

The Real War Never Got in the Books: How Veterans  
and Publishers Created The Civil War

by

Emma Z. Rothberg  
Class of 2015

A thesis submitted to the  
faculty of Wesleyan University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
Degree of Bachelor of Arts  
with Departmental Honors in History

# Acknowledgements

I knew I wanted to write a thesis before I entered Wesleyan University in the fall of 2011. At that time, this finished project was not even really an idea, just an aspiration. This has been a long and grueling process full of questions, self-reflection, and self-doubt and I am indebted to the following people for keeping me going and keeping me sane:

To the Wesleyan History Department for giving me the building blocks I needed to tackle a project of this length and analytical scope and for always providing support and feedback when I asked.

To the White Fellowship Committee who believed this project was worth supporting.

To my friends and family who have patiently listened to me talk about this project and all its nuances, pitfalls, and moments of clarity for the past year. You never asked me to stop talking and I thank you for all those hours.

To my incredible thesis advisors, Professor Demetrius Eudell and Professor Courtney Fullilove, for your undying support, guidance, and encouragement throughout this entire process. You helped make my ideas and my writing stronger and were always there to lend advice or calm me down in panicked moments. You agreed to take on this project when it was just an amorphous idea and believed I could turn a number of tangential thoughts into a cohesive argument. Thank you for believing in me as a scholar and never once doubting I had something to say. This thesis would not be what it is without you both.

And finally to my parents and Trevor, this is for you.

## Table of Contents

Introduction	3
1. An Original Secessionist Was Hard To Find: The Period of Government Reconstruction	13
2. “Eradicating forever the scars of the civil war”: The Grand Army of the Republic and the United Confederate Veterans	32
3. “We know that these reminiscences cannot be strictly true”: Veterans’ Memoirs	51
4. “We insist that our youth shall be taught that the war was more than a mere bloody contest”: The Textbook Battle of the 1890s	85
5. The Ubiquitous ‘Parade-Rest’ Soldier: Soldier Monuments and Memorials	103
6. Tales of Universalized Soldiers: The War in Popular Literature in the 1890s	139
Conclusion. “And so good-bye to the war...”	166
Bibliography	175

## Introduction

“And so good-bye to the war” wrote Walt Whitman in his 1882 collected reflections *Specimen Days & Collect*.<sup>1</sup> As the United States moved farther away from the events of 1861-1865, the American Civil War began to disappear. It appeared as a series of great and heroic events rather than a bitter and enduring conflict of political and social ideas resulting in the death of over an estimated 750,000 men, the maiming of thousands more, the destruction of countless amounts of property and lives, and the emancipation of over four million former slaves. Whitman did not bid farewell to the physical destruction the war wrought on the land and its people in this reflection, but to what he deemed the “real war.” Whitman continued:

Future years will never know the seething hell and the black infernal background of countless minor scenes and interiors...and it is best they should not—the real war will never get in the books. In the mushy influences of current times, too, the fervid atmosphere and typical events of those years are in danger of being totally forgotten.<sup>2</sup>

All that remained of the Civil War was its memory.

But memory, as Whitman so astutely pointed out, can quickly become unreliable. Its unreliability stems from its constructive nature. Memory, like a tool, can be wielded and shaped as a means to an end. It can be selectively constructed to produce a type of forgetting which, at least according to Whitman, was best. The forgetting of the “real war” brought a nation back together. It allowed for reunion

---

<sup>1</sup> Walt Whitman, "The Real War Will Never Get in the Books," *Specimen Days & Collect* (Glasgow: Wilson & McCormick, 1883), <http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=umn.319510019989238;view=1up;seq=5>. 80.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

because the “fervid atmosphere and typical events” of violent death, destruction, and enmity were left out of the historical record. While Whitman sadly admitted the “real war will never get into the books,” he did not propose a satisfactory answer for why this neglect occurred and for what ends. For Whitman it was “mushy influences of current times,” amorphous actors afforded agency, who created the false narrative devoid of “seething hell.” This thesis intends to point to the agents who prevented “the real war” from getting into the historical record by studying the memoirs of veterans, the publishers who created an industry around their stories of war, and the cultural responses to those narratives. It intends to answer the question why the “real war” was “buried in the grave, in eternal darkness.”<sup>3</sup>

The fundamental question of reconstruction<sup>4</sup> was how, and on what terms, the country should be reunited. As New England socialite Orestes Brownson wrote in 1865: “Among nations, no one has more need of full knowledge of itself, than the United States, and no one has hitherto had less. It has hardly had a distinct consciousness of its own national existence.”<sup>5</sup> The people and politicians of United States, after the war, had the opportunity to confront the implications of how they defined an American, and they did so through constricted and repetitive forms including memoirs, textbooks, public monuments, and works of fiction. In reality, it was less of a confrontation and more of an alteration.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 81.

<sup>4</sup> The term “reconstruction” will not be capitalized or periodized for this thesis because it is a historical construction with associated narratives. See the discussion about the use of Civil War in this later in the introduction.

<sup>5</sup> Orestes Brownson quoted Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution 1863-1877*, The New American Nation Series (New York: Perennial Classics, 2002), 24.

The politicians during reconstruction and into the early twentieth century tried to produce a sense of national unity. Men like Presidents Abraham Lincoln and Andrew Johnson insisted revenge not play a role in the political landscape and instead turned the nation's focus to how the states would constitute a new, more perfect union.

In contrast to the politicians, who sought a quick reconciliation as a political means to an end, white veterans sought a substantial and wholesale revision of the war's history that in turn allowed them to define what it meant to be an American. It is the contrast between politics and imagination, strategy and ideology. It rendered the historical narrative as one describing the "Civil War," printed in title case, rather than the narrative of any of its other names: War of Northern Aggression, War of Secession, War for Southern Independence, War of the Rebellion, or War Between the States. All of these other titles emphasize the states or the sections of the country: it was not a war between people but between geographic sections. These titles also lay blame on one section over the other rather than making the entire country responsible for the conflict. The 'Civil War' implies the existence of a single people, at war with each other. White Union and Confederate veterans, and the publishers who printed their stories, were central to the creation of this fraternal narrative of the 'Civil War.' They were also responsible for the fraternal narrative's adoption as *the* framing narrative of the war. The veterans created this narrative in order to preserve their legacy and make their duty, sacrifice and courage to country essential to the 'Americanism' created in the closing decades of the nineteenth century.

Central to the creation of narratives of 'Civil War' and fraternity were: the activities, rhetoric and lobbying efforts of the major veterans' groups of North and

South (the Grand Army of the Republic and United Confederate Veterans) and the publication of veterans' memoirs in popular magazines, local newspapers, and books. The dictates and economics of industrious publishers across several literary genres consolidated these stories of brotherhood and valor. All informed the memorialization, both in monuments and print, of the war in the second half of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth. Their emphasis on fraternity allowed the public to ignore the consequences of the war, especially emancipation.

This thesis challenges that of the 'road to reunion' first defined by historian Paul H. Buck in his 1937 work by the same name.<sup>6</sup> Buck argued the "reunited nation" only emerged as fact after "the memories of the past were woven in a web of national sentiment" selectively elevating deeds of mutual valor in order to promote pride in contemporary achievements and instill hope for future endeavors.<sup>7</sup> But the reunited nation did not emerge after memories were woven into the national sentiment. On the contrary, this thesis will argue, between 1865 and 1913, veterans' memories shaped what the national sentiment would be thus helping reunite the nation. This thesis analyzes the period from 1865 to 1913 because 1865 marks the end of the war and 1913 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the grand Blue-Gray Reunion held in its honor. 1913 is also the year before the world changed due to the beginning of World War One and when memorial practices started to center on that conflict rather than the Civil War. This thesis argues the 'road to reunion' was part of the historical narrative rather than in reaction to the Civil War.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Paul Herman Buck, *The Road to Reunion, 1865-1900* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1937).

<sup>7</sup> Paul H. Buck quoted in Thomas J. Brown, *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration: A Brief History with Documents*, ed. Ernest R. May Natalie Zemon Davis, Lynn Hunt, David W. Blight, The Bedford Series in History and Culture (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004), 9.

This thesis will use three terms consistently: nation/national, fraternity, and public. By nation, this thesis uses the definition derived from Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities*.<sup>8</sup> Anderson theorizes the nation as a human construct that unites a vast, but strictly defined, group of people over history and space through symbols in which the community instills value. It is both a social and political entity that produces a collectively felt identity out of imagined connections to fellow-members who are, sometimes, never met. The nation creates a framework for both individual and group definition of self.

Fraternity was the essential and underlying concept that retroactively constructed the conflict as the 'Civil War' thus creating claims to unity that were illusory. The unity was false not only because it masked the divides between Union and Confederate soldiers and later veterans, but more to the point, because it excluded blacks. A civil war works in reference to a unified people. White veterans conceptualized fraternity and both white veterans and publishers promoted it. Both constructed fraternity as an inclusive concept that inherently excluded both women and blacks. By focusing on the depiction of black veterans, this thesis explores the latter omission as central to the perpetuation of racism and inequality in the United States. White veterans conceptualized fraternity through a universalization of: their wartime experience, sense of duty, morality, and valor, sense of non-agency for the rank-and-file, and white supremacy. It forbade discussions of enmity, the consequences of emancipation and anyone or any group who reminded the public of those consequences.

---

<sup>8</sup> See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Rev. ed. (New York, London: Verso, 2006).

The public is a problematic yet essential term. It is problematic in that it homogenizes and diminishes agency, which this thesis attempts to fix with respect to the creation of fraternal narratives of war. Yet veterans, especially the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Confederate Veterans, saw the public as a single, homogenous group in need of their instruction. They homogenized the public just as they hoped the public would homogenize veterans and their legacy. For the purposes of this thesis, 'the public' refers to the 'veterans' public' comprised of their included groups and will be noted as such.

This thesis confines its analysis to the work of veterans and their public in consolidating a narrative of valorous war. It does not take up the trajectories of several related movements and ideologies. In particular, it is not an examination of the Lost Cause, a movement whose leadership did not consist chiefly of veterans. While Confederate veterans were certainly influenced by tenets of Lost Cause ideology, particularly that slavery was not the cause of the Civil War and secession was legal, veterans' ideology of fraternity took shape separately. The thesis also does not attempt a reexamination of reconstruction's failures and the basis of the Jim Crow South. Rather, it asks how Americans came to see the war as the 'Civil War' through memory and memorialization. While reconstruction set the stage for these productions, later memorial practices and forms were more significant in consolidating narratives of fraternity and unity.

This is also not an examination of the dissenting voices to the narrative. There were certainly many groups and individuals who vehemently attacked the fraternity and unity white veterans and their public promoted through questioning its

authenticity and purpose. Many of these voices were those of black men and women still facing unequal treatment both legally and socially. And while many of these freedmen were also veterans, their writings (for example their war reminiscences) never reached the same level of popularity, circulation, or readership as those written by white veterans.<sup>9</sup> Their membership in veterans' groups, such as the Grand Army of the Republic, was also lower than their white counterparts. Black experience of the war was not as foundational to the narrative because Union and Confederate veterans, and later their public, excluded them from the war's memorialization. This thesis is attempting to understand the agents in the creation of the fraternal narrative of the 'Civil War' and these dissenting voices were not a part of this creation and are thus mostly absent from the analysis.

This thesis consists of six chapters. Chapter one will review the period of reconstruction, identifying policies and rhetoric that promoted an understanding of the country as a single nation rather than a nation of sectional or regional identities. The chapter will show how politics and politicians emphasized and were concerned with recreating a single nation immediately after civil war.

Chapter two deals with the responses of the two major veterans' groups, the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR) in the North and the United Confederate Veterans (UCV) in the South. It will show these veterans actively sought to promote an understanding of the war as a forgotten quarrel by deemphasizing army affiliations and cause of the war, elevating service and valor, and promoting the view of veterans as a monolith. The two groups took these actions as the best measure to protect the

---

<sup>9</sup> W. Fitzhugh Brundage, "Black Veterans Recall the Civil War " in *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader*, ed. Larry M. Logue and Michael Barton (New York: New York University Press, 2007), 429.

veterans' collective legacy and ensure they held a prominent place in establishing post-war American identity. The chapter will also show how the GAR and UCV promoted the fraternal historical narrative.

Chapter three analyzes published and unpublished veterans' memoirs as the basis of a new concept of fraternity, arguing that they had enormous influence in shaping the nation's understanding of the war. The analysis will focus on three main tropes found in the memoirs: lack of descriptive violence (or descriptions which internalized or delegitimized violence); feelings of camaraderie, mutual sentiment and respect (especially as indicated and highlighted by episodes on picket lines); and pejorative and archetypal descriptions of blacks. It will also examine how publishers began to shape and solidify the fraternal narrative and make it a necessity for publication.

Chapter four examines the lobbying efforts of the GAR and UCV surrounding history textbooks during the 1890s. It will discuss how veterans' insistence on didactic patriotism substantiated fraternity further by making it part of historical, pedagogical text.

Chapter five deals with the physical memorials erected in vast numbers across the country between the civil war and the early twentieth century. It examines how the veterans' concept of fraternity became universalized in physical form through repetitive and restricted images. The chapter will also discuss how monuments illustrate the concepts of invisibility, innocuousness, ubiquity, and power and how those concepts continue to inform our understanding of the 'Civil War' in the twenty-first century.

The final chapter explores three key texts of popular novels published in the 1890s. The thesis ends with novels because of their status as creative fiction. While the other forms of memorialization of the war (memoirs, textbooks, and monuments) purported to represent historical events accurately, the novels were neither bound by the same obligations nor the same restrictions of authenticity. Therefore, it is particularly notable that the novels' fiction is informed by the same themes as these other forms of material representation. The chapter analyzes emerging psychological principles of the individual and the group and their reflection in the universalized experience in veterans' memoirs. It also discusses the key role of publishers in nationalizing the fiction. The chapter argues evidence for the pervasiveness of the retroactively created 'Civil War' lies in part in the narrative fiction's rooting in veteran conceptualized fraternity.

This introduction is the last time the term the Civil War, in title case, is used to refer to the war. For the rest of the text, the Civil War will be referred to as 'the civil war' or 'the war.' When referencing the narrative that retroactively created this civil war and claims to unity, the thesis uses 'Civil War' to indicate the constructiveness. My linguistic choice is not intended to question or undermine the categorization of this conflict as a civil war or to lend credence to Lost Cause ideology or revisionist history. It is intended to allow for a fuller exploration of the narrative's creation without presenting it as a historical given. The Civil War comes with implicitly associated themes and imagery of 'brother against brother' and 'Americans fighting Americans.' By using the title case Civil War I, and my reader, are acquiescing to the narrative rather than confronting its constructed nature.

Shelby Foote, in Ken Burns's 1990 PBS documentary *The Civil War*, explained that the Civil War "made us an is." It shifted our thinking and speaking of the United States as a collection of independent states, an "are," into a singular, united identity.<sup>10</sup> While the sentence, "The United States of America are" is grammatically correct, the sentence "The United States of America is" is what veterans desired their public to use and internalize.

---

<sup>10</sup> Ken Burns, in *The Civil War* (PBS Home Video: Paramount Home Entertainment; Time-Life Video; Florentine Films; PBS Home Video; American Documentary, Inc., 1990).

# 1

## *An Original Secessionist Was Hard To Find: The Period of Government Reconstruction*

A jubilant crowd gathered outside of the White House on April 11, 1865, their faces aglow from the festive display of light emanating from the White House. Two days prior, General Robert E. Lee of the Confederacy had surrendered to General Ulysses S. Grant of the Union at Appomattox Court House, Virginia. With a handshake, these two men concluded four years of bitter fighting that ended the lives of thousands and uprooted the lives of many thousands more. While the last major Confederate Army under General Joseph E. Johnston would not surrender for two more weeks, the men and women of Washington were celebrating the end of the war that night. They called for a speech from the President who had weathered the storm with them and lost with them; his eleven-year-old son Willie died from typhoid fever in the midst of the war. As described by reporter Noah Brooks, on hand for the event, the “tall, gaunt figure of the President, deeply thoughtful, intent upon the elucidation of the generous policy which should be pursued toward the South” stepped to the window over the White House’s main door.<sup>11</sup> Brooks held a light so the President could see his speech while the President’s twelve-year-old son, Tad, waited to grab the pages as they fluttered to the floor.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Abraham Lincoln, "Address on Reconstruction, Washington, Dc. April 11, 1865," Abraham Lincoln Online, <http://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/speeches/last.htm>.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

The President's speech addressed the complex issue of reconstruction and what the government and people needed to do now the war was over. It was the first, and last, time Abraham Lincoln expressed support for black suffrage. "We meet this evening, not in sorrow, but in gladness of heart" began Lincoln. He then continued to express his immense joy and honor at "transmitting much of the good news" to the crowd. Lincoln then stated his views on the post-war program:

We all agree that the seceded States, so called, are out of their proper relation with the Union; and that the sole object of the government, civil and military, in regard to those States is to again get them into that proper practical relation. I believe it is not only possible, but in fact, easier to do this, without deciding, or even considering, whether these States have ever been out of the Union, than with it. Finding themselves safely at home, it would be utterly immaterial whether they had ever been abroad. Let us all join in doing the acts necessary to restoring the proper practical relations between these States and the Union; and each forever after, innocently indulge his own opinion whether, in doing the acts, he brought the States from without, into the Union, or only gave them proper assistance, they never having been out of it.<sup>13</sup>

This was to be the last public speech Abraham Lincoln gave. Standing in the crowd that night was an individual who, incensed at the President's call for black suffrage and livid that the war ended against his preferred side, declared "That is the last speech he will make."<sup>14</sup> That man held true to his word when three days later he, John Wilkes Booth, shot President Abraham Lincoln in the back of the head at Ford's Theatre.

Expanding on Lincoln's theme of reconciliation, politicians during the period of reconstruction tried to make the individual and the state see themselves as parts of a single, unified nation. Americans had a twofold struggle during this period: the struggle of the living over the meaning of the dead and a political struggle over what

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

the new order included or excluded.<sup>15</sup> Through this struggle, the politicians were concerned with creating a sense of unity after the war. Unlike veterans, who rewrote the war's history to emphasize fraternity, politicians tried to inspire unionism as a means to a political end.

.....

“A house divided against itself cannot stand,” declared Lincoln in Springfield, Illinois on June 16, 1858. That sentiment was as true and as applicable before the civil war as it was in its aftermath. In his final speech on April 11<sup>th</sup>, Lincoln expressed the central issues the country must decide and come to terms with: how should its people constitute a nation. Lincoln urged a restoration of the relationship between the reunified sections of the country. Rather than focusing on the “immaterial” question of whether there was a true separation, the country should concentrate on unity. It was not only the people's duty but “easier,” argued Lincoln, to forget past offenses and look to the future. Even before reconstruction, the government project of reunion, formally started, the stated goal was a united country that would not dwell on but rather grow from its recent bloody past.

Historian Robert Wiebe has argued early nineteenth-century communities depended on the ability to manage the lives of their members. Rather than looking outwardly, these “island communities” looked inwardly to solve their own problems and moral quandaries and to suggest solutions. But, Wiebe argued, the civil war and reconstruction transitioned the United States from the community oriented nineteenth century to the national oriented system of the twentieth century. The insular sense of

---

<sup>15</sup> See David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001).

thinking of the early nineteenth century began to erode in the 1880s and 1890s as people began to look towards and afford more power to the Federal Government for solving the issues of the day.<sup>16</sup> Politics were also extremely important and partisan in the late nineteenth century and gave men a sense of identity in an uncertain order.<sup>17</sup> This meant when political leaders started agitating for certain policies, their constituents were more likely to adhere to their party's call and actively drum up support for the policy's implementation.

The transition from political sectionalism to a sense of political nationalism began with the programs of amnesty and pardon issued first by President Lincoln and then by President Johnson in the mid 1860s. Policies that began as a way to separate Confederate leaders from the people quickly turned into almost universal forgiveness. Beginning in 1868, the two major political parties, in attempts to secure their political footholds in the South, rebranded themselves by calling for stability and solidarity through movement beyond the issues of the war. By the election of 1872, the political rhetoric surrounding the nomination of Horace Greeley called for setting aside the divisions of the past and moving forward in harmony. All of these political calls for sectional cohesion produced a shift in individuals' thinking. While not a rewriting of the history of the war, Southerners started to rethink their actions during the secession crisis as a means to an end. This rethinking began the process that veterans both North and South expanded upon later in the century.

The period of reconstruction was, as Lincoln so eloquently stated in his Gettysburg Address, the when the living must "take increased devotion to that cause"

---

<sup>16</sup> Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order: 1877-1920*, ed. David Donald, The Making of America Series (New York: Hill and Wang, 1968), xiii-xiv, 5.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

for which the dead had given their lives. The living must remember and from that memory create “a new nation from the wreckage of the old.”<sup>18</sup>

### *The Lincoln Plan*

The beginnings of reconstruction began before the official end of the war and a definite Union victory. On December 8, 1863, President Lincoln issued his Proclamation of Amnesty and Reconstruction. It argued the country should move beyond the questions of blame and retribution, a theme continued by later reconstruction policy. The Proclamation began with a justification for the presidential power to grant pardons and reprieves:

Whereas, a rebellion now exists whereby the loyal state governments of several states have for a long time been subverted, and many persons have committed, and are now guilty of, treason against the United States;...it is now desired by some persons heretofore engaged in said rebellion to resume their allegiance to the United States, and to reinaugurate loyal state governments within and for their respective states: Therefore—I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, do proclaim, declare, and make known to all persons who have, directly or by implication, participated in the existing rebellion...that a full pardon is hereby granted to them and each of them, with the restoration of all rights of property, except as to slaves...and upon the condition that every such person shall take and subscribe an oath...this proclamation is intended to present the people of states wherein the national authority has been suspended, and loyal state governments have been subverted...<sup>19</sup>

Lincoln was concerned with the incorporation of the disloyal part of the country. Part of his reasoning for issuing such a proclamation before the end of the war was his belief that there were loyal factions of the seceded states just waiting for an opportunity to reenter the union. Southern leaders’ machinations subverted loyal members’ power and voice. Lincoln further supported his argument on the power of

---

<sup>18</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 6.

<sup>19</sup> Abraham Lincoln, "The Proclamation of Amnesty and Reconstruction, December 8, 1863," University of Maryland, <http://www.freedmen.umd.edu/procamn.htm>.

the Southern elites by excluding civil, diplomatic, and military officers of the “so-called Confederate government” or army in his Proclamation. He also excluded anyone who left their “judicial stations under the United States to aid the rebellion.”<sup>20</sup> This argument placed blame on Confederate leaders rather than the citizens and also firmly categorized the conflict as a civil war. Veterans would further explore and conceptualize this question of agency in their writings later in the century.

Yet what is so noteworthy to the analysis of this Proclamation is it did not ask the people, or the government, to forget or neglect the wrongs committed by former Confederates. Lincoln thought that secession and the fight against the United States were wrong. Lincoln rather asked the people and the government to forgive each other as a way to reunite. This urge did not rewrite the historical narrative of the war. It asked for the public and government to think of the war as a starting point to grow into a more perfect union. It was different than veterans’ request to forget the war as a quarrel in order to neglect its consequences later in the century.

The speed at which Lincoln hoped to achieve reunification was further indicated in his Ten Percent Plan. Lincoln issued the Plan as part of his Proclamation of Amnesty and Reconstruction. It defined “loyal citizens” as those who had taken a loyalty oath to the United States and had since not violated it. The Plan specified that when a state’s “loyal citizens” constituted ten percent of the votes cast in the presidential election of 1860, those individuals could reestablish a “republican” state government. The Federal Government would recognize this new “republican” government as the “true government” of the state and afford it the “constitutional

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

provisions” stated in the United States Constitution on the subject of the Federal Government’s duty to the states.<sup>21</sup> Ten percent is low, a small minority at best. This plan for readmission focused on the presentation of a unified country rather than having a unified country in 1863. The Ten Percent Plan did not create a national sentiment, nor was Lincoln reacting to a pre-established sense of unity. Lincoln hoped that the reunification would expedite nation rebuilding and create a national sentiment.

Radical Republicans and abolitionists widely criticized the Ten Percent Plan because of this extremely low bar it set for readmission. They deemed the policy too lenient. Ten percent of a state’s citizens could not ensure the maintenance of emancipation, for example, nor did it assure the other ninety percent of the state would willingly uphold the union moving forward. Eric Foner has argued contemporary Americans should recognize the Ten Percent Plan as a way to shore up white support in the third year of the war rather than a “hard and fast policy” for reconstruction.<sup>22</sup> Pro-Union Americans needed reassurance by 1863 that the Lincoln Administration had a plan for ending the war and reestablishing the union. Men and women would not support a war, especially as destructive as this civil war had become, if there was not a plan in place to end it on their terms.

### *The Johnson Plan*

After Lincoln’s assassination in April 1865, Andrew Johnson took over the task of reconstruction as the seventeenth President of the United States. As the only Senator from a seceded state that remained loyal to the union, Johnson had a different

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Foner, *Reconstruction*, 36.

view of Southerners than Lincoln. Johnson believed there were individual “traitors” who should be punished severely.<sup>23</sup> Johnson strongly believed, even more than Lincoln, the elites of the planter class, the “bobtailed aristocracy,” had disingenuously “railroaded” the “wool-hat boys,” the Southern masses, into secession.<sup>24</sup> Like Lincoln, and veterans’ writing later, Johnson questioned the agency of the Southern masses during the secession crisis.

Along with his vindictive attitude, Johnson willingly addressed the legality of secession. Whereas Lincoln urged individuals not to focus on whether the Southern states left the Union or not, Johnson was outspoken in his belief that secession was unconstitutional. With the nullification and voiding of secession, the union of states remained intact, thus making reconstruction the process by which the states would “resume their full constitutional rights as quickly as possible.”<sup>25</sup>

Using this logic, Johnson issued his own Amnesty and Pardon Proclamation on May 29, 1865, employing much of the same language as Lincoln’s 1863 Proclamation. President Johnson stated that he issued the Proclamation because many persons Lincoln excluded now desired to “apply for and obtain amnesty and pardon.”<sup>26</sup> Johnson also included a stipulation allowing for any members of the fourteen excluded classes in his Proclamation, many of them repeats from Lincoln’s,

---

<sup>23</sup> Andrew Johnson quoted in *ibid.*, 179.

<sup>24</sup> James E. Sefton, *Andrew Johnson and the Uses of Constitutional Power* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1980), 108.

<sup>25</sup> Foner, *Reconstruction*, 179.

<sup>26</sup> "President Johnson's Amnesty Proclamation.; Restoration to Rights of Property except in Slaves. An Oath of Loyalty as a Condition Precedent. Legality of Confiscation Proceedings Recognized. Exception of Certain Offenders from This Amnesty. By These Special Applications for Pardon May Be Made. Reorganization in North Carolina. Appointment of a Provisional Governor. A State Convention to Be Chosen by Loyal Citizens. The Machinery of the Federal Government to Be Put in Operation. Amnesty Proclamation.," *The New York Times*, May 30, 1865.

to send a “special application...to the President for pardon.”<sup>27</sup> Where the two Proclamations differed was in the language of their exclusions: not whom they excluded, but rather who the excluded served instead of the United States. Lincoln referred to the seceded states as the “so-called Confederate government,” while Johnson referred to them as “the pretended Confederate Government.”<sup>28</sup> Both terms recognized there was a division in sentiment, ideology, and identity between the sections but no legal separation. Secession was still unconstitutional whether one called the seceded states the “so-called Confederate government” or the “the pretended Confederate Government.” Both Lincoln and Johnson recognized Southerners had felt they were part of a distinct, sectional community, but their task as politicians was to now create a national community that included all Americans in the United States and the United States government. How “all Americans” would come to be defined remained the central and divisive question.

Johnson’s exclusion policy quickly unraveled as thousands of individual pardons streamed across his desk. Immediately following the Proclamation’s issue, 15,000 Southerners who were still excluded because of their wealth (over \$20,000 in property), along with other reasons, filed applications for pardon. Johnson started issuing them “wholesale.” By 1866, over 7,000 of these applicants received a presidential pardon.<sup>29</sup> What Johnson said was a way to separate the leaders from the masses turned into empty speech. Johnson granted pardons, except in the cases of

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> *Reconstruction*, 191.

some of the most notable and notorious Confederate civil and military leaders, to most everyone who applied.

Another way to read Johnson's Proclamation is that it was purely a way to shore up political power. If his plan for reconstruction succeeded, as Eric Foner argues, Johnson "would have created an unassailable political coalition." The public would credit him with reuniting the country thus guaranteeing him a triumphant reelection and the power over the shape of American politics for years to come.<sup>30</sup> The argument makes unification a means to a political end. But the electorate did not reelect Johnson; they were still divided over how to reunite the sections and perhaps questioned Johnson's policies of amnesty or his personal goal of retribution on disloyal Southerners.

#### *Unity for Political (Party) Ends*

As reconstruction continued, more and more former Confederate states found ways to circumvent the policies they pledged to uphold, especially when it came to the rights and safety of former slaves. Sectional loyalties still proved more powerful and important than an American loyalty for most individuals.

Both major political parties' Southern factions were experiencing a crisis of legitimacy in the post-war era. The Southern white public, which did not include Northern transplants, saw Republicans as an alien political force. The Democrats' historic base, due to the inclusion of black men in the electorate, was fundamentally altered. In 1868, the Republicans, who were trying to retain their post-war foothold in the South, cast themselves as the party of order and stability as opposed to the party

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 184.

of change. The Democrats, trying to reassert themselves as the dominant party in the South, cast themselves as “virtual revolutionaries” rather than obstinate retainers of the past.<sup>31</sup> “Like beauty, political legitimacy resides in the eyes of the beholder” and both parties needed beholders.<sup>32</sup> In order to create steadfast political constituencies, both parties had to create communities that would unite voters across state and class lines. Furthermore, they had to unite their constituencies against what would be classified as the pervasive influence of the other.

One way the parties accomplished this was through historical narratives substantiating the party’s claim to legitimacy in the South. If reunion was the vehicle through which these parties could maintain political power in the South, then reunion would pervade the political platforms and claims of legitimacy the parties would disseminate. The parties refocused their respective platforms on terms that would garner them reelection.

The Southern Democrats responded to their own crisis of identity and political relevancy in the late 1860s with the New Departure. The movement’s advocates “argued that their party could only return to power by putting the issues of the Civil War and Reconstruction behind them.”<sup>33</sup> The movement “proclaimed its realism and moderation and promised to ease racial tensions” just as Republicans did but, arguably, only one of them had the record to justifiably make this promise.<sup>34</sup> Neither New Departure nor the rebranding of the Republicans attracted significant black

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 343.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 346.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 412.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

support, but New Departure did gather significant strength by 1870.<sup>35</sup> Historically Democratic areas of the South adopted the tenets of New Departure. Democrats in Tennessee, Virginia, and Missouri created successful coalitions by merging with self-proclaimed Liberal Republicans and adopting a platform promising “universal amnesty and universal suffrage.”<sup>36</sup> In Missouri, a border state that experienced its own civil war during the larger civil war, only the areas that had been ravaged by guerilla fighting remained steadfastly Republican.<sup>37</sup> Like the politicians who wanted to retain their political power, many Americans too wanted to move past the issues of the war.

*The Election of 1872 and the Nomination of Horace Greeley*

In May 1872, alienated and dissatisfied with the leadership of President Ulysses S. Grant, a group of disgruntled Republicans assembled in Cincinnati. At this time the factions of Radical or Moderate Republican no longer described the Party; it was rather made up of alignments centered on attitudes towards President Grant and the politics of the Gilded Age.<sup>38</sup> Dedicated to reforming policies that did not harmonize with their antislavery and free trade inclinations, these former Republican Party leaders who met in Cincinnati rallied to the Liberal Republican cause. This new party would “enact on the *national stage*’ the stunning victories achieved by alliances of reform Republicans and Democrats in Virginia, Tennessee, and

---

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 414.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 499.

Missouri.”<sup>39</sup> The Liberal Republican platform, outlined in a speech in 1871, included civil service reform, tariff reduction, the inviolate status of post-war constitutional amendments, political amnesty, and an end to federal intervention in the South. The platform also advocated a return to “local self-government” that, they felt, would in turn be the safest way to secure blacks’ civil rights.<sup>40</sup> Since the Democratic Party was also criticizing the Republican governments in the South, a natural alliance emerged between the two.

When it came to picking a nominee for the dually supported Liberal Republican and Democratic Party’s run at the presidency in 1872, there was a considerable amount of back room maneuvering. While many qualified individuals clamored for the nomination, many were surprised when *New York Tribune* editor Horace Greeley emerged victorious.<sup>41</sup> Greeley was impeccably qualified and had a history of espousing reform, especially in regards to policies concerning the equality for black Americans. As soon as the war ended, Greeley came out in opposition to confiscation and treason trials and urged the “gentlemen” of North and South to jointly support a magnanimous reconstruction based on “Universal Amnesty and Impartial Suffrage.”<sup>42</sup> Greeley had even contributed towards the bond to free Jefferson Davis, former President of the Confederate States of America, from prison in 1867.<sup>43</sup> Greeley appealed to both Democrats and Liberal Republican for he

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 500.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 502.

<sup>42</sup> Horace Greeley quoted in *ibid.*, 503.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

supported policies that appealed to both bases. His history of reform appealed to Liberal Republicans and his plan for the future of the South appealed to Democrats.

Yet as the nominee, Greeley spoke publically about setting aside the divisions of the past and moved further away from his longtime, progressive stance towards blacks' rights. He penned a letter urging Americans to put the war and reconstruction behind them and to look towards future harmony between the sections.<sup>44</sup> In 1870, in a reference to relief efforts for blacks conducted in Washington D.C. by Josephine Griffing, Greeley stated, "They are an easy, worthless race, taking no thought for the morrow, and...your course aggravates their weakness."<sup>45</sup> In order to "clasp hands across the bloody chasm," Greeley and his supporters needed to stay away from the politically divisive issues, especially ones related to black civil rights and equality.<sup>46</sup>

Within a month of Greeley's nomination, Congress cut tariff duties by ten percent and passed an amnesty law restoring the right to hold office to almost all former Confederates still barred by the Fourteenth Amendment's clause that excluded former United States civil and military officer who aided the Confederacy.<sup>47</sup> The Liberal Republican platform included both of these policies. Politicians sought a popular way to move past the lingering issues of reconstruction and the war, and they insisted on forgiveness and selective forgetfulness to do so. Similar legislation had come before Congress and failed to get the two-thirds majority necessary for passage in both 1870 and earlier in 1871.<sup>48</sup> The national tune was transforming, and

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 503-04.

<sup>45</sup> Horace Greeley quoted in *ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> Horace Greeley quoted in *ibid.*, 504.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

transforming quickly. Another indication of this quick transformation was the Civil Rights Bill that the lame-duck Republican Congress eventually passed in 1875. The Bill, which guaranteed freedom of access regardless of race and the right to sue for personal damages, “languished” in committee in both 1870 and 1871.<sup>49</sup> The Amnesty Bill sailed through Congress with a nearly unanimous vote in December. A bill that allowed people to forgive past wrongs and continue to ignore the war’s consequences was extremely appealing in 1871; a bill that guaranteed the protection of rights that had caused so much strife did not reach the same level of popularity. The Federal Government rarely enforced the Civil Rights Act of 1875 during its short reign. The Supreme Court finally overturned it in 1883.<sup>50</sup>

By 1872, a newly formed party chose and supported a platform and candidate actively seeking to move beyond the divisions of civil war in order to create a unified electorate. Horace Greeley did not win the 1872 election against incumbent President Ulysses S. Grant. Americans were infatuated with their veterans; their vociferous reading of veterans’ writings and wide-scale, unprecedented erection of monuments shortly followed this election. Politicians wanted to move past the divisions of the war, not forget the divisions of the war.

*From ‘Secessionist’ to ‘Unionist’ as a Means to an End*

The urge for unity was not just appearing in the political sphere as means to move forward and rebuild the nation. Individuals too picked up on these transformations in rhetoric and saw them as a means to an end. The shift in individual

---

<sup>49</sup> "Jim Crow Stories: Civil Rights Act (1875)," Educational Broadcasting Corporation, [http://www.pbs.org/wnet/jimcrow/stories\\_events\\_civil.html](http://www.pbs.org/wnet/jimcrow/stories_events_civil.html).

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

thinking resulted in the coining of a new term and concept: ‘unionism’ and a ‘unionist.’

Unionism took on two different and competing definitions during the post-war period. The Northern definition of “unconditional unionists” was individuals who could legally take the Ironclad Oath and proclaim they never “voluntarily aided the Confederacy.”<sup>51</sup> This definition in essence only applied to Northerners. The Southern definition did not regard an individual’s war actions at all and instead focused on their “position during the secession crisis.”<sup>52</sup> This latter definition allowed individuals from many backgrounds to speak as Robert E. Lee did: their first loyalty was to their state. It transformed secession, for many individuals, from an ideological to a geographical movement. Reuniting the country and its people was easier if individuals just followed their state rather than followed their passion for the Southern cause. Slavery was not the issue, state loyalty was. If the state was back in the union, these ‘unionists’ were back in it as well; they just followed their state.

The Southern definition awarded agency to an entity rather than a person, put the onus of secession on others (who are also placing the onus on others), and allowed prominent Southerners to absolve themselves of believing in a failed cause. Southern ‘unionists’ demanded recognition of their status as those who fought for union and “repudiated the labels secessionist or traitor.”<sup>53</sup> Southern ‘unionists’ were an early example of individuals taking the historical narrative surrounding the civil war into their own hands and inserting a universal sense of unity into an event that was full of

---

<sup>51</sup> *Reconstruction*, 185.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*

enmity and bitter division. With this Southern definition of ‘unionist’ focusing on opposition to secession while conveniently glossing over or neglecting actions during the civil war itself, nearly everyone qualified as loyal in the South, for finding an original secessionists proved almost impossible in 1865.<sup>54</sup> One Union officer wondered how Florida had seceded in January 1861 given how everyone claimed to have been a unionist who simply “followed the state” in 1865.<sup>55</sup>

Congress established a Joint Committee on Reconstruction on December 4, 1865. Congress tasked the Committee with ascertaining “the condition of the States which formed the so-called Confederate States of America” and deciding whether “they or any of them are entitled to be represented in either house of Congress.”<sup>56</sup> When the Joint Committee deposed E.F. Keen, a Senator in the Senate of Virginia, on February 10, 1866, he proclaimed, “I was an original Union man and fought secession as long, perhaps, as he who fought longest in Virginia.”<sup>57</sup> After Virginia seceded, Keen joined the Confederate Army and served in the rank of colonel for “fifteen or eighteen months” before taking up a position as a state senator in the Virginia Congress.<sup>58</sup> When the Committee asked Keen what the general feeling “at present” amongst the secessionists in his district was towards the United States government, Keen responded, “I scarcely know how to answer that question of secessionists, for there are none now.” When the Committee then asked if abolition had “left a deep

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> The Reports of the Committees of the House of Representatives, Made During the First Session Thirty-Ninth Congress, 1865-1866, (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1866), [http://books.google.com/books?id=CFBHAQAIAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?id=CFBHAQAIAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false). xix.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 165.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid.

feeling of disloyalty towards the government of the United States?” Keen simply responded, “I think not.”<sup>59</sup> There was apparently no lasting affect on those who had fought bitterly and lost family, friends, and their social order to prevent the abolition of their “peculiar institution.” Keen did not tell the Joint Committee there had never been secessionists, just that there were none at the present. According to Keen, reconstruction was affecting its desired goal of recreating a nation out of the ashes of civil war.

Not only Confederate army veterans denied their original enthusiastic support for secession and the continued existence of secessionists. Some of the most prominent former Confederates took up this mantle of unionism. Alexander H. Stephens, former Vice President of the Confederate States of America, declared he was part of Georgia’s union element.<sup>60</sup> While certain historians have argued Stephens was a reluctant secessionist, his painting of himself as a unionist seems disingenuous given his position in the Confederate government. It comes across as an after thought to justify a course of action rather than an empirical truth. And while finding the truth of Stephens’s position on secession may not be the goal, the impression of his claim is integral to understanding the use of the term ‘unionist’ and the general trend of reimagining agency during this period. The people of Georgia elected Stephens in 1866 to the same Congressional seat he abandoned for secession.

‘Unionists’ started the process of rewriting a historical narrative that veterans both North and South would expand upon later in the century. ‘Unionists’ asked others, specifically the Federal Government, to focus on their duty to state and their

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., xix, 165.

<sup>60</sup> *Reconstruction*, 185.

lack of agency within secession. But declaring oneself a ‘unionist’ relied on the signing of a piece of paper. It was a practical rather than ideological means to regain or secure property and rights lost due to perceived status as an original secessionist. ‘Unionists’ did not focus on their reasons for secession or their experience during the war. Rather they implored others to forget that they had a war experience at all because to remember would be to expose wholehearted Confederate service.

Veterans, when they conceptualized fraternity later in the century, declared a type of ‘unionism’ for ideological and practical purposes and they did so within the context of their war experience. By the time veterans’ writings became popular, former Confederates already had the civil rights and rights to property reconstruction ‘unionists’ sought. Conceptualizing fraternity was still a means to an end, but it was a means to a collective rather than personal end. It was a way in which to define post-war ‘Americanism.’

It was exactly this question of nation rebuilding coming out of reconstruction that had veterans so worried about their legacy. Would this rebuilding maintain the importance of their duty and sacrifice? Would politicians’ urge to move past the war and forgive past wrongs result in forgetting the veterans? The answer to the latter question was yes, somewhat. Nineteenth-century Americans did start to move past the issues of the war by moving past the veterans and showing less interest in their affairs and stories. What the rest of this thesis analyzes is how the veterans rekindled Americans’ interest and helped rebuild the nation through a rewriting of the war’s narrative.

## 2

### *“Eradicating forever the scars of the civil war”: The Grand Army of the Republic and the United Confederate Veterans*

On July 1, 1913, a group of some 53,407 veterans descended on Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. They gathered in celebration of a grand reunion fifty years in the making. They traveled from almost every state in the ever-expanding union to join in friendship with their former comrades and foes. This “Great Reunion” between the men who had worn the blue and the gray was in celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg.

The state of Pennsylvania established a committee in 1909 to begin planning for the grand festivities. In total, states from across the United States allocated about \$1,750,000 (the equivalent of \$41,970,479.80 in 2014 dollars) to provide free transportation for the veterans. To build the “Great Camp” for the “Great Reunion,” Congress and the War Department devoted \$450,000; Pennsylvania devoted another \$450,000 on its own. This “Great Camp” eventually covered 250 acres, provided 688,000 cooked meals prepared by 2,170 cooks, had 47 miles of avenues on the battlefield lit by 500 electric lights, and had 32 “bubbling ice water fountains” throughout the veterans’ quarters. Several thousand Boy Scouts of America served as the aides-de-camp for the veterans solidifying the idea this “reunion was to be a source of lessons transmitted between generations.”<sup>61</sup> Not only was this a grand event

---

<sup>61</sup> David W. Blight, ““What Will Peace among the Whites Bring?”: Reunion and Race in the Struggle over the Memory of the Civil War in American Culture,” *Massachusetts Review* 34, no. 3 (1993), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25090451>. 400.

incorporating some of the most modern technological achievements, it was a national event. States from across the country were invested in and represented at this reunion. Furthermore it symbolized the themes the country upheld: fraternity, reverence, and respect for sacrifice. The nation's eyes turned towards the men who had survived the fight and helped establish a "new birth of freedom" for the United States as they met and reminisced on the rolling hills where the single bloodiest day in American history occurred.

The reunion made headlines in most newspapers throughout the week due to the presence of 155 reporters of the national and international press.<sup>62</sup> The *National Tribune*, an official organ of the Union veterans' group the Grand Army of the Republic, announced the reunion signaled the "death of sectionalism" and the "obliterating of the Mason and Dixon's line."<sup>63</sup> The *Confederate Veteran*, the official organ of the United Confederate Veterans, declared, "the day of differences and jealousies is past."<sup>64</sup> The *London Times* stated the congregating veterans were "eradicating forever the scars of the civil war in a way that no amount of preaching or political maneuvering could have done."<sup>65</sup> With this statement, the *London Times* pronounced the success of what veterans and their associations had done over the past few decades. As David Blight has argued, the veterans "were at once the embodiment of Civil War nostalgia, symbols of a lost age of heroism, and the fulfillment of the most human of needs—civil and spiritual reconciliation."<sup>66</sup> Americans believed this

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 400.

<sup>63</sup> *National Tribune* quoted in *Race and Reunion*, 9.

<sup>64</sup> *The Confederate Veteran* quoted in *ibid.*

<sup>65</sup> *London Times* quoted in *ibid.*

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 8.

reunion embodied and symbolized the fraternity veterans had insisted upon and the veterans' public had clung to for fifty years. The veterans present at Gettysburg during those days in July 1913 had no objections to being those symbols of reconciliation for they had willingly created for themselves this very symbolic status.

The act of forgetting can take two forms. It can either be an inadvertent neglect to remember or an active decision to move beyond what is past. The 1913 Gettysburg Reunion served as a fitting culmination to a fifty-year distortion of the historical narrative of the war that combined both these forms of forgetting. What started as an active decision to move beyond what was past transformed into an inadvertent neglect to remember within the historical narrative.<sup>67</sup> Attendants were unable to interpret the war except through a fraternal lens given the efforts of veterans, physical memorialization and education many Americans had received. Black veterans, who were not well represented in the ranks of veterans at the ceremony, would certainly disagree the battles were past and therefore settled. Black Americans were still fighting the central battle of the war: the battle for their equal place in society. To say the veterans were simply willing participants or fit themselves into the narrative that had been established by 1913 is an incomplete reading of the veterans' actions between 1865 and 1913. Rather than being passive observers, the veterans of both the Union and Confederate armies did a significant amount to both disseminate and encourage this fraternal narrative of conflict. While much of this presentation of fraternity across lines can be found in the memoirs of the 1880s and 1890s, it can also be found in the campaigns of veterans' groups of both North and South.

---

<sup>67</sup> Physical memorials are indicative of this inadvertent neglect that describes the mentality of most Americans by the early twentieth century. See Chapter five of this thesis for a fuller discussion on memorials.

The ways in which veterans began to conceptualize their own ideology of fraternity was through their membership and support of the two main veterans' groups: the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR) and the United Confederate Veterans (UCV). Originally established as ways to continue the bonds created during the war, veterans' groups faced a crisis of interest beginning in the 1870s and turned towards politics and an emphasis on unity between Union and Confederate veterans. During the 1880s and 1890s, the veterans, especially the GAR, tried to fight their crisis of ongoing relevancy through concerted lobbying efforts for more liberal pension law. The two literary mouthpieces of the GAR and UCV, *The National Tribune* and the *Confederate Veteran*, began seeking cross-national appeal and promoting veterans' fraternity in their weekly or monthly publications by publishing veterans' or their family's accounts.

*The Establishment of the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Confederate Veterans*

Veterans' groups were immediately established after the end of the war in 1865. Arguably the most notable of any of these groups was the GAR in the North. Developing an organization for Union veterans was the immediate postwar project of Benjamin Franklin Stephenson of Springfield, Illinois. Having served as a surgeon in the Fourteenth Illinois Infantry for two years, Stephenson sought to establish a group based on the principles of brotherhood, charity, and loyalty towards Union veterans. Membership in the GAR was limited to honorably discharged veterans of Union forces. Almost every prominent Union veteran was a member, including five United States Presidents: Ulysses S. Grant, Rutherford B. Hayes, James Garfield, Benjamin

Harrison, and William McKinley. The first post organized in Decatur, Illinois on April 6, 1866, less than one year after the surrender at Appomattox, had twelve members. By November 20, 1866, the first GAR national encampment held in Indianapolis had groups representing ten states and the District of Columbia.<sup>68</sup> The GAR was also predominantly racially segregated throughout its posts. This segregation should be described as 'de facto' rather than 'de jure,' for while the GAR did not openly bar black veterans from joining, white and black members mostly formed their own posts. In the extremely rare cases of local GAR posts that were integrated, mainly in areas where there were not enough total veterans to establish separate groups, the number of black veterans normally did not exceed a few members. In areas where the black population was significant, segregated posts were the rule. When in the 1890s the question of whether the GAR should continue to have segregated posts arose, the members and leadership did not reach consensus.<sup>69</sup>

While historians have done an extensive amount of research on the GAR, they have done far less concerning Confederate veterans' organizations. One group did not oversee Confederate veterans' affairs as the GAR did for Union veterans. The largest and most dominant group for Confederate veterans was the UCV, established in 1889 in New Orleans, Louisiana. While there were local organizations throughout the South before the UCV's establishment, many of these local groups joined under the UCV's umbrella when it appeared. At its inaugural meeting, fifty-two delegates representing nine separate organizations were present, far larger numbers than the

---

<sup>68</sup> "The Grand Army of the Republic and Kindred Societies: Introduction," The Library of Congress, <http://www.loc.gov/rr/main/gar/garintro.html>.

<sup>69</sup> Stuart C. McConnell, *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 213.

membership of the first GAR post. The expansion of the UCV never matched that of the GAR and, while the UCV never officially published its numbers, its peak membership was probably around 80,000. Like the GAR, the UCV grew fastest in the 1890s with 1,555 camps represented at the 1898 reunion.<sup>70</sup>

Veterans were keen to join veterans' organizations because of their desire to continue the bonds established during the war and the regimentation of army life. There was also a more pressing, ideological reason for membership. The protection of veterans' legacies quickly became the main objective of these organizations. The GAR's third principle of loyalty towards Union veterans was fostered through constant reminders to the post-war generation of the GAR's significant role in reuniting the nation. The GAR spent much of its time soliciting funds for monuments and memorials to Union soldiers and heroes as well as strongly encouraging the preservation of sites, relics and historic documents.<sup>71</sup> In many cases, the GAR members themselves gave "battle-stained flags, mementos, and documents to local museums" in order to further propagate and solidify their significance to the local community.<sup>72</sup> What is consistent in the efforts of the GAR and UCV was their insistence on *public* memory. Both felt their members' war experiences were important to defining post-war 'Americanism' and fundamental to late nineteenth century Americans' knowledge of self. It was why many of their efforts centered on proscriptive, pedagogical rhetoric and memorial forms.

---

<sup>70</sup> Herman Hattaway, "Clio's Southern Soldiers: The United Confederate Veterans and History," *Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 12, no. 3 (1971): 214.

<sup>71</sup> "The Grand Army of the Republic and Kindred Societies: Introduction".

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*

*The Veterans React to a Crisis of Interest and Ongoing Relevancy with Fraternity*

The initial spark of interest in veterans' affairs and groups of the 1860s dwindled as the 1870s and reconstruction progressed. "Americans settled into a decade in which they were more anxious to forget the conflict than to relive it" and GAR membership was at its lowest, around 30,000 men nationwide in the 1870s.<sup>73</sup> The GAR was not the only veterans' group affected by this disinterest; Confederate groups, both of veterans and civilians, experienced diminished membership and support as well.<sup>74</sup> Diminished interest was in part due to the Federal Government's insistence during reconstruction to move past the war and to forgive past wrongs. Reconstruction policies of amnesty and pardon as well as Horace Greeley's 1872 nomination point to this political desire for historical amnesia. Many Americans as well began to move past the veterans for they, too, reminded the people of the death and destruction wrought by the war. This diminished interest also in part stemmed from current issues including, Caroline Janney argues, the Panic of 1873 and political corruption (specifically incidents in President Grant's cabinet). People were justifiably preoccupied with issues currently defining their lives and could not focus or devote their time to memory activities.<sup>75</sup>

The veterans' crisis of ongoing relevancy was also due to the rapid changes the country underwent in the 1880s, particularly those concerning immigration and urbanization. Between 1870 and 1900, 12 million people arrived in the United

---

<sup>73</sup> Larry M. Logue, *To Appomattox and Beyond: The Civil War Soldier in War and Peace*, The American Ways Series (Chicago: I.R. Dee, 1996), 94.

<sup>74</sup> Caroline E. Janney, *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2013), 109.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 108-09.

States.<sup>76</sup> As the country filled with individuals who had no personal connection to or experience of the war and were coming into the “world the war made,”<sup>77</sup> the veterans were wary of how and if their legacy would be remembered and included in the formation of post-war American identity.

In response to this crisis of ongoing relevancy, the GAR reinvigorated its emphasis on camaraderie between Union and Confederate soldiers, and now veterans, rather than showing “more painful Civil War symbolism” in the 1880s.<sup>78</sup> They also began to conceptualize their own ideology of fraternity that informed the activities of the GAR, the UCV and individual veterans more generally. The GAR did this in order to reinvigorate people’s interest in themselves. Many Americans and the government did not want to dwell on the bloody past, and GAR members could not endear themselves to the American public if they continued to do so. If they did not endear themselves to the American people, the veterans would fade away with the past; they would become relics of the ‘old war’ rather than vibrant citizens who contributed to the post-war United States through their example and experience. Many veterans already found themselves as outcasts in society due to their own mental or physical handicaps and civilians fear of how the war transformed them. Veterans therefore felt themselves to be somehow inferior to those who did not fight. The GAR, the UCV and other veterans’ organizations both Union and Confederate needed to appeal to their public as well as to men of their own ranks. Veterans could

---

<sup>76</sup>“Rise of Industrial America, 1876-1900: Immigration to the United States, 1851-1900,” The Library of Congress, [http://www.loc.gov/teachers/classroommaterials/presentationsandactivities/presentations/time\\_line/riseind/immgnts/](http://www.loc.gov/teachers/classroommaterials/presentationsandactivities/presentations/time_line/riseind/immgnts/).

<sup>77</sup> Foner, *Reconstruction*.

<sup>78</sup> Logue, *To Appomattox and Beyond*, 94.

not become despondent and regard themselves as no longer relevant. Americans were struggling to define post-war ‘Americanism,’ and the only way they would incorporate veterans, their experiences, and their examples into the definition was if all veterans worked together towards the end goal of proving their fundamental importance to American identity.

Membership between the 1870s and 1890s skyrocketed—30,000 members to its peak of roughly 400,000-450,000. Between 1880 and 1885, membership increased from 60,000 to 270,000 alone.<sup>79</sup> Veterans wanted to feel important and also wanted to be part of a group that advocated for their rights and continued relevance in the post-war United States. In joining the GAR, Union veterans were taking an active and political role in securing their legacy through something tenable and tangible. The veterans’ ideology of and emphasis on fraternity, as will be explored, reinvigorated public interest because it conveniently allowed their public to continue ignoring the remaining issues and certain unaddressed questions of reconstruction, especially the question of race and the implications of emancipation. Forgetting was easier than dealing with contested remembering for both the veterans’ public and the veterans themselves.

#### *Pensions and The National Tribune as the Fraternal Mouthpiece*

In order to prove veterans’ ongoing relevance, the GAR also delved into battles of a more political nature, the fight for pensions for Union soldiers. At the close of the American Revolution, the government administered a limited pension service to soldiers wounded during active military service as well as veterans and the

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.

widows of soldiers pleading dire poverty. By 1861, the Federal Government had not changed the system much, but made concerted efforts to pledge support to veterans; this was most likely an attempt to induce men to volunteer, as there was no conscription.<sup>80</sup> In 1882, there were one million living Union Army veterans who still had no pension file on record.<sup>81</sup> By the 1890s, the original pension system still remained mostly unaltered and stated that only veterans whose disability was “incurred as a direct consequence of...military duty” or developed after the war “from causes which can be directly traced to injuries received or diseases contracted while in military service” could collect benefits.<sup>82</sup> The veterans’ rank and level of disability accorded to the pension amount received; this meant that black veterans received, on average, lower payments, because the government barred them from serving as officers during the war.

Confederate veterans would never receive federal pensions and instead petitioned their states directly. Several Southern Congressmen petitioned the Federal Government to pay Confederate pensions before the 1880s, but outcry from other Southern politicians and some financially comfortable Confederate veterans defeated the request.<sup>83</sup>

There was a dire and pressing practical need for more liberal and universal pension law. Many veterans, either due to physical or mental disability, were

---

<sup>80</sup> Jennifer L. Gross, "Pensions, Civil War," in *Encyclopedia of the American Civil War: A Political, Social, and Military History*, ed. Jeanne T. Heidler David S. Heidler (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2000).[http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/abcacw/pensions\\_civil\\_war/0](http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/abcacw/pensions_civil_war/0)

<sup>81</sup> Claire Prechtel-Klusens, "'A Reasonable Degree of Promptitude': Civil War Pension Application Processing, 1861-1885," *Prologue Magazine* 42, no. 1 (2010), <http://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/2010/spring/civilwarpension.html>.

<sup>82</sup> Gross, "Pensions, Civil War."

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

incapable of supporting themselves or their families; either they could not maintain a job or they did not qualify for a job. Also due to the increasing rate of immigration, labor competition rose dramatically. Before the decline in interest in veterans in the 1870s, veterans were well treated, respected, and cared for by their communities. The nation did not want to see their veterans in the poorhouse.<sup>84</sup> In March 1865, the Federal Government established The National Asylum for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers (the forerunner of the contemporary Veterans Administration). The agency opened eleven soldiers' homes by 1929, retirement homes of sorts for disabled Union veterans, across the country while most Northern states set up their own.<sup>85</sup> Confederate veterans were never allowed in these National Asylums, but several Southern states established similar ones funded and managed by either state governments or private organizations.<sup>86</sup> The Federal Government established three branches in the first year, but then the program slowed. With the slowing of this form of public financial support and comfort, many veterans found themselves unable to cope and felt abandoned by the country they thought they saved.

In order to rededicate their efforts towards pension law, the GAR turned to a publication that was already deeply entrenched in the discourse: *The National Tribune*. The magazine first appeared on October 1, 1877 with the aim "to secure to soldiers and sailors their rights, and to expose their wrongs to public inspection so

---

<sup>84</sup> James Marten, "Not a Veteran in the Poorhouse: Civil War Pensions and Soldiers' Homes," in *Wars within a War: Controversy and Conflict over the American Civil War*, ed. Gary W. Gallagher and Joan Waugh, *Civil War America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 207.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 205.

<sup>86</sup> "History of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers," National Park Service, [http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/veterans\\_affairs/History.html](http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/veterans_affairs/History.html).

that correction may be made...<sup>87</sup> The paper was the culmination of the particular interests of its founder George E. Lemon, a Union veteran, lawyer, and the most notorious pension claims agent in Washington D.C.<sup>88</sup> Lemon intended the magazine to advocate on veterans' behalf. Evoking the line from Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address—"to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan"—Lemon also called for laws ensuring receipt of pensions for both veterans and their families. Initially, *The National Tribune* covered Congressional news related to pensions and provided narratives, tables, and statistics about past wars; Lemon also frequently included advice to veterans on how best to claim pensions.<sup>89</sup>

Predominantly in response to the lobbying efforts of the GAR, its members, and *The National Tribune*, the Federal Government liberalized pension law with the 1890 Dependent Pension Act. The revision allowed any veteran who honorably served in the Union Army to receive a pension if "at some time he became disabled for manual labor."<sup>90</sup> In 1906, President Theodore Roosevelt signed an amendment making a veteran's old age reason enough for a pension.

Expansion of pension law was of extreme importance to the GAR because they felt it would remind the American people the government still felt veterans were relevant. It meant veterans' service was necessary for the country, valorous, and deserving of continued respect. It also monetarily universalized the experiences veterans claimed were universal to all soldiers in their writings. That the government

---

<sup>87</sup> *The National Tribune* quoted in "About the National Tribune (Washington, D.C.), 1877-1917," The Library of Congress, <http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn82016187/>.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., Wallace Evan Davies, *Patriotism on Parade: The Story of Veterans' and Hereditary Organizations in America, 1783-1900*, Harvard Historical Studies (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955), 106.

<sup>89</sup> "About the National Tribune (Washington, D.C.), 1877-1917".

<sup>90</sup> Gross, "Pensions, Civil War."

continued to pay veterans meant Americans should continue to regard veterans. In the end, some of their tax money became payments rendered for veterans' service. Veterans had supported the country, and now the country needed to support its veterans.

As the GAR turned to *The National Tribune* to help their pension lobbying efforts, *The National Tribune* turned to the GAR. Beginning in 1882, *The National Tribune* began to advertise and advocate for the GAR specifically. This was partly due to the close relationship of *Tribune* editor Lemon and newly elected Commander-in-Chief of the GAR Paul Vandervoort (also spelled Van Der Voort). In the September 16, 1882 issue of *The National Tribune*, a small paragraph stated, "As our readers all know, Commander-In-Chief Vandervoort has called on the members of the Grand Army to raise 509,000 new recruits during his year of administration, and THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE proposes to do its full share of the work."<sup>91</sup> *The National Tribune* continued to publish articles concerning the ongoing discussions around pensions, but it also more frequently published narratives of battles from officers and soldiers and later became known for its recurring feature "Fighting Them Over: What Our Veterans Have to Say About Their Old Campaigns." It also published a serialized version of General William Tecumseh Sherman's *Memoirs*.<sup>92</sup>

As part of the "Fighting Them Over" Series, on March 29, 1883, *The National Tribune* printed part one of a story entitled, "Good-Bye to Dixie" by Private John F. Hill of Co. K, 89<sup>th</sup> Ohio Volunteer Infantry. The story documented Hill's escape from

---

<sup>91</sup> "How to Build up the Grand Army," *The National Tribune*, September 16, 1882 1882, 4.

<sup>92</sup> Davies, *Patriotism on Parade*, 106.

Danville Prison in Virginia, one of the more notorious Confederate prisons. Hill's narrative was an example of the fraternity the GAR had begun to conceptualize that permeated veterans' accounts in the 1880s at least through the 1910s. In part nine, published on May 24, 1883, Hill wrote of how two Virginian men saved and sheltered him. One of the men, a Mr. Richmond, was "one of the leading Unionists of the country." John F. Hill described how Richmond's

eldest son was then in Castle Thunder, having been imprisoned because he had refused to accept a commission in the rebel army. His two other sons had been conscripted. The youngest deserted, but was followed home and shot down in his father's dooryard while attempting to escape. The second son deserted also, and took to the mountains to bushwhack the rebels.<sup>93</sup>

In its final printing, "Good-Bye to Dixie" restated what the *Circleville Union*, Hill's local county paper, wrote about his arrival back home: "All along the route they [Hill and his fellow Union soldier escapees] found Union men and women, who treated them with great kindness and hospitality, and bid them Godspeed on their journey."<sup>94</sup> While it is possible that John F. Hill truly did meet so many Southerners who both wanted to help Union soldiers and actively hurt the Confederacy, the truth of the story is not as important as what it chose to highlight. It highlighted fraternity between two sections that were supposedly divided.

*The National Tribune* became the most widely read journalistic mouthpiece of the GAR and claimed a total of 650,000 readers in 1887.<sup>95</sup> This was a significantly higher readership than another leading magazine, *The Century Magazine*, which also published veterans' accounts of the nature of John F. Hill's. Both of these

---

<sup>93</sup> John F. Hill, "Good-Bye to Dixie: One More River to Cross--Brothers of the Magic String," *The National Tribune*, May 24, 1883 1883, 3.

<sup>94</sup> "Good-Bye to Dixie: Homeward Bound at Last--the Happy Sequel to a Sad Story," *The National Tribune*, June 7, 1883 1883, 7.

<sup>95</sup> Davies, *Patriotism on Parade*, 106.

publications wide readerships signify how important, central, and popular veterans' ideology of fraternity was to their public. If *The National Tribune* continually employed the rhetoric of fraternity starting in the 1880s, then it had to guide the discussion in some way. The only way for it to maintain or expand its circulation was if its argument appealed to readers, and obviously the fraternal narrative renewed subscriptions.

### *The Confederate Veteran and Fraternity*

The decentralization of Confederate veterans' groups did not extend to a decentralized message. Similar to the GAR, Confederate veterans' groups turned towards fraternity in order to reinvigorate interest. Confederate veterans, like their Union counterparts, were also concerned with preserving their legacy and dictating what that legacy should be. One source indicating the appeal of fraternity to Southern veterans was the magazine the *Confederate Veteran*, founded in 1893 by Sumner Archibald Cunningham in Nashville, Tennessee. The UCV adopted the magazine as its official publication in 1894.<sup>96</sup> Cunningham published the monthly magazine "in the Interest of Confederate Veterans and Kindred Topics" according to its masthead. It ran until 1932.<sup>97</sup>

While the magazine's title professed a distinctly Southern appeal, Cunningham expressed a different purpose. In the opening paragraphs of its first volume, Cunningham stated the *Confederate Veteran*:

is intended as an organ of communication between Confederate soldiers and those who are interested in them and their affairs, and its purpose is to furnish

---

<sup>96</sup> Hattaway, "Clio's Southern Soldiers," 215-16.

<sup>97</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 181.

a volume of information which will be acceptable to the public, even to those who fought on the other side. It will at once be sent to every Confederate Veteran organization in existence and the patronage of such bodies is earnestly sought.<sup>98</sup>

The magazine further detailed how it received commendation from “the extremes of the South and from our friends at the North.”<sup>99</sup> Cunningham also believed in the pedagogical contributions the magazine could make when he observed its publication was more for those “who were not in the War, since its contents will make them more patriotic and prouder of their ancestry.”<sup>100</sup> From its initial printing, the *Confederate Veteran* hoped to express the fraternity between Union and Confederate veterans the GAR already promoted.

The *Confederate Veteran*, with its hope at cross-sectional appeal, achieved widespread popularity, with a national readership and circulation of over twenty thousand by the end of the nineteenth century.<sup>101</sup> Part of its mass appeal was its price: the magazine only cost fifty cents per issue.<sup>102</sup> Its appeal was also due to the types of articles it published, including pieces on: common soldiers (either written by veterans as reminiscences or children as part of essay contests), veterans’ obituaries, articles on commemorative efforts, the war’s western theater, information on the UCV and its corollaries, and the rising tide of white supremacy.<sup>103</sup> While inclusion of articles about white supremacy may seem counter to fostering unity between North and South, it was a sentiment which both Union and Confederate veterans adopted as a way to

---

<sup>98</sup> The Confederate Veteran Magazine, 1893, (Nashville: S.A. Cunningham, 1893), <https://archive.org/details/confederateveter01conf>. 1.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid.

<sup>100</sup> Sumner Archibald Cunningham quoted in Janney, *Remembering the Civil War*, 180.

<sup>101</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 181.

<sup>102</sup> Janney, *Remembering the Civil War*, 180.

<sup>103</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 181., Janney, *Remembering the Civil War*, 180.

promote unity between the sections through continuing to ignore the consequences of emancipation. White supremacy may certainly have close ties to the Lost Cause, but it was not exclusively part of Lost Cause ideology. Distinctions between the Lost Cause tenets and a more general belief in white supremacy must be recognized and maintained. *The Confederate Veteran's* featured articles on white supremacy are not antithetical to its organizing principle of being informational and useful to non-veterans and "those who fought on the other side."

There is a question as to why the Confederate veterans embraced and advanced this fraternal narrative. Like the GAR and Union veterans, the UCV and Confederate veterans wanted to remain relevant and continue to have people view them and their war experience as fundamental to the post-war American sense of self. Many Americans, including those in the South, did not want to dwell on the death and destruction wrought by the war nor its consequences, for emancipation upset their antebellum way of life. The South also did not want to confront the actual cause of their secession, slavery, because the Federal Government now deemed it as being on the wrong side of history. If Confederate veterans dwelled on or tried to reinvigorate enmity between the two sections, that would not endear them or their legacy to many Americans. The Confederate veterans worked within the parameters of fraternity because it secured the best path to preserving and protecting their legacy. This is not to say Confederate and Union veterans promoted the exact same narrative. Both Union and Confederate veterans embraced the overarching structure of the history, but there was nuance in their arguments. Particularly when it came to legality and cause of the war, the Confederate veterans demanded a history that interpreted the

war and its causes in a way that implicated the entire nation and exonerated former Confederates for past choices. They also demanded that secession was not unconstitutional. That being said, what the UCV and GAR did agree on for structuring the historical narrative of the war proves even more astounding given these differences.

.....

The 1913 Gettysburg Reunion's embrace of the narrative of fraternity was evident in its organizing principles. As early as 1910, the Pennsylvania commission on the reunion proclaimed it would be a "Peace Jubilee" representing the themes of nationalism, patriotism, and harmony: a "festival of reconciliation."<sup>104</sup> The Commission was not the only one to promote the spirit of reconciliation surrounding the event; the spirit rather informed the entire event and its invited speakers' rhetoric. On July 3, Governor William Hodges Mann of Virginia spoke to the thousands of veterans and spectators about what this reunion meant:

We are not here to discuss the Genesis of the war, but men who have tried each other in the storm and smoke of battle are here to discuss the great fight... We came here, I say, not to discuss what caused the war of 1861-65, but to talk over the events of the battle as man to man.<sup>105</sup>

The following day, newly elected President Woodrow Wilson spoke to the anxious crowd. His speech and presence at the event were both short, but his words echoed the prevailing sentiment of the past fifty years:

They have meant peace and union and vigor, and the maturity and might of a great nation. How wholesome and healing the peace has been! We have found one another again as brothers and comrades in arms, enemies no longer,

---

<sup>104</sup> Blight, "What Will Peace among the Whites Bring?". 400, 01.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., 401.

generous friends rather, our battles long past, the quarrel forgotten—except that we shall not forget the splendid valor, the manly devotion of the men then arrayed against one another, now grasping hands and smiling into each other's eyes. How complete the union has become and how dear to all of us, how unquestioned, how benign and majestic, as State after State has been added to this our great family of free men!...Come, let us be comrades and solidify yet to serve our fellow-men in quiet counsel, where the blare of trumpets is neither heard nor heeded and where the things are done which make blessed the nations of the world in peace and righteousness and love.<sup>106</sup>

Within this setting, veterans spoke “man to man” because of how veterans helped restrict public conversations about and memorialization of the war to valor and sacrifice in the spirit of fraternity between men. These veterans shook hands across the bloody chasm, because they made the war’s narrative one of a “forgotten quarrel” between “brothers and comrades in arms.” Both Governor Mann and President Wilson evoked the veterans’ fraternal history of the war in their speeches and insisted on absolute reconciliation between both white veterans and white citizens. Their speeches only mention causes of the war to say they will not be discussed. The *Louisville Courier Journal* on July 4, 1913 summed up much of what could be said about the rhetoric and themes of this event:

Thank God for Gettysburg, hosanna!...God bless us every one, alike the Blue and the Gray, the Gray and the Blue! The world ne’re witnessed such a sight as this. Beholding, can we say ‘happy is the nation that hath no history’?<sup>107</sup>

The answer was yes.

---

<sup>106</sup> Woodrow Wilson, "Address at Gettysburg, July 4, 1913," University of California, Santa Barbara, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=65370>.

<sup>107</sup> Blight, ""What Will Peace among the Whites Bring?". 402.

## 3

*“We know that these reminiscences cannot be strictly true”:  
Veterans’ Memoirs*

In 1881 in Columbia, Tennessee, a middle-aged former soldier sat down to compose his memoirs. Surrounded by his children who clustered around his knees and bumped his elbows, Sam Watkins recalled the spirited fervor that surrounded the war. Those were times of patriotism and sacrifice of the utmost degree, and now Watkins and his fellow veterans soberly reflected on questions of cause of the war, death, and country. In his opening lines, Watkins wrote,

Now, everybody knew at that time that it was by the idiosyncrasy of an unbalanced mind, and that the United States of America had no north, no south, no east, no west. Well, he [Wm. L. Yancey]<sup>108</sup> began to preach the strange doctrine of there being such a thing. He began to have followers. As you know, it matters not how absurd, ridiculous and preposterous doctrines may be preached, there will be some followers...Then after a while whole heaps of people began to say that they thought that there was a north and a south; and after a while hundreds and thousands and million said that there was a south...America has no north, no south, no east, no west; the sun rises over the hills and sets over the mountains, the compass just points up and down, and we can laugh now at the absurd notion of there being a north and south.<sup>109</sup>

Watkins identified as fallacy the notion of North and South as sectional identities.

They were rather creations of an “unbalanced mind” adopted by a community swayed

by the creation’s power. The United States had always been united and, much to

---

<sup>108</sup> William Lowndes Yancey (August 10, 1814-July 27, 1863) was a U.S. congressman, secessionist, and Confederate senator from Alabama. In 1848, Yancey began attempting to create a southern rights coalition independent of both political parties. He was elected to represent Montgomery County in the secession convention and was appointed to draft the ordinance of secession for Alabama. (<http://www.anb.org/articles/04/04-01080.html>)

<sup>109</sup> Sam R. Watkins, *Co. Aytch: A Confederate Memoir of the Civil War* (New York: Touchstone, 2003), 1,3.

Watkins's relief as he penned these words, returned to that mindset again. Watkins, using his direct prose, continued, "well, reader; let me whisper in your ear. I was in the row, and the following pages will tell what part I took in the little unpleasant misconception of there being such a thing as a north and south."<sup>110</sup>

These opening words from Watkins indicate a larger trend found in the memoirs of veterans published from the 1880s into the opening decade of the twentieth century. The veterans evoked their authority on the subject; their reminiscences are full of the true events they witnessed. They did not intend to write a grand history of the war but rather a narrative of their particular service. Yet the veterans took their stories of individual service and universalized them. Their memoirs are the origin of the fraternal 'Civil War' and partly explain the pervasiveness and longevity of the narrative.

The ways in which veterans employed the fraternal narrative in their memoirs fell into three general categories: lack of descriptive violence (or descriptions which internalized or delegitimized violence); feelings of camaraderie, mutual sentiment and respect, especially as indicated and highlighted by episodes on picket lines; and pejorative and archetypal descriptions of blacks. Through the analysis of seven memoirs<sup>111</sup>—four published between 1881 and 1910 and three unpublished until the

---

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>111</sup> "Narrative of Service as a Private, Company A, Ninth New York Heavy Artillery" by Alfred Seelye Roe (Unpublished Manuscript); "Gone for a Soldier: The Civil War Memoirs of Private Alfred Bellard, Pvt. 5<sup>th</sup> New Jersey Regiment, Co. C" (Found at estate sale 1962, originally published 1975); "A Yankee Private's Civil War" by Robert Hale Strong, Pvt. Co. B, 105<sup>th</sup> Illinois Volunteer Infantry (originally published 1961); "Co. Aytch" by Sam R. Watkins, Pvt. Co. H, First Tennessee Regiment, CSA (originally published serially in hometown Columbia, TN newspaper between 1881-1882); "Reminiscences of a Private" by Frank M. Mixson, Co. E, 1<sup>st</sup> South Carolina Volunteers (originally published 1910 by The State Company, Columbia, S.C.); "Life in the Confederate Army: Being Personal

1960s or yet still—this chapter will examine how veterans’ narratives become *the* history and framework for understanding and memorializing the war rather than *a* way to understand and memorialize the war. All the examined accounts are those of men who served as privates or uncommissioned lower officers. The decision made because, in the words of veteran Frank Wilkeson, “the epauletted history has been largely inspired by vanity or jealousy...”<sup>112</sup>

.....

### *Influence of Publishers*

Veterans’ memoirs became popular in the North and South beginning in the 1870s and generated a lucrative business by the 1880s.<sup>113</sup> While overall interest in veterans’ groups and activities was low in the 1870s, industrious publishers felt they could make a market out of the narratives. At first, publishers solicited stories penned by prominent generals or politicians since they already had a built in market. The people of the North and the South wanted to hear what either their favorite or best-known personages felt the late conflict was about and where battles had gone right or wrong. An example of this mass craving was the *Personal Memoirs of Ulysses S. Grant*. Published in 1885, the memoir became an immediate success and garnered

---

Experiences of a Private Soldier in the Confederate Army” by Arthur P. Ford (originally published 1905 by the Neale Publishing Company of NY and Washington, D.C.); *Turned Inside Out: Recollections of a Private Soldier in the Army of the Potomac* by Frank Wilkeson (originally published in 1866 by Putnam’s, NY); as well as selections from *Century Magazine’s* “Battles and Leaders of the Civil War” and *The Southern Historical Society Papers*.

<sup>112</sup> Frank Wilkeson, *Turned Inside Out: Recollections of a Private Soldier in the Army of the Potomac*, Bison Books ed. (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), xiii.

<sup>113</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 161, 171.

Grant's widow the equivalent of more than \$10 million in royalties in 2014 dollars.<sup>114</sup>

In March 1877, newspaper editor Alexander K. McClure, a former Pennsylvania House representative who played an instrumental role in swinging the state for Abraham Lincoln during the election of 1860, began soliciting narratives from both former Union and Confederate participants of the civil war for a series in *The Philadelphia Weekly Times*.<sup>115</sup> Two years later, McClure selected fifty-six of the articles to appear in his massive 800-page *Annals of The War: Written by Leading Participants North and South*.<sup>116</sup> In the preface, McClure described how publication of this tome was "to correct as far as possible the pages of the future history of the war of the late rebellion," that hasty, inaccurate and partisan compilations had already tarnished. McClure continued,

The Annals of the War furnish the most valuable contributions to the future historian which have yet been given to the world. They are far from being perfect; but they have elicited the truth to a degree that no other means could have accomplished.<sup>117</sup>

In McClure's estimation, veterans' narratives provided the necessary raw material for future histories of the civil war. While he admits they are not perfect, an interesting counter to his earlier claim that these narratives would correct earlier inaccuracies, these reminiscences are the most valuable, truthful, and worthy accounts for future study.

---

<sup>114</sup> Gilbert King, "War and Peace of Mind for Ulysses S. Grant," Smithsonian Institute, <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/war-and-peace-of-mind-for-ulysses-s-grant-1882227/?no-ist>.

<sup>115</sup> Janney, *Remembering the Civil War*, 163., Damon M. Laabs, "McClure, Alexander Kelly," Pennsylvania State University, [http://pabook.libraries.psu.edu/palitmap/bios/McClure\\_\\_Alexander\\_Kelly.html](http://pabook.libraries.psu.edu/palitmap/bios/McClure__Alexander_Kelly.html).

<sup>116</sup> Janney, *Remembering the Civil War*, 163.

<sup>117</sup> *The Annals of the War Written by Leading Participants North and South, Originally Published in the Philadelphia Weekly Times*, (Philadelphia: The Times Publishing Company, 1879), <https://archive.org/stream/annalsofwar00philrich#page/n9/mode/2up>. i-ii.

Another leading magazine soliciting the stories of veterans, *The Century Magazine*, was not as forthcoming about its views on the authenticity of its sources and actively kept these questions away from its readers.<sup>118</sup> McClure, along with Watkins and thousands of other veterans, felt without these stories the true civil war would be lost. Yet what quickly becomes apparent to a modern reader with hindsight is the publication and absorption of these narratives proved Walt Whitman was correct. The “real war” was not getting into the books, but an imagined one was.

Examination of *The Century Magazine* shows most conclusively the popularity and power of these solicited stories. *Century* began publication in 1881 as a successor to *Scribner’s Monthly Magazine* and quickly rose to prominence and popularity with its series of war reminiscences. From November 1884 to November 1887, *The Century Magazine* published hundreds of articles “lavishly illustrated with engravings, drawings...and maps in perhaps the most ambitious attempt ever to retell a war by its leading participants” as part of its series, “Battles and Leaders of the Civil War.”<sup>119</sup> Under the leadership of associate editors Clarence C. Buel and Robert Underwood Johnson, *Century* strongly began courting old soldiers to send them their stories. In a March 5, 1884 letter from Robert Underwood Johnson to Union General George B. McClellan, Johnson implored McClellan:

In arriving at your decision [to write] I trust you will give due consideration to the importance of the Series as a medium for authoritative Statement concerning disputed occurrences. A book would perhaps reach one-tenth of the audience which the magazine is assured of.<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 176.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, 174.

<sup>120</sup> Letter to Gen. George B. McClellan, Robert Underwood Johnson Papers, Manuscripts and Archives Division, The New York Public Library.

Appealing to McClellan's ego with the circulation numbers was one strategy, but it hinted at something larger. Like the physical memorials erected across the United States in the later decades of the nineteenth century, *Century* looked to instruct the next generation about the true experience and history of war on a scale that would reach every state. Between March 3 and April 24, 1884, Johnson sent letters of solicitation to Generals George B. McClellan, William Tecumseh Sherman, James Longstreet, Joseph E. Johnson, and Pierre Gustave Toutant Beauregard. In a letter to Union General William Tecumseh Sherman on March 13, 1884, Johnson referred to *Century*'s war series as a "historical project."<sup>121</sup>

In every letter Johnson wrote to a general soliciting a narrative, he stated the project's goal was to create an account the reader understood and to describe battles as they were with accounts from both sides. Yet he also implored his writers to include "incidents of the fight, especially of heroism" and to write of large rather than small events. These goals were at odds with one another, for to highlight heroism was to detract from truthful battle descriptions of a less valiant nature. More to the point, Johnson understood that in order for this war series to work it had to have wide appeal. What the public wanted were stories of heroism that did not leave them with questions on the consequences of the war. Rather, the veterans' public thought they wanted a heroic narrative due in part to the Federal Government's response and in part as a way to continue to ignore the destruction and death wrought by the civil war. Like physical memorials would do, *The Century Magazine*'s editors saw its purpose as one of producing consensus and resolution rather than prolonging conflict or

---

<sup>121</sup> Letter to Gen. William T. Sherman, Robert Underwood Johnson Papers, Manuscripts and Archives Division, The New York Public Library.

sectional divides. Thus readers of this series were hard pressed to find any discussion of cause of the war or consequences.<sup>122</sup> Johnson succeeded in persuading most of the officers he wrote to write pieces for the series.

Just as Johnson and Buel wanted narratives devoid of the war's cause and consequences, they also wanted ones devoid of extreme violence and destruction to men's bodies. Johnson and Buel carefully said the stories they wanted fell into a style they referred to as "fatigue dress account." Presumably this style refers to Johnson and Buel's wish for "non-technical, thoroughly popular papers (as we conceive them) describing battles as one might describe [men], so as to bring out their individuality."<sup>123</sup> An individual could make their description of a battle colorful and readable without involving violence or cause of the war. Leaving out the latter two allowed for the story's larger appeal and publishers were very aware of that fact. Within six months of the initial publication of these stories in 1884, *The Century Magazine* reached its peak popularity and its circulation increased from 127,000 to 225,000 making it one of the most widely read general magazines in the country.<sup>124</sup>

Due to the exponential growth in popularity of the series, Johnson and Buel began receiving unsolicited, and unwanted, narratives from all over the country. Many of these narratives came from veterans who served in unranked capacities or the wives and other family members of deceased veterans. *The Century Magazine's* war series originally only solicited narratives from individuals of higher ranks, and the editors began to thank but refuse these unsolicited submissions. In a letter to Mr.

---

<sup>122</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 175.

<sup>123</sup> Letter to Gen. Lew Wallace, Robert Underwood Johnson Papers, Manuscripts and Archives Division, The New York Public Library.

<sup>124</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 175., Finding Aid, Robert Underwood Johnson Papers, Manuscripts and Archives Division, The New York Public Library.

Omar Wilson on December 16, 1884, the editors declined an offer for the elder Mr. Wilson to write on the Wilson Raid since it was a “small event.”<sup>125</sup>

In another letter, *Century* declined a paper on “the Negro” because it did not concern their overarching goal of talking about the war.<sup>126</sup> More likely, they declined the paper because it would not fit into their goals of publishing accounts all individuals, both North and South, approached on common ground. It is unknown what the paper on “the Negro” consisted of or argued, but its subject matter was enough to divide a readership *Century* hoped was national in scope. Johnson and Buel’s decision not to include this paper, or any partisan accounts, helped to avoid the divisive issues and consequences of the war as a way to keep their publication numbers high. Consequently, and most importantly, the decision helped create a sense of unity within the narratives themselves by employing veterans’ ideology of fraternity. Literary fiction writers also employed this exclusivity of fraternity in their works produced around the same time.

*The Century Magazine* was not singular in its treatment, or lack there, of excluding blacks and black experience from the record of the civil war. The first major collection of war reminiscences did not include blacks and their emancipation except as props or archetypes. This trend, as seen in the memoirs discussed later in this chapter, intensified in the 1880s until “the ideological character of the war, especially the reality of emancipation, had faded from American literature.”<sup>127</sup> As David Blight has argued, part of white reconciliation of the war involved writing out

---

<sup>125</sup> Letter to Mr. Omar Wilson, Robert Underwood Johnson Papers, Manuscripts and Archives Division, The New York Public Library.

<sup>126</sup> Letter to “Sir”, Robert Underwood Johnson Papers, Manuscripts and Archives Division, The New York Public Library.

<sup>127</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 168, 217.

divisive issues, including slavery as a cause of war and emancipation and its consequences. Frederick Douglass feared for a “generous forgetfulness” caused by a reunion of whites through celebrations of duty and heroism that would distort the distinction between “those who fought for liberty and those who fought for slavery; between those who fought to save the Republic and those who fought to destroy it.”<sup>128</sup> Unfortunately for Douglass, due to the pervasive insistence on fraternity by veterans, the powerful ideology of the Lost Cause, and the overall writing out of slavery and black participation in the war, the distinction between those “who fought to save the Republic and those who fought to destroy it” was quickly lost in the adopted narrative of the war.

Presenting a fraternal understanding of the war was the best and most assured way to get published by the 1880s. Veterans and their families understood how lucrative memoirs were. If *Century* did not want any partisan accounts, they would not get any partisan accounts. Veterans would not purposefully disregard a viable option to secure, what was in many cases, much needed money. Thus *Century*'s readership of over a quarter of a million continued reading stories, maintaining reconciliation was natural and always destined as the end result of the war. *Century*'s decisiveness resulted in soldiers writing to the magazine offering to pen accounts to directly fit its non-partisan theme.<sup>129</sup> This suggests veterans seeking publication silently acquiesced to the norms established by the publishers, the Grand Army of the Republic and United Confederate Veterans by the 1880s.

---

<sup>128</sup> Frederick Douglass quoted Joseph Moreau, *Schoolbook Nation: Conflicts over American History Textbooks from the Civil War to the Present* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003), 57.

<sup>129</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 176.

*Century's* refusal to publish certain pieces did not stop the flow of unsolicited materials from piling up. Eventually the magazine published a separate section entitled "Memoranda on the Civil War" as a place of publication for the writings of lower or unranked individuals. Much of what *The Century Magazine* published in "Memoranda on the Civil War" were criticisms and rebuttals of accounts published in "Battles and Leaders of the Civil War." In some cases, the criticism lodged was with a specific general and his actions on the battlefield; the writer wanted to lay blame where he, and in a few cases she, felt it was due.<sup>130</sup> While those who wrote in with corrections received letters of thanks from Johnson and Buel, it is unclear how much the editors actually changed any of the previously published accounts. At the beginning of Volume Four of *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*<sup>131</sup> is a list of corrections to the previous three volumes. They mostly consist of corrections to misprinted names or misnumbered regiments. Even if the rebuttals focused purely on culpability, and reveal more about the author's loyalties than the actual event, this suggests a nuance within veterans' memories that is not evident in the published materials. The importance of recognizing the dissent, disagreement, and counter narratives emerging at the same time the fraternal narrative of the war emerged is because it symbolizes how carefully crafted that latter narrative was. It also shows how there were competing narratives and competing memories for the war that the memorialization almost exclusively did not recognize or account for until much later.

---

<sup>130</sup> An example of an article laying blame is William Farrar Smith's "General George H. Thomas at Chattanooga," *The Century Magazine: A Popular Quarterly* Vol 32, Issue 3 (July 1886).

<sup>131</sup> *The Century* eventually published *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War* as a four volume set between 1887-1888.

In 1893, Peter Michie, a veteran who served in a New York regiment, spoke candidly about the powerful and pervasive influence veteran memoirs and accounts held on the American psyche:

We know that these reminiscences cannot be strictly true... The greatest heroes of the war are still in the land of the living, for they are ourselves, and in telling our stories we generally so proportion the details with each repetition as to magnify more and more our personal prowess and tone down our errors until with frequent telling we end with actually believing ourselves to be the very heroes our stories make us out to be.<sup>132</sup>

Michie spoke in particular of the trend in memoirs to exaggerate personal accomplishments and sightings. In many of the memoirs, the author comes face to face with the likes of Ulysses S. Grant, Robert E. Lee, Abraham Lincoln, and Jefferson Davis and does them a personal service without the expectation of reward; truly noble and in most cases completely fictitious events. But Michie's caution about the affect of frequent retellings of these created stories also applies to a larger group than the veteran author himself. The nation heard, read, and saw the fraternal narrative so often from veterans by the closing decade of the nineteenth century that they came to believe in it implicitly.

The memoirs had such power because of their source material. Veterans wrote the accounts and their readers therefore believed the stories. They believed them even if the veteran author obviously used hyperbole in an attempt to make his service more valorous and his part exponentially more important. The air of truth surrounding these narratives made them the logical source for writing a history of the war and shaped in what terms memorialization occurred. An individual born of the post-war generation could not argue with the memories of an elderly man who did the bitter fighting and

---

<sup>132</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 173.

(although missing from much of the narratives) the brutal killing. These memoirs were the country's primary sources.

.....

*Memoir Analysis*

The text of veterans' memoirs created a fiction of fraternity characterized by tropes which fell into three general categories: lack of descriptive violence (or descriptions which internalized or delegitimized violence); feelings of camaraderie, mutual sentiment and respect, especially as indicated and highlighted by episodes on picket lines; and pejorative and archetypal descriptions of blacks.

*Violence*

The war resulted in the estimated loss of over 750,000 men. Veterans lost dear friends and close family members as well as more distant acquaintances from their communities. Shot and shell ravaged men's bodies as did the surgeon's knife. Disease left men crippled. The stress and destruction of battle left veterans with images of blood that plagued them for the rest of their lives. The war was a singularly bloody and destructive affair. The historical truth of this matter is well known, including by the war's contemporaries, and yet it is conspicuously missing from much of the written reminiscences. War letters dramatically presented descriptions of violence, but post-war writings did not.<sup>133</sup> Frank Wilkeson's account stated what could truly sum up much of the accounts of battles in the memoirs: "The fire was rather hot, and

---

<sup>133</sup> Ibid., 149.

the men were falling pretty fast. Still it was not anywhere near as bloody as I had expected a battle to be.”<sup>134</sup>

When there was a lack of violent description, it did not mean veterans excluded entirely accounts of death and wounds in their memoirs. Rather it rendered the descriptions of violence as superficial or unwillingly undertaken. In “Campaigning to No Purpose: Recollections of a Private-IL,” published as part of *Century’s* war series, its author Warren Lee Goss quoted a friend serving in Hooker’s division about battle wounds. All were superficial and included a missing part of a thumbnail and a scalp scratch resulting in the loss of hair. Goss implied more serious battle scars by mentioning fourteen “badly wounded” men, but he left the reader with no further description.<sup>135</sup> Superficial wounds heal and are forgotten. The loss of a thumbnail, while inopportune, does not leave a lasting effect. In this sense descriptions of superficial wounds mirrored the veterans’ calls for memorializing the war as a “forgotten quarrel.” What is so significant about this description is not that Goss tried to conceal mortal wounds, but rather that he reserved his descriptive highlights for those men who easily returned to, or never left, the battle. This literary choice forces the reader to focus on the more benign aspects of violence and thus renders the entire description of the battle as one resulting in little to no hardship for its participants. It read more as a familial spat, with brothers roughhousing to pass the

---

<sup>134</sup> Wilkeson, *Turned Inside Out*, 63.

<sup>135</sup> Warren Lee Goss, "Campaigning to No Purpose (Recollections of a Private--IL.)," ed. Clarence Clough Buel, Robert Underwood Johnson, 4 vols., vol. 2, *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War* (New York: The Century Co., 1887), <http://books.google.com/books?vid=HARVARD:32044050951789&printsec=titlepage#v=onepage&q=Warren%20Lee%20Gross&f=false>.

time, than as bitter enemies in a fight of life and death over the legality of secession and institutionalized racial slavery.

Similarly, two later published Confederate memoirs evidence the lack of violence. Frank M. Mixson in his 1910 publication described a snowball fight in the winter of 1862 between Confederate troops behind the lines:

There was a very heavy snow storm; snow fell about waist deep over the whole country. One morning a few men commenced to snow ball. These were added to until the whole army was engaged. Brigadier-generals took command of their brigades; colonels of their regiments; captains of their companies. It was a regular planned battle and was fought all day. Sometimes one would take the camp of another and plunder it of blankets, rations, cooking utensils and whatever else there was. It was the biggest snow ball fight on record. I did not engage in the fight, but took a hand in plundering the camp whenever we got into one.<sup>136</sup>

On first reading, this small story seems inconsequential. It provided individual color to one of many narratives of its kind published in the early twentieth century. Yet this snowball fight, when viewed within the context of the entire memoir, is just as graphic as Mixson's descriptions of actual battles with ammunition against Union troops. It is just as graphic in that there is no violence in both. As in Goss's description, death was not completely missing from Mixson's account. Rather, death was not central to his retelling of his experience. Mixson left the reader with the same emotional response to snow hitting men's bodies as bullets hitting men's bodies. Another Confederate veteran, Arthur P. Ford, had more pitiful and gruesome descriptions of violence committed against the bodies of horses than violence committed against the bodies of men in his 1905 published account. The only

---

<sup>136</sup> Frank M. Mixson, *Reminiscences of a Private* (Columbia, SC: The State Company, 1910), 39-40.

exception is his description of hogs desecrating the bodies of black soldiers left dead and exposed on the field of battle.<sup>137</sup>

On a basic level, the lack of violence in the reminiscences presents the war inaccurately. Yet this is not the trope's significance for understanding the framing of the war and its memorialization. The lack of violence renders the war far less divisive and resultant than it actually was for individuals. Rather than focusing on death, the memoirists chose to highlight examples of mutual valor and courage. The Grand Army of the Republic and United Confederate Veterans would similarly insist textbooks present mutual valor and courage in their sections on the civil war.

If veterans, potentially at the urging of publishers, removed the question of violence from the memoirs, then veterans simultaneously removed the question of blame. Avoiding blame, from the publisher's standpoint, was one way to ensure a more national audience and thus more profit. When the account's author neglected the main objective of the armies, to destroy one another, readers could forget, in a sense, there were two opposing armies. This purposeful omission left no room for promoting retribution. The Federal Government insisted on this in their reconstruction policies, but this insistence seemed much more logical if there is nothing for which to revenge. Furthermore, removing overt acts of violence helped substantiate the fraternal, 'Civil War' narrative. Individuals united in feeling would not and did not commit violent acts of destruction upon each other. Violence needs enmity. According to the memoirs, if read looking for true descriptions of death and

---

<sup>137</sup> Arthur Peronneau Ford, "Life in the Confederate Army: Being the Personal Experiences of a Private Soldier in the Confederate Army " in *Life in the Confederate Army: Being Personal Experiences of a Private Soldier in the Confederate Army, by Arthur P. Ford, and Some Experiences and Sketeches of Southern Life, by Marion Johnstone Ford.*(New York: The Neale Publishing Company, 1905), 30.

violence and not hints, there was no real enmity between the two armies during the war for soldiers did not commit true acts of violence against each other. Of particular interest to this analysis are the descriptions lacking violence only concerned white troops.

Even within this small sampling of published memoirs, not all conspicuously lack violence. Yet these examples are exceptions to the rule. Sam Watkins's *Co. Aytch*, a Confederate memoir published between 1881-1882, is replete with the type violence between Union and Confederate soldiers a modern reader expects. Men die in violent ways due to shot and shell and there are gruesome descriptions of death-ravaged fields of battle. Yet Watkins frames his discussions of this violence with discussions of a soldiers' lack of agency.

Frank Wilkeson's 1886 published memoir is also full of violence. Wilkeson highlighted and, in many instances, exaggerated accounts of violence committed by men against other men. His exaggerations made, as James McPherson pointed out, his memoir inaccurate. Thus his exaggeration of and others' downplaying of violence caused the same affect, a narrative disingenuous in its presentation of the war. In fact, Wilkeson's account mostly has Union soldiers willingly committing acts of either physical or mental violence against other Union soldiers. When describing a conversation between infantry men and men of a heavy-artillery unit<sup>138</sup> Wilkeson stated,

These bloody wrecks of soldiers derided the new-comers. Men would tauntingly point to a shattered arm, or a wounded leg, or to bloody wounds on their faces, or to dead men lying in fence corners, and derisively shout: 'That

---

<sup>138</sup> Units who manned the large cannons behind the lines of battle.

is what you will catch up yonder in the woods!’ and they would solemnly indicate the portion of the forest they meant by extending arms from which blood trickled in drops. I saw one group of these wounded men repeatedly cover and uncover with a blanket a dead man whose face was horribly distorted, and show the courage-sapping spectacle to the marching troops, and faintly chuckle and cause their pale cheeks to bulge with derisive tongue-thrusts, as they saw the heavy-artillery men’s faces blanch.<sup>139</sup>

In this instance, men of the same army used descriptions of violence and war-ravaged men to destroy the courage of their comrades. While Wilkeson included descriptive violence, he left the reader wondering why soldiers spoke of mortal destruction so lightly rather than focus on who committed the violence upon their fellow soldiers. The reader focused on frivolous violence committed in jest rather than grave violence committed with purpose. Wilkeson rendered the violence internal rather than external, one group committing violence rather than two groups committing violence upon each other. The importance of this distinction lies in Wilkeson’s emphasis of a single group. While soldiers committed acts of violence against each other, they were still united.

Both Frank Wilkeson and Sam Watkins also clearly stated who they felt was to blame for the war’s outbreak, violence, and continuation. Rank and file soldiers may have committed the actual violence, but Watkins and Wilkeson question whether they had agency in the task. Wilkeson reserved his most vitriolic hatred for bounty jumpers,<sup>140</sup> whom he called “coffee-boilers” (for they stay out of the fight and boil coffee), and West Point graduates. For Wilkeson, generals and these “coffee-boilers” should be blamed for the loss of life on both sides and for prolonging the war. Orders and ineptitude kept men fighting, not ideological differences. Watkins also felt

---

<sup>139</sup> Wilkeson, *Turned Inside Out*, 84-85.

<sup>140</sup> Men who enlisted solely for the bounty.

officers were to blame for the war. He argued, “ah! reader, there is no glory for the private soldier, much less a conscript” and described a private soldier as “an automaton” and “simply a machine.”<sup>141</sup> A machine does not have individual thought but is rather programmed to perform a certain task. A machine has no agency. Watkins talked of how, during the Battle of Atlanta (July 1864), he shot a Union soldier against his own wishes. Watkins would have rather captured the Union soldier but fear caused him to pull the trigger. Whether this was fear of being shot himself or fear an officer will discipline him for cowardice, Watkins did not specify. With either reading, Watkins was unable to act on his desires and was rather compelled by some other force to perform the “drudgery” of war.<sup>142</sup>

These questions of agency are more fully articulated by the trope of camaraderie in memoirs. If, as Watkins and Wilkinson argued so vehemently, individual soldiers had little to no decisive power over themselves and their actions, then unity is maintained. The violence in these two memoirs did not promote continued conflict between veterans or loved ones of the war’s deceased, but instead united them against superior forces of power. It universalized powerlessness and created consensus around the idea that rank-and-file soldiers, the majority of the war’s troops, did not fight each other due to desire. They fought due to orders.

To fully understand how crafted the fraternal narrative of the late nineteenth century was, unpublished memoirs must also be examined. Concerning violence, the most striking contrast between the published and unpublished memoirs is the general

---

<sup>141</sup> Watkins, *Co. Aytch*, 189, 28, 31.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, 95.

inclusion and type of violence described. All of the unpublished memoirs have either a vivid description of battle or a vivid description of death, violence, or destruction wrought on men's bodies. The memoirists also describe the soldiers as the committed agents of that violence. This may partly explain why these memoirs were excluded from the literary marketplace. Union private Alfred Bellard described wounds in dramatic detail and included his own hand-colored drawings of the dead in his 1975 published memoir.<sup>143</sup> Union private Alfred Seelye Roe wrote in his manuscript of how in battle all soldiers were "intent on another's destruction."<sup>144</sup> Union private Robert Hale Strong wrote of how he and some fellow soldiers took pleasure in shooting and killing a Confederate sharpshooter in a tree against orders.<sup>145</sup> Their emphasis on violence against men did not promote reconciliation between the two sides. Rather their reminiscences suggested an aspect of battle that necessitated their potential readers to think about consequences, oppositions and enmity.

As these memoirs with sanitized accounts of violence grew in popularity, and sheer numbers, communities erected physical monuments devoid of military action and overt violence, which like the published memoirs, promoted consensus instead of prolonging conflict.

---

<sup>143</sup> Alfred Bellard, *Gone for a Soldier: The Civil War Memoirs of Private Alfred Bellard*, 1st ed. (Boston: Little Brown, 1975).

<sup>144</sup> Typed Transcription of *Narrative of Service as a Private* by Alfred Seelye Roe, given by Kate Thornburg, Class of 2005, Alfred S. Roe Civil War Papers, Collection #1000-99, Special Collections & Archives, Wesleyan University, Middletown, CT, USA. 19

<sup>145</sup> Robert Hale Strong, *A Yankee Private's Civil War* (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc., 2013), 15.

*Feelings of Camaraderie, Mutual Sentiment and Respect*

The most prevalent and constant trope that appeared in veteran reminiscences was camaraderie across army lines. Regardless of publication date or origin, all of the memoirists highlighted events or utilized language that made the soldiers brothers in arms rather than enemies at arms. The emphasis on brotherly feelings and events made the reader look at descriptions of violent acts from a different perspective and wonder if the soldier acted on orders or on their own volition. Not only did the veterans shift blame from the individual soldier to the military and political leaders, a smaller, more elite group, but they also rendered the causes of the war less ideologically polarizing. If soldiers of opposing armies put aside their differences and saw each other as men rather than dehumanized soldiers, then non-combatants should follow their example. With a similar affect to the lack of violence, episodes of camaraderie across the lines turned the focus from two, opposing groups to one, unified group. Veterans described episodes of camaraderie with the same level of detail, but at a higher frequency than episodes of enmity in the accounts. This trend symbolized the former's prominence in veterans' minds and thus its importance to memorialization.

Frank M. Mixson's reminiscence explained in lengthy detail his duty as a guard for a Union Major's wife for thirty-eight days. While this service seems odd, its potential exaggeration is not the aspect upon which to dwell. Mixson wanted his readers to know that he, a veteran who fixed his reminiscence within Lost Cause ideology, willingly and dutifully protected relatives of the opposing forces. Union troops did not dismiss this service but rather greeted him with "Good morning,

Johnny” followed by “[sitting] around in the sunshine and [talking] till the corn was ready, when [the Union troops] put it up on the mule and helped [Mixson] up and bade [Mixson] goodbye.”<sup>146</sup> Wilkeson’s reminiscence offered its reader episodes of camaraderie within battle:

I saw, in the head of this fight, wounded men of the opposing forces aiding each other to reach the protective shelter of the trees and logs, and, as we advanced, I saw a Confederate and a Union soldier drinking in turn out of a Union canteen, as they lay behind a tree.<sup>147</sup>

Even if the veteran himself did not participate in the brotherly acts described, they were ubiquitous both on and off the field of battle. Even within the midst of battle, Wilkeson insisted to his readers brotherly sentiment overcame duty. One’s sectional affiliation was not stronger than one’s affinity for fellow men.

Veterans did not just recount episodes of camaraderie involving soldiers during wartime. Voices of civilian actors also helped promoted a sense of unity during wartime through declarations of futility. Wilkeson described to his readers a conversation he had with an elderly gentleman, a former small plantation owner, in Huntsville, Alabama. The man reportedly, “prated about the wickedness of war, and of his gladness that it was almost over, and the useless shedding of fraternal blood near its end.”<sup>148</sup> Even before the war officially ended, Wilkeson maintained a civilian construed the violent destruction of men’s bodies as the “shedding of fraternal blood.” It was not conquerors subduing a new nation’s attempts at independence, but rather citizens of the same country caught in a “useless” war resulting in the loss of life the entire country mourned.

---

<sup>146</sup> Mixson, *Reminiscences of a Private* 62-63.

<sup>147</sup> Wilkeson, *Turned Inside Out*, 72-73.

<sup>148</sup> *Ibid.*, 242.

The most prominent way veterans highlighted camaraderie and mutual sentiment in their reminiscences was through events on the picket line. Picket lines were precautionary measures taken to monitor the outer boundaries of an army's position or to scout out an enemy's position. The soldiers on picket duty, generally those of low or no rank, served as guards and checked movement in and out of camps.<sup>149</sup> Picket duty was normally uneventful and quiet and many soldiers were not fond of this service. During the civil war, it was not uncommon to find soldiers trading goods or words on the picket lines. Supplies were sometimes slow and picket duty dull, and this source of material and conversational exchange proved extremely important for soldiers of both sides. This trade on the picket line did not mean the two sides were united. More than anything else, it intimated necessity.

Yet the ways in which the memoirists described encounters on the picket line in all the memoirs analyzed, both published and unpublished, extend their importance beyond a simple exchange of goods. Veterans described these encounters on the picket line as anticipated and desired events where soldiers conversed along with exchanging tobacco and coffee. The picket lines became the place where soldiers expressed their true feelings, expressions always firmly rooted in fraternity. Picket lines become a valuable analytical tool for understanding the type of narrative fashioned because they were a consistent highlight in all the memoirs. Veterans wanted their readers to understand how fundamental these exchanges were to them and to see all the war's participants as men rather than fighting machines. For ultimately what these episodes of camaraderie on the picket lines highlight is the

---

<sup>149</sup> Ian M. Spurgeon, "Picket," in *Encyclopedia of the American Civil War: A Political, Social, and Military History*, ed. Jeanne T. Heidler David S. Heidler (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2000).

humanity of the soldiers involved, regardless of the army for which they fought. The episodes propagated the idea there was a brotherly understanding between soldiers of opposing armies during the war that veterans used to conceptualize fraternity and inform their views on how the country should be reunited.

Despite the account's deviation from the norm in its use of violence, Sam Watkins firmly grounded *Co. Aytch's* narrative in the fraternal narrative. Watkins described, in colorful detail, three instances of cordial and familiar episodes while on picket duty. On the night before the Battle of Perryville (October 1862 in Kentucky), Watkins recounted,

I stood picket in Perryville the night before the battle—a Yankee on one side of the street, and I on the other. We got friendly during the night, and made a raid upon a citizen's pantry, where we captured a bucket of honey, a pitcher of sweet milk, and three or four biscuit.<sup>150</sup>

Not only did this episode have Watkins and his “Yankee” on friendly terms, it had them work together to achieve the goal of getting something sweet to eat. The significant question is not if this description is accurate but rather why Watkins chose to highlight this episode of camaraderie. It raises the question of volition, which Watkins returned to again and again in his memoir and resoundingly stated was not the luxury of the private soldier. Watkins again discussed an individual soldier's agency in relation to his desire to kill men of the other army in his second description of picket line fraternity at Missionary Ridge (November 1863) in the following exchange:

We heard a Yankee call, ‘O, Johnny, Johnny Reb!’ I started out to meet him as formerly, when he halloed out, ‘Go back, Johnny, go back; we are ordered to fire on you.’ ‘What is the matter? Is your army going to advance on us?’ ‘I

---

<sup>150</sup> Watkins, *Co. Aytch*, 46.

don't know; we are ordered to fire.' I jumped back into the picket post, and a minnie ball ruined the only hat I had; another and another followed in quick succession, and the dirt flew up in our faces off our little breastworks.<sup>151</sup>

This was not a description of men willing and desirous to kill. This was not a description of men who due to their ideological differences were enemies. Rather it was a description of men forced to do the drudgery of soldiering much to their chagrin and disenchantment. If, as Watkins described, soldiers did not truly want to be a part of this war, then there was no real opposition to overcome. The men never felt separated by insurmountable differences but rather found themselves at opposite ends of a barrel due to orders. This episode too reconstituted the historical record for it made the soldiers passive participants rather than active actors or instigators of the war.

Robert Hale Strong employed this same type of language and lack of agency in his description of an episode on the picket line:

When we lay along the Chattahoochee River in Georgia, the Rebs and we agreed not to fire at each other except by order of an officer. If such orders were given either of us, we were to notify the other side before we began firing. We told each other across the river, which was about twenty to thirty rods wide, that the war was all nonsense and that if we did kill a man once in a while, it would have no effect on the war as a whole.<sup>152</sup>

As in Watkins's account, Strong promoted unity through further universalizing the non-agency of soldiers. Soldiers did not want but rather were told to fight, kill, and destroy who generals dictated was the enemy and not who soldiers felt was the enemy. This lack of true agency made Strong question the war entirely. If the soldiers did not want to fight each other, why were they there? Was there a point or, as Strong

---

<sup>151</sup> Ibid., 100.

<sup>152</sup> Strong, *A Yankee Private's Civil War* 117-18.

believed, was it “all nonsense?” Veterans who felt “that the war was all nonsense” could not then also harbor ill will against those whom they had fought. This was the government’s war, not the people’s war, and when the governments ended their feud so did the people. One can see this juxtaposition as similar to that between a soldier enlisting and a soldier getting drafted; the former indicates desire, the latter indicates coercion. The “nonsense” also redefined the historical narrative of the war by questioning cause of the war. It made cause of the war a creation of the government rather than the expression of the true feelings of the people.

Watkins’s final description of picket line fraternization gave him a level of agency that he felt he lacked in his service:

I would go up to the Yankee outpost, and if some popinjay of a tacky officer didn’t come along, we would have a good time. One morning I was sitting down to eat a good breakfast with the Yankee outpost. They were cavalry, and they were mighty clever and pleasant fellow. I looked down the road toward Atlanta, and not fifty yards from the outpost, I saw a body of infantry approaching.

The infantry, a black regiment, approached and the Captain asked,

‘What is this Rebel doing here?’ One of the men spoke up and tried to say something in my favor, but the more he said the more the captain of the blacks would get mad...The cavalymen tried to protest, and said a few cuss words...Here was my opportunity, now or never...I took up my gun very gently and cocked it. I had the gentleman. I had made up my mind if he advanced one step further, that he was a dead man...The cavalry motioned their hands at me, as much as to say, ‘Run, Johnny, run.’ The captain of the blacks fell upon his face, and I broke and ran like a quarter-horse. I never saw or heard any more of the captain of the blacks or of his guard afterward.<sup>153</sup>

It was not for duty that Watkins ventured to the picket line of his supposed enemy, but for desire to be with “friendly [fellows].” This picture showed where Watkins’s volition took him, and thus gave the sense of his true feelings. But it also placed the

---

<sup>153</sup> Watkins, *Co. Aytch*, 206.

opposition between officer and soldier and not Union and Confederate, who are supposedly ideologically and identifiably different. The “Yankee outpost” defended rather than attacked Watkins, making him a comrade rather than an enemy. Watkins and the Union soldiers were brothers in arms, united against an officer and (not coincidentally) against black troops. If there were feelings of enmity or feelings of disunity, a reader would not gather that sentiment from reading any of Watkins’s descriptions.

The episodes of camaraderie were key for creating a universalized sense of fellowship in powerlessness between soldiers because they created spaces where individuals interacted with each other as men. The veterans’ choice to not only include but to highlight these episodes in their reminiscences made fraternity as important to the history and memory of the war as battle or marching through the mud. These episodes illustrated a veterans’ true sense of agency and desire and therefore are supposedly the truest accounts of their civil war experience. The influence of this trope of camaraderie was evident in the physical monuments as seen through the formation of a standardized figure believed to represent the archetypal American.

### *Descriptions of Blacks*

The greatest consequence of the end of the war was emancipation. The Thirteenth Amendment and final surrender of Confederate troops in 1865 granted around four million men, women, and children freedom. Yet this did not translate to equal incorporation into the world the war created. Across the South, laws and codes developed to maintain the social hierarchy present before the war. In the Union Army,

the Federal Government did not provide for or pay black regiments the same as their white counterparts for much of the war. Much of the memorialization of the war ignored black participants or only presented blacks in specific and constricted ways. Both in the publically chosen forms of memorialization and written into veterans' memoirs were the same contradictions and omissions. Veterans' insistence on fraternity included either pejorative or archetypal descriptions of blacks rooted in white supremacy. Veterans, like the publishers of the *Century*, did not employ terms or descriptions that continued to divide their readership; it was not good for profits or a unanimous and glorified view of their legacy. The ways in which veterans chose to describe black civilians, slaves, or soldiers did not differ between Northern and Southern or published and unpublished memoirs and did not change as time progressed. While these descriptions may have truly reflected these memoirists' feelings of white supremacy and racism, the descriptions' consistency and forms throughout the publications raised it to a new level of significance and essentialness.

Veterans utilized two broad groups in their published accounts to address or describe blacks: black participants (troops) in the war and black non-participants (civilians or slaves) during the war. Both used the same archetypal characteristics: blacks were cowardly, stupid, servile, a source of entertainment for whites, and individuals with little or no free will. These descriptors united whites by emphasizing their superiority. Whether the veterans, or the readers, supported opposite sides during the civil war, they were all united in believing they possessed an elevated position in society. It created universality out of exclusivity by utilizing an in and an

out-group.<sup>154</sup> If soldiers all felt superior to blacks then the war's consequence (emancipation) would not upset the antebellum social order in the ways some feared before the civil war's outbreak. Reunion could be accomplished without the equal incorporation of blacks into the post-war United States.

Two of the Confederate memoirs highlighted episodes of less than valiant service of black regiments. After the Confederate army stationed Mixson's regiment in reserve at Fort Gilmer to protect Richmond, he described an assault carried out by black Union troops: "the assault was made by negro troops, with white officers with pistols in their hands, forcing the negroes forward on pain of death."<sup>155</sup> Arthur P. Ford almost used the exact same language when he stated, "I know it is a catch phrase elsewhere that the colored troops fought nobly, but I testify to what I saw and heard," black troops forced forward in battle by the threats of white officers.<sup>156</sup> This pejorative description of black soldiers as ignoble resembled memoirists' recollections of committing violence; each stripped the black or white soldier of agency and self-possession. These black troops were not agents of their own fate. This sense is further supported by Ford's description of how,

During the early period of the war a great many of the private soldiers in the Confederate Army had their own negro servants in the field with them, who waited on their masters, cleaned their horses, cooked their meals, etc... This system continued during the first year or two of the war, on the Carolina coast, but later on, as service got harder and rations became scarcer, these negro servants were gradually sent back home... As a rule, these negroes liked life exceedingly. The work exacted of them was necessarily very light... I never heard of an instance where one of these army servants deserted...<sup>157</sup>

---

<sup>154</sup> This was a new idea emerging in psychology that will be discussed in Chapter Five.

<sup>155</sup> Mixson, *Reminiscences of a Private* 102.

<sup>156</sup> Ford, "Life in the Confederate Army," 41.

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

Ford argued blacks were happy as slaves and, furthermore, did not want to be separated from their benevolent white masters. Since Ford stated emphatically that not “one of these army servants deserted,” it is not striking his description of the assault on Fort Wagner neglected that the advancing Union troops were the 54<sup>th</sup> Massachusetts Infantry, an all black regiment led by Robert Gould Shaw. Ford also did not mention the assault ended in extreme losses for the regiment. As mentioned earlier, Ford only described the violence committed against the bodies of black soldiers left exposed on the battlefield in his memoir. He also carefully chose to refer to Confederate soldiers’ army slaves as “servants.” “Servants” implies choice whereas slave implies force. This language gave the slaves a position and an agency Ford did not afford them as soldiers. It made them actors of their own fate, but only in a subservient position to whites. Thus Ford maintained the antebellum social order in war by making those at the bottom desire that position.

Sam Watkins’s account of black troops was overtly pejorative and employed archetypal language of blacks as unknowing and irresponsible. While in Dalton, Georgia, Watkins said he and his Confederate regiment came across a Union regiment of black troops guarding railroad tracks. Watkins recounted the following exchange:

‘Hello, boys!’ ‘What is it, boss?’ ‘Well, boys, we’ve come for you.’ ‘Hyah, ha; hyha, ha; hyah, ha; a hee, he, he, he; if it ain’t old master, sho.’ The place was guarded by negro troops. We marched the black rascals out. They were mighty glad to see us, and we were kindly disposed to them. We said, ‘Now, boys, we don’t want the Yankees to get mad at you, and to blame you; so, just let’s go out here on the railroad track, and tear it up, and pile up the crossties, and then pile the iron on top of them, and we’ll set the thing a-fire, and when

the Yankees come back they will say, 'What a bully fight *them nagers* did make.'<sup>158</sup>

There is an undeniable tone of a parent speaking to a child. In this description, Watkins creates camaraderie across racial lines. But this camaraderie is only possible when white soldiers are the masters of the situation and the racial other. Notably, this particular account uses an underlying white supremacy to depoliticize and delegitimize the main consequence of the war, emancipation. It is the same incorporation of a white supremacist argument as those found in Mixson's and Ford's memoirs. The black troops willingly placed themselves in a subservient position to the white troops implying they would continue to do so after war's end. The antebellum racial hierarchy would survive. Whether soldiers or civilians, white memoirists argued blacks could not envision themselves as masters of their own actions thus leaving whites as masters. Rather than defying the veterans' exclusive fraternity, Watkins's description supported it. Blacks acted with the same deference to white will whether on the battlefield in uniform or in the fields of a plantation. Blacks were not a part of the soldiers' fraternity as conceptualized by veterans because they did not act as valiant soldiers. While both black and white soldiers are portrayed as lacking agency in the memoirs that is the extent of the similarity afforded their war experiences. White soldiers valiantly served and did their duty, even if they questioned the order; black troops either forcibly served or blindly did what they were told regardless of who gave the order. According to the memoirs, black troops acted like children, white troops acted like men.

---

<sup>158</sup> Watkins, *Co. Aytch*, 211.

The narrative created through these memoirs concerning black participation in the war ignored the courage displayed by black troops in the face of unequal treatment by both armies in service, imprisonment, and death. Eighty-five percent of eligible black men enlisted in the Union Army. But presenting circumstances that maintained the racial hierarchy was more important than facts and consequences that continued to divide white Americans.

These archetypal and pejorative descriptions of black individuals extended beyond the direct sphere of war. In regards to black civilians in memoirs, Northern and Southern veterans approached their descriptions in more similar terms and through more similar episodes than their descriptions of black soldiers. Through these descriptions, the archetype of blacks as a source of entertainment is quite evident. Robert Hale Strong, a Union veteran, always referred to blacks as “niggers” in his 1961 published memoir. Alfred Seelye Roe, a Union veteran, described how he purposefully choose to sit on top of a train car, “it being ever so much more handy to stone the darkeys from this outlook.”<sup>159</sup> In contrast to this violent act of inhumane sport, Roe made it clear to his readers that he felt black troops would fight nobly and indicated after the war he worked for the Freedman’s Bureau as a teacher. Roe continued his description by explaining, “I’ll confess that I did not hurl many missiles, thinking it very mean to thus maltreat those who regarded us as their saviors.”<sup>160</sup> Even though this clause read as a disclaimer, Roe framed it as a “confession.” Roe’s hesitant participation was something he ostensibly preferred to keep private and his

---

<sup>159</sup> Typed Transcription of *Narrative of Service as a Private* by Alfred Seelye Roe, 54.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid.

audience would not support. This construction implied Roe's readers desired his full participation in the degradation and harming of blacks. Roe's sense of superiority was also evident in his contending that he did not whole-heartedly participate due to it being "mean" to "maltreat those who regarded us as their saviors."

The use and attempt to copy dialects are particularly noticeable in these descriptions of blacks as sources of entertainment. Sam Watkins recounted an experience he had with a black man identified as "Uncle Zack" who he described,

always sat in the chimney corner, his feet in the ashes, and generally fast asleep. I am certain I never saw an uglier or more baboonish face in my life, but Uncle Zack was a good Christian, and I would sometimes wake him up to hear him talk Christian.<sup>161</sup>

Hearing Uncle Zack "talk Christian" was not Watkins's attempt to hear scripture, but rather his attempt to give himself, and his reader, a laugh. Watkins confirmed this understanding of his description when he recounted these two conversations between him and Uncle Zack:

He said that when he 'fessed 'ligin, de debil come dare one nite, and say, 'Zack, come go wid me,' and den de debil tek me to hell, and jes stretch a wire across hell, and hang me up jes same like a side of bacon...

'Well, Uncle Zack, what sort of a looking lamb were you?'  
'Well, sir, I was sort of specklish and brown like.'<sup>162</sup>

Watkins only employed dialect when he recounted episodes involving black individuals. The dialect was a stereotype and made the language almost indecipherable for the readers. The implication was what these black characters had to say was inconsequential. It was also meant to entertain the reader, since Watkins described Uncle Zack as dim-witted and naive. His belief and insistence the devil

---

<sup>161</sup> Watkins, *Co. Aytch*, 122.

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid.*, 122-23.

came for him and subsequently turned him into a “specklish and brown like” sheep rendered Uncle Zack as an archetype of the gullible slave.

Veterans’ ideology of fraternity informed these descriptions of black individuals. Memoirists argued there was universality in feeling between soldiers and towards blacks. The universality framed the latter feeling as unrelated to sectional affiliation. White supremacy was nationally felt and therefore would continue to shape the social order. White supremacy would reunite white Americans with its exclusion of blacks as agents who desired a new, freer, and more powerful place in the United States.

.....

There is the overall question as to why veterans employed these tropes so consistently. As discussed, interest in the war and veterans activities more generally was low and immigration to the United States high in the 1870s and 1880s and veterans were concerned for their legacy and continuing relevance in the post-war United States. The Grand Army of the Republic, United Confederate Veterans, and veteran authors more generally focused on fraternity in order to reenergize public interest in the war and their sacrifice. As interest grew, publishers picked up on the fraternal theme and began heavily publishing accounts substantiating it. This in turn produced more fraternal accounts from veterans because it most assured publication and therefore much needed profit from their reminiscences.

There is evidence veterans copied themes or episodes in their entirety in the memoirs analyzed. For example, four of the seven memoirs all described trying to remove honey from a honeycomb and getting stung by the bees inside in almost the

exact same language. This copying reflected the extremely strong influence of publishers and previously published veterans' works on memoir writing. Since veterans used similar language to describe this single event, they presumably also copied certain tropes to get published. When this copying extended to the tropes cited in this chapter—specific types or lack of violence; feelings and episodes of camaraderie and mutual sentiment and respect; and pejorative and archetypal descriptions of blacks—their popularity represents the general sentiment. The veterans' public wanted to hear tales of their heroes who sacrificed all for their country and not ones that lingered on divisions. The copying identifies the circular nature of the publishing market and the tropes that exalted unity and fraternity. The fraternal narrative began as a way to garner more support and interest in veterans and their affairs. It ended as the dominant and most widely supported historical narrative creating the 'Civil War.' As veterans wrote the 'Civil War' into their memoirs, they would also lobby for its inclusion in secondary school textbooks.

## 4

*“We insist that our youth shall be taught that the war was more than a mere bloody contest”*: *The Textbook Battle of the 1890s*

The decades surrounding 1900 were a period of great expansion of public secondary school education. Before this expansion, the teaching of United States history was an occasional and unsystematic part of the curriculum. By the 1890s, professionalization of history at the university level trickled down to the secondary school level. As schools introduced history as a standard part of the curriculum, publishers scrambled to produce textbooks for the market.<sup>163</sup> Also emerging in the 1890s was a new faith in the power of education to regenerate society. Americans now believed education had the power to create active citizens and, as a result, subjects that the educator could use to promote patriotism and good citizenship received sanction. States and educators chose history as the vehicle to do so. Laws and statutes established the place of history as a vital and required part of a school’s curriculum by the end of the nineteenth century and, in particular, required United States history more so than any other field of history.<sup>164</sup>

Before 1900, nine-tenths of the leading publishers, and many of the authors, of history textbooks resided in the North and thus textbooks tended to reflect the “triumphant nationalism” growing out of federal policy from the period of

---

<sup>163</sup> James M. McPherson, *This Mighty Scourge: Perspectives on the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 97.

<sup>164</sup> Bessie Louise Pierce, *Public Opinion and the Teaching of History in the United States* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1926), 13, 21.

reconstruction.<sup>165</sup> With the emergence of this strong and influential new market, veterans found a new outlet for their struggle to preserve their legacy and history. Controlling the story of the war in the textbooks meant controlling the history and its exposure to the next generation. Thus battles over textbooks pitted the the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR) and the United Confederate Veterans (UCV), against each other. While the veterans may have disagreed over certain issues, they never disagreed that textbooks present veterans in the most valorous and opportune light. Disagreements over cause of the war certainly existed, but there was consensus over the role and honor of the soldiers.

.....

#### *Education and Patriotism: Post-War Educational Reforms*

The push to instill the principles of good citizenship, patriotism, and unity into public education in the United States in the last decades of the nineteenth century extended beyond the focus and inclusion of specific subjects. States regulated other aspects of public education besides history in an attempt to create proper, active citizens out of the next generation.

Teachers came under an added level of scrutiny. Beginning in the 1860s, fear led legislatures to impose loyalty oaths for certification for teachers.<sup>166</sup> Kentucky, a border state that remained loyal to the Union despite having individuals fight for the Confederacy, was the first to adopt a loyalty oath for teachers in 1862.<sup>167</sup> In 1866, Arkansas instituted a required pledge for all teachers in the state. The pledge included

---

<sup>165</sup> McPherson, *This Mighty Scourge*, 97.

<sup>166</sup> Pierce, *Public Opinion and the Teaching of History in the United States* 29.

<sup>167</sup> Ibid.

a statement of support for the constitution and laws of the United States and Arkansas and intent to encourage others to do so as well. The oath also required the speaker to declare, “I will never countenance or aid in the secession of this state from the United States” and pledge, “to inculcate in the minds of youth sentiments of patriotism and loyalty.”<sup>168</sup> The states, many in the South still under federal control, had to prove disunity would not be fomented again as part of youths’ education. As the veterans would in the 1890s, the state governments needed to give unity a pedagogical foundation.

While these stipulations may not have led to a full re-writing of the historical narrative, they certainly repositioned the rhetoric that many Southern states used during the war. The language of the oath targeted the next generation of Americans; the implied hope of its writers to maintain the Federal Government’s illegal view of secession and solidify lasting unity in the war’s aftermath. A speech by the Rhode Island state commissioner of education in January 1865 indicated much of the philosophy around the conduct of teaching the late war in the ensuing decades:

Better by far remain as he [the child] is, his untutored mind wrapped up in ignorance, than to be thus guided and piloted by the vile traitor, only to be finally dashed against the rocks and engulfed in the waves of rebellion.<sup>169</sup>

The state governments could not and would not allow American youth to identify sectionally; they needed to identify nationally.

During the decades of this grand institutional transformation, “the most common [state] regulation regarding textbooks pertained to the prohibition of books

---

<sup>168</sup> Ibid., 32.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid., 33.

showing partisan, political, or sectarian bias.”<sup>170</sup> State legislators firmly desired to avoid continuing sectional antagonisms in the discussions of the history. In 1872, both Georgia and North Carolina, two former Confederate states, forbade the use of books in public schools that might contribute to a “political” or “sectional” bias.<sup>171</sup>

Many of these regulations states passed and implemented while still under federally appointed governments. Yet the patriotism these governments hoped to instill in the next generation of Americans was the same the GAR and UCV hoped to instill as well beginning in the 1870s. It was a national patriotism that would create a single American nation out of a sectionally divided country. What makes the veterans attempts at inculcating this ‘Americanism’ so distinct lay in the fact that they rewrote the historical narrative of the war to include fraternity. Thus veterans made a sense of ‘Americanism’ a given.

The way states hoped textbooks would help avoid the continuation of sectional divisions was through a full discussion of the issues Americans had been “honestly divided” over. Yet what becomes quite clear in looking at some of the textbooks and the agitation surrounding them, particularly from veterans, was rather than fully discussing the divisions, publishers and textbook authors glossed over and rendered them less divisive and less sectional while promoting a universal respect for veterans’ and their experiences. The dominant form of textbooks during the first twenty years after the end of the war had a “telegraphic style” “characterized by extensive presentation of discrete bits of information, but little treatment of historical cause and effect” leading to a “loose consensus on the national past.” As in the case

---

<sup>170</sup> Ibid., 39.

<sup>171</sup> *Code of Georgia and Revised Statutes of North Carolina* quoted in *ibid.*, 40.

of memoirs and popular literature, publishers preferred this “loose consensus” afforded by this type of narrative form. It did not explicitly name one side as morally right or lay blame on one section over another and thus led to improved sales.<sup>172</sup> But this consensus was tenuous at best and could not last. When the two leading veterans’ groups got involved in the publication of textbooks in the 1890s, they moralized cause of the war and had a definitive stance on right and wrong. Through their disagreements, the GAR and UCV staunchly advocated for authors and publishers to continue to treat their legacy in the “telegraphic style.” Textbooks’ “loose consensus” over veterans’ legacy became a strong consensus when the GAR and UCV involved themselves in the discussion.

#### *The GAR and UCV Take Direct Action*

In the 1890s, the GAR focused its attention on the war’s legacy more acutely, specifically in terms of textbooks and their presentation of the war. The focus on textbooks folded into the GAR’s campaign to instill proper morals and values into school children, including prescribing the proper history for their education since the youth had no personal experience of the war.<sup>173</sup> The GAR created a Committee on a Systematic Plan of Teaching the Lessons of Loyalty to Our Country and One Flag in 1891 to tackle the question of how the next generation should be taught the history of the war.<sup>174</sup> The name of the GAR Committee, evoking the idea of “our country” and “one flag” and thus national unity, signified the fraternal history ultimately prescribed.

---

<sup>172</sup> Moreau, *Schoolbook Nation*, 67.

<sup>173</sup> Logue, *To Appomattox and Beyond*, 102.

<sup>174</sup> Stuart C. McConnell, "The Patriotic Boom," in *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader*, ed. Larry M. Logue and Michael Barton (New York: New York University Press, 2007), 367.

In their August 17, 1892 report from Boston, the Committee said to accomplish its goal of properly teaching the war they must “reach the youth of the land.” The report went on:

It is gratifying to observe at the present time the evident awakening of a higher patriotic sentiment, of a more intense Americanism, among the people of the land...If this is to be the actuating idea of the future, it is clear that the result can only come by inculcating it in the minds and instilling it into the hearts of the boys and girls who are to make the governing power and the controlling spirit of the years to come.<sup>175</sup>

The GAR Committee continued by stating:

And that with all of the intense loyalty and devotion of the Union veterans, there is no tinge of bitterness, but only best wishes for the future prosperity of those against whom, a quarter of a century ago, they contended in battle. It should be the work of the Grand Army of the Republic to see that alike in the schools of the North and the South, the true story of the great war for the Union is made one of the most prominent and important courses of study.<sup>176</sup>

The history of the war had to be taught, but it had to be taught in the proper way. Rather than forgetting or glossing over the war, textbooks needed to present it as a “forgotten quarrel”: not forgotten in the sense of left out of the historical record, but forgotten *as a quarrel*. The GAR claimed all Northern veterans felt no enduring “tinge of bitterness” and therefore educators and textbooks should not teach bitterness in schools. Confederate veterans were men whom Union veterans had fought “a quarter of a century ago,” not men whom they continued to fight physically, emotionally, or historically. Union veterans, the GAR claimed, “only [had] the best wishes” for the men who wore the gray by the 1890s. Fundamentally, the GAR Committee felt little fear GAR members, publishers, and authors could create a single

---

<sup>175</sup> Journal of the Twenty-Sixth National Encampment, Grand Army of the Republic, Washington, D.C., September 21st and 22d, 1892, (Albany: S.H. Wentworth, 1892), [http://books.google.com/books?id=tU81AQAMA AJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gb\\_s\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?id=tU81AQAMA AJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gb_s_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false). 80-81.

<sup>176</sup> Ibid., 81.

history of the war. To create a single history, the Union and Confederate veterans had to agree to a universalized narrative. The history's purported 'inclusiveness' made it worthy of dissemination to American students.

The United Confederate Veterans also sought to establish a historical committee given how "veterans revealed early their strong interest in history, and especially in the compilation of a certain kind of history."<sup>177</sup> The UCV's Historical Committee formed in 1892 was to

select and designate such proper and truthful history of the United States, to be used in both public and private schools of the South, and that said committee shall, as soon as possible, put the seal of their condemnation upon such as are not truthful histories of the United States.<sup>178</sup>

One of the members, Stephen Dill Lee, argued the UCV's Historical Committee should seek the aid of unbiased experts and that "to select those [histories] which are partisan to the South would be as objectionable as [selecting] those which are partisan to the North."<sup>179</sup> The goal from the outset, just like the GAR's Committee, was to write a national rather than sectional history. Choosing a sectional or partisan textbook extolling only Southern troops and victories was not in keeping with the spirit of fraternity GAR and UCV members so actively sought. Perhaps more importantly, a partisan Southern history was not marketable to the mostly Northern publishers of these textbooks. The UCV's Committee disregarded a suggestion to have southern literary giant Thomas Nelson Page, who heavily inundated his writings with Lost Cause ideology, write a new history of the conflict; the UCV Committee

---

<sup>177</sup> Hattaway, "Clio's Southern Soldiers," 216.

<sup>178</sup> Committee on Resolutions quoted in *ibid.*, 217.

<sup>179</sup> Stephen Dill Lee quoted in *ibid.*, 220.

felt he could only produce a polemical, sectional story line.<sup>180</sup> The UCV Committee also agreed the writings of Jefferson Davis and Alexander H. Stephens, prominent and respected Confederate leaders, were too radical and “marred by personal prejudices” to become the history of the war for textbooks.<sup>181</sup>

Stephen Dill Lee proclaimed, “the South wants no history in her schools that cannot be taught to the children in every state in the Union.”<sup>182</sup> Both the GAR and UCV desired a truly national history that created a homogenous view of the late conflict and veterans’ role in it. This universalization of veterans’ service would maintain their importance in the American creation of self after the war; it made veterans, all veterans, members of the pantheon of great Americans rather than a group who’s legacy would never cease to spark debate and division. Only with their public’s agreement would veterans’ remain of paramount importance to American history and future American endeavors.

While the history the UCV ultimately produced and advocated for was far from objective, they did not strive to be polemical. It was the same for the GAR and the histories it supported. Neither history would stand up to a test of objectivity from a modern audience, but both should be viewed through a different lens than those of the Lost Cause. Veterans’ ultimate goal was a national history to protect and promote their legacy; the Lost Cause’s ultimate goal was a sectional history that would protect and promote their antebellum way of life.

---

<sup>180</sup> Ibid.

<sup>181</sup> The New Orleans *Daily Picayune* quoted in *ibid.*

<sup>182</sup> Stephen Dill Lee quoted in *ibid.*, 233.

*Division in the Ranks*

While both the UCV and the GAR strove to create a singular, unified history which honored the soldiers of both sides, that did not mean they reached consensus on all issues related to the war. The two sides most vehemently disagreed on what caused the war and the legality of secession.

The GAR was adamant that the histories it endorsed have a moral discussion of right and wrong. In the *Thirty-First Journal of the National Encampment* (1897), the GAR's Committee on School Histories stated,

We insist that our youth shall be taught that the war was more than a mere bloody contest to gratify the selfish ambition or to test the military strength of the two sections of our country. We demand that it shall be plainly and clearly taught that it was a war, between the Government of the United States, and a part of its citizens in revolt against it; that it was prosecuted by the National Government for the maintenance of its constitutional authority, and the enforcement of its laws; and we further insist that it be made clear and beyond doubt, that those who fought for national unity in this struggle were right.<sup>183</sup>

The GAR desired a history that clearly stated there was a cause and a purpose to the war, albeit one devoid of references to slavery or emancipation. Both the GAR and the UCV, beginning around 1890, desired histories which presented a right and a wrong side for the war; it is why both the GAR and UCV moved away from endorsing textbooks of the dominant "telegraphic style."<sup>184</sup> Many states adopted regulations supporting this moralization of cause of the war. Of particular note was Mississippi's resolution passed in February 1890 to make sure there was a

'full, fair and candid presentation of questions upon which the American people' had been 'honestly divided,' and in the maintenance of which they had acted 'according to the promptings of courage and honor.'<sup>185</sup>

---

<sup>183</sup> McConnell, "The Patriotic Boom," 367.

<sup>184</sup> Moreau, *Schoolbook Nation*, 72.

<sup>185</sup> Pierce, *Public Opinion and the Teaching of History in the United States* 39.

Veterans' desires and goals were extremely influential.

However, the veterans did not want textbooks to moralize their service or their legacy. The GAR Committee reasserted this exact statement in the *Thirty-Second Journal of the National Encampment* (1898) after explaining:

The new glories that have come to our Army and Navy, do not, we believe in the least change the record of those identified with the great war from 1861 to 1865. We hope that our ex-confederate friends will join us in the thanksgiving that their plans for breaking up the Union failed, and that they will realize that the greatest calamity that could have befallen them would have been the accomplishment of the purpose for which they fought.<sup>186</sup>

“The new glories” referred to was the Spanish-American War (1898). While the fighting of Americans under one flag was inspiring and bolstered the sense of unity between the sections, the GAR was clear it did not believe the camaraderie of the grandchildren erased the choices of Confederate grandfathers. Secession was wrong. The UCV would vehemently disagree on this point and maintain the legality and honorability of secession.<sup>187</sup>

In contrast, the UCV's Committee made a list of tenets it felt were essential for any historical interpretation: secession was not a illegal; the term rebellion should not be used to censure; “the whole country and not the South alone was responsible for slavery, the system prevailing in the North as long as it was profitable”; “the slave trade was made possible only by New England vessels manned by New England crews”; and “the true cause of the war between the States was the dignified

---

<sup>186</sup> Journal of the Thirty-Second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, Cincinnati, Ohio, September 8th and 9th, 1898, (Philadelphia: Town Printing Company, 1898), [http://books.google.com/books?id=B\\_4PAQAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?id=B_4PAQAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false). 194.

<sup>187</sup> Gaines M. Foster, "A Respect for Confederate History," in *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader*, ed. Larry M. Logue and Michel Barton (New York: New York University Press, 2007), 378.

withdrawal of the Southern States from the Union, to avoid continued breaches of domestic tranquility, guaranteed but not consummated by the constitution.”<sup>188</sup> The UCV also focused its efforts on dismissing slavery as the cornerstone of the Southern cause since they felt this interpretation put them on the wrong side of history.<sup>189</sup> The UCV reported Northern textbooks caused many Southern children to “think that we fought for slavery... This is really pathetic,” for if school textbooks continued to “fasten upon the South the stigma of slavery and that we fought for it... the Southern soldier will go down in history dishonored.”<sup>190</sup> Avoiding dishonor for Confederate veterans was of supreme importance to the UCV as part of their attempts to protect and promote Confederate veterans’ legacy. Furthermore, the UCV demanded Confederates were never “rebels;” many Confederate veterans, despite what modern bumper stickers might say, deplored the label by the turn of the century.<sup>191</sup>

The members of the UCV committee “sincerely believed that the kind of history they advocated” with these stipulations on cause of the war “would be acceptable to unbiased people in every part of the country.”<sup>192</sup> The UCV wanted to be uncontroversial, meaning distance from any purposefully divisive topics. To have a history that appealed to the “unbiased” meant having a history that appealed to the widest margin of the general public. Thus the history had to be a universal story that promoted all veterans, downplayed cause of the war, and continued discussion and

---

<sup>188</sup> UCV Committee quoted in Hattaway, "Clio's Southern Soldiers," 222-23.

<sup>189</sup> McPherson, *This Mighty Scourge*, 97-98.

<sup>190</sup> UCV Committee quoted in *ibid.*, 97.

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*, Foster, "A Respect for Confederate History," 378.

<sup>192</sup> Hattaway, "Clio's Southern Soldiers," 233.

inclusion of specific groups (most especially blacks) in constricted and contrived ways.

As David Blight has argued, “the culture of veterans’ reminiscence in the 1880s and 1890s acknowledged a distinction between the causes for which North and South had fought, but no difference in the moral righteousness and valor with which they had performed their duty.”<sup>193</sup> Veterans agreed they all deserved public valorization, memorialization, and remembrance. The GAR in their *Journals* referred to the Southern veterans as their “ex-confederate friends” meaning they were no longer Confederates; they were Americans. Veterans were members of a single, national group with an underlying and universal spirit of friendship between them. Veterans needed a pedagogical support in order to have this sentiment last beyond the veterans themselves.

The UCV’s textbook crusade did advocate that textbooks have an explanation of the cause of the war informed by Lost Cause ideology, but this was not at the expense of the narrative of fraternal conflict. Whether the Confederacy fought for slavery or states’ rights or if the Union Army resoundingly defeated them or the Confederacy simply capitulated to overwhelming numbers, it did not change the UCV’s claim that soldiers of both side shared fraternal sentiment.

#### *Individual Textbooks Examples*

Between 1865 and around 1890, most public schools in the South did not favor “legalistic apologias for the Confederacy.”<sup>194</sup> Accordingly, the most popular

---

<sup>193</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 190.

<sup>194</sup> Moreau, *Schoolbook Nation*, 66.

textbook in the region was University of Virginia professor George Frederick Holmes's *A School History of the United States of America, from the Earliest Discoveries to the Year 1870*, first published in 1871 by the University Publishing Company of New York.<sup>195</sup> Holmes wrote in the opening to his section on "The First Year of the War of Secession, 1861":

details and facts are in dispute; accurate knowledge is unattainable; and the judgment is warped by recent and surviving passions. To other times belongs the sacred duty of composing a just record of the melancholy struggle. A calm narrative of the principal events is all that will be attempted here.<sup>196</sup>

His descriptions of the initial battles between Confederate and Union forces in 1861 read more like the description of troop movements over a single battlefield. There was no discussion of victories, losses, death, or a reason for why the troops met or fought at those locations or generally at all.

Even though Holmes and his publishers designed the work for a Southern audience, Holmes refused to romanticize his fellow Southerners or their antebellum way of life. He was also very proud that "no charge of partiality or prejudice, of sectional or political discoloration" was brought against his textbook.<sup>197</sup> In the early 1880s editions, Holmes was unafraid to discuss taboo topics. These included implying there were sexual relations between slaves and their masters and an attempt by the "firebrands" leading the secession movement to revive the Atlantic slave trade in 1860. The inclusion of the latter point greatly undermined many who argued, and would argue in later textbooks, that the Southern states established the Confederacy

---

<sup>195</sup> Ibid.

<sup>196</sup> George F. Holmes, "Part VI: History of the Great Civil War and the Years Ensuing," *A School History of the United States of America, from the Earliest Discoveries to the Year 1870* (New York: University Publishing Company, 1871), <https://archive.org/stream/schoolhistoryofu00holm#page/n5/mode/2up>. 272.

<sup>197</sup> George Frederick Holmes quoted in Moreau, *Schoolbook Nation*, 66.

to protect states' rights and not slavery. Finally, Holmes argued sectional divisions ran deep in the United States, both before and continuing after the war, and consequently that the war was inevitable. The war was not the creation of Northern abolitionists or profit seekers, as some Lost Cause adherents argued, but purely due to natural divides that arose in the antebellum period.

Rather than infuriating Southern leaders, many leading Southern educators endorsed the text. Joseph Moreau has argued this support was partly explained because of Holmes's "regional reputation as a scholar and his impeccable credentials as a Southerner" giving him "liberties" these Southern educators would not have afforded other authors.<sup>198</sup> Holmes's textbook fell out of favor in the 1890s: the same time the UCV and the GAR became heavily involved in textbook lobbying.

In 1897, Lida A. Field of Georgia produced the *Grammar School History of the United States*. The UCV included it on its list of approved textbooks and in the preface Field stated, "the war between the states [was] treated in a brief and impartial manner."<sup>199</sup> While the textbook's narrative of the war certainly favors the Confederacy and reflects the core tenets of Lost Cause ideology, the text does not present anything the veterans' public would find particularly inflammatory in its description of the events leading up to and during 1861-1865. In a footnote on Abraham Lincoln, Field stated the most "noted event of his administration was the Emancipation Proclamation," and that he is "often called the 'martyred president.'"<sup>200</sup> Cause of the war, which Field gave a description and distortion most assuredly fixed

---

<sup>198</sup> Ibid., 66-67.

<sup>199</sup> Lida A. Field, *A Grammar School History of the United States*, (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company, 1897), <http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=loc.ark:/13960/t4qj7sf79;view=1up;seq=9>. 5.

<sup>200</sup> Ibid., 306.

within the Lost Cause's states' rights argument, would have met disapproval from the GAR. Field argued, "the citizens of the seceded states, because they took up arms to resist invasion and assert their rights were declared to be 'rebels.'" The questions for further study at the end of the section included: "Name two of the best generals in the Southern army" and "Why was there greater suffering in the South than in the North during the war?"<sup>201</sup>

Field devoted most of the text to describing important battles, although not in detail, and giving brief biographies of both Northern and Southern generals. As in the veterans' memoirs, there was no mention of blood or extreme violence, and the only hints at death are indications of casualties at the ends of battle descriptions. Veterans' fraternity and their writings most assuredly informed Field's textbook.

While Field always described Confederate forces as acting with courage and valor, having fewer casualties than the Union Army, and retreating or ultimately surrendering due to overwhelming numbers and resources, the most vivid bias and distortion of the war comes at the expense of black troops and civilians. However, the students reading Field's textbook, either Northern or Southern, would not have seen the omissions of black participation or the inclusion of the 'happy slave' as inherently sectional. Field omitted the massacre of black Union soldiers at Fort Pillow in April 1864; the textbook just stated Confederates retreated from the location. Field's description of the affect of the Fourteenth Amendment, which extended the rights of citizenship and due process to anyone born or naturalized in the United States, read,

---

<sup>201</sup> Ibid., 358.

“negroes would be allowed to vote and some of the best and most prominent men of the South would be disenfranchised.”<sup>202</sup> A footnote on “the negroes” reads:

Generally, the kindest feeling had existed between the slave and his master. During the four years of war, though in some sections nearly all the white men were away in the army, their families dwelt in safety on the plantations with the negroes. There were no attempts at insurrection. After the war, the latter were hired as servants and laborers by the white people.<sup>203</sup>

The overwhelming white supremacy and white benevolence towards blacks, both slave and free, in this description were no different than similar descriptions in popular fiction and veterans’ memoirs. By describing blacks as happy slaves and devoted to their masters, the textbook avoided the main consequence of the war: emancipation. The textbook allowed its readers, in this case young men and women across the United States, continued ignorance of the pain and hardship suffered by blacks by uniting these youths through moral superiority. The textbook also described Southerners as happy to hire their former slaves as laborers rather than describing the system that kept them on the plantations.

Yet, Field’s textbook also included descriptions of unity between Union and Confederate soldiers, civilians, and officials during the war. In describing the mindset of Southerners going into the Peace Congress of February 1861, Field wrote:

Southern soldiers had fought in the army that had won independence for the states, and the Southern statesmen had helped to form and build up the government under which the country had developed; hence there were many who loved the Union, and who would have been glad to find some honorable way for the return of the seceded states.<sup>204</sup>

---

<sup>202</sup> Ibid., 364.

<sup>203</sup> Ibid.

<sup>204</sup> Ibid., 297.

Field, through this description, made many Southerners unionists. Field argued even though the unity between the sections was tested by the war, the people always desired a unified country.

While many textbooks included sections on the war, the civil war was recent history explicitly not addressed by others. One of the most prominent historians of the era, George Bancroft, did not address the war in his *History of the United States, from the Discovery of the American Continent* as he never expanded it past the American Revolution.

.....

Veterans as members of the UCV and the GAR participated in a production of history at the end of the nineteenth century. As Robert Winks has argued, “We all know history is, simultaneously, three things: what actually happened, what historians choose to record, and what the people—and people, some people, these people, those people—believe to be true about the past.”<sup>205</sup> Histories are written by authors even if he or she tries to hide his or her authorial commentary behind claims of a truly objective presentation. The textbook battle between the UCV and the GAR is a microcosm through which the larger never-ending battle between history and memory can be examined. What the UCV and GAR tried to produce was a certain historical memory substantiated by a series of facts and stories. Certain contemporary historians have argued there is no empirical truth in history and the historian who concedes the interpretive nature of his or her historical production is trustworthy; history, in the

---

<sup>205</sup> Sanford Levinson, *Written in Stone: Public Monuments in Changing Societies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), 64.

end, is ostensibly a narrative with a specific purpose.<sup>206</sup> Neither the GAR nor the UCV sought to create a purely sectional, polemical narrative. But the choice to create a national history that highlighted the role and sacrifice of the veterans was a choice, an interpretation that belied the authorship of the narrative. It was the veterans of the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Confederate Veterans choice to employ the same framework to view and write the war's history that made its production into a means for an ideological end.

---

<sup>206</sup> See Hayden White's "The Historical Test as Literary Artifact" and Jill Lepore's "Just the Facts, Ma'am: Fake memoirs, factual fictions and the history of history."

## 5

*The Ubiquitous 'Parade-Rest' Soldier: Soldier Monuments and Memorials*

The weather was not particularly welcoming on October 20, 1904, but still a crowd gathered on the Washington Green just off Wesleyan University's campus in Middletown, Connecticut. This crowd, composed of state and local officials, members of the fire and police departments, local clergymen, the Presidents of Wesleyan and the Connecticut Grand Army of the Republic, and local citizens, gathered to dedicate a monument to the county's sons who fought and gave their lives in the civil war as part of the 24<sup>th</sup> Regiment Connecticut Volunteers. Veterans who served in the regiment were also present; old men with graying hair who looked at the newly unveiled monument and thought of their comrades who had not come home forty years ago. The *Middletown Penny Press* began its article on the dedication:

There was dedicated on Washington Green in this city today, an enduring granite memorial to the gallant members of the Twenty fourth C.V. [Connecticut Volunteers], who gave their lives on the field of battle or suffered death through the slower processes of disease or the more painful death from wounds received in the service of their country in the hour of its dire need.<sup>207</sup>

But visually the monument did not reflect the death, violence, and suffering of which the *Middletown Penny Press* spoke.

.....

---

<sup>207</sup> "Monument in Honor of the 24th Regt., C.V., Unveiled on Washington Green," *Penny Press*, October 20, 1904 1904. Middlesex County Historical Society, Civil War Collection, Box 3, Folder 9.

The end of conflict in 1865 “provoked the greatest era of monument building ever seen” in the history of the United States. Between 1863 and 1919, Virginia went from ten monuments to eighty-three and Michigan went from seven to forty-two.<sup>208</sup> Nineteenth century Americans began to see monuments as viable and necessary forms of remembrance in the post-war era.<sup>209</sup> While communities erected monuments to honor other wars and individuals, never were monuments as ubiquitous as they became after 1865.<sup>210</sup> Due to their new form, and universality, nineteenth century Americans, and subsequent generations, felt monuments in the post-war era “claimed to be revelations of popular will” rather than part of “a cult of rulership” of a select elite circle.<sup>211</sup> Communities not only erected monuments, as they had, to honor great or prominent figures, but also erected them to honor great yet common men who performed exceptional deeds.

“History...is not merely something to be read. And it does not refer merely, or even principally, to the past...the great force of history comes from the fact that we...are unconsciously con-trolled by it in many ways, and history is literally present in all that we do” wrote poet and author James Baldwin.<sup>212</sup> While Baldwin was speaking about his wonder at what “white Americans talk about with one another” because they never say anything to him, his comment can be extended to the

---

<sup>208</sup> Brown, *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration*, 24.

<sup>209</sup> Kirk Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), 3,4.

<sup>210</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>211</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>212</sup> James Baldwin, "Unnameable Objects, Unspeakable Crimes," *The White Problem in America* (Chicago: Johnson, 1966), <http://engl101-rothman.wikispaces.umb.edu/file/view/Unnameable+Objects+Unspeakable+Crimes.pdf>.

materialization of the world.<sup>213</sup> The built environment represents historic change over time. Parks, street names, buildings, private homes, bridges, and monuments constantly remind people of past deeds, whether they are triumphs or mistakes. In this way, history continues to inundate and implicate contemporary actions and understanding of events. But history is also experienced through interpretation. Constant reevaluation of the past allows promotion, justification, or challenge to current decisions or trends.

Monuments served as consensus builders in the creation of post-war ‘Americanism’ by presenting a repetitive and restricted fraternal message that dominated all forms of memorialization by the turn of the twentieth century.<sup>214</sup> Whether civic or funereal, local or national, monuments reflected the fraternal narrative through their style and inscriptions as well as the included and excluded groups of their dedications. Consensus building began with the debate over the burial of black and white Union soldiers and Confederate soldiers in 1864 that ended with the creation of truly national cemeteries by the beginning of the twentieth century. Beginning the 1870s, single figures at ‘parade rest’ began appearing on civic monuments across the country and would dominate memorial forms by the 1880s. Beginning in the late 1880s, a counter narrative began to emerge through exceptions to monument patterns, including: violence, death, and the presence of black troops. However, these exceptions only underscored the rule of the fraternal narrative because they were construed and viewed, still presently, as anomalies.

---

<sup>213</sup> Ibid.

<sup>214</sup> See Kirk Savage’s *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves* and Sanford Levinson’s *Written in Stone* for other discussions on how monuments serve as consensus builders.

Monuments, as “literally present in all we do,” are fundamental to this process of knowledge of self. Monuments, in a sense, become invisible. But this invisibility is in fact their power. Monuments have a persistent power to structure daily experience and perceptions of history, and they still do so to this day.

*Dealing with the Dead—Monuments in the 1860s*

A war that many predicted would last three months dragged on for four bitter years. A conflict that one Southern man said would shed an amount of blood that he could wipe up with a pocket-handkerchief resulted in an unprecedented amount of human loss. Conservative estimates put the number of dead at 750,000 or the equivalent of two and a half percent of the population at the time. Similar losses equate to almost seven million dead in 2014 population terms. Historians keep raising the estimate of men killed.

This unprecedented number of dead left the United States with the problem of how to properly deal with their dead on an unforeseen scale. The solution did not simply entail proper reburials but required locating, identifying, and in many cases moving bodies that had been left out or abandoned in shallow graves with either no or rudimentary markers. Records kept during the course of the war by generals, clergymen, or others in official capacities only noted 101,736 registered burials, a number fewer than one-third of total Union fatalities.<sup>215</sup> Fostering a sense of nationalism in honoring the dead proved vastly more difficult than fostering a sense of nationalism among the living. The dead gave their lives for a cause or an idea they

---

<sup>215</sup> Drew Gilpin Faust, "Battle over the Bodies: Burying and Reburying the Civil War Dead, 1865-1871," in *Wars within a War: Controversy and Conflict over the American Civil War*, ed. Gary W. Gallagher and Joan Waugh, *Civil War America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 185.

could not recant and, in this sense, they proved everlasting bastions to that ideology and sentiment. This status proved especially true for the Southern dead. The question of the dead would at first continue sectional animosities and prove a divisive issue but, like other forms of memorialization, would play a central role in the unification of the country.<sup>216</sup> The public would eventually view the dead's former trespasses as emblematic of sacrifice for the country or, at the very least, not as wrongs committed against the nation.

The Federal Government quickly took measures to establish a bureaucracy to take care and account for the Union war dead. Locating and identifying bodies of soldiers still buried, perhaps haphazardly, in Southern soil became a Northern national endeavor with the government soliciting and receiving crucial information from the people. This bureaucracy of the dead did not just aid in the coping of a distraught populace and help to uphold nineteenth century views on proper death.<sup>217</sup> It was in response to a perceived, and in many cases substantiated, fear in the immediate post-war period. The North feared what former Confederates would do to their fallen sons who remained behind. As Drew Gilpin Faust has argued, "It had proved impossible to overcome a live Union army, but bitter Confederates could still wage war against a dead one."<sup>218</sup> In Georgia, locals disinterred the body of Union soldier Oliver Barger "for the purposes of studying anatomy;" his father had pleaded to have

---

<sup>216</sup> Ibid., 184.

<sup>217</sup> The 'proper death' in the nineteenth century, referred to as the 'good death, meant dying surrounded by loved ones and family followed by a burial in a family plot or local cemetery. For more see Gary Laderman, *The Sacred Remains: American Attitudes toward Death, 1799-1883* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).

<sup>218</sup> Faust, "Battle over the Bodies," 189.

his son moved to the national cemetery at Chattanooga.<sup>219</sup> Edmund B. Whitman, a former quartermaster who the Federal Government relieved of his duties in order “to locate the scattered graves of Union soldiers,” pursued the father’s plea.<sup>220</sup> He was forced to tell him all that remained of his son were “two small arm bones, one hand bone, and his clothing.”<sup>221</sup> In Kentucky, a local man was killed for allowing the burial of two Union soldiers in his yard; Kentucky never seceded and officially sided with the Union during the civil war.<sup>222</sup> Edmund B. Whitman wrote of his experience in Mississippi, “I am informed that a disposition has been shown in this vicinity to obliterate and destroy all traces of the graves union soldiers find scattered in the country.”<sup>223</sup> Apparently, Union soldiers would rather hide all traces of a grave of a comrade than risk its desecration by Confederates veterans and angry Southerners. The policies of reconstruction may have urged closure on or disregard of sectional loyalties, but the treatment of the dead reminded people that those who they now called fellow Americans wrought it.

In February 1866, “Maj. Gen. George Thomas issued an order forbidding the desecration of Union graves and directing specifically that they must not be mutilated or obliterated in the course of the spring plowing season,” that was occurring for the first time since the end of the war.<sup>224</sup> By April of the same year, concerns about vandalism of Union graves reached Washington. In response, Congress passed a joint resolution requiring the secretary of war “to take immediate measures to preserve

---

<sup>219</sup> Edmund B. Whitman quoted in *ibid.*, 188.

<sup>220</sup> Special Order No. 132 quoted in *ibid.*, 187.

<sup>221</sup> *Ibid.*, 188.

<sup>222</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>223</sup> Edmund B. Whitman quoted in *ibid.*, 191.

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid.*, 189.

from desecration the graves of the soldiers of the United States who fell in battle or died of disease...and secure suitable burial places in which they may be properly interred.<sup>225</sup>

Sectional animosities over proper handling and respect for the dead continued because the Federal Government did not, at first, dedicate any efforts or funds for caring for the dead of the former Confederacy. On July 17, 1862, Congress approved a bill permitting the creation of fourteen national cemeteries across the country for the burial of men who died while serving the Union cause.<sup>226</sup> This practice of only burying Union dead in cemeteries that were either established or adopted as national cemeteries by the Federal Government continued until the Reburial Program ended in 1870.<sup>227</sup> The reburial teams were careful to only reinter Union remains and generally left Confederate remains in their hastily constructed graves on the battlefields.<sup>228</sup> Proposals for national cemeteries allowing for the burial of both Union and Confederate troops together were abandoned due to public and political outcry, bitterness, and resentment.<sup>229</sup> Most prominent of these failed early proposals for cross-army burials were Antietam National Cemetery (Sharpsburg, Maryland) established in 1865 and Marietta National Cemetery (Marietta, Georgia) established in 1866. The only federally established cemeteries allowing for the burial of

---

<sup>225</sup> Congressional resolution quoted in *ibid.*

<sup>226</sup> National Cemetery Administration, "History and Development of the National Cemetery Administration," (U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 2014), 1.

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>228</sup> Kelly Merrifield, "From Necessity to Honor: The Evolution of National Cemeteries in the United States," National Park Service, [http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/national\\_cemeteries/Development.html](http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/national_cemeteries/Development.html).

<sup>229</sup> "Marietta National Cemetery, Marietta Georgia," National Park Service, [http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/national\\_cemeteries/Georgia/Marietta\\_National\\_Cemetery.html](http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/national_cemeteries/Georgia/Marietta_National_Cemetery.html) ., "Antietam National Cemetery," National Park Service, <http://www.nps.gov/anti/historyculture/antietam-national-cemetery.htm>.

Confederate troops were specifically established for Confederate prisoners who died in Northern prisoner of war camps. In some cases, the Confederate prisoner of war cemeteries were established adjacent, but separate, from cemeteries to Union troops and given much of the same name; two examples are Crown Hill National Cemetery and Crown Hill Confederate Plot (Indianapolis, Indiana) and Rock Island National Cemetery and Rock Island Confederate Cemetery (Rock Island, Illinois). The Federal Government and the individual communities felt responsible for the men who died under their direct watch, but not those who died fighting against them. This respect for dead prisoners of war hinted at the larger trend of reconciliation that occurred through the burial of the dead later in the century.

In vast numbers, Southern women took up the job of burying Confederate dead and dedicating a final resting place in their memory. Across the South, cemeteries were established to immortalize and bury the Confederate dead as the Federal Government buried their Union counterparts. Of particular importance was Hollywood Cemetery in the heart of downtown Richmond, Virginia. Already a cemetery for some of the South's most important or beloved figures, including President James Monroe (buried 1858), it became a final resting place for Confederates who died in and around Richmond. The 1866 establishment of the Hollywood Memorial Association of the Ladies of Richmond spurred Hollywood Cemetery's role as a Confederate burial site.<sup>230</sup> Founded to take care of Confederate graves, the group believed the Confederate dead were the Southern dead and should be treated as such; this was a far cry from the Southern political rhetoric of states'

---

<sup>230</sup> "History," Hollywood Cemetery, <http://www.hollywoodcemetery.org/about/our-history>.

rights during the war.<sup>231</sup> The ladies of the Hollywood Memorial Association took charge of reburying local Confederate bodies and also reinterred thousands of Confederate dead left on the fields at Gettysburg between 1866 and 1873.<sup>232</sup> No Union soldiers were or are buried in Hollywood Cemetery.

Yet the Federal Government quickly started thinking of sectional death as national death and became more inclusive with their burial practices. Under the direction of Quartermaster General Montgomery C. Meigs, in 1864 Washington, D.C began burying Confederate soldiers who died in the city's prisons and hospitals in what became Arlington National Cemetery.<sup>233</sup> The burial crews scattered these Confederate dead throughout the graves of their Union counterparts. At the urging of Southern advocacy groups, many of them women's groups, Congress authorized the reservation of a portion of Arlington National Cemetery for the burial of Confederate dead in June 1900. By the end of 1901, "all of the Confederate soldiers buried in the national cemeteries at Alexandria, Virginia, and at the Soldiers' Home in Washington were brought together with the soldiers buried at Arlington and reinterred in the Confederate section."<sup>234</sup> A total of 482 persons, including officers, enlisted men, wives, civilians, and the unknown, lay buried around a large monument dedicated by the United Daughters of the Confederacy in 1912.<sup>235</sup> Quartermaster General

---

<sup>231</sup> Faust, "Battle over the Bodies," 195.

<sup>232</sup> "History".

<sup>233</sup> Michelle A. Krowl, "'In the Spirit of Fraternity': The United States Government and the Burial of Confederate Dead at Arlington National Cemetery, 1864-1914," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 111, no. 2 (2003), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4250101>. 159

<sup>234</sup> James Edward Peters, "Confederate Memorial," Arlington National Cemetery, <http://www.arlingtoncemetery.mil/Explore-the-Cemetery/Monuments-and-Memorials/Confederate-Memorial>.

<sup>235</sup> Ibid.

Montgomery C. Meigs chose the grounds of the leading general of the former Confederacy, Robert E. Lee, for the nation's premier military cemetery. By the turn of the twentieth century, a place meant to honor those who served the country valiantly now honored those who at one point fought against the country.

The act of reburying Confederate dead at Arlington was in the name of reconciliation. Its end result promoted the same sentiment reconstruction policies evoked: the nation could and would reunite after its bloody civil war by forgiving past misdeeds. The Monument of the Unknown Dead, dedicated in September 1866 and located in the former rose garden of Robert E. Lee's Arlington House, embodies the reconciliationist sentiment eventually found through the burial of the dead. The Monument is a tomb containing the remains of unidentified Union and Confederate troops. It does not include men of the United States Colored Troops.

Nationalizing the dead also took place beyond the nation's premier military cemetery. The apparent reconciliation through the dead at Arlington inspired Ohio Senator Joseph B. Foraker in 1902 to introduce a bill authorizing the Federal Government to mark and provide headstones for Confederate dead as it had for Union dead almost fifty years prior.<sup>236</sup> Debate over appropriations delayed its passage until March 9, 1906. In its final form, the law only allowed the marking of graves of Confederate soldiers who "died as prisoners of war in Federal prisons and military hospitals in the North."<sup>237</sup> In Little Rock, Arkansas, the adjacent cemeteries for Confederate and Union dead operated separately until 1913 when the Secretary of

---

<sup>236</sup> Administration, "History and Development of the National Cemetery Administration," 5.

<sup>237</sup> "Foraker Bill" quoted in *ibid.*

War accepted ownership of the former. While the cemetery honors the dead of both armies, it is located on Confederate Boulevard.<sup>238</sup>

On January 20, 1914, Congress authorized an act for the furnishing of headstones of durable stone for all unmarked Union and Confederate graves. The War Department now recognized and marked any grave of a Confederate soldier anywhere in the country.<sup>239</sup> It would take an act of Congress in 1920 for all Confederate soldiers, and all soldiers who served in any war the United States ever was or would be engaged in, to receive the privilege of burial in a national cemetery.<sup>240</sup>

White soldiers from both armies could be buried side by side in a fraternity of death, but black soldiers who fought for the country were faced with separation. Blacks in the South showed no reluctance when it came to aiding Federal agents in locating and identifying bodies of Union soldiers for reburial. In many cases, former slaves were forthcoming about information implicating their former masters, on whose plantation they still resided, in the desecration of graves.<sup>241</sup> Yet those in charge of reburial buried members of the United States Colored Troops in segregated sections marked “colored” in the national cemeteries.<sup>242</sup> At Arlington, those in charge of burial relegated members of the United States Colored Troops and black civilians

---

<sup>238</sup> "Little Rock National Cemetery, Little Rock, Arkansas," National Park Service, [http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/national\\_cemeteries/Arkansas/Little\\_Rock\\_National\\_Cemetery.html](http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/national_cemeteries/Arkansas/Little_Rock_National_Cemetery.html).

<sup>239</sup> Jason Church, "Confederates in the Cemetery: Federal Benefits & Stewardship," in *International Cemetery Preservation Summit* (Niagra Falls, NY: National Center for Preservation Technology and Training, 2014).

<sup>240</sup> Administration, "History and Development of the National Cemetery Administration," 6.

<sup>241</sup> Faust, "Battle over the Bodies," 192-93.

<sup>242</sup> Steven B. Burg, "'From Troubled Ground to Common Ground': The Locust Grove African American Cemetery Restoration Project: A Case Study of Service-Learning and Community History," *The Public Historian* 30, no. 2 (2008), <http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=slceprojectsu>mmaries. 55.

living in the contraband camps to a separate section. Sections Twenty-Three and Twenty-Seven were not only segregated by race, but physically segregated from the rest of the grounds by natural elements.<sup>243</sup> Even in death, the veterans' public and the Federal Government did not confront the divisive question of equality for the new freedmen. Nationalism through death and in death was more important than equal honor for all those who served fighting for the Union

Segregation in death, more generally, was the norm in both national and communal cemeteries. There are two cemeteries in Shippensburg, PA the community did not integrate until 1993. The black cemetery, Locust Grove, dates from the late eighteenth century; the white cemetery, Spring Hill, Shippensburg residents established in 1861 for the express purpose of burying white residents only.<sup>244</sup> Yet what is particularly interesting about this form of segregation is although Shippensburg segregated cemeteries by race, all graves received government-supplied headstones. In 1879, Congress authorized the Secretary of War "to erect headstones over the graves of soldiers who served in the Regular or Volunteer Army of the United States during the war for the Union, and who have been buried in private village or city cemeteries, in the same manner...for those interred in national military cemeteries."<sup>245</sup> While the Federal Government extended equal treatment to graves beginning in the 1870s, many Americans did not follow their example. The

---

<sup>243</sup> Friends of Freedmen's Cemetery, "African-American Civilians Interred in Section 27 of Arlington National Cemetery, 1864-1867," <http://www.freedmenscemetery.org/resources/documents/arlington-section27.pdf>.

<sup>244</sup> Burg, "'From Troubled Ground to Common Ground': The Locust Grove African American Cemetery Restoration Project: A Case Study of Service-Learning and Community History". 58.

<sup>245</sup> David Maher, Steven Burg, Charles Evans, "Historic Site Report for the Locust Grove Cemetery Shippensburg, Pennsylvania,"(Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, 2007), 34.

segregation of black and white troops would unduly influence many people's perception of who should be included in the physical memorialization accomplished by monuments. Black cemeteries, like Locust Grove, experienced and continue to experience more vandalism than their predominantly white counterparts. And while Confederate dead were eventually reburied in or incorporated into national cemeteries, black Union troops remained in their original cemeteries or segregated sections.

Starting in the late 1860s, memorials in cemeteries began to mirror civic memorials to the war in form and presentation. The chosen form transformed from the simple to the more ornate, the undecorated to the figured. It is extremely important to note this expanding repetition because funereal and civic monuments originally differed in purpose. Funereal monuments paid homage to the dead while civic monuments paid homage to the sacrifice, duty, and legacy of groups, communities, and nations. While public and governmental responses to death initially continued the sectional divides and provided a vehicle for Southern pride and sectionalism to persist, by the late 1860s the monuments communities erected in both North and South presented a nationalist sentiment and a universalized experience of war. The cemetery monument went from looking like the Confederate Soldier's Monument in Hollywood Cemetery (1869)—a ninety-foot stone pyramid dedicated to the 18,000 Confederates buried in the cemetery with a simple embedded stone reading "To The Confederate Dead"—to the Mansfield Post Civil War Monument in Indian Hill Cemetery, Middletown, CT (1884)—a 'parade rest' single soldier figure atop a dedication pedestal. In 1895, a group of southern politicians, former Confederate soldiers, and business leaders traveled to Chicago for the unveiling of a

monument dedicated to the Confederate prisoners who died at Camp Douglas, a prison located in that city. The monument received funding from local businessmen, mostly northerners, and attracted a considerable amount of national attention.<sup>246</sup> Its design includes a thirty-foot granite column topped with a bronze single-figure Confederate soldier. The sculptor based the figure on the painting “Appomattox” by John A. Elder, which depicts a bareheaded man without weapons looking down at his feet, arms crossed over his chest, a slouch hat in his left hand, and his left foot slightly in front of his right at an angle. The figure duplicates this painting exactly. A twin figure can be found on the 1889 civic Confederate Memorial in Alexandria, Virginia located at the intersection of Washington and Prince Streets. The intersection marks the spot from which three units from Alexandria left to join the Confederate Army on May 24, 1861.

Monuments to the dead began to reflect the same fraternal narrative represented by similar archetypal soldier figures as their civic counterparts did. This undivided visual landscape masked the enduring divisions in the post-war United States.

#### *Monuments in the 1870s Onward—The ‘Parade Rest’ Figure*

As honor became a public event rather than a private one, so too did the economics of monument building. The public purse rather than private coffers supported the upsurge in monument building between 1865 and 1920. Yet it was municipalities and local governments rather than state or federal ones that sponsored

---

<sup>246</sup> Nina Silber, *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865-1900*, ed. Gary W. Gallagher, Civil War America (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 1, 172.

the construction of most monuments. The Federal Government was not very concerned with monument building outside of national cemeteries and Washington D.C.; state governments rarely concerned themselves with building monuments outside of capital cities, although they did encourage local building.<sup>247</sup> Community desire, rather than federal or state law, inspired monument building. Supported by popular will, monuments acquired a new level of authority and pedagogical resonance. The *Middletown Penny Press*'s coverage of the monument dedication to the 24<sup>th</sup> Connecticut Volunteers picked up on this pedagogical theme in the speeches it reprinted and its own editorial. The *Middletown Penny Press* stated:

This granite shaft is to be at once a memorial and an inspiration; a memorial to those who are gone, an inspiration to those who are here, an incentive to the thousand yet to come who will receive a lesson in patriotism when they learn for what this memorial of stone and bronze stands. The old soldiers will soon pass away, but their deeds shall live after them... Their memory will be cherished and their deeds recounted wherever men may speak of bravery and self sacrifice.<sup>248</sup>

Mayor Crittenden of Middletown evoked this same sentiment in his address to the crowd:

All over our broad land, carved in granite and marble and cast in bronze are these monuments to our dead and living heroes; and now we add one more, which, with the others, will stand, let us hope, for all time, a memorial of deeds and valor and a lesson in patriotism to those who shall come after us.<sup>249</sup>

As did the language used by Rev. D.R. Lowell, Commander of the Middletown G.A.R. post:

What we do here today reaches back to those days of carnage and heroism. More—it touches the coming ages for which this monument stands, it will teach patriotism to the future generations, and will be incontestable proof of

---

<sup>247</sup> Brown, *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration*, 22.

<sup>248</sup> "Monument in Honor of the 24th Regt., C.V., Unveiled on Washington Green."

<sup>249</sup> Ibid.

appreciation of heroic deeds...it honors every soldier who had part in that memorable struggle of the sixties, for when we honor our regiment, we honor all; when we honor our soldiers we honor all.<sup>250</sup>

Rev. D.R. Lowell did not specify Middlesex County soldiers, or Connecticut soldiers, or even Union soldiers as deserving of the honor the community offered.

As communities began to erect more monuments in public places rather than cemeteries, veterans became more interested in the chosen propagated message. Often it was the veterans, or loved ones of veterans both living and deceased, who organized to erect the new soldier monuments.<sup>251</sup> The Grand Army of the Republic played a central role in this push for monument construction and was instrumental in helping raise awareness and funds for new local and national projects; in the North, the Grand Army of the Republic and its women's auxiliaries were responsible for erecting many or most of the soldiers monuments.<sup>252</sup> Since the veterans, and veteran organizations, were so involved in the planning, financing, and presentation of these monuments, they informed the representations with their moral interpretation and sense of history. It is not coincidental the monuments mirror the terms used by veterans' organizations and also omit many of the same elements as veterans' writings.

Due to the overwhelming demand for monuments, especially those with figures, memorialization became a consumer industry and met demand with a supply of prefabricated models.<sup>253</sup> What started as perhaps one of the most personal forms of expression became commercialized and standardized. In Connecticut, some of the

---

<sup>250</sup> Ibid.

<sup>251</sup> Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 162.

<sup>252</sup> Ibid., 247.

<sup>253</sup> Ibid., 164.

biggest contractors for these monuments were Fox-Becker Granite Company, Ames Manufacturing, Smith Granite Company, and James G. Batterson. Ames Manufacturing of Chicopee, Massachusetts was one of the first foundries in the United States to cast sculptures using the same technique for casting cannons and was involved in the production of swords and cannons during the war.<sup>254</sup> It is notable firms that provided arms for soldiers easily began providing for their memory. It meant firms saw both as mass markets that could be capitalized on with a mass product.

James G. Batterson produced the style of monument that dominated the post-bellum landscape out of his prosperous design and supply firm in Hartford before the war started. At the war's conclusion, Batterson bought up quarry land and established firms in both New York and Hartford to ensure he could meet demand, provide the most desired materials for sculpting, and garner as much business as possible. Given his experience and recognizable name, Batterson's firm was commissioned for many monuments around New England.<sup>255</sup> Batterson also brought in two experienced sculptors, Irish immigrant George Keller and Charles "Carl" Conrads, as "part of the firm's preparation for participation in the postwar demand for cemetery and other monuments." Keller designed the monuments commissioned from Batterson for Gettysburg and Antietam and, later under his own name, war monuments in

---

<sup>254</sup> "Soldier's Monument, Middletown," Connecticut Historical Society, [http://www.chs.org/finding\\_aides/ransom/066.htm](http://www.chs.org/finding_aides/ransom/066.htm)., The Apartments at Ames Privilege, "Historic Mill Living, Redesigned," <http://amesprivilege.com/>.

<sup>255</sup> "Connecticut's Monuments: An Essay, Purpose of Monuments," Connecticut Historical Society, [http://www.chs.org/finding\\_aides/ransom/overview3.htm](http://www.chs.org/finding_aides/ransom/overview3.htm).

Manchester (New Hampshire), Buffalo, Brooklyn, and Utica (New York), and Hartford and Cornwall (Connecticut).<sup>256</sup>

The greatest aid to solidifying the fraternal narrative and veterans' ideology of fraternity was the common soldier figure at 'parade rest' that emerged as a featured element of monuments as they were further integrated into public, communal spaces in the late 1860s.<sup>257</sup> So far as it is known, the first use of the ubiquitous and standard 'parade rest' figure monument appeared at Antietam, Maryland on September 16, 1867. James G. Batterson supplied the monument and submitted the design.<sup>258</sup> The figure meant to physically represent the archetypal American.<sup>259</sup> This archetype was the same for both North and South and therefore national.

The figure is a white, common soldier who served valorously. The figure depicts a young man in full uniform normally with his hat on who looks off into the distance. The figures had a typical format and pose: a lone infantryman on the top of the pedestal holding his rifle in an upright and relaxed position as if standing on parade.<sup>260</sup> In Connecticut, there are about sixty-one monuments listed as either "Soldiers Monument" or "Soldiers and Sailors Monument" according to the Connecticut Historical Society. About forty-one of Connecticut's monuments to the war, excluding those dedicated to individuals, have a single soldier figure either depicted as holding the American flag or in the 'parade rest' form. The figure's left leg is normally bent and placed in front of the right with the foot a slight angle. The

---

<sup>256</sup> Ibid.

<sup>257</sup> Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 162.

<sup>258</sup> "Connecticut's Monuments: An Essay, Monument Designs," Connecticut Historical Society, [http://www.chs.org/finding\\_aides/ransom/overview2.htm](http://www.chs.org/finding_aides/ransom/overview2.htm).

<sup>259</sup> *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 162.

<sup>260</sup> For more on the form of the 'parade-rest' soldier see Savage pg. 163-64

figure either has one or two hands on the barrel of the gun; the butt of the gun is always resting on the ground normally by the right leg. In many cases, one of the figure's two hands positioned on the gun physically blocks the muzzle. These single-soldier statues replaced the more funereal obelisk as the dominant form of war monument in the North by the 1880s and the South by the 1890s.<sup>261</sup> By the end of the 1880s, there were almost two hundred single-figure soldier monuments across the country.<sup>262</sup>

Both Northern and Southern monument commissioners and designers, by presenting the same figure, emphasized their similarity rather than their difference. Their idea of an archetypal American is one in the same, meaning both these sculptors believed the civil war soldiers and veterans belonged to the same fabric. The logic of this shared national presentation only worked if the secession crisis was conceived not as a crisis but as a small upset perpetrated by a few men and women. If the former Confederate States felt they had been forced back into the union, it was peculiar they chose to use the same model as their professed conquerors. The memorial figures as identical twins symbolized fraternity was central to the veterans' public will and understanding.

These generic figures of the common soldier for both the North and South in 'parade rest' allowed for equality in glory, for "no one could claim the defeated Confederates were any less dutiful soldiers than their conquerors" based on the sculptural elements.<sup>263</sup> While the sponsors of the monuments were adamant and

---

<sup>261</sup> Brown, *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration*, 24.

<sup>262</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>263</sup> Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 178.

careful to produce the most authentic uniforms and accouterments for the figures,<sup>264</sup> this precision did not extend to the story the monument told. Rarely is the soldier figure depicted as a combatant with the calamities of war present on the body, like “rents in the uniform,” physical stresses or wounds, or even signs of fatigue.<sup>265</sup> Rarely did “death obtrude in the sculptural program” throughout this period.<sup>266</sup> Just as in the memoirs of veterans, violence is conspicuously missing from the monuments.

By 1888, the Gettysburg battlefield had more than three hundred monuments. Most illustrated battle lines as well as honored veterans both living and dead.<sup>267</sup> Almost none of these monuments depicted violence and this fact remained true during the 1913 Gettysburg Reunion. Depiction of violence would remind the veterans’ public of who had committed the violence on the bodies. And unlike other wars, where the enemy was a defined and understood entity, the enemy in the civil war was quickly becoming more amorphous due to the veterans’ ideology of fraternity. The need to depict unity and shared experience between soldiers was stronger than the need to more realistically depict the war.

On the battlefield of Shiloh, the bloody battle fought from April 6-7, 1862, are a series of monuments to individual men, regiments, and states. The first former Confederate state represented on the field through a monument was Tennessee. On August 22, 1905, three thousand individuals from Tennessee and neighboring states, including veterans of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Tennessee Infantry, witnessed the dedication of the

---

<sup>264</sup> Ibid., 164.

<sup>265</sup> Ibid.

<sup>266</sup> Ibid.

<sup>267</sup> Brown, *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration*, 17.

monument to the regiment.<sup>268</sup> The monument, a pedestal with a single soldier figure on top, depicts a young, clean-shaven man in full uniform. His cartridge box is slung across his chest, his left foot is slightly in front of his right, and he raises his rifle and holds it diagonally in his hands across his body. While the gun is raised, thus differentiating it from the more stereotypical 'parade rest' soldier figures whose gun rests next to it, this Tennessee monument does not render the figure combative. It shows purpose and pride but not vengeance, violence, or enmity. The muzzle is not pointed at its viewer but at the sky where there is still no intent to kill.

In Union Park in Middletown, Connecticut stands a typical example of the 'parade rest' figure. Known as "The Soldier's Monument," it is emblematic of a community's desire to commemorate their citizens' sacrifice in the war. Talks for a monument began in 1865, but it was not until June 1870 that the Monumental Association formed. The selectmen appropriated town funds on January 3, 1874 and Melzar H. Mosman, a sculptor with Ames Manufacturing Company, received the contract. Mosman went on to sculpt many of Connecticut's soldier monuments.<sup>269</sup> Middletown's 'parade rest' figure is typical in all ways: the figure depicts a young man with a moustache, in full uniform, looking off in the distance, his left leg bent, and the butt of his gun resting on the ground. The exception is the muzzle of the gun is held to the right of the figure's right foot. This difference in placement does not change the effect the monument has on its audience. The monument still depicts a soldier as a non-combatant without any distresses or violence depicted on his body.

---

<sup>268</sup> "Park Administration and History: Dedications of State Monuments," National Park Service, <http://www.shilohbattlefield.org/new/admhiswar14.htm>.

<sup>269</sup> "Soldier's Monument, Middletown".

The monument to the Confederate soldiers of Dooly County, Georgia in front of the courthouse in Vienna also contains a single-soldier figure on top of a pedestal at 'parade rest.' The figure is of a young, clean shaven man looking off into the distance in a kepi, his left foot is slightly in front of his right, and his gun is placed next to his left foot, held with both hands, with the butt resting by the left foot. On the battlefield at Gettysburg, amongst the hundreds of obelisks and stone markers to regiments, are twenty-three monuments which feature either the typical 'parade rest' soldier or a derivation of that form still depicting the soldier as a non-combatant. Various groups or states dedicated all twenty-three of these monuments between 1884 and 1899.

The Seventh Regiment Memorial located on the West Drive by 69<sup>th</sup> Street in Central Park in New York City fits into this figure pattern. But contemporary visitors to the monument might be intrigued by a juxtaposition the Seventh Regiment Monument's placement affords. The monument, dedicated in June 1874 with funding from surviving members of the regiment and placed by Frederick Law Olmsted (co-designer of Central Park), presents the typical 'parade rest' figure and is wholly devoid of violence. The figure is of a young man, clean-shaven, looking off in the distance and standing in a relaxed position with a bent knee. Like most 'parade rest' figures, the depicted soldier's gun rests on the ground and his left hand physically blocks the muzzle. If the figure could fire, the bullet would go straight through his stone fingers. For the viewer, the implication of this hand placement is there is no intention or rush to fire. It is the only monument to a New York regiment who participated in the war in the entire park.

While it may seem logical to honor courage rather than destruction, many monuments to other conflicts do not follow this pattern of omitting violence. Outside of Central Park by the 68<sup>th</sup> Street and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue entrance is the 1927 monument to the 107<sup>th</sup> United States Infantry that served in World War I. The monument depicts soldiers as combatants: their guns raised, their mouths open as if yelling at the enemy, and they are shown in motion. The soldiers are also depicted as men who are in the midst of the fight, a fight that is not their first; one figure is slumped over his comrade's arm either unconscious or dead, while another on the far right has a bandage over his head and struggles on. The figures seem to be running through a raging inferno. This World War I memorial is willing to address the unprecedented violence of the monumental struggle. Not only does the monument address the violence, but it forefronts the violence. The sacrifice of the men of the 107<sup>th</sup> United States Infantry is palpable and will be noticed on their bronze bodies for as long as the monument stands. The violence is also not gratuitous but glorious; being affected by and surviving the violence makes soldiers extraordinary individuals deserving of reverence.

The 'parade rest' soldier's popularity was due to its evasion of right and wrong, loss and death, and cause for which men fought. It was also popular because it made duty a sign of morality in and of itself. The 'parade rest' soldier could be any soldier and the figure was devoid of what that soldier had done or would do. It could look the same and be interpreted in the same way by the veterans' public of both North and South and lend further credence to the fraternity veterans constructed. It also allowed the veterans' public to continue to ignore the consequences of the war,

including their own melancholy, shock, and potential questioning of what the civil war accomplished, if anything. That last point is what had veterans so concerned for their legacy and continued importance for defining ‘Americanism.’ The ‘parade rest’ figure emerged and remained the popular form in the last decades of the century and into the next because it mirrored veterans’ descriptions of war experience as lacking extreme violence and abundant in respect for men of the opposing army.

Standardization helped make Union and Confederate monuments indistinguishable. The exception to the standardization between Northern and Southern monuments are the details that are only noticeable upon closer inspection. Visually, in some cases, it was only the letters on the belt buckle that could distinguish which soldiers the monument memorialized. It is also why monument committees chose to highlight only specific elements of the war’s causes. The literary giant and influential editor of the age, William Dean Howells, felt monuments should remember what the soldiers’ deeds ultimately achieved, rather than the deeds themselves.<sup>270</sup> The ultimate achievement of the veterans was in uniting the country. The monuments, therefore, needed to represent a single nation with a single future and a single history.

The monument’s inscriptions almost always reinforced this image of courageous duty and made the soldier’s sacrifice to nation “paramount” while the justice of the soldier’s cause remained of secondary importance.<sup>271</sup> The question of slavery and its abolition as a cause of the war also rarely made it into the inscriptions.

---

<sup>270</sup> Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 166.

<sup>271</sup> *Ibid.*, 178.

Less than five percent of known Union monument inscriptions, excluding those that used the end of the Gettysburg Address, explicitly list the abolition of slavery as an achievement of the war.<sup>272</sup> Most of the monuments in Connecticut, a staunchly Northern and abolitionist state during the war, make no mention of slavery in their inscriptions. Instead, the dedications are for the men who served in the war of the rebellion, in the war to preserve the Union, who died so that the Union may live, or fought for liberty, to name a few of the most prominent evocations. Another popular inscription on monuments both North and South came from Theodore O'Hara's 1847 poem *The Bivouac of the Dead*. The first stanza reads:

The muffled drum's sad roll has beat  
The soldier's last tattoo;  
No more on life's parade shall meet  
The brave and daring few.  
On Fame's eternal camping-ground  
Their silent tents are spread,  
And Glory guards with solemn round  
The bivouac of the dead.<sup>273</sup>

O'Hara, a native of Kentucky who served in the Confederate Army, wrote the poem to honor those Kentuckians who fell at the battle of Buena Vista during the Mexican-American War. The Northern communities who employed the poem in its memorial inscriptions to its dead sons were apparently not upset by its author's Confederate service.<sup>274</sup> Just as with the rhetoric at the 1913 Gettysburg Reunion, representations of the war more often than not left out its cause. Questions of cause of the war, and the legality of that cause, were left within academic discussions but did not need to be a

---

<sup>272</sup> Brown, *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration*, 37.

<sup>273</sup> Theodore O'Hara, "The Bivouac of the Dead," University of Kentucky, <http://www.uky.edu/KentuckyCulture/bivouac.html>.

<sup>274</sup> "National Cemetery Walking Tour: Four Score and Seven Years Ago...". Soldiers' National Cemetery, Gettysburg, PA.

part commonplace display. Focus on the causes of the war divided the populace, and these monuments were not erected to continue conflict.

Just as monument committees wrote slavery and emancipation out of the inscriptions in the 1870s, so too was black participation in the war. Even while black soldiers continued to serve in the Union Army after the war during reconstruction, “they became increasingly invisible in the war’s commemoration.”<sup>275</sup> Before 1860, there were no known sculptures that depicted black figures, slave or free.<sup>276</sup> Before the 1870s, there were no black slaves depicted on major public monuments.<sup>277</sup> In the post-war era, when erected, there was variation and nuance in the form of monuments depicting blacks.

Unlike their counterparts to the common soldier, Northern and Southern projects for these statues did not operate within the same framework and depicted blacks in dissimilar yet expected ways. White Southerners retained parts of their pre-war society through memorialization. While law prohibited slavery from legally returning, pro-slavery forces could remember it in terms that appealed to and promoted their interpretation of the reasons for secession: states’ rights rather than preserving slavery. Variation in the ways in which monument committees included, or more generally excluded, blacks in monuments allowed sectional memory to remain and selective memory to pervade.

Many monuments in the North, when they included blacks, focused their projects on the freedman. Many artistic monuments, meaning those not meant to

---

<sup>275</sup> Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 174-75.

<sup>276</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>277</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

serve as civic memorials on a village green or funereal monuments in a cemetery, tried to depict the image of the freedman himself. This was somewhat difficult since, during the fashioning of many of these monuments and sculptures, the definition of freedom for former slaves was still unfolding. Many monument committees chose to erect civic memorials to emancipation with the figure of Abraham Lincoln, further solidifying his image as “The Great Emancipator.”<sup>278</sup> Of all the monuments erected to the civil war in Connecticut, only two physically depict blacks: the Soldiers and Sailors Memorial Arch in Hartford and the Soldiers Monument in Waterbury. Both have representations of freed slaves, included at the initiative of the architects. Slavery is never explicitly mentioned in any Connecticut monument.<sup>279</sup> Monuments of neither North nor South confronted black participation in the war until the 1880s and 1890s and even then this confrontation was minimal.

There are a number of examples of monuments in the South dedicated to the loyal slave. The loyal slave became an important trope in Lost Cause ideology and it is partly from where the mammy figure emerges. The loyal slave memorials were the attempts of former Southern slaveholders to valorize slavery while not construing it as the cause of the war. They had to depict slaves as content in their lives and as members of the family and community; they had to depict them as servants and not as forced laborers without rights. If rendered in this way, slavery became the benevolent, paternalistic institution that united whites and blacks.<sup>280</sup>

---

<sup>278</sup> For more on how emancipation was figured into memorial building after the Civil War see “Imagining Emancipation” in Kirk Savage’s *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*.

<sup>279</sup> “Connecticut’s Monuments: An Essay, Purpose of Monuments”.

<sup>280</sup> For more on how pro-slavery forces memorialized slavery see “Exposing Slavery” in Kirk Savage’s *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*.

*The Counter Narrative Emerges (A Bit): Memorials in the 1880s Onward*

While the predominant form for monuments both civic and funereal was the ‘parade rest’ figure, there were counters to this form. Between 1890 and 1920, the soldier on the march with the gun over his shoulder became a common and popular motif for monument figures.<sup>281</sup> Simply raising the gun off the ground did not make this now mobile soldier figure violent. Yet violence did begin to creep into the monuments’ depictions of the war. In the 1890s, large groups of soldiers in combat began to appear on monuments, but fallen or wounded soldiers were still rare.<sup>282</sup> Two examples that completely defy the pattern of unobtrusive death in monuments are those of Jackson, Michigan and Gettysburg. The Jackson, Michigan monument, dedicated in 1903 to the “soldiers and sailors of Jackson County who gave their services, and many their lives to their country in the war for the Union” includes three figures. To the right of the main, erect figure holding a flag is a slumped over soldier in full uniform seen grasping his side with a look of agony on his face. The monument to the 116<sup>th</sup> Pennsylvania Volunteers, dedicated by the State of Pennsylvania in 1889, is located just south of the Gettysburg Battlefield on Sickles Avenue. The monument, dedicated to the regiment’s fallen soldiers from the battle, features a single soldier figure. He lies, dead, next to a broken fence in a battered stonewall. Yet these two examples are truly the exceptions to the ‘parade rest’ rule.

During this same period when more combative or violent figures appeared on civic monuments, soldier figures at ‘parade rest’ still accounted for over eighty percent of known single-figure monuments. Economic determinants did not explain

---

<sup>281</sup> Brown, *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration*, 31.

<sup>282</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

the overwhelming popularity of this form for it was not less expensive to carve a figure with its gun touching the ground than it was to carve a figure with the gun over its shoulder. Nor was it the suppliers that explain the trend for they offered many different designs. Trade journals went so far as to criticize the parade rest figure, yet its popularity remained.<sup>283</sup>

Just as violence appeared in a limited way in some late monuments, so did black military service begin to appear in memorials in the late 1880s. In 1887, a proposal for a national monument to black soldiers outside Howard University in Washington D.C. by George Washington Williams, a black veteran and historian, almost reached fruition. While the Senate voted on the proposal, and passed it, it never made it to the House floor for a vote. The House's objections to the proposal included that a monument to black soldiers constituted special treatment and monuments to common soldiers were inclusive. It did not matter to the House that every single one of these common soldier monuments employed the figure of a white soldier. By the end of the nineteenth century only three monuments depicting black soldiers had been erected. All appeared in the last decade of the nineteenth century. All were generic monuments, and only one had its figures in full army uniform.<sup>284</sup>

Perhaps the most famous counter example to the inscriptions, leaving out the question of slavery and race, is the Shaw Memorial on Boston Common. Sculpted by renowned artist Augustus Saint-Gaudens, the monument depicts and is dedicated in part to the 54<sup>th</sup> Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry. Massachusetts raised the all black regiment, albeit with white officers, shortly after the issuing of the Emancipation

---

<sup>283</sup> Ibid., 35.

<sup>284</sup> Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 191-92.

Proclamation in 1863. It included in the rank-and-file the sons of Frederick Douglass. The regiment's most famous service came with its assault on Fort Wagner in the port of Charleston on July 18, 1863. Of the approximately six hundred men in the regiment, only three hundred made it back. On the back frame of the memorial, the inscription reads in part:

Together/ they [the black troops] gave to the nation and the world/ undying proof that Americans of African/ descent possess the pride courage/ and devotion of the patriot soldier/ one hundred and eighty thousand such Americans enlisted under the Union flag in/ MDCCCLXIII-MDCCCLXV

Even though this monument explicitly features the service and sacrifice of black troops, it does not mention emancipation as a cause for which men fought. It also physically emphasizes the white officer of the regiment, Colonel Robert Gould Shaw, by depicting him on horseback in front of his walking, black troops. The memorial, unveiled on May 31, 1897, is named the Shaw Memorial, not the 54<sup>th</sup> Massachusetts Memorial; the inscription on the front of the monument is dedicated solely to Shaw and not his troops. Even explicit depictions of black soldiers are framed within a white context and permission.

### *Monuments' Enduring Legacy and Power to Inform*

Monuments dot village greens, are placed at important crossroads, and become a part of the daily experience. Monuments' very innocuousness is what makes them so powerful. As Sanford Levinson writes, "All monuments are efforts, in their own way, to stop time." Successful monuments are, in a sense, "invisible," becoming part of quotidian experience.<sup>285</sup> If individuals do not confront the

---

<sup>285</sup> Levinson, *Written in Stone*, 7.

monument, then the history and historical interpretation the monument presents has become a given. In fact the invisible monument is far from innocuous; it plays an active role in shaping public understanding and public memory of past events, individuals, and outcomes. Monuments do not represent history, but rather selective memory; countries and communities do not memorialize everything fully and sometimes not at all. Confrontation over what these nineteenth century monuments say was the history of the civil war are ongoing. The back and forth between citizens and state or local governments or citizens and fellow citizens symbolize how fraught on the one hand and how cherished on the other the fraternal narrative is. Americans continue to defend civil war monuments, as they do the Confederate Flag or the song “Dixie,” because they have become American symbols due to this very narrative.

The *New York Times* reported in its February 8, 1997 front page article “Symbols of Old South Feed a New Bitterness” that attempts to remove Confederate memorials, flags, or songs from public or political places was equated to “cultural genocide” by South Carolina Senator Glenn G. McConnell.<sup>286</sup> In January 1997, black leaders in Walterboro, South Carolina petitioned the Colleton County Council to tear down the 1911 Confederate monument, a brown stone obelisk, in front of the building.<sup>287</sup> The monument still stands and the state recognizes Confederate Memorial Day. The Colleton County offices close for all the national holidays and Confederate Memorial Day. Many Americans continue to inscribe the monuments in a specific narrative of fraternity that has always dictated how we think and construct

---

<sup>286</sup> Senator Glenn G. McConnell quoted in Kevin Sack, "Symbols of Old South Feed a New Bitterness," *The New York Times*, February 8, 1997 1997.

<sup>287</sup> Ibid.

our sense of self and history of the civil war. Monuments to the war have yet to be disconnected from their original purpose of creating consensus rather than conflict.<sup>288</sup>

A notable comparison to the static nature of war monuments is the story surrounding an anti-reconstruction monument. Beginning in the 1970s, agitation over competing resonances centered on The Battle of Liberty Place Monument in New Orleans, Louisiana. In 1874 the White League, a paramilitary group organized that same year for white political rule, attempted to overthrow the reconstruction Republican leadership of New Orleans. Fighting broke out between the White League and the integrated Metropolitan Police Force. While the White League defeated the Metropolitan Police Force and forcibly deposed the Republican Governor, the victory was hollow and short lived; President Ulysses S. Grant ordered the army to reinstate the governor three days later. After years of suggestions for a monument, a woman's group and a monument association full of mostly Confederate veterans erected a monument in 1891. They dedicated the monument to the members of the White League who died while fighting the Metropolitan Police Force on Canal Street.<sup>289</sup> The monument soon became a prominent white supremacy symbol and annual wreath-laying ceremonies took place at the monument starting in World War One.<sup>290</sup> It also became a sight of black protest and the monument was normally covered in some type of graffiti. In response to numerous protests and acts of vandalism in the 1970s, the New Orleans mayor put an explanatory plaque next to the monument that condemned its expressions of white supremacy. No one was satisfied. The NAACP

---

<sup>288</sup> For more examples of communities battling over the war's heritage, see "Symbols of Old South Feed a New Bitterness," *New York Times*, February 8, 1997.

<sup>289</sup> "The Battle of Liberty Place (September 14, 1874)," Louisiana Endowment for the Humanities, <http://www.knowla.org/entry/757/>.

<sup>290</sup> Ibid.

Youth Council asked for the removal of the monument in 1976, some proclaimed the plaque was a symbol of historical revision, and white supremacist groups, including the Ku Klux Klan, now saw the memorial as a rallying point for marches and demonstrations. The monument was left in the same spot on Canal Street until 1989 when the new mayor removed it for safe keeping amidst construction in the area. The Grand Wizard of the KKK sued for its return. The monument now rests on a much more secluded spot on Iberville Street between a parking garage and the railroad tracks; the city replaced its original plaque championing white supremacy with one honoring the casualties of the Metropolitan police, which included some African Americans. Heated protests accompanied the rededication ceremony. The monument, still normally covered in graffiti, still rests in this public spot on Iberville Street because no museum offered to take it.<sup>291</sup>

This monument had a description that blatantly promoted white supremacy, unlike Confederate memorials which only imply it because of for whom they are dedicated. No senators argued the Liberty Place monument represented “Southern pride,” because to argue that would admit white supremacy played an integral role in Southern identity. The veterans’ public defends Confederate soldier memorials as part of Southern history, pride, and culture. They can be because many contemporary Americans, like that of the nineteenth century, envision them to represent duty, sacrifice, courage, and patriotism with no relationship to the Southern cause to protect slavery. The argument follows Confederate monuments are dedicated to Americans; thus to remove, change, or augment them would directly challenge what it means to

---

<sup>291</sup> Gordon Chadwick, "The Battle of Liberty Place Monument in the Late 20th Century," New Orleans Historical <http://neworleanshistorical.org/items/show/283#.VPEAHLPF-Uc>.

be an American. The Confederates were Americans because the veterans' ideology of fraternity positioned them as such. The nineteenth century veterans' public adoption of this ideology helps explain why Northern and Southern soldier monuments remain in place and unchanged across the country today. It explains why contemporary American still believe all civil war monuments were dedicated to Americans who exhibited the purest American values, patriotism and sacrifice for country. Why would anyone want to undermine American exceptionalism and patriotism by removing monuments to these principles?

While the vast majority of the monuments with figures on the battlefield at Gettysburg, including the ones already described, depict soldiers as non-combatants, there are exceptions in the form of state memorials. These exceptions include: the Mississippi Monument, the Delaware State Monument, the Maryland State Monument, and the Louisiana Memorial entitled "Spirit Triumphant." The Mississippi, Louisiana, and Delaware monuments all prominently feature a dead soldier. The Maryland and Delaware monuments depict wounded soldiers. The Delaware State Monument's visual is of a battle featured in bronze relief on the stone façade. The relief features two dead soldiers, two wounded soldiers, two surrendering Confederate soldiers, one soldier who has just been shot, and many other figures running forward with their guns in a fighting position. All of these state monuments realistically depict aspects of battle, particularly violence and death, not seen in the majority of monuments. The only caveat is the states dedicated these four memorials between the years 1971 and 2000. The United States has begun to explore, come to terms with, and memorialize the more divisive issues of the civil war. States now

want to honor the heroism of the men in their service by depicting their ultimate sacrifice: their death for the country. These figures do not replace the ‘parade rest’ monuments nor do they come close to equality in numbers. These state monuments are located on a national battlefield, not in local town squares. The predominant message of the civil war, as seen through these monuments, is still that of The Civil War.

Perhaps this closing example of a ‘parade rest’ figure is most emblematic of how similar and interchangeable the common soldier memorials were. Since they promoted the same memory and operated within the same framework, members of either section could find meaning and resonance in the monuments regardless of whether they truly honored their soldiers or not. Sometime in the early 1990s, residents of Kingstree, South Carolina found out that their Civil War statue did not truly belong. Residents of York, Maine had also harbored doubts about their Civil War statue for it had “a striking resemblance to Colonel Sanders.”<sup>292</sup> It is unclear how and if the statues were accidentally switched. But it is plausible given the consumer industry churning out these standardized monuments allowed for a simple switch. What became clear through discussions with locals and newspaper articles is that locals of both Kingstree and York feel attached to their mismatched soldiers. Tony Horowitz documents how the possible switch became a type of urban legend of which locals of both towns are fond. The AWOL Confederate and the AWOL Union soldier are respected members of each community. When there was a proposed switch of the

---

<sup>292</sup> Kingstree newspaper quoted in Tony Horowitz, *Confederates in the Attic: Dispatches from the Unfinished Civil War*, 1st ed. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1998), 71.

“last two prisoners of war,” the local Daughters of the Confederacy in Kingstree demurred and responded, “We are contented with our handsome Yankee friend.”<sup>293</sup>

---

<sup>293</sup> Kingstree’s Daughters of the Confederacy quoted in *ibid.*, 75. For more on this story, and others, see Tony Horowitz’s *Confederates in the Attic*.

## 6

*Tales of Universalized Soldiers: The War in Popular Literature in the 1890s*

Just as industrious publishers felt they could make a market out of veterans' memoirs beginning in the late 1870s, so did they turn their attention to literature of a more creative vein. The transformation of socioeconomic life precipitated by the war industrialized the literary marketplace. Literature, seen by authors and readers as a way to escape the horrors of battle during the war, now became a professional, cash-driven marketplace in the post-war era.<sup>294</sup> Publishers now wanted to reach the largest possible number of consumers and they did so through a system that secured the highest profit while disregarding local needs.<sup>295</sup> Authors were also aware of this new desire, and potential profit margin, and tailored their novels according to the new national market. In 1888, William T. Adams, a beloved boys' book author known by his pseudonym Oliver Optic, understood that his earlier books, tailored towards a solely Union audience, would have a much more limited "field of circulation" in the new national marketplace.<sup>296</sup> One way in which publishers and authors appealed to the mass market was by continuing to present the fraternity to which audiences were accustomed.

---

<sup>294</sup> Mary Saracino Zboray Ronald J. Zboray, *Literary Dollars and Social Sense: A People's History of the Mass Market Book* (New York: Routledge, 2005), 169.

<sup>295</sup> Ibid.

<sup>296</sup> Alice Fahs, "Remembering the Civil War in Children's Literature of the 1880s and 1890s," in *The Memory of the Civil War in American Culture*, ed. Joan Waugh Alice Fahs, *Civil War America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 81.

Popular literature in the post-war period included novels, memoirs, and prison stories, but only novels made no claims to report true events. Novels' authors certainly professed the historical accuracy of their stories, but never did they proffer their works as true events written from personal experience. Yet the emerging literary fiction after the close of the war mirrored, in many ways, the reportedly true stories published and serialized in national magazines, local newspapers, and books. The genre of war literature created by publishers by the 1890s continued the memoirists' political work of reunion by conceptualizing fraternity through white supremacy and the experience of the individual. This conceptualization obscured the larger structural and political issues of reconstruction and reunion, because it implied a universality of that experience which was inherently exclusionary.

.....

*Universalized Psychology*

The veterans' desire to universalize soldiers and veterans' experiences and their sentiments was partly in reaction to the newly developing ideas of psychology during the immediate post-war period and into the Gilded Age.<sup>297</sup> The economic transformations in the 1890s and 1900s dramatically affected psychologists' views on the individual within society.<sup>298</sup>

The nation's most prominent and first sociologist, William Graham Sumner, argued the "group" rather than the "'individual' was the basic agent or 'ultimate' unit of all social relations." Since he defined individuals by their group, Sumner argued an

---

<sup>297</sup> For more see Jeffrey Sklansky, *The Soul's Economy: Market Society and Selfhood in American Thought, 1820-1920* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

<sup>298</sup> In particular, the government afforded rights to large, vertically integrated corporations that it had previously only given to individuals. *Ibid.*, 131.

individual's "primary allegiance" was patriotic "identification with their families, communities, nations, and cultures": an "in-group."<sup>299</sup> Not only did this line of thinking extend the familial to the national, but Sumner also felt the devotion to the "in-group" carried with it an inherent "superiority to any out-group and readiness to defend the interests of the in-group against the out-group."<sup>300</sup> The Gilded Age also witnessed a resurgence in belief in Hegelian philosophical principles, specifically the belief in the fundamental human need for social recognition. Hegel argued social recognition meant seeing one's "identity fully reflected in that of the group and the group's social spirit wholly manifested in oneself."<sup>301</sup> Progressive psychologists at the turn of the twentieth century took Hegel one step further and argued sympathy and solidarity were the "basic attributes of human nature."<sup>302</sup>

Combined, these two psychological principles made the individual inseparable from the group or group experience. In this way, the individual was universalized because he or she was defined by something larger than his or herself. Unlike memoirs in which a veteran wrote about an individual experience, war fiction authors wrote about group experience through an individual. Understanding the individual meant understanding the group. Due to reconstruction policies of inclusion, amnesty, and the Ten Percent Plan, the post-war United States included former Confederates. Through the veterans' memoirs and the popular literature, the out-group established was not the Confederates. Rather the out-group included anyone who reminded the

---

<sup>299</sup> Ibid.

<sup>300</sup> William Graham Sumner quoted in *ibid.*, 131-32.

<sup>301</sup> Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel quoted in *ibid.*, 155.

<sup>302</sup> *Ibid.*, 161.

country why they split: blacks and their emancipation. The cause the in-group would fight the out-group to preserve was reunion.

Three authors of popular fiction, who all published works in the 1890s, universalized either individual experience or individual sentiment in their novels. One created fraternity through universalizing white supremacy. The other two created fraternity through universalizing the soldier's experience, thus adhering to veterans' calls for such universalization. They also explored the psychology of their individual characters through the heroic (or in some cases futile) actions on the battlefield while avoiding characters' opinions on cause of the war or division. As in the memoirs, the individual characters, rather than feeling enmity towards their supposed foes, felt a connection through the smoke and flame of battle or, in one case, familial ties.

*William T. Adams's Universalized White Supremacist*

William T. Adams, also known as Oliver Optic, was one of the most popular children's authors of the mid to late nineteenth century. Of particular importance, and popularity, were his three series of boys' books written about the war: the "Army and Navy Stories" published between 1863-1866; "The Blue and The Gray—Afloat" series published between 1888-1893; and "The Blue and The Gray—On Land" series published between 1894-1899. His original "Army and Navy Stories" centered on the heroic tales of brothers Tom and Jack Somers as "boy heroes engaged in exciting adventures facilitated by the new nation-state at war."<sup>303</sup> The books were exceptionally popular but had an obvious pro-Union sentiment to them. In 1888, a little over two decades after the war ended, Adams began to write his second series

---

<sup>303</sup> Fahs, "Remembering the Civil War in Children's Literature of the 1880s and 1890s," 80.

about the war. When asked why he took up the topic again, he responded that “the call upon [me] to use the topics of the war has been so urgent, and its ample field of stirring events has been so inviting that [I] could not resist.”<sup>304</sup>

Adams’s desire to write a new series coincided with a renewed interest in veterans’ groups and affairs more generally, the commodification and popularity of veterans’ memoirs, and a proliferation of public memorials to the late war. Rather than a coincidence, Adams’s renewed literary interest, and that of his publishers, was a calculated and well-thought out way to profit on this resurgent interest. His narratives featured tropes of fraternity and reunion while staying away from the divisive question of emancipation. Adams’s publishers chose to reflect and publicize his new, more national sentiment in the covers of his published works: one side in gray and one side in blue with *Oliver Optic* written across the center in gold.<sup>305</sup> Either section could see itself reflected in the cover, but that sectional reflection had to be taken as part of the whole. One could not see the gray without seeing the blue and *visa versa*. In the prefaces to some of his novels, Adams insisted on the historical accuracy of the tale. Unlike veterans, he made no claim to authenticity, but he wanted his readers to know he firmly rooted his fiction in true events. Anything read in the following pages, assured Adams, reflected an accurate experience and depiction of the war. Partly due to this statement, and partly due to the books’ popularity, many boys who grew up in the 1880s and 1890s admitted that much of their perception of the war came from Adams’s series.<sup>306</sup>

---

<sup>304</sup> William T. Adams quoted in *ibid.*, 79.

<sup>305</sup> *Ibid.*, 85.

<sup>306</sup> *Ibid.*, 80.

The first book of “The Blue and The Gray—On Land” series symbolized the type of fraternal sentiment that would run throughout its pages: *Brother Against Brother or, The War on the Border* (1894). The story, set in 1861, centers on the Lyon family, whose two sides are divided first over the terms of a will and then within the larger terms of the civil war itself. Noah Lyon, the patriarch of the central part of the family to the series, moves with his wife and children from the North to the border state of Kentucky in order to take over his inheritance, a plantation with fifty-one slaves. His brother Titus, already living in the South, feels he was the rightful heir and gets embroiled in the secessionist fervor. Adams implied Titus’s secessionist loyalties are partly because they are in direct opposition to what his brother embodied—the union. While Titus joins and eventually leads a regiment of secessionist Home Guards, Noah Lyon and his two sons form their own regiment, the Riverlawn Cavalry, and eventually take part in the campaigns of the Union Army of the Cumberland throughout the rest of the series. There are two main tenets to the story told in *Brother Against Brother*: happy slaves involved in good and paternalistic slavery and a family at war.

Whenever Adams described black characters in the novel or gave them dialogue, there was a level of subservience and overwhelming respect for the white characters expressed through dialect. Adams gave the black characters names that were either pejorative, like Dummy and Wooly, or descriptive of a position, like General (the leader of the slaves) mammies, and uncles. When Noah Lyon and his family first arrive at Riverlawn Plantation towards the beginning of the novel, Adams wrote:

Gathered in the walks in front of the house were all the servants of the mansion, and all the field-hands belonging to the place, to welcome the family...they all broke out in a yell, which was intended for a cheer...It was a cordial welcome, and the 'people' put their whole souls into it...Most of them were somewhat shy at first, though they intended to give a proper welcome to the family of the new proprietor, and they were rather restrained in their demonstration; but as soon as the party waved their hats and handkerchiefs, with pleasant smiles on their faces, all of them shouted, 'Glad to see you!' their enthusiasm being limited only by the vigor of their voices and the strength of their lungs.<sup>307</sup>

There was a sense of pride evoked by the “servants” when the white Lyon family arrived. Adams carefully avoided the use of the word slaves in this description and put the word people in quotation marks in order to indicate he used the term with the specifically Southern inflection (indicating a population of dependent slaves).<sup>308</sup> This linguistic choice allowed Adams to both include and exclude slavery from the novel. The only way his reader knew these men and women “gathered in the walks” were slaves was if they were part of the culture which used the word ‘people’ for this purpose. Adams’s choice avoided angering his Southern readers by respecting their paternalistic rendering of slavery.

Rather than a showing of forced devotion, Adams styled the servants’ “cheer” as something genuine and as exuberant as their bodies allowed. Adams did not include an overseer standing by, or any other white presence excepting that of the arriving family, implying the slaves appeared “in the walks” of their own volition. They were truly “glad to see” the family, the new masters, therefore indicating perfect happiness in their state of servitude. It also denoted paternalism, for the slaves

---

<sup>307</sup> Oliver Optic, *Brother against Brother or the War on the Border*, The Blue and the Gray Army Series (United States of America: CreateSpace Publishing, 2014), 13.

<sup>308</sup> Professor Matthew Garrett, March 21, 2015 2015.

were gladly willing and enthusiastically welcoming the benevolent, guiding, authoritative hand of a white man and his family.

The trope of paternalism erased and replaced the work of reconstruction and emancipation with white supremacy. Paternalistic language worked in the same ways as archetypal or pejorative descriptions did in the memoirs; it framed all whites as intellectually and morally superior. Whether formerly supportive of Union or Confederate, the country could believe in universal white supremacy because white supremacy was not directly associated with a cause of the war. It was therefore safe to include in memoirs or fiction pieces for publishers and authors. Even in novels where racial stance is ambiguous, as in Mark Twain's *The Tragedy of Pudd'nhead Wilson* (1894), there was no place for the black man in the white community. In the penultimate scene, lawyer David Wilson reveals slave-born Chambers (masquerading as his white master Tom) is a murderer and a slave. Only after this revelation, and running Chambers out of town, does the divided white community feel uplifted and reunite. According to this literature, reunion was only achieved when white communities either cast out blacks entirely or only included them in subservient positions based on benevolent paternalism. In neither case would united white communities, or the united country at large, equally include blacks in the "world the war made." In neither case did whites deal with the consequences of emancipation.

Adams further supported this sense of paternalism and a good form of slavery in the ways in which the Lyon family treated and referred to their slaves. Towards the end of the story, the slave Mose comes to tell the Lyons of an approaching band of Home Guards. In relating this information, Adams described Mose as "trying to be as

respectful and deferential as possible.”<sup>309</sup> Even when awarded agency, through this important task to ensure the Lyon family’s survival, Mose chose to and must be “deferential.” During this exchange, Mose also states his real name is “Zekel;” neither the family nor Adams ever used this name throughout the rest of the text. Adams also highlighted the good form of slavery when the two “octoroon” female slaves show the two young Lyon daughters their rooms:

Though they knew that these girls were slaves, they treated them like sisters, and before the day was over they were fast friends; for both of them were utterly devoid of the Southern prejudices against those who were so nearly their own color. They were disposed to treat all the servants kindly, but they had not the same feeling towards those of ebony hue. The same sentiment prevailed through the family; and as a rule it pervaded most of the enlightened families of the South.<sup>310</sup>

Adams proposed the lighter an individual’s skin tone, the more the individual deserved preferential treatment. Both families of the North and the South knew those of “ebony hue” did not deserve or need “kindly” treatment, and this statement needed no further explanation. Adams rendered the family as kind, moral, and good because they were able to treat their visibly white servants well; their pejorative treatment of those of darker skin did not tarnish their rectitude. Adams also implied that slavery was the natural state of blacks because his fictionalized Northern family, one that never owned slaves before, seamlessly came into the role of plantation masters and mistresses. They assumed their superiority as naturally as those servants on the front steps assumed their subservience.

Of particular importance to the dynamic of white and black Adams presented is Noah Lyon’s decision to arm some of his slaves. With his family and home under

---

<sup>309</sup> Optic, *Brother against Brother or the War on the Border*, 89.

<sup>310</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.

threat of attack by Titus and his band of secessionist Home Guards, Noah Lyon is forced to call on the most able bodied of his field slaves. White fear of armed slaves pervaded throughout the South before, during, and after the war. An armed black man signified an independent agency that many in the South, and the North, feared above all else. Slaves rising up and killing their white masters in their beds was not only a nightmare and terrifying bedtime story, but an actuality in the case of the few slave rebellions in the antebellum period. Yet the arming of the Lyon slaves in this story had a very particular justification: to protect the master and his family. Before receiving guns, a supplementary character asks one of the slaves:

Are you willing to fight for your master?’ demanded Colonel Belthorpe sharply, as though he expected a negative response to the question.

‘Yes, sar!’ answered General with more energy than he had spoken before. ‘Ready to be killed for Mars’r Lyon; an’ so’ all de boys on de place.’<sup>311</sup>

Adams did not arm the slaves in his novel to protect the nation, thus staying away from the divisive issue of black participation in the Union Army. Adams armed the black men in his story to protect their masters. Furthermore, Adams proposed these black men wanted arms for this task. Since Adams painted slavery as a kind institution, the reader expected the slaves’ desire to protect those who enforced it. Adams presented an episode similar to Arthur P. Ford’s statement in his memoir that Confederate soldiers had “Negro servants” on the field with them who were happy to do the washing and the cooking as well as protect their masters as they fought to keep their “servants” enslaved. Even in fiction, an author did not award the black man an

---

<sup>311</sup> Ibid., 69.

agency or desires outside of the direct context and direction of their benevolent white masters.

The main plot of *Brother Against Brother* centers on the division of a single family over the economics of slavery; specifically it centers on how one brother reaps the economic benefits of slavery while the other cannot due to the terms of the will. The placement of this familial story within the larger context of the war forces the reader to see them in the same terms. In speaking to his sons, Noah Lyon states,

For some time I have seen that this was what we must come to; but I have put off saying anything about it, for it is a solemn and even an awful thing to engage in the strife of civil war, brother against brother, the son against his father and the father against his son.<sup>312</sup>

Noah Lyon spoke of his individual family's struggles. But because Adams framed this story within the context of the war, a reader could not see it in a vacuum as pure fiction. The reader transposed the fraternity of the familial strife literally putting brother against brother upon the larger struggle happening around the family. Adams allowed, or arguably agitated, for this transposition, because he insisted his stories were based on fact.

In the final paragraphs of the novel, Adams wrote, "before, the fight had been a sort of neighborhood quarrel; but now it had become a national affair."<sup>313</sup> Adams explicitly did for his readers what he implied throughout the story: augmented the familial struggle by arguing it mirrored the larger struggle between the North and the South. Noah and Titus Lyon, representative of the two sides, are brothers divided over a family affair. The familial division over an inheritance of an economic

---

<sup>312</sup> Ibid., 39.

<sup>313</sup> Ibid., 128.

institution, plantation slavery, and its associated way of life; the national division during the war, even if the South refused to admit it, centered on this very institution as well. This story did not need the backdrop of the war to work or compel readers. Adams and his publishers employed the war setting because it was popular. The choice allowed them to capitalize on a proven and durable public interest. But in order to sell, Adams used the war and black characters in very specific and constricted ways determined by veterans and, by this time, their publics' insistence on fraternity.

In examining the beginning of “The Blue and The Gray—On Land” series through *Brother Against Brother*, it is important to see where the series ends. Adams wrote these stories with the intention his readers would follow his characters' entire journeys and not read each novel as its own, contained piece. Just as the title of *Brother Against Brother* evokes the overarching sense of the series, the final chapter reflects on its overall purpose and conclusion—*An Undivided Union* (1899). In the final chapter of the final book of the final series written about the war, and last book that William T. Adams ever wrote (he died before finishing it), Adams presented the reader with an “undivided union.” In the final chapter, the narrator announces the end of the war and the soldiers quickly transform into elderly veterans reflecting on the war and their service. Dexter Lyon, one of Noah Lyon's young boys who proved himself a courageous soldier throughout the preceding novels, exhibits the valiance and sentiment of the veteran. In the final chapter he makes a speech, the same speech he makes every year at the reunion of the Riverlawn Cavalry,

...let me give to you the toast I have proposed to you every year since the war closed: An Undivided Union. May God prosper it, and every citizen do all he can to uphold it!’ ‘An Undivided Union!’ would come back in deep unison. ‘Once and forever! AN UNDIVIDED UNION!’<sup>314</sup>

These are the last lines of the novel and in them the phrase “an Undivided Union” is used three times. Adams overwhelmed the reader with this insistence of a present “undivided union.” Veterans gave their lives and exhibited courage to ensure the country remained whole. It was now the job of its civilians to take up that mantle. All felt and cheered the “undivided union.” As Adams wrote,

The Union was saved! ...Henceforth it would be the United States of America, and nothing less—against all comers. The Constitution of our forefathers, baptized in the blood of thousands of martyrs, should henceforth be held sacred!<sup>315</sup>

This statement in the novel comes directly after Lee’s surrender to Grant. At the very moment of surrender, admittedly a Northern view of what victory entailed, the soldiers reestablished the United States. All soldiers, without reference to a specific side, helped in its reestablishments and therefore all are “martyrs” to the country. Arguing that the moment of surrender symbolized the being of the United States “and nothing less” silenced the true divisions continuing between the two sections during and after reconstruction.

### *Stephen Crane’s Universalized Individual*

As Adams’s used universally felt white supremacy to obscure the lasting divisions in the United States, Stephen Crane used the universalized individual. When twenty-two year old Stephen Crane began collecting materials for his war novel, he

---

<sup>314</sup> completed by Edward Stratemeyer Oliver Optic, *An Undivided Union* (Boston: Lee & Shepard, 1899), <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nc01.ark:/13960/t3vt2f31m>. 482.

<sup>315</sup> *Ibid.*, 480.

asked the mother of a childhood playmate if he could borrow their copy of *The Century Magazine's Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*.<sup>316</sup> Born six years after the close of the war, Crane desired to create a story that was his own brand of Realism, the in-vogue literary style at the end of the nineteenth century. Realists believed a writer should only write about what he or she knew and experienced, and Crane broke protocol by relying on others' accounts. Eventually published as *The Red Badge of Courage: An Episode of the American Civil War* (1894-1895), veterans touted the novel as a realistic depiction of their experience and reaction to combat.<sup>317</sup> Crane presented the reader with the psychological journey of a young Henry Fleming, a private in the fictitious 304<sup>th</sup> New York Regiment.

Beginning with romantic notions of battle and glorious death in war, Fleming ultimately coped with the knowledge of his and his fellow soldiers' vulnerability and mortality. Crane described how "at times [Fleming] regarded the wounded soldiers in an envious way. He conceived persons with torn bodies to be peculiarly happy. He wished that he, too, had a wound, a red badge of courage."<sup>318</sup> Only after Fleming received his "red badge of courage" (a knock on the head from a rifle wielded by a fellow Union soldier) could he stand courageously under fire and not doubt his manhood or potential as a soldier. He can, and is, treated as a hardened and experienced veteran wounded in battle. Fleming never corrects his fellows' inaccurate understanding of the origin of his wound, but instead lets them think of him as the warrior rather than as the accidentally wounded deserter. That the receipt of a "red

---

<sup>316</sup> Richard Fusco, "Introduction," in *The Red Badge of Courage and Selected Short Fiction*, ed. George Stade, *Barnes & Noble Classics* (New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 2003), xxvii.

<sup>317</sup> *Ibid.*, xxviii.

<sup>318</sup> Stephen Crane, *The Red Badge of Courage and Selected Short Fiction*, *Barnes & Noble Classics* (New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 2003), 54.

badge of courage” led to respect from peers, and later civilians, supported veterans’ claims that any service merited the upmost honor and veneration.

Fleming wants to be the romanticized soldier, a cherished ideal before the outbreak of war in 1861. In many ways, Fleming becomes the ideal: he faced his baptism of fire, received his “red badge of courage,” survived the war, and came home to his mother. In *The Veteran*, a short story written one year after *The Red Badge of Courage*, Fleming, now an old man surrounded by children who want to hear his war stories, gets to be the fully realized ideal of a romanticized soldier. He dies while trying to save two colts from a burning barn, his death caused because he sacrificed himself to save the life of another and his home.

With its tactical descriptions and focus on heroics, Crane imbued *The Red Badge of Courage* with the essence of the memoirs published in *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*. There is also no ideology of cause of the war in this novel; characters do not take time to discuss who is on the right or wrong side or for what they are ultimately fighting. The only black character, whose presence hints at black participation in the war and slavery more generally, comes on the first page of the novel: “A negro teamster who had been dancing upon a cracker box with the hilarious encouragement of twoscore soldiers was deserted. He sat mournfully down.”<sup>319</sup> The depiction is paternalistic. The “negro teamster” only “does” when he has white encouragement; when “deserted,” he mourns the loss of his white onlookers. The “negro teamster” ‘s only descriptive purpose is to entertain and help transport the

---

<sup>319</sup> Ibid., 3.

supplies needed by white soldiers. The character only has meaning within a white context.

Unlike William T. Adams's boys' books, Stephen Crane did not rely as much on a plot to drive his novel. Psychology and self-examination drive *The Red Badge of Courage*. Due to this focus, much of what Crane, through Fleming, thinks about are themes and ideas that solidly drive veterans' memoirs: insistence on mutual valor and courage and questions of an individual soldier's agency. At one point, Fleming realizes, "he had never wished to come to the war. He had not enlisted of his free will. He had been dragged by the merciless government. And now they were taking him out to be slaughtered."<sup>320</sup> Governments, and not the people, were at war with each other.

While *The Red Badge of Courage*, arguably, is an anti-war novel, it is certainly not an anti-soldier novel. Soldier characters in *The Red Badge of Courage* are, as the title entails, courageous and serve the country dutifully. Crane himself was infatuated with soldiering and attended a military school for a few years in his youth.<sup>321</sup> Ambrose Bierce too made a similar argument in his collection of short stories: war was folly and soldiers simply caught up in the government's frenzy. But Bierce, like Crane, would not extend the folly of the government to the soldiers. If anything, the folly of the government cemented the fraternal bonds between soldiers of opposing armies even further because it took agency out of the equation. Individual soldiers felt no antagonism towards other soldiers, but rather duty was of paramount importance. Duty kept soldiers fighting, not his cause.

---

<sup>320</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>321</sup> Fusco, "The Red Badge of Courage."

As in the memoirs, picket duty conveys fraternity. Early on in the novel, Henry Fleming reminisces about a Confederate who he had the pleasure of speaking to on picket duty:

The only foes he had seen were some pickets along the river bank. They were a sun-tanned, philosophical lot, who sometimes shot reflectively at the blue pickets. When reproached for this afterward, they usually expressed sorrow, and swore by their gods that the guns had exploded without their permission. The youth, on guard duty one night, conversed across the stream with one of them. He was a slightly ragged man, who spat skillfully between his shoes and possessed a great fund of bland and infantile assurance. The youth liked him personally. 'Yank,' the other had informed him, 'yer a right dum good feller.' This sentiment, floating to him upon the still air, had made him temporarily regret war.<sup>322</sup>

The parallels between this description in the fiction of Crane and the claimed authenticity of veterans' memoirs are too similar to disregard. The pickets sit together, desirous of each other's company, and show respect. There is no intention to shoot at the soldiers of the other army, and there is a "regret" in the forced opposition between the two sides. If this scene was emblematic of the realism Crane so desperately sought, then the realism was unquestionably informed by veterans' ideology of fraternity. The Realism of fiction based its authenticity of the fictionalizing of real events.

Where *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War* and *The Red Badge of Courage* differ most starkly is in Crane's psychological exploration of death. Whereas the editors of *Battles and Leaders* removed violence whenever possible from their published memoirs, Crane used the violence to connect soldiers across the lines. Much like Frank Wilkeson did in his 1886 memoir and Ambrose Bierce would do in

---

<sup>322</sup> Crane, *The Red Badge of Courage*, 8.

his collection of short stories, an exaggeration of violence united both Northern and Southern soldiers in the shared violent experience. Veterans could all agree, as they did in their memoirs, that soldiers on both sides never quaked and deserved praise for their valiant service. In the midst of a battle, the narrator of *The Red Badge of Courage* explains,

There was a consciousness always of the presence of his comrades about him. He felt the subtle battle brotherhood more potent even than the cause for which they were fighting. It was a mysterious fraternity born of the smoke and danger of death.<sup>323</sup>

The “fraternity born of the smoke and danger of death” applied to troops generally. Any soldier of any war entered into this fraternity because they all could and had felt the “subtle battle brotherhood.” Crane augmented this fraternity by mostly using descriptors, like “the youth,” “the tall soldier” or “the veterans,” rather than names when referring to his characters throughout the novel. The characters become stand-ins for any soldier, and later veteran, thus helping the reader see them as a monolith. This “brotherhood” is stronger than the cause for which men fought, which Crane never specified or described in more detail in the novel.

Perhaps the most enduring scene from *The Red Badge of Courage* confronts the reader and Fleming with death in the most personal way. After having fled the battlefield, Fleming finds himself wandering through a forest whose “high, arching boughs made a chapel.” Upon entering a clearing, a corpse with the “liquid looking eyes” and “gray skin” leaning against a tree whose “uniform that once had been blue, but was now faded to a melancholy shade of green” confronts Fleming. The narrator describes how Fleming “was being looked at by a dead man... The dead man and the

---

<sup>323</sup> Ibid., 35.

living man exchanged a long look.”<sup>324</sup> The dead man looking into the eyes of the living can be read as Crane’s reminder to his reader her or she can never forget the sacrifice of the men who served.

Experience of loss and witnessing of death united soldiers of both armies and civilians of both sections. Death was the universal experience of all who lived through the war period and thus was definitive common ground. Crane’s focus on death thereby created a fraternity between his readers because he presented them with a topic which all understood deeply. While every reader’s individual experience of death was different, it would not be difficult for him or her to sympathize and feel a sense of solidarity with anyone who experienced death. In this case, that “anyone” was the entire country. It is also worth noting the uniform of the corpse, while once “blue,” had “faded to a melancholy shade of green.” In death, all soldiers wore the same uniform, devoid of side but full of sadness. The dead were not Union dead or Confederate dead but American dead and Crane’s audience should regard them as such.

#### *Ambrose Bierce’s Universalized Dead*

Unlike many of the other authors trying their hand at war fiction, Ambrose Bierce had first hand knowledge of the events he described. Enlisting at age nineteen in the Ninth Indiana, Bierce witnessed and experienced some of the most brutal battles of the war and was badly wounded in one.<sup>325</sup> Rather than writing a memoir, as many of his fellow veterans did, Bierce instead turned to fiction as the way to express

---

<sup>324</sup> Ibid., 47.

<sup>325</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 244.

his disillusionment (and “adoring hatred”)<sup>326</sup> with war. His stories in *Tales of Soldiers and Civilians* (1892), like Crane’s *The Red Badge of Courage*, are a psychological exploration of soldiers and warfare. War is bloody and heartless; it accomplishes nothing except to waste the lives of men, women, and children, to tear apart families, and to destroy homes. Bierce’s own brutal experience of war informed his stories through their obsession with senseless death and destruction of men’s bodies as well as their heightened emotional journeys ending in broken minds. David Blight argues an underlying “survivor’s contempt” permeates Bierce’s stories. Blight further argues Bierce’s obsession and focus on death, destruction of men’s bodies, and sacrifice in this collection of short stories allowed for Bierce’s easy reconciliation with former Confederates.<sup>327</sup>

Bierce’s focus on universal, senseless death obscured the war’s political context in the same way the focus on the individual did. That death was “senseless” divorced the killing from any enmity; there was no reason, or cause, of death, rather there was just death. As Drew Gilpin Faust has argued, during the war “loss became commonplace; death was no longer encountered individually; death’s threat, its proximity, and its actuality became the most widely shared of the war’s experiences.”<sup>328</sup> The witnessing of death or the experience of losing a loved one was not sectional but national; everyone had lost and therefore everyone felt included in what became a universal experience. Bierce, like Crane, created a fraternity in death; a fraternity for those who died and a fraternity for those who witnessed death.

---

<sup>326</sup> Ibid.

<sup>327</sup> Ibid., 244, 48-49.

<sup>328</sup> Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008), xiii.

Soldiers had died in violent ways regardless of who or how they served, and the country at large mourned their loss with the same reverence and sadness.

In “A Tough Tussle,” a Union officer and a Confederate private are found dead, side-by-side. It is described, “the officer had died of a sword-thrust through the heart, but not, apparently, until he had inflicted upon his enemy no fewer than five dreadful wounds.”<sup>329</sup> The death and destruction described in these stories are universal and occur equally on both sides (many of the stories alternate between having a Union or a Confederate protagonist). This type of fighting is useless; both the Confederate and Union soldier in “A Tough Tussle” die violently and end up right where they started, next to each other. All of the soldiers were caught up in the “folly” of a nation at war.<sup>330</sup>

Of the ten stories included in the “Soldiers” collection of *Tales of Soldiers and Civilians*, two deal with the destruction of families. In “A Horseman in the Sky,” the first story in the collection, Union soldier Carter Druse discharges his weapon while on picket duty. When confronted by his superior officer as to why he fired his weapon, Druse responds he saw a horse and, after prompting, a Confederate soldier. Druse then states very matter-of-factly that the Confederate soldier was his father. The superior officer walks away without another word. Similarly in “The Affair at Coulter’s Notch,” a Union artillery captain, Captain Coulter, is told to fire his cannons at a group of Confederate artillery stationed around a civilian home in the woods. Coulter, after some hesitancy, does what he is told. Later, after the Union officers take over the house for the night, they find a group of three in the cellar: a

---

<sup>329</sup> Ambrose Bierce, *Tales of Soldiers and Civilians* (Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 2004), 56.

<sup>330</sup> Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 248-49.

man clutching a bloodied woman clutching a bloodied young girl in her arms. When the man, thought to be dead, looks up, Bierce reveals he is Captain Coulter. The house he dutifully fired on, and the woman and child he killed, were his home and family. In neither of these stories is anything accomplished by the bloodshed. The Union army is not made safer due to the killing on the picket line or the destruction of the Confederate artillery. Rather these two instances show how duty and orders unnecessarily destroy families and lives. None of the dead needed to die and none of the living needed to kill. What is left is dead families and destroyed men. There is no tactical advantage, there is no victory; there is only senseless death. It is also particularly poignant both of these stories deal with divided families. The destruction of the so-called enemy is literally rendered as the destruction of kin.

Two other stories in the “Soldiers” collection present the readers with a ghastly twist. In them, descriptions of perceived courageous heroics instead become fruitless struggles between life and death. Both “An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge” and “One of the Missing” concern the final psychological experience of those who are already dead. The story of “An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge” concerns Peyton Farquhar, a civilian caught and convicted of aiding the Confederacy, in the process of his hanging by Union troops. Bierce presented the reader with the story of a daring escape: as the rope is put around his neck, Farquhar tumbles into the creek, swims for his life as the Union soldiers fire at him, and arrives home tired, wet and safe to see his wife on the steps of their home. Bierce then jolted the reader out of this satisfactory and heartwarming tale with the final line of the story: “Peyton Farquhar was dead: his body, with a broken neck, swung gently from side to side beneath the

timbers of the Owl Creek Bridge.”<sup>331</sup> The resilience of the human spirit is suddenly rendered as the death throes of a doomed man. Home and family is a dream, not a reality.

In “One of the Missing,” Union private Jerome Searing volunteers to perform the duty of determining the enemy position. He comes upon a wooden structure in the yard of an abandoned plantation house and, after securing himself under the joists and floorboards, “considered where he could plant his shot with the best hope of making a widow or an orphan or a childless mother.”<sup>332</sup> Just as he is about to pull the trigger, a shot rings out from bored Confederate artillery attempting to hit the Union position up on a hill; the shot goes high and hits the out building, burying Jerome Searing inside. The reader is then taken through Jerome Searing’s thoughts, his feelings of extreme pain, and attempts to move the debris around him enough to fire off a shot. Throughout this psychological diversion, Bierce consistently juxtaposes courage with terror: “Jerome Searing, the man of courage...screamed with fear. He was not insane—he was terrified.”<sup>333</sup> And like in “An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge,” just as Jerome Searing pushes through the debris, grabs his gun, and is in the process of pulling the trigger (thus accomplishing his duty and goal) Bierce writes, “but Jerome Searing was dead.” Again, the daring and courageous feats of someone finally getting free are revealed to be the final thoughts of a dead man.

A Union officer finds Jerome Searing’s body a week later. This comes as a surprise to the reader who was again tricked by Bierce’s use of parallel action in an

---

<sup>331</sup> Bierce, *Tales of Soldiers and Civilians* 16.

<sup>332</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.

<sup>333</sup> *Ibid.*, 36.

unspecified timeline throughout the story. The officer “[cast] his eyes curiously upon the ruins and [saw] a dead body half–buried in boards and timbers. It [was] so covered with dust that its clothing [was] Confederate gray.”<sup>334</sup> Similar to Crane’s description of the corpse in his “melancholy shade of green” uniform, in death sides are obscured. The only reason the arriving Union troops know the body is of a Union soldier is because the officer who discovers it is Lieutenant Adrian Searing, the dead man’s brother. Jerome Searing’s goal of destroying families, not just soldiers and their arms, results in the destruction of his own.

Both of these stories force Bierce’s reader to understand the psychology of a soldier. Rather than just telling the reader that war is folly, Bierce lets the reader experience the folly for his or herself. The reader undergoes the psychological experience of death as the characters do thus linking fictional character with reader. Bierce creates a universal experience out of the reading of his fiction by having the reader go through the same experience as every other reader of this story. Furthermore, he creates a universal experience between veterans and civilians by giving the latter a glimpse into the former’s war. Bierce creates a universality experienced across place and time.

To further connect the reader with veterans, Bierce includes in the collection a story that confronts the reader with their own relationship to the war. “Chickamauga” recounts the story of a young boy of six who wanders away from his home and mother into the woods. Charging after rabbits with his wooden sword and playing soldier, the young boy quickly finds himself lost and sobs himself to sleep. Upon

---

<sup>334</sup> Ibid., 37.

waking, the young boy wanders into an opening in the forest and finds it strewn with dead and wounded men creating a “merry spectacle” for the child.<sup>335</sup> These are the abandoned dead and wounded of the Battle of Chickamauga. Not fully realizing what he witnesses, the young boy moves about the wounded and dead “freely, going from one to another and peering into their faces with childish curiosity.”<sup>336</sup> The boy thinks it is a game and tries to mount a wounded soldier, crawling on all fours, to play pony. The soldier throws him to the ground and then “turned upon him a face that lacked a lower jaw—from the upper teeth to the throat was a great red gap fringed with hanging shreds of flesh and splinters of bone.”<sup>337</sup> After continuing to wander through the pools of blood, abandoned knapsacks, and dead and dying men, the young boy finds himself staring at a series of familiar buildings. He has returned home only to find the buildings collapsed and the body of his mother in the yard, killed by a shell as she searched for her lost son. It is revealed, “The child was a deaf mute.”<sup>338</sup>

The child cannot hear the pain of the soldiers just as he cannot communicate with them. There is an insurmountable gap in understanding between the civilian child and the military man. Neither can communicate their feelings nor be truly understood because one lacks the skill while the other lacks a jaw. The child stands in for the larger civilian population during the war. For Bierce, civilians were “deaf” to the pain and suffering of veterans, even after he forced them to understand the psychological experience of warfare through his other stories. Civilians were able to ignore what the veteran wants to say and only see what they want: “a merry spectacle”

---

<sup>335</sup> Ibid., 19.

<sup>336</sup> Ibid.

<sup>337</sup> Ibid.

<sup>338</sup> Ibid., 22.

which is both entertaining and scary. Civilians wander through the memory of the war without fully understanding its consequences until it arrives directly in their front yards. Like the child, civilians “slept” through the war by not participating and can now only interact with the battles’ aftermath. Civilians’ relationship to the war is not whole, and therefore civilians can never fully understand events correctly. The war was “folly,” and trying to understand it or place it within the context of a higher or more glorious purpose is also “folly.”

Bierce’s fraternity in death for soldiers, while in stark contrast to the more sanitized renderings of the war, still worked to universalize the soldier’s experience and present a sense of unity between them. It united veterans in the shared experience of death and the senseless destruction their actions wrought. While Bierce believed the American public could never fully understand the experience of war, they could be made to understand the veterans’ suffering. Bierce, through his “Soldier” stories and fraternity in death, implored veterans, as he did, to show the American public that war was folly and veterans all experienced unnecessary hardships that accomplished nothing. In this way, Bierce sought to instruct the public about veterans’ experience as the GAR or UCV did. Both wanted the public to see the veterans as a monolith. The main (and crucial) difference between them was while Bierce claimed war had no purpose, the veterans’ groups claimed it did, albeit a highly restricted one.

.....

Fiction and memoir employed similar literary tropes; evoked the same sentiments towards service and duty; proclaimed the courage and valor of all soldiers involved; discussed questions of division within a fraternal context; and used

pejorative, paternalistic and archetypal descriptions of blacks. The episodes of camaraderie and lack of violence highlighted in veterans' memoirs supported their fraternity just as the framing and sentiment of the narratives in popular fiction.

Yet the ways in which the novelists approached and incorporated veterans' ideology of fraternity into their narratives were not homogenous. Some authors focused on the psychology of war, while other focused on the internal struggles between families. Some used violence to depict the folly of war and the destruction of all soldiers, while others used violence to romanticize the service of all veterans. Some used paternalism to continue ignoring the consequences of emancipation.

This multiplicity of approaches coalesced in descriptions that presented a universal experience of war and its consequences. While presented as inclusive, the universalized individual and sentiment was inherently exclusive. It was exclusive in that authors, whether of fiction, memoirs, or legislation, would not confront divisive issues in their writings. William T. Adams, Stephen Crane, and Ambrose Bierce all participated in this exclusionary universalism by focusing on individual struggles that then stood in for the larger struggles of the country. By creating a fraternity of individual characters based on the characters' views of blacks, death, fellow veterans, and duty, these authors obscured the larger issues outside of their characters' immediate experience. What the individual chose to ignore, the group ignored as well. The individual soldier was inseparable from the group, and therefore the individual's war experience defined the war experience of all veterans. Through universalizing the individual, the nation was whole again.

## Conclusion

*“And so good-bye to the war...”*

May 30, 1871 was Decoration Day. Groups gathered at the Monument of the Unknown Dead near Robert E. Lee’s former home, Arlington House, at Arlington Cemetery. Speakers rose, spoke, and then sat down again. The scene was mournful yet reverential. The crowd recognized the need for the ceremony on this day; they had decorated the graves of the fallen civil war soldiers across the grounds. The crowd knew and desired to pay homage to the country’s fallen sons.

One of the speakers who rose was Frederick Douglass. As he stood by the Monument, he asked his listeners to “tarry here for a moment. My words shall be few and simple.”<sup>339</sup> In keeping with the spirit of honor of the day, Douglass reminded his audience why this day of recognition was so important and so necessary:

Dark and sad will be the hour to this nation when it forgets to pay grateful homage to its greatest benefactors. The offering we bring to-day is due alike to the patriot soldiers dead and their noble comrades who still live; for, whether living or dead, whether in time or eternity, the loyal soldiers who imperiled all for the country and freedom are one and inseparable.<sup>340</sup>

The dead soldiers and the living veterans had saved the United States. They had “imperiled all for the country” and therefore imperiled all for the “freedom” that American still hold so dear. Douglass believed, as did Lincoln, that it was the job of the living to both take and show “increased devotion” to “these honored dead,”

---

<sup>339</sup> Frederick Douglass, "Address at the Monument of the Unknown Dead," *What So Proudly We Hail*, <http://www.whatsoproudlywehail.org/curriculum/the-american-calendar/address-at-the-monument-of-the-unknown-dead>.

<sup>340</sup> *Ibid.*

whether their grave was marked with a name or “unknown.” But for Douglass, “these honored dead” were not the all of the war’s dead:

We are sometimes asked, in the name of patriotism, to forget the merits of this fearful struggle, and to remember with equal admiration those who struck at the nation’s life and those who struck to save it, those who fought for slavery and those who fought for liberty and justice...but may my ‘right hand forget her cunning and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth,’ if I forget the difference between the parties to that terrible, protracted, and bloody conflict.<sup>341</sup>

Douglass urged his crowd not to acquiesce to the voices that called for an active forgetfulness of the war’s bitter divisions and causes. There was a difference between “those who fought for slavery” and those who “fought for liberty and justice.” Even in the name of patriotism, the American people could not allow for the white washing of history. If, Douglass asked his crowd, they can forget so easily this war that caused so much death, pain, suffering, violence, destruction, and loneliness, then “in the name of all things sacred, what shall men remember?”<sup>342</sup> If the real war was not worth remembering, then nothing was.

In the closing sentences of his speech, Douglass asked his listeners to do some self-reflection as to why they performed these “offerings” of remembrance. Was the “essence and significance of our devotions here to-day” found in military duty or manly courage? Or was there a more important, underlying purpose for this public honor to soldiers both living and dead? Douglass continued:

The essence and significance of our devotions here to-day are not to be found in the fact that the men whose remains fill these graves were brave in battle. If we met simply to show our sense of bravery, we should find enough to kindle admiration on both sides.... unflinching courage marked the rebel not less

---

<sup>341</sup> Ibid.

<sup>342</sup> Ibid.

than the loyal soldier. But we are not here to applaud manly courage, save as it has been displayed in a noble cause.<sup>343</sup>

When remembering, Americans needed to separate Union soldiers, “those who fought for justice and liberty,” from Confederates, “those who fought for slavery.” Courage and duty did not obscure or erase the cause for which one fought. Rather, duty, courage, and the cause for which one fought were inseparable. While the monument Douglass stood by as he spoke these words made Confederate and Union dead inseparable, their unidentified bones mixed together, Americans could not let their memory do so as well. But the “dark and sad” hour that Douglass feared had already crept into the day.

While the services at the Monument to the Unknown Dead continued, a delegation of black men arrived at Arlington Cemetery to hold a commemoration ceremony for the black troops who died during the war and were buried on the grounds. What the delegation and “a large number of colored persons” found upon arriving at the section for the black dead shocked and appalled them:

[They] proceeded to the cemetery of the colored soldiers to the north of the mansion, and on arriving there they found no stand erected, no orator or speaker selected, not a single flag placed on high, not even a paper flag at the head boards of those loyal but ignored dead, not even a drop of water to quench the thirst of the humble patriots after their toilsome march from the beautifully decorated grand stand [by the Monument to the Unknown Dead] to this barren neglected spot below.<sup>344</sup>

In stark contrast to the honor paid towards white soldiers were the undecorated, uncelebrated, neglected graves of the black soldiers. Their headstones, not stone markers but temporary wooden boards, lay barren. There was no fanfare to valorize

---

<sup>343</sup> Ibid.

<sup>344</sup> "Decoration Day and Hypocrisy," *The New Orleans Semi-Weekly Louisianian*, June 15, 1871 1871.

their service, there was only quiet. The delegation waited for two and a half hours, but still no decorations arrived; they dispatched for their own. An “indignation meeting was improvised” by the delegation who unanimously passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the colored citizens of the District of Columbia hereby respectfully request the proper authorities to cause the removal of the remains of all loyal soldiers now interred in the north end of the Arlington cemetery, among paupers and rebels, to the main body of the grounds at the earliest possible moment.<sup>345</sup>

The delegation also unanimously resolved to form a committee who would take their complaints to Congress and ensure their requests were met. One of the members was Frederick Douglass.

These black men and women who gathered to honor these dead soldiers would not allow the country to forget them or their service. These buried black men were Union soldiers just as their white counterparts buried in the rose garden of Arlington House. They were loyal soldiers and therefore deserved the reverence, honor, and valorization that Douglass called for in his speech on that same day. But this resolve to preserve memory fell on deaf ears. Despite the statements of this delegation and despite Douglass’s speech, many white Americans would forget the service of these black soldiers, both living and dead. In many ways, they had already disappeared. No number of resolutions could change the fact that white Americans began to abandon some of their veterans in order to create national cohesion and unity. White Americans chose to remember duty and courage rather than the war’s causes for which men rendered that duty and courage.

---

<sup>345</sup> Ibid.

No one came to move the graves. Instead, the grounds of Arlington were expanded to include them. The wooden boards were replaced with proper headstones, but most read “unknown.” The members of the United States Colored Troops were not separated from the black civilians also buried in the section. The section is now known as Section Twenty-Seven and is still found on the outskirts of Arlington National Cemetery. The Confederate dead, the “rebels” referred to in the resolution, were eventually moved to their own section further in Arlington’s grounds.<sup>346</sup>

*The New Orleans Semi-Weekly Louisianian*, a bi-weekly black newspaper published in New Orleans, printed a small editorial on the Decoration Day ceremony in its June 15, 1871 issue. In it, the editors reflected on the hypocritical nature of Decoration Day ceremonies across the South. The editorial first reflected that, “besides the bad effect among the whites there comes a still more evil influence from the dastardly discriminations made by the professedly union people themselves.”<sup>347</sup> The act of forgetting on display at Arlington Cemetery on Decoration Day was not sectional forgetting but national forgetting. This act of forgetting was made worse, argued the *Semi-Weekly’s* editors, because the “union people themselves” supported and participated in it. After printing an extract from the *Washington Chronicle’s* coverage of the event, *The New Orleans Semi-Weekly Louisianian* wrote:

If any event in the whole history of our connection with the late war embodied more features of disgraceful neglect, on the part of the union whites, or exhibited more clearly the necessity of protecting ourselves from insult, than this behavior at Arlington heights, we at least acknowledge ignorance of it.<sup>348</sup>

---

<sup>346</sup> Andy Hall, "George W. Hatton, Politician," *The Atlantic* (2011), <http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2011/01/george-w-hatton-politician/69692/>.

<sup>347</sup> "Decoration Day and Hypocrisy."

<sup>348</sup> *Ibid.*

Black civilians and soldiers, both living and dead, were losing their supposed allies to the steadily encroaching belief in ‘Americanism.’ The selective memory on display on the outskirts of Arlington Cemetery on May 30, 1871 continued in the decades to come, prompted by the calls and ideology of the white veterans who received public honor that same day down the hill

Thirteen years later in Keene, New Hampshire, a group of veterans gathered outside the John Sedgwick Post No. 4, Grand Army of the Republic to celebrate Decoration Day (now called Memorial Day). The featured speaker on this May day in 1884 was Oliver Wendall Holmes Jr., a thrice-wounded veteran who would go on to serve as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court for thirty years. His speech embodied all of the rhetoric, sentiment, and cross-sectional fraternity that Frederick Douglass feared in 1871. Holmes began his speech with a reflection:

Not long ago I heard a young man ask why people still kept up Memorial Day, and it set me thinking of the answer...but an answer which should commend the assent of those who do not share our memories, and which we of the North and our brethren of the South could join in perfect accord. So far as this last is concerned, to be sure, there is no trouble.<sup>349</sup>

Over the course of thirteen years, the purpose of Memorial Day had gone from remembering those who were gone to teaching the next generation and from remembering who fought for which of the war’s causes to remembering and presenting unity between veterans and unity of their public. Like the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Confederate Veterans, Holmes too believed that the country celebrated Memorial Day to remind the American people as well as the

---

<sup>349</sup> Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., "In Our Youth Our Hearts Were Touched with Fire," What So Proudly We Hail, <http://www.whatsproudlywehail.org/curriculum/the-american-calendar/in-our-youth-our-hearts-were-touched-with-fire#note3>.

veterans themselves of their sacrifice and courage. Memorial Day, Holmes argued, sought to promote memories that the North and the South “could join in perfect accord.” To do so required an active act of forgetting. It meant doing exactly what Douglass urged the country not to in his 1871 speech: to remember courage and duty without the cause for which men fought. Yet Holmes urged just that:

You could not stand up day after day...without getting at last something of the same brotherhood for the enemy...The soldier of the war...can join in commemorating a soldier’s death with feelings not different in kind, whether he fell toward them or by their side.<sup>350</sup>

Veterans informed Memorial Day, like most other forms of public remembrance by the 1880s, with their fraternity. In many respects, argued Holmes, the day served to remind and broadcast publically this idea of fraternity; the day “[celebrated] and solemnly [reaffirmed] a national act of enthusiasm and faith.”<sup>351</sup> For Holmes, the brotherhood born of battle needed to be a part of the memorial activities. By 1884, the active forgetting of enmity and focus on brotherhood caused no trouble to the veterans or the public who read their reminiscences, erected monuments in their honor, absorbed their history through textbooks, and read about their universal courage and suffering in popular literature.

Holmes told his rapt audience that their memorial activities did not just concern veterans. He urged his listeners to remember the women who wanted to “offer their lives” but were barred from service by their sex.<sup>352</sup> Their desire was enough to merit the same recognition as the men who sacrificed themselves for country. Women needed special recognition, but not black soldiers. The only mention

---

<sup>350</sup> Ibid.

<sup>351</sup> Ibid.

<sup>352</sup> Ibid.

of slavery or any hint at black participation in the war came at the beginning of Holmes's speech when he stated that he and his fellow Union troops felt slavery "had lasted long enough."<sup>353</sup> This was not the admonishment one expected from an ardent abolitionist and the descendant of abolitionists. Holmes presented slavery as a nuisance rather than a divisive issue. It was an institution that had run its course, not one that was forcibly ended by a bloody and protracted war.

While Holmes spoke at length about his brave comrades who he saw die in the heat of battle, none of them died ignominiously, quietly or violently. All died heroically while doing their duty and urging their fellows forward. All died as the romanticized soldier. Not once did Holmes call secession treasonous. Not once did he say those who fought for the Confederacy were wrong. Not once did he say those who fought for the Confederacy fought for slavery. Never did he use the words rebellion, secession, or treason throughout his speech. To do so would have been to break the spell of fraternity and unity for which he and his fellow veterans had pressed. To do so would have been to recreate the divisions that the veterans, and their public, had tried so hard to forget and render less divisive. To mention any of those words—enmity, disunion, violence, slavery, or emancipation—would have been to bring the real war back into popular memory. Holmes and his fellow veterans would not allow that to happen, not on the day that honored their sacrifice and duty to country, not on the day that solidified that all soldiers, regardless of their cause and regardless of section, were Americans. Holmes ended his speech with the following words:

---

<sup>353</sup> Ibid.

As I listen, the great chorus of life and joy begins again, and amid the awful orchestra of seen and unseen powers and destinies of good and evil our trumpets sound once more a note of daring, hope, and will.<sup>354</sup>

And so went the war.

---

<sup>354</sup> Ibid.

# Bibliography

## I. Primary Sources

*The Annals of the War Written by Leading Participants North and South, Originally Published in the Philadelphia Weekly Times.* Philadelphia: The Times Publishing Company, 1879.

<https://archive.org/stream/annalsofwar00philrich#page/n9/mode/2up>

Baldwin, James. "Unnameable Objects, Unspeakable Crimes." In *The White Problem in America* Chicago: Johnson, 1966. <http://engl101-rothman.wikispaces.umb.edu/file/view/Unnameable+Objects+Unspeakable+Crimes.pdf>.

Bellard, Alfred. *Gone for a Soldier: The Civil War Memoirs of Private Alfred Bellard.* 1st ed. Boston: Little Brown, 1975.

Bierce, Ambrose. *Tales of Soldiers and Civilians* Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 2004. 1892.

*The Confederate Veteran Magazine, 1893.* Nashville: S.A. Cunningham, 1893. <https://archive.org/details/confederateveter01conf>.

Crane, Stephen. *The Red Badge of Courage and Selected Short Fiction.* Barnes & Noble Classics. New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 2003. 1894.

"Decoration Day and Hypocrisy." *The New Orleans Semi-Weekly Louisianian*, June 15, 1871 1871.

Douglass, Frederick. "Address at the Monument of the Unknown Dead." What So Proudly We Hail. <http://www.whatsoproudlywehail.org/curriculum/the-american-calendar/address-at-the-monument-of-the-unknown-dead>.

Field, Lida A. *A Grammar School History of the United States.* New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company, 1897. <http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=loc.ark:/13960/t4qj7sf79;view=1up;seq=9>.

Ford, Arthur Peronneau. "Life in the Confederate Army: Being the Personal Experiences of a Private Soldier in the Confederate Army ". In *Life in the Confederate Army: Being Personal Experiences of a Private Soldier in the Confederate Army, by Arthur P. Ford, and Some Experiences and Sketeches of Southern Life, by Marion Johnstone Ford.* New York: The Neale Publishing Company, 1905.

Goss, Warren Lee. "Campaigning to No Purpose (Recollections of a Private--II.)." In *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, edited by Clarence Clough Buel Robert Underwood Johnson New York: The Century Co., 1887.  
<http://books.google.com/books?vid=HARVARD:32044050951789&printsec=titlepage#v=onepage&q=Warren%20Lee%20Gross&f=false>.

Hill, John F. "Good-Bye to Dixie: Homeward Bound at Last--the Happy Sequel to a Sad Story." *The National Tribune*, June 7, 1883 1883.

———. "Good-Bye to Dixie: One More River to Cross--Brothers of the Magic String." *The National Tribune*, May 24, 1883 1883, 3.

Holmes, George F. "Part VI: History of the Great Civil War and the Years Ensuing." In *A School History of the United States of America, from the Earliest Discoveries to the Year 1870* New York: University Publishing Company, 1871. <https://archive.org/stream/schoolhistoryofu00holm#page/n5/mode/2up>.

"How to Build up the Grand Army." *The National Tribune*, September 16, 1882 1882, 4.

*Journal of the Thirty-Second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, Cincinnati, Ohio, September 8th and 9th, 1898*. Philadelphia: Town Printing Company, 1898.  
[http://books.google.com/books?id=B\\_4PAQAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?id=B_4PAQAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false).

*Journal of the Twenty-Sixth National Encampment, Grand Army of the Republic, Washington, D.C., September 21st and 22d, 1892*. Albany: S.H. Wentworth, 1892.  
[http://books.google.com/books?id=tU81AQAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?id=tU81AQAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false).

Jr., Oliver Wendell Holmes. "In Our Youth Our Hearts Were Touched with Fire." What So Proudly We Hail.  
<http://www.whatsoproudlywehail.org/curriculum/the-american-calendar/in-our-youth-our-hearts-were-touched-with-fire#note3>.

Lincoln, Abraham. "Address on Reconstruction, Washington, Dc. April 11, 1865." Abraham Lincoln Online, Last Modified 2015.  
<http://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/speeches/last.htm>.

———. "The Proclamation of Amnesty and Reconstruction, December 8, 1863." University of Maryland. <http://www.freedmen.umd.edu/procamn.htm>.

Mixson, Frank M. *Reminiscences of a Private* Columbia, SC: The State Company, 1910.

- "Monument in Honor of the 24th Regt., C.V., Unveiled on Washington Green."  
*Penny Press*, October 20, 1904 1904. Middlesex County Historical Society,  
Civil War Collection, Box 3, Folder 9.
- O'Hara, Theodore. "The Bivouac of the Dead." University of Kentucky.  
<http://www.uky.edu/KentuckyCulture/bivouac.html>.
- Oliver Optic, completed by Edward Stratemeyer. *An Undivided Union* Boston: Lee &  
Shepard, 1899. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nc01.ark:/13960/t3vt2f31m>.
- Optic, Oliver. *Brother against Brother or the War on the Border*. The Blue and the  
Gray Army Series. United States of America: CreateSpace Publishing, 2014.  
1894.
- "President Johnson's Amnesty Proclamation.; Restoration to Rights of Property  
except in Slaves. An Oath of Loyalty as a Condition Precedent. Legality of  
Confiscation Proceedings Recognized. Exception of Certain Offenders from  
This Amnesty. By These Special Applications for Pardon May Be Made.  
Reorganization in North Carolina. Appointment of a Provisional Governor. A  
State Covention to Be Chosen by Loyal Citizens. The Machinery of the  
Federal Government to Be Put in Operation. Amnesty Proclamation.". *The  
New York Times*, May 30, 1885.
- Robert Underwood Johnson Papers, Manuscripts and Archives Division, The New  
York Public Library.
- The Reports of the Committees of the House of Representatives, Made During the  
First Session Thirty-Ninth Congress, 1865-1866*. Washington, DC:  
Government Printing Office, 1866.  
[http://books.google.com/books?id=CFBHAQAIAAJ&printsec=frontcover&  
source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?id=CFBHAQAIAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false).
- Sack, Kevin. "Symbols of Old South Feed a New Bitterness." *The New York Times*,  
February 8, 1997 1997.
- Strong, Robert Hale. *A Yankee Private's Civil War* Mineola, NY: Dover Publications,  
Inc., 2013. 1961.
- Typed Transcription of *Narrative of Service as a Private* by Alfred Seelye Roe, given  
by Kate Thornburg, Class of 2005, Alfred S. Roe Civil War Papers, Collection  
#1000-99, Special Collections & Archives, Wesleyan University, Middletown,  
CT, USA. 19
- Watkins, Sam R. *Co. Aytch: A Confederate Memoir of the Civil War* New York:  
Touchstone, 2003. 1882.

Whitman, Walt. "The Real War Will Never Get in the Books." In *Specimen Days & Collect* Glasgow: Wilson & McCormick, 1883.  
<http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=umn.319510019989238;view=1up;seq=5>.

Wilkeson, Frank. *Turned Inside Out: Recollections of a Private Soldier in the Army of the Potomac*. Bison Books ed. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1997. 1886.

Wilson, Woodrow. "Address at Gettysburg, July 4, 1913." University of California, Santa Barbara. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=65370>.

## II. Secondary Sources

"About the National Tribune (Washington, D.C.), 1877-1917." The Library of Congress. <http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn82016187/>.

Administration, National Cemetery. "History and Development of the National Cemetery Administration." U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 2014.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. New York, London: Verso, 2006.

"Antietam National Cemetery." National Park Service.  
<http://www.nps.gov/anti/historyculture/antietam-national-cemetery.htm>.

"The Battle of Liberty Place (September 14, 1874)." Louisiana Endowment for the Humanities. <http://www.knowla.org/entry/757/>.

Blight, David W. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001.

———. "'What Will Peace among the Whites Bring?': Reunion and Race in the Struggle over the Memory of the Civil War in American Culture." *Massachusetts Review* 34, no. 3 (1993): 393-410.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25090451>.

Brown, Thomas J. *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration: A Brief History with Documents*. The Bedford Series in History and Culture. edited by Ernest R. May Natalie Zemon Davis, Lynn Hunt, David W. Blight Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004.

Brundage, W. Fitzhugh. "Black Veterans Recall the Civil War ". In *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader*, edited by Larry M. Logue and Michael Barton. New York: New York University Press, 2007.

- Buck, Paul Herman. *The Road to Reunion, 1865-1900* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1937.
- Burg, Steven B. "'From Troubled Ground to Common Ground': The Locust Grove African American Cemetery Restoration Project: A Case Study of Service-Learning and Community History." *The Public Historian* 30, no. 2 (2008). <http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=slceprojectsummaries>.
- Burns, Ken. In *The Civil War* 660 minutes. PBS Home Video: Paramount Home Entertainment; Time-Life Video; Florentine Films; PBS Home Video; American Documentary, Inc., 1990.
- Cemetery, Friends of Freedmen's. "African-American Civilians Interred in Section 27 of Arlington National Cemetery, 1864-1867." <http://www.freedmenscemetery.org/resources/documents/arlington-section27.pdf>.
- Chadwick, Gordon. "The Battle of Liberty Place Monument in the Late 20th Century." New Orleans Historical <http://neworleanshistorical.org/items/show/283#.VPEAHLPF-Uc>.
- Church, Jason. "Confederates in the Cemetery: Federal Benefits & Stewardship." In *International Cemetery Preservation Summit*. Niagra Falls, NY: National Center for Preservation Technology and Training, 2014.
- "Connecticut's Monuments: An Essay, Monument Designs." Connecticut Historical Society. [http://www.chs.org/finding\\_aides/ransom/overview2.htm](http://www.chs.org/finding_aides/ransom/overview2.htm).
- "Connecticut's Monuments: An Essay, Purpose of Monuments." Connecticut Historical Society. [http://www.chs.org/finding\\_aides/ransom/overview3.htm](http://www.chs.org/finding_aides/ransom/overview3.htm).
- Davies, Wallace Evan. *Patriotism on Parade: The Story of Veterans' and Hereditary Organizations in America, 1783-1900*. Harvard Historical Studies. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.
- Fahs, Alice. "Remembering the Civil War in Children's Literature of the 1880s and 1890s." In *The Memory of the Civil War in American Culture*, edited by Joan Waugh Alice Fahs. Civil War America. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. "Battle over the Bodies: Burying and Reburying the Civil War Dead, 1865-1871." In *Wars within a War: Controversy and Conflict over the American Civil War*, edited by Gary W. Gallagher Joan Waugh. Civil War America. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009.

- . *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008.
- Foner, Eric. *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution 1863-1877*. The New American Nation Series. New York: Perennial Classics, 2002. 1988.
- Foster, Gaines M. "A Respect for Confederate History." In *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader*, edited by Larry M. Logue and Michel Barton. New York: New York University Press, 2007.
- Fusco, Richard. "Introduction." In *The Red Badge of Courage and Selected Short Fiction*, edited by George Stade. Barnes & Noble Classics. New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 2003.
- Garrett, Professor Matthew. March 21, 2015 2015.
- "The Grand Army of the Republic and Kindred Societies: Introduction." The Library of Congress. <http://www.loc.gov/rr/main/gar/garintro.html>.
- Gross, Jennifer L. "Pensions, Civil War." In *Encyclopedia of the American Civil War: A Political, Social, and Military History*, edited by Jeanne T. Heidler David S. Heidler. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2000.
- Hall, Andy. "George W. Hatton, Politician." *The Atlantic* (2011). Published electronically January 19, 2011. <http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2011/01/george-w-hatton-politician/69692/>.
- Hattaway, Herman. "Clio's Southern Soldiers: The United Confederate Veterans and History." *Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 12, no. 3 (1971): 213-42.
- "History." Hollywood Cemetery. <http://www.hollywoodcemetery.org/about/our-history>.
- "History of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers." National Park Service. [http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/veterans\\_affairs/History.html](http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/veterans_affairs/History.html).
- Horowitz, Tony. *Confederates in the Attic: Dispatches from the Unfinished Civil War*. 1st ed. New York: Pantheon Books, 1998.
- Janney, Caroline E. *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2013.
- "Jim Crow Stories: Civil Rights Act (1875)." Educational Broadcasting Corporation. [http://www.pbs.org/wnet/jimcrow/stories\\_events\\_civil.html](http://www.pbs.org/wnet/jimcrow/stories_events_civil.html).

- King, Gilbert. "War and Peace of Mind for Ulysses S. Grant." Smithsonian Institute. <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/war-and-peace-of-mind-for-ulysses-s-grant-1882227/?no-ist>.
- Krowl, Michelle A. "'In the Spirit of Fraternity': The United States Government and the Burial of Confederate Dead at Arlington National Cemetery, 1864-1914." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 111, no. 2 (2003): 151-86. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4250101>.
- Laabs, Damon M. "McClure, Alexander Kelly." Pennsylvania State University. [http://pabook.libraries.psu.edu/palitmap/bios/McClure\\_\\_Alexander\\_Kelly.html](http://pabook.libraries.psu.edu/palitmap/bios/McClure__Alexander_Kelly.html).
- Laderman, Gary. *The Sacred Remains: American Attitudes toward Death, 1799-1883*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Levinson, Sanford. *Written in Stone: Public Monuments in Changing Societies*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.
- "Little Rock National Cemetery, Little Rock, Arkansas." National Park Service. [http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/national\\_cemeteries/Arkansas/Little\\_Rock\\_National\\_Cemetery.html](http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/national_cemeteries/Arkansas/Little_Rock_National_Cemetery.html).
- Logue, Larry M. *To Appomattox and Beyond: The Civil War Soldier in War and Peace*. The American Ways Series. Chicago: I.R. Dee, 1996.
- "Marietta National Cemetery, Marietta Georgia." National Park Service. [http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/national\\_cemeteries/Georgia/Marietta\\_National\\_Cemetery.html](http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/national_cemeteries/Georgia/Marietta_National_Cemetery.html).
- Marten, James. "Not a Veteran in the Poorhouse: Civil War Pensions and Soldiers' Homes." In *Wars within a War: Controversy and Conflict over the American Civil War*, edited by Gary W. Gallagher and Joan Waugh. Civil War America. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009.
- McConnell, Stuart C. *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- . "The Patriotic Boom." In *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader*, edited by Larry M. Logue and Michael Barton. New York: New York University Press, 2007.
- McPherson, James M. *This Mighty Scourge: Perspectives on the Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

- Merrifield, Kelly. "From Necessity to Honor: The Evolution of National Cemeteries in the United States." National Park Service.  
[http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/national\\_cemeteries/Development.html](http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/national_cemeteries/Development.html).
- Moreau, Joseph. *Schoolbook Nation: Conflicts over American History Textbooks from the Civil War to the Present* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003.
- "National Cemetery Walking Tour: Four Score and Seven Years Ago...". Soldiers' National Cemetery, Gettysburg, PA.
- "Park Administration and History: Dedications of State Monuments." National Park Service. <http://www.shilohbattlefield.org/new/admhiswar14.htm>.
- Peters, James Edward. "Confederate Memorial." Arlington National Cemetery.  
<http://www.arlingtoncemetery.mil/Explore-the-Cemetery/Monuments-and-Memorials/Confederate-Memorial>.
- Pierce, Bessie Louise. *Public Opinion and the Teaching of History in the United States* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1926.
- Prechtel-Klusken, Claire. "'A Reasonable Degree of Promptitude': Civil War Pension Application Processing, 1861-1885." *Prologue Magazine* 42, no. 1 (2010).  
<http://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/2010/spring/civilwarpension.html>.
- Privilege, The Apartments at Ames. "Historic Mill Living, Redesigned."  
<http://amesprivilege.com/>.
- "Rise of Industrial America, 1876-1900: Immigration to the United States, 1851-1900." The Library of Congress.  
<http://www.loc.gov/teachers/classroommaterials/presentationsandactivities/presentations/timeline/riseind/immgnts/>.
- Ronald J. Zboray, Mary Saracino Zboray. *Literary Dollars and Social Sense: A People's History of the Mass Market Book*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Savage, Kirk. *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Sefton, James E. *Andrew Johnson and the Uses of Constitutional Power* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1980.

- Silber, Nina. *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865-1900*. Civil War America. edited by Gary W. Gallagher Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993.
- Sklanksy, Jeffrey. *The Soul's Economy: Market Society and Selfhood in American Thought, 1820-1920* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- "Soldier's Monument, Middletown." Connecticut Historical Society.  
[http://www.chs.org/finding\\_aides/ransom/066.htm](http://www.chs.org/finding_aides/ransom/066.htm).
- Spurgeon, Ian M. "Picket." In *Encyclopedia of the American Civil War: A Political, Social, and Military History*, edited by Jeanne T. Heidler David S. Heidler. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2000.
- Steven Burg, David Maher, Charles Evans. "Historic Site Report for the Locust Grove Cemetery Shippensburg, Pennsylvania." Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, 2007.
- Wiebe, Robert H. *The Search for Order: 1877-1920*. The Making of America Series. edited by David Donald New York: Hill and Wang, 1968.