

plied throughout the book. Clearly, Culpepper's interest lies in simply allowing the women to "speak for themselves and their times" (3). The question that lingers, however, is whether, unassisted by contemporary scholarly insight, we can fully understand the larger implications of what the women were saying when we "hear" them "speak."

However one responds to that question, *Trials and Triumphs* is still an important addition to the rapidly growing literature on women and the Civil War. Readers of all types will find the women's words informative, engaging, heartrending. Scholars, too, owe Culpepper a debt of gratitude for uncovering and bringing together in one volume excerpts from so many wonderful primary sources.

Dubious Victory: The Reconstruction Debate in Ohio, by Robert D. Sawrey. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1992. xii, 194 pp. Illustrations, map, tables, notes, bibliography, index. \$30.00 cloth.

REVIEWED BY ROBERT R. DYKSTRA, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

Dubious Victory is about Ohio politics in the period 1865–1868, which—as in Iowa—centered on the related issues of Reconstruction and African-American civil equality. Professor Sawrey gives us a straightforward, blow-by-blow account of both internal state politics and the national events that influenced Ohio's electoral behavior.

Ohioans experienced something roughly similar to what voters underwent in other northern states in the Reconstruction era, inviting specific comparisons. For example, the events of 1865 in Ohio contrast remarkably with those of Iowa that same year as presented in my *Bright Radical Star: Black Freedom and White Supremacy on the Hawkeye Frontier* (1993). In both states, the Republican party was forced to grapple with proposed black suffrage at its June convention; returned soldiers were rumored to strongly oppose voting rights for blacks; in August the Democrats nominated a gubernatorial candidate who ran as an outspoken white supremacist; the ensuing campaign (between two Civil War officers) hinged on black civil equality; and the Republicans won October's election, but by margins down from those won by President Abraham Lincoln in 1864. There the similarities end. Ohio's Republicans refused to endorse black suffrage. In fact, their gubernatorial candidate, Jacob D. Cox, had his agents in the convention actively campaigning against such an endorsement. He later issued a statement favoring a

kind of "ethnic cleansing" by which the nation's African-Americans would be expatriated to all-black enclaves in the lower South. Iowa's Republicans, on the other hand, *did* endorse black suffrage; and their gubernatorial candidate, William M. Stone, straightforwardly supported the civil equality of blacks. In Ohio, Cox won by 54 percent—down only 2 points from Lincoln's percentage. In Iowa, Stone won by 56 percent—down a worrisome 8 points from Lincoln. But at least the issue of black equality had been confronted and forthrightly won against the Democrats, setting up Iowa's 1868 referendum victory for equal suffrage. In Ohio, on the other hand, black suffrage had only been sidestepped, foreshadowing its defeat in that state's referendum of 1867. The comparison is instructive on several counts.

But Sawrey's book, as a single-state study, is less an advance over Felice A. Bonadio's *North of Reconstruction: Ohio Politics, 1865-1870* (1970) than it might have been. Other than briefly questioning Bonadio's cynicism about Radical Republican commitments to Reconstruction and equal rights, together with a quibble over the immediate effect of Andrew Johnson's veto of the Freedmen's Bureau Bill, there is no effort to engage Bonadio. Indeed, the earlier work is mentioned only once in the text and cited in only four endnotes. So, while covering the same ground as Bonadio, Sawrey has done so without any sustained revisionist intent.

What would have made *Dubious Victory* an improvement on Bonadio is a systematic quantitative analysis of the elections that are so crucial to both books. Bonadio wrote before the advent (for historians) of computer-aided research, but Sawrey has no excuse. It is, after all, twenty years since publication of J. Morgan Kousser's *The Shaping of Southern Politics* (1974), which ought to have convinced political historians that the future lay in multiple ecological regression. And the methodological revolution should have been consolidated with William E. Gienapp's *The Origins of the Republican Party* (1987).

Sawrey's failure to subject Ohio's critical black suffrage referendum to computer-aided analysis is particularly unfortunate. "One might marvel," he notes, "that over two hundred thousand white males had indicated a willingness to allow blacks to vote in Ohio." One might indeed, but—without the computer—one can do little more than that. Sawrey assumes that these voters were all Republicans, that an additional fifteen thousand Republicans voted against black suffrage, that twelve thousand Republicans refused to vote either way on the proposition, and that "thousands of Republicans simply stayed away from the polls." These assumptions may be cor-

rect, but we will never know with reasonable certainty until some historian undertakes a statistical analysis. Nor can we hope to learn *what kinds* of Ohio Republicans—in terms of ethnicity, religion, economic situation, and so forth—were egalitarians, what kinds were racial conservatives, what kinds were abstainers or “no-shows.” Such information cannot be plausibly inferred from visually reviewing aggregate election returns.

Dubious Victory is not an assessment, as promised, of “public opinion” in postbellum Ohio, but only of the opinions expressed in various newspapers and letters. (Even Sawrey’s newspaper research lacks any overtly systematic basis. Did he read *all* extant papers? Most? Some?) And his single attempt at quantitative analysis—of 26 Republican county convention platforms in 1865—is flawed. That only 7 platforms (or 26 percent) endorsed black suffrage is not the correct datum, since 9 conventions offered no platforms at all. The valid calculation is that 7 of 17 platforms (or 41 percent) were pro-suffrage—suggesting that grass-roots racism among Ohio Republicans was much less powerful than Sawrey is willing to concede.

The last word on this subject has not yet been written.

Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865–1900, by Stuart McConnell. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992. xvii, 312 pp. Illustrations, tables, notes, bibliography, index. \$32.50 cloth.

REVIEWED BY GEORGE MCJIMSEY, IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Stuart McConnell has written a fresh and valuable account of the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR). Seeking to go beyond the “partisanship and patronage” interpretations that have characterized earlier treatments of the organization, he examines the GAR’s social and cultural history. Founded in order to provide the northern veteran with a myth about his place in the civilian order, the early GAR experienced the tension between civilian equality and military order and discipline that historians have long attributed to the soldiers in the field. Early attempts to establish a rank system failed, and in the 1880s the GAR became a fraternal organization, envisioning an ideal of a republican middle-class community of self-disciplined comrades who respected each other’s rights and led exemplary lives.

Alert to discern social differences, McConnell examines three GAR posts: socially conscious Philadelphia; working-class Brockton,

Copyright of Annals of Iowa is the property of State of Iowa, by & through the State Historical Society of Iowa and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.