



Review Essay

UNION, LOYALTY, AND PATRIOTIC SACRIFICE IN THE CIVIL WAR NORTH

AMY LAUREL FLUKER

Bodies in Blue: Disability in the Civil War North. By Sarah Handley-Cousins. (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2019. Pp. xi, 186. \$39.05 cloth; \$27.59 e-book.)

Contested Loyalty: Debates over Patriotism in the Civil War North. Edited by Robert M. Sandow. (New York: Fordham University Press, 2018. Pp. ix, 310. \$65.00 cloth; \$64.99 e-book.)

A Great Sacrifice: Northern Black Soldiers, Their Families, and the Experience of Civil War. By James G. Mendez. (New York: Fordham University Press, 2019. Pp. xi, 262. \$35.00 paper; \$34.99 e-book.)

Our Country: Northern Evangelicals and the Union During the Civil War Era. By Grant R. Brodrecht. (New York: Fordham University Press, 2018. Pp. iii, 264. \$140.00 cloth; \$40.00 paper; \$39.99 e-book.)

Women and the American Civil War: North-South Counterpoints. Edited by Judith Giesberg and Randall M. Miller. (Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 2018. Pp. vii, 358. \$49.95 paper; \$42.99 e-book.)

ONE spring afternoon in northeastern Ohio, I embarked on a unit on the American Civil War in my introductory history course. “I have a question,” a freshman student asked tentatively. “Why do *they* still care so much?” Although we had not yet discussed the conflict in any detail, I began by inviting my students to speculate about why, after the passage of more than one hundred and fifty years, people still feel so passionately about this conflict. As that student

The New England Quarterly, vol. XCIII, no. 1 (March 2020). © 2020 by The New England Quarterly. All rights reserved. https://doi.org/10.1162/teq_a_00795.

spoke, I realized my question stemmed from a false premise—one likely borne of six years spent teaching in Mississippi—that students in Ohio *did* feel passionately about the Civil War. Of course, expecting college students to feel anything about history thirteen weeks into an introductory course is a bit of an ask, but “Civil War Week” generally pulls in good attendance and provokes interesting questions. It certainly had in this instance. The inflection in this student’s voice made me think. The student implied “*they*,” meaning white Southerners, still cared about the Civil War. From the vantage point of this Ohio native, it was more *their* war than *ours*. Another student responded by talking about the many battles waged in the South. Explaining what they learned about Jim Crow in a different course, still another student wondered how racism shaped Southern attitudes about the war. These students, sitting just a few blocks from a massive monument dedicated to the dozens of locals who died “in the War of the Rebellion,” did not consider why Northerners would ever care.

I certainly cannot blame the students for the oversight. It is one of the most common clichés of Civil War history, likely a testament to the pervasiveness of the Lost Cause mythology, that white Southerners bore the brunt of the devastating conflict, leaving Northerners largely unmoved and unscathed. Fortunately, a flurry of new scholarship has emerged that will help historians better understand and interpret the Civil War North. As this compelling assemblage of research persuasively demonstrates, Northerners were profoundly affected by the Civil War. They participated in and sustained the Union war effort in myriad ways and found their lives, families, communities, and government reshaped as a result.

As each author makes sense of the ways in which a diverse range of Northerners confronted the war, a number of threads bind their contributions together. Each pays careful attention to the social context of the Civil War, especially to the intersection of the home front and battlefield. Each author also remains attuned to the multifaceted identities of Northerners, acknowledging the distinct circumstances related to gender, race, ethnicity, and politics that determined their Civil War experiences. In the process, three common themes emerge: the nature of the Union, the meaning of loyalty, and the obligations that both inspired and attended patriotic sacrifice.

The Union

Perhaps the most crucial concept explored throughout these works is the meaning of “Union.” For nineteenth-century Northerners,

Union was an expansive and complicated concept, describing at once a political and cultural construct—both a form of government and a set of republican values that included liberty, equality, and, in the words of Grant R. Brodrecht, “all that was seemingly good in America.”¹ As a result, many Northerners associated the Union more with the ideology of the American Revolution and the Founding Fathers than with the government of the United States itself. Several contributors to the edited volume *Contested Loyalty: Debates Over Patriotism in the Civil War North* make this distinction. Melinda Lawson, for example, argues that the ideals espoused in the Declaration of Independence commanded the loyalty of Northerners more than the government whose creation it inspired.² According to Thaddeus M. Romansky, Northern African American soldiers understood that the United States government, particularly the army, did not always live up to the republican promise of equality. As a result, they felt empowered to protest discriminatory policies in defense of their inalienable rights. “Loyalty to the country’s founding ideals had established a long tradition of protest against inequality and disfranchisement,” Romansky insists, which reflected black soldiers’ understanding of the historical origins of the Union.³ Matthew Warshauer makes a related assertion. He contends that Democrats in Connecticut regarded their opposition to Republican war aims as essential to the preservation of the Union as envisioned by the Founders—a vision which favored limited government and also countenanced slavery.⁴ Jonathan W. White finds that Democrats in the Pennsylvania legislature adopted a comparable position as they vouched for the loyalty of property holders seeking compensation for wartime damages.⁵ In short, although Northerners did not always agree on the nature of

¹Grant R. Brodrecht, *Our Country: Northern Evangelicals and the Union during the Civil War Era* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2018), 13.

²Melinda Lawson, “‘Dedicated to the Proposition’: Principle, Consequence, and Duty to the Egalitarian Nation, 1848-1865,” *Contested Loyalty: Debates Over Patriotism in the Civil War North* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2018), 22.

³Thaddeus M. Romansky “‘Deeds of Our Own’: Loyalty, Soldier Rights, and Protest in Northern Regiments of the United States Colored Troops,” *Contested Loyalty*, 288.

⁴Matthew Warshauer, “Connecticut Copperhead Constitutionalism: A Study of Peace Democratic Political Ideology During the Civil War,” *Contested Loyalty*, 65.

⁵Jonathan W. White, “‘I Do Not Understand What the Term ‘Loyalty’ Means,” *Contested Loyalty*, 83, 88–9.

the Union, they often understood it as rooted in their Revolutionary past.

Northerners often invested the Union with spiritual as well as political meaning. In *Our Country: Northern Evangelicals and the Union during the Civil War Era*, Brodrecht claims many white Northerners believed the United States was “providentially created by God” and that “preserving the Union . . . was an act of faithfulness to God and the Founding Fathers.”⁶ Centering his analysis of Northern evangelical thought around three ministers, Methodist George Peck, Presbyterian Henry Boardman, and Congregationalist George Cheever, Brodrecht shows how the notion of a Christian Union shaped Northerners’ responses to the secession crisis, the Civil War, and Reconstruction. He finds that, for white evangelicals, their “near-idolatrous” reverence for the Union was more important than their opposition to the institution of slavery or their commitment to racial equality.⁷ Although evangelicals ultimately accepted the necessity of emancipation and the Reconstruction Amendments, the well-being of the Union and the consolidation of the nation’s white, Protestant, Christian culture remained their foremost concern.⁸

By focusing on how evangelicals understood the Union, Brodrecht explains Reconstruction’s failure to secure full equality for African Americans and illuminates the appeal of reconciliation to many white Northerners. Brodrecht says that the Christian roots of Union led white Northern evangelicals to seek the rapid reunion of the nation as the best means of fulfilling their covenant with God. At the same time, the Christian teachings of love, peace, and forgiveness tempered their hostilities, if not toward the fire-eating militants they blamed for the war, then toward the majority of defeated Southerners. Brodrecht maintains that the reluctance of white evangelicals to support African American equality was not wholly due to ignorance or a lack of concern—indeed, their missionary efforts in the Reconstruction South prove they understood the challenges facing freed people—but rather to their fear that agitation over the expansion of rights jeopardized reunion. Their goal was the prompt restoration of the Christian Union, not the birth of a new, racially-inclusive nation. “For white evangelicals,” Brodrecht concludes, “a war that had been fought to preserve one Anglo-American Protestant people flowed seamlessly

⁶Brodrecht, *Our Country*, 6, 7.

⁷Brodrecht, *Our Country*, 2, 12.

⁸Brodrecht, *Our Country*, 11.

into a Reconstruction concerned with seeing a fuller, more secure realization of that people.”⁹

Loyalty

Regardless of how Northerners conceived of the Union, the Civil War required that they prove their unswerving commitment to it in public. Northerners might demonstrate their loyalty in a multitude of ways according to their individual roles, their partisan affiliation, and their gender, race, and ethnicity, but they generally evinced a patriotic commitment to the war effort. To do otherwise was to invite accusations of disloyalty or treason—and, even without evidence, such accusations could hold serious consequences. Thus, conversations about the meaning of loyalty took on tremendous significance in the wartime North.

The way Northerners perceived of their obligation to the Union varied depending on their particular roles in Northern society. In *Contested Loyalty*, Lawson argues that Wendell Phillips, George Julian, and Abraham Lincoln felt a duty as leaders to direct the nation toward the fulfillment of its founding ideology of freedom and equality. Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai demonstrates that the “New Brahmins,” a generation of elite, college-educated, New England men, thought of themselves as “society’s shepherds” and felt compelled by their understanding of honor to take leading roles in the defense of the Union.¹⁰ Sometimes, however, individuals clashed with their communities over the most appropriate way of exhibiting their loyalty. Sean A. Scott, for example, tells the story of William S. Plumer, a Presbyterian minister in western Pennsylvania, whose adherence to the mandate of the separation of church and state cost him his job. Although he privately supported the Union war effort, Plumer believed his role as a minister called for him to practice public neutrality. Nevertheless, to his congregation this attitude smacked of disloyalty. Having lost the confidence of his congregation, Plumer had little choice but to resign.¹¹

⁹Brodrecht, *Our Country*, 148.

¹⁰Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai, “Loyal to Union: College-Educated Soldiers, Military Leadership, Politics, and the Question of Loyalty,” *Contested Loyalty*, 138.

¹¹Sean A. Scott, “‘Patriotism Will Save Neither You Nor Me’: William S. Plumer’s Defense of an Apolitical Pulpit,” *Contested Loyalty*, 169.

Plumer fell afoul of the bitter partisan divisions that characterized Northern society during the Civil War. In fact, partisanship was central to how Northerners understood loyalty. Jonathan White, for example, holds that Republicans considered support of the Lincoln administration as essential to loyalty while Democrats imagined loyalty as devotion to the Constitution before all else.¹² There were important practical ramifications for this. Timothy J. Orr describes how “idle political talk,” including grumblings against the administration, led to the temporary dismissal of fifteen workers at the Allegheny Arsenal in western Pennsylvania. Despite the lack of any real proof of their disloyalty, partisan extremism merged with fears of industrial sabotage to justify firing the workers.¹³

Demonstrations of loyalty in the wartime North were also shaped by gender, race, and ethnicity. According to Wongsrichanalai, New Brahmins felt compelled to volunteer out of a sense of obligation to the Union informed by attitudes about manhood, character, and honor. Romanky observes that the desire to adhere to masculine standards of loyalty exerted an equally important influence on African American soldiers, for whom loyal service to the Union embodied not only their patriotism but also their humanity. Similarly, Keating argues that Irish Americans in the Midwest viewed demonstrations of loyalty as an essential means of countering nativist stereotypes—particularly as they sought to distance themselves from the actions of their countrymen in the New York City Draft Riots.¹⁴

Discussions about loyalty were not always tied to the government or to the war effort. Julie A. Mujic, for example, emphasizes the deeply personal dimensions of loyalty. Mujic analyzes the courtship of Gideon Winan Allen, a civilian and Peace Democrat, and Annie Cox, who supported emancipation and the Lincoln administration. As their relationship grew more intimate, sparring over politics became a way to test one another’s boundaries. Still, neither considered their disagreements about the Civil War serious enough to end their relationship nor did Cox pressure Allen to enlist. Thus, in Mujic’s telling, the war played a role in Cox and Allen’s relationship, but they placed

¹²White, *Our Country*, 83.

¹³Timothy J. Orr, “‘A Source of Mortification to All Truly Loyal Men’: Allegheny Arsenal’s Disloyal Worker Purge of 1863,” *Contested Loyalty*, 222, 230, 235.

¹⁴Ryan W. Keating, “All of That Class That Infest N.Y.: Perspectives on Irish American Loyalty and Patriotism in the Wake of the New York City Draft Riots,” *Contested Loyalty*, 241.

their commitment to one another above their commitment to the nation.¹⁵

Patriotic Sacrifice

The Civil War, in one way or another, touched the lives of most Northerners. While a few, like Cox and Allen, had the privilege of remaining on its periphery, many more committed their bodies, their labor, their lives, and the lives of their loved ones to the war effort. Often couched in terms of a “patriotic sacrifice” to the nation, Northerners understood that their contributions were vital to Union victory. In return for their patriotic sacrifices, Northerners demonstrated an expectation that the government would recognize the suffering incurred through those sacrifices and reward them accordingly.

For Northern men, the highest form of patriotic sacrifice was military service. Indeed, Wongsrichanalai notes, some Northerners considered the army the very embodiment of the Union.¹⁶ Handley-Cousins elaborates on the symbolic importance of military service for Northern men in *Bodies in Blue: Disability in the Civil War North*. Handley-Cousins takes a broad look at the social and cultural implications of disability and illness (both visible and invisible), detailing how Union soldiers understood their duty in the context of “martial masculinity,” which dictated that true men lead productive lives and bear adversity with resolve.¹⁷ Whether they were wounded in battle or suffered from physical or mental illness, disabled soldiers found their masculinity called into question. Men who left combat duty or complained too vocally of their ailments risked being associated with “bummers,” shirkers, and malingerers. For Northern soldiers molded by “martial masculinity,” coping with disability meant “walking the fine line between manhood and disgrace.”¹⁸ Contrary to the popular rhetoric revering patriotic sacrifice, Handley-Cousins argues, “disabled soldiers were just as likely to be used, rejected, separated, and distrusted as they were to be honored.”¹⁹

¹⁵Julie A. Mujic, “‘We Are Setting the Terms Now’: Loyalty Rhetoric in Courtship,” *Contested Loyalty*, 108, 121.

¹⁶Wongsrichanalai, “Loyal to Union,” 150.

¹⁷Sarah Handley-Cousins, *Bodies in Blue: Disability in the Civil War North* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2019), 3–4.

¹⁸Handley-Cousins, *Bodies in Blue*, 41.

¹⁹Handley-Cousins, *Bodies in Blue*, 3.

In perhaps the book's most affecting chapter, "The Disabled Lion of Union," Handley-Cousins illustrates how celebrated Union general Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain grappled with his own disability. Chamberlain often passed as able-bodied, although he suffered a grievous wound at the 1864 Battle of Petersburg that plagued him until his death in 1914. Like many other veterans, Chamberlain's disability forever changed him, but he nevertheless lived a long, successful, and well-adjusted life. "Disability and achievement," Handley-Cousins reminds us, are not "mutually exclusive."²⁰ Near the end of his life, however, financial distress related to medical expenses led Chamberlain to seek an increased pension. Doing so required him to expose his disability and testify to his total helplessness, challenging his carefully curated war hero image and undermining his sense of masculinity. Still, the Pension Board refused to grant Chamberlain the increased pension.

Through Chamberlain's case, Handley-Cousins establishes the critical role authorities played in determining whether or not an individual's patriotic sacrifice merited special consideration by the government. In making such determinations, authorities weighed their appreciation for patriotic sacrifice against the practical necessity of maintaining the army's fighting strength and against their generally stigmatized view of disability. Ultimately, the need for manpower led the government to eliminate medical discharges except in cases of severe disabilities. Soldiers seeking medical leave or transfer faced intense scrutiny and their expressions of suffering were largely dismissed. Army surgeons were authorized to collect specimens from soldiers' bodies for exhibition in the Army Medical Museum—an act that simultaneously deprived men of self-determination and dignified their sacrifices as worthy of preservation and remembrance. After the war, the Pension Board similarly scrutinized the applications of disabled veterans, favoring those men who exemplified board members' prejudicial perceptions of masculinity. Thus, Handley-Cousins concludes, "soldiers praised as exemplars of Northern manhood were also mocked and segregated. They were stripped of the power to determine their own identity or to control their own bodies."²¹

Disabled men were not alone in asserting that their patriotic sacrifice merited recognition from the government. Women likewise thought of their obligation to the nation as reciprocal. In *Contested*

²⁰Handley-Cousins, *Bodies in Blue*, 75.

²¹Handley-Cousins, *Bodies in Blue*, 134.

Loyalty, Judith Giesberg demonstrates that many Northern women considered their duty to the Union as fulfilled by their willingness to send their husbands, brothers, and sons into military service. Others, however, emphasized their direct contributions to the Union war effort. According to Giesberg, women war workers not only stressed the sacrifices they endured due to the absence of their male relations in the army but also insisted on recognition for the vital, patriotic labor that they individually performed. Seamstresses, for example, insisted that money-grubbing contractors took advantage of the war by inflating prices and underpaying workers, and they pressed the government to open more jobs and, in some cases, won increased wages.²²

African Americans were similarly determined that their sacrifices merited recognition. In *Contested Loyalty*, Romansky argues that African Americans believed “soldiers possessed specific rights” and that it was their duty to protest when racial discrimination led to the circumscription of those rights.²³ James G. Mendez documents this same resolve in *A Great Sacrifice: Northern Black Soldiers, Their Families, and the Experience of Civil War*. Although much of *A Great Sacrifice* treads familiar ground, including the formation of black regiments and their protests over unequal pay, its most important contribution is calling attention to the experiences of the families of black soldiers. In addition to the many hardships endured by families of servicemen, the challenges black families faced were compounded by racial discrimination. Nevertheless, in countless letters to military authorities and elected officials they demonstrated their expectation for equitable treatment merited by their sacrifices on behalf of the nation.

Families are vital to understanding the black military experience, Gomez maintains, because a higher proportion of Northern African American men served than their white counterparts. The Civil War therefore put a disproportionate burden on black families. In addition to the suffering caused by the absence of loved ones on the battlefield, black families met with adversity born of unequal and delayed pay, which was exacerbated by discrimination in employment, and by the threat of racial violence. Still, over the course of the war and even after, the families of black soldiers persistently called attention to their distress. Families wrote letters seeking information about the

²²Judith Giesberg, “‘American Matrons and Daughters’: Sewing Women and Loyalty in Civil War Philadelphia,” *Contested Loyalty*, 213.

²³Romansky, “‘Deeds of Our Own,’” 269, 272.

whereabouts and well-being of their loved ones, requesting back pay, and asking for discharges for their soldiers on the basis of hardship. Their letters speak to their conviction that the sacrifices they made for the Union war effort entitled them to the rights and considerations due any loyal American. "In taking these actions and asserting what they felt were their rights," Gomez concludes, "black families achieved something they hadn't before: nearly full participation as citizens."²⁴

Regional Segregation and Civil War Scholarship

Our understanding of the impact of the Civil War on Northern society is immeasurably advanced due to this excellent collection of scholarship. Indeed, there is very little here to critique except the fact that despite the wealth of information contained in these essays and monographs the geographic boundaries of the North remain unclear. While some of the works speak only to circumstances within particular states, when taken as a whole they still do not necessarily reflect the experience of the entire Union. Handley-Cousins, for example, includes sources from St. Louis, Missouri, in her analysis of disability in the Civil War North while Gomez deliberately excludes slaveholding border states like Missouri because of his interest in free African Americans. Considering the significant free black population of Maryland, however, this feels like a missed opportunity. The interest of several of the authors in the politicization of loyalty in the Civil War North makes the exclusion of the border states even more curious. While Warshauer rightly points out the pervasiveness of this problem, even in the Republican stronghold of New England, surely loyalty was politicized nowhere so much as in the states operating under martial law. Although the border states are fraught with myriad local peculiarities and certainly complicate the regional parameters of the "North," any attempt to analyze what the Union and loyalty meant to Civil War Era Americans seems incomplete without them.

The myopia of regionalism is not indicative of a failing on the part of these scholars so much as it is a symptom of the nature of Civil War history itself. Giesberg and Randall M. Miller have sought to present a remedy to this problem through their edited collection *Women and the American Civil War: North-South Counterpoints*. Giesberg and

²⁴James G. Mendez, *A Great Sacrifice: Northern Black Soldiers, Their Families, and the Experience of Civil War* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2019), 6.

Miller, citing a criticism raised by Thavolia Glymph, argue that Civil War scholarship remains perhaps the most regionally segregated of historiographies.²⁵ Historians often emphasize the dramatic differences between Northern and Southern society, but as Elizabeth R. Varon notes in her essay, such differences were often more perceived than real.²⁶

As a corrective, *Women and the American Civil War* utilizes a comparative approach, offering both Northern and Southern perspectives on the specific themes of politics, wartime mobilization, emancipation, wartime relief, women and families, religion, Reconstruction, and Civil War memory. The virtue of this approach is that it highlights the power of the pervasive social constructs that shaped the lives of American women, Northerners and Southerners alike. In the process, it reveals that race, gender, class, age, and family circumstances were at least as important as sectionalism in determining how individuals related to the Civil War.

For example, many of the contributors to *Women and the American Civil War* acknowledge the widespread influence of the “separate spheres” ideology on antebellum Americans. Particularly prevalent among white, middle-class Americans, this ideology held that women should remain removed from public life and that they were inherently more pious, pure, and submissive than men. Because society perceived women as “moral caretakers,” Stacey M. Robertson explains, Northern women entered “the political arena as the voice of virtue,” utilizing their authority in religious and moral matters to advocate for antislavery causes in the 1850s.²⁷ According to Jessica Ziparo, however, such activism did little to expand women’s political power. Ziparo insists that while Northern “women participated in the national conflict in critical ways,” they did so “under paternalistic terms” that only reinforced the popular belief in women’s submissiveness.²⁸ Jeanie Attie makes a similar argument, explaining that the contributions of Northern women to the war effort were generally regarded “as acts of love and not work, as sacrifices driven by biology

²⁵Judith Giesberg and Randall M. Miler, eds., *Women and the American Civil War: North-South Counterpoints* (Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 2018), xi.

²⁶Elizabeth R. Varon, “Southern Women and Politics in the Civil War Era,” *Women and the American Civil War*, 4.

²⁷Stacey M. Robertson, “‘All Ladies Have Politics’: Women, Morality, and Politics in the North,” *Women and the American Civil War*, 23, 27.

²⁸Jessica Ziparo, “Northern Women, the State, and Wartime Mobilization,” *Women and the American Civil War*, 73.

rather than politics or calculation.”²⁹ As a result, Attie doubts that the Civil War brought any meaningful change to the status of women. Libbra Hilde, on the other hand, says that Southern women also traded on notions of “patriotic domesticity” and “feminine sacrifice” to extend their influence into politics, but she has a differing assessment of the outcome. Hilde argues that as a result of the Civil War, a diverse range of Southern women including the elite, the poor, and the enslaved “became increasingly assertive, political actors with shifting expectations of their future place in the nation.”³⁰ Although these historians disagree over whether the Civil War advanced the cause of women’s rights, each powerfully demonstrates the importance of gender norms in defining women’s Civil War experiences.

What *Women and the American Civil War* does extraordinarily well is position the war as a national rather than sectional or particularly Southern experience. At the same time, the other works reviewed here make a strong case for the necessity of regionally-specific studies. As this research bears out, the North was from far from monolithic, and there was no singular Northern experience of the Civil War. It was a place of “profound internal divisions,” Robert M. Sandow insists, marked by strong localism and “multiple and overlapping layers of loyalty.”³¹ Indeed, those divisions existed within families, ethnic groups, congregations, workplaces, and even within individuals. In *Bodies in Blue*, perhaps the most illuminating and engaging book on Civil War soldiers in decades, Handley-Cousins provides unique insight into how the narrow prescription of “martial masculinity” threatened the self-worth of disabled soldiers and altered their relationships to their families and to the state. Even within the context of regional studies focused on the North, therefore, there is ample room for highly nuanced research.

Each of these contributions goes a long way toward dismantling the popular perception that Northerners were somehow removed from the turmoil of the Civil War. By exploring the intersection of war and society down to the most intimate level, these authors offer a more complete picture of the experiences of Northerners in the Civil War than has heretofore been available. They illustrate how politics,

²⁹Jeanie Attie, “Real Women and Mythical Womanhood: War Relief at the Northern Home Front,” *Women and the American Civil War*, 156.

³⁰Libbra Hilde, “Needles as Weapons: Southern Women and Civil War Relief,” *Women and the American Civil War*, 127, 130.

³¹Robert M. Sandow, “Introduction,” *Contested Loyalty*, 1.

gender, race, and ethnicity guided the responses of Northerners to the war and highlight some essential concerns they shared as they contemplated the nature of the Union, the meaning of loyalty, and the rewards of patriotic sacrifice. These historians reveal the devastating toll the war took on the bodies and health of soldiers, how it intruded on romantic and familial relationships, and how it redirected lives and careers. Finally, they provide a wealth of evidence establishing the profound impact of the Civil War in the North and of its far-reaching consequences for individuals, society, and the nation.

Amy Laurel Fluker *is assistant professor of history at Youngstown State University, where she teaches courses in nineteenth century US history. Her forthcoming book, COMMONWEALTH OF COMPROMISE: CIVIL WAR COMMEMORATION IN MISSOURI, will appear in May 2020.*