

tional differences and exploiting divisions among local Democrats, black Republicans secured some protection against the violence and wholesale abrogation of rights that would follow after 1900.

Fitzgerald acknowledges his debt to Thomas Holt, *Black Over White: Negro Political Leadership in South Carolina during Reconstruction* (Urbana, 1977), which likewise stressed class divisions among black Republicans. In method, however, the two books are strikingly different. Holt made heavy use of analytical and descriptive statistics to identify cohorts among black lawmakers and to argue for their support of different class agendas. Fitzgerald's book is an effective but conventional political narrative with little statistical analysis. Fitzgerald is generally successful in establishing the social profile of factional leaders and in charting their struggles over patronage, but he is not as persuasive in demonstrating their pursuit of distinct class interests or their connection to the black electorate. Indeed, the wider public of freedmen and freedwomen do not receive as much attention as one might wish in a book with a subtitle that promises a study of "popular politics." Nonetheless, *Urban Emancipation* is a valuable contribution to a neglected area of Reconstruction historiography.

Stephen A. West
Catholic University of America

The Mysterious Death of Jane Stanford. By Robert W. P. Cutler (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2003) 161 pp. \$29.95

Jane Leland Stanford was the "mother" of the university that she and Leland Stanford Sr. had created in 1885 to honor their late teenage son. Sen. Leland Stanford had been a moving force behind the Central Pacific Railroad when it joined the Union Pacific Railroad at Promontory Summit, Utah, in 1869, thus bridging the continental United States, and amassed wealth vast enough to build a university. Together the Stanfords traveled to Bloomington, Indiana, in 1891 to hire David Starr Jordan as Stanford University's founding president.

Jordan, born in 1851 on a farm in upstate New York, became a teacher and then studied at Cornell, graduating in 1872 with an M. Sc. in botany. He was also elected the class poet, and had earlier been class president. After teaching natural science at Lombard University in Illinois, he took summer courses and became a marine biologist and an ichthyologist, and then, after one year's further study, became an M. D. at Indiana Medical College. By 1875, he was a professor of biology at Butler University. Four years later he became professor of natural history at Indiana University, then little more than a high school for Bloomington, and five years' later—at thirty-four years of age—he became the university's president. After becoming president of Stanford, Jordan became an active anti-imperialist and an ardent advocate of the peaceful resolution

of international disputes, an opponent of the arms race, and an active advisor to Edwin Ginn, a publisher and the founder of the World Peace Foundation.

Jane Stanford died unexpectedly at the age of eighty in Honolulu in early 1905. Cutler demonstrates that she was indeed poisoned by strychnine, as the testimony of the physicians summoned to her side and an autopsy revealed. His elegant, medically informed, forensic examination of the case details how she consumed a teaspoon or so of medicinal bicarbonate of soda spiked with strychnine. She quickly fell into spasm, summoned help, and then became rigid in spine and jaw (typical of strychnine poisoning). A few weeks before, there had been an unsuccessful attempt in San Francisco to poison her by putting a weaker mixture of one of the poisonous alkaloids (used in commercial rodenticides) into a bottle of mineral water from Maine.

That much is straightforward. But the primary intention of this book is to describe the extraordinary and successful cover-up managed by Jordan. He steamed to Honolulu, produced a young physician who cast severe doubt on the poisoning hypothesis, deprecated the knowledge and training of the several more senior physicians who had observed Jane Stanford's death, dismissed the implications of the autopsy, and, with the cooperation of Stanford's family lawyer and a member of the Stanford Board of Trustees, fabricated a tale of her demise. He persuaded the Stanford community, the San Francisco police, and the San Francisco press to believe that Jane Stanford died naturally from a heart complaint, or a rupture of the coronary artery. Jordan maintained the lie to his death.

Cutler does not explain how Jordan, admittedly a nonpracticing medical doctor as well as an ichthyologist, managed to gull Stanford and San Francisco. He is more concerned to set the medical record straight, which he does, and briefly to imply that Jordan, an imperious and devious man, may have wanted Jane Stanford out of the way before she persuaded the trustees to dismiss him. She was still upset about Jordan blaming her for the firing of an outspoken, left-leaning, professor of economics at the beginning of the century. She believed, as did President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard University, that Jordan was autocratic, and was abusing his power.

Cutler may have felt that he had too little firm evidence to indict Jordan, and Bertha Berner, Stanford's personal secretary and long-time traveling companion, of conspiracy to murder. But his excellent diagnosis of the case indicates that only Berner was present during both poisoning episodes. Berner, because of a lack of obvious motive and because of her exemplary character, was never interrogated extensively by the police. Jordan also went out of his way to protect and defend her.

Jordan had a motive. He would have had knowledge of strychnine's properties. If he had somehow induced Berner to slip strychnine into Jane Stanford's water and then into her bicarbonate of soda, his journey to Honolulu, his taking personal charge of the dissemination of (mis-)

information about her death, and his energetic dismissal of the initial reports of her poisoning all fit. Otherwise, why? Could Stanford's first president have been a murderer?

R. I. R.

Managing White Supremacy: Race, Politics, and Citizenship in Jim Crow Virginia. By J. Douglas Smith (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2002) 411 pp. \$55.00 cloth \$19.95 paper

Close your eyes and conjure the image of the classic white southern opponent of black civil rights. What appears is the barrel-chested Mississippi sheriff, whose steely glare and tight-lipped scowl melt seamlessly into the jowls straining the inevitable mid-century collar and tie. That one does not think of Virginians Carter Glass, Colgate Darden, or Harry Byrd in this context has more to do with their style than the substance of their power: No twentieth-century southern state was more firmly under the thumb of a local oligarchy committed to white supremacy than Virginia. As few as 1,000 state and local officials controlled the state during the decades leading up to the *Brown* decision in 1954. (Drawing what must have seemed the most extreme comparison possible, Key once quipped that in contrast to Virginia, "Mississippi is a hotbed of democracy."¹) Less colorful, and on the whole less violent than their Deep South Jim Crow collaborators, Virginia's white elite was nonetheless equal to the task of defending white privilege when its back was to the wall. Rather than comply with the Supreme Court's decision ending segregated schools, Virginians led the white South down the path of massive resistance to African-American civic equality.

Like North Carolina, white Virginia always considered itself a civilized exception to the more openly exploitive racial regimes of the cotton and sugar South. The essence of the "Virginia Way," Smith tells us, was the desire for "separation by consent." If only African-Americans had stood to the side, white paternalists would have seen "that the negro [had] decent living conditions, educational facilities, and absolute justice in the courts of law" (62). Voting was denied, but in this matter black Virginians were not much more mistreated than nonelite white Virginians, most of whom had been purged from the rosters between 1895 and 1902. This elite-sponsored system of paternalistic racism—what Smith calls "managed race relations"—worked reasonably well in Virginia through World War I but began to come unglued during the 1920s under pressure from black and nonelite white Virginians. Working in tandem, if at cross purposes, neither group was willing to trust its interests to Virginia's first families or to settle for second-class citizenship.

Drawing on a wide variety of sources, *Managing White Supremacy*

1 Valdimer Orlando Key, *Southern Politics in State and Nation* (Knoxville, 1984; orig. pub. New York, 1949), 20.

Republicans' and Democrats' vastly different starting points help explain why the politics over voting and elections have been and likely will remain so fraught, through and beyond Election Day this year. Sometimes it seems as if the politicians involved barely live in the same country. It has become common for one side to discount the legitimacy of a victory by the other. International legal framework. DEDAW. CEDAW. VDPA. DEVAW. BelÃ©m do ParÃ¡. Maputo. Istanbul. Related topics. Prosecution of gender-targeted crimes. Women's shelter. 25 November. 6 February. By country. Gender violence. v. t. e. National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization with the mission to be the voice of victims and survivors of domestic violence. It is based in Denver, Colorado. National Coalition Against Domestic Violence's vision is to create a culture Though there are some differences between democrats and republicans, it's next to impossible to classify everyone based on every political issue, there are many specific important points that members of each party agree with. These important points are generally found in each party's platform. In order to understand the fundamental differences and beliefs of each party, we must look at the histories of Democrats and Republicans to understand their motives for becoming a party. It is also necessary to understand their fundamental beliefs and positions and how they have stuck with these positions through their voting records. This deep division led to the creation of a new Democratic party, the one we now know today. History of the Republican Party. Start studying Political divisions 1981-92. Learn vocabulary, terms and more with flashcards, games and other study tools. split between republicans and democrats. over traditional moral values and big government. split among republicans. traditional moral values. split about Bush. insufficiently conservative. Reagan aide Pat Buchanan and televangelist Pat Robertson said Bush was more eastern establishment liberal than rugged individual. 1988. split among democrats. over big government. campaign conservative protestants. against moves to secure ERA. This set is often saved in the same folder as history usa 3 week test dates. 62 terms. margot1234567. USA - conformity and urbanization mix. 58 terms. Ellabaileyyy. Some Toyota Motor shareholders have criticized its President Akio Toyoda for questioning Japan's plans to ban conventional cars only days after the firm said it was reviewing its climate lobbying and aimed for carbon neutrality by 2050. The five investors, who collectively have around \$500 billion in assets under management and spoke exclusively to Reuters, said the carmaker risks falling behind competitors that are rolling out electric vehicles, while giving cover for other companies seeking to avoid big changes to meet climate goals.