

Confederate Rage, Yankee Wrath: No Quarter in the Civil War, by George S. Burkhardt. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2007. xiii, 338 pp. Illustrations, maps, notes, bibliography, index. \$37.95 cloth.

Reviewer David Brodnax Sr. is associate professor of history at Trinity Christian College. He is the author of "‘Will They Fight? Ask the Enemy’: Iowa’s African American Regiment in the Civil War," *Annals of Iowa* (2007).

After the Battle of New Market Heights in September 1864, one Confederate soldier happily reported the massacre of African American soldiers, writing, "We killed in our front about a million dollars worth of niggers, at current prices" (178). This view of black soldiers as property unworthy of being taken prisoner is the focus of George Burkhardt’s *Confederate Rage, Yankee Wrath*, the culmination of 20 years of research on Civil War atrocities. Although many scholars and Civil War enthusiasts will already be familiar with Fort Pillow, Fort Wagner, and other interracial conflicts, Burkhardt has brought these events together in his book to show the "pervasive pattern" of violence against African American soldiers and their white officers, which "stemmed from Southerners’ common desire to defend and protect their heritage and society" (1). This pattern was made possible not only by the actions of southern politicians and soldiers, he argues, but also by the indifference of Northerners, who had ambivalent feelings about black soldiers and were unwilling to respond to their murder with the execution of captured Confederates.

A journalist by trade, Burkhardt draws primarily on military records and the writings of soldiers and politicians, including (among many quotes from Iowans) Samuel J. Kirkwood’s infamous statement: "When this war is over . . . I shall not have any regrets if it is found that a part of the dead are niggers and that all are not white men" (25). The research is remarkable, considering that Federal records on African American regiments are often incomplete, while many Confederate accounts either exaggerated or covered up the events. Burkhardt’s chronological, battle-by-battle account begins with a discussion of how both Northern and Southern whites felt about black enlistment and emancipation. For Confederates, he argues, these were apocalyptic changes that would destroy the South itself. Given their antebellum views on violence, slavery, and race, executing African American men who had dared to put on military uniforms and engage in manly combat was the only appropriate action; taking them prisoner was not an option. Even so, black troops were sometimes sold into slavery rather than murdered when they were captured in larger numbers; that, Burkhardt shows, was another manifestation of the Southern desire to maintain traditional racial dynamics in the midst of massive wartime

change. As the South became increasingly desperate towards the end of the war, white soldiers on both sides did begin to engage in “no quarter” conflict, although their shared racial, religious, and cultural heritage prevented this from becoming widespread.

Overall, Burkhardt has provided a comprehensive, well-written account of racial violence during the war, definitively showing that it was not random but rather the result of an intentional Southern policy. In his discussion of the Fort Pillow massacre, he argues that newly uncovered letters and diaries provide irrefutable proof that Nathan Bedford Forrest’s troops did in fact massacre black soldiers. Unfortunately, the value of that discussion is diminished by the failure to explain in the endnotes what those sources are or why they have become available after so many years. The excellent analysis of antebellum white racial attitudes also begs for more exploration of this same issue among black soldiers, who on several occasions retaliated in kind, and among Native American Confederates, who seemingly treated black troops much as their white allies did. These minor issues aside, *Confederate Rage, Yankee Wrath* is an essential addition to Civil War scholarship, recommended to anyone interested in that topic or more generally in the ways that race, class, and violence intersect.

History’s Shadow: Native Americans and Historical Consciousness in the Nineteenth Century, by Steven Conn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004. xii, 276 pp. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$35.00 cloth.

Reviewer Michael J. Sherfy is visiting assistant professor of history at Western Illinois University. His dissertation (University of Illinois, 2006) is “Narrating Black Hawk: Indian Wars, Memory, and Midwestern Identity.”

History’s Shadow, despite its subtitle, is not about Native Americans. Nor is it really about how Native American people came to be represented as “Indians.” It is instead an intellectual study of those who studied Indians and an examination of how, over the course of the nineteenth century, Native people were effectively removed from history—and contemporary relevance—and persisted in “the American mind” only as exemplars of an ancient past. Conn’s work, therefore, charts the trajectory of historical thinking about Indians until, by the end of the period he discusses, disciplinary experts had stripped Native people of history (a changing and dynamic past) and left them only with culture (something unchanging and timeless). That is, Conn explains, “Native Americans could very well have a past, but they did not, by and large, have a history. In this sense, Native Americans constituted history’s shadow” (6).