

By the late 1850s, however, many PCS officers “eschewed the antislavery aspects of their enterprise” for fear that they might lead to sectional uproar (p. 99).

Burin’s tightly focused study might have benefited from a broader examination of black internationalism during the nineteenth century, particularly the competing notion of Haitian emigration (which attracted nearly as many black émigrés as colonization). Nevertheless, his book adds considerably to our understanding of colonization’s appeal to black as well as white supporters. Hopefully, it will soon be available in paperback for classroom use.

*Rochester Institute of Technology*

RICHARD S. NEWMAN

*The Boundaries of American Political Culture in the Civil War Era.* By MARK E. NEELY JR. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005. xiv, 159p. Illustrations, notes, selected bibliography, index. \$29.95.)

This slender volume’s brevity belies its ambition. In *The Boundaries of Political Culture in the Civil War Era*, Mark Neely seeks to challenge some of the most influential works of recent historiography; each of its four chapters addresses the thesis of a different work on the political history of the mid-nineteenth century: Glenn C. Altschuler and Stuart M. Blumin’s *Rude Republic* (2000); Joel H. Silbey’s *The American Political Nation* (1991); Iver Bernstein’s *The New York City Draft Riots* (1990); and Jean H. Baker’s *Affairs of Party* (1983). Neely’s vision of the nature of politics in the Civil War era is framed by his critique of these works, though he is quick to point out, “only very good books stimulate debate and send us back to the sources to look further into historical questions” (pp. x–xi).

The book is tied together by Neely’s broader reassertion of the importance of politics in the Civil War era. While conceding that historians had overstated the pervasiveness of politics in nineteenth-century America, Neely insists that the revision goes too far. He draws upon the rich material culture of American politics to demonstrate the centrality of politics to nineteenth-century Americans. Neely’s comfort and familiarity with such sources is evident, and he handles them with considerable sophistication, giving attention to medium as well as content. The small size and intricate detail of Currier and Ives’s lithographic political prints, for example, indicate that they were intended for display in the home, breaking down supposedly strict boundaries between home and politics. While some political historians have argued for the relative insignificance of Civil War era elections, Neely instead reads the explosion of visual political material as evidence of an increase in the electorate’s engagement with politics, as indicated by the fact that such material was produced for sale. Political engagement was so high that “people willingly paid for what they got” (p. 65).

If the first three chapters make various arguments concerning the pervasiveness of politics in the nineteenth century, the final chapter argues that there were, in fact, boundaries to political culture. Neely disagrees with historians, Jean Baker in particular, who have argued that distinct connections existed between the political culture of northern Democrats and the blackface minstrel show. Noting both that the Whigs were the first party to employ elements of minstrelsy in election campaigns and that the minstrel show was a pervasively popular, and seemingly nonpartisan, form of entertainment in the nineteenth century, Neely argues that the electorate effectively compartmentalized these political and cultural worlds. Here Neely's argument is less persuasive than in the first three chapters. If various political parties made use of elements of the minstrel show, did they make the same use of them? It is clear that Democratic campaign materials that incorporated minstrelsy were more virulently racist than those of their competitors. Perhaps more importantly, Baker also argues that the racial ideology promoted by the minstrel show became critical to Democratic criticisms of Republicans, whether or not specific elements of minstrelsy were used. Nevertheless, Neely's evidence demands a rethinking of the relationship between minstrelsy and politics. More broadly, his book is an admirable effort to understand what exactly politics meant to the mid-nineteenth-century American electorate. It is essential reading for those interested in nineteenth-century politics, and it is a model in its innovative reading of political material culture.

*Temple University*

ANDREW DIEMER

*Lost Triumph: Lee's Real Plan at Gettysburg—And Why It Failed.* By TOM CARHART. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 2005. xiii, 288p. Maps, notes, index. \$25.95.)

*Retreat from Gettysburg: Lee, Logistics, and the Pennsylvania Campaign.* By KENT MASTERSON BROWN. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005. xv, 534p. Illustrations, maps, notes, bibliography, index. \$34.95.)

One would naturally assume that to date, *everything* that could or should have been published about the Battle of Gettysburg and its aftermath has already been written. Just in recent years, however, such works as Mark H. Dunkelman, *Gettysburg's Unknown Soldier: The Life, Death, and Celebrity of Amos Humiston* (1999); Thomas A. Desjardin, *These Honored Dead: How the Story of Gettysburg Shaped American Memory* (2003); James M. Paradis, *African Americans and the Gettysburg Campaign* (2005); Margaret S. Creighton, *The Colors of Courage: Gettysburg's Hidden History* (2004); Earl J. Hess, *Pickett's Charge: The Last Attack at Gettysburg* (2001); and Carol Reardon, *Pickett's*