

ignore the importance of emancipation—in fact, he consigns a whole chapter to its discussion—but he notes that loyal white citizens, both on the home front and on the battlefield, accepted liberation (and, for that matter, black military service) only as a “practical application” to achieve victory (95).

Gallagher also blames academic and popular historians for failing to deal with military action soberly. As Lincoln recognized, and as Gallagher points out, “all else” depended on the progress of Union arms, and “all else” meant the dual goals of Union and emancipation (119). In Gallagher’s words, historians have failed to appreciate the “larger political and social implications of military campaigns” (121). Popular historians trivialized battles and academic historians ignored them. Emancipation could not have occurred without the integral role played by Union soldiers, and the progress of arms resulted in the ebb and flow of the conflict’s other meanings. By avoiding the crucial intersection of military and social life, Gallagher maintains, the significance of Union dropped from the pages of history.

Gallagher’s analysis is forthright and convincing, but not without weaknesses. *The Union War* repeatedly asserts that loyal Northerners used the phrases “Union” and “nation” interchangeably, an avowal that some scholars of nationalism might find troublesome. The true bone of contention, though, stems from Gallagher’s antimodernist approach. He argues that the Union war effort revealed more continuity than change and that “no one should infer a sea change in attitudes toward the nation” (161). Critics might carp on Gallagher’s limited conception of the transformative powers of the war, for he depicts the conflict as a process of restoration, not an ideological crusade to uphold human freedom. These critics have a point; Gallagher might have considered that white Northerners understood and welcomed the transformative powers of the war even if revolutionary motivations never actuated their participation in it.

At any rate, the debate on the Union war is not yet closed, but Gallagher’s excellent book is a sturdy analysis that reminds us that the concept of “Union,” though foreign to readers of the twenty-first century, was nevertheless wholly real and supremely significant to loyal Northerners in the nineteenth.

*Old Dominion University*

TIMOTHY J. ORR

*Last to Leave the Field: The Life and Letters of First Sergeant Ambrose Henry Hayward, 28th Pennsylvania Volunteers.* Edited by TIMOTHY J. ORR. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2011). 344 pp. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$52.)

During the sesquicentennial commemoration of the Civil War, it is only natural that a plethora of books, articles, essays, and online publications has begun

to appear, highlighting in depth one of America's most tumultuous periods of history. Timothy J. Orr's *Last to Leave the Field* is, hopefully, a portent of the valuable scholarship that will continue to be made available to the avid follower of the war that truly "won't go away" but continues to enthrall both the general public and academic community.

The reader is drawn into the mind and heart of Massachusetts-born soldier Ambrose Henry Hayward from his first enlistment in a Philadelphia militia unit in the spring of 1861 to his death in Tennessee—brought about from wounds received at the Battle of Pine Knob, Georgia, in June 1864—as a sergeant in the Twenty-Eighth Pennsylvania Infantry. This attraction is derived not only from Hayward's own observations but from Orr's succinct writing style and meticulous attention to detail, as revealed both in his transcription of the primary source material and in his highly informative, annotated notes, which effectively contextualize Hayward's thoughts and experiences throughout his participation in the Civil War.

In order to elucidate Hayward's life and career in the Union army, Orr has taken the letters from the Ambrose Henry Hayward Collection at the Archives of Gettysburg College as well as primary source material from fellow members of Hayward's regiment (including the letters of Colonel and Governor Geary), which are available at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and elsewhere. These rich sources, coupled with Orr's fine scholarship, make this work the authoritative publication on the history of the Twenty-Eighth Pennsylvania. To date, no individual regimental history has ever been written of this unit—there have only been short sketches such as those that appear in Frank Taylor's *Philadelphia in the Civil War* (1913) and Samuel P. Bates's *History of Pennsylvania Volunteers* (1869). This is surprising, considering that the Twenty-Eighth Pennsylvania was formed by postwar governor of Pennsylvania Colonel John W. Geary and that the unit was involved in such famous battles as Chancellorsville, Antietam, and Gettysburg. *Last to Leave the Field* is thus a valuable contribution to Civil War history on a number of levels.

One criticism of the volume is that in each chapter, prior to providing readers the transcribed correspondence of Sergeant Hayward, Orr makes his primary source somewhat redundant by quoting excerpts from many of the letters. This is done, of course, to highlight a point, person, or chronological event pertinent to the letter to be discussed. Having done so, however, Orr once again quotes portions of the letters, often repeating in part what he has already stated. Some of this material could no doubt have gone into the annotated notes at the end of the volume. Another short, critical comment is that the price of the volume may cause many "lay" Civil War enthusiasts to assume the work is too "scholarly" and thus miss out on its true potential for both educational and pleasurable reading.

These criticisms aside, the reader should not be discouraged. If one truly wants to know firsthand how most Federal, or Union, soldiers personally felt

about Copperheadism in the North, slavery in the South, desertion, daily camp life, the rigors of the march, inclement weather, participation in battles or engagements, the horrors of war, and the heroism of individuals (both officers and privates), then this book deserves to be read by all current or would-be historians of the American Civil War. Most importantly, the letters and life of First Sergeant Ambrose Henry Hayward reveal heroic character traits that represent a worthy example for any generation.

*Historical Society of Pennsylvania*

DANIEL N. ROLPH

*Soldiers to Governors: Pennsylvania's Civil War Veterans Who Became State Leaders.* By RICHARD C. SAYLOR. (Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. xiv, 173 pp. Photographs, notes, bibliography, index. \$59.95.)

"War," as General William T. Sherman put it, "is Hell"; yet, as author Richard C. Saylor generously reminds us, it can also prove advantageous to one's future career. In *Soldiers to Governors*, Saylor offers a compilation of biographies of the six governors of the Keystone State who first answered their nation's call to service during the Civil War and later parlayed their military experience into political fortune. Relying predominantly upon official gubernatorial papers, personal diaries, and other correspondence held by the Pennsylvania State Archives, Saylor crafts an impressive encyclopedic description of the lives of John White Geary, John Hartranft, Henry Hoyt, James Beaver, William Stone, and Samuel Pennypacker while simultaneously seeking to understand how "their war experiences shaped their vision and beliefs" (ix).

*Soldiers to Governors's* greatest contribution lies in its consideration of these heads of states' postbellum travails and political struggles. Saylor's work draws needed scholarly attention to the consequences and reverberative influence of the nation's bloodiest conflict on those living above the Mason-Dixon Line. Postwar soldiers' issues such as pension reform, battlefield commemoration, and support for the state-run Soldiers' and Sailors' Home became legislative minefields through which, Saylor insists, the veteran governors successfully navigated, while motivated by the loyalty and sense of duty they retained for their fellow brothers-in-arms. Saylor also demonstrates, however, that not all wartime fealty was as progressive or benevolent. As early as John W. Geary's 1866 gubernatorial run, and throughout the remainder of the century, Republicans feverishly "waved the bloody shirt" and condemned their Democratic opponents as traitorous Copperheads simply in the name of political expediency. Nor did all of the six soldier-governors demonstrate particular affinity for African American veterans. Echoing the work of historian David Blight, Saylor maintains that after the