syndicalist propositions were simply wrong, especially in underestimating the role of politics, state, and culture. In other respects though, most of the contributors conclude, the legacy lives on in the idea of workers’ control, industrial unionism, and the tactics of direct action.

This volume provides an excellent introduction to a complex but important phenomenon. There is room for further collaborative work but it is to be hoped that future national studies of syndicalism and its influence will start from here.

Erik Olssen


Feeling akin, perhaps, to Edmund Ruffin firing the ceremonial first shot at Fort Sumter, Maris Vinovskis has unloaded a well-aimed charge at historians who have ignored the social history of the American Civil War. Despite more than fifty thousand books and articles about this internecine war, we retain a very limited assessment of the war’s repercussions for civilian life in both the Union and the Confederacy, during and after the war. This remains a major and persistent blind spot in United States historiography. The four-year conflict (between 1861 and 1865) was the most deadly war for Americans, and, like all wars, its cost in human suffering lingered long after smoke had cleared from the battlefields. Although Vinovskis leads this assault, he has enlisted the services of six young and able comrades whose original and diverse contributions about the North will stimulate further scholarship.

Vinovskis fires the opening salvo by asking, “Have Social Historians Lost the Civil War?” He then modestly proposes “Some Preliminary Demographic Speculations” in an essay published previously in the influential Journal of American History. Vinovskis first emphasizes the tragedy of the war by assessing its human costs. Together, Northern and Southern forces lost 618,000 men, but these casualties were disproportionate: about 6% of Northern white males aged 13 to 43 died, while about 18% of their Southern counterparts perished. These heavy losses, Vinovskis reminds us, were “unparalleled” in American history. Casualty rates by themselves tell us little about social history or human suffering, and Vinovskis then centers his aim on one community, Newburyport, Massachusetts, to offer additional insights. Historical analysis through community study is a theme and methodology that permeates this volume.

Although one can debate whether Newburyport – a small maritime center with an ethnically diverse population – was indeed “typical” of other Northern communities, its townspeople experienced the full brunt of war. There as elsewhere, initial war enthusiasm gave way to demoralization, a process reflected in enlistment patterns, increased bounty payments to entice soldiers, and the gradual shift toward federally-imposed conscription. The war cut an especially broad swath through Newburyport, as over forty percent of the town’s enlistees were killed, wounded,
deserted, or discharged as disabled through their military service. Local ties remained distinctive during this national conflagration, a bond reinforced by military recruitment in which “most men served with friends and neighbors who were familiar with their social background and earlier experiences”. Although some contemporaries complained that this was a “rich man’s war and a poor man’s fight”, Vinovskis disagrees based upon his analysis of military recruitment and enlistment patterns. Yet he notes that foreign-born servicemen suffered from a “particularly high casualty rate, even though they had been less willing to enlist initially”. This last point deserves closer scrutiny since it suggests the salience of wartime ethnic and class tensions, social strains played down in the remaining essays, as well.

Vinovskis explores the cost of war from another angle: the disbursement of Civil War military pensions. Complaining correctly that “almost nothing has been written about the postwar experiences of Civil War veterans”, Vinovskis urges historians to examine pension payments because these “had a profound and longlasting impact on the lives of veterans”. Constituting more than forty percent of the federal government budget in 1893, Civil War pension expenditures represented an unprecedented peacetime intrusion by the federal state into lives of individuals and, by extension, their communities. Because he is more interested in sketching demographic trends and posing provocative questions, Vinovskis does not provide a detailed social history of Newburyport, but his essay does offer a valuable framework for subsequent studies of the American Civil War.

Following his mentor’s lead, Thomas Kemp offers instructive, detailed, and comparative social history in “Community and War: The Civil War Experience of Two New Hampshire Towns”. Kemp skillfully analyzes a wide range of events and experiences during the war by utilizing both quantitative methods and a useful chronological narrative. For the citizens of both Claremont and Newport, New Hampshire, the “expectations of the Civil War created a sense of community identification with the war and a perception that the war was ‘their’ war”. Upon the war’s end, Kemp contends, the towns’ respective citizens “readopted the vision of war that they had in April 1861 – of war as ‘noble’ and ‘glorious’”, which they affirmed through parades, rituals, and fraternal associations embodied by the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR).

The centrality of community is reiterated by Reid Mitchell’s contribution, “The Northern Soldier and His Community”. Mitchell emphasizes that “community values” were “crucial to the way in which Americans made war from 1861 to 1865”. Volunteers fought primarily for their families – the love of home became the “cement of armies”. Mitchell reinforces how homefront and battlefield were linked by the continued exchange of gossip, information, and sentiment between civilians and soldiers. These local ties and the prevailing notions of voluntarism, moreover, undercut the rigidity of military service and created stronger bonds among soldiers as comrades. While Mitchell contends that domestic notions of home, family, and community remained vital to the men in battle, he does suggest that soldierly affinity led to some hostility toward civilians who remained at home.

In making the transition from war to peace, veterans “domesticated” their military service through membership in the Grand Army of the Republic, according to Stuart McConnell. In his satisfying assessment, “Who Joined the Grand Army? Three Case Studies in the Construction of Union Veteranhood, 1866–1900”, the
author highlights the GAR’s sponsorship of memoirs, monuments, parades, and pension payments. Organized along quasi-military lines for honorably-discharged Union veterans, the GAR was the largest postwar fraternal organization and certainly the “single most powerful lobby of its age”, illustrated by ever more generous federal pension legislation. To its members, McConnell explains, the GAR was a Victorian fraternal order marked by ceremonial ranks and secret rituals organized around the rallying cries of “fraternity”, “charity”, and “loyalty”. Whether veterans joined one GAR post among several in a city such as Philadelphia or enlisted in the sole GAR post in a small Wisconsin town, they shared a “cosmology of veteranhood” that reflected a “white bourgeois paradise” in which order, discipline, and camaraderie muted class, racial, and ethnic conflict. These are fascinating insights about the ways in which postbellum society was shaped by Union veterans.

Social history of the Civil War need not be confined to small towns, and two essays examine larger cities. J. Matthew Gallman’s piece centers on “Voluntarism in Wartime: Philadelphia’s Great Central Fair”. Like most northern communities, this city’s residents sponsored numerous fund-raising events during the war, many of which were organized by women. Philadelphia’s Great Central Fair in June 1864 raised over one million dollars for the United States Sanitary Commission, a national group devoted to improving the health and hospital conditions of Union soldiers. Despite this unprecedented organized benevolence and trends toward increased centralization, Gallmann argues that the events of war failed to undermine “persistent localism and gender divisions”. Moving to the Midwest, Robin L. Einhorn concludes, in “The Civil War and Municipal Government in Chicago”, that the war initiated machine politics in that city. Wartime events transformed city government from an apolitical “segmented system” of elite rule to a more competitive, partisan, and public governmental system, defined here as machine politics. Two major issues – military bounty payments and municipal funding of pollution controls – illustrated the wartime debates of city authorities. It is not clear how these legislative skirmishes actually affected the lives of Chicago’s residents, however, and changes in the political system could be attributed to rapid urbanization and industrialization rather than to the war itself.

National political debates were central to the development of the military pension system, the largest expenditure of the federal government in the fifty years after the Civil War. Although few historians have investigated how these pension funds affected the individual, family, and household economies, Amy E. Holmes offers some suggestions. In comparing the widows in Kent County, Michigan, and Essex County, Massachusetts, Holmes concludes that the military pension system became “in effect an old-age pension” that augmented uncertain or nonexistent ages. In her article, “‘Such is the Price We Pay’: American Widows and the Civil War Pension System”, Holmes provides a succinct overview of the evolution of the pension system and estimates that over 108,000 women became Union widows, of whom about 52,000 were listed on pension rolls in 1883. The author makes clear that “widowhood in the nineteenth century was a very different experience from widowhood today”, due mainly to larger families and fewer sources of support. Although war widows were often ignored in public celebrations of the Civil War, Holmes...
contends, their suffering and sacrifices were remembered and shared through pension payments.

Holmes can be faulted for failing to give a "voice" to her grieving widows, thereby raising a complaint about several of these essays as exemplars of "social history". As a concept refined by able practitioners since the late-1960s, social history seeks to explore the history of "inarticulate" people and to view history "from the bottom up". Several contributions fall short of this goal and reflect rather traditional historical approaches. Although no essay examines an African-American community during the Civil War, and women are viewed either as widows or as benevolent volunteers, these seven selections do suggest how this war encompassed a variety of experiences refracted through the prisms of class, race, ethnicity, gender, and region. These scholars' efforts to link battlefield and homefront, soldiers and civilians, men and women, wartime and peacetime, will certainly fortify the efforts of other historians to depict war in all of its social complexity. Vinovskis and his allies have signalled the start of a new assault on the bulwark of Civil War historiography. Commence firing!

Earl F. Mulderink, III

MARTIN, BENJAMIN. The Agony of Modernization. Labor and Industrialization in Spain. [Cornell International Industrial and Labor Relations Series, no. 16.] ILR Press, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca 1990. xvii, 570 pp. $ 42.00.

As a bibliographical essay at the end of this fine survey gratefully points out, the last two decades have witnessed the appearance of a large number of first-rate articles and monographs on various aspects of the history of the Spanish labour movement. South of the Pyrenees, the final years of the Franco dictatorship were marked by a resurgence of political, cultural and labour protest. Despite all manner of official obstruction, historical research on Spain's ill-fated working class, Martin informs us, at long last began in earnest. In due course, detailed scholarly works appeared on anarchism, anarcho-syndicalism, catholic unions, socialism and a host of other topics. Some of the most valuable contributions have been regional studies, not least on the industrial zones of Catalonia, the Basque Country and Asturias, as well as the troubled agricultural region of Andalusia. This is not to mention the outpourings of foreign researchers, including the excellent monographs of Edward Malefakis, Adrian Shubert, Gerald Meaker and Sebastian Balfour. From his exile in Pau, France, the indefatigable Manuel Tuñón de Lara did more than anyone to promote the study of Spanish labour history. His three volume synthesis, El movimiento obrero en la historia de España (Barcelona, 1972), still ranks as a seminal volume. Martin, perhaps is a tiny bit scathing in his assessment of Tuñón's achievement.

The Agony of Modernization, for its part, is clearly no product of the bourgeois academy. Its author, a long-standing labour activist, breathes new life into many a tired old theme. He writes with passion, understanding, clarity and painstaking objectivity. The general reader, particularly in the English-speaking world, will not