snapshot of the business end of his studio, in general readers do not get a clear sense of the economics of these artist-businesspeople. Statements about photographers owning a business block or the first car in town clash with the supposition that many probably practiced a second trade to make a decent living. The ups and downs of the local and national economies during the Gilded Age, combined with a profession in which one was producing not necessities but luxuries, may be able to encompass the apparent contradictions.

The people who put this book together have a wonderful sense of the importance of photography for history. As the first line of the introduction says, “The historical imagination needs to be nurtured, and photography remains a powerful force for doing so.” Bennett and Juhl go a step further by asserting that “we can vicariously share the dreams of these midwesterners by absorbing the surviving imagery.” To the considerable extent that those dreams are reflected in these deliberate recordings of the modifications in American life that occurred in the second half of the nineteenth century, they may be right. This book gives historians and others a black-and-white opportunity to view the nineteenth-century Midwest.


REVIEWED BY PATRICK J. JUNG, MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY, MILWAUKEE

Jerry Cooper makes an important contribution to our understanding of the National Guard’s role as the principal reserve combat component of the U.S. Army. The Guard’s status as a reserve combat force was not clearly defined until after the Spanish-American War, and the assumption of this responsibility led to increased federal regulation by the War Department. Previous studies of the National Guard have focused on the issue of states’ rights to explain this phenomenon, but Cooper argues persuasively that “Money, or the lack of it, and not states’ rights, determined the National Guard’s military value as a reserve force and its willingness to accept federal regulation” (xv).

State militias of the early nineteenth century functioned primarily as systems designed to mobilize men during war. The only real military forces that most states possessed were uniformed companies of volunteers that were generally self-governing. Uniformed companies came into being through the efforts of private citizens and were more
social than martial. The members elected their own officers, conducted their own training, and raised their own funds. State governors chartered the companies, thus giving them official recognition, but the states rarely provided them with any money and made almost no attempts to regulate them. That changed with the Civil War, when northern states developed new laws to assert more control over their militias. The postbellum era saw the rise of the National Guard, as it came to be called, which enjoyed increased funding from, as well as regulation by, the states. Great disparities existed in the level of funding and regulation from one region and even one state to the next, but the Guard generally retained the self-government and social atmosphere that had characterized the antebellum uniformed companies. The desire for additional support led to the creation in 1879 of the National Guard Association (NGA), a lobbying organization that sought increased state and federal funding for the Guard. The NGA lobbied to have the federal government recognize by statute the Guard’s role as the army’s reserve force, but state soldiers bristled at the idea of their organizations being regulated by the War Department. The National Guard’s status in this regard remained undefined until Congress passed a new militia law in 1903, which recognized the Guard’s role as the army’s reserve force and provided increased federal funds so that it could perform that function. While guardsmen welcomed the new influx of federal dollars, they thoroughly disliked the increased oversight by the War Department. The National Defense Act of 1916 and an amendment to the act in 1920 reaffirmed the Guard’s reserve role and provided more adequate funding than the 1903 legislation, but in the process, the Guard lost the autonomy that it had enjoyed in the late nineteenth century.

Cooper makes the issue of federal funding central to his book, but he also provides a wealth of information that regional and state historians will find useful. Indeed, any examination of the postbellum National Guard, according to Cooper, “must be tempered by examining the state soldiery from a regional perspective and sometimes state by state within regions” (25). He does so expertly with tables that show funding and strength by state and region during various years. The South and the West usually lagged in both categories, while the Midwest and particularly the Northeast excelled. Cooper also provides regional and state-level examinations of the Guard’s role in quelling civil disturbances, race riots, and labor disputes as well as its social and ethnic composition. Scholars interested in the labor and social history of the Midwest and Iowa will want to cull through his footnotes and bibliography, both of which aptly illustrate Cooper’s
meticulous research into federal sources at the National Archives, private manuscript collections, and secondary sources. That he manages to document this formative period of the National Guard’s history in a mere 184 pages of text makes this book all the more remarkable. Future scholars will need to consult this work in order to fully understand the historical context of the National Guard’s role in the United States military.


REVIEWED BY ELAINE FRANTZ PARSONS, THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

Saloon historians face a daunting task. To begin with, saloon-goers did not tend to record their experiences. Those rare contemporary accounts of saloon life that do exist are scattered through sources such as unindexed newspapers, personal memoirs, and legal records. As a result, saloon historians have found it difficult to include saloon-goers’ voices in their accounts. Madelon Powers’s compelling book uses non-traditional means to tackle this problem, looking at the saloon through saloon-goers’ eyes.

Powers begins by asking who saloon-goers were. She explores their backgrounds and status, and discusses how individuals were accepted into the inner circles of specific saloons, becoming “regulars.” This group of “regulars,” she shows, behaved not merely as a collection of individual customers, but as something resembling an organization or society. For instance, some regulars would form groups to buy their alcohol collectively, either by “treating”—the custom so infamous to temperance reformers—or by collecting money to buy larger, often cheaper, volumes of liquor. These saloon-goers also shared rich lore and customs, including stories, songs, and norms for behavior and group membership.

The saloon, in Powers’s account, was a unique blend of capitalism and camaraderie. Though a saloon was a business, with a proprietor and customers, saloon-goers also formed close personal bonds with one another. This is significant, as Powers argues, because many political and social organizations arose out of saloons. She suggests that saloon customs and traditions helped shape those organizations.

Powers’s book invites two criticisms. The first involves her use of sources and the originality of her arguments. Those who know the scholarship on saloon history will find much that is familiar in _Faces_