

1-1-2014

Book Reviews

Joy M. Giguere
Ivy Tech Community College

John D. Fowler
Dalton State College

Jay S. Hoar
University of Maine at Farmington, Emeritus

Stanley R. Howe
Bethel Historical Society

Jenna Hodges
Bangor Museum and History Center

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mainehistoryjournal>

Recommended Citation

Giguere, Joy M., John D. Fowler, Jay S. Hoar, Stanley R. Howe, Jenna Hodges, Libra Hilde, Russell R. Williams, Rachel Snell, John J. Zaborney, Daniel S. Soucier, and David C. Turpie. "Book Reviews." *Maine History* 48, 1 (2014): 213-238. <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mainehistoryjournal/vol48/iss1/10>

This Book Reviews is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maine History by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact um.library.technical.services@maine.edu.

Book Reviews

Authors

Joy M. Giguere, John D. Fowler, Jay S. Hoar, Stanley R. Howe, Jenna Hodges, Libra Hilde, Russell R. Williams, Rachel Snell, John J. Zaborney, Daniel S. Soucier, and David C. Turpie

BOOK REVIEWS

Mainers in the Civil War. By Harry Gratwick. (Charleston, South Carolina: The History Press, 2011. Pp. 128. Paper. \$17.)

In this slim volume, Harry Gratwick, author of *Hidden History of Maine* (2010), provides a “who’s who” sketch of individual Mainers and their contributions to the Civil War period. Gratwick acknowledges in his introduction that he could not “present an inclusive review of important people from Maine who fought in the war” (12), but the twenty-two Mainers included highlight the variety, and in a number of cases, the national significance, of those from the Pine Tree State who served the Union (and in one case, the Confederate!) cause. With each chapter devoted to a particular theme, Gratwick begins with “The Politicians,” including Abraham Lincoln’s first vice president, Hannibal Hamlin, and three of the state’s wartime governors – Israel Washburn, Abner Coburn, and Samuel Cony. The second chapter explores the contributions of Mainers who transitioned from the military to gubernatorial roles, including the most well-known, Joshua Chamberlain, and the lesser-known Selden Connor and Harris M. Plaisted.

Gratwick proceeds in the third chapter by spotlighting Mainers from the different branches of the military, including soldiers, sailors, and one marine. Among those discussed in this chapter include General Neal Dow, who before the war, served as a temperance advocate and mayor of Portland. As colonel of the Thirteenth Maine Infantry Regiment, Dow’s recruitment of sober young men earned his unit the nickname “The Prohibition Regiment.” In Chapter 4, entitled “Three Islanders Go to War,” Gratwick highlights the military service of three young men from Deer Isle and Vinalhaven, and the impact that their sacrifices made on their local communities.

Perhaps the most surprising chapter of *Mainers in the Civil War* is Chapter 5, in which Gratwick writes first about Confederate raider Charles Read, who was not a Mainer but who attempted to attack Portland harbor. What makes this section of the book most compelling is how it reveals the actions of Maine civilians when the war came, ever so briefly, to their doorstep. As described by Reuben Chandler, “Every man jack in Portland rolled up his sleeves and started for the dock armed with everything from ancient blunderbusses to cutlasses. Fishermen,

stedores and bakers, undertakers and teamsters, doctors and a college professor. By cracky, they were made as hornets” (96). Gratwick then discusses the life and career of General Danville Leadbetter, a native Mainer who married into the South and allied himself with the Confederacy during the war.

In his final chapter, “Three Daughters of Maine,” Gratwick finishes with biographical sketches of Harriet Beecher Stowe, Dorothea Dix, and Amy Morris Bradley. Stowe, “perhaps the best-known woman in the country during the Civil War era,” was not a native Mainer but married Calvin Stowe, a Bowdoin College professor. It was while living in Brunswick with her husband that Stowe penned *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, the book that would make her internationally famous. In proceeding to Dorothea Dix, Gratwick states, “If Harriet Beecher Stowe was the most influential woman connected with Maine during the Civil War era, Dorothea Dix runs her a close second” (110). Working first as a teacher, then as a social reformer who sought to improve the living and treatment conditions of the mentally ill, Dix eventually served as the strict Superintendent of Nurses during the Civil War, thus earning for herself the moniker, “Dragon Dix” (114). Gratwick concludes his final chapter with Amy Morris Bradley, the “saintly” carpetbagger – a Union nurse who, after the war, successfully established a number of schools in Wilmington, North Carolina, during Reconstruction.

Written mainly for a lay readership, *Mainers in the Civil War* provides a readable introduction for those unacquainted with the history of the Civil War even as it focuses specifically on the contributions of those who hailed from Maine. In many ways, this volume could be re-titled *Significant Mainers of the Nineteenth Century*, as so many not only made widely known contributions during the war, but also led lives of national significance beyond the war’s context – in particular, Neal Dow, Harriet Beecher Stowe, and Dorothea Dix. While Gratwick often refers to the source information of quoted material within the text, the utility of his text for scholars would have been strengthened had he used footnotes or endnotes to indicate the precise source. This absence of notation, however, may perhaps be attributed to the style required by The History Press rather than due to the author’s choice. He does, however, include a bibliography, and Gratwick further provides a list of libraries and historical societies where he conducted his research, which offers a starting point for those who may seek to conduct research on the individuals covered in *Mainers in the Civil War*.

Joy M. Giguere
Ivy Tech Community College

The 22nd Maine Volunteer Infantry in the Civil War: A History and Roster. By Ned Smith. (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland, 2013. Pp. 260. Paper. \$35.)

So many good regiment studies have been written and published on units from both the North and the South that one would be tempted to ask, "What makes this one special?" The answer is nothing and yet everything. Only by exploring the history of various units can historians truly appreciate the communities and the men that these communities sent to war. While a single unit history tells us one story, combined with ten histories or fifty histories, the larger story of the war begins to unfold, a story that cannot be gleaned from general overviews.

Author Ned Smith follows the Twenty-second Maine Infantry Regiment from its formation through its part in Major General Nathaniel Banks' campaign in Louisiana. This was a nine-month regiment formed in the war's second year, when Union recruitment efforts sagged and soldiers were badly needed to continue an increasingly unpopular war. This study contains a solid account of the fighting and disease endured by the officers and men of the regiment and the physical, mental, and emotional struggle they faced. The author follows the standard modern style of regiment studies by including a wealth of primary sources such as first-person accounts from private soldiers, a company commander, and the colonel of the regiment. This supports material from the Official Records, unit reports, and newspaper accounts.

One unique aspect of this study is that the author has managed to collect the letters that Francis Ireland wrote to his parents (which include his observations and thoughts on the regiment from September 1862 to June 1863), as well as the letters his parents wrote in response. This two-way communication is often missing from our sources, and it greatly aids in reconstructing the daily lives of soldiers. Given the ravages of time on historical records such as personal letters, this correspondence is fortuitous and allows Smith to tell the story of the regiment from different points of view.

The author traces the unit's history chronologically in a series of brief chapters organized around a key event. Chapter one covers a history of both Maine and Louisiana and the events leading to the outbreak of the Civil War. Although the author is obviously trying to provide readers with background information before delving into the story of the Twenty-second Maine, this is unnecessary and probably could have been left out of the volume. The next two background chapters, how-

ever, are both significant and relevant to the work. In chapter two, the readers are introduced to Maine's efforts to raise nine-month regiments for the Union, including the Twenty-second. This chapter is followed by one that introduces Francis Ireland and the men from Dexter, Maine, who form part of the newly organized regiment.

Chapters four through six relate the experiences of the regiment as it begins to prepare for its part in the war and examine the daily life of the soldiers as they settle into the routine of camp life and the monotony of drill. The author has included several long, block quotes in this section of the book. Instead of distracting, however, they engage the reader by allowing the men to speak for themselves.

The next four chapters (seven through ten) follow the regiment's movement to New Orleans, Baton Rouge, and the lower Mississippi River swamps. It is here that the men first encounter the exotic southern landscape, with its sweltering heat and humidity, its natural beauty, and its deadly diseases. Fevers, such as typhoid and malaria, plagued the men, as did internal disorders such as dysentery, which ravaged the ranks at one time or another. Inadequate rations added to the misery. Clearly, the regiment suffered greatly even before they met the Confederates in combat.

The second half of the book explores the regiment's combat experiences, when the men finally got to "see the animal." The Twenty-second Maine was part of Major General Banks' campaign against Port Hudson. The fall of this Confederate bastion would block the mouth of the Red River as it flowed into the Mississippi, making it harder for rebel forces to ship men and material from the Trans-Mississippi Theater to the rest of the Confederacy. It also would bring the Union one step closer to controlling the entire Mississippi River. Indeed, by late 1863, only the fortifications of Port Hudson, Louisiana, and Vicksburg, Mississippi, gave the Confederacy a tenuous hold on the great river.

Initially, however, the men of the Twenty-second joined with other Union forces to gain control of the roads, hamlets, and bayous around Baton Rouge. It was in these early skirmishes with rebel forces that they tasted their first combat. As the spring of 1863 dragged on, it became clear to the men that they would not be released from their tour of duty until the rebel threat in the area had been destroyed or until Port Hudson had fallen. The regiment participated in the fighting at Irish Bend and eventually in the two ill-considered assaults on the fortifications of Port Hudson. The Twenty-second finally saw the fort surrender soon after Major General Ulysses S. Grant's capture of Vicksburg, thus opening

the Mississippi to northern shipping. With the fall of Port Hudson, the regiment could finally head for home to be mustered out of service.

Smith's work gives us good insight into an ordinary nine-month Union volunteer regiment during the Civil War. The Twenty-second did not participate in the most acclaimed battles of the war, and none of its men were among the most applauded. Within its rank and file would be no future political, business, or ecclesiastical giants. Yet, the regiment's story is both interesting and significant. Most Civil War regiments, northern and southern, were comprised of men just like those who served in the Twenty-second. While not famous, their experiences reveal to us the reality of the Civil War. Combined with others like it, this study offers historians the opportunity to grasp the impact of the war at the community level, and that is where the real war is to be found.

John D. Fowler
Dalton State College

Write Quick: War and a Woman's Life in Letters 1835-1867. Edited by Anne Fox Chandonnet and Roberta Gibson Pevear. (Bethel, Maine: Bethel Historical Society, 2011. Pp. 538. Paper. \$34.95.)

This Civil War era study is as literary as it is historical as it is genealogical. The authors/editors deserve praise for salvaging what was ostensibly destined to be beyond retrieval through deliberate destruction by fire: aging diaries and letters of Eliza Howard Bean (1835-1867), her teacher-farmer brother Andrew Jackson Bean, Sr. (1828-1919) of Bethel, her husband Henry Charles Foster of the Twenty-sixth Massachusetts Infantry, and some twenty-eight major personalities of the Bean(e), Foster, Fox, Hickford and Lynch families. Posterity has this New England saga because Roberta G. Pevear was determined to preserve it and Anne F. Chandonnet superbly transcribed and arranged the extant correspondence, provided insightful commentary, and composed amplifying footnotes.

The centerpiece personality, Eliza, sixteenth child of Ebenezer S. Bean of West Bethel, Maine, became, at age sixteen, a mill girl weaver at Biddeford's Pepperell Company, operating two or three looms at a time for some thirteen hours a day. Most of her monthly pay (\$48) was used to augment the family farm earnings, went for her brother's education, or was squirreled away for her dowry. Dangers in the mill abounded, in-

cluding breaking leather belts and clothing drawn into machinery. Eliza later worked twelve-hour days, six days a week, at Lowell's Boott Cotton Mill.

As readers of this book, we learn why volunteers fought, re-enlisted, and died. We come to know stay-at-home women's privations, endless chores, dreaded wash days, and loneliness during the 1860s and after. We are treated to dozens of first-time published photographs, and the scholarship is sound. Epistolary exchanges, so vital to the morale of all recipients, are the vehicle that moves this poignant story, its entire self an encapsulation of the nineteenth-century New England world. Readers, convinced, may at length safely infer that the hopes, dreams, misgivings, fears, struggles, joys, longings, and loves of these featured families are representative and typical of the majority of New Englanders, whether rural or urban during the era.

Transcendent truths of yesteryear have surely come out of Oxford County. Despite all of today's inventions and electronics, one emerges from this book to discover that our present society has the same prevailing moods, preoccupations, concerns (blessing and curses) as people did in this era. Once Mainers and those well beyond the state have perused this nigh unique nonfiction achievement, they will possess a deeper, firmer grasp of their heritage.

Jay S. Hoar

University of Maine at Farmington
Emeritus

Civil War Senator: William Pitt Fessenden and the Fight to Save the American Republic. By Robert J. Cook. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011. Pp. 316. Cloth. \$43.20); *Lincoln's Friend: Leonard Swett.* By Robert S. Eckley. (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 2012. Pp. 307. Cloth. \$34.95.); *We Are in His Hands Whether We Live or Die: The Letters of Brevet Brigadier General Charles Henry Howard.* Edited by David K. Thomson. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2013. Pp. 281. Cloth. \$52.00.)

Three recent books (two biographies and one collection of letters) do much to underscore the significant role Mainers have played in national affairs, particularly during the Civil War era. Of the three, the one on Fessenden is perhaps the least revealing since a previous biography

appeared a half century ago, but the other two provide new perspectives on a couple of individuals—one in the political and legal realm, the other whose providential faith greatly assisted in his command of Union soldiers.

William Pitt Fessenden (1806-1869) was born out of wedlock in Boscawen, New Hampshire, just north of Concord. His parents did not marry, and the son was sent to his father's mother and was raised by her and her daughters in Fryeburg, Maine. His father, Samuel, was a friend of Daniel Webster, who was asked to become the boy's godfather. A precocious Fessenden went to Bowdoin College and studied law long enough to be admitted to the bar in 1827. He began his legal practice in Bridgton and, after two years, spent most of his life in Portland, marrying Ellen Deering in 1832, the daughter of a prominent Portland businessman. Three years later he joined William Willis in a partnership that would last nearly twenty years, during which time he became one of the ablest attorneys in the state.

With his connection to Daniel Webster, it is not surprising that he was invited by the great statesman to accompany him on a tour of the American West. He enjoyed cordial relations with his mentor, but grew skeptical of some of Webster's positions on issues and refused to support his presidential nomination in 1852. After service in the Maine legislature, he was elected to a single term in the U.S. House of Representatives, where he began as a conservative on the issue of slavery. However, his exposure to the views of John Quincy Adams transformed him to advocate greater hostility to the "peculiar institution." His opposition to slavery increased as time passed to such an extent that he became an organizer of the newly formed Republican Party in 1854.

Elected to the U.S. Senate from Maine in 1853, he served in that body until he resigned in 1864 to accept Abraham Lincoln's plea to become secretary of the treasury. His most important work began about 1857, but during that time he endured the death of his wife and a prolonged period of ill-health from which he gained a reputation for irritability and a quick temper. His work in the Senate on financing the Civil War helped solidify his reputation as a strong supporter of the Lincoln administration, as he generally backed the policies of Secretary of the Treasury Salmon Chase despite his disapproval of legal tender paper. When he became secretary of the treasury, he faced a nearly bankrupt nation with all kind of debts. His response was to raise the return on government bonds, recruit Jay Gould to market another great loan, and stand firm on any additional inflation of the currency. With his re-elec-

tion to the U.S. Senate in 1865, he resigned as treasury secretary.

His greatest legacy was undoubtedly his work on Reconstruction, during which he served as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reconstruction, the report of this committee largely reflecting his views and influence. He helped draft the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which gave African Americans citizenship. In addition, he stood up to President Andrew Johnson, stating that Reconstruction was a function of Congress and not the executive branch's domain. He then mediated a middle course between Johnson and Congress. Although he possessed little regard for the president, he remained true to his principles and disapproved of the Tenure of Office Act, casting a key vote against impeachment of the president despite public opinion from his Maine constituents. He died before his last Senate term expired, but his record of national leadership in financing the Civil War and legislating Reconstruction provide this Mainer with a high profile.

Robert J. Cook, a professor of American history at the University of Sussex in the United Kingdom, has written a balanced treatment of the life and career of this great Mainer. He does not neglect Fessenden's flaws including his hair-trigger temper and limited sympathy regarding issues of race, gender, and class. Professor Cook has done a masterful job of assembling the evidence to support his contention that Fessenden's reputation and legacy to American history is well-deserved and has withstood the test of time.

Robert S. Eckley, a central Illinois native with a doctorate in economics from Harvard and a former president of Illinois Wesleyan University, has provided historians and others interested in the past with this first biography of a Maine man who had close ties to our sixteenth president. Leonard Swett was born in Turner, Maine, in 1825, the fourth child of John and Remember Berry Swett. His forebears extended back to the *Mayflower*, and his grandfather served in the Revolutionary War as a surgeon. His father was a veteran of the War of 1812 and a farmer. Leonard Swett received his education in Turner and at North Yarmouth Academy before entering Waterville College (now Colby). There he received a classical education, but also studied sciences and history among other disciplines. He also met a classmate, Josiah Hayden Drummond, later his college roommate. Drummond, who became a leading Portland attorney, served in both houses of the Maine legislature, including as House speaker. They became lifelong friends and worked with other Lincoln supporters in 1860, and as Lincoln delegates in 1864, to ensure their friend's presidential victories.

Swett never graduated from Waterville College, but departed after his junior year, perhaps because he was eager to begin a legal career. Luckily in 1845, he landed in the offices of George Foster Shepley, who had prepared for a legal career in the more traditional manner, Dartmouth College as an undergraduate and Harvard Law. Two years later, Swett left law to teach in a school in Gray, but found that discipline for sixty students was more than he could bear, so decided to move to New Orleans, then the nation's third largest city. To get there he decided on the "all water route around Florida," which provided some adventure as he had to survive a heavy gale that almost destroyed the ship. He soon concluded that the city was more morally wayward than he had anticipated, so he migrated up the Mississippi to Cairo, Illinois, and eventually settled in Madison, Indiana. He soon ran out money and could not find employment, so he joined the U.S. Army.

Swett endured some tough basic training in the army. At one point, he challenged the drill sergeant with a bayonet and ended up in the guard house facing the possibility of a court-martial and execution if found guilty. This was a defining moment in his life as it called upon all his legal skills to gain a pardon. He was then shipped down the Mississippi to guard General Winfield Scott's supply during the Mexican War. He developed malaria and nearly died. He wanted to return to Maine and started up the Illinois River, but his fever returned and he knew he could not make it home. He decided to stay in Bloomington, Illinois, where he met David Davis, who was shortly elected judge of the Eighth Judicial Circuit of Illinois, and had previously made important connections with individuals who would be influential later in his life including a friendship with Abraham Lincoln. Swett was soon practicing law again and teaching. He passed the Illinois bar exam in June 1849 and by the end of year had moved to Clinton, Illinois, to set up his own practice. By that year, while traveling in his legal work with Davis, he met Lincoln for the first time. Swett spent a good deal of his professional life riding the circuit and became an accomplished lawyer. Through Lincoln, he met the future president's law partner, Ward Hill Lamon, and the three men became close friends, sometimes opposing one another in their legal defense travels.

Through Lincoln's influence, Swett became involved in Whig Party politics and served as a presidential elector for General Winfield Scott in 1852. He also began in this period looking for wife and through his landlord met Laura Quigg. They were married in 1854. Moving back to Bloomington, he established a law office with William Ward Orme.

Later it was Swett, Davis, and Lincoln who rode circuit and honed their legal skills. Swett greatly admired Lincoln, who served as a remarkable role model as he became the accomplished lawyer that would characterize the rest of his life. From Lincoln, Swett, who had been trained in classical languages, learned the verbiage of ordinary people that made it possible for mastering the art of communicating with plain folks who often served on juries. Swett was no teetotaler and was surprised to learn that Lincoln, in 1859, admitted that he had never tasted hard liquor. He and Lincoln served together in more than ninety cases on the Eighth Circuit.

With the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 and the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, Lincoln was moved to denounce the possible extension of slavery and decided to become a candidate for the U.S. Senate. Swett offered to help him campaign and was dispatched to northern Illinois. Lincoln led in early voting, but did not carry the day, much to his disappointment. Swett was a Republican before Lincoln, but both attended the first Republican presidential convention in 1856. Swett ran for the Illinois House of Representatives in 1858 in order to support Lincoln's election as U.S. Senator. Stephen Douglas was re-elected that year despite State Representative Swett's effort on behalf of Lincoln. This would be the only time that Swett held elective office despite numerous subsequent attempts.

From 1860 to Lincoln's assassination in 1865, Swett spent much of his time working for his friend's election in 1860, and later his re-election in 1864. Upon Lincoln's success at the polls in 1860, Swett, along with his friends Judge Davis and Josiah Drummond, worked closely with Lincoln on appointments. Swett was not a good manager of money and despite his success as a lawyer was long in debt. After Lincoln's accession to the presidency, he came to believe that some government post might relieve his financial worries, but despite his intimate association with the president, nothing ever came his way. The author believes Swett was so close to Lincoln that the president did not have to worry about his loyalty and if he had received a major position in the administration their easy familiarity might have been jeopardized. He continued to serve the president in many ways despite his disappointment. Lincoln, moreover, consulted Swett while considering and drafting the Emancipation Proclamation and eagerly sought his advice on numerous occasions. He also became very familiar with life in the White House during Lincoln's tenure.

Leonard Swett, according to author, should be recalled for his out-

standing professional achievements in the law, his critical assistance in securing Lincoln's election and re-election, and his fifteen-year association with the president, during which he served as an unofficial yet valued presidential advisor and personal emissary on many missions. He also later recorded many personal memories of the president in preparation of a biography on his friend that he never completed. Countless Lincoln biographers and other scholars have consulted these notes, which have provided greater clarity to the history of this era. Eckley also praises Swett's later courage in defending the Haymarket anarchists and his legal brilliance in interacting with some of the most significant figures in the America of his era.

Charles Henry Howard was born in 1838 in Leeds, Maine. He was the youngest brother of Oliver Otis Howard, the famed Civil War general and the supervisor of the Freedman's Bureau, whose name was also placed on a Washington, D.C., university in 1867. A precocious child, Charles Howard received his education at Kents Hill School in Readfield, Maine, and at North Yarmouth and Topsham academies. He graduated from Bowdoin College in 1859. Following his departure from Bowdoin, Charles joined his brother at West Point to recover from the strains of his college years. During his time at West Point, Charles became increasingly cognizant of the sectional tension regarding slavery that loomed over the cadets. After a year with his brother, he returned to Maine to attend Bangor Theological Seminary with the intention of joining the ministry while he kept an anxious eye on the secession crisis of 1860. He was resolute in his determination to remain at the seminary until a providential sign should manifest itself to instruct him to change his course.

What came forth to nudge him out of his religious studies was the Confederate firing upon Fort Sumter. Almost immediately, he received a message from his brother that he was now a colonel in the Union army and was needed to raise troops for war. Even before receiving his officers' commission, he was involved in the disastrous (for the Union) first Battle of Bull Run. This encounter was the first of sixty-eight battles (according to him) that would take him through the conflict. In his remarkable rise from drum major to brevet brigadier general during the war, he was wounded twice and faced formidable challenges. Yet, he never doubted his faith and dedication to a God that oversaw the battle between the North and South in the American republic.

After the war, he became a member of the Freedman's Bureau, where he was a school inspector in Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina, and

rose through the ranks to the post of assistant commissioner for the District of Columbia, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia. Moreover, he also connected with the American Missionary Association and edited a number of publications. In addition, presidents Garfield and Arthur both named him to serve as inspector of Indian agencies.

This book contains some hundred letters ranging from 1852 to 1908, certain ones of great interest and others not so much, but all reflecting in a particular manner Charles Howard's providential view of human affairs guided by the will of God. He (with his brother often accompanying him) recorded conducting prayer meetings, visiting hospitals to distribute religious literature, and ministering to those in need of spiritual guidance. In addition, he notes the shift in his racial attitudes with the senseless shooting by a member of the Irish Brigade of an African-American servant boy whom he had come to know and admire and who died after a long struggle. As the war progressed, he observed in his correspondence the shift from a war to preserve the Union to one of emancipation of the slaves. He increasingly came to believe that with the ongoing Union success God indeed favored the men in blue, even though he was very well aware of the weaknesses of mortal men.

Editor David K. Thomson has provided a very useful organization and analysis of the letters contained in this volume, which also sheds new light on the life and career of the "Christian General," Oliver Otis Howard. It also provides insight into the role of religion in war and gives the reader details of Charles Howard's dedication to duty in regard to his God and country.

Stanley R. Howe
Bethel Historical Society
Executive Director Emeritus

Fanny & Joshua: The Enigmatic Lives of Frances Caroline Adams and Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain. By Diane Monroe Smith. (Lebanon, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 2013. Pp. 432. Paper. \$35.)

Diane Monroe Smith contends that in order to understand Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain's celebrated military career one must consider his entire life, including his relationship with his beloved wife Fanny. Indeed, she found Fanny to be interesting enough to merit a dual biography, although the latter half of the book focuses much more on Joshua

than his wife. Previous scholarship has portrayed Fanny in a negative light. Smith takes pains to counter this image with one of a loving wife who was more educated and independent than most women in her time and who provided Joshua with the support he needed in order to accomplish his celebrated feats. *Fanny & Joshua* spans the Chamberlains' entire lives from Fanny's birth in 1825 to Joshua's death in 1914, with his military service presented as only part of a long and interesting life. However, despite her stated desire to add serious analysis to Chamberlain's life, the book leaves readers to draw their own conclusions as to how Chamberlain's entire life illuminates his military career.

Smith's background in human development is clearly evident throughout the biography. *Fanny & Joshua* focuses heavily on the interactions between the Chamberlains and their families, so in place of military maneuvers the reader learns about Cousin Deborah's tendency to cause discord in the Adams family and Chamberlain's distress when letters from home failed to reach him in the field. In a welcome contrast to works centered on his military career, Smith examines the many facets that combined to make Chamberlain the man he was: an officer, husband, father, college professor, and veteran. The reader is left with a balanced view of Joshua Chamberlain, not merely as a soldier, but as a man with unique flaws, strengths, and, above all, an unshakeable sense of duty. Fanny Chamberlain was herself a multi-faceted individual. The reader gains new appreciation for the challenges she faced living with a man who could be obstreperous; he struggled with jealousy early in their relationship and in later years was away from home much of the time, even as Fanny was slowly losing her sight.

Originally published in 1999, *Fanny & Joshua* was republished in 2013, presumably in celebration of the sesquicentennial of the Battle of Gettysburg, although this is not explicitly stated. Although this edition contains a new preface, the bibliography does not cite any new scholarship since 1999, nor does the preface discuss any revisions.

For source material, the author drew heavily on letters between the couple, supplemented with letters to and from other family members, diaries, Chamberlain's speeches, and his memoirs. It is the author's preference to let her subjects speak for themselves through numerous and lengthy quotations, some up to a half a page or longer, leaving no doubt that Smith devoted considerable time to reading the widely dispersed Chamberlain family papers. Additionally, the extensive use of primary sources lends credibility to Smith's flattering portrayal of Fanny. Indeed, Chamberlain's own words indicate that he loved and respected his wife.

Letting the Chamberlains speak for themselves often provides a compelling and personal view of their lives. It is an especially effective technique in the chapters devoted to their three-year engagement, during which they rarely saw each other, but wrote numerous letters proclaiming their affections and working out their plans for the future. This method is less useful when the couple was together, as they did not leave such a rich trove of documents. It is weakest during the couple's separation when Chamberlain served as governor, a time of monumental importance to their relationship that merits more discussion in a book so devoted to human relationships. Smith offers little to explain the estrangement and reconciliation other than one passionate letter from Joshua begging Fanny not to tell people that he abused her and that if she wished to separate to do it without "wretchedness." Here the book might have been well served by considering other source material. It is likely that some observations regarding the governor's marriage were recorded and these could provide more information when the Chamberlains themselves left little record.

This is a complex portrait of the Chamberlains, but Smith is content to tell their story with little attempt to interpret it. The preface makes it clear that it is necessary to understand Chamberlain's whole life in order to know Chamberlain the Civil War officer, but the author is so wary of making unwarranted assumptions that she fails to present any wider analysis beyond the assertion that Fanny was not the terrible wife that previous scholarship had painted her to be. Thus *Fanny & Joshua* presents a well-told, compelling, and convincing story, but does not explain the broader significance of that story.

Jenna Hodges
Bangor Museum and History Center

This Birth Place of Souls: The Civil War Nursing Diary of Harriet Eaton. Edited with an Introduction by Jane E. Schultz. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012. Pp. xii, 278. Paper. \$24.95.)

Jane Schultz points out, early in her introduction to the wartime diary of Harriet Eaton, that this is one of only five existing unreconstructed diaries of female Civil War nurses. The diary, housed at the University of North Carolina, is a crucial example of women's lives and

work during the war, as Eaton was one of thousands of women who offered their services to their country in a time of national crisis, but one of only a handful who left a lengthy record of her wartime experiences. Eaton, unlike many of her peers, never published her diary and reacted with indignation when folks at home published her personal letters without her permission. This self-effacing woman avoided calling attention to herself. Thus Schultz's careful research grants Eaton, and female nurses more broadly, the attention they deserve as vital agents in the prosecution of the war and health of the fighting men.

Eaton, moreover, regularly interacted with some of the most widely recognized personalities of the Civil War period, including nurse administrator Dorothea Dix, numerous fellow nurses such as Cornelia Hancock, and noted military figures such as Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain. Hers is a story of interest not only to students of Maine history and wartime medicine and medical care, but of the Civil War itself. This volume is a valuable addition to Civil War literature, and Schultz provides a thorough and lively introduction, meticulously researched notes on the text, and an excellent biographical dictionary of the people Eaton encountered in the course of her relief work.

Eaton's diary and letters discuss state relief work, field nursing, regimental hospitals, and the evolving logistics of medical care and the movement of sick and wounded men. In particular, Eaton's diary provides a picture of the chaotic state of medical care early in the conflict and prior to Union organization of the ambulance corps. Eaton's diary and letters demonstrate the importance of state-run relief agencies, in this case the Maine Camp Hospital Association, which are often overlooked in the focus on the United States Sanitary Commission. A comparison of Eaton's two tours of duty also shows increasing Union organization in the care and evacuation of the sick and wounded as the war lengthened.

Although Eaton hesitated to call herself a nurse, Schultz rightly identifies her as such; Eaton's diary reveals the varied labors performed by relief agents, including hands-on nursing. Eaton engaged in direct patient care both physical and emotional, wrote letters, attended death beds, bathed and dressed wounds, and spent a great deal of time cooking and distributing food, clothing, and other comforts. The diary richly documents the various foodstuffs packed by women's aid societies on the home front and forwarded to agents at the front, and the pivotal role nurses and relief agents played in preparing meals sick and wounded men could consume.

Furthermore, this diary explores a host of human relationships during wartime, including those between caregivers and patients and the sometimes tense interactions of different medical personnel. Eaton discusses the relationships between state and Sanitary Commission agents, nurses, and medical workers of different ranks and positions. Schultz could have delved a bit more deeply into the class implications of the rift between Eaton and fellow Maine agent Isabella Fogg, but her speculation regarding Eaton's postwar relationship with patient Nathaniel Jaques is deftly handled despite a minimal amount of extant evidence. Though comprehensive in her coverage, the pious Eaton was a circumspect diarist, and in the introduction and notes, Schultz has skillfully teased out the nuances of meaning in the diary. Because I so enjoyed Schultz's commentary, I would have liked to know her thoughts on Eaton's negative reaction to Helen Gilson. Schultz's cross-referencing of Eaton's letters with her diary is especially useful, and it actually makes sense to read the narrative letters prior to reading the more tersely constructed diary. The two sources in concert, diary and letters, provide a fascinating and significant portrait of Civil War nursing, women's patriotic service and experiences, supply networks connecting home front and war front, and the sacrifices, suffering, and chaos of war.

Libra Hilde
San Jose State University

Army at Home: Women and the Civil War on the Northern Home Front.
By Judith Giesberg. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012. Pp. 248. Paper. \$24.95.)

Judith Giesberg's *Army at Home* is a sophisticated examination of the myriad roles and hardships faced by rural, working-class, and marginal women on the northern home front during the Civil War. At its core, her work skillfully challenges traditional narratives that either ignored these women altogether or conveniently lumped them in with the middle- and upper-class women who more consistently supported the war. It was the latter whose wealth and status insulated them from many of the privations described in *Army at Home*. Rather than portray women whose lives and families were disrupted and dislocated by the war as stoic patriots who suffered and sacrificed in silence, Giesberg re-

veals a northern home front that roiled with women on the edge of being crushed in the gears of the new economic reality of the war. As a result, these women actively and consciously attacked prewar gender, class, and racial boundaries.

Given that the working-class women of the period did not typically leave behind detailed narratives of their daily lives, Giesberg draws on an extensive array of sources. The author, for example, relies on housing records, particularly state records of appeals for assistance. Although there is frequent use of letters, many of the stories are less in their own voices but rather reflected through a wide variety of sources ranging from almshouse records, relief requests, the observations of middle-class women, and even monuments. Giesberg admits that the trails of some individual women were faint at best as they would surface short periods in state and local records only to submerge and reappear again. Giesberg's work shifts its scope widely from chapter to chapter, attempting to link very diverse groups of women. Alongside white women in the countryside, the city, and the factory in the Midwest and Northeast, she examines the efforts of black women in San Francisco to desegregate streetcars. In a lot of ways, the groups of women in the book are so different the only thing that links them together is their gender and the vulnerability at the edges of the economic, social, and political spectrum in the Civil War North.

Giesberg draws inspiration from previous research into the ways white southern and slave women weakened and fatally undermined the Confederate war effort. The collapse of the southern home front became possible following the decision by northern military leaders to wage a total war in the South. As all total wars require the rapid mass mobilization and centralization of the economy, many of the stories in *Army at Home* are of northern women dislocated and disrupted in the process. The North was victorious despite the toll it took on working-class women and their families and their resulting protests. Going further, Giesberg points out that for decades, the dominant, gendered narrative of the Union victory held that it was the sacrifices of male, nationalist free labor that powered the northern economy to victory.

Giesberg begins by considering the role of farm women whose husbands left them to fight. After the war's conclusion, northern elites favored a reassuring and convenient narrative in which the war was won on northern farms by the young sons of yeoman farmers cum Union soldiers operating manmade machines. The stories of sacrifices made by these soldiers' wives were generally ignored, though they were the ones

who actually freed the men to fight, fed the army through their labor in the fields, and held together rural communities and families through a variety of efforts. This included calling in and granting favors, applying for aid, and finding temporary jobs when forced to do so. The author then turns her attention to urban working-class women. Giesberg examines a host of urban institutions including hospitals, asylums, jails, and temporary homes. At the same time, she studies the ways rumors influenced the lives of women forced to turn to these institutions for relief. In addition to the obvious role of rumors, in the form of “news” from the front, rumors were often the only guide to the confusing layers of bureaucracy that governed local and state relief. Rumors could also keep a woman from obtaining the relief she and her family had been promised by Union recruiters. Top-down gendered notions of chastity were used to deny women relief if rumors of a woman’s infidelity circulated. Women were, of course, not completely powerless in the face of rapidly changing economic realities of the urban, industrial North. While only a small minority of women were active rioters, they were disproportionately important in the New York City draft riots of 1863, orchestrating the violence in many cases and egging on male rioters. At the same time, the local, state, and national authorities seem to have been only able to obscure the problems of discontent over the draft and economic inequalities created by the war and never did develop coherent, consistent strategies to obtain and maintain the consent of marginal urban women.

The author also examines the role of women war workers and the variety of ways their labor blurred the prewar gender boundaries of industrial work. A curious aside in this section involves the cleanliness of the female war workers undergarments and the attempts by a Union major to send home women who made the air in the work room “unpleasant.” Giesberg uses this to further her exploration of the men who found the presence of women in the arsenals a threatening feminization of the war effort. Also included, though, are the paternalistic men who self-identified as the defenders of the female workers. Like many of the groups studied by Giesberg, the reader learns the stories of the female workers filtered by others first. Following an explosion at an arsenal outside of Pittsburgh, what we learn is shaped by the male interviewers questioning women in the wake of the disaster, those who saw female war workers as an opportunity for political grandstanding, or even through the design and layout of a monument erected to commemorate the dead.

Army at Home decries the ways the victory for the North’s military

and political systems was conflated to mean a victory for northern women as well. In many ways, women on the margins fought two wars. In the war against the Confederacy, working-class and rural women could legitimately claim to have played a major role in the Union victory; acknowledging them, however, would have required a more complicated narrative than many were willing to countenance. Marginal white women in the North also fought a war against the draft, emancipation, and privatization. This “war,” largely ignored until now, was one they lost but not without a significant struggle.

Russell R. Williams
Lausanne Collegiate School

A Visitation of God: Northern Civilians Interpret the Civil War. By Sean A. Scott. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010. Pp. 360. Cloth. \$80.)

Sean A. Scott’s impressively researched work, *A Visitation of God: Northern Civilians Interpret the Civil War*, examines the response of religious believers in the Old Northwest to the American Civil War. Scott is concerned with the attitudes of “plain people” and consulted a wide range of letters, journal entries, sermons, newspaper editorials, and other writings to access their opinions on the war, politics, and theology. From these sources, he has formulated a narrative that includes the voices of clergy and laity, soldiers, housewives and other family members on the home front, newspaper editors, Republicans, and Democrats. From such a disparate group, unsurprisingly, little consensus is revealed. Certainly most religious Americans assigned providential understanding to the events from the secession crisis to Lincoln’s assassination (and beyond). Despite this shared theological assumption, in Scott’s analysis, a tumultuous religious and political environment emerges. He emphasizes the lack of unity in the North during the war, both political and religious, as a harbinger of the divisions to come during Reconstruction.

Scott addresses a wide range of themes, including providence, scripture, theology, slavery, death, Christian patriotism, Lincoln’s religious faith, Christian manhood, and women’s piety on the home front. The connections between the subthemes and the overall argument are often murky. Scott’s discussion of women’s personal faith could be much improved by engagement with current historical scholarship. While Scott

seems to view domesticity and personal piety as opposing forces, scholarship in nineteenth-century women's lives by historians and literary critics, including Mary Ryan, Nicole Tonkovich, Mary Kelley, Sarah Newton, Jane Tompkins, Cindy Weinstein, and many others, reveals domesticity and piety as complementary forces in women's lives. According to the domestic ideal, women served as the moral and spiritual founts of the home. Within this role, many women negotiated religious practices within their families, an activity evidenced by Scott's own research. In discussing women's influence on soldier's behavior in the camps, Scott concedes, "abstaining from alcohol or avoiding evil companions out of consideration for wife or mother accomplished the same purpose as if it had been done for spiritual reasons" (93). While he often resorts to criticizing historians of women for emphasizing domesticity over piety, he does not name these scholars or their work and his critique reveals his lack of familiarity with scholarship on mid-nineteenth-century women's lives.

One area that could benefit from critical engagement would be Scott's assumptions about his sources. He explains that he accepts all religious statements at "face value," but one must wonder how often these religious utterances were the product of habit or the result of frustration by individuals swept up in events and circumstances beyond their control (8). For families on the home front, one might question what else they would write to a beloved soldier on the battlefield to offer comfort, hope, and support. Intended audience always influences writers, and Scott would be wise to remember these individuals were not writing for the benefit of future historians.

Scott should be commended for revealing his personal bias to the reader in the text's introduction. However, once revealed, his particular and personal religious perspective becomes problematic. Historians generally seek to avoid judging historical actors and strive to present the past as unbiased, dispassionate observers. Of course, as human beings, we regularly fail at this goal and our inherent biases, personal interests, and subconscious assumptions infiltrate our presentations of the past. In presenting his bias, Scott simultaneously drops any pretense toward an unbiased interpretation of the past and he is often critical of past actors. His main interest is the battle between northerners who connected politics and religion and those who felt the church should be removed from secular matters. Scott unapologetically agrees with the second group and often criticizes the "religious Northerners [who] placed greater emphasis on political cohesion than the unity of believers in Christ" (225).

Scott's overall argument is connected to his disdain for historical actors who used theology for political ends. He concludes that, "the effort to Christianize the Union ranks as the ultimate legacy of northern religion during the Civil War," and argues those efforts, "trivialized religion by making it the handmaiden of politics" (266). While this reviewer agrees that the connections between religion and politics in American history have had unintended and often undesirable consequences, I remain unconvinced that religion was trivialized. In fact, it appears to be a vital force in American life and politics to the present day. Further, because war and religion have long intermingled in American history as scholarship examining major conflicts demonstrates, how were the connections forged during the Civil War unique? In what ways did the actions of religious northerners trivialize religion that the actions of clergy and laity during King Philip's War, the Seven Years' War/French and Indian War, or the American Revolution (to name a few well-studied conflicts) to legitimize violence and political strife with theology did not?

Despite these criticisms, Scott's extensive primary-source research and focus on ordinary people makes this a valuable contribution to our understanding of the northern home front during the Civil War. The individual reflections on war and religion by ordinary people serve to move the practice of religious history away from the dominating clerical perspective and toward a more populist understanding of religion in American life during the mid-nineteenth century.

Rachel Snell
University of Maine

Freedom National: The Destruction of Slavery in the United States, 1861-1865. By James Oakes. (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2013. Pp. 595. Cloth. \$29.95.)

As the subtitle of this highly informative study indicates, James Oakes examines the destruction of slavery in the United States. For Oakes, the Civil War represented the culmination of prewar assaults against the institution by antislavery forces. Those who sought to eradicate slavery from the United States at various points included some of the founders, the abolitionists, Abraham Lincoln and other Republican politicians, generals and soldiers in the Union army, and the slaves themselves. It all began with some of the founders. Although several

clauses of the Constitution acknowledged the existence of slavery in the United States, the document defined slaves not as property, but as persons, and constitutional compromises with slavery interests proceeded upon the incorrect assumption that slavery would die on its own. From the very beginning, therefore, the right of property in slaves was protected only by the laws of individual states where slavery existed, and not by the Constitution.

In the late 1850s, the Republicans, too, subscribed to the natural law and constitutional notion that slaves were persons, not property. Upon this basis, although they could not touch slavery where it existed and was legally sanctioned at the state level, the Republicans attacked slavery indirectly by opposing its spread to the territories, where it was afforded neither state nor constitutional protection. Even prior to the war, and even in light of the Dred Scott case, therefore, Republicans made no secret of their desire to destroy slavery, thus southerners were correct in their perception of this. Accordingly, Lincoln's election in 1860 prompted southerners, who did believe that the Constitution protected property in slaves, to opt for disunion in order to keep slavery.

Yet secession and war merely gave Lincoln and the Republicans additional means to eliminate slavery. For them, the laws of war allowed for "military emancipation" because southerners had forfeited their right to slaves as property within their now-rebellious states, where slavery no longer fell under federal protection and so could be attacked legally and directly by the federal government there. Accordingly, the Fugitive Slave Law was not enforced when slaves ran to Union lines, and "tens of thousands of slaves [were] freed by the First Confiscation Act" (143). Also, the Emancipation Proclamation did not make the war about slavery because, for Lincoln and the Republicans, it always had been. Rather, the proclamation signaled a shift in policy whereby slaves could be "enticed" to abscond, and they also could enlist in the army. For Lincoln and the Republicans, attacking slavery directly in the southern states in time of peace was not constitutional, but attacking it there in time of war was. Southern secession and war, therefore, gave Republicans the means to pursue directly and aggressively what they had sought to do indirectly and gradually before the war began: destroy slavery in the United States. Yet because military emancipation freed only some slaves and, particularly in view of the protection of slavery by state laws and the Dred Scott case, the Thirteenth Amendment was required to guarantee permanent abolition for all slaves everywhere following southern defeat. Ultimately, Lincoln's war to save the Union necessarily entailed slavery's destruction.

Anyone interested in slavery and the Civil War must read this book. Oakes' illumination of the legal and political facets of familiar issues and events greatly enhances our understanding of what were arguably among the most significant developments in U.S. history.

John J. Zaborney
University of Maine at Presque Isle

War Upon the Land: Military Strategy and the Transformation of Southern Landscapes during the American Civil War. By Lisa M. Brady. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012. Pp. xiii, 208. Paper. \$24.95.)

Lisa Brady has written an excellent foundational monograph on the environmental history of the Civil War. Employing a wide base of evidence, including diaries, letters, memoirs, and newspaper accounts, she adeptly shows that “nature is an active force in human affairs”: in this case, the military’s strategic decision-making process during a war (3). Aside from the military importance, Brady also engages her sources to tease out mid-nineteenth century ideas regarding nature, which includes notions about the improvement of wilderness and the ability for humans to exert complete control over the natural world. Lastly, she shows that nature was not a passive victim, but, instead, a dynamic agent that resisted and undermined the Union army’s attempts at domination.

In her introduction to *War Upon the Land*, Brady seeks to reconcile the differences between environmental history and military history. By defining terms such as wilderness, agroecosystem, and hybrid landscapes, she bridges the conceptual divide between these two disciplines. Brady also provides a thorough survey of the secondary literature, which can be utilized by scholars unacquainted with new trends in the environmental history of the Civil War.

Using the lens of environmental history, Brady focuses on several case studies that are all well represented in the secondary literature of the Civil War: the Union campaigns in the lower Mississippi valley in 1862-1863 (Chapter 1), Grant’s Vicksburg campaign in 1863 (Chapter 2), Sheridan’s Shenandoah Valley campaign in 1864 (Chapter 3), and Sherman’s March to the Sea and march through the Carolinas in 1864 and 1865 (Chapter 4). Despite the breadth and depth of knowledge regarding these campaigns in the current literature, Brady’s distinctive ap-

proach provides a new and refreshing analysis that adds greatly to the understanding of these events.

The Union army's strategy sometimes dictated that their troops fight the war not against Confederate soldiers but against the southern landscape. During the campaigns discussed in chapters one and two, Union soldiers had to contend with disease-carrying mosquitoes, unpredictable water levels, sickness, and poisonous snakes as they attempted to construct a system of canals to redirect the flow of the Mississippi River away from Vicksburg. Chapter three highlights General Philip Sheridan's war on southern agriculture in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. By attacking this Confederate agroecosystem, Sheridan seized control of the valley from southern farmers and "transformed it from a civilized, improved landscape into a virtual wilderness" (80). The final chapter follows General William T. Sherman's march through the South as he utilized the destruction of the landscape as a "deliberate weapon of war," burning and consuming the infrastructure and undermining the agricultural base of the Confederacy (93).

Brady concludes by arguing that the physical damage and impact of the Civil War on the landscape of America may have influenced the "postwar nature preservation activity" of conservationists such as John Muir and Frederick Law Olmstead (138). Furthermore, she asserts that the Civil War created a strong federal government with the power to set aside natural landscapes, protecting them from commercial and industrial development. This, she says, was the "Civil War's greatest environmental legacy" (140).

Although Brady does acknowledge her lack of sources from the South, she overlooks the affect this limited focus has on the overall potency of her argument. Without analyzing Confederate documents, it becomes difficult to know whether or not thoughts about the human ability to control the landscape permeated all of American society during the mid-nineteenth century or just in the North. Furthermore, the lack of southern sources obscures the degree to which the environmental strategies of the Union affected the resolve of the Confederacy.

Despite this shortcoming, *War Upon the Land* is a fine amalgamation of environmental history and military history. It adeptly demonstrates that the historical study of warfare has much to gain from a focus on nature, and, conversely, that the historical study of the environment has much to gain from examining military sources, strategy, and conflicts.

Daniel S. Soucier
University of Maine

Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation. By Caroline E. Janney. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013. Pp. 451. Cloth. \$35).

Historians have long argued that the late nineteenth century was a period during which whites from the North and South gradually set aside past differences and reunited as Americans. Years of civil war and reconstruction were forgiven, if not forgotten. This was a difficult process, but by the 1890s, so the narrative goes, former enemies from the North and South had joined hands. This process of sectional healing culminated in the Spanish-American War in 1898, the nation's first war since the Civil War, and this foreign war was the final nail in the coffin of sectional bitterness. Not only did white northerners and white southerners fight together in the war, but they joined together in supporting white supremacy at home and abroad (in America's new overseas colonies). This view has been expounded by many historians, beginning with the Pulitzer-Prize winning work of Paul Buck, *The Road to Reunion, 1865-1900* (1937), and including more-recent books by Nina Silber, David W. Blight, and Edward J. Blum.

Only recently have some historians begun to challenge this narrative of sectional harmony in the postwar decades. Although not the first historian to do so, Caroline E. Janney has produced a masterful work on the shaping of Civil War memory in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Janney distinguishes between two terms that are often used interchangeably: *reunion* and *reconciliation*. Reunion was a legal and political fact as of 1865; the nation had been reunited by the victories of the Union armies. By contrast, Janney argues, reconciliation was an ideal that was never fully reached. Although politicians, newspapermen, and the purveyors of popular culture liked to speak of sectional harmony in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era, Janney argues that "reconciliation was never the predominant memory of the war among its participants" (6). For both Union and Confederate veterans, the war had been too bloody and too life-altering to simply "forgive and forget."

Although some veterans could offer forgiveness to their former enemies, for most, bitterness remained, especially when their version of the war was challenged. For Union army veterans, the war had two major consequences: the reunion of the country and the emancipation of four million slaves in the southern states. They had fought for country and freedom; Confederate soldiers had fought for treason and slavery. By contrast, for most Confederate veterans, neither slavery nor secession

was unconstitutional. Therefore, they fought to defend hearth, home, and their new nation from the invading Yankee hordes. They were neither treasonous nor wrong. Each side viewed the other as un-American. Each side was committed to reconciliation, as long as it was on its terms. Such divergent memories of the war made reconciliation in the postwar decades difficult. Although there were many Blue-Gray reunions over the years, these were the exception, Janney notes. In most cases, Union and Confederate veterans preferred to be around their own kind; each side celebrated their own holidays into the early twentieth century.

Janney is at her best when discussing the role women played in Civil War memorialization efforts, which often fostered sectional hatred. Women could be more open about their dislike for the former enemy because, unlike men, they did not have to worry about negative repercussions in business or politics. Southern women, in particular, remained vehemently opposed to sectional reconciliation well into the twentieth century. Through organizations like the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC), white southern women promoted a Confederate version of the past, one with chivalrous Old South planters, gallant Confederate officers, and happy slaves. As Janney points out, the UDC was founded in 1894, in the middle of what is often viewed as the culminating decade of sectional reunion. Southern women were even able to use their role as memorializers to gain some power within patriarchal southern society; in 1906, a UDC chapter in Lexington, Kentucky, for example, was able to successfully petition the state legislature to ban theatrical performances of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (because it offered a "false" portrait of slavery) in the state (255-256).

Janney takes her story up to the eve of World War II, something few historians who have examined these issues have done. In taking such a broad view of post-Civil War sectionalism, though, Janney largely ignored one pivotal event: the Spanish-American War. Many previous historians (incorrectly I would argue) have considered that war to be the death knell of post-Civil War sectional bitterness. Yet, Janney devotes only ten pages to the war in 1898. Considering the importance that has been assigned to that conflict in healing sectional wounds, Janney might have expanded her coverage of the war. That minor quibble aside, this is an excellent book that should be read by anyone interested in the ways Americans remembered their most destructive war. Janney's book will be the standard work on this topic for many years to come.

David C. Turpie
Kentucky Historical Society