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The discussion of his actions on the New York-Canada frontier during the War of 1812 shows this clearly. Personally brave to the point of recklessness, the young officer sought dangerous assignments and complained bitterly when senior officers bungled their tasks. He soon learned that conserving manpower was better than winning bloody victories and carried that lesson with him throughout his career. The author demonstrates how Scott learned military tactics and strategy gradually and how his increasing knowledge made him a competent planner.

In places, such as the discussion of the War of 1812, the narrative seems too detailed, while in others, such as treatments of the Second Seminole War or the Cherokee Removal, it lacks enough detail. Overall, however, Scott's personality, his skills, and his difficulties controlling his temper all come through. Repeatedly, the author mentions Scott's petty and detailed arguments with almost every other high-ranking army officer he met. Vain, petty, but knowledgeable and skillful, too, the general had presidential ambitions for a time. When the Civil War erupted in early 1861, he offered plans to avoid war and to defeat the South if full-scale fighting broke out. Old and sickly, he retired that same year.

This is a readable book based on thorough research. It shows how Scott worked to develop the army as an effective tool for national policies and defense. His career spanned the settlement era of Mississippi valley states. During that time issues that pioneers faced, such as Indian affairs, national expansion, and preservation of the Union, all received his attention.


Historians have long speculated about the connection between the American Civil War and industrialization—from Charles Beard’s thesis that the North’s triumph was that of an emerging bourgeoisie, through Thomas Cochran’s macroeconomic arguments about whether the war retarded economic growth, to military histories focused on the North’s industrial capacity. All of these were essentially studies of capital. By contrast, Russell Johnson sets out to examine the effects of mili-
tary service on workers and work habits, using soldiers and civilians from Dubuque, Iowa, as a test case.

As Johnson points out, his overall argument is essentially an inversion of that made by John Keegan for World War I: Rather than urban-industrial society "pre-conditioning" men for military service, the Union army absorbed large numbers of farmers and artisans and "gave them their first taste of an urban-industrial-like lifestyle" (318). The army provided dangerous work under close supervision, with an orientation toward time management rather than task completion. Much of the work was regimented and deskill ed, even jobs (such as those in the artillery) that once had called for significant technical expertise. Moreover, work was carried out in an environment with marked similarities to the industrial city: crowding, disease, vice, ethnic diversity, class differences between officers and men, and very little mobility up the ranks. After the war, veterans were characterized by persistence, both geographical and social—they were more likely than non-veterans to remain in Dubuque, and less likely to change class position. In short, the army took a population of men with largely pre-industrial work habits and turned them into compliant industrial foot soldiers.

Johnson's methods are those of the traditional social historian, involving quantitative analysis of sources such as census schedules, pension and military service records, and the files of the Iowa Adjutant General's Office. He also makes extensive use of local Dubuque history sources, such as letters, diaries, and newspapers, which allows him to examine not only worker-warriors, but also the town they left behind (or never left, or periodically returned to, or argued about around the campfire—enlistment is a complicated thing). Local politics, including Democratic editor Dennis Mahony's antiwar polemics, come in for suitable scrutiny, as do the use of bounties (successfully employed in Dubuque to avoid a draft throughout the war) and the provision of local relief to war widows and orphans. Whatever the book's other virtues, it is safe to say that we will never have a more complete or careful history of the war in Dubuque.

The quantitative findings on Dubuque enlistees will surprise no one familiar with the makeup of Union armies, or for that matter people familiar with the composition of American armies of later wars. After the initial rush to the colors, working-class men were more likely to enlist and re-enlist, and to serve longer terms in the army, than were youths from higher social classes. Immigrants (especially the Irish) were underrepresented among Dubuque volunteers, while the native-born were overrepresented. Men whose families had migrated from
the East were likely to enlist, while those from the South were not. Republicans and War Democrats tended to own more property and hold higher social status than antiwar Democrats.

Such truisms are the bases of the "rich man's war, poor man's fight" idea, though Johnson is wise enough to avoid such simplifications. For example, he distinguishes between the records of "independent soldiers" (those living apart from their parents, sometimes heads of households) and "soldier-sons" (those living with parents) to make the point that "military service in the Civil War was absorbed as one more option in family strategies in Dubuque," strategies premised first and foremost on the reality that the army "represented a permanent job and a steady paycheck" (58). Johnson might have pursued the family strategy idea further than he does, but his book grounds Civil War service in the basic facts of working-class life. Historians who have attributed Civil War service to more ethereal motives are on notice.

The main difficulty with Johnson's argument is his stretch from exhaustive research to broad historical meaning. For example, in comparing "the veteran's description of battle with comments from two women who worked in the Lowell, Massachusetts, cotton factories in the 1830s and 1840s" (178), Johnson tries to establish that both were smoky workplaces, something most readers would probably take on faith. Similarly, his close study of property records leads him to the conclusion that Dubuque's civic elite "had much in common" with army officers because it built residences on the city's bluffs in order to make "a greater display of its wealth" during the war years. A burgher might build a house on the bluff without having much in common with army officers, and vice versa, as recent social and military experience amply demonstrates. Working-class people have complicated points of view, which census statistics do nothing to elucidate. One must be cautious about using the paucity of working-class voices to impose a retrospective scheme upon them. The absence of workers' voices is also the weakness of Johnson's main argument regarding work habits: much is inferred from the structure of the workplace, little from the people who worked there.

The strength of *Warriors Into Workers* is its close-to-the-ground focus. From the standpoint of Dubuque's recruits, the Civil War does not appear as a crusade against slavery, a defense of fading republican virtue, an expression of manhood, or a war to establish a newly powerful national state—all interpretations advanced by recent historians. Instead, service in the Union army was just a job, the first of many such jobs in the lives of working-class Iowa veterans. That is an important
thing to remember. From the ground up, all wars look like work, always dangerous and always smoky. The rest is added afterwards.

Russell L. Johnson won the 2004 Benjamin F. Shambaugh Award for *Warriors Into Workers: The Civil War and the Formation of Urban-Industrial Society in a Northern City*. With this award, the State Historical Society of Iowa recognizes the most significant book on Iowa history published each year.—Ed.
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Like many others in the field of Civil War history, and particularly the history of women in that war, I have known for a long time that Jane Schultz is the premier scholar of Civil War-era women hospital workers. An unusually generous scholar, Schultz has always been one to share her findings and her insights with others doing research on topics related to her own. She has also published many articles in professional journals and has given many professional talks in which she has more formally presented different aspects of her vast knowledge of the field. Now it is a great pleasure to have her excellent book, *Women at the Front*, in hand.

*Women at the Front* is a thorough and gracefully written study of the work that women of all sorts performed in Civil War hospitals both in the North and in the South, the ways their wartime experiences affected their postwar lives, and how they (and others) memorialized their wartime service. Schultz begins with a discussion of the “vast complexity of the medical world that women and men inhabited” during the war (12), and then traces the many paths by which women found their way there. Among other things, in contrast with notions that Civil War era women necessarily took their cues from men, Schultz reminds readers that “women began volunteering for hospital work before the medical departments of either section had adequately assessed the magnitude of their task” (15). Right from the start Schultz