

Sherman's Other War: The General and the Civil War Press. By John F. Marszalek. (Memphis: Memphis State University Press, 1981. Pp. x, 230. Notes, bibliographical note, index. \$14.95.)

The American Civil War occasioned an intense struggle between the demands of military commanders for press censorship and the equally strong attempts by newspaper reporters and publishers to protect their right to print news from the battlefield. In his study of the strained relationship between the press and General William T. Sherman, John F. Marszalek argues that Sherman believed the Constitution had to be set aside during the course of the Civil War. Sherman insisted that the military had the right to maintain total secrecy; consequently, the First Amendment was invalid in wartime. Any criticism of the war effort aided the enemy, according to Sherman, and newsmen helped the Confederate cause by printing intelligence and criticizing the army and its leaders, thereby lowering military and public morale. Sherman especially hated the reporters who followed his army's movements, referring to them as "a set of dirty newspaper scribblers who have the impudence of Satan" (p. 81). He blamed newspapers for the sectional split that had brought on the war and once threatened to have any reporter found in his camp arrested "as a spy and . . . tried by a Court Martial and if possible shot or hung" (p. 81).

Marszalek's book is divided into seven well-organized chapters that cover the historical development of military-newspaper relations; Sherman's civilian life before the Civil War; the early war years; the military occupation of Memphis, Tennessee; the court-martial of reporter Thomas Knox; Sherman's march through the South; and Sherman's ill-fated "treaty" with Confederate General Joseph Johnston. The weakest chapter in the volume, ironically, covers press relations on Sherman's famous march to the sea. The first 150 pages of the monograph appear to set the stage for a forceful conclusion, but the treatment of the military-press conflict during the march to the sea does not reflect the dramatic nature of the march itself. Sherman had fought his major battles with the press early in the war, and by 1864 neither antagonist seemed to have the inclination for further editorial conflict.

The sources used for the study are a skillful blend of Sherman's public and private papers, newspaper accounts, diaries, memoirs, letters, and relevant secondary materials. Each chapter is well documented, although some passages, such

as the discussion of Sherman's alleged "exogenous neurotic depression" (p. 68), are more speculative than substantial. One annoyance is the volume's lack of any illustrations, charts, or maps; they could have made the presentation more graphic.

Although Marszalek expends much effort trying to establish a "constitutional struggle" framework for the book, he is soon forced to admit that the conflict between Sherman and the press was actually one of personality, not abstract theory. Neither adversary seemed to have a solid understanding of the larger constitutional issues involved in the Civil War that raged around them.

Just as Sherman and the other military commanders sought to achieve various degrees of press censorship, the Civil War newspaper publishers and their correspondents were equally determined to protect what they considered to be their constitutional guarantees. They battled government restrictions and those military men who tried to enforce them. Since Sherman's antipress activities were so blatant, he was a constant target of intense newspaper criticism. The war within a war exemplified the problems inherent in the universal question of freedom of the press in a democracy at war. Unfortunately for the reader this otherwise perceptive monograph does not offer an adequate understanding of the press during the Civil War years. Too many pages are spent rationalizing the behavior of an obsessed military commander who attempted to instill total censorship over the press, and too few pages are offered to help understand what it meant to be a reporter or a publisher trying to cover the military action of the Civil War.

Indiana Historical Society,
Indianapolis

John W. Miller

Lives of Their Own: Blacks, Italians, and Poles in Pittsburgh, 1900-1960. By John Bodnar, Roger Simon, and Michael P. Weber. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982. Pp. 286. Maps, tables, notes, illustrations, appendixes, index. \$22.95.)

The Bodnar-Simon-Weber study under review is the best monograph on Pittsburgh ever done. Not only that, it provides a solid methodological model that integrates quantification, oral history, foreign language materials, and major, primary documentary sources in order to illustrate and dissect the complex interrelationship between blacks and white ethnics in the factory neighborhoods they inhabited. The authors are es-