

and “miscegenation” in American English between 1800 and 2012, showing that the latter term (coined only in 1863) largely eclipsed the former by the early twentieth century (p. 190). To this reader, the graph raises the possibility that the institution of slavery itself may have played an essential role in maintaining the racial differentiation so clearly documented here. That this transition question now seems pressing is testimony to the rich historical harvest offered in *The Color Factor*.

GAVIN WRIGHT, *Stanford University*

Chained in Silence: Black Women and Convict Labor in the New South. By Talitha L. LeFlouria. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015. Pp. xi, 257. \$39.95, cloth.
doi: 10.1017/S0022050716001121

In *Chained in Silence*, Talitha LeFlouria offers a rich and vibrant study of women ensnared in Georgia’s convict labor system from the end of the Civil War through WWI. She seeks to address two weaknesses in the historiography of southern prison, labor, and gender studies. First, she chides historians of convict labor for paying scant attention to woman prisoners, though she warmly praises and builds on Mary Ellen Curtin for her work on the role that black women played in Alabama’s penal regime. Second, she urges scholars of black working class women to expand their canvas. While acknowledging that “wage-earning poor black women” found work primarily in domestic and agricultural labor, she underscores the significance of “unwaged, bound black female labor” (pp. 5–6, 64). In Georgia, unlike Alabama where the State’s prison officials and convict lessees observed “gender norms,” convict lessees employed these women in industrial labor, often working them alongside male prisoners. Women prisoners in Georgia could be found laboring in logging, brickyards, saw mills, along railroad tracks, in broom manufactories, and in the coal mines (though the evidence for this industry is less clear) (p.76). Convict lessees, LeFlouria notes, hired prisoners out of economic expediency and had no qualms about exploiting these women as “non-gender exclusive” labor. In one Georgia camp, black women prisoners “plowed fields, sowed crops, paddled through rivers of cotton, felled trees, sawed lumber, ran gristmills, ginned cotton, forged iron, cooked meals, cleaned camp quarters, and washed their faded strips” (p. 12).

By locating women in these wide-ranging forms of labor, LeFlouria comes to her central argument—these women were at the center of the modernizing postbellum New South. She describes these women as “modernizing instruments” and underscores the New South’s march towards “modernity.” In making this argument, LeFlouria is at pains to distinguish Georgia’s management of its prisoners from the exigencies of slavery. Unlike slave owners, neither Georgia’s postbellum governments nor its various convict lessees had any interest in having the prison labor force grow in number through childbirth. Some women gave birth while in prison, but that rationale of convict labor meant that lessees provided scant accommodations to pregnant women. They were treated mercilessly and exploited horribly. The convict lessees “reviled” maternity. Pregnancy diminished the value of these women as workers, rather than enhance their value (p. 190).

If LeFlouria is on firm ground making this argument, she is not entirely compelling on the impact of these women on the New South economy. While convict labor helped bridge the gap between the agrarian slave-based economy to the industrializing world of the New South, the number of women leased to industrialists between 1873 and 1899 never exceeded more than 3.6 percent of the convict labor force. Nor are we told the degree to which convict labor contributed to Georgia's GDP during the years in which the lease operated (pp. 11, 66, footnote 16). The vast majority of freedwomen remained in rural areas in the postbellum South and those that migrated to cities like Atlanta by and large entered domestic service (pp. 24, 31). LeFlouria did not need to underscore the significance of black women convict laborers as modernizing agents of the New South to analyze the anomalous position of these women in the Georgia's New South economy. She is at her best when she describes the lives of these women. They emerge as far more than statistics, but skilled workers with complex positions in the convict lease system. Mattie Crawford, with whom LeFlouria opens her text, was convicted of murder and sentenced to life in prison. She initially worked in a brickyard, became a highly skilled blacksmith, then later worked at the state prison farm where she became a "trusty" and the farm's sole blacksmith, all the while circumventing gender specific work and finding herself in liminal positions in the prison labor pecking order.

LeFlouria also shines in her analysis of the brutal sexualized forms of punishment that convict lessees and their hirelings inflicted on women prisoners and their gender specific forms of protest and resistance. Overseers subjected the women working on railroads to naked or seminude public floggings. With their buttocks, bosoms, and vaginas exposed, the whipping bosses beat the women ruthlessly and publicly. Other convict lessee employees, as well as their jailed counterparts, would have witnessed these floggings. Harkening back to antebellum norms, some overseers forced prison women to lay across a log and, with a woman prisoner's head between his knees, he would flog her on her naked buttocks (pp. 71–72).

Prison women resisted conditions imposed upon them by the prison authorities and convict lessees. Adopting forms of resistance reminiscent of subordinate classes in diverse times and places, they shirked work, destroyed property, feigned illness, ran away, ignored and cursed their guards, and "stole"/"took" goods that would ameliorate the condition of their lives. LeFlouria provides a particularly forceful analysis of one particular form of resistance—the decision of women working in the brickyards to burn their uniforms. Not wanting to be "defeminized" and forced to wear pants instead of skirts, they both objected to the masculinization of their outward appearance and simultaneously made their work in the brickyards more difficult since long skirts were not propitious sartorial gear near the brick ovens (pp. 85–94).

Based on wide-ranging sources, *Chained in Silence* provides a powerful and necessary addition to convict labor studies. It's particularly superb in its complex portrayal of the work and social experiences of Georgia's prison women. It also, however, provides a compelling overview of structural transformations in the convict lease system, tracing the fiscal and ideological origins of convict labor. Georgia's convict labor system began with the outsourcing and sub-contracting of laborers to work in a range of industries and farms, but moved towards single-sex farms, with government officials viewing the latter as reformist. In reality, awful conditions still pertained. Georgia also established a state prison farm, which presaged industrial agriculture (pp. 156–57), and ultimately

placed women prisoners in chain gangs to work on roads, bridges, and public works. As the contemporary carceral state gains evermore and necessary attention, LeFlouria's well-written and accessible study should be read by scholars and the general public alike.

KARIN A. SHAPIRO, *Duke University*

Brethren by Nature: New England Indians, Colonists, and the Origins of American Slavery. By Margaret Ellen Newell. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015. Pp. Xi, 316. \$45.00, cloth.

doi: 10.1017/S0022050716001078

Margaret Ellen Newell's ambitious survey of the economic and legal development of Indian slavery and servitude in New England argues that although the region's labor regime differed from other English colonies, it "looks less exceptional than previous scholarship has suggested" (p. 6). Before 1700 Indians rather than Africans were the dominant form of nonwhite labor, and Indians continued to be enslaved or endure service for life for more than two centuries. As in other New World colonies that embraced slave labor, New England leaders made a conscious decision to exploit Indian and subsequently African slaves in ways they did not treat European servants, and those who acquired captive Indians were also among the first to purchase Africans. Enslaving Native Americans proved a cheap solution to labor shortages, since bound workers were acquired within the region through capture or legal processes, so they cost only 10 to 25 percent of the price of imported Africans. Local elites held most of the Indian slaves, ensuring that legislatures and courts would serve slaveholders' interests. Some English officials did look askance at Indian slavery, considering Native Americans subjects of the crown on an equal plane with colonists (hence *brethren by nature*), but during the formative seventeenth century they lacked power to prevent colonists from asserting sovereignty over Indians in the region.

Acquiring captives became a primary purpose of English conflicts with Native Americans, beginning with the Pequot War of 1637 which established policies that continued through King Phillip's War of 1675–1676, and the northeastern Wabanaki conflicts of 1676–1749. In each, colonial soldiers were recruited and paid with promises of plunder including captives. Massachusetts became the first English colony to legalize slavery in 1641 in response to a need to define the status of captured Pequots. They rationalized captive taking in just wars, and enslavement of "strangers . . . sold to us" (p. 53), but simultaneously held Indians to be in rebellion. Consequently fighters were denied protections due foreign combatants and noncombatants judged supporters of insurrection, leading to widespread enslavement of women and children. But the legislatures were sufficiently uncomfortable with the idea of Indian slavery that they avoided clear definitions of who was eligible to be enslaved and whether slavery was hereditary. Instead, "local norms and usages, and the ability of purported owners to invoke the policing power of local officials and institutions, shaped what was possible for the owners of captives" (p. 54).

Following King Phillip's War the colonial governments viewed all Indians as subject people with rights of petition, and either outlawed slavery or set limits on the terms of