daughters had successful marriages; son Wick always needed money.

A Henry Clay Whig, Preston believed in states’ rights and slavery. He volunteered for Mexican War service but did not see combat. Bored with law, Preston turned to politics. In Kentucky’s 1849–1850 constitutional convention he defended slavery but insisted on fair treatment for Catholics and immigrants. An effective speaker, he served terms in both houses of the General Assembly without particular distinction. During three years in the U.S. House of Representatives he was a popular member who supported the Kansas-Nebraska Bill and the Gadsden Purchase.

When the Whig party dissolved in the 1850s, Preston became a Democrat. His support of James Buchanan resulted in his appointment as minister to Spain. Unable to purchase Cuba, he settled the Amistad claims and some minor issues.

Upon the outbreak of the Civil War, Preston became an aide to his brother-in-law, Albert Sidney Johnston. He was on a committee that secured admission into the Confederacy for a minority Kentucky government. Promoted to brigadier general on April 1, 1862, Preston performed well at Stones River and Chattanooga. Participation in an anti–Braxton Bragg cabal resulted in his January 1864 assignment to the Trans-Mississippi Department. The order was suspended when he was given a diplomatic assignment to seek support from the Maximilian government that the French were establishing in Mexico. European politics rendered his mission impossible, and Preston reached Texas via Mexico in April 1865. Edmund Kirby Smith promoted him to major general, but the Confederate army surrendered on June 2, 1865.

In December 1865 Preston received permission to return home; he was pardoned in 1868. Lexington became his home, but he and his wife were often separated. Much of his prewar property had been saved, but he often endured cash problems. Still, he enjoyed a lavish life-style. Elected to the Kentucky House in 1868, Preston maintained an active interest in state and national politics, and he was a popular speaker. “Kentucky’s Last Cavalier” died on September 21, 1887. He was buried in Louisville.

Peter J. Sehlinger, professor emeritus at Indiana University, Indianapolis, has done well in presenting a minor nineteenth-century public figure. Many of Preston’s ventures were unsuccessful, and much of what he valued disappeared with the defeat of the South. But he continued to enjoy good food, good wine, and good friends; with them he was reasonably content.

Lowell H. Harrison, Emeritus Western Kentucky University Bowling Green, Kentucky


A generation ago, scholarship on the American Civil War seemed insulated from broader historiographic trends, prompting Maris A. Vinovskis to ask, “Have Social Historians Lost the Civil War?” (JAH, June 1989). It was a fair question. Civil War historians were concentrating on traditional military and political themes, while the disciples of the new social history generally ignored the war. Since then, scholars have closed the gap from both directions: social historians have produced a long list of home front studies, while military historians have examined the attitudes, motivations, and experiences of ordinary soldiers. Russell L. Johnson’s history of Dubuque, Iowa, is a welcome contribution to these scholarly conversations.

Dubuque, the nation’s eightieth-largest city in 1860, was declining as a regional commercial center and gradually shifting toward manufacturing when the war began. The city had long been a Democratic stronghold, and during the war vocal Peace Democrats, led by an outspoken newspaper editor, threatened to disrupt public order. But the tensions never gave way to violence, and Dubuque always managed to fill its recruiting quotas without resorting to conscription.

Johnson has identified 1,321 recruits credited to Dubuque, matching 595 of these
against the 1860 census. A short review cannot do justice to Johnson’s superb quantitative analysis of those data. He asks the familiar questions about the age, occupation, and ethnicity of volunteers, while adding valuable nuance by distinguishing between men who were living with their parents and those who were already independent in 1860. Johnson also distinguishes between the men—disproportionately of the business classes—who responded to calls for short-term recruits and the volunteers from more modest circumstances who signed on for three years. The occupational mix among reenlistees provides further evidence that Dubuque’s volunteers responded to particular economic circumstances as well as patriotic and ideological motivations.

Johnson then offers a provocative, but not entirely convincing, analysis of how military life shaped the volunteers. Army life and the acquired skills of soldiering, he argues, effectively trained men for the routine and discipline of industrial labor, while the emphasis on hierarchy and the limited opportunities for advancement were ideal preparation for life in an increasingly stratified industrial society. Moreover, the physical hardships suffered by soldiers approximated the various disamenities of an urban environment. Thus, army life prepared men for their postwar roles in an industrializing, urbanizing world.

Finally, Johnson asks how these soldiers fared when they returned to Dubuque. What happened when the warriors became workers? Apparently, their experience as soldiers generally produced postwar stability. Veterans were geographically less mobile than their peers, perhaps because they had seen enough of the world to appreciate Iowa’s gifts. But they also experienced less occupational mobility, either up or down, than nonveterans. As Johnson sees it, military life “apparently helped them cope, though not necessarily excel, in postwar urban-industrial Dubuque” (p. 275).

_Warriors into Workers_ illustrates the enduring possibilities available for exploration when social historians turn to the Civil War. Far from producing a narrow study of wartime Dubuque, Russell L. Johnson has offered valuable insights into the broader characteristics of Union soldiers and the war’s enduring impact on industrializing American society.

J. Matthew Gallman  
_University of Florida_  
_Gainesville, Florida_


By the mid-1860s, the U.S. government faced a glut of potential claims for Civil War–related expenses. State governments alone could demand as much as $468 million for the costs of troops, supplies, and damages incurred in the Union cause. Kyle S. Sinisi argues that the states’ pursuit of these claims “represented the most sustained and expensive intergovernmental contact of the three decades following the war” (p. xii). But the national government was “not terribly sympathetic” (p. 180). Secretary of the Treasury Salmon P. Chase’s stringent rules made it difficult to claim reimbursement from the federal coffers. With millions at stake and the cash-strapped states desperate for help, state officials set out on a pathbreaking quest to get their (more or less) just rewards by lobbying Congress for special settlements.

Most of the book centers on efforts by Missouri, Kentucky, and Kansas to secure compensation. These border states had suffered substantial damages, but each was in a different political position. Missouri, with influential politicians of both parties, had a measure of political clout. Kentucky, a Democratic state, faced difficulty when it lost political leverage after the surrender at Appomattox. The rudimentary government of Kansas seemed a kind of Job of the plains, plagued with crushing fiscal burdens, Indian uprisings, drought, and even grasshoppers. To pursue their claims, these states relied on such agents as hired-gun Washington lawyers or state militia officers. Their success was modest and uneven. Missouri had the largest claims and the earliest victories, but rivalries, confusion, and fraud soon rendered its efforts generally futile. Kentucky also did well initially, but peace and