Complicating this process were Native peoples' own narratives, which Cothran invites readers to grapple with through a history written by Toby Riddle's son Jeff and military pension requests presented by Klamath Basin Indians during the early twentieth century. The author alludes to but does not pursue another intriguing act of reinscription when he notes that there was "vandalism" of a cross marking the place where Major General Edward Canby was killed during peace negotiations (178).

Cothran reflects on the 1988 addition of a new memorial to the "victims of nineteenth-century U.S.-Indian violence in the Klamath Basin," as another moment in which Modoc people talked back to the dominant narrative even as it became more deeply embedded in popular consciousness. The National Park Service commissioned a plaque that Cothran sees as emblematic of the era's "liberal multiculturalism," paralleling the violence experienced by Indians and non-Indians during the Modoc War. It featured the names of all the people who died, Native or non-Native; combatants or non-combatants. "[B]y suggesting that 'we all pay the price' and that 'there are no true winners,'" argues Cothran, "the memorial normalizes the U.S. federal government's possession of a culturally, spiritually, and materially significant place and elides the fundamentally unequal nature of nineteenth-century U.S.-Indian violence and American settler colonialism writ large" (188).

Both *A Misplaced Massacre* and *Remembering the Modoc War* engage the challenges in forging collective memories, the dangers in attempts to reconcile the irreconcilable, the fallacy of healing open wounds, and the impossibility of bringing closure to living histories. In the wake of forgetting to remember Indigenous experiences, narratives, and ways of knowing, it is not enough to remember in the interest of forgetting. At Sand Creek and in the Klamath Basin, the authors amplify voices saying, "It's our collective past." "It's our shared suffering." "It's our equivalent pain," and "It's history." On all counts, we hear the riposte, "No, it isn't."

In the song "Hurt," the narrator self-inflicts pain hoping that it will "kill it all away" only to find that "I remember everything." Commemorative encounters with the violence of history and the history of violence suggest a similar dynamic. Kelman and Cothran take us into these difficult spaces without offering easy answers. Public commemorations of and historical knowledge production about violence do not offer final resolutions by killing pain or healing wounds—nor should they. *A Misplaced Massacre* and *Remembering the Modoc War* make important contributions to American Indian and Indigenous Studies, memory studies, and the history of the Civil War and Reconstruction.

NOTES

[1]Trent Reznor, "Hurt," Nine Inch Nails, *The Downward Spiral* (Interscope, 1994).

[2]Jerome A. Greene and Douglas Scott, *Finding Sand Creek: History, Archeology, and the 1864 Massacre Site* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004).

PERSISTENT HOSTILITIES IN CIVIL WAR MEMORY

HARRIS, M. KEITH. *Across the Bloody Chasm: The Culture of Commemoration among Civil War Veterans*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2014. xi + 220 pp. $42.50 (cloth), ISBN 0-807-157224.

REVIEWED BY GAINES M. FOSTER, Louisiana State University
doi:10.1017/S1537781415000675

In the midst of a relatively calm Sesquicentennial of the Civil War, the historiography on the memory of the war has become increasingly contested. Ten years ago in a book on Civil War

cemeteries, John R. Neff emphasized persisting sectional tensions, and more recently Barbara A. Gannon, in a study of the Grand Army of the Republic, and Caroline E. Janney, in a comprehensive examination of Civil War memory into the late 1930s, have stressed how both the North and South continued to believe their cause right and just—and the other side wrong and either traitorous or barbarous or both.[1] Gannon and Janney also conclude that Northern veterans continued to maintain that they had fought to end slavery, not just to preserve the Union. Together, these books make a strong case that, during the first 75 years or so after the war, resentments against former foes festered and, if they did not stop reunion, certainly restrained reconciliation between the sections. They thereby challenge David W. Blight's influential *Race and Reunion*, which argues that reconciliation overcame sectional differences and facilitated the establishment of white supremacy, and a host of earlier and later studies that also found considerable evidence for reconciliation and a converging memory of the war. These earlier studies often focused on the same subjects and drew on similar evidence as the new ones do, and the resulting stark differences in interpretation testify to the vigorous debate within the discipline, though hardly to the reliability of its methodology.

M. Keith Harris completed the dissertation out of which *Across the Bloody Chasm* developed before Gannon's and Janney's books appeared, and he thanks both in his acknowledgments. His book fits squarely within the new interpretive paradigm that stresses continued sectional tensions and resentments. Harris looks only at the attitudes of veterans, Union and Confederate, through an examination of what he calls "the culture of commemoration," by which he means "speeches, parades, monument dedications, and literature reflecting on the war" (3). He has examined an impressive array of manuscripts, newspapers, and other printed sources in search of veterans' views. He concludes that the "former soldiers of the Union and Confederate armies commemorated national memories denoting American valor and fealty. But more important, they worked tirelessly to preserve sectional memories that advanced one side over the other and conjured fear, anger, and resentment among formerly warring parties" (1–2). In the process, reunion was achieved but never true reconciliation, much less forgiveness.

Veterans of the Union army, Harris shows, celebrated their achievements, preserving the Union and freeing the slaves. Although Northern veterans accepted the "marginalization of black people" in the postwar period, they still saw emancipation as central to the war and stressed its importance (5). And they adamantly maintained that Southerners had fought for slavery and to destroy the Union, in the process committing treason. They condemned their former foes for their barbaric mistreatment of prisoners of war, their destruction of property, their ill treatment of civilians, and their abuses of black troops. Union veterans also criticized Jefferson Davis and Robert E. Lee.

That Confederates remained unapologetic long after Appomattox probably did nothing to improve their former foes' attitudes toward them. Southern veterans, Harris writes, did not seek "to reestablish the Confederacy as they had once envisioned it: an independent nation." They did seek, though, to prove "the rightness of their principles in direct contention with northern commutations" (89). Southerners therefore portrayed themselves as fighting for true constitutional principles, local self-government and states' rights, and blamed the Yankees for destroying the Union. A few acknowledged that the war was about slavery: most denied it. But since Northern veterans put slavery at the center of the conflict, even they sometimes addressed it as a means to condemn Northerners for "suppression of rights, jealousy, vindictiveness, abuses of power and other wicked deeds. … They exposed northerners as fanatics determined to use emancipation as a tool to punish the South" (115). Southerners, too, pointed to the destruction of property and treatment in prisons, although Harris has less to say about Southern condemnations of the Yankees than about their defense of themselves.

Despite emphasizing the "bloody chasm" that persisted, indeed widened, as veterans aged, Harris rightly acknowledges reunion. He observes that what made it and a degree of reconciliation possible was a common sense of identity as Americans, rooted in tying the wartime cause to "the

original intentions of the founders" (3). He shows how Southerners drew on the revolutionary tradition, more so than Northerners; this important insight might have been better developed. In other places, in a sophisticated reading of the evidence, Harris acknowledges moves toward and rhetoric of reconciliation among the veterans, but argues that they often turned on themselves. For example, the "recognition of southern courage—a prominent refrain in reconciliatory rhetoric—did not preclude the acknowledgement of southern treachery" (51).

Even though he stresses "contention and continuity among former enemies" (14), Harris refers to a national reconciliation culture, created primarily by people born after the war, which "embraced a celebratory message speaking to the power of progress and unity" (9). The focus of his book—the veterans—prevents a full exploration of that culture, but its existence does raise the interesting if never really addressed question of why veterans did not prove more influential. In an epilogue, Harris offers an arresting observation on the current state of Civil War memory, that today the issue of slavery remains prominent and its role in the war widely (though not universally) acknowledged, but that the issue of treason has faded from view. He attributes that to a Confederate "interpretative victory" (143).

Across the Bloody Chasm raises many such interesting points. It is a thoroughly researched, well-argued, nuanced treatment that will quickly establish itself as an important work in what might be termed "the persisting resentment and sectionalism" school of interpreting Civil War memory. Whether the view of Civil War memory it so ably presents will win the emerging historiographical battle remains to be seen.

NOTE

[1]Barbara Gannon, *The Won Cause: Black and White Comradeship in the Grand Army of the Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011). Caroline E. Janney, *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013).

MYTH AND HISTORY

TETRAULT, LISA. *The Myth of Seneca Falls: Memory and the Women's Suffrage Movement, 1848–1898*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014. 199 pp. $34.95 (cloth), ISBN 978-1-4696-1427-4.

REVIEWED BY FAYE DUDDEN, Colgate University
doi:10.1017/S1537781415000687

Lisa Tetrault has written an important, original book that should generate much fruitful discussion among women's historians. She focuses on a neglected phase of the women's rights movement: the interval between the movement's antebellum origins and the final push for the vote in the Progressive Era. In that period, Tetrault argues, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, who had been stymied in their Reconstruction-era hopes to win woman suffrage, made a bid to hold their movement together and claim its leadership by writing its history. Their massive three-volume *History of Woman Suffrage,* written between 1880 and 1886, put together an origins story, making the 1848 Seneca Falls convention the movement's agreed-upon birthplace. The story Stanton and Anthony chose to tell in the *HWS* was durable, dynamic, and influential, but also biased, partial, and self-serving. As Stanton and Anthony elaborated the story in speeches and other writings, it served to elevate them over potential rivals for leadership, and it highlighted middle-class white women while neglecting women of color.