




Nina Silber. *Gender and the Sectional Conflict.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008. xxi + 117 pp. \$24.95 (cloth), ISBN 978-0-8078-3244-8.



Reviewed by Anya Jabour (University of Montana)

Published on H-CivWar (June, 2009)

Commissioned by Matthew E. Mason (Brigham Young University)

The Centrality of Gender and the Invisibility of Race in Civil War America

In 1894, a Confederate veteran ran a story about a mother and son attending a play about the Civil War. When the son asked his mother why the Yankees fought, she replied, “For the Union, darling.” A while later, as the orchestra played “Home Sweet Home,” the boy asked why the Confederates fought. The mother replied, “Do you hear what they are playing? That is what the Confederates fought for, darling.” The story concluded with the child declaring his political sympathies. “Oh mother,” he announced, “I will be a Confederate.” This anecdote neatly captures the themes explored by Nina Silber in the three lectures that she delivered as part of the Stephen and Janice Brose Distinguished Lecture Series in the Civil War Era at the Richards Civil War Era Center at Pennsylvania State University in 2006. Now published as *Gender and the Sectional Conflict*, these lectures explore themes of masculinity and nationalism, femininity and patriotism, and home and family in Civil War America. Offering a comparative analysis of the North and South, Silber convincingly argues that “gender was integral to northerners’ and southerners’ differing conceptions of why

they fought and what the war was about” (p. xii).

Both building on and extending recent scholarship on gender and the Civil War, Silber examines the central role of gender ideology from secession through Reconstruction. Her first essay, “Gender and the ‘Cause,’” reveals that while both Union and Confederate soldiers highlighted their attachment to home and family, they did so in regionally distinctive ways. Southern soldiers closely identified Confederate nationalism with domestic life; Northern soldiers, by contrast, prioritized the preservation of the Union over family relationships. “My duties to my country are of more importance now than my duty to you,” one Union soldier told his wife (p. 20). Silber connects Northern soldiers’ ability to separate national and family loyalties to the separation of home and work in the industrialized North. “The separate spheres ideology,” she suggests, by separating the domestic sphere from—and making it secondary to—men’s world of work and politics, “helped accustom Union soldiers to the ‘nation over home’ discourse of the Civil War era” (p. 24). Southern men, by contrast, “blended the causes of home

and country and implied that while the nation may have been a cause worth fighting for, it meant nothing in the absence of homes and familiesâ (p. xiv). As one North Carolina officer expressed it, âSo long as we have wives, mothers, and sisters to fight for so long will this struggle continueâ (p. 9).

Silberâs second essay builds on the first, exploring âthe problem of womenâs patriotismâ at a time when most Americans, North and South, did not acknowledge the possibility that women might have political loyalties independent of those of their husbands. If Southern women, in accordance with patriarchal ideology, relied on their husbands and fathers to protect them, and if Northern women, consistent with the separate spheres model, remained isolated from political issues, how could women from either section be motivated to support the war, especially when war threatened the domestic life for which women were responsible? While the solution to this conundrum remained elusive—both at the time and in current scholarship—by the end of the war, womenâs political loyalties had acquired new significance as Southern women were required to take an oath of loyalty to the Union and Northern activists organized on behalf of emancipation and woman suffrage. Although Silber suggests that the ânotion that women lack an independently patriotic perspective was ... especially pronounced in the South,â wartime Northern and Southern commentators frequently commented on Southern womenâs strong support for the Confederacy, often making invidious comparisons between Southern womenâs fierce defense of their cause and the lukewarm patriotism of Northern women (p. 40). Silber offers an interesting interpretation of both praise for and criticism of womenâs patriotism, proposing that praise for female patriotism functioned to mute class tensions, while criticism of womenâs waning enthusiasm served as a metonym for a critique of class divisions. In the Confederacy, Catherine Edmondston pronounced: âNever was known such unanimity of action amongst all classesâ (p. 43). Meanwhile, Northern newspapers sharply criticized fictional characters like âMrs. Shoddy,â elite women who allegedly spent their ill-gained wartime profits on luxury goods (p. 49).

In her third and final chapter, Silber compares the memory-making work of Northern and Southern women. For Southern white women, she contends, celebrating the Lost Cause constituted âthe single most important springboard into the public arenaâ (p. 95). By contrast, âUnionist women were strikingly silent and unseen in postwar commemorationâ (p. 83). Confederate women were more central to commemorative activities for both practical and ideological reasons. In burying the Confederate dead and providing material support for their widows and orphans, âsouthern white women did for Confederate soldiers what the federal government was doing ... on behalf of Union soldiersâ (p. 73). Perhaps more importantly, however, Southern white women built on the wartime tradition of highlighting women and families as central to the Confederate cause. Silber suggests that the highly visible role of white women in Confederate memory-making reflected âa desire to portray the southern cause as moral, virtuous, and righteous; at the same time, placing white women and families at center stage was critical to be âpolicy of forgetfulnessâ that allowed Americans in both sections of the country to elide race in the memory of the Civil War (pp. 75, xix). African American women attempted to call attention to slavery and emancipation as war issues and to their own role in the conflict by joining the Womanâs Relief Corps (the womenâs auxiliary of the Grand Army of the Republic) and by publishing memoirs and novels about black womenâs contributions to the Union. Ultimately, however, Silber contends that the same notions of gender that underlay Northernersâ and Southernersâ interpretations of the war effort âconspired in the postwar period to erase the memories of northern womenâs wartime contributions and to focus exaggerated attention on the experiences of southern white womenâ—and to ignore African Americans entirely (p. 98).

Unfortunately, *Gender and the Sectional Conflict* perpetuates the invisibility of African Americans in the American Civil War at the same time that it calls attention to this lacuna in both Civil War commemoration and current scholarship. Nonetheless, this insightful and thought-provoking volume is a valuable addition to the burgeoning literature on gender and the Civil War.

If there is additional discussion of this review, you may access it through the network, at:

<https://networks.h-net.org/h-civwar>

Citation: Anya Jabour. Review of Silber, Nina, *Gender and the Sectional Conflict*. H-CivWar, H-Net Reviews. June, 2009.

URL: <http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=24227>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 United States License.