finally, the section titled “Indian Country Today” addresses the various ways the descendants of the Native peoples who met and helped Lewis and Clark have worked to maintain and recover their land, languages, and livelihood in the face of an American nation intent on celebrating Lewis and Clark as the great explorers who discovered the American West.

This collection presents a vast amount of information that is not easily digested the first time through its pages. That is as it should be. In an introduction that begins by analyzing Americans’ love for bicentennials, Frederick Hoxie notes that “the greater the celebration, the smaller the questions being asked about it” (5). Needless to say, Hoxie and Jay Nelson have done a great service by moving far beyond the simple questions of the Lewis and Clark expedition. Page by page, readers encounter accounts and information that are diverse and at times unfamiliar, but they are not told what to think of them. Indeed, the conclusion written by renowned Lewis and Clark scholar James P. Ronda presents more questions to consider than conclusions to accept.

*Lewis and Clark and the Indian Country* ultimately delivers on the promise of the introduction. It places the Corps of Discovery and its leaders in “a broad and multifaceted historical context that will allow serious students of history the opportunity to reflect on the deeper meaning of the expedition” (7). Most important, it provides readers with a vast amount of information with which they can assess all that has been written, said, and celebrated about the Corps of Discovery and the Indian men and women who played such vital roles in the expedition and live with its legacy.

Reviewer David Walker is professor of history at the University of Northern Iowa. He regularly teaches courses on the American West and Indians in American history.

The Lewis and Clark bicentennial resulted in a wide variety of scholarly works that naturally focused on the remarkable voyage. Topics included expedition food, medicine, psychological probes, and two excellent biographies of Clark, most taking advantage of Gary Moulton’s significant 13-volume edition of the *The Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition* (1983–2001). No works, however, surpassed the earlier popular success of Stephen Ambrose’s *Undaunted Courage: Meriwether Lewis, Thomas Jefferson, and the Opening of the American West* (1996) that spent several years on the *New York Times* best-seller list. As might be expected, scholars did not find a definitive answer to the controversy surrounding the deaths of two individuals: Meriwether Lewis and Sacagawea.

Jay H. Buckley adds an important volume to bicentennial scholarship by emphasizing the significant post-expedition life of Clark. As the major figure in implementing U.S. Indian policy from 1807 to 1838, Clark used his diplomatic skills to negotiate 37 treaties of war, land cession, and trade; and he participated in the formal removal of thousands of Native inhabitants. Clark’s diplomatic skills were developed and honed during the expedition, when he learned acceptable Indian protocol and developed strategies recognizing tribal differences. Thereafter he “used threats, force, and deception as well as generosity, kindness, friendship, . . . as part of his diplomatic repertoire” (15). Clark, who clearly enjoyed being with Indians and valued their history and culture more than a typical contemporary, firmly believed that Indian land should be purchased, not taken by force, and that trade rather than war would enhance friendships and alliances.

Clark’s diplomatic career began in St. Louis in 1807, when he was appointed principal Indian agent for all tribes west of the Mississippi. As governor of Missouri Territory (1813–1820), he organized tribes to fight against Indian allies of the British and negotiated two dozen treaties, most important at Portage Des Sioux during the summer and fall of 1815. Although Clark played a prominent role in helping Missouri achieve statehood in 1821, he lost the election to become its initial governor. During the campaign he was the target of two main criticisms: he had failed to protect the frontier against Indians, and he favored Native people over settlers.
Throughout his life in St. Louis Clark was active in the fur trade, helping establish the city as the true Gateway to the West. Although he never returned to the Rockies, he used his governmental positions to enhance the trade by negotiating treaties that he considered fundamental to forging Indian alliances and by investing in and providing leadership for several formally organized companies. Yet he recommended total prohibition of liquor in the Indian trade, a position that ran counter to established views of the fur trade. Clark and Michigan territorial governor Lewis Cass played instrumental roles in developing policies that led to the important Indian Intercourse and Indian Reorganization acts of 1834, legislation fundamental to federal relations with western tribes for decades.

Clark, a skilled cartographer, produced an extremely valuable map of the West in 1810. From that base, at the end of his territorial governorship he sent a map to Secretary of War John C. Calhoun outlining a permanent Indian territory on the Great Plains. He believed that in order to “improve,” Indians needed to be isolated from potentially corrupt frontier society. That meant assisting tribes from the East and protecting them from settlers and Indians already residing on the Plains. This was a major focus of his effort as Superintendent of Indian Affairs at St. Louis from 1822 until his death in September 1838, the longest term in American history.

Buckley clearly presents a balanced portrait of Clark, as neither purely the Indians’ antagonist nor the tribes’ humanitarian friend. Clark promoted federal policies based on the belief that westward expansion benefited Indians. Ultimately, he was “a federal representative first and foremost” (27). Buckley demonstrates that although Clark’s expedition legacy can never be diminished, his service for more than three decades helping to formulate and implement the nation’s Indian policy is an equally important historical legacy. He was indeed “antebellum America’s most important and influential Indian diplomat” (242).

Buckley immersed himself in a voluminous array of primary sources, and the publisher added an excellent collection of contemporary portraits as well as eight essential maps. The narrative is well written and flows smoothly through its chronological organization. The book will appeal to a wide variety of readers, especially those interested in Indian, western, and regional history.


Reviewer Loren N. Horton is retired senior historian for the State Historical Society of Iowa. His research and writing have focused on the social history of the nineteenth century and Iowa aspects of Mormon and western trails history.

These two books make nice companion volumes, in subject matter and methodology. Both focus on the Mormon Trail, the route members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints took as they crossed Iowa in 1846, as well as on the remaining areas on the route to their destination, the Great Salt Lake Valley. This was one of the great migrations on the U.S. frontier. Both books are in the format of guidebooks. Franzwa concentrates on the physical geography of the route and how present-day travelers can retrace the journey. Hartley and Anderson are concerned more with the campsites as well as the trail, and their book perhaps contains more formal information about the expeditions. Both books give enough background information about the trail to enable readers unfamiliar with the historical context of the trail to understand the reasons for the trek. Although neither volume concentrates exclusively on the Iowa sections of the trail, the detail presented adequately covers that aspect. Hartley and Anderson provide a more complete introduction to the religious group that followed the trail.

With these two books as guides, one can follow the routes of the various companies in 1846 and 1847 and literally step in the footprints of the Saints as they “wended” their way to their “Zion in the West.” Extensive photographs in both books show the present-day conditions of campsites and the few remaining pieces of physical evidence, such as wagon ruts. Historic photographs and drawings are extremely helpful to the reader. Both books have useful maps that clearly explain the geography through which the 1846 and 1847 refugees passed from the persecutions in Nauvoo, Illinois. Hartley and Anderson also include information about the 1856 and 1857 handcart companies’ routes.

Because Hartley and Anderson deal solely with Iowa and Nebraska they are able to go into greater detail about the trail and the contemporary roads and highways nearest to that original route. Their book contains more maps and, in some cases, more detailed maps than Franzwa’s does. However, Franzwa includes as an insert the National Park Service fold-out leaflet and map of the Mormon Pioneer
National Historic Trail, which helps readers understand the extent of the trail, the awesome distances that had to be covered from Nauvoo to Utah. In general, the maps included are valuable aids in tracing the trail’s geography.

As is often the case, there are points in each book where readers might wish things had been done differently. For instance, both Franzwa’s “sources and acknowledgements” section and Hartley and Anderson’s bibliography seem unnecessarily complex. But Hartley and Anderson’s extensive use of diaries and journals of people who made the journey must be applauded.

On the whole, it is difficult to imagine two books more useful to people interested in the Mormon Trail or in Iowa history. Only Matthew Chatterley’s *Wend Your Way: A Guide to Sites along the Iowa Mormon Trail* rivals them, and it is, as its title indicates, exclusively about Iowa sites. (See the review in the *Annals of Iowa* 60 [Spring 2001], 205). No library or school in Iowa should be without these two books (or all three). Franzwa and Hartley and Anderson offer a wealth of detail about this interesting and significant episode in Iowa’s history, an episode that is important in the context of the history of the U.S. frontier experience. And the authors bring the added benefit of personal acquaintance with the trail sites. It seems as if all three authors have walked every step of the way that they describe, which adds to the excellence of both books. Both books are unqualified successes for the purposes intended.


Reviewer Wesley I. Shank is emeritus professor of architecture at Iowa State University. He has written extensively about Iowa architecture.

When a museum is housed in a historical building such as Old Capitol, people go to it to learn not only about what is in the building, but also about the building itself. This book is a visitor’s illustrated guidebook for both. The first chapter relates the history of the building, from its construction in the 1840s through its rehabilitation in the early 1920s, its detailed restoration in the early 1970s, and its exterior restoration in the early 2000s. The second chapter tells about how the building served as capitol of the territory, then of the state until 1857, and then in several different ways for the University of Iowa until its restoration in the 1970s, when it became a museum. The third chapter, which makes up about two-thirds of the book, is a guidebook that takes the visitor through the rooms, including the rotunda, telling the history of each
one and its furniture and other artifacts. Langdon’s photographs and the historic photographs reproduced from various collections accompany the text throughout.

Historic building guidebooks are rarely presented so well. This book is significant for its accurate and succinct text, the fine selection of historic photographs reproduced in it, and the excellent color photographs of the building today. It is also significant for the way the text and photographs work so well together to tell their story. In years to come, Facing East and Facing West will itself doubtless become an important historic document of Iowa’s Old Capitol.


Reviewer Kristen L. Anderson is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Iowa. Her research and writing focus on German Americans and African Americans in nineteenth-century St. Louis.

In *Independent Immigrants*, Robert Frizzell chronicles the experiences of the peasant farmers who migrated from Hanover to Lafayette County, Missouri, settling near the future town of Concordia. He uses a wide variety of sources—including wills, passports, ship passenger lists, and land ownership records—to recreate a detailed picture of life in both Germany and America. In doing so, Frizzell sheds light on the settlers’ lives before migration, the reasons they chose to leave Europe, the resources they brought with them to Missouri, and their new lives in America. This study thus follows the trend in immigration history of studying the entire migration experience, including the migrants’ place of origin and the journey itself, as well as their experiences once they reached the United States.

Frizzell begins with the migrants’ lives in Hanover. He argues that most of these farmers decided to leave Europe primarily for economic reasons, as the shift to industrial production and the division of the common lands undermined the standard of living for many peasants. Frizzell traces a number of immigrants directly from Hanover to Missouri, examining their economic standing and agricultural activities in both countries. He argues that they quickly adopted the crops grown by their native-born neighbors, although unlike many Americans in Lafayette County, the Germans seldom used slave labor to work their farms.

Frizzell argues that the Germans’ opposition to slavery became the strongest line of division between them and their native-born
neighbors, particularly during the Civil War. Confederate guerrillas targeted Germans in their raids, particularly once large numbers of German men joined the Union army. Frizzell describes in detail the 1864 Confederate raid on Lafayette County's heavily German Freedom Township, when Bloody Bill Anderson's band of bushwhackers killed many Germans in the settlement, massacring the wounded and raping women. Despite this hostility, many Germans remained in Lafayette County and maintained a strong ethnic identity as German. Furthermore, as the former slave owners struggled to adapt to a free labor force, the German farmers continued to prosper economically, although they became isolated politically within the county as Missouri took a conservative turn in the 1870s.

Independent Immigrants is an excellent example of both immigration history and local history, in that it successfully combines local detail with larger trends in international migration. Frizzell recreates the immigrants' world, both in Hanover and in Missouri, in impressive detail, while never losing sight of his larger arguments regarding the causes of migration. Frizzell also makes an important contribution to the literature on the participation of midwestern immigrants in the Civil War. He argues against the position that the Civil War served as an Americanizing influence for immigrants, demonstrating that the Concordia Germans maintained their ethnic identity throughout the nineteenth century. He argues instead that the hostility the German-born faced during the war served to subordinate regional identities as Hanoverians or Westfalians to an identity as German American. He further demonstrates how this German identity varied from place to place. In Lafayette County, for example, being German meant being Protestant, living a rural life, and speaking a north German dialect. The detailed portraits Frizzell creates of individual families and migrants challenge our assumptions about the causes of German migration and shed new light on the lives these individuals led in Europe and America.


Reviewer Kenneth L. Lyftogt is a lecturer in history at the University of Northern Iowa. He is the author of several books on Iowa and the Civil War, including Iowa’s Forgotten General: Matthew Mark Trumbull and the Civil War (2005).

A frequent question asked of scholars of Iowa and the Civil War is: “How close did the fighting come to Iowa?” The question is answered

The book is the result of a lifetime’s fascination and study by the author, who first visited the battle site in 1962 at the age of eight and returned many times after. Cooper-Wiele’s research is extensive, ranging from the standard Civil War sources to interviews with local people who are familiar with the town and the battle. The result is local history at its best, complete with fascinating participants, a good account of the brutal nature of the war in Missouri, and a thorough explanation of the author’s methodology. Iowa’s role, especially that of the town of Keokuk and the participation by Iowa troops in the battle, is critical and makes this book a must for Iowans.

I have published two books with Clark Kenyon’s Camp Pope Bookshop and heartily endorse every word of Cooper-Wiele’s praise for Kenyon’s skill as an editor and publisher. He is an Iowa treasure, and this book is one more example of why.


Reviewer Peter Hoehnle is project manager, Iowa Valley Resource Conservation and Development. His research, writing, and teaching have focused on communal societies and all aspects of Iowa history.

The story told in John Koblas’s book, Jesse James in Iowa, is a tale of murder, thievery, and a notorious American outlaw. Koblas traces the exploits of Jesse James (1847–1882) as the outlaw’s area of operation encompassed the Hawkeye State in the 1860s and 1870s.

Koblas has written prolifically on James and on western history topics primarily for a younger audience. His accounts of the James Gang’s activity in Iowa are engaging and should appeal to readers who are interested in James and western lore. Copious footnotes demonstrate that he mined newspapers, court documents, memoirs, and county histories for his account, which discounts some popular misconceptions about the James Gang’s activity in the state.

The chief weakness of the book is a lack of focus. A lengthy chapter is devoted to the so-called Honey War between Iowa and Missouri in 1839. What impact that dispute had on James and company is not explained; the event appears to be included simply because it makes for a good story. Until bound by the strict chronology of James’s robberies in Iowa, Koblas wanders through Iowa and Missouri history,
the background of Jesse James, and the lives of other western figures, such as Wyatt Earp, who shared an Iowa connection. The accounts are compelling but disjointed. Some anecdotes about James are related in more than one place in the book, as is a lengthy quotation from James’s nemesis, detective Allan Pinkerton.

Koblas reaches his stride when he provides detailed narratives of three robberies attributed to the James Gang in or near Iowa. The first of these was the 1871 robbery of the bank at Corydon, Iowa, while most of the townspeople were away listening to orator Henry Clay Dean. The second was the daytime robbery of a train near Adair in 1873, which, Koblas notes, was not the first train robbery in the West, as is often stated. The third incident involves James’s escape through Iowa following the robbery of the bank at Northfield, Minnesota, in 1876. Koblas’s meticulous research suggests that little new information remains to be uncovered about these events.

This book represents careful research but, unfortunately, less careful editing. An entertaining read, its lack of focus and historical contextualization and perspective limit its effectiveness.


Reviewer Patrick Nunnally, research associate, University of Minnesota, coordinates the Telling River Stories project, which tells stories of how people have shaped the Mississippi River and been shaped by it.

Annette Atkins undertakes a brave foray into the often undervalued field of state history. What identifies the distinctive characteristics of a particular state? Is there anything that marks an Iowan, say, from a Minnesotan or a South Dakotan? Recent historical scholarship has tended not to concern itself with questions such as these, focusing instead on smaller or larger aggregations of population, or on groups defined in ways other than political geography. But Atkins makes a compelling case that close examination of a state’s history can indeed be illustrative of many aspects of that state’s past that remain important in the present. If, ultimately, her book is not fully satisfactory for all readers, that isn’t because it is poorly written or sloppily thought out.

The notion that there can be an “inside out” to Minnesota history, presumes, of course, that there’s an “outside in.” For Atkins, the traditional biases of state history toward a “march of progress” narrative emphasizing political and economic triumphs unduly narrow the
complexity of lived experience in time and place, and are therefore the “outside in.” Furthermore, the traditional narrative doesn’t really explain what most people’s experience was, say, in the rural nineteenth-century Midwest. Accordingly, Atkins borrows theoretical insights from the folklorist Henry Glassie and posits her narratives as “looking over the shoulder” of historical figures, some well known, others obscure. In the process, Atkins very self-consciously turns her back on a mode of historical writing that seeks to “cover” a previously defined “important” subject or take an incontrovertible position on a matter of historiographical controversy. The reader won’t find some of the most well-known and contentious incidents in Minnesota’s history here.

Instead, Atkins treats her readers to a series of well-crafted, highly particular miniatures, studies of a particular family, person, or community that shed light on critically important large-scale changes characterizing the state, region, and nation. Her writing achieves a specificity and vividness that make her work accessible to non-historians, even non-scholars. For the most part, these miniatures work. Her essay on the Scott Campbell family and its wide net of descendants is one of the best accounts of the mix of family, race, and culture in the turbulent decades prior to the Dakota War of 1862 that I have ever seen. Her treatment of the 1920s follows a fairly conventional historiography of a growing split between urban and rural lives, but her way into this divide, through an examination of historic photographs, is unconventional. She argues that cameras had become inexpensive enough by the 1920s that they were widely accessible and could be used as a lens through which to understand everyday life as well as the lives of the elites who had been photographed for decades.

Ultimately, Atkins’s sketches provide interesting and plausible insights about how particular people in a particular place made a life for themselves in the past. That said, there are some omissions that are interesting, if not puzzling. Between 1880 and 1930, more flour was produced and shipped at St. Anthony Falls on the Mississippi River in Minneapolis than anywhere else in the world. Household brands such as Pillsbury and General Mills had their origins there. James J. Hill’s Great Northern Railroad, headquartered in nearby St. Paul, played an important role in the manufacturing and transportation hub of the Twin Cities that fueled growth across the northern plains. Yet Atkins tells the stories of the 1880s by “looking over the shoulder” of Mary Gillett, an office worker in Red Wing. It’s true that Gillett’s story is illustrative, and perhaps the flour-and-railroad story is so well known as not to bear retelling, but, still, Atkins’s choice of subject invites questions.
And I think that is exactly her intent: to inspire questions about the people and places that have made Minnesota what it is today. Every state should have a history like this, which recalls the WPA guides, sometimes idiosyncratic accounts but always conveying a particular voice and a distinct perspective. Readers don’t rely on volumes such as these for “The Truth,” but for a way into the complex reality of a state, which is a problematic concept right now. Despite the academic “interrogation” of the term “state,” many people think of themselves as “Minnesotan” or “Iowan.” A book like this, then, might almost be seen as the start of a wiki on Minnesota history, where others can add the milling material to supplement Atkins’s basic perspective.

Annette Atkins may have modeled a twenty-first century state history. But this book isn’t for everyone. If readers are looking for the “definitive word” on a subject, or for systematic coverage, then they should consult earlier systematizers such as W. W. Folwell, Theodore Blegen, William Lass, or Clifford Clark. But because those books do exist, there’s no need to do them again. For generalists interested in vivid stories and informed reflection on what historical patterns become “Minnesotan,” this is your book.


Reviewer Kristin Elmquist is a high school social studies teacher in Minnesota. Her background is in cultural anthropology and immigration history.

Minnesota 150 is the result of an enormous project created to coincide with the state’s 150th birthday. The goal was simple: to create a collection of people, places, and things that promoted change within or outside of Minnesota, and display that collection in a book and an exhibit at the Minnesota History Center. The public was invited to submit nominations and make a case for why each choice merited consideration, and the list was narrowed by exhibit planners and historians. The resulting 150 choices range from the general (immigrants) to the specific (SPAM), from the famous (Charles Lindbergh) to the obscure (Frederick McKinley Jones, an African American migrant to Minnesota who invented refrigeration units for trucks). The collection includes events from prehistory (the ancient tropical sea that created the limestone from which the Twin Cities is built) to modern figures (Prince).

Readers may take issue with some of the choices, and that is part of the project’s value. The arbitrary nature of the 150 final choices and the
wide range of entries make it inappropriate to read this as a comprehensive reference on all that is significant to Minnesota. Rather, the project engages the public in history making by starting conversations (or arguments) about what the state’s history is, or should be. This is a successful example of history telling as an ongoing debate, open to a variety of interpretations. A project like this would be valuable for any state, to encourage its inhabitants to play a role in telling their own story.


Reviewer Kevin Byrne is professor of history at Gustavus Adolphus College. His areas of interest include railroad, political, and military history and the history of technology.

As railroad historian Don Hofsommer observes in his foreword, *Rails to the North Star* is “a masterful catalog of data” (xii). This reprint of a 1966 book is all of that. Author Richard Prosser referred to the endeavor as “essentially a library-oriented project” that covered “all facets of railroad development” (xiii). Compiled to celebrate a centennial of Minnesota railroad history, the volume met its goals admirably when it first appeared and remains useful today.

*Rails to the North Star* opens with a 115-page history of Minnesota railroads. Short chapters of ten or fewer pages tell the story chronologically, and other chapters add information on specific themes such as logging railroads and urban lines. The narrative is factual, straightforward, and descriptive, providing essential information, some judgments by its railroad-enthusiast author, and a few digressions. More than half the volume, however, is a compendium of documents derived mainly from Minnesota Railroad & Warehouse Commission records. There are short entries on every railroad company that built or planned to build a railroad or street railway in the state, and more: brief commission reports, an index of state statutes, and some historical photographs, for example. Perhaps most interesting are the maps—25 of them, using full-color legends redrafted for this edition. They demonstrate the growth of railroads by decade, by system, and by category in a clear, enlightening manner. Midwestern railroad buffs seeking a brief history of and reference book on Minnesota railroads will want to take a look at Prosser’s contribution.

Reviewer Mark R. Ellis is associate professor of history at the University of Nebraska at Kearney. He is the author of Law and Order in Buffalo Bill’s Country: Legal Culture and Community on the Great Plains, 1868–1910 (2007).

Although Minnesota has no death penalty and has one of the nation’s lowest homicide rates, the state has a dark legacy of violence. Minnesota, for example, holds the dubious distinction of hosting the largest mass execution in American history. In 1862, on orders from President Abraham Lincoln, 38 Dakota Indians were executed in Mankato for their part in the Santee Uprising that left hundreds of settlers dead. Minnesota has also witnessed a number of extralegal executions, including the appalling 1920 lynching of three young African American men by the citizens of Duluth. Despite these blotches on the state’s history, by 1911 the state had abolished the death penalty and in the 1920s led the way toward eliminating lynching in the United States. Combining his experience as an attorney, professional writer, and law professor, John D. Bessler examines the history of legal and extralegal executions in Minnesota and the events and people that eventually convinced Minnesotans to ban such practices.

Bessler has written and lectured extensively on the death penalty and has done pro bono legal work for death-row inmates in Texas. Although Bessler is clearly against the death penalty, his book does not read like a vitriolic propaganda piece against the death penalty. Still, the primary argument in this book is that executions, legal or extralegal, are wrong and harmful to society. The author views Minnesota as a leader in the movement to eliminate the death penalty and lynching, and he hopes that other states—and the world—will look up to, and eventually follow, the North Star State’s lead.

The author tells his story in eight chapters. The first chapter provides an overview of Minnesota’s death penalty and extralegal movements from the territorial period to 1920. Here a number of lesser-known executions and lynchings are briefly reviewed. Bessler then expands on specific case studies, the first being a well-done chapter on the 1862 mass execution of 38 Dakota Indians. Bessler’s theme that violence only begets further violence is reinforced in this chapter, as the Dakota executions sparked decades of warfare with American Indians. In chapter three Bessler reviews the trial and execution of Ann Bilansky, the only woman legally executed in Minnesota. Several chapters examine the history of the anti-death penalty movement in Minnesota and the ultimate penalty’s transformation from a public
spectacle to an act carried out behind closed doors in the wee hours of the morning. The botched hanging of William Williams (chapter 6), who had to be hoisted up and strangled by rope for 14 minutes after his feet touched the ground, finally gave anti-death penalty proponents the power to end capital punishment in Minnesota. A final chapter explores the causes and consequences of the 1920 lynching of three young black men who were wrongly accused of raping a white teenager.

Although there is nothing specific about Iowa in this case study, Iowans, as residents of another state without a death penalty and with a low murder rate, will find much of interest. Iowa, too, has a history of extralegal violence, as Michael Pfeifer has highlighted in his many publications on violence in the Hawkeye State. And, like Minnesota, Iowa moved away from public executions during the Progressive Era and eventually banned the death penalty. Bessler’s message is clear. States such as Iowa and Minnesota that have abandoned the death penalty should be admired for their modernity and recognition of human rights.

Bessler did extensive archival research in newspapers, private papers, and legal and legislative records. Ample photographs provide a visual history of those who brought an end to the death penalty in Minnesota and those who were killed by legal and extralegal executions. The author is a skilled storyteller who grabs readers’ attention. Legacy of Violence is an important addition to a growing historiography that focuses on regional variations of lynching outside the American South.


Reviewer James W. Hewitt is adjunct professor of history at Nebraska Wesleyan University and has been a practicing lawyer for 52 years. He has written a history of the Nebraska Supreme Court.

The drama of the courtroom has made millions for those who write about it, who detail the excitement of cross-examination and the impeachment of witnesses. The reading public devours every offering by Scott Turow, John Grisham, and Richard North Patterson—books about trials, witnesses, lawyers, judges, and nefarious schemes. But one would search in vain for a fictional account of the intellectual aspects of review by appellate courts of the errors that may have occurred in those sometimes mundane, sometimes breathtaking trials.

It is up to scholars such as Jeffrey B. Morris to detail the work of courts of appeal. Our legal system affords more than one bite at the
apple. In virtually every instance, the losing party at trial has the right to seek review by a higher court, a court possessing the power to reverse the result of a trial if error has occurred. In the federal judicial system, those reviewing courts are the U.S. Courts of Appeal. Morris has told the story of the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, the court that oversees trial results in the Midwest.

Writing under the auspices of the Eighth Circuit Historical Society, the author has produced a laudatory chronological history of the court from its creation as a circuit court in 1862, when it possessed both trial and appellate jurisdiction, through the end of the twentieth century. The court, as presently constituted, encompasses Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, North and South Dakota, and Nebraska. Morris writes of major cases decided by the court over the years, with special emphasis on cases indigenous to the region, those involving agriculture, transportation, American Indians, bankruptcy, and debtors’ rights.

He lists all of the judges who have served on the court since its inception and characterizes them as liberal, moderate, or conservative. Since 1862, 11 Iowans have served as judges on the court: John F. Dillon, George W. McCrary, Walter Smith, William Kenyon, Seth Thomas, Martin Van Oosterhout, Roy Stephenson, George Fagg, David Hansen, Michael Melloy, and Steven Colloton. Although never a judge on the court, Samuel F. Miller of Keokuk, Iowa’s only member of the U.S. Supreme Court, was the circuit justice overseeing the work of the court for years after its inception. In a burst of legal incestuousness, Miller managed to secure the appointment of Dillon and McCrary, both of Keokuk and both of whom had been previously allied with him in the practice of law, as the first two judges on the court.

Morris conducted oral interviews with virtually all of the living active and senior judges of the court, immersed himself in regional history, and analyzed hundreds of cases decided by the court, following and discussing as well those that were ultimately decided by the U.S. Supreme Court on appeal. His research was wide ranging and impressive.

He discusses to some extent how the Courts of Appeal free up the U.S. Supreme Court to decide matters of great public significance, and he offers statistical evidence of how the court’s case load has swelled over the years. He does not, however, show how few cases the Supreme Court hears each year, a substantial contrast. He recites in some detail how the court has administratively attempted to enhance its efficiency, mentioning how much of the decisional work is done by administrative staff rather than by the judges. He briefly notes how the court has
curtailed opportunities for oral argument, without discussing the importance of such argument.

Because the book was produced for the court’s historical society, it is highly complimentary of the court, raising questions about the author’s objectivity. The book is obviously intended primarily for lawyers and judges and may leave lay people wondering about how the court functions. There is no discussion of how cases are filed, how they are set for argument, how the panels to hear the cases are selected, how decisions are reached, or how and why cases can be heard by the entire court after they have been heard by a panel. Morris assumes the reader knows all of these things, but it may be disconcerting to a lay public accustomed to seeing all nine of the Supreme Court justices present for oral argument.

But all in all, the book is a successful exposition of the work of a busy and capable court intent on bringing legal finality to much of the litigation in the region. Iowans should find interesting discussions of cases involving bridges over the Mississippi River, the attempted repudiation of municipal bond obligations, the right of students to exercise disruptive speech at school, and a host of others. Like all of their midwestern brethren, Iowa readers can take pride and pleasure in learning from this thoughtful and perceptive analysis of one of their government’s most important but least understood entities.


In this commendable new volume on the 1877 railroad strikes, editor David O. Stowell has collected a stellar cast of historians. Joshua Brown’s examination of the illustrated press’s treatment of labor unions and the 1877 strikes sets the tone for the book’s collection. Brown discusses how Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper captured and then modified the imagery of downtrodden Pennsylvania miners and railroad workers. Leslie’s tried to distinguish between rioters and strikers, arguing that each group held a different place in the unfolding dramas. The examination is an interesting one but left this reader wondering about the Leslie’s editors’ political view of workers and strikers.
Shelton Stromquist concentrates on the railroad town of Hornells-
ville, New York. By the time of the 1877 outbreaks, Hornells-
ville, the population was ready to oppose the wage cuts. Rails were
soaped by sympathetic supporters (women and children), and train
crews were forced from their cabs. After 1,500 state troops were dis-
patched to the town, the strikers adopted a more secretive stance by
organizing late-night meetings in the woods surrounding the town.

Richard Schneirov’s essay takes a more traditional tack by looking
directly at the 1877 strikes as they unfolded in Chicago. Schneirov
frames his approach by examining the political battles between estab-
ilished political elites and the newly arrived immigrants from Ireland
and Germany. Schneirov identifies women who took an active role in
the conflict but does not fully explain their actions. What does their
activity say about working-class female status and action?

Steven Hoffman’s essay takes the reader to the South. By doing so
he succeeds in extending treatment of the strike beyond its usual north-
eastern and midwestern borders. Although no major strike outbreaks
took place in Tennessee and Kentucky, its effects were nonetheless
keenly felt. Hoffman convincingly shows that although railroad work-
ners and others in the South did not join the great upheaval, they bene-
fited from it in terms of wage increases.

Michael Kazin takes the reader farther west to San Francisco.
There the effects of the 1877 uprising were racial: the instability occa-
sioned by the upheaval led white workers to blame Chinese immi-
grants for the economic woes of the 1870s. For San Francisco’s white
workers, the 1870s were fearful times. Initially demonstrations and
rallies were called to support eastern strikers, but they quickly degener-
ated into mob action in which Chinese workers were attacked and
brutally killed. The mob action merely allowed the established trade
unions in the city to cement their power and embark on a remarkable
political road well into the twentieth century.

In the final chapter David Miller examines Mexican American con-
ceptions of the 1877 conflict in the Hispanic press, notably La Cronica.
According to Miller, La Cronica sympathized with strikers and mob
action against the San Francisco Chinese. Such a position was riven
with contradiction and peril, though it is difficult to determine who
took this position because the editors of La Cronica are not identified.

All of the essays highlight the Paris Commune as an example of
widespread fear of insurrection. Perhaps the editor could have taken
the study beyond the national border and incorporated an examina-
tion of the connections between the Commune and the 1877 strikes.

Reviewer Jeffrey J. Pilz is an instructor in the social science division at North Iowa Area Community College. He is the author of The Life, Work and Times of George Henry Evans: Newspaperman, Activist and Reformer (2001).

I once wrote of a brilliant but forgotten newspaperman of the nineteenth century that he was “a person who tried to change things and failed.” That so few show interest in the person who fails is no surprise, but that does not deter historian Thomas Mach from attempting to rescue another forgotten nineteenth-century subject from obscurity. His well-structured study of a relatively unsuccessful man and the complex political times in which he lived and worked ensures that his subject will not be forgotten.

“Gentleman George” Hunt Pendleton: Party Politics and Ideological Identity in Nineteenth-Century America is more about the latter than the former, making this a more rewarding read for the political specialist than the historian. There are two reasons for this. First, the political ideology of the latter half of the nineteenth century—especially for the Democratic Party, steeped in Jacksonian individualism and states’ rights, haunted by the ghosts of slavery and war, and faced with the challenges of racism and isolationism—is far more complex and interesting than any of the men who shaped, espoused, and practiced it. Second, source materials for and analyses of party ideology are plentiful, broad, and deep, but Pendleton “left no diaries, memoirs or journals . . . nor [did he] deposit his correspondence in a public archive” (1). The man has been forgotten, argues Mach, due to this dearth of sources rather than his lack of contribution to the American political process. Pendleton’s résumé seems to point to an accomplished man—state senator in his native Ohio; U.S. representative, 1857–1865; George McClellan’s running mate on the Peace Democrat ticket in 1864; U.S. senator, 1879–1885; “father” of the Civil Service Reform Act (or Pendleton Act) of 1883; minister to Berlin in 1885. But Pendleton was not what Mach wishes him to have been.

“Gentleman George” is a favorite son, in his own time and of his biographer. From the advantage of a well-to-do family in Ohio, Pendleton attempted to mesh the Whiggish ideas of his father with those of pre-war, pre-industrial Jacksonian individualists. But the realities of the late nineteenth century—urbanization, mechanization, diversification, increasing corporate/government partnership—prevented not only success but the notice of his own party. That did not matter at
home where he remained, well, a favorite son. Mach’s analysis of Pendleton’s roots, his idealism and ideology, and his efforts to breathe life into anachronism in the face of daunting challenges, is complete and compelling. But even his subject’s keystone accomplishment denied him ideological success. The Civil Service Reform Act was one of the most intrusive federal programs of the day, and Pendleton was its guiding light. In the end, the reader is less convinced than the Ohio author that Pendleton was a success in a Jacksonian sense. He remains a favorite son.

That does not diminish the value of the work, however. That Mach has constructed a valuable history of Pendleton and a viable account of his efforts to shape his party, without traditional sources, is a testament to his research skills and political acumen. To explain in such detail the inner struggle of a man, his party, and his country in the face of the sea change that was the post-Civil War era is a notable feat. That he fails to resurrect Pendleton as a significant figure in American political history, or even in his own party, reflects not on the author but on his subject. Mach cannot make Pendleton brilliant, but he has ensured that he will not be forgotten.


Reviewer Joy K. Lintelman is professor of history at Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota. Her book, I Go to America, on Swedish American women in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, will be published in early 2009.

Melissa Klapper’s examination of immigrant children in the United States during the era of mass immigration is the most recent addition to publisher Ivan R. Dee’s American Childhoods Series. In a brief and accessible monograph, Klapper synthesizes existing work on immigration relating to children. She also incorporates primary research of her own, although, as she states clearly in her preface, she “makes no claim to provide a theoretical outlook on the historical experiences of immigrant children” (xii). Klapper focuses on the decades from 1880 through 1920 and defines immigrant children as individuals “whose childhood and adolescence were centrally shaped by immigration and adaptation to the United States, whether they were born abroad or in America” (xi).

Klapper’s study opens with a chapter outlining nineteenth-century ideas about childhood and youth as life phases distinct from adult-
hood. She considers how these ideas influenced the attitudes of reformers and broader society toward children. She continues with three carefully written and richly detailed chapters following the chronological stages of immigrant children’s lives. In “Early Childhood” she addresses issues such as the challenging physical conditions in which many immigrant children lived and the ways ethnic groups’ practices of infant and child care often conflicted with practices advocated by reformers or by the American middle class.

Once immigrant children were old enough for school, they were also old enough to contribute to the family economy. In a chapter titled “School, Work, Home, Play,” Klapper examines how immigrant children tried to balance those elements in their young lives. Many struggled to negotiate the differing expectations placed on them: homeland traditions of child labor and family’s financial needs encouraged children to find employment, while public educators and reformers encouraged children to remain in school as long as possible.

In the chapter “Adolescent Years,” Klapper continues her examination of the often difficult journey from immigrant childhood to American adulthood. Although parents wanted their children to be successful—often part of their motivation for immigration in the first place—definitions of success varied. Most immigrant children saw success as “becoming American” and thus adopted the values and habits (including those regarding gender) of their non-immigrant peers. Many sought to continue their education, even if that meant attending night schools while employed. Their parents and ethnic community did not always affirm their choices.

Klapper extends her study beyond the era of mass immigration with a brief discussion of international migration trends in the 1920s and 1930s and U.S. legislation restricting immigration. This chapter lacks the detail about immigrant children’s experiences that enriches the previous three chapters. Her conclusion draws some brief parallels between historical and contemporary immigrant children.

One of the reasons historians have shied away from studying immigrant children is the challenge of finding primary sources. As Klapper notes, “Because much of the historical record of childhood was actually produced by adults . . . the available documentation must be viewed with a great deal of suspicion” (xi–xii). Yet I found a critical assessment of sources sometimes lacking. Klapper relies on several immigrant autobiographies, including Barrio Boy by Ernesto Galarza, but does not address the degree to which these accounts may reflect remembrances significantly shaped by experiences after childhood (Galarza eventually obtained a Ph.D. from Columbia University and
was a civil rights and labor activist), or how representative these life stories may be for the author’s immigrant group or for immigrant children more broadly. The book’s copyediting also could have been more thorough. For example, Klapper refers to Norwegians eating a porridge called ømmegrot when the correct word is rommegrot (106), and I noted at least one date error in the note on sources, unfortunately a reference to the *Annals of Iowa* (209).

Because the book aimed to provide an overview of immigrant children in America, readers from Iowa or other states in the upper Midwest may be disappointed by how much attention is focused on the experiences of children in large urban areas or immigrant communities in other regions of the United States, with relatively few references to rural immigrant children. Nonetheless, for a general reader or undergraduate student interested in immigrant children, this book is an excellent introduction to the field. Both its broad scope and the helpful “note on sources” should encourage further reading and research on immigrant children in specific ethnic groups or particular regions of the nation.


Reviewer Gregg R. Narber is assistant professor of history at Luther College. His latest book, *The Impact of the New Deal on Iowa*, is scheduled for publication later this year.

At a time when the “greenness” of products is heavily promoted, and when tired and failing levees in Iowa unleash floodwaters, producing uncounted tons of lost topsoil, billions of dollars of crop and property loss, and grief to thousands of families, it seems appropriate to revisit a time when conservation’s needs were addressed with action—even if not always perfect action—rather than carefully framed sales pitches, when trees were planted rather than scythed, and when a U.S. president’s “Tree Army” sought to keep the nation’s soil in place. Both reviewed works do so by examining the federal government’s most suc-
cessful conservation effort ever and the New Deal’s most popular program: the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC).

Looking back, the achievements of the CCC nearly defy belief. Nationally, from 1933 to 1942, 2.5 million CCC enrollees “planted 2.3 billion trees . . . on 2.5 million acres of previously barren, denuded, or unproductive land . . . half of the trees ever planted in U.S. history.” The CCC developed 800 new state parks; constructed 10,000 small reservoirs, 46,000 bridges, and 13,000 miles of hiking trails; stocked rivers with 1 million fish; created 68,000 miles of fire breaks; and built 3,000 fire lookout towers, dozens of visitor centers, and more than 200 museums, interpretive sites, and park lodges (Maher, 43–76).

Barbara Sommer’s *Hard Work and a Good Deal* adds a paean to Minnesota’s CCC to a bookshelf of histories of the CCC in the several states and particular parks, company in which it stands out for its organization, well-chosen photos, and readability. The data Sommer arrays for the accomplishments of the Minnesota CCC are as impressive as the national data. Neil Maher’s *Nature’s New Deal* invites us to accord the CCC a centrality in the history of environmentalism.

In terms of interest to Iowans, the projects undertaken by the Minnesota CCC were similar to projects undertaken in Iowa. While Iowa had a single CCC program for American Indians (at Tama), though, Minnesota had several such programs on its reservations. (Minnesota also had a CCC company of veterans, which Iowa lacked.) Work in Minnesota state parks and on erosion control projects was much like that done in Iowa; and in contemporary interviews Minnesota enrollees, like their Iowa counterparts—hard up, single males, aged 18–25, who were paid $30 per month, of which $22 to $25 went home to support their families—take continuing pride in what the CCC accomplished, and articulate high regard for what CCC work did for them and their families. In light of these similarities, Sommer’s descriptions of life and work in the Minnesota CCC give a reasonable sense of how Iowa’s CCC workers lived and worked, although Iowa companies stood less risk of frostbite. (Minnesota camps worked their enrollees outdoors every day unless it got “too cold,” and “too cold” meant minus 30° Fahrenheit!) Unlike Iowa, Minnesota had a significant African American population and consequently a large number of black CCC enrollees. They were rigidly segregated in Minnesota CCC camps—in accord with army policies of the time—and most were sent to work in all-black camps in southern states. Sommer’s particular contribution is the documentation of the insult, frustration, and mostly unavailing protest of Minnesota’s African American community when confronted with Jim Crow racial order in the CCC. African Americans
wanted their sons to work in Minnesota, rarely got what they wanted, and, when they did, got it only in segregated form.

In terms of more general interest, Sommer’s narrative clearly contextualizes the CCC for those unfamiliar with it and skillfully interweaves excerpts from interviews with former CCC enrollees. These voices keep *Hard Work* lively and add a human dimension to her story. (The Iowa Department of Natural Resources conducted similar interviews with former Iowa CCC enrollees and has posted them on the department’s Web site.) Oral histories, particularly ones compiled at a 50- to 60-year remove from the event, are obviously problematic, but the way Sommer uses them—to provide color, emotional content, and a sense of the lasting pride of CCC veterans—seems appropriate.

In *Nature’s New Deal* Neil Maher considers the CCC from a national perspective. He emphasizes, first, the political uses Franklin Roosevelt made of the CCC, particularly to cement New Deal allegiance among rural Americans and in the western states. FDR had learned as governor of New York that conservation provided political benefits at scant cost in political capital. When dust storms began to blow, the CCC added erosion control projects to its work in Minnesota and nationally. The value of soil conservation was by then, thanks to the dust, evident to most Americans. Consequently, there was as much to be gained politically and as little to be lost from soil conservation and erosion control as had proved true with reforestation. Such activities had been an early focus in Iowa with its considerable complement of unemployed youth and fewer forests.

Work on state parks likewise began earlier in Iowa than in Minnesota and many other states. Key to this was that Iowa had in place a comprehensive 25-year plan for the development of state parks, preservation of areas of geological significance, protection of habitat, and the like. States such as Minnesota had to develop such plans quickly, usually from scratch, as a precondition for using CCC labor. Although Iowa had a model plan, the state lacked the means to implement it until the CCC provided the missing means. Iowa’s plan was advanced by more than a decade through federal and CCC efforts. Iowa state parks nearly doubled in number, and both new and existing parks were transformed by the CCC with lodges and interpretive centers, picnic shelters, cabins, latrines and septic systems, miles of hiking trails, artificial beaches, and more. (See Rebecca Conard, *Places of Quiet Beauty: Parks, Preserves, and Environmentalism* [1997], chap. 4.)

Some pristine nature was either destroyed or much altered to create such park amenities, a source of growing controversy. Maher’s discussion of the conflict between “conservation” and what we might
now call “environmentalism” calls attention to a conflict that is still very much with us and is the second primary emphasis of Nature’s New Deal. As early as the Progressive Era, the conflict Maher describes was framed in terms we would find familiar: conservation, identified with Gifford Pinchot, first chief of the Forest Service under Theodore Roosevelt, meant prudent management of natural resources so they might be exploited but not depleted; wilderness preservation, identified with John Muir, signified protecting pristine nature. The Progressives, Theodore Roosevelt included, emphasized conservation as so defined, and FDR’s bent was similar, although the preservationist current had some pull on FDR as well.

Because FDR thought experiences in nature were antidotes to urban ills, he introduced yet a third strain of “conservation” to compete with the other two: “conservation of human resources.” New Deal officials proudly recounted statistics showing the weight and height gains of CCC enrollees and the muscle they added, one facet of the “human conservation” Roosevelt advocated. The enrollees were “restored” by their work in natural settings. Increased leisure—forced leisure, in the case of Depression-idled workers, and leisure for the masses, aspired to in the context of economic security and a 40-hour work week pursued by the New Deal—implied more opportunities for more people for comparably restorative experiences in nature. The drive to create recreational infrastructure in parks proved prescient, although it left preservationists aghast: millions of new visitors re-created in increasingly accessible national, state, and local parks. Reported increases in usage of 600 percent were common.

As Maher documents, CCC activities evolved in response to this increasingly three-sided debate, seeking to accommodate all three visions to some degree. These three demands still shape debates about parks, wilderness, and the fate of natural resources and landscapes. In the New Deal’s final years, Roosevelt sought to institutionalize the juggling and balancing function among these competing interests—preserving pristine nature, managing resources, and increasing recreational access to experiences in nature—in a single Department of Conservation. The centralizing tendencies of this proposal and others, however, ran into the political realities of conservative backlash in the late 1930s, so there is, of course, no such cabinet-level department. Such discussions of how New Deal political debates about the role of the CCC brought us to the environmental politics of today is the third emphasis of Nature’s New Deal.

There are many claimants to primacy as the source for green thinking, ecological consciousness, and wilderness preservation. Maher per-
suades that the New Deal and the CCC deserve a central place in that history. Besides enlarging the debate to include human conservation, the ranks of the interested were swelled by what the CCC accomplished, not least by former enrollees who flocked to forestry jobs and the forestry departments of state universities, but also by the legion of citizens who had come to value recreating in altered landscapes, and even by the opponents of CCC “violations” of pristine nature. All became and their successors remain advocates for conservation, however defined.


Reviewer Martin Halpern is professor of history at Henderson State University. He is the author of Unions, Radicals, and Democratic Presidents: Seeking Social Change in the Twentieth Century (2003); and UAW Politics in the Cold War Era (1988).

Labor’s Cold War stems from a 2000 conference organized by the Center for Recent United States History. Several essays illuminate important developments in the history of labor in the Midwest; all are well researched and address questions animating current scholarly debates.

To what degree did the cold war narrow visionary impulses in the labor movement? Rosemary Feurer chronicles the “community-based grass roots” (60) campaign of District 8 of the left-wing United Electrical Workers (UE) to democratically plan economic development, protect the environment, and create interesting jobs through a Missouri Valley Authority (MVA). The UE at first gained diverse allies, but as the cold war intensified, it became preoccupied with defending itself. Moderate CIO leaders sidelined left-wing activists, and MVA opponents used antisocialist rhetoric to defeat the project. In Milwaukee, Eric Fure-Slocum notes, AFL, CIO, and community activists sought non-market approaches to expanding housing but began to divide because of anticommunism in 1946. Although cold war liberals succeeded in promoting racial tolerance, the vision of a large-scale interracial public housing program was replaced by a limited segregated program tied to business-oriented economic development. In Japan, Christopher Gerteis argues, encouragement of unionization by New Dealers in the U.S. occupation led to vibrant movements among Japanese working women, many of whom put achieving gender equality on their list of goals. The cold war hurt all union militants but was
particularly costly for women as even left-wing leaders seeking to resist the occupation’s shift to suppression of union rights confined women to subordinate roles.

How strong and long-lasting was the Communist-led trend within the labor movement? Robert Cherney provides a helpful review of diverse networks of organizations and government agencies on the Pacific Coast active in opposing communism long before the purges of the late 1940s. He highlights the mini-purge undertaken by anti-Communists during the period of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, notes that “not even Harry Bridges could persuade rank-and-file longshoremen to oppose Roosevelt” in 1940, and concludes that “the acceptance of the CP within the CIO was always tenuous at best” (37). The fact that Bridges’ San Francisco local voted to endorse Roosevelt despite his position might better be used as evidence of the existence of democracy within the International Longshoremen’s and Warehousemen’s Union, which Bridges headed for another 37 years.

Two essays provide evidence that unionists labeled Communist were well accepted within the CIO and continued to have strong followings during the cold war years. James Lorence argues that the abiding strength of the left-wing Mine Mill and Smelter Workers union in the Southwest stemmed in significant part from its close connection with Mexican American workers’ struggles for equality. Lorence also emphasizes Mine Mill’s democratic unionism and its support for feminist activism, recounted in the film Salt of the Earth. Local 890, highlighted in the film, “retained its independent identity” and “found it possible to maintain democratic local control” (219) even after Mine Mill merged with the Steelworkers union in 1967. Lisa Kannenberg notes rank-and-file and community support for Schenectady UE Local 301 and its ability to resist raids. Even after its popular president decided to lead the local into the UE’s anti-Communist rival on pragmatic grounds in 1954, the UE received over 35 percent of the vote in the ensuing election contest, “a tribute to that union’s remarkable resilience and the loyalty it inspired” (157).

To what degree did a significant progressive trend survive cold war repression of labor radicalism? In an essay on the United Auto Workers’ experience during the Korean War, Seth Widgerson argues that anti-Communist president Walter Reuther used “controlled worker militancy” (246) to settle grievances and gain improved contracts but politically failed to receive the help he expected from the Truman Administration on wages, prices, civil rights, and meaningful participation in economic mobilization agencies. David Lewis-Colman notes, moreover, that Reuther’s moderate approach to civil rights pro-
duced some results, but he marginalized the radical black caucuses that were “best situated to generate the bottom-up pressure” and achieve “real gains” for Detroit’s black workers (131). In an essay on Mexican Americans’ struggle for fair employment in Los Angeles, however, Kenneth Burt argues that there was activism by overlapping alliances that included anti-Communists as well as Communists. The alliances achieved the election of Edmund Roybal to the Los Angeles City Council in 1949. Although they failed to secure a fair employment ordinance, Roybal, the Community Services Organization, and a liberal anti-Communist network led principally by Socialists and Social Democrats helped secure the passage of state legislation in 1959.


Reviewer Douglas C. Baynton is associate professor of history at the University of Iowa. He is the author of _Forbidden Signs: American Culture and the Campaign Against Sign Language_ (1996).

One of the many useful features on Google Book Search is its “Places Mentioned in this Book,” an on-screen map that locates every place mentioned in a book. On the map for James H. Omvig’s _The Blindness Revolution: Jernigan in His Own Words_, a dense mass of red arrows obscures the state of Iowa, gradually thinning as you reach its borders, with a smattering of arrows beyond. This is an Iowa story.

Kenneth Jernigan arrived in Iowa in 1958 with a master’s degree in English, four years of teaching experience at the Tennessee School for the Blind, and five years with the California Training Center for the Blind, to become director of Iowa’s Commission for the Blind. The Commission was in a sorry state. The year before, a federal study had found it to be the least effective state agency for the blind in the country. By the time Jernigan left in 1978, however, it was considered a model for the nation. How he accomplished that is the tale Omvig sets out to tell.

Jernigan’s professed aim was to demonstrate that blindness was the least of the problems that he and other blind people faced, that their generally low educational achievement and underemployment were the result of societal prejudice. The “blindness revolution” of the title was the product of Jernigan’s long struggle against two entrenched adversaries: blindness professionals whose paternalism and low expectations fostered habits of dependency and self-doubt among blind people, and certain Iowa politicians who fought with Jernigan over re-
sources. The former battle was doubtless the more substantive and far reaching, but the political battle turns out to be the more gripping tale.

Omvig has arranged Jernigan’s correspondence and reports chronologically, interspersed with his own commentary and narrative. Jernigan’s forceful personality and intellect turn what might have been dry bureaucratic business into fascinating reading. His first report to the governor, submitted after two weeks on the job, bluntly catalogued the gross inadequacies of the commission as he found it: “It would not be an exaggeration to describe the present situation as desperate.” Too many blind Iowans were “simply being permitted to sit at home and rot . . . , receiving no instruction in Braille, no help in learning to travel or perform simple household tasks, no information about what other blind people have accomplished, no hope or encouragement—in short, nothing.” If his recommendations were adopted, he concluded, “the present Director [that is, Jernigan] should be given a reasonable (but only a reasonable) time in which to show results. If he does not show results, he should be fired” (51–52).

Such “Jernigan classics,” as Omvig aptly terms them, would by themselves justify the price of the book. In another, Jernigan responds to a publishing company’s attorney who has refused to grant permission for a textbook to be transcribed into Braille for a blind college student:

We are now at a stage where certain circumstances are likely to cause a chain reaction. When you receive my letter, you either will or will not give us permission. . . . Assuming that the material is transcribed without your permission, you either will or will not decide to commence litigation. Assuming that you choose to commence litigation, I will either decide to make a public case out of the matter . . . or I will not. Assuming that I should choose so to react, your client will either decide that you have served his interest well or that you have not (153).

Omvig approaches historical explanation in a manner long out of favor among historians. He is an unabashed practitioner of the exemplar model of history, dominant in the eighteenth century but today found mostly in popular didactic works. It is also history in the “great man” tradition, with little attention given to larger social and cultural developments. But Omvig is not a historian, and historical explanation is not his primary aim. Rather, he wants to “examine the civil rights–based empowerment model and the kinds of characteristics, traits, skills, and abilities that have proven to be successful in work with the blind” (5). As such, professionals will find this a valuable guide. While the lack of an index may limit the book’s usefulness to scholars, it nevertheless serves as an accessible and highly readable introduction to Jernigan’s ideas and to the revolution in ideas about blindness that he did so much to initiate and advance.

Reviewer Thomas M. Spencer is associate professor of history at Northwest Missouri State University in Maryville. He is the author of The St. Louis Veiled Prophet Celebration: Power on Parade, 1877–1995 (2000) and the editor as well as a contributor to The Other Missouri History: Populists, Prostitutes, and Regular Folk (2005) and to a forthcoming anthology on the conflict between Missourians and Mormons during the 1830s.

Independence, Missouri, is a town with a fascinating and complicated history. In 1831 Mormon leader Joseph Smith proclaimed Independence to be the New Zion and the New Jerusalem. In the months following his proclamation, hundreds of Mormon migrants came to Jackson County but were brusquely expelled from the area in 1833. The idea of Jackson County as the New Zion is important to both Mormons and members of the Community of Christ (formerly the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints), which moved its world headquarters to Independence in the 1920s. Members of the Community of Christ attempted to make Smith’s vision of Independence as Zion come true. During the 1830s Independence was a major “jumping off point” for the Santa Fe, Oregon, and California trails. Finally, Independence was also the hometown of Harry Truman, the thirty-third president of the United States. Over the past 60 years, the National Park Service and Independence residents have worked to preserve Truman historical landmarks or, more generally, the entire neighborhood in which Harry Truman lived.

In A President, a Church and Trails West, Jon E. Taylor maintains that Independence has an unusual problem in that three competing historical narratives describe the city’s place in the nation’s history. Taylor maintains that the three different metanarratives of the city’s historical role, while overlapping in some ways, have caused problems for the city’s historic preservation community. In his introduction, Taylor provides a brief survey of the scholarly literature on public memory and commemoration. He contends that his study will examine the role these three competing histories have had on historic preservation in Independence. More specifically, Taylor states that his book will explain how these three historic identities have affected historic preservation decisions since World War II. At present, he argues, the Mormon and Trails West histories and historic sites have begun to impinge on the Truman history and historical sites.
The book is purportedly about all three of these competing histories and their role in the historic preservation decisions of Independence residents. However, the book is actually primarily about the preservation of the Harry Truman National Historic Landmark District—Truman’s old neighborhood. The first two chapters offer a superficial discussion of the Mormon and trails history of Independence. Those two chapters comprise 68 pages of the book, while the following six chapters and 156 pages focus on a very detailed discussion of the Truman history and the issues facing the Harry Truman National Historic Landmark District. The later chapters include detailed accounts of meetings and interoffice memoranda produced by various Independence authorities and National Park Service officials concerning the future of the Truman National Historic Landmark District. It becomes obvious early in the book that it is really about the Truman history, while the other two “competing histories” are dealt with in an almost perfunctory fashion.

Most glaring is that there is no extended discussion of the views of the city’s history by any of the prominent actors in the Independence community, regardless of their particular historical interest. There is no attempt to explain, for example, what the members of the Community of Christ were hoping to achieve in Independence. Were they really attempting to create Joseph Smith’s “New Zion” in the city? Or did their worldview as to the role of the city change? Similar problems exist in the short chapter on the Trails West history as well.

The voices of the people currently living in Independence are also curiously absent. Was there no time for interviews? The reader keeps expecting a discussion of the conceptions of history of the three groups and how those affected their plans for Independence, or perhaps an insightful passage or two about the role that encouraging historic tourism played in all of these decisions. Sadly, however, these important topics are missing from the book.

Unfortunately, A President, a Church and Trails West promises too much and fails to deliver on the promises made in the introduction. Taylor thoroughly describes the evolving mindsets and plans of those involved in the creation and preservation of the Harry Truman National Historic Landmark District, but the same cannot be said about the Mormon history and Trails West sections. If readers wish to learn about how Harry Truman’s neighborhood in Independence is being preserved, this is a valuable book. The title and introduction might lead one to believe that this is a book about how three very different competing histories and their advocates have interacted over the past 50 or so years in Independence, but this is simply not that book.

Reviewer Paula A. Mohr is an architectural historian and Certified Local Government coordinator at the State Historical Society of Iowa. Her research interests include nineteenth-century public architecture and sacred spaces.

As the title of this book suggests, sometimes historic preservation is not about actual rehabilitation but rather involves working to ensure that a threatened building lives to see another day. J. Myrick Howard, a veteran preservationist with more than 30 years experience, believes that using the real estate market is one of the more effective tools preservationists have at their disposal. By acquiring control of a property through temporary ownership, an option to buy, donation, or an easement, the fate of a property can be shifted from inevitable loss to a new lease on life. This highly readable “how-to” book is based largely on Howard’s experience as executive director of Preservation North Carolina, which has acquired and sold more than 600 historic properties since 1977. Included in this book are model purchase contracts, covenants, rehabilitation agreements, and case studies. Along the way, Howard recounts numerous success stories (illustrated with compelling “before” and “after” photographs) as well a discussion of the lessons learned from projects that did not come to fruition.

One of the first misconceptions Howard addresses is about the financial capital required to participate in the real estate market. Perhaps the most important message of this book is that he is describing a preservation program, not a bank account, and his examples bear this out. Chapter five is subtitled “Using Others’ Money and Time to Do Your Work”; there he details the options available short of outright purchase. What is required instead of money is knowledge of real estate and financing, determination, and creative partnerships. A key aspect, Howard notes, is “keeping your eye on the preservation goal and not being diverted by personality and personal differences”(100). Yet he acknowledges that these projects often carry risk and are not for the faint of heart. Having a committed board is critical to taking decisive action quickly to save a property from ruin or demolition.

This book also tackles a number of hot topics in preservation today, including the museum question. When is it appropriate to convert a historic property into a museum? Howard takes the position many pragmatic preservationists have adopted: museum use is sometimes valid for exceptional properties, but private ownership and
adaptive use can be more effective in broadening preservation’s base of support. Howard also devotes a chapter to the increasing popularity of moving historic buildings; the chapter includes a straightforward explanation of the issues, advantages, and disadvantages of relocating a historic property.

This book invites the question: Could a similar acquisition fund help Iowa preserve its historic properties? Iowa shares in common with North Carolina a rural base, comparable median income, a similar historic building stock, and a state historic tax credit program that can go a long way toward facilitating rehabilitation of endangered properties. As elsewhere in the nation, there is a great need to find new stewards for old buildings as public institutions, manufacturing facilities, and private property owners rethink priorities or downsize their physical operations. As Howard puts it, many of these historic properties are like the dogs at an animal shelter. They are worthy adoptees in search of a caring owner.
New on the Shelves

“New on the Shelves” is a list of recent additions to the collections of the State Historical Society of Iowa. It includes manuscripts, audio-visual materials, and published materials recently acquired or newly processed that we think might be of interest to the readers of the Annals of Iowa. The “DM” or “IC” at the end of each entry denotes whether the item is held in Des Moines or Iowa City.
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Davenport. See also Quad Cities.
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Iowa City. *Application for Iowa City, Iowa, USA to the UNESCO Creative Cities Network*. Iowa City: The Literary Community of Iowa City, 2007. 81 pp. IC.


Keosauqua. *See Van Buren County*.


Monroe County. *See Albia*.


Spencer. *Brief History of Spencer.* N.p., n.d. 7 pp. IC.


**Church Histories**


Cresco. *First Congregational Church, 1856–1956.* DM.

Decorah. *Congregational United Church of Christ, 1854–2004.* IC.

Hazleton. *Saint Mary’s Catholic Church, 1881–2005.* IC.

Hopkins Grove. *Evangelical United Brethren Church, 1851–1951.* DM.

Leon. *First Presbyterian Church, 1857–2007.* DM.
North English. North English Christian Church, Disciples of Christ, 1856–2006. DM, IC.
Sidney. Sidney United Methodist Church, 1852–2002. IC.
Spragueville. Salem Lutheran Church, 1872–1906. DM, IC.
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academic freedom, 1–50
African Americans, 141, 149–50, 216, 298–300
Agricultural Emergency in Iowa
   Series of pamphlets, 4–5
agriculture, 196–207
Agriculture, U.S. Department of, 7, 8, 16, 46
Albia, Iowa, 131–44, 146; photos of, 133, 134, 139, 143
   “An Albia Childhood,” 131–46
Albia High School, photo of, 139
Albia Interurban Railway, 132
Albia Junior College, photo of, 139
Allbaugh, Leland G., 29
American Indian Nonfiction: An Anthology of Writings, 1760s–1930s, reviewed, 229
Americans with Disabilities Act (1990), 216
Ames, Iowa, 182–85
Ames High School, 184
Ames Laboratory, 51–81
   “Ames School” of economics, 1–50
Amish Education in the United States and Canada, reviewed, 244–46
Anderson, A. Gary. See Hartley, William G.
Anderson, Kristen L., book reviews by, 97, 340–41
Anderson-Bricker, Kristin, book review by, 238–39
Anderson, Thomas L., 288
Applied History Series, 174
Arrowhead Lake, 177–78
Atkins, Annette, book by, reviewed, 343–45
atomic bomb, 72, 326
atomic energy, 79
Atomic Energy Commission, 53, 73–76, 80
Atomic Research, Institute of, 75–78; photo of, 77
Auge, Tom, 163
Baker, Ella, 321
Baker, H. Robert, book by, reviewed, 93–95
Bankhead-Jones Act (1935), 40
Banned in Kansas: Motion Picture Censorship, 1915–1966, reviewed, 113–14
Bartlett, Ralph, photo of, 13
baseball, 155
Bates, Mildred, 141
Baynton, Douglas C., book review by, 361–62
Bear, Richard, 63, 76n
Beard, Charles, 191
Bednarek, Janet R. Daly, book review by, 243–44
Bennett, Mary, et al., CD by, reviewed, 331–34
Benton, Thomas Hart, 290
Berkeley Laboratory, 53
Berrier, Galin, book review by, 224–25
Bessler, John D., book by, reviewed, 347–48
Bethe, Hans, 63
Bibbs, John, 298, 308–9, 310, 311, 313, 314, 319, 325, 330
Birmingham, Iowa, 279
Black, John D., 16
Black Hawk Lake, 177–78
Black Hawk War, 278, 280
Blank Memorial Children’s Hospital, Des Moines, 216, 217
The Blindness Revolution: Jernigan in His Own Words, reviewed, 361–62
Bliss, Ralph K., 6, 29
Boggs, Lilburn W., 281–91
Bohr, Neils, 61; photo of, 62
Bonaparte, Iowa, 279
border conflict, 269–97
Boswell, Leonard, 330
The Border between Them: Violence and Reconciliation on the Kansas-Missouri Line, reviewed, 95–97

371
boundary dispute, 269–97
Bowes, John P., book review by, 334–35
Bowman, Mary Jean, 15, 48n
Boyd, George, 67
Boys State, Hawkeye, 138
Brady, Bob, 163
Brandt, Karl, 27
Bright, William, book by, reviewed, 89–90
Broadlawns Medical Center, Des Moines, 216
Brodnax, David, Sr., book review by, 98–99
Brown, Beth, photo of, 214
Brown, Joseph C., 276
Brownlee, O. H., 10, 16, 19, 20, 24, 35–39, 44, 47, 48; photo of, 38
Bruner, Julius, 12; photo of, 13
Buchanan, Robert, 4–7, 20–22, 25, 29, 34–44, 47, 48; photo of, 22
Buckley, Jay H., book by, reviewed, 336–37
Buenker, Bob, 154
Buenker, John D., article by, 147–64; photos of, 155, 162
Buffalo, Johnathan Lantz. See Bennett, Mary
Bundy, Clarence E., 197
Burkhart, George S., book by, reviewed, 98–99
Burlington, Iowa, 277, 279
Burrows, J. M. D., 269
Burton, Milton, 67
Butter Manufacturers Association, Iowa, 13
“The Butter-Margarine Controversy and ’Two Cultures’ at Iowa State College,” 1–50
Butters, Gerald R., Jr., book by, reviewed, 113–14
Buying Time for Heritage: How to Save an Endangered Historic Property, reviewed, 365–66
Byrne, Kevin, book review by, 346
Cain, Marie, 139
California, Iowans in, 205
Calling This Place Home: Women on the Wisconsin Frontier, 1850–1925, reviewed, 231–33
Carson, Rachel, 205–6
Carver, George Washington, 145
Catholicism, Roman, 148, 149, 150, 158–59, 161–63
Catron, John, 295
Century Farm oral history project, 169–71
Chaichian, Mohammad A., book by, reviewed, 238–39
chain stores, 6
Chambers, John, 291
Chariton, Iowa, 209–10
Chariton High School, 196–97
chautauqua movement, 209–10; photo of in West Branch, 209
chemistry, 51–81
Chemistry Laboratory, Chicago, 66
Chicago and North Western Railroad, 175
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. See Mormons
churches, 143–44
Cinematic Journeys: An Uncommon Guide to Classic Movie Theaters: Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, reviewed, 115
Civil Liberties Union, American, 43, 45
civil rights legislation, 301–3, 306–8, 325
civil rights movement, 166–67, 298–330
Civil War, 197
Civilian Conservation Corps, 133, 200–1
Clark, Richard, 164
Clark, William, 270, 278
Clark County, Missouri, 280, 282, 284, 285, 288, 296
Clarke, James, 294
Clemson University, 145
coal mining, 132
Cold War, 148
Columbia University, 188
Communist Party, 305, 310–11, 326
community studies, 174–78
Compton, Arthur H., 66–68, 71
Conard, Rebecca: article by, 165–80; photo of, 170
Confederate Rage, Yankee Wrath: No Quarter in the Civil War, reviewed, 98–99
Congregational church, 185
Congress of Racial Equality, 327
Conn, Steven, book by, reviewed, 99–101
Conservation, Iowa Board of, 177
conservation movement, 173
Consuming Nature: Environmentalism in the Fox River Valley, 1850–1950, reviewed, 240–41
Coon, Stephen C., book review by, 118–19
Cooper-Wiele, Jonathan K., book by, reviewed, 341–42
Coover, Winfred, 64
Cornell University, 62–63
Coryell, Charles, 67
Cottrell, Barbara J. See Larsen, Lawrence H.
Council Bluffs, Iowa, 275–76
Craven, Avery, 197
Creameries, Iowa Association of Local, 12
Creamery Journal (Waterloo), 12; advertisement from, 18
Creamery Operators Association, Iowa, 13
Creating Minnesota: A History from the Inside Out, reviewed, 343–45
Critical Regionalism: Connecting Politics and Culture in the American Landscape, reviewed, 248–49
Crowley, P. W., photo of, 13
Culver, John, 164
Current, Richard, 191
Curti, Merle, 191
Daane, Adrian, 76n
Dairy Association: American, 17–18, 25; Iowa State, 25, 48–49
Dairy Council, National, 25
Dairy Industry Commission, Iowa, 13
Dairy Record, 12
Dairy Union, National, 25
Dalstrom, Harl A. See Larsen, Lawrence H.
Dalstrom, Kay Calame. See Larsen, Lawrence H.
Dary, David, book by, reviewed, 228–29
Daughters of the American Revolution, 177
Davis, Colin J., book review by, 350–51
Davis County, 294
Days on the Family Farm: From the Golden Age through the Great Depression, reviewed, 219–23
Dean, Thomas K., book review by, 120–21
Dean, Virgil W., book edited by, reviewed, 226–27
Democratic Party, 150–51, 154, 164
Depression, Great, 4, 132–33, 151, 152, 153, 169, 195, 200, 219–23
Des Moines, Iowa, 298–330
Des Moines rapids, 271, 273, 276–78, 292, 295
Des Moines Register, 12, 16–18, 34–35, 41; advertisement from, 17
Des Moines River, 272, 273, 275, 276–80, 292, 293, 295
desegregation, 298–330
Dewalt, Mark, book by, reviewed, 244–46
Diaspora in the Countryside: Two Mennonite Communities and Mid-Twentieth-Century Rural Disjunction, reviewed, 115–18
A Dictionary of Iowa Place-Names, reviewed, 89
Diehl, Harvey, 63, 76n
Dinsmore, Henry “Hank,” 132, 133
Dinsmore, Katherine Beerkle, 132–36
Dirck, Brian, book by, reviewed, 90–93
disability, 216–18
discrimination, racial, 298–330
Dodge, Augustus, C., 293
Donald, David, 189
Doyle, Mildred, 139
Drake University, 305, 317
Dubuque, Iowa, 147–63; photos of, 149, 151, 152, 161
Dubuque Star Brewing Co., 153
Dunkin, Fred, 142
Eagle Point Park, Dubuque, photo of, 149
Earthwatch-SHSI Oral History Project, 169–71
Economics, “Ames School” of, 1–50
Economics and Sociology, Department of, at Iowa State College, 4–5, 29–30, 47
Edna Griffin Building, 330
Edna Griffin Memorial Bridge, 322n, 330
Education, 138–39, 154, 168, 183, 184, 195; Catholic, 150, 158–59, 161–63; higher, 144–45, 147, 149, 153, 162, 163, 164, 168–69, 183, 186–92
Education, Iowa State Board of, 19, 47, 64, 75
Edwards, John C., 293
Eggers, Lolly Parker, book by, reviewed, 119
Ellis, Mark R., book review by, 347–48
Ellis, Scott, photo of, 13
Elmquist, Kristin, book review by, 345–46
Energy, U.S. Department of, 53, 54, 80
Engelhardt, Carroll, book by, reviewed, 101–3
Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of, 292
environmentalism, 173, 180
Establishing Justice in Middle America: A History of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, reviewed, 348–50
Everett, Derek R.: article by, 269–97; book review by, 95–97
Experiment Station, Iowa Agricultural, 21–22
Extension Service, Iowa State, 5, 6, 29, 47, 177
Facing East and Facing West: Iowa’s Old Capitol Museum, reviewed, 339–40
Fair Employment Practices Committee, 325, 326
Faragher, John Mack. See Hine, Robert V.

Farm Bureau Federation: American, 32; Iowa, 13–14, 29, 31, 36
Farmer’s Union, Iowa, 15n, 31n, 197–98, 326
Farmington, Iowa, 279, 286, 287
Fassel, Velmer, 76n
Favretti, Rudy J., book by, reviewed, 104–6
FBI, 304n, 310–11, 325–26, 328–30
Fearon, Peter, book by, reviewed, 241–43
Federal Bureau of Investigation, 304n, 310–11, 325–26, 328–30
Fenelon Place Elevator, Dubuque, photo of, 152
Fessler, Paul, book review by, 227–28
Finding Freedom: The Untold Story of Joshua Glover, Runaway Slave, reviewed, 93–95
Finlay, Mark, review essay by, 82–88
Fisk University, 304–5
Fleeger, Jennifer, book review by, 115
Fleming, Roger, 29
Foerstner, Abigail, book by, reviewed, 246–48
food policy, 1–50
Forster, G. W., 26
Forsyth, John, 286
Fort Des Moines, 278, 302
Franck, James, 61, 72
“Frank Spedding and the Ames Laboratory: The Development of a Science Manager,” 51–81
Franzwa, Gregory M., book by, reviewed, 338–39
Friley, Charles E., 7, 11, 13–16, 19–24, 26–30, 33–37, 41–47; photos of, 8, 13
Frizzell, Robert W., book by, reviewed, 340–41
Frontiers: A Short History of the American West, reviewed, 103–4

games, childhood, 155–56
Gateway to the Northern Plains: Railroads and the Birth of Fargo and Moorhead, reviewed, 101–3
gender roles, 316–18
"Gentleman George" Hunt Pendleton: Party Politics and Ideological Identity in Nineteenth-Century America, reviewed, 352–53
Godfrey, George, 14
Goldman, Joanne Abel, article by, 51–81
Gomberg, Moses, 56
A Good Day's Work: An Iowa Farm in the Great Depression, reviewed, 219–23
Gore, C. L., 298, 308–9, 311, 313–15
Grant, H. Roger: article by, 131–46; photos of, 135, 145
Grant, Harry, 131, 135
Grant, Marcella Dinsmore, 132, 135
Grant, Richard, 135–36
Grant, Rose Heimann, 131
Grant, Samuel M., 131
Great Plains, 199–200
The Great Strikes of 1877, reviewed, 350–51
Green, William, book review by, 331–34
Greenwald, Emily, book review by, 230–31
Gregory, Dick, 167
Gregory, Uriah S., 284–86, 288
Griffin, Edna, 298–330; photo of, 328
Griffin, John, 140
Griffin, Phyllis, 298, 304, 305, 312, 318, 321–22, 329, 330
Griffin, Stanley, 304, 305, 321–22
Grinnell College, 144, 186–88, 193
"Growing Up Iowan—Sort Of!" 147–64
Grund, Harry, 315

"Hairy Nation," 280, 296
Half-Breed Tract, 273, 275, 278
Hall, Joann, photo of, 217
Halpern, Martin, book review by, 359–61
Hamilton, Carl, 15–16
Hard Work and a Good Deal: The Civilian Conservation Corps in Minnesota, reviewed, 355–59
Harper's Magazine, 36
Harstad, Peter, 169
Hart, Albert G., 15, 43, 44
Heffleman, Henry, 284–86
Hemness, Fritz, photo of, 72
herbicides, 206
Hewitt, James W., book review by, 348–50
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., 31
Himstead, Ralph, 41, 43
Hine, Robert V., and John Mack Faragher, book by, reviewed, 103–4
Hines, Stephen W., book edited by, reviewed, 110–11
"Historians Remember Iowa: An Introduction," 129–30
historic preservation, 171–80
History's Shadow: Native Americans and Historical Consciousness in the Nineteenth Century, reviewed, 99–101
Hiteman, Iowa, 132, 134–35, 136, 140
Hixon, Ralph M., 35, 37–41, 44, 66, 69
Hodgin, Rachel, photo of, 170
Hoehnle, Peter, book review by, 342–43
Hohmann, Heidi, book review by, 104–6
An Honest Calling: The Law Practice of Abraham Lincoln, reviewed, 90–93
Honey War, 270, 282–90
Hoover, Dwight, book by, reviewed, 219–23
Hopkins, Harry, 192–94
Horowitz, Roger, book by, reviewed, 82–88
Horton, Loren N., book review by, 338–39
housing, discrimination in, 327
Howard, Charles P., 317–18, 323
Howard, J. Myrick, book by, reviewed, 365–66
Hughes, Harold, 164
Hughes, Raymond, 5
Humeston, Helen, 137–38

Ice Cream Manufacturers, Association of, 13
immigrants and immigration, 153, 163, 164, 169, 208
Independent Immigrants: A Settlement of Hanoverian Germans in Western Missouri, reviewed, 340–41
Indians, American, 271–73, 278, 295
Investing in Iowa: The Life and Times of F. M. Huibell, reviewed, 233–35
Iowa Bystander, 301, 306, 319, 323–25
Iowa City, Iowa, 293
Iowa City Municipal Airport: Opening the West to Aviation, 1918–2007, reviewed, 243–44
Iowa City’s Irving Weber: A Biography, reviewed, 119
“The Iowa Polio Stories Oral History Project,” 212–18
Iowa River, 273
Iowa State College, 1–81, 197, 198, 52, 54–55, 63–81. See also Iowa State University
Iowa State College Press, 9, 28
Iowa State Fair: Country Comes to Town, reviewed, 106–8
Iowa State University, 183, 192. See also Iowa State College
IowaVille, Iowa, 279
Ioway Indians, 273
Izaak Walton League, 177

Jackson, Andrew, 281
Jackson, Ruby West, and Walter T. McDonald, book by, reviewed, 93–95
Jacob Weidenmann, Pioneer Landscape Architect, reviewed, 104–6
James Van Allen: The First Eight Billion Miles, reviewed, 246–48
James, Jesse, 136, 342–43
Jenkins, G. A., 141
Jensen, Joan M., book by, reviewed, 231–33
Jensen, Merrill, 191

Jesse James in Iowa, reviewed, 342–43
Joffe, Abram, 61
John Brown to Bob Dole: Movers and Shakers in Kansas History, reviewed, 226–27
Johns, Iral B., 66–68
Johnson, D. Gale, 48n
Johnson, Francis, 13–15, 31
Jones, Alan, 187
Jones, Velma, 139
Kalish, Mildred Armstrong, book by, reviewed, 219–23
Kansas in the Great Depression: Work Relief, the Dole, and Rehabilitation, reviewed, 241–43
Katz, Maurice, 299, 300, 305, 308–9, 311, 314, 315, 318, 321, 325
Katz Drug Store, Des Moines, 298–330; photo of, 302
Keenan, Thomas W., 34–35
Kehoe, Terence, book review by, 240–41
Kendall, Nathan, 137
Keosauqua, Iowa, 279
Kilbourne, Iowa, 279
Kildee, Henry H., 14, 25
King, J. E., 140
King, Martin Luther, Jr., 329
Kirkendall, Richard S., 202
Klapper, Melissa R., book by, reviewed, 353–55
Koblas, John, book by, reviewed, 342–43
Korean Conflict, 136, 148, 326
labor unions, 151
Labor’s Cold War: Local Politics in a Global Context, reviewed, 359–61
LaGrange, Missouri, 287
Lake City, Iowa, 174–76
Lake View, Iowa, 177–78
Lake View–Auburn High School, 166, 168
land stewardship, 180
Landon, Alf, 201–2
Langdon, Thomas. See McCray, Linzee Kull
Langmuir Award, 60
Larrabee, Fred, 48–49
Larsen, Lawrence H., et al., book by, reviewed, 235–37
Index

Larson, Robert, 137
Latter-day Saints. See Mormons
Launius, Roger D., book review by, 246–48
Laura Ingalls Wilder, Farm Journalist: Writings from the Ozarks, reviewed, 110–11
Lawrence, Ernest O., 53, 57, 58, 67; photo of, 58
Lawrence, Noah, article by, 298–330
Lea, Albert Miller, 277–78
League of Women Voters, 192
Legacy of Violence: Lynch Mobs and Executions in Minnesota, reviewed, 347–48
legal history, 301–3, 306–8, 325
Legion of Decency, 150
LeMaster, Ann Brown, photo of, 214
Leslie, Thomas, book by, reviewed, 106–8
Leuchtenburg, William E., 189
Lewis, G. N., 56–60, 62, 63, 66, 70
Lewis, Meriwether, 270–72
Lewis and Clark and the Indian Country: The Native American Perspective, reviewed, 334–35
Lewis County, Missouri, 280, 289
libraries, 140, 163
Lincoln the Lawyer, reviewed, 90–93
Linn, Lewis F., 290
Lintelman, Joy K., book review by, 353–55
liquor regulation, 151–52
Little Heathens: Hard Times and High Spirits on an Iowa Farm during the Depression, reviewed, 219–23
Loewen, Royden, book by, reviewed, 115–18
Loras, Mathias, 150; statue of, 151
Loras Academy, 150, 161; photo of, 161; photo of baseball team, 155
Loras College, 161
Lorch, Fred W., 198
Louisiana Purchase, 270, 276, 278
Loveless, Hershel, 164
Lucas, Robert, 281
Lucas County, 205, 207–10
Lucky Man: Memories of a Life in Communications, reviewed, 118–19
Lyftogt, Kenneth L., book review by, 341–42
Mabry, Beulah, 140
Mach, Thomas S., book by, reviewed, 352–53
Macy, Jesse, 187
Manhattan Project, 66–74
Marching with the First Nebraska: A Civil War Diary, reviewed, 227–28
margarine, 1–50
Marion County, Missouri, 288
Materials Preparation Center, 80
McCain, James, 327
McCarthy, Joseph R., 148
McCoy, Herbert, 60–61, 66, 67
McCray, Linzee Kull, and Thomas Langdon, book by, reviewed, 339–40
McDonald, Walter T. See Jackson, Ruby West
McDonnell, Paul C., 308, 314
McJimsey, George: article by, 181–95; photo of, 191
McJimsey, Harriet, 182, 183; photo of, 191
McJimsey, Robert, 185, 186, 187, 190; photo of, 191
McJimsey, Sandra Bryant, 192
McLester, L. Gordon, Ill. See Hauptman, Laurence M.
meatpacking, 82–88
medical practice, 175–76
Meredith, James, 167
Mergenthal, Rebekah, book review by, 93–95
Meskwaki History, reviewed, 331–34
Meskwaki Indians, 273, 278
Metallurgical Laboratory, Chicago, 66–68, 70, 72, 73
Methodist church, 166–67
Methodist Church, First, Albia, 143–44; photo of, 143
Meyer, Carrie, book by, reviewed, 219–23
Michigan Territory, 281
Midwest Bag and Burlap Co., 326
militia, 281–91
Milk Dealers Association, Iowa, 13
Miller, John E., book review by, 226
Miller, Viva, 139
mining, coal, 132
Minnesota 150: The People, Places, and Things that Shape Our State, reviewed, 345–46
Mississippi River, 271, 272, 273, 276–80, 292, 295
Missouri, boundary dispute with, 269–97
Missouri River, 272, 273, 275, 295
Missouri v. Iowa, 294–96
Mitchell, Franklin D., article by, 196–211
Mohr, Paula A., book review by, 365–66
Monroe County Courthouse, 134
Monticello, Missouri, 285
Morgan, Phil, 142
The Mormon Trail Revisited, reviewed, 338–39
Mormons, 281, 291
Morris, James B., 303
Morris, Jeffrey Brandon, book by, reviewed, 348–50
motherhood, 316–18
movie theaters, 141, 158
Muelder, Owen W., book by, reviewed, 224–25
Murphy, J. Thomas, book review by, 228–29
Murray, William G., photo of, 31
museums, 136–38
NAACP, 301, 303, 307, 308, 312, 323–24, 327
Narber, Gregg R., book review by, 355–59
Nash, Jan Olive: book by, reviewed, 243–44; book review by, 119
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 301, 303, 307, 308, 312, 323–24, 327
National Conference of Christians and Jews, 324
Native American Placenames of the United States, reviewed, 89–90
“Naturalized Iowan,” 181–95
Nauvoo, Illinois, 281
Neely, Jeremy, book by, reviewed, 95–97
Nelson, Jay T. See Hoxie, Frederick E.
Nelson, Paula M., book review by, 231–33
Nemanic, Mary Lou, book by, reviewed, 108–9
New Deal, 133, 151, 178, 200–1
New Republic, 43, 45
newspapers, 280–84, 290
Newsweek, 27
Nicholls, William, 20–23, 29, 30, 48n
Nielson, Clarence, 24; photo of, 13
no-till farming, 206
Nobel Prize, 48
Not Just Any Land: A Personal and Literary Journey into the American Grasslands, reviewed, 120–21
Nourse, Edwin G., 26–27, 33n
nuclear research, 75
Nunnally, Patrick, book review by, 343–45
Nutting, George, 63
O’Neil, Clem, photo of, 13
O’Neill, J. M., 43–45
Oak, V. V., 301–3
Ohio, 281
Ohio State University, 64
oleomargarine, 1–50
Omvig, James H., book by, reviewed, 361–62
The Oneida Indians in the Age of Allotment, 1860–1920, reviewed, 230–31
Osage Indians, 271–72
“An Out-Migrant’s Tale,” 196–211
Pabst, Alfred, 140
Papish, Jacob, 63
Parker, Addison, 11
parks and preserves, state, 173, 177–78
Pederson, Sally, 330
pesticides, 205–6
Peterson, David, 76n
Peyer, Bernd C., book edited by, reviewed, 229
Pike, Zebulon M., 271
Pilz, Jeffrey J., book review by, 352–53
Pittsburg, Iowa, 279
Platte Purchase, 275
Plumbe, John, Jr., 278
Poinsett, Joel R., 291
polio, 212–18
Polk, James, 294
Porter, Paul, 76n
Potter, James E., book edited by, reviewed, 227–28
Powell, Burke, 137
Powell, Douglas Reichert, book by, reviewed, 248–49
Powell, Jack, 76n
A President, a Church and Trails West: Competing Histories in Independence, Missouri, reviewed, 363–64
Price, John, book by, reviewed, 120–21
Prizer, Jessie Powell, 137
Progressive movement, 173, 177
Prohibition, 208–9
Prosser, Richard S., book by, reviewed, 346
“Public History and the Odyssey of a Born-Again Native,” 165–80
Public Works Administration, 200
Putting Meat on the American Table: Taste, Technology, Transformation, reviewed, 82–88
Quarton, William Barlow, III, book by, reviewed, 118–19
racial discrimination, 298–330
radio, 156–57
railroads, 132, 138, 140, 141, 145, 175; and railroad architecture, 171–73
Rails to the North Star: A Minnesota Railroad Atlas, reviewed, 346
Rare-Earth Information Center, 80
rare earth metals and compounds, 59, 63, 66, 70–73, 79–80
Rasmussen, Chris, book review by, 106–8
Reader’s Digest, 36
Redpath Enterprises, 209–10
Reid, Margaret, 6, 10, 19, 28, 36, 37, 48n
religion, 143–44, 148, 149, 150, 158–59, 161–63, 185, 193
Reno, Milo, 197–98
Reschly, Steven D., book review by, 115–18
The Rescue of Joshua Glover: A Fugitive Slave, the Constitution, and the Coming of the Civil War, reviewed, 93–95
Reserve Officers’ Training Corps, 161–62; photo of officers of, 162
Reynolds, Thomas, 291
Richards, E. C., 309
Riesman, David, 188
Robbins, Edith, book translated and edited by, reviewed, 227–28
Roberts, Kate, book by, reviewed, 345–46
Robeson, Paul, 326
Robinson, Lenora, 302–3
Rochester, Iowa, 279
Rock River, 273
Rockefeller Foundation, 7–8, 16, 46
Rogers, Pat, 141
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 161, 193, 194, 195, 201
Rosenberg, Ethel, 326
Rosenberg, Julius, 326
Rury, John L., book review by, 111–13
S. M. Grant & Co., 131
Sac and Fox Indians, 273. See also Sauk Indians and Meskwaki Indians
Sac City, Iowa, 174–76
Sauk Indians, 273, 278
Savage, Tom, book by, reviewed, 89
Scherer, Mark R., book review by, 103–4
Scherneckau, August, book by, reviewed, 227–28
Schnell, J. Christopher, book review by, 241–43
Schultz, Theodore W., 4–10, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 29, 30–33, 36, 40, 45, 47, 48; photo of, 31
Schuyler County, Missouri, 294
Schweninger, Lee, book review by, 229
Schwieder, Dorothy, and Gretchen Van Houten, book edited by, reviewed, 111–13
scientific research, 51–81
Scott, Kathleen M., article by, 212–18
Seaborg, Glenn T., 57, 58, 67
Seim, David L., article by, 1–50
A Sesquicentennial History of Iowa State University: Tradition and Transformation, reviewed, 111–13
settlement of Iowa Territory, 278–80, 296
Shambaugh, Benjamin, 174
Shank, Wesley I., book review by, 339–40
Sherfy, Michael J., book review by, 99–101
Shortridge, James R., book review by, 248–49
Silent Spring, 205–6
Simmons, Jerold, book review by, 113–14
Simpson College, 144–45, 210
Sims, Terry Lee, 326
“Since it is my right, I would like to have it”: Edna Griffin and the Katz Drug Store Desegregation Movement,” 298–330
Sister Kenny Institute, 216
Skim Milk Yankees Fighting: The Battle of Athens Missouri, August 5, 1861, reviewed, 341–42
Smith, Gladys, 139
Smith-Hughes Act (1917), 197
social science research, 1–50
Sommer, Barbara W., book by, reviewed, 355–59
Southern Christian Leadership Council, 166–67
spectroscopic research, 59, 60, 63, 66
Spedding, Ethel, 61, 64
Spedding, Frank, 51–81; photos of, 52, 58, 62
Spencer, Thomas M., book review by, 363–64
Sponberg, Harold, 199
Sports, 141, 154, 157, 184, 185
Spring Branch Creamery, 3
Stassis, Constantine, 81
State Historical Society of Iowa, 169, 174
Steiner, Mark E., book by, reviewed, 90–93
Stigler, George, 48n
Still Osteopathic School of Medicine, 305, 317
Stinson, Paul, 308, 314
Stowell, David O., book edited by, reviewed, 350–51
Stromquist, Shelton, book edited by, reviewed, 359–61
Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, 167
Sullivan, John C., 272
Sullivan line, 272, 273, 276, 277, 293, 295
Summers, Gregory, book by, reviewed, 240–41
Supreme Court: Iowa, 306, 315; U.S., 294–96
Svec, Harry, 70
Swope, Gerard, photo of, 8
Sylvester, E. P., 206
taxes and taxation, 280, 282–86, 292, 296
Taylor, Jon E., book by, reviewed, 363–64
Teaford, Jon C., book review by, 235–37
television, 157
Terrell, Mary, 139
territorial Iowa, 269–97
theaters, movie, 141, 158
Tied to the Great Packing Machine: The Midwest and Meatpacking, reviewed, 82–88
Time, 27, 36
Toledo, Ohio, 281
Tolman, Richard C., 74
True Tales of the Prairies and Plains, reviewed, 228–29
Truman, Harry S., 202–3, 310; photo of, 203

The Underground Railroad in Western Illinois, reviewed, 224–25
unions, labor, 151
Unitarian church, 185
University of Akron, 145
University of California Berkeley, 53, 56–60, 63, 64
University of Chicago, 9n, 32, 48, 60, 67
University of Iowa, 174
University of Michigan, 56
University of Missouri, 145, 198
University of Wisconsin, 190–92
University Professors, American Association of, 34, 41–43, 45
Upstream Metropolis: An Urban Biography of Omaha and Council Bluffs, reviewed, 235–37
Uthoff, Sarah S., book review by, 89

Van Buren, Martin, 279, 281, 282
Van Buren County, 279, 283, 285, 296
Van Fleet, Donald, 15n, 31n
Van Houten, Gretchen. See Schwieder, Dorothy
Van Nuys, Frank, book review by, 108–9
Vernon, Iowa, 279
Vieg, John, 20–23, 29, 30, 41, 42
Vinson, Donald, 139
vocational agriculture, 196–97
Voigt, Adolf, 77n

WAC, 302–3, 316
Walker, David, book review by, 336–37
Walker, Kenny, 325
Walker, Mike and Vicki, book by, reviewed, 115
Wall, Joseph Frazier, 181, 186, 188
Wallace, Henry, 322

Wallaces’ Farmer, 32
Walt, Joseph, 144
Wanatee, Dawn Suzanne. See Bennett, Mary
Wapello Coal Co., 132
War of 1812, 272
Wartime Farm and Food Policy Series of pamphlets, 1–50
Washburn University, 199
Waterloo, Missouri, 285–87
Watertown, Iowa, 279
Waymack, W. W., 80
Webber, Philip E., book by, reviewed, 97
West, Cornel, 329
White Racism on the Western Urban Frontier: Dynamics of Race and Class in Dubuque, Iowa (1800–2000), reviewed, 238–39
Whyte, William H., 188
Wickard, Claude, 7, 8
Wilhelm, Harley A., 66–68, 70, 71
Wilkins, Roy, 301, 303
Willard, H. H., 56
William Clark, Indian Diplomat, reviewed, 336–37
Williams, William A., 191
Willits, Joseph, 8, 9n, 16
windmills, 199; photo of, 200
Winkle, Kenneth, book review by, 90–93
Wisconsin Territory, 276–77, 279
Women’s Army Auxiliary Corps, 302–3, 316
Wood, Richard, 315
Wood, W. Raymond, book review by, 89–90
World War II, 1, 159–61, 182, 184, 195, 203–5, 316, 320–21
Wright, J. Joe, 197
Wright, James, 76n
Yoder, Frank, book review by, 244–46
Zaffarano, Dan, 77n
Zoar in the Civil War, reviewed, 97
Announcement

The Iowa History Center at Simpson College seeks nominations for the outstanding master’s thesis in Iowa history. Selection will be based on contribution to the knowledge of Iowa history; originality of the subject matter or methodology; use of sources; and written expression. Nominees must have completed their master’s degree between May 2008 and June 2009.

The winner will be announced in the fall of 2009 and receive a $300 cash prize and a certificate. Three copies of the thesis and a brief letter of nomination from the thesis advisor should be submitted to Bill Friedricks, Director, Iowa History Center, Simpson College, 701 North C Street, Indianola, IA 50125. Application deadline is June 30, 2009.

For further information, please contact Linda Sinclair, (515) 961-1528 or linda.sinclair@simpson.edu.
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The Biographical Dictionary of IOWA

David Hudson, Marvin Bergman, and Loren Horton, editors

“Comprehensive and concise, The Biographical Dictionary of Iowa will save generations of reporters, students, teachers, historians, and reference librarians hours tracking down who’s who in Iowa’s past. In simple alphabetical order, hundreds of Iowa luminaries from chiropractic medicine, women’s suffrage, environmentalism, politics, astronomy, the Nobel Prize, education, the military, and art of all stripes take a bow. Bravo.” —TOM MORAIN, author, Prairie Grass Roots
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Contributors

DEREK EVERETT received his doctorate in western American history from the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, where he currently teaches. He is the author of *The Colorado State Capitol* (2005) and articles on state and regional history in the *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* and the *Southern Historian*.

NOAH LAWRENCE is a high school history teacher at Hinsdale Central High School in Hinsdale, Illinois. He earned his B.A. in history from Grinnell College in 2002 and his M.A. in social studies education from the University of Iowa in 2005. Recently, his proposal to create an African American history course at Hinsdale Central was accepted, and will be among the course offerings for the 2008–09 school year.
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