

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).

Conn begins by examining images of Indians in visual art, then shifts to the development and professionalization of academic disciplines: linguistics, archaeology, ethnology, and anthropology. His conclusion considers the development of “historical writing proper” in the United States and the assumptions that came to undergird the discipline in this country (including the privileging of written texts over other types of evidence and the dismissal of Native oral accounts as little more than myths). Obviously, such a broad and interdisciplinary approach makes it impossible for Conn to be comprehensive in his coverage. By including such a variety of intellectual pursuits, however, he clearly demonstrates that his central premise of Indian removal applies not only to historians, but to Americans across a wide intellectual spectrum.

At the heart of the book are three chapters on the development and institutionalization of academic disciplines. Each details the early years of a particular field and explains how its practitioners began by seeking to confirm biblical assumptions, came to adopt and employ scientific principles, and eventually embraced the study of the “Old World” as its mainstream. The study of Native American languages, archaeology, and culture was relegated to backwaters, too often ignored by the leaders in the field.

Conn’s discussion of how linguistics developed in the United States illustrates his approach. He tells us first of those early missionaries and traders who studied Native languages for very practical reasons. Later, learned amateurs and early professionals collected their grammars and vocabularies—and conducted fieldwork with living Native people—in hopes of finding connections between Native tongues and Old World languages. But once it became apparent that no connections existed between Ojibwe, Lakota, or Salish and Hebrew, Welsh, or Sanskrit, linguists lost interest. The public, interested in connecting the Americas to classical antiquity, did so as well. Leading American linguists began establishing reputations in the European-dominated academy, which demanded the study of Old World antiquity. The study of American languages fell out of linguistics and became part of anthropology—and only anthropology—by the end of the nineteenth century. The public, interested in the romance of ancient connections rather than mere migrations of Natives, paid little attention.

The same trajectory, Conn explains, can be found in American archaeology. His most interesting discussion concerns the mound builders, who stand “if not precisely as the greatest discovery of nineteenth-century American archaeology, then as its greatest invention” (121). The presence of mounds and complex artifacts posed a problem

in that, when compared to the “savagery” of Indians of the historical period, they challenged the notions of linear progress that underpinned American notions of history. To address this problem, experts peopled the Americas with a “lost race” — which both inspired feelings of pride in America’s ancient past and justified treatment of contemporary Native people. But once archaeologists applied scientific principles and rigor to their work, amateurs were excluded from the conversation, mound builders were recognized as fabrications, and Indians came to be viewed as belonging to a separate (and less interesting) historical trajectory than those who studied them.

As fascinating as this book is, it has some problems. Chief among these is Conn’s selection of examples. He effectively demonstrates his points, but he does so by idiosyncratically selecting those works that best fit his premise. Any art historian could cite works that confound his schema, and most linguists, archaeologists, historians, and anthropologists could provide dissonant examples from their own disciplines. Conn also fails to include Native scholars who operate within the fields he describes — and who, by their very presence, complicate this story of removal.

Nonetheless, Conn’s work is important. Despite exceptions, his premise rings true: For all the gains that have been made, Native people remain marginal to most historians and other scholars — and to most Americans as well. Conn’s work helps explain why and how this happened. Understanding this problem is the first step toward addressing it.

Gateway to the Northern Plains: Railroads and the Birth of Fargo and Moorhead, by Carroll Engelhardt. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007. xx, 366 pp. Illustrations, maps, tables, notes, index. \$29.95 cloth.

Reviewer Eric J. Morser teaches history at the University of Florida. His research and writing have focused on the relationship between business and government in nineteenth-century LaCrosse, Wisconsin.

In this thoroughly researched and panoramic book, historian Carroll Engelhardt explores the influence of railroads on North Dakota’s Twin Cities, Moorhead and Fargo, during the nineteenth century. In the book’s first half, Engelhardt examines how local boosters and railroad corporations, most notably the Northern Pacific, helped make the two cities commercial hubs on the Great Plains. Early boosters, such as Thomas Hawley Canfield of Moorhead and James B. Power of Fargo, realized that attracting railroads was key to urban prosperity. To that end, they negotiated with politicians, business leaders, and railroad managers to attract lines, which helped each city take root and blos-