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(originally published in this journal) suggests that Iowa soldiers, recognizing that they could not micromanage from a distance, instead relied on their wives to handle the affairs of the family farm by themselves. Finally, Brett Barker examines the reaction of Republicans in three southeastern Ohio counties to local newspapers that gave voice to the antiwar position held by many in the Democratic Party. Challenging popularly held assumptions about the subject, Barker asserts that the efforts of rank-and-file Republicans in Ohio to suppress dissent by subtly or overtly attacking disloyal newspapers suggest that civil liberties were more severely curtailed during the Civil War than previously believed.

Obviously, Iowans will find Anderson’s essay of greatest interest, as it deals directly with the experiences of Iowa women hoping to keep their family farms functioning. The essays by Hurt and Aley will also strike a responsive chord among Iowans, as they devote a significant portion of their analyses to affairs within the Hawkeye state. With a little imagination, readers can benefit from the other chapters as well. For example, are Mujic’s conclusions about the students at the University of Michigan applicable to those who attended Iowa colleges during the war? And was the fate of the Keokuk Constitution (whose press ended up at the bottom of the Mississippi River) a logical extension of trends Barker detected among Ohio’s civilian populace? Union Heartland in its entirety should therefore be an interesting read for Iowans.

By way of full disclosure, I should mention that I was favorably disposed towards Union Heartland when I discovered that three of the authors had made excellent use of my book Love Amid the Turmoil. But I can honestly say that under any circumstances I would highly recommend this thought-provoking look at a region that too often has been neglected in studies of the Civil War on the Northern home front.


Reviewer Sarah J. Purcell is professor of history at Grinnell College. She is the author of Sealed with Blood: War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America and is working on a book tentatively titled “Spectacle of Grief: The Politics of Mourning and the U.S. Civil War.”

Caroline Janney’s Remembering the Civil War is an ambitious book that makes a bold argument, taking on the dominant themes in the grow-
ing historical field of Civil War memory. Janney counters the judgment, argued most prominently by David Blight in *Race and Reunion* (2000), that by the early twentieth century Southern memory of the Civil War had triumphed as the Lost Cause became dominant in American culture and white Northerners acquiesced to a Civil War memory that emphasized a shared military sacrifice tinged with white supremacy and that largely silenced the memory of slavery and its role in the war. Janney, instead, emphasizes a distinction between reunion and reconciliation, and she argues that memories of the “Union Cause” not only survived but became the dominant theme in American patriotism. She also maintains that Northerners did not forget slavery or its role in the Civil War, even as they endorsed white supremacy.

In nine chapters, organized chronologically and thematically, Janney traces how the Civil War generation battled to shape its remembrance from 1861 until after the turn of the twentieth century, when their children and grandchildren took up the battle. The book begins with three chapters tracing the seeds of memory in the war period, fights over the peace in 1865, and the influence of mourning in the war’s immediate aftermath. The next three chapters oscillate between North and South, tracing how veterans’ and women’s organizations, monument-building efforts, and African American civic organizers and intellectuals marked public culture with their own versions of Civil War memory. The final three chapters show how slavery persisted in Civil War memory, even as efforts at reconciliation accelerated after the 1880s; the author pays particular attention to the role of women in shaping the memory of the war, even after the turn of the twentieth century.

Janney uses a wide range of examples, most potently focusing on controversial monument ceremonies, veterans’ reunions, and popular culture. She engages the vast quantity of recent scholarship on specific themes in Civil War memory, touching on topics as diverse as the United Daughters of the Confederacy, the veneration of William Carney, and the cultural power of prisoner-of-war memory. The notes and bibliography can serve any interested reader as a sweeping overview of the past 30 years of scholarship in this important field; the notes bear special attention because Janney often punctuates her argument with extended commentary in them.

Janney is most convincing in her portrayal of how Northerners persistently discussed the importance of slavery to the “Union Cause” even as they often failed to endorse equal treatment for African Americans. She cites many examples of Grand Army of the Republic (GAR) orators and writers who marked the destruction of slavery as
one of the war’s greatest achievements, even as some GAR posts (especially in Iowa, she notes) refused to integrate black members. Janney also vividly portrays the rise of the Lost Cause ideology in the South, in a manner similar to Blight, but she makes a new and important point about how Lost Cause proponents at the turn of the twentieth century shifted their dominant emphasis from military defeat to the “abuses” of Reconstruction. She also brilliantly addresses how and why the Lost Cause became feminized.

Overall, Janney’s point about Northerners resisting amnesia about slavery is potent, but she does not end up demolishing Blight’s thesis. For instance, Janney points out how many Southern veterans were “buying into” the “Union Cause” by mourning the death of Ulysses S. Grant in 1885, but she fails to note how many Northerners likewise had endorsed Robert E. Lee as a great man immediately upon his death in 1870—helping to boost the Lost Cause (173). If the “Union Cause” became so dominant a theme in a generic American patriotism by 1898, such a bland umbrella that everyone from temperance activists to imperialists could insist upon it generically, did this still constitute Civil War memory, or had it changed into something else entirely?

Janney’s most important lessons are that historians must be careful when discussing the loaded terms of Civil War memory: reunion and reconciliation are not the same, and neither are race and slavery. Her book will become important in the field, and it will need to be read alongside Blight’s to emphasize the subtle power of Civil War remembrance.
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Norwegian immigrants to America wrote thousands of letters to their friends and relatives back in “the old country,” just as those in Norway wrote countless missives in reply. Many collections of letters are found on both sides of the Atlantic, but rarely do both sides of a set of correspondence survive. The Stavig letters from Norway and America is one of those rare instances. The edited volume of this correspondence includes letters written by two half-brothers, Lars and Knut...