

From this perspective, *Glory's* characterization of Shaw as the master disciplinarian who transferred his own self-discipline to his men seems rather empty. Likewise, the struggle for equal pay and the protests that followed derived not from the enlistees' sudden discovery of a light pay envelope, but from their long and practiced opposition to second-class citizenship. The possibility of discriminatory treatment had been at issue in the black community for months before enlistment. Some black leaders had demanded—and received—explicit promises from federal authorities that black soldiers would be treated as the equals of whites. The 54th's famous strike for equal pay had deep roots in a protest tradition almost a century in the making.

The depiction of discipline infused from the top—the white top—is another matter of importance, since that notion has been seized by those obsessed with the question of discipline in contemporary Afro-American society.⁶ *Glory* contrasts Shaw and his disciplined Northern troops to a regiment of unruly former slave soldiers led by Colonel James Montgomery, an Ohio-born veteran of the Kansas border wars who had taught school in Kentucky and Missouri before the war. Whereas Shaw exhibited supreme respect for his men, Montgomery is portrayed as a crude racist who is motivated by hatred for the slaveholder, not sympathy for the slave, and who has nothing but contempt for his men. In one of *Glory's* most chilling scenes, Montgomery's South Carolina Colored Volunteers—soldiers who had been recruited among former slaves on the Sea Islands—loot and burn a plantation and abuse its residents, white and black. Montgomery leers, and acts only when a black soldier turns his lust from a black to a white woman. Then Montgomery coolly dispatches the offending soldier with a bullet. Shaw watches in horror.

James Montgomery, as far as is known, harbored no such contempt for the men under his command or black people generally. His admiration for John Brown and record in Kansas confirms his long opposition to slavery and commitment to racial equality.⁷ Like many Western soldiers, however, he believed that the war must be carried to the enemy—the civilian enemy. Like many veterans of Kansas, he thought of himself as a "practical abolitionist." Having witnessed the slaughter that accompanied direct frontal assaults on established positions—much as the 54th would attack Fort Wagner—Montgomery preferred to punish the slave-holding class directly. If some white Southerners were so foolish to ally with the slave masters, or so unlucky to stand in the way of the Union army, that was most unfortunate. The retributive raids he and other commanders of the South Carolina Colored Volunteers launched up the rivers of Georgia during the summer of 1863 marked, among other things, the changing nature of the struggle between North and South. Ultimately, Montgomery's understanding of the war, carried to its logical conclusion by William Tecumseh Sherman, would prove decisive. As Sherman noted, such warfare universalized the soldier's hell, but it did not make soldiers