Vicksburg: the Campaign That Opened the Mississippi
Neely succeeds in provoking second thoughts about the "party system" argument. However, he fails to persuade that the time has come to dismiss it.
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Despite the size, duration, and significance of the several Union efforts to seize Vicksburg during the Civil War, no one has until now written a one-volume history of these campaigns that combines broad coverage with some degree of depth and modern analysis. The largest study yet published remains Edwin C. Bearss's three-volume *The Vicksburg Campaign* (1985–86). On the other end of the spectrum of size, recent shorter studies of Vicksburg include William L. Shea and Terrence J. Winschel's *Vicksburg Is the Key: The Struggle for the Mississippi River*, (2003), and Winschel's *Triumph and Defeat: The Vicksburg Campaign* (1999). All of these studies offer unique contributions to our understanding of the campaigns.

Michael B. Ballard’s new book fills a comfortable and necessary role between the detail of Bearss’s three-volume study and the conciseness of the Shea-Winschel volumes. Ballard, university archivist and coordinator of the congressional and political research center at Mississippi State University, has authored the standard biography of the major Confederate commander at Vicksburg, John C. Pemberton, and thus is well qualified to take on a project such as this. He covers Vicksburg in all its aspects, from May 18, 1862, through July 27, 1863. Thus he includes Farragut’s attempt to take the city in the summer of 1862, Grant’s northern Mississippi campaign in November–December 1862, Sherman’s Chickasaw Bayou campaign, McClemand’s capture of Arkansas Post, Grant’s several efforts to find a way to outflank Vicksburg in the winter of 1863, his brilliant campaign to the rear of the city in May 1863, the first Jackson campaign, the siege of Vicksburg, and the second Jackson campaign.

Ballard gives us our first good one-volume history of this string of events. His primary focus is strategy and grand tactics (it would be impossible to include minor tactics as well). He brings in civilian aspects, soldiers’ attitudes toward emancipation, and the postwar history of the battlefield. He offers readers a particularly good summary
of Grant’s moves in the winter of 1863 and of the siege operations from May 23 to July 4. Illustrative and rarely published photographs of the siege works are another plus.

The book’s weaknesses—it is difficult to summarize well-known, complex operations and always make the telling sound fresh, and the maps tend to be of minimal usefulness—are far outweighed by its strengths. This will be the standard history of the Vicksburg campaign for classroom students, enthusiasts, and scholars who do not want an exhaustively detailed discussion of the events.

Of course, Iowa contributed enormously to the capture of Vicksburg. Its regiments were represented in many brigades in Grant’s army. And, as a Mississippi valley state, its residents had a good deal of interest in opening the river to northern navigation and commerce.

Now we have a good general history of Vicksburg, but we still need detailed, tactical-level studies of the individual battles of the campaign.
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Music was central to the Civil War. Before the war, planters cited songs from the quarters as evidence that their slaves were contented. Abolitionists sang of “bereaved slave mothers” torn from helpless children. During the conflict, Union soldiers marched off singing “John Brown’s Body” while Confederate troops drilled to “The Bonnie Blue Flag.” In later decades, soldiers held emotional reunions, openly weeping at the playing of regimental bands. With its wealth of sources, music holds much promise for illuminating and complicating assumptions about the era’s values, conflicts, and lived experiences. Accordingly, the goal of this collection is to provide an “interdisciplinary model” for understanding this music. The results, roughly split between musicological and historical approaches to the material, are mixed at best.

The essays reflecting a standard musicological approach are limited by tendencies toward categorization and strict functionalism. Bruce Kelley’s overview places the period’s music into ten broad categories. Although this approach gives a sense of the subject’s scope, some of these categories are ideological and problematic. Certainly “African American music” should include more than “slave songs.”