Interdisciplinary Studies Faculty Publications

Interdisciplinary Studies

3-2019

When the Hurlyburly's Done / When the Battle's Lost and Won: Service, Suffering, and Survival of Civil War and Great War Veterans

Ian A. Isherwood
Gettysburg College

Follow this and additional works at: https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/idsfac

Part of the Military History Commons, and the United States History Commons

Share feedback about the accessibility of this item.

Recommended Citation

When the Hurlyburly's Done / When the Battle's Lost and Won: Service, Suffering, and Survival of Civil War and Great War Veterans

Abstract

Marching in the Gettysburg Liberty Parade in May 1918 was a drum corps consisting entirely of Civil War veterans. As local citizens demonstrated their patriotism—notably with the Kaiser hanging in effigy—the old soldiers helped keep the pace for two thousand citizens who turned out to vigorously support the Great War. It was no doubt a moving moment, the nation's largest veteran demographic encouraging and supporting the next generation of soldiers to fight for cause and country in a very different war waged on a very different continent. Though fifty years separated the trenches of Petersburg from those of the western front, for one moment, the men who fought in the nation's bloodiest war marched alongside doughboys who were training, on a battlefield of that war, to fight in France.

Keywords

civil war, veterans, Great War

Disciplines

History | Military History | United States History

"When the Hurlyburly's Done / When the Battle's Lost and Won" Service, Suffering, and Survival of Civil War and Great War Veterans

IAN ISHERWOOD

Marching in the Gettysburg Liberty Parade in May 1918 was a drum corps consisting entirely of Civil War veterans.[1] As local citizens demonstrated their patriotism—notably with the Kaiser hanging in effigy—the old soldiers helped keep the pace for two thousand citizens who turned out to vigorously support the Great War. It was no doubt a moving moment, the nation's largest veteran demographic encouraging and supporting the next generation of soldiers to fight for cause and country in a very different war waged on a very different continent. Though fifty years separated the trenches of Petersburg from those of the western front, for one moment, the men who fought in the nation's bloodiest war marched alongside doughboys who were training, on a battlefield of that war, to fight in France.[2]

It is common to see the two conflicts as though existing in separate historical worlds. One is distinctly nineteenth century in its conduct and in its soldiers' experiences. The other is decidedly more modern; it was fought with bolt-action rifles, high explosives, and during it, new technologies like tanks, airplanes, and gas came into their own as weapons of war. To see the Civil War and Great War as similar invites obvious criticism. But soldiers who fought in each could identify common characteristics of their experiences. Soldiers of both wars knew the deep bonds of service forged through fire that carried over into the uncertain postwar world; both knew the burden of survival and living with mental or physical reminders of their service; and they both knew what it was like to survive, memorialize old comrades, and guard the memory of their war generation for decades afterward. When the doughboys came back from France, they shared spaces of memory—Memorial Day parades and Armistice Day observances—with veterans who understood what it was like to come home from a major war.

In both the United States and Great Britain scholars of the Civil War and the First World War have increased their attention to veterans' history, and, despite the major differences between the two conflicts, historians approach these subjects using similar language and methods.[3] This essay considers comparatively this literature according to three tropes common in the historiography of both wars: service, suffering, and survival. First, scholars in each field have focused on how veterans created a sense of group identity—defined here as a war generation—based on the shared experience of military service.[4] Veterans organized, lobbied, wrote, and sought care from one another and within their communities. Second, scholars are particularly interested in the concept of suffering, a subject that has grown in influence due to a wider discussion of veterans and mental health. Both war generations returned men and women who lived through traumatic events, and historians of the Civil War and the First World War have built a substantial literature around the psychology of traumatic experiences, one that has fostered significant debate. The last concept for analysis is the notion of survival. In both cases, by surviving and participating in memorialization, veterans were important to the legacy of their wars. Veterans served as agents of memory for decades; they reflected on and wrote about their experiences, erected monuments to lost comrades, and participated in social rituals acknowledging their status within society. Through their service, suffering, and survival, veterans became powerful reminders of their wars; they helped frame how later scholars interpreted both the Civil War and First World War as it was—and as it has been—experienced and remembered.

Though there are general similarities in veteran experiences in the modern period, it is important to acknowledge that the concept of the "universal veteran" is inherently problematic.[5] Each conflict is obviously distinct, and every society has its own culturally constructed ways of understanding war. Yet, the way historians write about veterans across the two fields reflects parallel themes, indicating researchers' practical impulse to use similar methodologies and tools to conceptualize veterans across time and space. While veterans' experiences should remain firmly contextualized within their own age, the discussion of veterans can benefit from comparison. In terms of the literature on veterans' service—their communities, identity, and politics—the work of Civil War scholars provides a significant model for First World War historians to understand how veterans both shaped the postwar period and were shaped by it. The wealth of Civil War scholarship on veteran communities and organizations can shed light on the birth of modern veterans' advocacy and healthcare in ways that First World War historians can learn. In terms of veterans' suffering and the unending

struggles over mental health, the Great War can serve as a guide for Civil War historians struggling to reconcile the experience of suffering in the nineteenth century with what we now, in the twenty-first century, know of mental disorders. Compared to their Civil War counterparts, historians of the Great War have focused their attention on the cultural contexts of suffering more broadly and with increased emphasis on a broader spectrum of trauma. In terms of veterans' survival, there are many similarities in the ways veterans wrote about and memorialized their wars. These similarities offer opportunities for collaboration between Civil War and First World War scholars, but the cultural contexts of each war make the distinct lessons between the fields more general than instructional. In the memory of both wars, veterans proved the essential arbiters of interpretative legacies for decades following their service at the front.

With the exception of a few international histories, the literature reviewed here reflects that of two nations—the United States and Great Britain. The decision to limit the literature was not made lightly but was one made out of pragmatism and based on analytical similarities found in the secondary literature between the experiences of Billy Yank / Johnny Reb and Tommy Atkins. Unlike the German and French armies, the British army was a small volunteer professional force at the start of the Great War.[6] The first two years of war brought mass volunteering within local regiments that were organized in battalions of just over a thousand men each.[7] Within British New Army battalions early in the war, many men served together were from the same communities. As was the case for Civil War regiments, once attrition ground these battalions down, the British government instituted conscription, though with a different system than in the American Civil War. Within British New Army battalions early in the war, many men who served together who were from the same communities. British and Civil War soldiers faced material and physical hardships of life at the front, were scarred by their experiences, and learned the value of comradeship and the importance of coping mechanisms to maintain their morale in the face of fear and loss over four years of war.[8]

Once soldiers of both armies returned home after years of service, they experienced a similar process of veteran readjustment. Both British veterans of the Great War and American veterans of the Civil War struggled in their homecoming, experienced disillusionment and alienation from their prewar lives, and struggled mentally and physically with their war wounds. Both nations—the federal and state governments in the United States and the British government—had never dealt with such a large number of veterans before; this created problems surrounding pensions

and the care of those who survived and believed a grateful nation owed them for their sacrifice. Especially for families who lost a loved one or for soldiers who returned disabled, the burdens of war continued for decades afterward and created a new relationship between citizens and the state. "Citizen soldiers snatched from the midst of life generated obligations for a nation defining its purposes and polity through military struggle," writes Drew Gilpin Faust, a statement that could easily be about the Great War as it is about the Civil War.[9] For both Civil War and Great War veterans, the struggle over the meaning of their sacrifice continued afterward.

■ In the last fifty years, in the fields of Civil War–era studies and of First World War studies there have been significant changes in emphasis and method, broadening each field considerably. Building on the foundations of the new social history, Civil War historians moved into something of a "golden age" of revisionism after the Vietnam War. Historians writing in the wake of the 1960s revisited the common soldier experience of the Civil War and developed new interpretations, challenging the old heroism, romanticism, and sentimental gossamer surrounding Civil War soldiers and including the important contribution of African American soldiers.[10] The legacy of Vietnam also brought to the forefront questions about soldier readjustment and mental health, especially after the clinical diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in 1980.[11] The new emphasis on trauma has helped Civil War historians make comparisons with other fields as well as engage with contemporary veterans' issues. Feeding into this reevaluation of Civil War soldiers' experiences is the so-called dark turn within the field, which has led to important work pushing back against the romanticism of combat experience, the myth of reconciliation, and the continuing difficulties in assessing the war's legacy in terms of racial and social justice. The fairly recent emphasis on soldier suffering and anti-romanticism makes the topic of veterans a fertile field to till.[12]

The field of First World War Studies, too, experienced a turn in revisionist scholarship after the 1960s. Perhaps the most popular work, the one that "inspired an entire generation of scholars interested in literary and cultural questions," was Paul Fussell's *The Great War in Modern Memory*.[13] The work also created controversy, as historians have struggled to reconcile Fussell's narrative of cultural disillusionment with the war's meaningfulness to the generation that survived its carnage.[14] Unlike in the field of Civil War–era studies, the cultural turn in First World War studies since the 1990s accepts the darker aspects of the war's horror but also pushes back against a generational narrative of victimization.[15] Initially led by military historians, this new interpretation emphasizes that the war's

meaningfulness to its generation has been forgotten, mired and muddied by futility narratives and interpretations of the war's pathos. This work has influenced literary historians, psychologists, and gender historians interested in complicating the history of the war—essentially attempting to understand why men and women gave their lives, youths, and bodies to their nation and empire; how they coped with battle, and how they interpreted their experiences afterward. This interpretation, if it can be summarized neatly, emphasizes understanding the motives of the war's participants from within their own cultural context and to muddying the waters of convenient soldier stereotypes.

In both fields, contentious debates have benefited from a wider tent approach to historiography. Certainly, the recent emphasis on cultural history and the increase in interdisciplinary scholarship has created new paths of inquiry. Both fields have seen major anniversaries in the last five years—the sesquicentennial of the Civil War and the centennial of the Great War—which led to a predicable boom of public interest. The anniversaries also revealed the dissonance between academic and public interpretations of the wars. Certainly, the anniversaries falling within a decade in which the United States and Great Britain were fighting two wars abroad, in Afghanistan and Iraq, brought veterans' health issues to the forefront. Similar to the new revisionism post-Vietnam, the wealth of scholarship interested in veterans of the last ten years reveals that there is much work being done on both of these wars that reflects a wider political and social conversation about the impact and memory of war.

■ For veterans of both the Civil War and the Great War, the magnitude and uniqueness of their military experiences were powerfully predominant. Veterans' postwar identities were forever linked to a war unlike anything their societies had known; in each case, they had experienced violence that grew beyond their expectations of brutal campaign life and combat. Veterans of both wars knew that their experiences created bonds that separated them from society. Oliver Wendell Holmes prefaced his most famous phrase with the claim that "the generation that carried on the war has been set apart by its experiences."[16] Forty-five years after Holmes described the war generation's youthful uniqueness and "hearts touched with fire," Charles Carrington, a veteran of the Somme and Passchendaele, wrote, "The generation of young men who were soldiers before their characters had been formed . . . is conscious of the distinction, for the war made them what they are." That sense of difference—distinctiveness and exceptionalism within society—resonated with both veterans of Gettysburg and of the Somme. Holmes would have no doubt agreed with Carrington that

soldiers regardless of cause or country "have an inner life in common . . . they are 'illuminati.'"[17]

Civil War historians have emphasized the distinction of the war generation and its influence on a Gilded Age society that sought both to commemorate the war and to move on from it. James Marten writes of the ubiquity of veterans who turned out for parades or dedications and were an important part of American civic and social life. Similar to the influence of veterans of the Second World War, he explains, "they were the most common and most easily understood members of the nineteenth century's 'Greatest Generation.'" Marten indicates that veterans relied on each other for "respect and support" and, though his work drifts darkly into the struggles of many men who felt alienated from society, he suggests that over time the majority of veterans created "a heroic identity that transcended ordinary ways of being a man."[18] Marten's work asserts a distinct generational identity both North and South, an argument echoed by others.[19] Over time, Gilded Age civilians stereotyped veterans as either heroes or freeloading hard cases, although the latter image dissipated slightly by the Spanish-American War.[20] For those who suffered "honorable scars"—the maimed and mutilated men who survived into the postwar period—a newfound heroic identity emerged through suffering.[21] And though thousands of men found their service deeply traumatizing, as Paul Cimbala argues, "for most veterans . . . their service had meaning, thus making it honorable in its memory, if not glorious, at least bearable."[22]

Civil War historians have also recognized that demobilized soldiers were important voices and symbols within postwar society. Veterans embodied a collective reminder of both the causes and the consequences of violence, but they did not share the same voice. Civil War veterans—North and South—clung to their respective causes and found little common ground. Recent research on veterans pushes back against David Blight's argument in *Race and Reunion* to indicate that Union and Confederate veterans developed their own myths and justifications and failed to reconcile their wartime differences even into the twentieth century.[23] Caroline Janney's *Remembering the Civil War* emphasizes that though the nation remained reunited, it did so with considerable animus. She writes of veterans in the 1890s, "As they had done since the 1860s, the majority adamantly defended their own cause as righteous and just while refuting their opponent as without merit."[24] Janney demonstrates that former foes remained such in peace and that the concept of reunion was not the same as a nation willing to reconcile its differences. In *Across the Bloody Chasm,* M. Keith Harris argues that veterans preserved and protected their causes and continued to justify their service afterward; they gave lip service to reconciliation but always

understood it to be conditional.[25] Barbara Gannon's *The Won Cause* shows that white northern veterans did not uniformly reject African American veterans, but instead both black and white Grand Army of the Republic members marched in solidarity because they believed in the righteousness of the war's outcome.[26] The war generation—North and South, black and white—vehemently divided into the camps of victor and vanquished, each emphasizing its own moral justification for fighting and further exacerbating existing sectional divides. For men who had witnessed or participated in atrocities and who deeply hated their foe, there was little sense of sentimental reconciliation. As Harris writes pithily, "as each side asserted moral supremacy in war, so too did they claim it in peace."[27]

The wealth of Civil War scholarship on veterans has several transferable approaches for scholars of later wars. Civil War scholars have done foundational research on veterans' roles in creating communities both within and apart from Gilded Age society as well as a distinctive culture of advocacy for rights and pensions.[28] Though Great War historians such as Niall Barr and Deborah Cohen have trodden some of this ground by working on veterans' organizations and pensions/advocacy, there is still much work to be done.[29] Similarly, Alison Fell's work on female veterans in Britain and France has expanded the definition of the serviceperson in the postwar period.[30] Yet, in a wider sense, Civil War historians have been able to contextualize the role of veterans more comprehensively in society. They have also linked the debates held by veterans over the causes and conduct of the war to show that wartime grievances carried over into the postwar period, shaping ideas of nationhood.[31] Though the specter of the Great War haunted the interwar period, historians, with a few notable exceptions, have only fairly recently begun to delve into the ways veterans used their experiences to shape the postwar world.

Another approach used by Civil War historians that offers a provocative application for scholars of later wars is found in the dark turn historiography, which has emphasized the brutal realities of homecoming for those emotionally or physically scarred by the war. Veterans' scholarship is more than just old soldier clubs and pensions; it is also about how former servicemen found ways to function—or, crucially, did not—in their postwar societies. Certainly, the horrors of the Great War are widely known, and there is no shortage of dark history in the literature of soldier experiences. Yet, the horrors of surviving the war and living with physical and mental wounds for decades afterward remains more of an enigma and certainly deserves more rigorous scholarship that moves beyond stereotypes of veteran trauma.[32] Though controversial in their conclusions, Civil War historians working in the subfield of veteran homecoming—including

such grim but necessary subjects as depression and suicide—offer tangible models for Great War scholars of how important it is to investigate those whose war experiences failed to end at the front.[33]

One of the more obvious ways the literatures of both wars overlap but do not engage with each other concerns the role of the veteran in creating postwar myths of service. For the defeated in particular, these myths provided a way to grieve while at the same time protecting masculinities undercut by surrender. In the case of the American South, the Lost Cause became the tonic to assuage northern notions of moral vindication. In Weimar Germany, a very different legend emerged from returned soldiers, the stab-in-the-back myths (*Dolchstoßlegenden*) that blamed civilians, socialists, Jews, and politicians for German defeat.[34] Though each legend had its own specific context, they both functioned as politically toxic fabrications perpetuated by veterans who were reeling defiantly in defeat and were unhappy with the direction of their societies afterward.

Though both fields approach postwar legends and their violent legacies through dissecting the mythologies—in the case of the Civil War, laboriously so—there has not been much scholarly overlap concerning postwar violence. George Mosse's work serves as a potential methodological model for linking the two historiographies. Mosse demonstrates that the Great War was both a deeply traumatic but also a sacred event for the "front" generation. He writes of veterans balancing seemingly contradictory feelings in ways easily understood by those studying Civil War soldiers: "They were often torn between their memory of the horror of war and its glory: it had been a time when their lives had taken on new meaning as they performed the sacred task of defending the nation." Especially for defeated soldiers, the "myth of the war experience," essentially the way the brutal reality of serving in the trenches was repurposed as a spiritual and sacred event that justified the cause of the defeated and helped to "displace the reality of war."[35]

Mosse's approach is similar to those of Civil War memory scholars, particularly because it places emphasis on postwar grieving and the "cult of the fallen soldier." David Blight uses this same terminology to describe the hold the war dead had over Gilded Age society, describing the cult of the fallen as a "nineteenth-century manly ideal of heroism."[36] That sense of mournful heroism and the hold of the fallen over veterans helped draw veterans toward one another, extending wartime comradeship into the postwar period. Brian Matthew Jordan's work on Union veterans powerfully demonstrates that men who lived "in the shadow of the dead" also were caring for one another.[37] Alienated from civilians who grew impatient with their sufferings, veterans turned to one another for help, dutifully seeing

the bonds of comradeship that were forged at the front extended into the decades of peace afterward. The Confederate veteran faced many different difficulties upon homecoming, but in defeat he created bonds through the Lost Cause, which defiantly served as an affront to Union magnanimity. As in post–First World War Germany, violence was part of this story; in his *Veterans North and South*, Paul Cimbala indicates that "war had confirmed in the minds of veterans an idea rooted in their antebellum lives: violence had a useful and important purpose in maintaining the Southern way of life."[38] Service had made some men more comfortable with political violence as a tool to exert racial superiority during Reconstruction and Jim Crow eras.

Clearly, historians of both wars are striking similar notes on the subject of veterans' homecoming and the shaping of the eras to follow, with Civil War historians providing a host of provocative questions and new approaches to understanding veteranhood that, if not completely transferable, at least push other fields to think about veterans more comprehensively. In particular, Civil War historians have labored to create a complex and messy panoramic of veteran homecoming, where the history has moved from the tangible and traditional sources of memorialization—monuments, memorial observances, and memoirs—to remember those forgotten, marginalized, and whose lives were forever altered by the war.

■ Rebecca West's novel *The Return of the Soldier* (1918) portrays a British officer suffering from shell shock. To West, the condition was brought by a new sinister age of industrialized war. Jenny, the story's narrator, poses a rhetorical question: "Why had modern life brought forth these horrors, which made the old tragedies seem no more than nursery-shows."[39] To Jenny, the new horror was mental illness caused by the "new" types of warfare seen on the western front. High explosive shells, gas, air bombardment, and, perhaps beyond anything else, the fear of letting down their communities, comrades, and manly codes of conduct, contributed to men's madness.

Of course, West's modern "horror" was not new at all. A number of Civil War–era women struggled as Jenny did with relatives fighting mental illness caused by war trauma. Men entered both conflicts from cultures that had expectations of courage and heroism. In both conflicts, men's mettle was tested by metal; they felt fear, struggled physically and mentally to meet the challenges of campaign and battle, and then had to reconcile their violent memories with a life of peace. And as war generations, both Civil War and First World War veterans defined their experiences by what happened to them at the front. In the words of Samuel Hynes, "no man

goes through a war without being changed by it, and in fundamental ways." To Hynes, what war does to people is just as important as what they do in war.[40]

War brings suffering, and suffering is an important part of veteran identity. To be a veteran is not just to be a part of a fraternal culture. It is to acknowledge in others the mutual experiences of hardship, boredom, loneliness, fear, and, for some, grievous physical and/or psychological wounds. Suffering is universal in war, but it is a culturally constructed condition; due to its subtleties and its differing social meanings, it requires analytical and contextual caution. Within that cultural construct, there are variations depending on the motivations of the person: some show their suffering to prove their manliness and patriotism, some to show a sense of reluctant duty, and some do not show it at all. To serve is to suffer; to survive is to reconcile a way of living with that suffering.

Though all who fight witness and participate in traumatic events, not all are traumatized by their experiences. Even after correcting for gross underreporting and misdiagnosis, in both the Civil War and First World War a minority of soldiers had what would now be considered diagnosable psychological disabilities, ranging from 4 percent to more than 25 percent of men who served.[41] Though historians are right to question the diagnoses and reports by army medical officers, there are certainly many other methodological problems in diagnosing people in the past with metal disorders, even though there might be evidence to point to it.[42] Is it possible, or prudent, to take a disease in the present—one that has social stigma or a cultural meaning—and read that into a body of limited source materials from the past? Or is it more prudent for historians to try to understand traumatized soldiers on their own terms, building a context of medical diagnosis and treatment from *within* the period of study rather than imposing our own views, which come with no shortage of moral justifications and political beliefs, on the subject in the past?[43] Civil War and Great War historians struggle with both of these questions when we consider the ways men write about their suffering. Though there are differences, there are also some ways the fields can learn from one another's approaches to psychological trauma.

The Vietnam War changed the way Civil War historians saw the common soldier. Gerald Linderman's *Embattled Courage* created a problematic universal narrative of hardening, disillusionment, and alienation that would have been recognizable to any Vietnam veteran (or First World War veteran) alive when the book was released in 1987.[44] Linderman's Civil War soldiers found the central value of their prewar lives—courage—was not enough to sustain them on the battlefield once the brutality of service

tested that value. As courage is deeply tied to masculinity, disillusionment cut men to the core of their gender identities. Following Linderman, Eric Dean's controversial *Shook over Hell* saw similarities between Civil War soldiers' trauma and that of Vietnam veterans.[45] Other scholars have picked up this mantle and argued that Civil War soldiers suffered from the same types of trauma as soldiers returning home from Iraq and Afghanistan. Indeed, the dark turn of Civil War–era studies has focused intently on men who collapsed under the stress of their suffering and then led disenchanted, if not broken, postwar lives. Certainly, the sense of fragile and disappointed homecoming contributed to the suffering of Civil War veterans. Both James Marten and Brian Jordan paint a portrait of pain, loss, and uncaring support systems that is based on strong evidence that there were many veterans who were deeply scarred by their service.[46] Their works build on the insights of Linderman and Dean, but contextualize the veteran more thoroughly within Gilded Age society. They expand our understanding of how nineteenth-century people dealt with such a large group of wounded men, as well as how wounded men struggled to rejoin a society that was keen to move on from the war.

Dean's emphasis on PTSD is problematic for many. Of course, there was no clinical criteria for PTSD in the nineteenth century and cultural determinants are essential factors in understanding trauma. The work of a team of historians and psychologists in Britain led by Simon Wessely and Edgar Jones demonstrates that the symptoms of PTSD are not the same as the symptoms recorded by medical professionals in past wars; as such they advocate much caution in diagnosing people using clinical criteria from the present in the past.[47] Yet, as Diane Somerville and David Silkenat's work indicates, veterans clearly suffered from depression, despair, and self-destructive behavior, and the temptation to label soldiers with PTSD is a way to deromanticize the experiences of Civil War soldiers while also making their suffering empathetically familiar in our present society.[48]

The debate over Civil War PTSD is both healthy and distracting. Does it matter whether Civil War soldiers fit the clinical criteria of PTSD if scholars can agree that they suffered and faced trauma similar to soldiers at Waterloo, Antietam, Ypres, and the Ardennes? Or is the fact that they continued to suffer within a culture that did not understand, accept, or value psychoanalysis the same way that we do now a more compelling point? Frances Clarke's work is revealing, as she demonstrates that within the nineteenth century, suffering was understood as a redemptive virtue. Rather than soldiers minimizing their pain, Victorians saw pain as an indication of humanity and suffering as an inspirational way of proving one's Christian morality. Amputees, or at least some of them, did not feel a loss

of masculinity but instead saw their wounds as honorable scars; those who died painfully were comforted by the fact that they were made exceptional—and exceptionally close to God—by their suffering. Clarke emphasizes that the Victorian culture of sentiment was beneficial for a society confronting the realities of mutilation and mass death. Of course, her work also reveals that these sentiments faded by the end of the century as American society entered a "more secular cutthroat age."[49] Clarke's work demonstrates the vast differences between how people in the past viewed their emotions and how we do and cautions against making presentist assumptions based on different cultural contexts for understanding suffering.

The wealth of discussion on soldier experiences and mental health in First World War history may offer some insights for Civil War historians debating the issue of PTSD.[50] For decades, First World War historians have worked to contextualize shell shock and examine how the disease affected wartime and postwar lives. Though shell shock had varying symptoms and inconsistent forms of classification at first, as the war went on it became a generally accepted disorder among other mental disabilities diagnosed.[51] Especially in its public memory, the Great War has become a story of mental anguish because of the new disorder's use as convenient shorthand for wartime trauma, but shell shock is only part of the story of men's emotional health in the war.

As Jay Winter indicates in his extensive work on this subject, the shell shock diagnosis was not just a medical phenomenon, it was also a cultural means of understanding war-wracked society. "Shell shock," he writes "became a metaphor for the nature of industrialized warfare, a term which suggests the corrosive force of the 1914–1918 conflict *tout court,* and in peculiarly compelling ways."[52] The two sides of the coin are first, the diagnosis and treatment of the condition during the war, and second, the way the condition influenced society afterward. The latter might seem an esoteric point, but for Britons who lived through the Great War, the social shock of enduring a conflict like no other within their history reached from the trenches to the streets of every village in the nation. Shell shock was an accepted metaphor for what had happened to a people traumatized by war.

Great War historians have written extensively on the medical aspects of the disorder; however, its wider meaning for soldiers and veterans has been the subject of scholarship particularly applicable to those in the field of Civil War–era studies. Gender studies has proven especially important to understanding the way the war challenged, and crucially *changed*, definitions of manhood and heroism. [53] Though shell shock is predominant in the literature on First World War mental health, the condition was not the most common one that soldiers had during the war. Like their Civil

War counterparts, most men who fought in the trenches were not mentally disabled by service, though it might scarred them. Most learned to adapt to hardship and developed coping mechanisms to aid in their emotional resiliency.[54] Most went on to live well-adjusted postwar lives and were able to manage the trauma they lived through. In First World War scholarship, the emphasis, particularly of the last ten years, concerns both the men who collapsed under the stress of battle and those who learned to cope with the horrible conditions of the front. The Great War led many men to long-term emotional suffering, but it also led to a redefinition of heroic masculinity based on notions of duty and the close bonds of comradeship.[55] Men at the front could express feelings of fear without feeling like their masculinity was forfeited. In fact, to have served and suffered was an important part of their character and masculine identity, one that remained prominent in their lives afterward as they commemorated their service.

Just as veterans contextualized their service in both wars, the ways they understood their suffering were different but still reflected an underlying acceptance and overwhelming evidence of the trauma of war. The great difference is, of course, within the medical/psychological advancements made after the Civil War that allowed for diseases of the mind to be diagnosed and treated along with those of the body. If ever there is opportunity for collaboration between scholars of each field, it is in wrestling with the question of war trauma and the appropriate and ethical ways for historians to treat subjects of the past in their interrogations. Great War historians have labored over the cultural contexts of understanding mental illness within the period of the war. One of their conclusions is that there is much more to First World War mental health than shell shock; men reacted to trauma in many ways and along a broad spectrum, but most who fought continued to endure. In a similar way, the Civil War was a deeply traumatic event for its generation, but one that does not have "shell shock" or "PTSD" to define its mental suffering. Similar to their Great War descendants, Civil War soldiers suffered through the war utilizing a wide variety of means— coping mechanisms—to endure. There is clearly much more work to be done in both fields in the ways we discuss suffering within the cultural contexts of each war generation, which lived a mere fifty years apart.

■ In 1969, the historian Guy Chapman missed his first battalion reunion dinner in forty-one years.[56] Chapman was an eighty-year-old veteran of the Thirteenth Battalion Royal Fusiliers who remained both physically and mentally affected by his service in the Great War. Yet, being a "a kind of survivor" was a source of pride for him. "To the years between 1914 and 1918 I owe everything of lasting value in my make-up," he wrote. "For any

cost I paid in physical and mental vigour they gave me back a supreme fulfillment I should never have otherwise have had."[57]

Fulfillment is a curious and complicated word for the veteran, especially one who suffered from the strains of war over the course of a long life in peace. "It is easy to see why men remember their wars," writes Samuel Hynes. "For most men who fight, war is their one contact with the world of great doings."[58] That contact with "great doings"—a sense of being a part of history, an agent in its development—is one of the most important martial virtues held by veterans: comradeship based on a shared sense of service, suffering, and survival. Oliver Wendell Holmes, writing nearly a century before Chapman, wrote of his own regimental dinner as a sacred rite:

> But as surely as this day comes round we are in the presence of the dead. For one hour, twice a year at least—at the regimental dinner, where the ghosts sit at table more numerous than the living, and on this day when we decorate their graves—the dead come back and live with us. I see them now, more than I can number, as once I saw them on this earth. They are the same bright figures, or their counterparts, that come also before your eyes; and when I speak of those who were my brothers, the same words describe yours.[59]

for the veteran, remembering was a means of not only recalling events and people from the past but also reinvigorating those memories and giving them added purpose.

Chapman and Holmes served in different wars but recalled their service in similar ways. It would be easy to dismiss them as old men with sentimentalist inclinations; but to do so would be a disservice to the important role veterans have in preserving the memories of their wars through commemoration, reunions, and artistic expression. To revisit war experiences is to pay tribute to memory and the bonds formed in service; these carry over as soldiers join another martial cohort through their survival. With such large numbers of men and women affected by each war, the lasting cultural imprint, the legacy of each conflict was significantly influenced by veterans.

Civil War and Great War veterans were agents of memory through writing and in participating in public memorialization of their fallen comrades. Each is a tangible symbol that imprinted on the public memory of the conflicts for decades to follow. The emphasis here on tangibility comes from Jay Winter's notion that "memory" is a term that needs a degree of grounding to be understood. He writes, "To privilege 'remembrance' is to insist on specifying agency on answering the question who remembers, when, where, and how?"[60] In the United States and Great Britain, the Civil

War and First World War saw the largest boom of memorialization in each nation's history. At the forefront of acts of remembrance were veterans, their families, and the surviving families of the war dead.

Civil War and Great War veterans were highly literate. The nineteenth century witnessed a tremendous boom in publishing largely due to increased literacy, cheap paper, and better education. This new book market reflected a dominant culture of sensibility in which readers wanted to learn about war in all its aspects—especially the way war felt to those who fought.[61] Each war saw a subsequent publishing boom of various genres. Veterans wrote memoirs, poems, regimental histories, short stories, and historical accounts. Though similar in terms of publishing booms, there is significant difference in how the literature of each war has affected its social memory. For the most part, Civil War literature written during the Gilded Age remains a field of study important to literary scholars and historians of the nineteenth century interested in print culture from that period.[62] This literature was no doubt influential to those in the time period, but it has not had the same cultural impact over a long term as the literature of the Great War.[63] This is perhaps because of changing feelings of public sentiment toward the redemptive suffering of the war generation.[64] Yet, as Drew Faust argues, some Civil War authors clearly foreshadow the great war literature to come later.[65]

The veteran/writers of the Great War—in the British case the war poets—have had perhaps the most significant impact on the war's public memory.[66] The Great War's literature has fed into the "mud, blood, and poppycock" school of interpretation, emphasizing the war's meaninglessness and suffering over its actual history and the broader interpretations of veterans' reflections on their experiences.[67] Though the Great War generation is widely known for war poets and disillusioned novelists, recent work by cultural historians, military historians, and literary scholars has attempted to refine that view. This work has largely been spearheaded by British scholars interested in pushing back against Paul Fussell's interpretations in *The Great War and Modern Memory*.[68] Recent work on middlebrow literature, publishing history, and war memoirists shows that both patriotic and pessimistic war literature sold well in the 1920s and that, to some degree, the way even the most jaded of war poets felt about their experiences is only one side of the story. The war generation as a whole was more intent on showing that their sacrifices had meaning than on embracing the futility of war.[69] By taking a larger sampling of veterans' literature and trying to understand the ways veterans from many different perspectives—theaters of war, experiential variations, political beliefs, gender, et cetera—historians have shown how veterans remembered their

wars differently but still contributed to the idea of war "memory." In short, through writing and publishing, veterans have helped frame the notion of the war's social and cultural memory even to the present day.

Though the Civil War's written legacy might not match that of the Great War in terms of its long-term cultural influence and its public memory, the war did create a deluge of books and periodical publications by veterans.[70] The war's literature helped subsequent generations understand the conflict as well as rationalize the political ramifications of both war and peace. Veterans were avid writers, and their work was undoubtedly influential in its time, particularly in the former Confederacy, where the Lost Cause was in part born and certainly widely propagated through print.[71] Veterans' literature clearly had an impact on the way the public saw the image of the veteran and the experience of war in the Gilded Age. To some degree, Civil War historians can benefit from the contentious debates in First World War history over the effect of war literature on framing perceptions of the war, especially as such a wealth of print culture emerged that defended, justified, and attempted to place meaning on what was, in a way similar to the Great War, a brutal experience for American society. Especially as the Civil War—like the Great War—continues to inspire imaginative work in abundance, more work could be done on the lasting impact of veterans on the war's representations and how they influenced the social memory of the conflict.

Civil War and Great War scholarship reveal similar connections in how survivors remembered and memorialized "their" wars. In both conflicts, civilians and veterans became integral to remembering the war dead. Civil War scholarship is robust on this subject, in particular on Confederate cemeteries and iconography. Southern women, through both the Ladies Memorial Associations and the United Daughters of the Confederacy, created a cult of the fallen with profound political ramifications.[72] Their work was about not just burying the dead but also keeping the fire of the cause alight. For Union veterans, regimental monuments at battlefields or in cities and towns further bound the bonds of comradeship with the mortar of memory. Placing of a memorial on the site of a great victory, such as Gettysburg, was a way to show future generations that veterans' sacrifice for the cause in which they believed would be preserved. Similarly, erecting a Confederate monument in a strategic location became an act of defiance. Civil War monuments remain a reminder of political, racial, and sectional division that challenges the great myth of reconciliation.[73]

Historians have noted, however, that Great War veterans' memorials were different. Especially in Britain, monuments to the fallen litter nearly

every village and plaques adorn most churches. The great monuments at Thiepval on the Somme and the Menin Gate at Ypres combined are adorned with the names of 120,000 men whose bodies were never identified. This is to say not that these memorials are not political but that as works of art they provoked different feelings, especially during public rituals. Alex King writes that though many people participated in memorial activities in the interwar period, "they understood what they were doing in widely different ways."[74] For Jay Winter, the European memorials erected after 1918 had, however, some general characteristics. By and large, they were focused on grief. "They were built as places where people could mourn. And be seen to mourn. Their ritual significance has often been obscured by their political symbolism which, now that the moment of mourning has long passed, is all we can see." Though there is considerable debate over the politics of war memorialization, the fact remains that the overall emphasis on war memorialization after the Great War focused on sadness and loss.[75]

Veterans of both wars clearly affected the social memory of their conflicts. In both cases, they wrote in abundance of their experiences, hoping to shape the memory of war. Civil War veterans' writings remain an area in which there could be more work. In this aspect, the Great War's emphasis on war writing and artistic representations of the conflict could prove useful, especially in the ways historians have pushed back against literary influencing public perceptions of the conflicts. Similarly, some useful comparative work could be done between veterans of both wars and the physical memorials they dedicated. Stephen Trout notes that American monuments to the Great War were caught in a stage "betwixt and between" the Civil War model and new interpretations on war memorialization. In the 1920s there was some confusion as to how to remember the most recent war, in part, because of the Civil War's legacy. Across America, town notables dedicated heroic doughboy statues, while at the same time, a nation mourned the Unknown Soldier in Arlington.[76] The Civil War clearly influenced both types of memorialization.

■ Veterans of the Civil War and the Great War had vastly different experiences, but the narrative of veteranhood constructed by historians has many similarities. For the returning veterans of both wars, peace came with a new adjustment period. Veterans looked to their own for support, care, and validation. They wrote of their experiences and memorialized their dead comrades. They learned to live with wounds both physical and mental. They survived—most of them—despite their suffering and despite the state failing to give them their expected rewards for service. They created

their own histories and in the process developed their own myths, which complicated notions of victory and defeat. As they aged, they remembered their wars with increasing vigor and never forgot their comrades. Though there are many problems in universalizing veteran experiences, the ways historians approach the subject of veterans within the modern period reveals a host of similarities.

This is understandable. Historians are mostly bound to our sources; in both conflicts, we work within the same memorial space created by the leaves of printed paper and stone memorials left behind by those whose survival gave us the tools to understand war. The implicit value in comparison is not necessarily that historians of either area will gain direct links between the two wars and their legacy issues. To do so would be superficial; each conflict has its own context, in which our job is to add nuance and not to generalize too broadly. The value, instead, is in the breaking down of the chronological and geographical barriers of the existing research to broaden our understanding of the veteran in modern history and to find kinship through comparison.

NOTES

1. The article's title comes from William Shakespeare, "Macbeth," in *The New Cambridge Shakespeare*, ed. A. R. Braunmuller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 118. "Hurlyburly" is defined here as "turmoil, tumult, especially of rebellion or insurrection." "Liberty Parade Great Success," *Gettysburg Times*, May 6, 1918.

2. It is worth noting that fifty years is the same length of time as separates the Vietnam War and the current conflicts in the War on Terror.

3. Some subfields within the subfields are demobilization and homecoming, pensions and the economics of state support, veterans' organizations and reunions, postwar violence and radicalization, trauma and post-traumatic stress disorder, and battlefield tourism.

4. Robert Wohl's groundbreaking work *The Generation of 1914* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979) remains the central text for understanding the idea of a "war generation" in a late-nineteenth / early twentieth-century context.

5. "Modern period" here means "post-1789."

6. One of the best single-volume books on the British army on the western front is Richard Holmes's *Tommy: The British Soldier on the Western Front, 1914–1918* (London: HarperCollins, 2004).

7. See Peter Simkins, *Kitchener's Army: The Raising of the New Armies 1914–1916* (Barnsley, UK: Pen & Sword, 2007). For Civil War counterparts, see James M. McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades: Why Men Fought in the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998) and Joseph Glatthaar, *General Lee's Army: From Victory to Collapse* (New York: Free Press, 2008).

8. For morale, coping, and the emotional toll of battle, see Alexander Watson, *Enduring the Great War: Combat, Morale, and Collapse in the German and British Armies, 1914–1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades*, chapter 12.

9. Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Vintage, 2008), xv.

10. Gerald Linderman, *Embattled Courage: The Experience of Combat in the American Civil War* (New York: Free Press, 1987). Since Linderman, many others have either supported his sentiments or pushed back against his claims. Of the latter, see McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades,* and Earl Hess, *The Union Soldier in Battle: Enduring the Ordeal of Combat* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1997). For African American soldiers/veterans, see Donald Shaffer, *After the Glory: The Struggles of Black Civil War Veterans* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004), Richard Reid, *Freedom for Themselves: North Carolina's Black Civil War Soldiers in the Civil War Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), and Barbara Gannon, *The Won Cause: Black and White Comradeship in the Grand Army of the Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011).

11. Eric Dean, *Shook over Hell: Post-Traumatic Stress, Vietnam, and the Civil War* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997).

12. For discussions of the "dark" turn and the state of military history within the field, see Gary Gallagher and Kathryn Shively Meier, "Coming to Terms with Civil War Military History," *Journal of the Civil War Era* 4 (December 2014): 487–508; Earl J. Hess, "Where Do We Stand? A Critical Assessment of Civil War Studies in the Sesquicentennial Era," *Civil War History* 60 (December 2014): 371–403. For a pithy summary of the 'dark' literature and veterans, see Wayne Wei-siang Hsieh, "'Go to Your Gawd Like a Soldier": Transnational Reflections on Veteranhood," *Journal of the Civil War Era* 5 (December 2015): 531–32.

13. For a summary of First World War historiography, see Jay Winter and Antoine Prost, *The Great War in History: Debates and Controversies, 1914 to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), see esp. 27; Paul Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995). For a careful dissection of the work, see Robin Prior and Trevor Wilson, "Paul Fussell at War," *War in History* 1, no. 1 (1994): 63–80.

14. Jay Winter, *Remembering War and Winter, Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995); Janet Watson, *Fighting Different Wars: Experience, Memory, and the First World War in Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Adrian Gregory, *The Silence of Memory: Armistice Day, 1919–1946* (Oxford: Berg, 1994); and *The Last Great War: British Society and the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Rosa Marie Bracco, *Merchants of Hope: British Middlebrow Writers and the First World War, 1919–1939* (Oxford: Berg, 1993).

15. Brian Bond, *The Unquiet Western Front: Britain's Role in Literature and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Helen McCartney, "The First World War Soldier and His Contemporary Image in Britain," *International Affairs* 90, no.

2 (2014): 299–315; Gary Sheffield, *Forgotten Victory: The First World War—Myths and Realities* (London: Headline, 2001); Daniel Todman, *The Great War: Myth and Memory* (London: Continuum, 2005).

16. "Memorial Day," *Speeches by Oliver Wendell Holmes* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1896), 11.

17. C. E. Edmonds [Charles Carrington], *A Subaltern's War: Being a Memoir of the Great War from the Point of View of a Romantic Young Man, with Candid Accounts of Two Particular Battles, Written Shortly after They Occurred, and an Essay on Militarism* (London: Peter Davies, 1929), 192, 194.

18. James Marten, *Sing Not War: The Lives of Union and Confederate Veterans in Gilded Age America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011), 1, 246, 257.

19. Works that demonstrate this sense of generational exceptionalism include Linderman, *Embattled Courage*; Shaffer, *After the Glory*; Mitchell, *Civil War Soldiers*; Gannon, *The Won Cause;* Brian Matthew Jordan, *Marching Home: Union Veterans and Their Unending Civil War* (New York: Liveright, 2014); McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades*; Glatthaar, *General Lee's Army*.

20. Marten, *Sing Not War*, 246–47.

21. The term "honorable scars" is from Frances Clarke, *War Stories: Suffering and Sacrifice in the Civil War North* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), chap. 6.

22. Paul Cimbala, *Veterans North and South: The Transition from Soldier to Civilian after the American Civil War* (Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2015), xiii.

23. David Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001)

24. Caroline Janney, *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013), 161–62.

25. M. Keith Harris, *Across the Bloody Chasm: The Culture of Commemoration among Civil War Veterans* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2014), 2–4.

26. Barbara Gannon, *The Won Cause*, 5–7.

27. Harris, *Across the Bloody Chasm*, 16.

28. On pensions specifically, see Theda Skocpol, "America's First Social Security System: The Expansion of Benefits for Civil War Veterans," *Political Science Quarterly* 108, no. 1 (1993): 85–116; Megan McClintock, "Civil War Pensions and the Reconstruction of Union Families," *Journal of American History* 83 (September 1996): 456–80; Jeffrey Vogel, "Redefining Reconciliation: Confederate Veterans and the Southern Responses to Federal Civil War Pensions," *Civil War History* 51 (March 2005): 67–93; Larry Logue and Peter Blanck, "'Benefit of the Doubt': African-American Civil War Veterans and Pensions," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 38, no. 3 (2008): 377–399; and Dora Costa, "Pensions and Retirement among Black Union Army Veterans," *Journal of Economic History* 70, no. 3 (2010): 567–92.

29. Deborah Cohen, *The War Come Home: Disabled Veterans in Britain and Germany, 1914–1939* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001). Niall Barr, *The Lion and the Poppy: British Veterans, Politics, and Society, 1921–1939* (London: Praeger, 2005).

30. Alison Fell, *Women as Veterans in Britain and France after the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

31. Susan-Mary Grant's essay on reimagined communities is particularly rich on this subject. See Grant, "Reimagined Communities: Union Veterans and the Reconstruction of American Nationalism," *Nations and Nationalism* 14, no. 3 (2008): 498–529.

32. This is not to say that these subjects are completely neglected in the British historiography—or wider European historiography—but that there has not been the same emphasis on veterans and homecoming as on other subjects. There are some pragmatic reasons for this: the war ended only one hundred years ago and veterans lived well until the 1980s, some into this century, making the subject an awkward and difficult one for researchers struggling with the ethical implications of writing objectively about people within living memory.

33. Diane Sommerville, "'A Burden Too Heavy to Bear': War Trauma, Suicide, and Confederate Soldiers," *Civil War History* 59 (December 2013): 453–91; David Silkenat, *Moments of Despair* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011).

34. For more on the stab-in-the-back myth and Nazi propaganda, see James Diehl, "Victors or Victims? Disabled Veterans in the Third Reich," *Journal of Modern History* 59, no. 4 (1987): 705–36.

35. George Mosse, *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 6, 7.

36. Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 72.

37. Jordan, *Marching Home*, 72–73.

38. Cimbala, *Veterans North and South*, 96. For more on violence in the pre–Civil War South, see Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior of the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982)

39. Rebecca West, *The Return of the Soldier* (New York: Modern Library, 2004), 27.

40. Samuel Hynes, *The Soldiers' Tale*: *Bearing Witness to Modern War* (New York: Viking, 1997), 3.

41. Jay Winter estimates that a quarter of British soldiers in the Great War were invalided for psychological stress. Fiona Reid's work indicates that there are significant difficulties in reporting due to class, terminology of medical professionals, and varying interpretations of diagnosis. According to Alexander Watson, German records indicate a much lower number, around 4 percent. See Winter, *Remembering War*, 53; Fiona Reid, *Broken Men*: Shell Shock, Treatment, and Recovery in Britain, 1914-1930 (London: Continuum, 2010), 11–23; Watson, *Enduring the Great War*, 238–40. Civil War rates are far more elusive as to diagnosis; based on modern rates of occurrence, Paul Cimbala estimates 10 to 30 percent of Civil War soldiers likely suffered mental trauma. See Cimbala, *Veterans North and South*, 87.

42. Wayne Hsieh offers a strident response to the presentist impulse of historians to this question; see Hsieh, "Go to Your Gawd Like a Soldier," 554–56.

43. See Richard McNally, "Is PTSD a Transhistorical Phenomenon?" in *Culture and PTSD: Trauma in Global and Historical Perspective,* ed. Devon Hinton and Byron Good (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 117–34.

44. Linderman, *Embattled Courage.*

45. Dean, *Shook over Hell.*

46. Jordan, *Marching Home;* Marten, *Sing Not War.*

47. Edgar Jones et al., "Flashbacks and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder: The Genesis of a 20th-Century Diagnosis," *British Journal of Psychiatry* 182 (2003): 158–63.

48. Sommerville, "Burden Too Heavy to Bear," 453–91; Silkenat, *Moments of Despair.*

49. Frances Clarke, *War Stories: Suffering and Sacrifice in the Civil War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 53, 144–74, 177.

50. See Ben Shephard, *A War of Nerves: Soldiers and Psychiatrists, 1914–1994* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2000); Tracey Loughran, "Shell Shock, Trauma, and the First World War: The Making of a Diagnosis and Its Histories," *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 67 (January 2012): 94–119. Both provide summaries of shell shock, its diagnosis, and history.

51. Fiona Reid's work is insightful on the history of shell shock in Britain. See Reid, *Broken Men.* Also, the *Journal of Contemporary History* has an excellent special edition on the history and cultural legacy of the condition from an international perspective ("Shell Shock," ed. Jay Winter 35, no. 1 [2000]).

52. Jay Winter, "Shell-Shock and the Cultural History of the Great War," *Journal of Contemporary History* 35, no. 1 (2000): 8.

53. For some of this discussion, see Joanna Bourke, "Effeminacy, Ethnicity, and the End of Trauma: The Sufferings of 'Shell-Shocked' Men in Great Britain and Ireland, 1914–39," *Journal of Contemporary History* 35, no. 1 (2000): 57–69; Joanna Bourke, *Dismembering the Male: Men's Bodies, Britain, and the Great War* (London: Reaktion, 1999), 107–22; Tracey Loughran, "A Crisis of Masculinity? Re-Writing the history of Shell-Shock and Gender in First World War Britain," *History Compass* 11, no. 9 (2013): 727–38; Jessica Meyer, "Separating the Men from the Boys: Masculinity and Maturity in Understandings of Shell Shock in Britain," *Twentieth Century British History* 20, no. 1 (2009): 1–22; and Michael Roper, "Between the Psyche and the Social: Masculinity, Subjectivity, and the First World War Veteran in Britain," *Journal of Men's Studies* 15, no. 3 (2007): 251–70. Also, Michael Roper's *The Secret Battle: Emotional Survival in the Great War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010) demonstrates how important families were to the emotional survival of soldiers at the front.

54. Watson, *Enduring the Great War*, chapter 3. See also Jessica Meyer, *Men at War: Masculinity and the First World War in Britain* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), and Roper, *Secret Battle.*

55. Jessica Meyer, "'Gladder to Be Going out Than Afraid': Shellshock and Heroic Masculinity in Britain, 1914–1919," in *Uncovered fields: Perspectives in First World War Studies*, ed. Jenny Macleod and Pierre Purseigle (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 195–210.

56. Chapman was the former chair of international history at the University of Leeds. Prior, he had worked in the publishing industry. He served in both world wars, the first as an infantry officer and in the second as an instructor for the army. He wrote a war memoir, *A Passionate Prodigality* (London: Nicholson &Watson, 1933), as well as a longer autobiography, *A Kind of Survivor* (London: Gollancz, 1975).

57. Chapman, *Kind of Survivor*, 280.

58. Hynes, *Soldier's Tale*, 2.

59. Holmes, "Memorial Day," 5.

60. Winter, *Remembering War*, 3.

61. Yuval Harari, "Military Memoirs: A Historical Overview of the Genre" *War in History* 14, no. 3 (2007): 297.

62. Works surveying the cultural impact of the war include Stephen Cushman, *Belligerent Muse: Five Northern Writers and How they Shaped out Understanding of the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014); Alice Fahs, *The Imagined Civil War: Popular Literature of the North and South, 1861-1865* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001); Randall Fuller, *From Battlefields Rising: How the Civil War Transformed American Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Coleman Hutchison, ed., *A History of American Civil War Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); Timothy Sweet, ed., *Literary Cultures of the Civil War* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2016); and Edmond Wilson, *Patriotic Gore: Studies in the Literature of the American Civil War* (New York: Norton, 1994).

63. This is not to imply that there was not significant variety to veterans' books nor is it a statement of their quality. For a thorough study of Civil War veterans' writings within the context of the Gilded Age, see John Casey, *New Men: Reconstructing the Image of the Veteran in Late-Nineteenth Century Literature and Culture* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2010).

64. Clarke, *War Stories*, 177–80.

65. Faust, *Republic of Suffering*, 208.

66. For a survey of the influence of war poets on the British public, see Todman, *Great War*, chapter 5. The term "war poets" indicates those who wrote largely in opposition to the war or those who wrote on its grimness and futility.

67. This colorful phrase comes from Gordan Corrigan, whose book of the same name is a strident attempt to correct the record on the war's myths. Gordon Corrigan, *Mud, Blood, and Poppycock: Britain and the Great War* (London: Cassell, 2007)

68. These include the aforementioned Robin Prior, Trevor Wilson, and Gary Sheffield. Of literary or cultural historians they also include Bracco, *Merchants of Hope*; Vincent Trott, *Publishers, Readers, and the Great War*: *Literature and Memory since 1918* (London: Bloomsbury, 2018); and Ian Isherwood, *Remembering the Great War: Writing and Publishing the Experiences of World War I* (London: IB Tauris, 2017).

69. Hugh Cecil, *The Flower of Battle: How Britain Wrote the Great War* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1995).

70. Marten, *Sing Not War*, 73.

71. Gary Gallagher, "Jubal A. Early, the Lost Cause, and Civil War History: A Persistent Legacy," and Alan Nolan, "The Anatomy of a Myth, both in *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History*, ed. Gary Gallagher (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000), 35–53, 12–13.

72. See Karen Cox, *Dixie's Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2003);

and Caroline Janney, *Burying the Dead but Not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Association and the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008).

73. In addition to Cox's *Dixie's Daughters,* see LeeAnn Whites, "You Can't Change History by Moving a Rock," in *The Memory of the Civil War in American Culture,* ed. Alice Fahs and Joan Waugh (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 213–36; John Neff, *Honoring the Civil War Dead: Commemoration and the Problem of Reconciliation* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005).

74. Alex King, *Memorials of the Great War in Britain: The Symbolism of Remembrance* (Oxford: Berg, 1998), 7

75. Winter, *Sites of Memory*, 93, 94.

76. Stephen Trout, *On the Battlefield of Memory: The First World War and American Remembrance, 1919–1941* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2010), 108–9.