SCULPTING THE CITIZEN SOLDIER:

REPRODUCTION AND NATIONAL MEMORY,

1865-1917

by

Sarah Denver Beetham

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the University of Delaware in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Art History

Spring 2014

UMI Number: 3631153

UMI

Dissertation Publishing

UMI 3631153

ProQuest

SCULPTING THE CITIZEN SOLDIER:

REPRODUCTION AND NATIONAL MEMORY,

1865-1917

by

Sarah Denver Beetham

Approved: _____
Lawrence Nees, Ph.D.
Chair of the Department of Art History

Approved: _____
George H. Watson, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Approved: _____
James G. Richards, Ph.D.
Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Education

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____
Wendy Bellion, Ph.D.
Professor in charge of dissertation

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____
Sandy Isenstadt, Ph.D.
Member of dissertation committee

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____
J. Ritchie Garrison, Ph.D.
Member of dissertation committee

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____
Kirk Savage, Ph.D.
Member of dissertation committee

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasure to look back on the dissertation process and to reflect on the great debt I owe to the colleagues, friends, family and institutions who assisted me on this journey. I am deeply grateful to my advisor, Wendy Bellion, who over the years has been a mentor, advocate, and friend. She has given me both the freedom to find myself as a scholar and the intellectual and emotional support I have needed to grow, and for this I am in her debt. Thanks are also due to the members of my dissertation committee, Sandy Isenstadt, Ritchie Garrison, and Kirk Savage, whose feedback and suggestions have shaped this study. I have been fortunate to receive the support and encouragement of the faculty of the University of Delaware, and I am especially grateful to Camara Holloway, Lauren Petersen, Vimalin Rujivacharakul, and Bernard Herman for their guidance. Conversations with Alan Braddock, Jenny Carson, and Jennifer Wingate were also an enormous help to me.

I could not have completed my dissertation without the generous support offered by the University of Delaware and several other institutions during the course of the project. In June 2010, with the support of a Dissertation Development Grant from the University of Delaware, I studied and documented soldier monuments in thirty-seven towns across New England. During that same summer, I spent six weeks in Italy with the assistance of an Ailsa Mellon Bruce Predoctoral Fellowship for

iv

Amanda Douberley about American sculpture have kept my head in the game. And I am deeply indebted to Ann Fangmann, Katie Wood Kirchhoff, and Cara Zimmerman for their warmth, good humor, and sympathy over the years.

I could not have completed this dissertation without the love and care of the Beetham and Mahoney families, especially John, Michael, Belinda, Erin, Judy, Rick, Teddy, and Jamie. Special thanks are due to Abby and Jelly for their careful supervision of late-stage dissertation edits and wordless emotional support. My parents, Donald Beetham and Mary Denver, have been a constant source of inspiration and guidance. Their love affair with each other and with the discipline of art history began at the University of Pennsylvania in the 1970s, and their passion for art and the built environment has greatly influenced my life. They were present at every stage of this dissertation, listening patiently to early explanations of my ideas and encouraging me to keep at it. For this, I thank them.

My deepest affection belongs to Charlie Mahoney, who lived and breathed the American soldier monument along with me for the past four years. Through flashes of inspiration and weeks of writer's block, through the roads of rural Georgia and the traffic of suburban Boston, he has remained a constant and steady presence. He has been a perpetual source of strength and hilarity, and his belief in me has kept me going. This dissertation is dedicated to him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

xix

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the development of the citizen soldier monument: the profusion of figures, obelisks, and columns that appeared after the Civil War in honor of the war veteran. I explore the citizen soldier monument in an effort to understand the relations between sculptural form, the formation of national memory, and the marketing of multiplied art in the late nineteenth century. Engaging with the work of scholars of Civil War memory outside the field of art history, including David Blight, John R. Neff, Drew Gilpin Faust, and Eric T. Dean, I offer a new interpretation of the importance of the citizen soldier monument in the American landscape. I propose that the citizen soldier monument is a phenomenon catering to the memorial needs of a culture struggling with meaning in the wake of America's first modern war. In this context, the soldier monument, so often interpreted as lacking originality, became an emblem for the enormity of Civil War death, the connection between local loss and national memory, and the tastes of a public trained to experience sculpture through plaster casts and other copies. In considering why these statues look the way they do, and how they came to be so popular, I propose that sculptural form is key to understanding the creation of national memory in the wake of the Civil War.

In Chapter Two, I investigate the relationship between the monumental soldier, the reality of postwar life for the veteran, and the commemoration of the dead in the

context of the nascent monument industry in the former Union states. Chapter Three considers how Southern Confederate monuments, using the same classical iconographies of victory employed in the North, negotiated the delicate ground of memorializing a lost cause during Reconstruction. In Chapter Four, I read Daniel Chester French's *Minuteman* as an emblem of Civil War commemoration, placing the *Minuteman* alongside the heightened rhetoric of Civil War reconciliation encouraged by the 1876 Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia. And finally, Chapter Five examines the Spanish-American War, where copies of *Hikers* created by Theo Alice Ruggles Kitson and Allen George Newman were marketed by prestigious foundries, mirroring the global imperial concerns of the war in the standardization of production.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In a quiet glade amid the trees and lawns of Boston's Forest Hills Cemetery, a bronze soldier of the American Civil War stands on a low plinth with his rifle clutched in front of him (figure 1.1). His posture is reminiscent of parade rest, a pose often assumed by soldiers on ceremonial occasions, but in this case the figure gazes downward and to his right with a wistful air (figure 1.2). Dressed in a Union forage cap and overcoat, the soldier evokes a cold winter's night of guard duty. His unbearded face reflects the youthfulness of the typical Union recruit, and his pensive expression sets an appropriate funereal mood for a war memorial to those who lost their lives in the Civil War. The base of the statue declares that it was "Erected by the City of Roxbury in honor of Her Soldiers, who died for their Country in the Rebellion of 1861-1865." Its grassy clearing is enclosed with a low stone fence inscribed with the names, units, and dates of death of the Civil War soldiers of the Boston suburb of Roxbury. Overall, the monument is part gravestone and part triumph, mourning the deaths of the young soldiers of Roxbury while honoring their valorous deeds in war.

Statues like this belonged to an explosive new phenomenon in sculpture in the wake of the American Civil War: the monument to the citizen soldier. In response to the staggering loss of more than 750,000 men in four bloody years of war, towns across the United States erected statues, columns, obelisks, triumphal arches, multi-figure groups and other monument forms to honor and celebrate the sacrifice of Civil

War soldiers.[1] The citizen soldier monument has generally and rightly been read in the context of what Erika Doss identifies as "statue mania," the sudden vogue for public statuary in the postbellum decades.[2] But there are rich connections with other cultural spheres, including the Victorian culture of death, the nineteenth-century interest in replicated art, and the growing monument industry. These monuments appeared in the North, South, East, and West, mostly in states that had participated in the conflict, but also in far-flung territories that sent their young men to the war and achieved statehood later. This sudden and massive outpouring of memorial sculpture was the effect, in part, of an American monument industry that was only just beginning to form, and sculptors and carvers in the United States and abroad benefited from this new demand for their services. To produce enough statues to meet the demand, artists and monument forms took advantage of the replicability of sculpture: through the use of casting or measuring devices, it was possible to fabricate exact copies of popular soldier figures. The rush to commemorate the soldiers of the Civil War inspired tributes to the veterans of other American wars, and the postbellum decades saw the erection of several monuments to the soldiers of the Revolutionary War and, later, the Spanish-American War. In considering why these statues look the way they do, and

---

[1] The figures for the total number of Civil War soldier dead come from a recent study by J. David Hacker, who used census data to demonstrate that Civil War deaths, especially among Confederate soldiers, had been underreported. Hacker's figure of approximately 750,000 dead has already been widely accepted by Civil War historians, and the old figure of 620,000 has been replaced. See J. David Hacker, "A Census-Based Count of the Civil War Dead," *Civil War History* 57, no. 4 (December 2011): 307-348.

[2] Erika Doss, *Memorial Mania: Public Feeling in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 24.

how they came to be so popular, I propose that sculptural form is key to understanding the creation of national memory in the wake of the Civil War.

This study contextualizes and problematizes the relationship between the physical appearance of these statues and the political, historical, and cultural landscapes in which they appeared. The soldier monuments that appeared after the Civil War and throughout the postbellum era varied in size, materials, and design. Some were columns and others were triumphal arches. Some had multiple figures representing various branches of the armed forces or bas-reliefs of war scenes, while others had no figural sculptural elements at all. But by far the most popular motif for soldier monuments through the end of the nineteenth century was the figure of the single infantryman, standing with his rifle. Depending on available funds, a particular town might add additional elements to the infantry figure, or eliminate it entirely. But for most locales in the postbellum era, the standing soldier was the iconic figure that represented America at war. Because this single figure iconography was a feature of soldier monuments across the nation, variations in that figure speak to the memorial needs of particular locations and contexts. Thus, this project gleans specific insights from a battered but dignified sandstone sentinel in Hartford, Connecticut; a shattered soldier whose remains are displayed prone in a museum in Elberton, Georgia; a proud and slender Revolutionary minute man on the battlefield in Concord, Massachusetts; and a muscle-bound Hiker of the Spanish-American War in Morristown, New Jersey. Through variations in iconography, physicality, and spatial context, these statues offer illuminating views of specific moments in time.

The single-figure soldier monument offered artists an opportunity to explore representations of the human body in a nationalistic, memorial context. Depicting the

human figure has long been an artistic trope for sculptors, and in sculpting the citizen soldier, nineteenth-century American soldiers looked to connect with famous artists from earlier eras. The bodies sculpted for nineteenth-century soldier monuments were invariably white and male, privileging a certain type of individual for ideal citizenship. Sculptors of monuments experimented with ways to represent this white, male figure, drawing from tropes from other artistic eras, including antiquity and the Renaissance. Even the simplest, most often-reproduced soldiers stood in classical *contrapposto*, and more ambitious figures, such as Daniel Chester French's 1875 *Minute Man*, took on more dynamic poses that emulated famous classical works, such as the Roman *Apollo Belvedere*. In part, this is a story of sculpted human forms and the methods used to reproduce and market them.

A key aspect of this study examines the marketing of the citizen soldier monument in the context of the culture of artistic reproductions that dominated the American nineteenth century. The most popular designs for soldier monuments were reproduced over and over, both by the companies that developed them and through unauthorized emulation. In both North and South, the citizen soldier monument was proliferated through a network of sculptors, carvers, foundries, and quarries both domestic and foreign. These monuments are now so numerous that for many viewers they have become almost invisible. Indeed, in 1919, critic Adeline Adams called them an "army of bronze simulacra."[3]

But as this study argues, the formal *sameness* of the soldier monuments may be what made them effective: the visual repetition that united small towns connected

---

[3] Adeline Adams, "War Memorials in Sculpture," *Scribners* 65 (March 1919): 381.

local trauma to national memory. The citizen soldier monument was a potent symbol precisely because of its repetitive mimetic qualities, making it a highly recognizable and legible form. The demand for soldier monuments stimulated the growth of an American industry for the production of monumental sculpture, encouraging foundries to hone their skills in creating works of fine art. Soldier figures were reproduced both on a monumental scale and as table-top bronzes for domestic settings. This replicative process can be understood alongside other forms of copied art, including chromolithography and the sculptures of John Rogers.[4] The replication of the citizen soldier monument encapsulates many of the themes important to the study of nineteenth-century American sculpture.

The nineteenth-century soldier monument is also a lens through which the era's social, political and historical context may be better understood. Representing a white, male, and able-bodied citizenry, the typical soldier statue is implicated in the era's changing political landscape. The monument sets these narrow parameters for citizenship at a time when those rules were changing. Even as the government of the United States moved slowly toward a more inclusive citizenry, the citizen soldier monument – almost always white and male – devalued the worthiness of any individuals who did not conform to its idealized body. African American soldiers and women of all races who aided the war effort were written out of the story told visually by the soldier monument. The meaning of this erasure is further shaded by the location

[4] See Michael Clapper, "Reconstructing a Family: John Rogers's Taking the Oath and Drawing Rations," *Winterthur Portfolio* 39, no. 4 (Winter 2004): 259-278; Joni L. Kinsey, *Thomas Moran's West: Chromolithography, High Art, and Popular Taste* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, Joslyn Art Museum, 2006); Kimberly Orcutt, ed., *John Rogers: American Stories* (New York: Philip Wilson Publishers, 2010).

of a statue in the North or the South, and whether it represents the Civil War,

Revolutionary War, or Spanish-American War. The able-bodied, idealized soldier

statue also contrasted with the real body of the soldier returning from war, physically

and psychologically scarred from war's terrible wounds. In a Northern context, the

idealized soldier monument presented a simplified notion of victory, erasing

references to individuals who might point to the war's unfinished business. African

Americans, still waiting for the promise of civic acceptance to be fulfilled, and

disabled soldiers, whose fractured bodies recalled the divided nation, complicated the

narrative of Union triumph. Southerners were comfortable with the disabled veteran as

a symbol of the Lost Cause, but the Confederate soldier statues that dominated their

civic spaces reinforced white supremacist rule in the years following the end of

Reconstruction. Revolutionary War statues honored the minute man, who fought

against British rule but also mobilized to protect white society from the threat of slave

rebellion or Native American attack. And the brawny proportions of the sculpted

Spanish-American War soldier belied the disease-ridden, dreary experience that many

volunteer soldiers experienced during the war.

As an iconographic type, the lone idealized figure, standing atop a pedestal,

presented a solution to the memorialization of a mass number of soldiers that was

unlike any of the illustrative or memorial art produced to represent soldiers during the

war. During and after the war, the thousands of men who fought and died in the

conflict were represented through a number of visual strategies that played on the

tension between the individuality of particular soldiers and their participation in a

group. In newspaper engravings of regiments mobilizing for war, many illustrators

relied on a representational technique that blurred the soldiers into a faceless, disciplined mass.

Consider an illustration of German volunteers massing before City Hall in New York City that appeared in *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper* in 1861: a motley crowd of admirers looks on as the regiment is presented with its flags (figure 1.3). The civilian crowd is made up of men and women of differing heights and in varying costumes, grouped organically across the front of the picture plane. But in the middle ground stands the regiment, all in the exact same position, at the exact same height, wearing the exact same uniforms. The soldiers on the front lines can at least be identified as distinct figures, but those behind them are rendered only as kepi-wearing heads, receding diagonally into the distance until the regiment blurs into an unintelligible mass of lines. This strategy for rendering a large crowd of soldiers probably saved the artist considerable time in preparing the sketch, and it also may echo the way in which a casual observer might have taken in the spectacle of the regimental ceremony. But for the civilian onlooker with a relative in the regiment, the experience would have been very different. Instead of glancing over an array of soldiers, these individuals would have searched for a son, father, brother, or husband, picking out that one well-loved face from the crowd. This phenomenon is expressed in an account of Kansas volunteers returning from the Spanish-American War on parade, with "every mother's son of them being watched and gloated over by their kin, who 'pointed with pride' from the crowd."[5] For the local onlookers watching a regiment of

---

[5] Justin Dragosani-Brantingham, "'Proud Are We': Private Rhinehart and the College Company of the Twenty-Second Kansas Volunteers," *Kansas History* 22, no. 2 (1999): 115.

young men from the same town departing for or returning from war, there was no such thing as a faceless mass of soldiers.

A similar display of specific identities in a uniform setting is at play in the soldiers' cemeteries that began appearing toward the end of the Civil War. In both the North and the South, soldiers' graves were marked with uniform headstones that bore the soldier's name, regiment, and date of death. These headstones were arranged in neat geometric rows that might recall the formation of a regiment on the march or standing at attention, exhibiting perfect discipline (figures 1.4 and 1.5). Even today, the experience of visiting a Civil War cemetery conveys the enormous and overwhelming human cost of the conflict. But as is the case for the marching regiment, the overall visual effect of the cemetery masks the specific stories of individual soldiers. Although the white headstones suggest military uniformity, each grave names a soldier who is buried on that spot. Thus, the individual soldier's physical remains are represented within the unit, and it is possible for the visitor to seek out an experience with a particular grave. In a mass of conformity, one finds specificity.

The soldier monument operates somewhat differently. While some of these monuments reside in cemeteries, most are far removed from the remains of the soldiers they honor. They are not composed of a mass of faces where one can pick out a loved one, or a mass of graves where one can visit an individual gravesite. Instead, the soldier monument represents all of the town's soldier dead in one figure. Fittingly, it usually has relatively generic features in order to allow as many citizens as possible to look on its face and see their own relative. The statue stands alone, a guard or sentinel, without his regiment around him. In appearing singly as a representative of

the infantry's rank and file, the citizen soldier monument recalls the tintype photographs that were popular with both the Union and Confederate armies, showing a soldier in uniform gazing at the camera (figures 1.6 and 1.7).[6] These small, personal objects, bearing the faces of specific soldiers, could have served as models for the family members of fallen soldiers who projected their own loved ones' identities onto the soldier monument.

And so the soldier monument, with its idealized visage, may be interpreted as a sign that remembers the individual soldier and connotes the broader concept of American citizenship for which the soldiers fought. Moreover, it is a sign of nonviolence. With rifle held in a resting position, the sculpted soldier waits and watches, but does not fight. In visiting the soldier monument, some viewers may have been reminded of "All Quiet on the Potomac Tonight," a popular poem later set to music that was first published in *Harper's Weekly* in 1861. In the poem, Ethel Lynn Beers tells the story of a lonely picket guard shot and killed while on duty one night, thinking of his wife and children as his spirit leaves his body. The poem begins:

> "All quiet along the Potomac," they say,
> "Except now and then a stray picket
> Is shot, as he walks on his beat, to and fro,
> By a rifleman hid in the thicket.
>
> 'T is nothing—a private or two, now and then,
> Will not count in the news of the battle;
> Not an officer lost—only one of the men,

---

[6] For a recent discussion of soldiers' tintypes in the Civil War, with many fine full-color examples, see Jeff L. Rosenheim, *Photography and the American Civil War* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2013).

Moaning out, all alone, the death rattle."[7]

Unlike some of the most famous monuments that would be raised during the nineteenth century, the citizen soldier statue was not a battle monument. Hence it does not commemorate the valor of a particular unit on a particular field. Indeed, it does not remember only the soldiers who died in battle, but also the victims of disease or the isolated pickets commemorated in Beers' poem. It represents the rank-and-file soldier, not the general officer. The soldier monument is thereby a site as well as a statue, a conceptual space where the enlisted man and his family can mediate the relationship between his individual participation in military conflict and the aims and goals of the nation.

Structure of the Dissertation

The four chapters of this dissertation examine the material, social, historical and memorial implications of the single-figure soldier monument in four different regional contexts. The chapters are arranged in a rough chronology according to the earliest appearance of a significant monument in a particular region or historical moment. Thus, chapters concerning Civil War monuments in the North and South are followed by a chapter that considers the renewed interest in Revolutionary War soldiers at the time of the nation's Centennial, and another that explores how the Civil War monument informed statues to the Spanish-American War. In the postbellum era, however, these chronological borders are not easily drawn. The first Northern monuments to feature a soldier figure appeared years before similar statues in the

---

[7] Ethel Lynn Beers, "All Quiet on the Potomac Tonight," *Harper's Weekly* 5, no. 257 (November 30, 1861): 766.

South, as the war-torn region directed its resources toward rebuilding. Both North and South continued building monuments for decades following the war, and so the chronological span of these chapters overlaps those chapters devoted to later movements.

Regional considerations also resonate across chapters. Revolutionary War statues were produced through the Northern monument industry for Civil War monuments, and the production of Lost Cause monuments to the Confederacy was emboldened by the South's participation in the Spanish-American War. Each chapter looks forward and backward, moreover, as the memorialization of each American conflict is contextualized by looking back at an earlier war or reframing the past through a more current lens. Thus, this dissertation offers a dynamic timeline of the citizen soldier monument, in which several historical strands are interwoven through the production of sentinels in bronze and granite.

Chapter Two examines how the Union states coped with the war's staggering human cost through the erection of memorials. Emerging from a pool of American-born sculptors trained largely in Europe and a homegrown industry of gravestone carving, the soldier monument blended classical tropes and ideas from the nineteenth century's rich mourning culture. Visually, the sculpted infantryman standing at parade rest served as an exemplar of civic virtue, as his posture suggested ceremonial review rather than active combat. But these tall, straight specimens of white Victorian manhood also denied the real experience of war, countering the image of the ruined bodies of veterans returning from the front. The repetition of these popular monument forms at times masked the reality of war, but in sheer numbers across the landscape, they stood as a visual reminder of the psychic pain caused by the war's destruction.

The third chapter views these same decades from a Southern perspective, examining how former Confederates memorialized a lost cause during the Reconstruction era. This chapter centers on the first Elbert County Confederate Monument of Georgia, which was pulled down in 1900 for looking "too Yankee" only to be replaced by a statue that looked the part but was mass-produced by a Northern firm. The story of this unfortunate statue reveals the tension between white Southerners' desire to form a distinct image of Confederate soldiers and the scarcity of Southern infrastructure for producing images in print or sculpture. As I suggest, the nighttime violence against the monument in Elberton carries disturbing resonances with the postwar history of lynching and Southerners' resistance to Northern intervention, for the Confederate monument doubled as a representative of the region's white supremacist goals.

While citizens North and South were erecting monuments to their soldier dead, the nation was also preparing to celebrate its Centennial, inviting comparisons between heroes of the more recent conflict and their Revolutionary forefathers. Chapter Four begins with the *Minute Man*, Daniel Chester French's 1875 bronze statue, dedicated on the one hundredth anniversary of the battle of Concord. Sculpted when French was just twenty-three, this now-famous statue was originally conceived as a simple granite figure on a plain pedestal. If all had gone according to plan, it might have borne a strong resemblance to a similar statue in Concord's sister city of Lexington, erected just four years earlier. Lexington's *Minute Man* was one of four commemorative statues placed in a Memorial Hall honoring the town's Revolutionary and Civil War soldiers; the project slipped into obscurity almost immediately after it was executed. The divergent paths of these two *Minute Men*, one granite and one

bronze, are implicated in the nation's attempt to reconcile its recent conflicted past and the realities of Reconstruction with the celebratory atmosphere of the 1876 Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia.

At the end of the nineteenth century, the domestic crisis of the Civil War gave way to global, imperial concerns. The fifth chapter examines monuments to the soldiers of the Spanish-American War, a brief conflict that expanded American territory and raised questions about whether the United States should seek to build a global empire. The young men who volunteered for the army in 1898 were raised on stories of the Civil War, and the monuments to their fight build on the statues raised by their fathers. Two of the most popular statues of *Hikers* (a name for the soldiers of the Spanish-American War) were designed by Theo Alice Ruggles Kitson and Allen George Newman, and together these statues account for more than seventy-five monuments across the United States. These two *Hikers* take a more naturalistic approach to the standing soldier than do many Civil War soldier monuments, but in privileging an idealized, white male physicality over all other traits, they echo the Civil War's conception of the American hero. Further, these brawny, heroic statues mask the real experiences of many volunteers of the Spanish-American War, who languished in disease-ridden stateside camps rather than deploying overseas. Copied across the nation, the statues echo the global scope of the Spanish-American War.

Methodological Approach

While broad in geographical and temporal scope, this dissertation centers around the monumental figure of the lone infantryman with his rifle, standing atop a plinth inscribed with commemorative text. Even with variations in monumental style, the rifle-bearing infantryman remained a constant, appearing in all geographical

13

regions of the United States. With the advent of large monument firms like Connecticut's Monumental Bronze Company, it became possible for towns across the nation to erect the exact same sculpted soldier, and thus an overcoat-wearing infantryman in Westfield, New Jersey can also be viewed in Denver, Colorado or Goldsboro, North Carolina. In returning again and again to this basic figural type, it is possible to analyze how the sculpted infantryman served the various memorial needs of Northern and Southern towns, and how its iconography could be adapted for soldiers of earlier or later wars. In so doing, this dissertation traces how the single-figure soldier monument served as a visual symbol for the interpretation of American military and cultural history through the crucible of the Civil War.

The citizen soldier monument has received scholarly attention in several important studies. To date, the most comprehensive cultural analysis of soldier monuments has been by Kirk Savage, who in 1997 referred to the citizen soldier as "the most prolific figure in public sculpture."[8] Savage contrasted the typical soldier monument topped by a white male figure with Augustus Saint-Gaudens' *Shaw Memorial*, the first Civil War monument to represent African American soldiers in uniform. In so doing, he raised questions concerning race, gender and materiality that continue to inform this dissertation. This dissertation builds on Savage's work by exploring how the racially white, idealized body of the citizen soldier resonated through the nineteenth century and across the United States, especially in contrast to the real bodies of the soldiers who served in the American military. Savage's work on soldier monuments, largely focused on memorials in Northern cities, is matched by

---

[8] Kirk Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997), 162.

Cynthia Mills and Pamela H. Simpson with their *Monuments to the Lost Cause*, a compilation of essays that laid the groundwork for future explorations of Confederate memory.[9] The essays highlight the role of Southern women in protecting Confederate memory and probe the deep racial and sectional tensions embodied in these monuments. Both of these themes are central to my discussion of Confederate soldier monuments.

Several key studies of American sculpture more generally inform this dissertation. Michael Edward Shapiro's work on bronze casting and Carol Grissom's exhaustive study of the zinc monument industry, both of which feature soldier monuments, have illuminated the material relationships of sculptors to foundries and the processes of copying inherent to the production of monumental sculpture.[10] Compendiums of sculptors' biographies written by Lorado Taft, Wayne Craven, and Charlotte Rubenstein have proved invaluable in recreating the careers of artists of monumental sculpture.[11] Studies of public monuments, race, gender, and the human body by Joy S. Kasson, Michele Bogart, Erika Doss, Melissa Dabakis, and Charmaine

---

[9] Cynthia Mills and Pamela H. Simpson, eds., *Monuments to the Lost Cause: Women, Art, and the Landscapes of Southern Memory* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2003).

[10] Michael Edward Shapiro, *Bronze Casting and American Sculpture, 1850-1900* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1981); Carol Grissom, *Zinc Sculpture in America, 1850-1950* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2009).

[11] Lorado Taft, *History of American Sculpture* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930, first published 1903); Wayne Craven, *Sculpture in America* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1968, reprint: 1984); Charlotte Streifer Rubinstein, *American Women Sculptors: A History of Women Working in Three Dimensions* (Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1990).

Nelson have also informed this dissertation's investigations into how the citizen soldier monument participated in discourses of masculinity and whiteness during a period when public monuments dominated the American landscape.[12]

In identifying how the iconography of the sculpted infantryman developed and changed over time, this dissertation also considers the broader scope of war-related visual culture circulating through the postbellum era. The American soldier's image was shaped not only by sculpture, but also through the exchange of photographs, newspapers, and other printed materials, and through the medium of painting. The writing of this dissertation has taken place at an exciting moment for Civil War scholarship, as the war's sesquicentennial has inspired several art exhibitions and new visual culture studies. Eleanor Harvey recently reexamined several important American landscape paintings from the Civil War era, arguing that their themes of strange astronomical events, tempestuous storms and a natural world at war with itself reference the turbulence of the war era.[13] Civil War photography has also received recent attention, with an exhaustive new catalogue of images by Jeff L. Rosenheim and a new examination of Alexander Gardner's *Photographic Sketch-Book of the Civil*

---

[12] Joy S. Kasson, *Marble Queens and Captives: Women in Nineteenth-Century American Sculpture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990); Michele Bogart, *Public Sculpture and the Civic Ideal in New York City, 1890-1930* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997); Erika Doss, *Memorial Mania*; Melissa Dabakis, *Visualizing Labor in American Sculpture: Monuments, Manliness, and the Work Ethic, 1880-1935* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Charmaine A. Nelson, *The Color of Stone: Sculpting the Black Female Subject in Nineteenth-Century America* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007).

[13] Eleanor Harvey, *The Civil War and American Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012).

War by Anthony Lee and Elizabeth Young.[14] Throughout the Northern states during

the Civil War, photographs of war scenes were widely available alongside illustrated

magazines like *Harper's Weekly* or *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*, political

cartoons, lithographs, broadsides, and even patriotic envelopes.[15] Fewer resources for

producing printed images were available in the South, and most of these were devoted

to official government functions, but a few artists, including Frank Vizetelly of the

Illustrated London News and Conrad Wise Chapman, managed to produce images of

the war from a Confederate perspective.[16] All of this printed and photographic

imagery helped to shape the idea of the citizen soldier in the public mind, influencing

the choices that individual sculptors made in working to produce ideal figures.

The soldier statues that grew from this array of visual imagery commemorated

a difficult and bloody era in American history. This project explores how these

---

[14] Jeff L. Rosenheim, *Photography and the American Civil War*; Anthony W. Lee and Elizabeth Young, *On Alexander Gardner's* Photographic Sketch Book *of the Civil War* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007). See also Timothy Sweet, *Traces of War: Poetry, Photography, and the Crisis of the Union* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990).

[15] Important sources on Northern print culture during the Civil War include Bryan F. Le Beau, *Currier and Ives: America Imagined* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2001); David Tatham, *Winslow Homer and the Pictorial Press* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2003); and Steven R. Boyd, *Patriotic Envelopes of the Civil War: The Iconography of Union and Confederate Covers* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2010).

[16] For instance, see Mark E. Neely, Jr., Harold Holzer, and Gabor S. Boritt, *The Confederate Image: Prints of the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987); Douglas W. Bostick, *The Confederacy's Secret Weapon: The Civil War Illustrations of Frank Vizetelly* (Charleston, SC: The History Press, 2009); and Ben L. Bassham, *Conrad Wise Chapman: Artist & Soldier of the Confederacy* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1998).

sculpted bodies participated in this memorial work, illuminating how the monument was a site for mourning, remembrance, and commemoration of the bodies lost to war. The Civil War was a time of change in American mourning culture, in which the Victorian idea of what Drew Gilpin Faust has called a "good death" was tested by the grisly realities of warfare.[17] In the wake of the Civil War, both North and South had to deal with the innumerable soldier dead left behind by warfare, and while Union soldiers were given honorable burials in newly-created national cemeteries, Confederate remains were interred in burial grounds arranged privately by ladies' memorial associations.[18] And for many families who lost loved ones, these burial grounds were far from home, the soldier relative's gravesite not readily available as a place to mourn or remember.

The monumental soldier body has a relationship not only with the soldier dead, but also with the living veterans returning home from battle. The sculpted soldier is imbued with the wartime experiences of the soldiers he represents, and yet his perfect bronze or granite body stands in contrast to the physical and psychic wounds carried

---

[17] Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008); see also Mark S. Schantz, *Awaiting the Heavenly Country: The Civil War and America's Culture of Death* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008).

[18] The burial and reburial of Civil War soldiers has received a great deal of scholarly attention. For instance, see John R. Neff, *Honoring the Civil War Dead: Commemoration and the Problem of Reconciliation* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2005); William A. Blair, *Cities of the Dead: Contesting the Memory of the Civil War in the South, 1865-1914* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004); Caroline E. Janney, *Burying the Dead but Not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008); and Michael Kammen, *Digging Up the Dead: A History of Notable American Reburials* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 93-109.

by the war's veterans. That tension between the real soldier's body and the sculpted body is central to this dissertation. This study is informed by scholarship on the visual culture of amputation by Lisa Herschbach, J.T.H. Connor, Michael G. Rhode, Robert I. Goler, and Elaine Scarry.[19] With the war's sesquicentennial, the photographs of amputees taken by the Army Medical Museum during and after the Civil War have received much recent attention in conference presentations, and it is probable that there will be much new published research on these images within the next few years. These images of shattered soldiers, while not necessarily intended for public consumption when they were taken, remind the viewer of the visual impact that so many wounded men would have had on the psyche of American citizens living in the decades after the Civil War. The clean, sanitized soldier monument, then, must be considered with these disabled veterans in mind.

The citizen soldier monument appeared during an extremely fraught period in American history, when Northerners and Southerners were working to reconcile their

---

[19] Lisa Herschbach, "Prosthetic Reconstructions: Making the Industry, Re-Making the Body, Modelling the Nation," *History Workshop Journal* 44 (Autumn 1997): 22-57; J.T.H. Connor and Michael G. Rhode, "Shooting Soldiers: Civil War Medical Images, Memory, and Identity in America," *Invisible Culture: An Electronic Journal for Visual Culture*, issue 5: Visual Culture and National Identity [journal on-line]; available from http://www.rochester.edu/in_visible_culture/Issue_5/ConnorRhode/ConnorRhode.html; Internet; accessed 15 November 2011; Robert I. Goler, "Loss and the Persistence of Memory: 'The Case of George Dedlow' and Disabled Civil War Veterans," *Literature and Medicine* 23, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 160-183; Robert I. Goler and Michael G. Rhode, "From Individual Trauma to National Policy: Tracking the Uses of Civil War Veteran Medical Records," in *Disabled Veterans in History*, David A. Gerber, ed. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000); and Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985).

role in the Civil War with the nation's memory of the conflict. This is a period that has rightly received a great deal of attention from historians. Interpretations of the Reconstruction era by Eric Foner and David Blight, which highlight the catastrophic failure of attempts toward racial harmony, have been very important in informing this dissertation.[20] In understanding how Southerners adapted the citizen soldier monument to suit their interpretation of the Civil War, this dissertation has also drawn on the vast literature related to the Lost Cause and Southern culture.[21] In focusing an entire chapter on the Southern memorial landscape, this dissertation participates in recent directions in the field of American art history to consider the artistic production of regions outside the Northeast. While not always produced by Southern artists, the monuments to the Confederacy reflect the region's memorial needs in the wake of the Civil War, reconciling the need to rebuild and to heal in the wake of military defeat with the desire to erect memorial statues.

---

[20] Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution* (New York: Harper Collins, 1988, reprint Perennial Classics, 2002); David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001).

[21] For instance, see David H. Donald, "A Generation of Defeat," in *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader*, Larry M. Logue and Michael Barton, eds. (New York: New York University Press, 2007); Edward L. Ayers, *Vengeance and Justice: Crime and Punishment in the 19th-Century South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984); Michael T. Bernath, *Confederate Minds: The Struggle for Intellectual Independence in the Civil War South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010); Gaines Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865 to 1913* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); and David Goldfield, *Still Fighting the Civil War: The American South and Southern History* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002).

Through the citizen soldier monument, this dissertation newly evaluates the development of an American school for sculpture in the nineteenth century, the relationship between the human body and the sculpted body, the proliferation of copied images through the United States in the postwar era, and the profound effect that the Civil War had on America's image of itself surrounding its Centennial and through the end of the nineteenth century. At a time of renewed interest and energy concerning American sculptural studies, and continued attention to the Civil War during the commemoration of the war's sesquicentennial, this project demonstrates the relationship between American soldier monuments and the practices of sculptural replication that made them possible. Again and again, these sculpted soldiers of the Civil War, Revolutionary War, and Spanish-American War reveal avenues for exploring the relationship between the military hero and aspects of the American psyche. Ultimately, these monuments invite us to consider how our current military struggles connect with the past.

Chapter 2

SOLDIER MONUMENTS OF THE UNION

At what point does a soldier statue become a monument? A badly weathered figure of a Civil War soldier in Hartford, Connecticut seems both a victim of neglect and a site for memory, with a small American flag at the base of the statue representing the community's affection (figure 2.1). The statue's foraging cap, heavy overcoat, and U.S.-labeled belt buckle identify him as a soldier of the Union army, but he lacks other key identifiers of a military subject. The position of the statue's arms suggests the presence of a rifle, but the rifle is long missing, as are the statue's hands. These missing pieces are only the most obvious examples of the statue's overall dilapidated condition. The lower half of the face has been mostly worn away. In many places, the outermost layer of carved stone has been completely chipped away, leaving a lighter shade of rock beneath exposed. Several sections of the overcoat, trousers, and boots are worn in this way. The exposed stump of the right wrist betrays two drill holes, perhaps suggesting that the missing appendage was carved from a separate piece of rock (figure 2.2). The statue evokes both pathos and pride, physically dilapidated and yet marked with patriotic symbolism.

This statue, sometimes called the "Forlorn Soldier," came to its lonely plinth in a roundabout fashion. First created sometime in the 1880s or 1890s by the New

England Granite Works, owned by James Goodwin Batterson, the statue changed hands in 1895 when Batterson sold his monument company to brothers John and Michael Kelly. For the next seven decades, the statue was almost forgotten, "buffeted by flood and bruised by vandals," as a plaque on the statue's base reads today, until 1968, when it was placed at its current site by J. Michael Kelly, a grandson of one of the Kelly brothers who bought the Batterson firm. Even today, the site bears the legacy of the nineteenth-century stonecutting industry, with Pistritto Marble Imports offering "Granite Kitchen Countertops" (figure 2.3). The plaque at the statue's base suggests that it was originally rejected for a "faulty foot position," but this is unlikely. Although the statue's feet are placed counter to the proper position for a soldier at "parade rest," the most common pose for Civil War soldier figures, this same variation appeared in several other soldier statues produced by Batterson's firm, including an 1867 statue carved for the town of Deerfield, Massachusetts (see figure 2.11). More likely, the statue was a leftover piece of inventory from the nineteenth-century boom in citizen soldier monuments, carved but never sold, and inherited by the new owners when Batterson's business changed hands. By setting it up on a pedestal and marking it with explanatory text, J. Michael Kelly imbued it with significance as a monument to the Civil War and to the monument industry.

Hartford's "Forlorn Soldier" provides an opening into the industry that supplied soldier monuments to the former Union states in the years following the Civil War. The statue is one of many like it, carved from stock designs that were circulated both legally and illegally among the monument companies. Its quick, cheap

production and inexpensive material makeup is evident in the way that it has badly weathered over time, with the top layer of carved surface separating from the underlying rock. The statue is in bad shape, the product of an industry that often experimented unwisely with untried materials in order to keep costs down. And yet, even in its dilapidated, forgotten state, left in a marble yard and never dedicated as a particular town's war memorial, something about the statue inspired someone to preserve and revere it. Even in its remote location, the statue is not forgotten, and even though it has never been specifically dedicated to the memory of a particular group of soldiers, its form carries meaning.

The modern treatment of this embryonic monument speaks to the power of the citizen soldier monument as both a national symbol and a marker of local participation in the nation's major historic struggles. After the Civil War, tensions between national and local and history and myth were embodied in the citizen soldier monuments that grew up in Northern and Western cities across the nation in honor of Union soldiers. In the wake of a conflict that had caused more than 750,000 soldier deaths, some visual representation of the nation's remembrance of the conflict was necessary, and the soldier monument quickly emerged as the dominant memorial form. The sudden demand for monuments to the citizen soldier came at a period in American sculptural history when the necessary infrastructure for producing monumental sculpture was only just forming. By 1865, there were only a few bronze foundries in the United States capable of producing fine art sculpture, but the general demand for monuments fed the development of the infrastructure necessary to produce them on a vast scale.

This movement was helped along by trained American sculptors, many of whom had spent time in Italy, and homegrown stonecutters and carvers of gravestones, who adapted their vernacular monument industry to the new demand for Civil War themes. The monuments they produced resonated with and served as a metaphor for the soldier's bodily experience of war, while their sheer number marked the landscape with a visual index of Civil War participation and death. These bronze and granite soldiers offer an opportunity to consider just how Northerners conceptualized and memorialized the role of the citizen at war. While the sculptural form raises questions about the market for sculpture in postwar America and the preponderance of multiplied forms, the iconography of the soldier reveals the nation's deep disquiet with the injured body of the soldier and reflects in numbers the human cost of the conflict. In the historical circumstances surrounding the creation of these statues, one finds the key to their enduring symbolic value.

Postwar Political Landscape and the Birth of the Soldier Monument

Almost immediately after the Civil War ended, Americans began to question how best to memorialize the soldier dead. In choosing how to react to victory in a bitter sectional conflict, Northerners had to decide how the war would be remembered. The living veteran could choose to become reconciled with his former enemies, but the dead had to be reckoned with, their cause defined by a shifting American memory.[22] David W. Blight has suggested that three major strains of Civil War

---

[22] John R. Neff, *Honoring the Civil War Dead: Commemoration and the Problem of Reconciliation* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2005), 6.

memory took shape in these years: the reconciliationist vision, which attempted to find healing after the massive loss of life; the white supremacist vision, which was often violent and closely related to the Southern myth of the Lost Cause; and the emancipationist vision, which attempted to keep the ideals of freedom, equality and African American rights alive in a culture that quickly turned away from them.[23] In Blight's analysis, the reconciliationist vision largely overshadowed the emancipationist concerns, as the rhetoric of abolition and freedom was replaced by the rhetoric of preserving the Union and upholding the Constitution. Blight's categorization of the postwar situation is complicated further by the clash between members of the population who wished to heal the nation's divisions and the Union veterans who insisted that their triumph over the Confederacy must be remembered and honored as the morally virtuous side of the conflict. The complexity of views surrounding the reconciliation of the states is reflected in the commemoration of the war's dead.

Justification for the very existence of war memorials, and their appearance and iconography if attempted, was a chief concern for many American writers in the wake of the Civil War. Some Northerners worried that overzealous commemoration of the war dead and the controversial causes for which they fought might constitute "waving the bloody shirt" or preserving the conflict in a way that might hamper reconciliation

---

[23] David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001), 2.

between the warring sides by dwelling on past wrongs.[24] For the reconstituted nation to survive, war memory had to allow for a cessation of hostilities.

Even among those who agreed that soldiers should be memorialized, the exact visual form of that memory became a point of contention. Some, like Charles Eliot Norton at Harvard, felt that buildings would make better remembrances than monuments. For Norton, who scorned a rival proposal for a bronze column as a "heathen monument" evoking the classical past, a building better expressed the civic intentions of the soldier than a Roman triumphal form. The resulting Memorial Hall became a theater and gathering space.[25] But in the postbellum era, memorial buildings were relatively rare, with purpose-built monuments quickly becoming the most common form of commemoration. In 1866, William Dean Howells advocated for physical monuments, praising proposals for charitable institutions or scholarship funds in honor of soldiers as worthy of truths but reminding his readers that "the poor we have always with us; while this seems the rare occasion meant for the plastic arts to supply our need for beautiful architecture and sculpture." He even allowed that soldier monuments "need not…be toward novel forms of expression" but exhorted communities to choose the best available sculptors and architects to submit designs.[26]

[24] Blight, *Race and Reunion,* 51-53; John S. Farmer, *Americanisms Old and New* (London: Thomas Poulter and Sons, 1889), 65-66.

[25] Linda C. Dowling, *Charles Eliot Norton: The Art of Reform in Nineteenth-Century America* (Lebanon: University of New Hampshire Press, 2007), 64-67. For a discussion of how "living memorials" eventually became the most important form of war memorial in the years following World War II, see Andrew M. Shanken, "Planning Memory: Living Memorials in the United States during World War II." *The Art Bulletin* 84, no. 1 (March 2002): 130-147.

[26] William Dean Howells, "Question of Monuments," *Atlantic Monthly* 18 (May 1866): 646-649.

And yet, commentators like these were only a small part of the story. While Norton, Howells, and others were giving their opinions on monuments in the Northern press, towns and cities across the nation were making their own decisions on how to remember their soldiers, employing anyone who could furnish a monument. Both academically-trained sculptors and local craftsmen contributed to this decentralized popular art movement.

The Civil War broke out at a time when the American sculptural tradition was still in its developing stages. While the eighteenth century had seen a developing tradition in gravestone carving and early efforts in wood sculpture by individuals such as Samuel McIntire, in Salem, and William Rush, in Philadelphia, the first sculptures in marble and bronze by American-born artists were not produced until the 1820s. By the 1860s, most American sculptors were interested in producing ideal marble works in a neoclassical style, and most artists were faced with a choice of whether to study or even settle permanently in Italy, then the center for sculptural production in the Western world. Sculptors like Hiram Powers, whose *Greek Slave* became an international sensation in the 1850s, or Harriet Hosmer, who became the most famous member of a colony of American female sculptors, chose to set up permanent workshops in Florence or Rome. Others, like Erastus Dow Palmer of Albany, New York, tried their fortunes in the young nation. Palmer's Albany studio became something of a Mecca for young sculptors, and he trained a generation of artists who chose to practice within the United States. When the war created a need for monumental sculpture, artists abroad and at home took advantage of the sudden demand for their skills. While many of the more established artists opted for specialized commissions for standing figures or equestrian statues of famous generals

and statesmen from the war, many participated in the nascent commemoration of the average man in the form of the citizen soldier monument.

Probably the first citizen soldier monument featuring a figure of a standardized Union soldier was the *Sentinel* or *Soldier of the Line* of Spring Grove Cemetery in Cincinnati, Ohio, modeled by Randolph Rogers in 1864 and cast by the Royal Foundry in Munich in 1865 (figure 2.4).[27] Rogers, an expatriate American sculptor living in Rome, was at this point known for his neoclassical figures of mythological or Biblical subjects, especially his *Nydia, the Blind Flower Girl of Pompeii*, first modeled in 1853-1854 and representing a character from Edward Bulwer-Lytton's popular novel, *The Last Days of Pompeii*. The *Sentinel* depicts a Union soldier in overcoat and foraging cap, slightly over life size, with his rifle held diagonally across his chest, a pose that was not often repeated in soldier monuments during the ensuing decades. Primary source documents suggest that Rogers did not think of himself as creating a new type of monument, or that he considered how his soldier monument would participate in the making of postwar memory. Working during the war, Rogers seems to have been largely influenced by patriotic fervor and his interest in supporting the ongoing war effort. A *Harper's New Monthly* article details the sculpting of the soldier:

---

[27] The author's identification of this statue as the first single-figure soldier monument honoring the Civil War is based on exhaustive searches within the Smithsonian's Inventory of American Sculpture, a thorough database of extant sculpture in America populated with the assistance of local volunteers. It is possible that an earlier model exists, but the identity of such a sculpture has not yet been determined through research. For a discussion of the Rogers statue, see Millard F. Rogers, Jr., *Randolph Rogers: American Sculptor in Rome* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1971), 92-93.

> An English lady chanced to enter [Rogers'] studio, and being told that in this statue she might see a brave of the ideal United States army, remarked eagerly, "Ah, yes. It is Stonewall Jackson, I suppose;" he being the only hero among his cousins of whose exploits John Bull permits his unsophisticated family to read. "No, Madam, on the contrary," replied the loyal sculptor with distinct emanation, "this is the man who shot him!"[28]

Rogers' enthusiasm for the Union cause and for the demise of a military leader who would later become one of the heroes of the Southern Lost Cause reflects the climate of the mid-war period when the *Sentinel* was modeled. Although by 1864 the outcome of the war was reaching a point of inevitability, the war was still ongoing, and Rogers was clearly uninterested in producing art, at least at this point, that would promote reconciliation with the secessionist South.

Rogers would go on to collaborate on some of the grandest monuments to the citizen soldier erected in the first decade after the close of the Civil War, including his *Soldiers National Monument* at Gettysburg, begun in 1865 and dedicated in 1869; *Rhode Island Soldiers and Sailors Monument* of Providence, Rhode Island, begun in 1866 and dedicated in 1871; and *Michigan Soldiers and Sailors Monument* of Detroit, Michigan, begun in 1869 and dedicated in 1872. All of these monuments employed multiple military and allegorical figures combined with imposing, multi-stepped architectural forms. The *Michigan Soldiers and Sailors Monument*, the most elaborate of the three, serves as the most fully realized example of Rogers' monumental vision (figure 2.5). The eight-sided column is divided into four tiers and topped with a ten-foot allegorical figure of Michigan. From the bottom upward, the lower tiers consist of: a series of four projecting plinths decorated with eagles; a series of four soldier

---

[28] "American Studios in Rome and Florence," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine* 33, no. 193 (June 1866): 104.

statues representing Army, Navy, Cavalry, and Artillery, and separated by relief portraits of Abraham Lincoln, Ulysses S. Grant, William T. Sherman, and David Farragut; and a series of four seated female allegories representing Victory, Union, History, and Emancipation, separated by various government seals and a plaque bearing the monument's inscription.[29] With his designs for Detroit and Providence, Rogers set a precedent for honoring multiple branches of the armed services in a single monument, spawning designs including figures of Army and Navy only, or, more opulently, Army, Navy, Cavalry, and Artillery. These "soldiers' and sailors'" monuments were popular in locations where the large sums to erect them could be raised, whether through local wealth or a particularly favorable political environment, and they represent the lavish lengths to which some cities went to honor their fallen soldiers.

Just as my research suggests that Randolph Rogers can be credited with modeling the first citizen soldier figure and popularizing the more elaborate soldiers' and sailors' monument, Martin Milmore is one of the first individuals to produce a soldier monument that would be replicated in several Northern towns. Born in Sligo, Ireland, Milmore immigrated to the United States with his parents and three brothers at the age of five and settled in Boston. His elder brother, Joseph, trained as a marble cutter and sculptor. The younger Milmore soon joined his brother in the trade. Martin Milmore received further instruction in the studio of Thomas Ball, and, at the age of twenty, when the war ended, he was prepared to devote his career to the production of citizen soldier monuments. Milmore produced several designs for various New

---

[29] Dennis Alan Nawrocki, *Art in Detroit Public Places* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1980), 18.

England towns, but none proved quite as popular as a soldier monument that he modeled for the Forest Hills Cemetery in the Roxbury suburb of Boston (figure 2.6). Generally called the *Roxbury Soldiers' Monument* in period literature, the statue portrays a Union soldier in an overcoat and foraging cap, leaning on his rifle. The statue gazes downward and to the left in a posture that has often been interpreted as "indicative of grief" or "contemplating the graves of his comrades."[30] This sober, reflective posture was highly effective for the statue's original location within a quiet glade in one of Boston's garden cemeteries. Later, the sculpture was replicated in at least six other towns in both cemetery and civic settings, both during Milmore's lifetime and after his untimely death at the age of thirty-eight in 1883.[31]

The reception of Milmore's Roxbury soldier and other designs for Civil War soldier monuments points to the early stages of a rift between the local communities responsible for erecting war memorials and the art critics in major cities who appraised their merits. This debate recalls earlier conversations about how and whether to memorialize the war, and shows that a community's goals in commissioning a war memorial were often not the same as those of the art world. As would be expected, mentions of the designs in local newspapers or in materials accompanying a monument's dedication are generally glowing. In 1869, the *New*

---

[30] "Military Notes: Dedication of a Soldiers' Monument," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, September 8, 1873; "Death of Martin Milmore," *Boston Morning Journal*, July 23, 1883.

[31] Known replicas of the *Roxbury Soldiers Monument* were erected in Claremont, New Hampshire in 1869; Peterborough, New Hampshire in 1869; Amherst, New Hampshire in 1871; Chester, Pennsylvania in 1873; York, Pennsylvania in 1874; and Waterville, Maine in 1876.

Hampshire Patriot declared that Milmore's "easy" and "graceful" monument in Claremont, New Hampshire, had "done him honor."[32] Also in 1869, the *Boston Daily Journal*, showing a strong desire to drive the point home, called the Woburn *Soldiers' Monument* "one of the best specimens of a soldier yet cast in bronze" and "one of the finest monuments that has yet been erected in memory of our fallen soldiers" (figure 7).[33] These early glowing notices from local newspapers gave way to harsh criticisms beginning in the 1880s. In 1894, sculptor Truman H. Bartlett, reviewing the civic monuments of New England, called the Roxbury soldier "the most suggestive of ridicule of any in Boston," citing the statue's attempt to express sadness in what he considers a "thoughtless" manner.[34] A brief respite from criticism accompanies the deaths of Martin and Joseph Milmore in 1883 and 1886, respectively, but even an overall glowing obituary of Joseph Milmore makes reference to the "loathsome caricaturing" of the Milmore brothers' style due to "a demand for cheap soldiers' monuments."[35] Two 1894 articles reviewing the public monuments of Boston cement the ultimately tepid reception of Milmore's work, at least in high art circles. Frank T. Robinson calls Milmore's 1877 *Soldiers' and Sailors' Monument* for Boston Common a "lamentable failure," but praises his "vastly superior" Charlestown monument of

---

[32] "The Claremont Soldiers' Monument," *New Hampshire Patriot*, October 27, 1869.

[33] "Woburn – Soldiers' Monument," *Boston Daily Journal*, September 9, 1869.

[34] Truman H. Bartlett, "Civic Monuments in New England, IV," *The American Architect and Building News* 10, no. 289 (July 9, 1881): 15.

[35] "Death of Joseph Milmore," *American Architect and Building News* 19, no. 527 (January 30, 1886): 49.

1871 as "one of the few in the country…which impresses."[36] And finally, William Howe Downes dismisses the Boston Common monument as "one of the poorest monuments in Boston, and even one of the poorest army and navy monuments of all the innumerable poor ones in the country," and calls the Charlestown monument "puerile" and "hardly worth serious consideration as sculpture."[37] Ironically, Downes' criticisms of Milmore's work appear just below effusive praise of Daniel Chester French's *Milmore Memorial*, also called *The Angel of Death and the Sculptor*, a tribute to the Milmore brothers' untimely deaths. Downes foreshadows Milmore's current reputation in American sculptural studies, in which he is remembered more as a subject of French's work than as a sculptor in his own right.

Other sculptors of note also contributed designs for soldier monuments. John Quincy Adams Ward, the most celebrated American monument sculptor in the mid-nineteenth century, designed his only citizen soldier monument to be placed in New York's Central Park. The *Seventh Regiment Memorial* is a generic soldier figure leaning on his rifle, of the type already popularized by Randolph Rogers and Martin Milmore (figure 2.8). Completed in 1869 and unveiled in 1874, the statue stands on a base designed by Richard Morris Hunt. Intriguingly, an earlier design for the monument included two seated groups that would have appeared below the central figure: one of two soldiers relaxing in camp, and the other of a wounded soldier, with one of his fellows tending to him. That these groups were never realized in the final

---

[36] Frank T. Robinson, "Sculptured Monuments of Boston," *Monumental News* 6, no. 7 (July 1894): 335.

[37] William Howe Downes, "Monuments and Statues in Boston," *New England Magazine* 11, no. 3 (November 1894): 354, 361.

model is probably at least partially a testament to lack of funding, but, as will be explored later, they also may have undermined the citizen soldier monument's ability to transcend postwar anxieties about the human cost of the war.[38] Among the many other sculptors who designed soldier monuments were Launt Thompson, trained in the Albany studio of Erastus Dow Palmer; James Edward Kelly, a New York artist who spent his entire career in the United States and made a name for himself by focusing on famous war veterans; and Caspar Buberl, a German immigrant who worked almost exclusively on monuments for Union and Confederate soldiers, often in zinc or white bronze.

While trained sculptors were instrumental in developing some of the initial ideas for soldier monuments, manufacturing companies were necessary to enable these designs to be executed in metal or stone, and many of these companies eventually branched out from relying on artists to producing monuments based on simple prototypes. Many of these companies began by producing related goods, such as cemetery markers or munitions, and adapted their skills with the explosion of the market for soldier monuments. By the end of the nineteenth century, the monument industry was widespread enough to support its own trade journals, including the *Monumental News*, which began publishing in 1889.

Three monument firms active in the first years after the Civil War demonstrate the pathways for the creation of soldier monuments. These are the Ames Manufacturing Company of Chicopee, Massachusetts, which began as a cutlery business, expanded to the manufacture of arms, and began casting monuments at the

---

[38] Lewis I. Sharp, *John Quincy Adams Ward: Dean of American Sculpture, with a Catalogue Raisonné* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1985), 51-53, 172-177.

urging of sculptor Henry Kirke Brown; the New England Granite Works of Hartford, Connecticut, headed by stonecutter and insurance salesman James G. Batterson; and the Monumental Bronze Company of Bridgeport, Connecticut, one of the largest producers of soldier monuments and other outdoor sculpture in zinc, also called white bronze. All three firms were based in New England, but they spawned an industry that spread across the United States, with similar firms appearing in southern and western states. Based on their representative character and on the availability of documentary material, these three companies show how mass-produced monuments were distributed in the Northern and Western states.

The Ames Manufacturing Company, founded by and named for James Tyler Ames, began manufacturing cutlery in 1829 and quickly expanded into making cannon and swords, becoming the largest supplier of these goods to the federal government by the mid-1840s. In 1851, the firm was approached by American-born sculptor Henry Kirke Brown, who had received training in Italy between 1842 and 1846 but preferred to work within the United States. Brown, distraught over the lack of American foundries that could handle his sculptures, understood that a flourishing national sculpture tradition would need skilled artisans who could cast fine art bronze. After conducting some experiments in bronze casting on a small scale in his own Brooklyn studio, he sought outside assistance from firms that had experience in other forms of casting. Ames agreed to experiment in fine art casting, and with the aid of some advice from a few European foundries, his company flourished in the production of sculpture. Within a few years, the Ames Manufacturing Company was also accepting work from other sculptors, including Thomas Ball and Richard S. Greenough, and by 1856, the foundry had a high-profile success with Brown's

equestrian statue of George Washington for New York's Union Square. With the onset of the Civil War, the company switched its focus back to the production of arms, but as the war ended and a new demand for sculpture ensued, Ames was uniquely positioned to take advantage of a burgeoning market.[39]

After the war ended, the Ames Manufacturing Company went back to producing monuments, and continued to do so through the end of the nineteenth century. While the Ames output of soldier monuments was not as far-reaching as some companies that would emerge a little later, the firm's soldier monuments did include some important prototypes, including all known examples of Martin Milmore's *Roxbury Soldier*. In addition to Milmore's works, the firm produced several equestrian statues, sculptural groups intended for Abraham Lincoln's tomb in Springfield, Illinois, and soldier monuments by other sculptors, including Karl Gerhardt and Melzar Hunt Mosman. In 1875, the Ames Manufacturing Company cast Daniel Chester French's first major sculptural commission, the *Minuteman*, for Concord, Massachusetts, based upon a recommendation the young French had received from John Quincy Adams Ward, who had in turn studied with Henry Kirke Brown. An intriguing note on the *Minuteman* is that it was cast from melted-down Civil War cannon, a material that must have been readily available for a manufacturer of arms.[40]

---

[39] Shapiro, *Bronze Casting and American Sculpture*, 50-60; Wayne Craven, "Henry Kirke Brown: His Search for an American Art in the 1840's," *American Art Journal* 4, no. 2 (November 1972): 44-58.

[40] Shapiro, *Bronze Casting and American Sculpture*, 78-81; *Proceedings at the Centennial Celebration of Concord Fight, April 19, 1875* (Concord, Mass.: Published by the Town, 1876), 13-14. An act of Congress in April 1874, approved by President Ulysses S. Grant, allowed for the appropriation of "ten pieces of condemned brass cannon" to the people of Concord for the erection of their monument. For more

While there are no surviving records to suggest that the bronze used in the Milmore statues or any other explicitly Civil War-themed monuments from Ames came from reconstituted munitions, the fact that it happened in this one case is suggestive. In manufacture, the materials of war became the materials of memory.

As the Ames Manufacturing Company turned from casting swords and other weapons to monuments, James G. Batterson's monument firm, eventually incorporated as the New England Granite Works, added a sideline in soldier memorials to a business that already had strong ties to the funerary sphere. Born in Bloomfield, Connecticut in 1823, Batterson was apprenticed as a stonecutter in his father's marble yards while simultaneously pursuing a more classical education, a dual training that would prepare him for a life as an entrepreneur. By 1845, the younger Batterson had become fully entwined in his own branch of the family business, which produced all sorts of cemetery markers and memorials and provided building material for public works projects.[41] The monument industry was not to be Batterson's only interest, however: in 1863, after learning about railroad insurance while traveling in England, he returned to the United States and founded the first American accident insurance company, Travelers Insurance.[42] With this eye for business opportunities, it

---

information on the relationship between French's *Minuteman* and Civil War commemoration, see Chapter 4 of this dissertation.

[41] New England Historic Genealogical Society, *Commemorative Biographical Record of Hartford County, Connecticut* (Chicago: J.H. Beers and Company, 1901), 23-28; J.A. Spalding, *Illustrated Popular Biography of Connecticut* (Hartford, Conn.: Case, Lockwood, and Brainard Company, 1891), 18-19.

[42] *Four Men of the Travelers* (Hartford, Conn.: Travelers Insurance Company, 1944), 9-17.

is not surprising that Batterson adapted his already-flourishing stonecutting business to the production of monuments when the need for them after the Civil War became clear.

One of Batterson's first and most elaborate forays into Civil War commemoration was the *Soldiers' National Monument* in the center of the Soldiers' National Cemetery at Gettysburg, an elaborate cousin of the emerging citizen soldier monument type with a complicated allegorical program (figure 2.9). Built between 1864, when the cornerstone was laid, and 1869, when the final dedication took place, and with sculpture executed under the supervision of Randolph Rogers, this tall columnar monument incorporated a Genius of Liberty at the apex and four seated figures of War, History, Peace and Plenty. Batterson is generally credited as "designing" the monument, and this ambiguous terminology is a hallmark of period accounts of his monuments.[43] At some point, possibly as early as 1866, Batterson enlisted the services of Carl Conrads, a German-born sculptor who immigrated to the United States in 1860, served in the Union army, and then settled in Hartford. Conrads' name often appears alongside the name of Batterson or his firm in period accounts of monuments, especially after Batterson's firm was renamed the New England Granite Works in 1875.[44]

---

[43] "The Gettysburg Monument," *Harper's Weekly* 13, no. 655 (July 17, 1869): 457-458; Rogers, *Randolph Rogers*, 96-97.

[44] The connection between Batterson and Conrads appears several times in records of the Smithsonian Institution's online *Inventory of American Sculpture*, and is most clearly realized in the sculpting of a colossal soldier for the battlefield at Antietam, credited to Conrads and the New England Granite Works, first displayed at the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition in 1876. See, for example, George D. Curtis, *Souvenir of the Centennial Exhibition, or Connecticut's Representation at Philadelphia, 1876* (Hartford, Conn.: George D. Curtis, 1877), 150-151.

The *Soldiers' National Monument* is by far the most elaborate monument that

Batterson's firm produced. Other examples from the same period serve as precursors

to the stock monument trade that would flourish in the ensuing decades. Early

monuments in Bristol, Connecticut (1866) and Deerfield, Massachusetts (1867) typify

the Batterson output. The Bristol monument, a brownstone obelisk topped with the

figure of an eagle and inscribed with the names of the town's soldier dead, is located

in the town's West Cemetery and is the first Civil War soldier monument erected in

the state (figure 2.10). Deerfield's monument is slightly more elaborate, with a taller

shaft and a figure of a Union infantryman instead of an eagle, and it is situated on the

town common rather than in a cemetery (figure 2.11). Batterson and his firm adapted

these designs to several other monument commissions, with the exact same

infantryman also making appearances in East Bloomfield, New York (1868); New

Haven, Connecticut (1870); and Woonsocket, Rhode Island (1870). Like Martin

Milmore and the Ames Manufacturing Company, Batterson was willing to repeat

popular designs, a trend that became one of the defining features of the monument

business. Batterson's involvement with the granite industry continued through the

nineteenth century, becoming more focused on major building projects such as the

Connecticut State Capitol (1871-1878), until he sold his business in 1895.

Founded more than a decade after the Civil War, the Monumental Bronze

Company, first incorporated as such in 1879, was one of the most successful producers

of a relatively inexpensive and highly standardized form of soldier monument,

generally cast from zinc, also known as white bronze. During the mid-nineteenth

century, zinc was a popular and cheap alternative to bronze, and its purveyors often

claimed its superior durability to other metals for outdoor sculpture, claims that have

unfortunately been discredited. Zinc statues were often tinted to take on the appearance of other materials, such as bronze, granite, or marble. For the Monumental Bronze Company, zinc soldier monuments for Union and Confederate patrons were just one part of a vast output that also included all manner of cemetery memorials. The firm was active from the late 1870s until 1939, and, like the Ames Manufacturing Company during the Civil War, it switched gears to produce armaments during World War I.[45]

The Monumental Bronze Company and its affiliates had great success marketing a limited number of prototypes for soldier monuments in large quantities across the entire nation. Their most widely reproduced Union monument, dubbed the "American soldier" by Carol Grissom, exists in at least eighty-six examples in twenty-three states, and was sold from the early 1880s well into the twentieth century (figure 2.12). The zinc statue depicts a Union soldier at strict "parade rest," a pose that will be discussed in depth later in this chapter. He wears the highly recognizable foraging cap and heavy overcoat of a Union private, with the cape of his overcoat thrown jauntily over his right shoulder. His mustachioed face is smooth, generic and nearly expressionless, reflecting the monument industry's desire to typify the "average" Union soldier. The "American soldier" appeared in many architectural settings, from stepped bases and tall shafts to triumphal arches, and occasionally with other figures, as in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, where the 1888 *Soldiers and Sailors Monument* featured both the "American soldier" and a Union sailor. The statue even appeared almost completely unchanged as a Confederate soldier on two North Carolina

---

[45] Grissom, *Zinc Sculpture in America*, 86-87; Shapiro, *Bronze Casting and American Sculpture*, 79-80.

monuments, with the only modification being the change in initials from "US" to "CS" on the figure's belt buckle.[46] The ubiquity of the mass-produced "American soldier" prototype speaks to the symbolic importance of the citizen soldier monument.

That the inexpensive zinc became such a popular material for soldier monuments is a testament to the material's versatility and a link between the monuments and other uses of the metal. As Drew Gilpin Faust notes, zinc was often used to manufacture metallic caskets for deceased soldiers being shipped from the front lines to the faraway homes of their families for burial. In fact, many shipping concerns only accepted remains packed in metal caskets, due to odor and other hygienic concerns associated with the transport of corpses.[47] Strongly associated with the bodies of dead soldiers during the war, zinc contributed to the elevation of their memory in the postbellum decades. As will be explored later in this chapter, the strong material link between the funerary and the memorial implied by the various uses of zinc extends to linkages between the sculpted soldier's body and the actual soldier's body, and the adaptation of funerary forms and locations to a more civic form of monument.

The artists and artisans who designed citizen soldier monuments borrowed forms and iconographies from several known classical sources, including Egyptian obelisks and pyramids and Roman triumphal arches and columns, melding these classical elements with other architectural forms to create unique assemblages. The monuments ranged from simple granite markers with no sculptural elements to multi-

---

[46] Grissom, *Zinc Sculpture in America*, 509-537.

[47] Faust, *This Republic of Suffering*, 91.

figure groupings involving allegorical figures, representations of branches of the armed forces, military heroes, or bas-reliefs; some of the most elaborate monuments, such as Rogers' *Michigan Soldiers and Sailors Monument*, had examples of all of these things. The size and scope of an individual monument was most strongly influenced by the prominence of the town or city commissioning it and the availability of funds; obviously, more elaborate and individually designed monuments were much more expensive.

In considering the sculptural elements of the soldier monuments, it is crucial to note that the sculpted infantryman was the basic building block upon which most figural monuments were based. A town fortunate enough to afford a single statue would invariably choose an infantryman at parade rest or, occasionally, a standard-bearer. The infantryman might be joined at the base of a column by a sailor, bringing the composition to two figures, and to these two figures might be added a cavalryman and an artilleryman, bringing the total group of military figures to four. In fact, beyond the pair of soldier and sailor, additional elements were generally added to monuments in groups of four: four bas-relief war scenes, four portraits of important individuals, or four allegorical figures. Nevertheless, the infantry figure was the most common element of the soldier monument and the key to its interpretation.

Inscriptions were often as important as the formal attributes of sculpture in interpreting a monument.[48] For the scholar of visual culture, it is easy to privilege the

------

[48] For a perspective on the importance of pedestals and inscriptions in eighteenth-century British memorial statuary, see Malcolm Baker, "Playing with Plinths in Eighteenth-Century Sculpture," in *Display And Displacement: Sculpture and the Pedestal from Renaissance to Post-Modern*, Alexandra Gerstein, ed. (London: Paul Holberton Publishing, 2007), 58-68.

sculpted aspects of a monument over the written ones, or to dismiss monuments entirely that have no significant sculptural element as lacking in artistic merit. But many soldiers' monuments were designed to be read just as much as viewed, with long lists of the names of a town's dead and inscriptions that offered specific views of the war. Speaking at the dedication of Milmore's *Soldiers' Monument* in Charlestown, Massachusetts, Mayor William H. Kent exhorted his listeners to remember that "[the monument] has a more immediate, and higher purpose [than serving as an object of beauty]. The simple inscription upon its face tells us and all who come after us what that purpose is."[49] For Kent and many others, the inscription and the sentiments it conveys rank even higher than the artwork in making meaning. Some towns, like Braintree, Massachusetts in 1877, published guides to the service history of the men listed on the monument, meant to provide additional information for viewers.[50] Inscriptions and lists of names activated the meaning of monuments that might otherwise be indistinguishable from one another when interpreted through visual cues alone. Further, the names of deceased soldiers listed on a monument served as palpable traces of the individuals they referenced. These carved traces resonated strongly with family members and friends of the deceased, generating powerful memories of lost soldiers.

---

[49] *Proceedings at the Dedication of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Monument by the City Council of Charlestown, June 17, 1872* (Charlestown: Chronicle Office, 1872) 24. The inscription reads, "In honor of the men of Charlestown who fought in the War of 1861 for the Preservation of the Union erected by the City A.D. 1872."

[50] George A. Thayer, *The Braintree Soldiers' Memorial: A Record of the Services in the War of the Rebellion of the Men of Braintree, Massachusetts, whose Names are Inscribed on the Braintree Soldiers' Monument* (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1877).

One monument that clearly illustrates the power of textual material is the

Soldiers' Monument of Rhine, Wisconsin, dedicated in 1868, the first monument of its

kind in the state of Wisconsin (figure 2.13). The monument itself is a simple marble

obelisk, topped by a polychrome eagle that was placed in the twentieth century to

replace the original bronze eagle, which was stolen.[51] Located at a remote rural

crossroads in a grove of red cedar trees, the visual aspects of the monument do not

necessarily inspire further scrutiny from the few passersby who happen upon it.

Visually, this obelisk could represent anything: a grave marker, a boundary stone, a

historical event. But the inscriptions written on the stone activate the monument's

meaning. The base is inscribed with the names of men from Rhine who fell while

serving in the 26th and 27th Wisconsin Regiments. On the shaft of the obelisk are two

further inscriptions. The south side reads, "You wish to know the valor of the West.

Go ask the rebels for they know it best." The north side bears an inscription in

German, which can be translated as, "Of all Life's possessions, Glory is certainly the

most sublime. When the body has turned to dust, a great name lives on." From these

two inscriptions, the viewer picks up two pieces of information: first, that the citizens

of Rhine felt strongly about their regional identity, and second, that the community is

largely German-speaking. The English inscription is both proud and incendiary,

unapologetically refusing to participate in any sort of reconciliation between the

formerly warring sides of the Civil War, and specifically evoking "West," rather than

North, as the region of the country that produced Rhine's fighting men. The German

inscription, provided without translation, presupposes an audience with the specialized

---

[51] Eleanor Kuhn, *The Town Rhine Monument to Civil War Dead* (Sheboygan: Sheboygan County Landmarks, Ltd., 1976), 1.

knowledge necessary to read it. While the plain marble obelisk at first cloaks meaning, the inscriptions offer strong local associations, providing the didactic evidence necessary for the viewer's understanding. And in invoking how a "great name lives on" through glory, the German inscription mimics the obelisk's soaring and enduring form.

A *Harper's Weekly* cartoon drawn by Thomas Nast further illustrates the significance of text in monuments. Titled "Patience on a Monument" and dated October 10, 1868, the cartoon evokes the citizen soldier monument in illustrating the fraught position of the African-American Civil War veteran in the violent postwar years, when the rights won by the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments were already showing signs of erosion (figure 2.14). The image depicts an African-American veteran in the garb of a freedman sitting despondently atop a squat obelisk, not unlike the Soldiers' Monument of Rhine, Wisconsin. His rifle sits unused at his feet. At the base of the monument, a woman and two young children, presumably the veteran's family, lie slaughtered in pools of blood. Behind the fictive monument are two vignettes, one the burning of the Colored Orphan Asylum by Irish rioters during the New York Draft Riots in 1863, and the other a scene of members of the Ku Klux Klan burning a freedmen's school and menacing the veteran with a pistol. Kirk Savage and David Blight have both pointed out Nast's overt moralizing message, detailing the irony of the veteran's elevation to memory but inability to protect his family from harm.[52] But the cartoon also points to Nast's basic understanding of the mechanics of soldier memorials in his subversion of the form. The African-American soldier

---

[52] Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 175; Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 115.

topping the monument is seated, not standing heroically. Even more telling, the monumental obelisk is inscribed with meaningful text, much in the same way that the Rhine monument is. But instead of the heroic inscriptions, lists of names of the dead and of major engagements like Gettysburg or Antietam, Nast's fictive monument evokes atrocities against African Americans, such as the New York Draft Riots, in which the city's African American population became the target of anger over the draft; the Fort Pillow Massacre, in which Confederate soldiers under the direction of General Nathan Bedford Forrest slaughtered African-American prisoners of war; and other, more generalized sites of pain, such as the whipping post and the auction block. Like the Rhine Soldiers' Monument and many others like it, Nast's satirical monument to the plight of the African-American veteran draws heavily on the ability of text to deliver information and evoke feeling.

The Soldier Monument and the Sculpted Body

Citizen soldier monuments dotted the post-Civil War landscape from east to west and north to south. But how was their presence interpreted by postwar viewers, and how specifically did the sculpted infantryman who capped most of these monuments participate in the creation of Civil War memory? The whiteness of the typical citizen soldier's monument has been one of the most studied aspects of these memorials, most notably by Kirk Savage, who rightly points out that the normative and generic white body put forward by these monuments denies ethnicity and multi-racial participation in the fighting of the Civil War, particularly excluding African Americans. As Savage notes, no Civil War monument featured recognizably African-American soldiers until Augustus Saint-Gaudens' *Shaw Memorial* of 1895, a monument that cannot quite be considered a "typical" soldier monument, due to the

elite nature of its authorship and financial support and the privileging of the figure of

Colonel Robert Gould Shaw (figure 2.15). The first soldier monument of the common

type featuring an African-American soldier to be erected in the United States appeared

in 1920 (figure 2.16). As Savage explains, the reasons for this whitewashing of Civil

War memory range from the mundane to the insidious: from the fact that most

African-American regiments were formed under a federal banner while most

monuments represented localities, to the entrenched racism that resisted the rendering

of a black male body in sculpture.[53] The local and predominantly white communities

that ordered, paid for, and erected these monuments looked for soldier statues

representing a memory of the Civil War that filtered out all controversy and violence,

figuring an "ideal" type.

One specific example shows how that "ideal" functioned. An unnamed

Philadelphia writer, published in the 1872 *Proceedings* accompanying the unveiling of

Launt Thompson's *Soldier Monument* for Pittsfield, Massachusetts, describes the

figure of a color bearer topping the monument as (figure 2.17):

> not a portrait, but rather an ideal figure…Representing no particular
> hero, no particular company, it is at once the representative picture of
> the American volunteer. It is not such a figure nor face as can be
> claimed by any particular town, hamlet, or city; yet we venture the
> assertion that there are thousands throughout these United States who
> would lead themselves to believe that the statue was intended for son,
> brother or lover.[54]

---

[53] Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 162-208.

[54] J.E.A. Smith, ed., *The Proceedings at the Dedication of the Soldiers' Monument, at
Pittsfield, Mass., September 24, 1872, including the Oration of Hon. Geo. Wm. Curtis*
(Pittsfield, Mass.: Chickering & Axtell, 1872), 10.

Particularly striking is that the writer identifies Thompson's statue as an "ideal" figure, standing in for faces across the nation and presenting a "representative figure" of the soldier. For this writer, an ideal figure is one that summarizes an idea, representing the whole in the image of one. The soldier figure topping the citizen soldier monument is at once individual and collective, standing alone but representing many.

Variations in pose of soldier figures existed, especially in the hands of classically trained sculptors such as Randolph Rogers, Martin Milmore, and Launt Thompson, but by far the most common form of soldier monument was some version of the soldier at "parade rest." As defined by several period drill manuals, parade rest was a slightly more relaxed version of standing at attention, allowing the soldier some relief:

> At the second command, the men will carry the right foot six inches in rear of the left heel, the left knee slightly bent, the body upright upon the right leg, the piece resting against the hollow of the right shoulder, the hands crossed in front, the backs of them outward, the left hand uppermost, the eyes direct to the front.[55]

While the pose was not as rigid as some other military poses, the soldier at parade rest did observe a certain amount of discipline, with eyes and head facing

---

[55] *The Volunteer's Hand Book: Containing an Abridgement of Hardee's Infantry Tactics, adapted to the use of the percussion musket in squad and company exercises, Manual of Arms for Riflemen, and United States Army Regulations as to parades, reviews, inspections, guard mounting, etc.* (Richmond, Va.: West & Johnson, 1860), 27. During the Civil War, infantry drills were not yet completely standardized, and different handbooks were used by different groups. Hardee's Infantry Tactics were used mainly by Confederate soldiers during the Civil War, but descriptions of parade rest are basically the same across several handbooks of drills.

directly forward. Indeed, a commentator in 1875 refers to parade rest as "steadiness of position, eyes square to the front, perfect immobility."[56] In practice, parade rest was generally employed at ceremonial moments, such as grand reviews or military funerals. In this regard, the choice of parade rest for the soldier monument seems particularly appropriate, as the bronze figure standing in this ceremonial pose could be interpreted as witnessing his own commemoration. Also, as parade rest was typically employed at moments when the soldier was on display, either lined up for review or for the benefit of a photographer's lens, the use of parade rest in sculpture solidifies the association of this pose with the publically visible military body.

Several explanations have been suggested for the popularity of the soldier at parade rest as a monument type. As Thomas J. Brown points out, the parade rest figure was overwhelmingly popular in civic settings, while more active poses were generally chosen for battlefield monuments.[57] Battlefield statues, functioning as illustrations for events that had happened on the field, had some freedom of expression, while the more ceremonial parade rest figure may have been thought more appropriate for a town square. Savage points out the relationship of parade rest to the traditional *contrapposto* that would have been familiar to classically trained sculptors, and notices that the self-contained figure produced by the pose would have been economical to carve from a granite block. However, the parade rest pose should not

---

[56] "Communications. Letters from the People. Our Militia. Criticisms from an Observant Correspondent – The Deficiencies of Service and What is Needed," *Boston Globe*, August 30, 1975, 2.

[57] Thomas J. Brown, *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2004), 33.

necessarily be interpreted as one that allowed the soldier "freedom to relax" and to maintain a sense of autonomous self, as Savage suggests.[58] While the slight shift in weight prescribed at parade rest by the drill manuals may have allowed a bit of respite from standing at rigid attention, the soldier's body and focus remained in complete control, with eyes fixed straight ahead.

The rigidity implied by the true experience of parade rest, however, may have been lost on many of the artists who depicted soldiers in this pose during and after the war. The pose would have been disseminated mainly through photographs of regiments and companies taken at camp by photographers like Matthew Brady and Alexander Gardner. A photograph of a company of the 21st Michigan, attributed to the Brady studio, shows a group of riflemen, most of whom seem to be standing at parade rest (figure 2.18). That images like this one did not clearly convey the particulars of infantry drill is apparent in lithographs like Currier and Ives' 1864 *The Soldier Boy: "On Duty"* (figure 2.19).[59] While the soldier's legs are more or less positioned in a correct approximation of parade rest, the unnecessarily raised arms and dramatic turn of the head betray a great deal of artistic license. The cannon to the rear of the soldier also displays some inconsistencies, suggesting that the author of the image was probably working from a secondhand knowledge of military details.

A rigid interpretation of parade rest is also uncommon among soldier monuments, despite the fact that the term "parade rest" was used to describe their pose

---

[58] Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 176-177.

[59] For a different reading of this print in the context of home front anxieties about soldiers at war, see Bryan F. Le Beau, *Currier and Ives: America Imagined* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2001), 97-98.

throughout much of their heyday in the postbellum decades. Among the early, foreign-trained sculptors who produced the first prototypes for these monuments, variation was common: statues by Randolph Rogers tend to carry the rifle diagonally in front of the body, while Milmore's Roxbury soldier looks deliberately down and to the right with a pensive air. An early infantryman prototype from Green-Wood Cemetery in New York City, later emulated by J.W. Fiske and Melzar Hunt Mosman, imprudently rests his hand on the barrel of his probably-loaded rifle (figure 2.20). The Monumental Bronze Company's "American Soldier" does correctly picture the parade rest pose.[60] But this prototype seems to be the exception rather than the rule: by 1913, the W.H. Mullins Company did offer a correct parade rest figure in its trade catalogue, but on the facing page is a figure also labeled as parade rest, but with the head turned distinctly to the right (figure 2.21). For most designers of monuments, then, the rules of parade rest served as a guideline for depicting the soldier, freely combined with conventions of representing the human figure absorbed from other sources.

The connection between parade rest and classical *contrapposto* was probably not lost on the sculptors of soldier monuments. During the same years that the soldier monument was rising in popularity in the United States, a probable Roman copy of the *Doryphoros*, or Spear Bearer, by Polykleitos was taking its place in the modern canon of classical Greek sculpture (figure 2.22). First excavated in Pompeii in 1797, the statue was identified as the *Doryphoros* in 1865 by Karl Friederichs, who saw in the rigid proportional structure of the statue an echo of the canon of proportions of an

---

[60] Grissom, *Zinc Sculpture in America*, 509-523.

ideal human body proposed by Polykleitos and preserved by Roman writers.[61] Based on a body to head ratio of seven to one (the body equal to seven times the length of the head), Polykleitos' canon put forth a series of specific measurements designed to guide the sculptor in scaling the human figure. While the identification of the *Doryphoros* was taking place at the same time that the soldier monument was in development, and thus the statue would have been an unlikely source for the earliest sculptors of soldier figures, the relationship between Polykleitos' efforts in producing a canon of proportions and the soldier monument is striking. Both projects are concerned with producing an ideal body that is representative of an entire population. By 1903, Edmund von Mach, who wrote widely on Greek and Roman art, was already aware of a connection between the *Doryphoros* and the citizen soldier figure. In identifying the *Doryphoros* as the "Typical Male Figure," he writes:

> The direction of the head, following the weight of the body, is noteworthy; the Doryphoros is a thoughtless, brainless, soulless automaton. Many modern figures are modeled after the Doryphoros. Clothed in a uniform, with a gun instead of a spear, he becomes the volunteer.[62]

Placing the Naples *Doryphoros* alongside one of the designs produced by the W.H. Mullins Company, it is easy to see what von Mach saw. The seven-to-one ratio of body to head employed in the *Doryphoros* seems remarkably close to the ratio

---

[61] K.J. Hartswick, "Head Types of the Doryphoros," in *Polykleitos, the Doryphoros, and Tradition*, Warren G. Moon, ed. (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995), 173.

[62] Edmund von Mach, *Greek Sculpture: Its Spirit and Principles* (Boston: Ginn & Company, 1903), 251.

employed in the Mullins prototype. Both heads are turned slightly to the right, and both sets of arms are positioned to accommodate the carrying of a prop: a spear for the *Doryphoros* and a musket for the infantryman. The weight shift of *contrapposto* is engineered differently in the two figures, with the *Doryphoros* striding forward while the infantryman stands at rest with his weight on his rear right leg. Even so, the effect on the upper body is comparable, with the jutting right hip of both figures allowing for the gentlest of S-curves. It seems plausible that by this point, new information about the Greek rendering of the human body symbolized by the *Doryphoros* may have influenced even the anonymous sculptors working for the W.H. Mullins Company. Even if this is not specifically the case, the relationship between the two figures is noteworthy. In rendering a canon of proportions for a "typical" body, Polykleitos' *Doryphoros* is a precursor to the often messy nineteenth-century investigations into the "ideal" human form.

Even as the soldier monument referred to a long history of "ideal" bodies in art, however, the real soldiers memorialized through its forms experienced a much different reality. The tall, straight specimens of sculpted Victorian manhood compensated for and displaced the real wartime experiences that left soldiers physically and mentally traumatized. During the war, some of the most widely available images of soldiers were the battlefield photographs: fields of shattered bodies, gruesome and pitiful in death. In reviewing the first public display of such images, Matthew Brady's "The Dead at Antietam," located at his Broadway gallery, the *New York Times* likened Brady's images to an imagined physical display of the bodies of dead Civil War soldiers on the streets of New York. The columnist further observes a bizarre phenomenon in relation to the viewing of the images:

Crowds of people are constantly going up the stairs; follow them, and you find them bending over the photographic views of that fearful battle-field, taken immediately after the action. Of all objects of horror one would think the battle-field should stand preeminent, that it should bear away the pain of repulsiveness. But on the contrary, there is a terrific fascination about it that draws one near those pictures, and makes him loth [sic] to leave them. You will see hushed, reverend groups standing around these weird copies of carnage, bending down to look in the pale faces of the dead, chained by the strange spell that dwells in dead men's eyes.[63]

The compulsion to scrutinize photographs of deceased soldiers on the battlefield observed by the *New York Times* columnist is supported by the inclusion of these images among cartes-de-visite and stereographs sold by many of the major photography studios during the war, including the galleries of Matthew Brady and Alexander Gardner. One particularly gruesome image of a soldier disemboweled and dismembered by a shell at Gettysburg was sold as a stereoview at Alexander Gardner's Washington gallery (figure 2.23).[64] The stereoview allowed the viewer to have a detailed and indeed three-dimensional experience viewing a horrifying image of a soldier destroyed by war, an experience that Gardner later tempered when he included only a few images of fallen soldiers in his 1866 *Photographic Sketch Book of*

---

[63] "Brady's Photographs: Pictures of the Dead at Antietam," *New York Times*, October 20, 1862.

[64] A discussion of this photograph as an attempt to control and direct the horrors of war with the use of props to direct the viewer's eye can be found in Timothy Sweet, *Traces of War: Poetry, Photography, and the Crisis of the Union* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 107-109.

the Civil War.[65] These "copies of carnage," which broadcast the human toll of the war, would have served as a disturbing contrast to the staid soldier monument. Indeed, an owner of the right collection of stereoviews could make this comparison directly, as images of sculpture and sculptor's studios were also popular subjects for these views (figure 2.24). An undated stereoview of Martin Milmore's Boston studio shows his "Roxbury soldier" among several other works. Both the war view and the studio view use the same technology to suggest three-dimensional space, and both are scaled as domestic commodities, eliding the experience of viewing these vastly different bodies.

Visual representations of the war's carnage were sometimes matched by literary accounts, especially in the reminiscences and fiction of Union veteran Ambrose Bierce. His writings brought the horrors of the battlefield to the reader on the home front, presenting the effects of modern weapons on the human body in chilling detail. In his short story "Chickamauga" of 1891, Bierce employs his usual bitter realism in imagining an encounter between a small, deaf child and the wounded of the eponymous battle. The boy meets a group of these wounded men crawling away from the battlefield and at first believes that they are playing a game, just as "[he] had seen his father's negroes creep upon their hands and knees for his amusement – had ridden them so, 'making believe' they were his horses." He climbs on the back of one of the wounded men, only to be jarred by the reality of the scene:

---

[65] Anthony W. Lee suggests that the choice to include only a few images of carnage in the *Sketch Book* was a deliberate one by Gardner. While the photographer first became famous for his grisly views of dead soldiers at Antietam, his *Sketch Book* focused on remembering the war through landscape views. See Lee and Young, *On Alexander Gardner's* Photographic Sketch Book *of the Civil War*, 40-43.

The man sank upon his breast, recovered, flung the small boy fiercely to the ground as an unbroken colt might have done, 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. The unnatural prominence of nose, the absence of chin, the fierce eyes, gave this man the appearance of a great bird of prey crimsoned in throat and breast by the blood of its quarry.[66]

Bierce's ghastly descriptions of battlefield injuries brought images of war to those far from the front lines, refusing to participate in the general sterilization of war memory. His later characterization of a monument as "a structure intended to commemorate something which either needs no commemoration or cannot be commemorated" reflects bitterly on the citizen soldier monument.[67] The clean, placid sculpted soldier masked the harshness of war carnage.

The wholeness of the monumental citizen soldier's sculpted body also served as a counterpoint to the anxiety over the deeply fractured bodies of real veterans returning from war. The physical injuries caused by the Minié ball and the artillery shell often translated into disfiguring, disabling battle scars, and the wounded Civil War veteran became a common but always troubling sight in the postbellum period. Popular fiction and other writing detailed the problems of their reintegration into civilian life. In August 1865, a short story and accompanying illustration by Winslow Homer, both titled "The Empty Sleeve at Newport," concern the homecoming of the young Captain Harry Ash, a veteran and amputee who returns to his home in Newport only to discover that his sweetheart, Edna Ackland, has learned to drive a horse and

---

[66] Ambrose Bierce, *Shadows of Blue and Gray: The Civil War Writings of Ambrose Bierce* (New York: Tom Doherty Associates, 2002, originally published 1891), 16.

[67] Ambrose Bierce, *The Devil's Dictionary* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999, originally published 1911), 128-129.

carriage (figure 2.25). Acutely aware of the fact that his injury has left him "shut off

from manly sports for life at twenty-six," Harry assumes that Edna has forsaken him in

pursuit of her new accomplishments, and he vows to forget her. But one night, while

strolling through a darkened garden, he meets the weeping Edna, and at first

admonishes her for her "unwomanly" behavior in learning to handle not only the reins,

but the oar, only to discover that she has applied herself to these activities in hopes of

becoming a useful helpmate to him, upon hearing of his wartime injury. Harry repents

for ever chiding her, and the story ends:

> They are married now, and you may see them any day driving upon the
> Newport beach in the pleasant August afternoons. Her hands guide the
> reins, and he sits with his empty sleeve beside her. Yet, for all that, his
> eye is on the road and his voice guides her; so that, in reality, she is
> only his left hand, and he, the husband, drives.[68]

Even though Edna has taken on traditionally masculine responsibilities in response to

Harry's injury, the writer assures the reader that all is as it should be in this marriage,

with the husband firmly in command of his wife's decisions. Presumably, young

veterans afflicted by such injuries might be similarly assured of their masculinity. As

David Tatham points out, however, the accompanying engraving by Winslow Homer

may have been prepared before the story was written, as the young lady driving the

carriage in Homer's image seems perfectly assured of her abilities, while the injured

soldier, still wearing his Union foraging cap, gazes into the distance.[69] Rather than a

comforting and cheaply romantic celebration of harmony between the genders, the

---

[68] "The Empty Sleeve at Newport; or, Why Edna Ackland Learned to Drive," *Harpers Weekly* vol. 9, no. 452 (August 26, 1865): 534.

[69] David Tatham, *Winslow Homer and the Pictorial Press* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2003), 131-132.

Homer illustration is a melancholy reminder that the scars of war are visible even in places of leisure and luxury. The tension between story and illustration reflects the deep disquiet caused by the injured body and reinforces the need for a more reassuring way of picturing the soldier.

Of course, Americans in the decades after the Civil War would have been aware of wounded soldiers not only through popular media, but also through day-to-day encounters, as veterans with debilitating injuries struggled to re-enter peacetime life. Many of the most disabled veterans applied for and succeeded in obtaining pensions from the government to compensate for their wartime injuries, and they devised means of supplementing that income by capitalizing on their war service. One such individual was Private Alfred A. Stratton of New York, a blacksmith before the war, who lost both of his arms above the elbow on June 18, 1864, when he was struck by a solid shot in the trenches outside Petersburg. Receiving a government pension of twenty-five dollars per month, Stratton generated additional income by posing for and then selling *cartes de visite* depicting his shattered form, a form of employment that does not seem to have been uncommon for postwar amputees.[70] It appears that he posed several times for a number of commercial photographers, as there are multiple surviving portraits of the disabled soldier. In one example taken by Fredericks & Co. of New York, Stratton stands at attention in his military uniform, with sleeves pinned

---

[70] Bob Zeller, *The Blue and Gray in Black and White* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005), 187; J.T.H. Connor and Michael G. Rhode, "Shooting Soldiers: Civil War Medical Images, Memory, and Identity in America," *Invisible Culture: An Electronic Journal for Visual Culture*, issue 5: Visual Culture and National Identity [journal on-line]; available from http://www.rochester.edu/in_visible_culture/Issue_5/ConnorRhode/ConnorRhode.html; Internet; accessed 15 November 2011.

up to highlight his injury (figure 2.26). With the inclusion of an ornamental table, decorative wainscoting and rug, the photograph evokes conventions of portrait photography, but Stratton's uniformed figure, military posture, and youthful face also call to mind statues of the citizen soldier. Indeed, in a lecture titled "The Soldier's Empty Sleeve," delivered on October 2, 1865 as a benefit for Stratton's support, Susannah Evans equated the wounded soldier's body with the wounding of the body politic with the firing on Fort Sumter, and advocated for the soldier monument as a symbol of healing and memory.[71] Images of Stratton's war-damaged body memorialized the soldier's dignified identity and sacrifice but also served as a means of support through their commodity value, not unlike the marketed soldier monument.

The soldier monument was further mirrored in the experience of the disabled soldier in the development of prosthetic limbs for veterans who needed them. The unprecedented destruction of flesh and bone caused by new technologies such as the Minié ball and the resulting rise in battlefield amputations fueled new investigations into prosthetics that would help to reintegrate the veteran into an increasing industrial civilian life.[72] As Robert Goler has pointed out, the sight of a seriously injured veteran in the postwar North was a jarring one, as the "indelible inscriptions of loss" of the wounded body ran counter to the narrative of victory.[73] Prosthetics allowed veterans

---

[71] "General City News," *New York Times*, October 2, 1865; "The Soldier's Empty Sleeve – Lecture by Miss Susannah Evans at Cooper Institute – The Duty We Owe to the Soldier," *New-York Daily Tribune*, October 10, 1865.

[72] Lisa Herschbach, "Prosthetic Reconstructions: Making the Industry, Re-Making the Body, Modelling the Nation," *History Workshop Journal* 44 (Autumn 1997): 25.

[73] Robert I. Goler, "Loss and the Persistence of Memory: 'The Case of George Dedlow' and Disabled Civil War Veterans," *Literature and Medicine* 23, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 167.

to mask that loss by appearing whole, and the restructured body became an index for the restructured United States that was assured by the Union victory. A medical photograph of Private L. Coombs of the 4th U.S. Infantry with his prosthetic leg illustrates the potentially concealing properties of prosthesis (figure 2.27).[74] While the photograph is intended to show the site of amputation and the prosthetic, it would be a simple matter for Coombs to conceal his injury by putting on the prosthetic and unrolling his trouser leg. In "re-membering" the body, the prosthetic injury made it easier for onlookers to forget the trauma of war. The citizen soldier monument likewise offered viewers an opportunity to see the soldier's body as whole, even if the soldiers honored in lists of names were not.

Awareness of the fragmented veteran's body was occasionally quite literally elided with the monumental body. An 1892 issue of *Harper's Bazaar* illuminates this exact tension with a brief satirical exchange: "'We are very much embarrassed about the Old Soldiers' Monument. The bronze figure costs $4,000, and we have only $3,000.' 'Why don't you cut it down? Take off a leg and both arms. Many an old soldier has lost 'em for his country.'"[75] In an article criticizing the standardization of the citizen soldier monument, William Jean Beauley attributes a similarly macabre notion to a "Standard Oil Man" who suggests that a soldier figure standing atop a

---

[74] The Coombs photograph is a *carte de visite* from the private collection of Robert E. Greenspan. The provenance is unknown, but given that Coombs displays a slate identifying his name and regiment, it was probably intended as a documentary photograph rather than an image for public display, like the *cartes de visite* of Pvt. Stratton. Published in Robert E. Greenspan, *Medicine: Perspectives in History and Art* (Alexandria, VA: Ponteverde Press, 2004), 223.

[75] Quoted in *The Monumental News*, May 1892, p. 206.

fifty-foot column might be truncated at the knees to save funds, as the column's capital would hide these features from the ground. The soldier in this apocryphal instance is saved by a "doubting Thomas" who admits that "a soldier with both legs shot off would be more typical of modern warfare than one in possession of all his limbs," but that such a soldier would never be chosen to top a monument, but instead "would be more likely to be sent home on a furlough."[76] These direct evocations of the wounded body in conjunction with the monumental body illustrate the soldier monument's relationship with the surviving veteran. Just as the sculpted body stood for the ideal imagined soldier, the dismemberment of that body mirrored the real trauma of war.

Soldier Monuments, Cemeteries, and Mourning Culture

The soldier monument served not only as a counterpoint to the injured soldier, but as a cenotaph for the dead. The Civil War took place during a period when many Americans were experiencing a shift in their perception of death, as the Puritan notion of fearing God's judgment at death was replaced by a hope for a glorious afterlife. Mark S. Schantz has identified a mid-nineteenth century "culture of death" that valued a beautiful eternity and the memory of heroic deeds, which may have contributed to many soldiers' willingness to lay down their lives in an often brutal and senseless war.[77] The new sensibility concerning death manifested itself in many cultural forms, from redesigned "rural" cemeteries and new forms of cemetery monuments to

---

[76] William Jean Beauley, "A Peculiar Type of American Art," *Art and Progress* 4, no. 11 (September 1913): 1104.

[77] Schantz, *Awaiting the Heavenly Country*, 2-3.

specialized mourning dress and print culture. This era also saw changes in post-mortem practices, with experiments in embalming gaining traction during the war and an interest in cremation beginning shortly afterward. For a culture already obsessed with mortality, the Civil War provoked an outpouring of mass culture dedicated to mourning the dead. In its use of forms also popular in funerary art and connection with other practices involving soldier death, the soldier monument can be understood as participating in this cultural shift.

In the early nineteenth century, changed attitudes toward death were manifested in physical changes to the landscape of funerary commemoration. During the colonial and early national periods, burials took place in small church graveyards within cities, with graves marked by simple headstones whose carving formed the basis of the first American sculptural tradition. By the 1820s, these small urban cemeteries were plagued by overcrowding and a growing fear of contagion caused by the presence of corpses in living areas. These conditions prompted the birth of the "rural" cemetery movement, as burial grounds were moved to large tracts of land outside the city, supported by wealthy citizens committed to their care. The first of these rural cemeteries was Mount Auburn Cemetery on the outskirts of Boston, first proposed by physician and prominent citizen Dr. Jacob Bigelow in 1825, and consecrated in 1831. Instead of tight, cramped rows of simply-marked graves, Mount Auburn boasted rolling hills, picturesque views and increasingly elaborate monuments that borrowed from Neoclassical, Gothic, and Egyptian architectural styles. For residents of Boston, the cemetery was not only a burial ground, but also a pleasure park for leisurely walks and picnics, and for the quiet contemplation of mortality. Mount Auburn Cemetery was soon followed by similar cemeteries across the United

States. For a culture increasingly comfortable with mortality and with the practices of mourning, the new rural cemeteries offered spaces for the blending of life and death.[78]

Another highly visual shift in funerary practices was the development of specialized clothing for mourning, generally worn by women, with rules of etiquette that became increasingly complicated. As Lou Taylor notes, there were specific guidelines for women for the wearing of mourning garb, dictating the length of time in mourning necessary for different family members: six months for a brother or sister, twelve months for a child, eighteen months for a parent, and two and a half years for a husband, with the mourning for a husband progressing gradually through heavy, full, and half mourning, indicating a lightening in the mourning garb.[79] These periods of time were guidelines, and many women exceeded them, letting their outward garb illustrate their inner feelings.

Two of the most famous widows of the postbellum era, Queen Victoria and Mary Todd Lincoln, wore mourning in remembrance of their dead husbands for the rest of their lives. When Prince Albert died suddenly from typhoid in 1861, leaving Queen Victoria a widow at the age of forty-two, the Queen remained secluded from public life for more than four years, appearing only at the weddings of two of her children. A photograph of the Queen with the Prince and Princess of Wales on their wedding day on March 10, 1863 illustrates the depth of the Queen's grief (figure

---

[78] Blanche M.G. Linden, *Silent City on a Hill: Picturesque Landscapes of Memory and Boston's Mount Auburn Cemetery* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007), 133-153.

[79] Lou Taylor, *Mourning Dress: A Costume and Social History* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1983), 133.

2.28). While the Prince and Princess face the camera, the Queen is pictured in profile, completely shrouded in black, as she gazes upon a portrait bust of Prince Albert.[80] The Queen's mourning practices, often deemed over the top, are mirrored by Mrs. Lincoln, who was only beginning to recover from the death of her son Willie in 1862 when her husband was murdered by John Wilkes Booth less than a week after the surrender of Robert E. Lee at Appomattox. As Shirley Samuels notes, Mrs. Lincoln's extravagant grief, excessive spending on mourning apparel, and investigations into the paranormal were often met with scorn by the American public.[81] One of the most famous images of Mrs. Lincoln's mourning is the "spirit photograph" taken by Edward Mumler, showing the wife of the president seemingly visited by her spectral husband, an effect produced through trick photography (figure 2.29).[82] The powerful emotional responses of these two prominent women to widowhood may have triggered uneasiness in the general public, but their public displays of mourning also served as a model for women struggling with their own private grief. Many women followed the examples of Queen Victoria and Mrs. Lincoln, and wore mourning indefinitely. This elaborate mourning process encouraged the spread of soldier monuments as sites where rituals of grief could be enacted.

---

[80] Taylor, *Mourning Dress*, 154-161.

[81] Shirley Samuels, *Facing America: Iconography and the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 106-108.

[82] For a complete account of Mumler's photography practices and eventual trial for fraud, see Michael Leja, "Mumler's Fraudulent Photographs," in *Looking Askance: Skepticism and American Art from Eakins to Duchamp* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 21-58.

The soldier monument has a significant relationship with this profound mourning culture and with the cemetery and funerary spheres, a connection that has gone largely unnoticed in scholarly literature. Most of the earliest monuments were placed in cemeteries, and many were fabricated by carvers who also specialized in gravestones. Like gravestones, many monuments bore the names of the dead. For many families who had lost loved ones in the war, these tombstone-like monuments may have stood in as surrogate tombstones for soldiers who never came home. As Drew Gilpin Faust has illustrated, many of the soldiers who fell during battle were buried in battlefield cemeteries far away from their homes.[83] The degraded condition of bodies often left for days before burial and the inconsistent record-keeping of both the Northern and Southern armies meant that often bodies went unidentified, and by necessity many soldiers were buried in unmarked graves. The sudden confrontation with the realities of war death on such a grand scale forged a deep sense of anxiety for a Victorian society that had grown used to a certain amount of ceremony accompanying the end of life.

The need for an organized system of interring the war's dead made itself apparent shortly after the fighting began. After a battle had occurred, fallen soldiers were often buried in the most convenient ground near the battlefield, and the locations of these improvised graves were not always well recorded. During and immediately following the war, the "loose connection of burial grounds" that had been instituted by military leaders became the National Cemetery System with the help of federal and local governments. Five months after the battle in July 1863, the Soldiers' National

---

[83] Faust, *This Republic of Suffering*, 61-101.

Cemetery at Gettysburg was dedicated with great fanfare as the first of many cities of the dead that would honor fallen soldiers with uniform white headstones. To create the national cemetery, the bodies of Union soldiers were disinterred from the temporary graves where they had been laid to prevent decomposition in the late summer heat and reburied in a new cemetery on land that had been purchased as a planned extension of the town's burial grounds. At Gettysburg and other national cemeteries connected with Civil War battlefields, only Union soldiers were allowed in the hallowed grounds, with careful attention paid to the deceased's clothing to determine by the type of uniform which side of the conflict the individual had supported.[84] For the families of killed and missing soldiers waiting for news in Northern homes, this was often an emotionally devastating process. While the recovery of a loved one's remains might solve the mystery of a disappearance, the confirmation of loss was difficult to bear, and soldiers' cemeteries were sometimes too far away to visit. The soldier monument must be considered alongside these anxieties.

A poem that appeared in *Harper's Weekly* on April 1, 1865 makes explicit the contemporary connection between the soldier's distant grave and the local soldier's monument. The six stanzas evoke a small town erecting a monument, first in memory of one slain soldier, and then for more and more, as war casualties grow and new names are engraved onto the same stone. Two stanzas in particular evoke the relationship between the monument and the grave that cannot be visited:

The grass had not been touched by spade

---

[84] Jim Weeks, *Gettysburg: Memory, Market and an American Shrine* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2003), 17-18; Neff, *Honoring the Civil War Dead*, 107-111; Blair, *Cities of the Dead*, 177-193.

Where its slant shadow lay,
The soldier's resting-place was made
On red field far away,
And yet with bowed, uncovered heads
They kneeled around to pray.
[…]
So let the soldiers' monument
In every grave-yard stand—
Although their buried forms be blent
With distant sea or sand—
To keep their memory for aye
Within a grateful land.[85]

The poem makes the relationship between the monument and the grave abundantly clear. The soldier's grave is far away, as is made clear by the fact that the ground around the monument "had not been touched by spade," and yet this imagined monument is a site for enactment of the types of rituals usually held at a gravesite, namely prayer or later, patriotic celebration. At this early point, soldier monuments were most often placed in cemeteries, and the poem's writer makes clear that even if the actual remains of soldiers are encased in "distant sea or sand," the monument placed at home is an important vehicle for soldiers' memory.

Early accounts of attempts to erect soldier monuments further the connection that the *Harper's Weekly* poem makes between the soldier monument and the cenotaph, or monument to the death of an individual or individuals whose remains are elsewhere. In an 1866 meeting devoted to the question of whether to erect a monument to the soldier dead of Illinois, Major General Benjamin M. Prentiss explicitly advocated for the soldier monument as a duty to soldiers who had not returned home:

---

[85] "Soldiers' Monuments," *Harper's Weekly* 9, no. 431 (April 1, 1865): 198.

When we persuaded these boys to go into the army, we pledged not only the faith of the nation, but our own and that of the State that they should not be forgotten. At this day there are thousands of our Illinois soldiers who are lying in Southern soil, and many of their parents and those who loved them, ignorant of their last resting place. It would be a consolation to the families bewailing the lots of those dear to them, to know that the people of the State, and particularly their military associates, do not forget them.[86]

For Prentiss, the soldier monument served as an answer to the dispersal of the remains of Union dead and a site for mourning families to remember their lost sons. Similarly, an 1865 writer advocating for a soldier monument at Fortress Monroe in Hampton, Virginia saw the monument as a centerpiece for a cemetery where families of soldiers could "visit their graves in future years with a quiet, though sad satisfaction, and plant thereon the flowers of the most sacred affection."[87] In the years after the war, the placing of flowers on the graves of soldiers and at the feet of monuments was a continual feature of Decoration Day ceremonies in both the North and the South, even as the overall tenor of the occasion became more patriotic than mournful.

Another vehicle for at-home remembrance of the distantly buried war dead could be found in *The Soldier's Grave*, an 1865 lithograph by Currier and Ives that provided buyers with space to write the name of the deceased onto an elaborate gravestone (figure 2.30).[88] Images like this one participated in a trend toward

---

[86] "Illinois Soldier Monument: Meeting of the United Service Club – Address by Major General B.M. Prentiss," *Chicago Tribune*, May 8, 1866.

[87] "Soldiers' Monument at Fortress Monroe," *New York Times*, August 14, 1865.

[88] For other discussions of *The Soldier's Grave* and mourning lithographs, see Schantz, *Awaiting the Heavenly Country*, 163-179; Faust, *This Republic of Suffering*, 231; and Bryan F. Le Beau, *Currier and Ives: America Imagined* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2001), 103-104.

memorial lithography, existing in the United States since the early nineteenth century. In the antebellum convention, a printed gravestone with space to write details of the identity of the deceased would be accompanied by mourners, usually a lone female in mourning costume, and other emblems, often including a willow tree. In *The Soldier's Grave*, this conventional type is adapted for a military purpose. Instead of an urn or other Greek Revival symbols, the gravestone is decorated with the accoutrements of war: rifles, drums, cannons, and an eagle with outstretched wings bearing a laurel wreath. As the young lady in mourning leans against the gravestone, a sea of marching troops appears to the left. And as Mark S. Schantz has pointed out, the unmediated space for inscribing the name of the dead of the antebellum lithographs has been replaced by a much more regimented form: "In memory of [Name of deceased] of the [Corps, Brigade, Regiment, etc.] who died at [Place, date], 186[year]."[89] The discipline of military life is reflected in the structuring of form.

The relationship between lithographs like *The Soldier's Grave* and the citizen soldier monument is unmistakable. Like the ephemeral gravestone, the soldier monument often employed iconography such as the eagle, the laurel, and the collections of armaments. Both, too, helped to mediate the anxiety of losing a loved one in a distant land. Those who bought copies of *The Soldiers' Grave* could inscribe the paper gravestone with the memory of their lost loved one to display in the home as a replacement for another resting place that might be too far away to visit, or even unknown. Likewise, the soldier monument provided a physical location for enacting rituals of memory in front of a stone carved with the names of the dead. Even the

---

[89] Schantz, *Awaiting the Heavenly Country*, 177.

regimented formal structure of *The Soldier's Grave* reflects the monument. The lithograph provides the generic inscription, "A brave and gallant soldier and a true patriot," alongside a poem evoking the "victory won" and the soldier's final rest. Rather than leaving space for the owner of the lithograph to write her own description of the deceased, the image assumes that all soldiers are "gallant" and "true," and that a single inscription can be adapted to any circumstance. The soldier monument participates in a similar form of collective rhetoric, providing a list of names along with an inscription meant to speak for all of them. Even in memory, the soldier is memorialized through military discipline.

In addition to its connection with other aspects of mourning culture, the soldier monument bears a strong formal relationship with developments in cemetery sculpture. This is true of the architectural forms involved, which borrowed from classical precedents for both military and funerary monuments, as well as the use of sculpted figures. During the same years that the soldier monument was rising in popularity as the most commonly mass-produced civic statue, the angel was enjoying a similar status in the funerary sphere. Developing out of a tradition of winged formed appearing on early colonial headstones, fully in-the-round cemetery angels began appearing on tombs in the 1850s, beginning with human-sized monuments and becoming more elaborate as the century progressed. As Elisabeth Roark notes, the rise of the cemetery angel has often been dismissed by scholars as sentimental and uninteresting, but for nineteenth-century viewers, the sculptures represented important theological principles connecting the deceased with heaven.[90] A similar observation

---

[90] Elisabeth L. Roark, "Embodying Immortality: Angels in America's Rural Garden Cemeteries, 1850-1900," *Markers: The Annual Journal for Gravestone Studies* 24 (2007): 70.

might be made about the soldier monument, which embodied deep-seated anxieties about the postbellum nation but maintains a reputation for rote, patriotic copying. That the same monument firms were often responsible for marketing both soldier monuments and funerary sculpture speaks to the interconnectedness of these forms. A page of advertising from the July 1892 issue of *Monumental News* shows an advertisement for the stock soldier figures of Cole and Marciasi right alongside similar ads for funerary monuments (figure 2.31).[91] For most nineteenth-century buyers, the soldier monument and the funerary monument were part of the same industry.

The soldier monument and the angel sculpture also borrowed from similar iconography, both occasionally evoking attitudes of mourning. The *Arsenal Monument* of 1865, erected in the Congressional Cemetery in Washington, D.C., to commemorate a tragic explosion on June 18, 1864, that took the lives of twenty-one female cartridge makers in the Washington Arsenal, bridges the gap between the funerary sphere and the civic soldier monument (figure 2.32). The monument, a tall shaft topped by an allegorical figure of Grief, is sited in a cemetery, like so many early soldier monuments, and also like the soldier monument, its meaning is activated through the reading of a list of names and a description of the tragedy on the monument's base. The figure of Grief atop the shaft is female, and simply clad in classicizing garb, evoking the standard angel figure but without wings. She gazes downward and to her right in a posture symbolizing mourning, calling to mind the antebellum mourning lithographs that featured women as the prime mediators of loss. This posture and gaze was later adopted by Martin Milmore for his Roxbury soldier;

---

[91] "Cole & Marciasi, Successors to Robins & Co.," *Monumental News* vol. 4, no. 7 (July 1892): 276.

one assumes that Milmore and *Arsenal* sculptor Lot Flannery may have been familiar with the same iconographical tropes. Milmore even reused the downward-gazing posture a few years after designing his Roxbury soldier, when sculpting an *Angel of the Resurrection* for the tomb of Maria Frances Copenhagen in Boston's Mount Auburn Cemetery, bringing the connection between the cemetery angel and the soldier monument into sharper focus (figure 2.33). For Milmore and many other artists who worked in both the funerary and the commemorative realm, connections between the two worlds were clear, and the soldier monument thus incorporated aspects of the nation's mourning and its triumph.[92]

The Copied Soldier Monument

The elaborate mourning practices of the post-Civil War era provided ample fuel for the development of a soldier monument industry that relied on the production of copies. Throughout the nineteenth century, most middle class Americans consumed artworks through inexpensive copied forms, such as chromolithographs or plaster casts. As a widely multiplied form, the soldier monument relied on sculpture's inherent ability to be replicated. Unlike a painting, which can reasonably be produced by a lone artist in front of an easel, the production of a bronze or marble sculpture is almost always a collaborative process. The artist makes a model of the design and then turns it over to a team of workmen, who assist in scaling the model to the appropriate

---

[92] Abby Arthur Johnson, "'The Memory of the Community': A Photographic Album of Congressional Cemetery," *Washington History* 4, no. 1 (Spring-Summer 1992), 43; Melissa Sheets, "A Memory Forgotten: Representation of Women and the Washington D.C. Arsenal Monument (M.A. Thesis, University of Nebraska – Lincoln, 2011), 21; Linden, *Silent City on a Hill*, 276-277.

size, usually with the assistance of precise mechanical measuring tools, and then convert the model either to carved stone or cast metal. With the time and expense associated with creating a single model and the ease of producing mathematically exact copies, American sculptors through much of the nineteenth century focused their energies on producing prototypes that would generate requests for multiples.

Even as American sculptors learned to collaborate with workshop teams to produce multiples of their works, however, the general public remained skeptical of this process. In 1864, just after the completion of her ideal marble figure *Zenobia*, sculptor Harriet Hosmer defended herself and her profession against charges that her sculptures were more the product of Italian marble carvers than her own ingenuity.[93] In a strongly worded letter that was later printed in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Hosmer describes the process of sculpture from the initial clay model to the finished work in marble, pointing out that all of her contemporaries and most of their Renaissance and Baroque predecessors employ workmen in the same way that she does, and correctly surmising that it is her gender that places her work under such scrutiny.[94] More than thirty years later, an article in the *Monumental News* about the sculptor Paul Wayland Bartlett demonstrates a continued inability to absorb Hosmer's view of sculptural practice. The author, Emma Bullet, denigrates the use of workmen in sculpture and elevates the ideal of the lone sculptor involved in every aspect of his work. Bartlett is praised "because he spends his days in his studio, in his foundry, not only giving life

---

[93] Joy S. Kasson, *Marble Queens and Captives: Women in Nineteenth-Century American Sculpture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 155-157.

[94] Harriet Hosmer, "The Process of Sculpture," *Atlantic Monthly* 14, no. 86 (December 1864): 734-737.

to his conceptions and molding them in clay, but after the selection of the material, it is he who cuts and chisels."[95] At the end of a century in which sculptural reproductions became a part of the culture, the lone genius was still privileged.

The replicated soldier monument must therefore be understood in the context of the tension in critical circles between the encouragement of multiplied art in mass culture and the privileging of the lone original work and the artistic genius who produced it. While the copying of painting and sculpture through prints and plaster models made viewership and ownership of art more affordable for the average American, the art world and the elites who supported it needed a way to set certain works apart as masterpieces in an increasingly mass-produced world. The discourse of copying, then, should be seen as a negotiation between social classes, with the citizen soldier standing in for the needs of the common man. The privileging of originals over copies should also be considered in the context of the development of the modern discipline of art history, which emerged in the same years that the soldier monument was at its peak in the United States.

In the mid-nineteenth century, the American middle class was highly familiar with the concept of copied art. Knowledge of important paintings was communicated mainly through print culture, while plaster casts of antique and Renaissance sculpture formed the basis of artistic training. Since the colonial and early national periods, European conventions of portraiture had spread via mezzotints, and the ownership of printed images was within the means of most middling families. In the antebellum period, one of the most influential artistic organizations was the American Art-Union,

---

[95] Emma Bullet, "What French Sculptors Think of American Sculptors," *Monumental News* 7, no. 5 (May 1895): 305.

organized upon the dual principles of encouraging American artists through financial support and elevating the public taste through the dissemination of fine art images. The Art-Union, active between 1839 and 1852, solicited subscriptions by offering at least one fine art engraving each year, a ticket for the annual Christmas lottery giving the subscriber an opportunity to win an original artwork, and eventually, a subscription to the Art-Union's journal. With the money procured through inscriptions, the Art-Union bought works by American artists, offering 36 paintings to 829 subscribers in 1839, and eventually ballooning in 1849 to 18,960 subscribers, who had a chance to win one of 460 paintings, 400 medals, 100 sets of engravings, and 20 bronze statuettes.[96] The Art-Union folded in 1852, nominally because the New York State Supreme Court had declared its annual lottery to be illegal, but as Rachel Klein points out, more accurately because of the combined pressures of a genteel press that ridiculed the Art-Union's attempt to elevate popular taste, a penny press that resented the privileged Art-Union's attempt to manipulate the art market, and artists who felt that they had been treated unfairly by the organization.[97] The forces that brought down the Art-Union prefigured similar assaults at the end of the century that would eventually drive a wedge between popular culture and the fine arts, but during its heyday, the organization served as an important mediator of public taste. Paintings by American artists disseminated through the Art-Union's engravings and other

[96] Patricia Hills, "The American Art-Union as Patron for Expansionist Ideology in the 1940s," in *Art in Bourgeois Society, 1790-1850*, Andrew Hemingway and William Vaughan, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 314-339.

[97] Rachel N. Klein, "Art and Authority in Antebellum New York City: The Rise and Fall of the American Art-Union," *The Journal of American History* 81:4 (March 1995): 1536.

publications promoted an awareness of a burgeoning national art tradition, while putting ownership of art images at an accessible level for most Americans.

As prints were useful in disseminating versions of painted images to a mass audience, so plaster casts of ancient and Renaissance sculptural masterpieces were considered to be useful teaching tools. During the nineteenth century, major museums in both Europe and the United States amassed massive collections of plaster casts, often displaying these casts alongside original contemporary artworks. In 1868, the *Convention for Promoting Universal Reproductions of Works of Art for the Benefit of Museums of All Countries*, made by "several Princes of the reigning families of Europe," facilitated the exchange of casts of famous works through the establishment of national commissions, and created a climate wherein the production and distribution of casts by major institutions was greatly encouraged.[98] As Pamela Born demonstrates, the cast collections built as a result of this agreement formed the basis of American study of the classics, and the acquisition of casts remained popular until the beginning of the twentieth century, when increased donations by rich museum patrons made it possible for American institutions to become competitive in the market for acquiring antiquities.[99] For much of the nineteenth century, then, the typical American museum made little differentiation between display of copies and

---

[98] South Kensington Museum, *Catalogues of Reproductions of Object of Art, in Metal, Plaster, and Fictile Ivory, Chromolithography, Etching, and Photography* (London: George E. Eyre and William Spottiswoode, 1869), iii-iv.

[99] Pamela Born, "The Canon is Cast: Plasters Casts in American Museum and University Collections," *Art Documentation: Bulletin of the Art Libraries Society of North America* 21, no. 2 (2002): 8-13.

originals, and indeed there was no clear line between these two categories of visual material.

The cast collections were featured in a debate over the function of museums. As Alan Wallach notes, the presence of casts in museums functioned in conversations over whether the museum should serve primarily as an institution for democratic education, or as a site for the joyful observation of elite artworks.[100] Casts functioned primarily as educational tools, allowing viewers unable to travel to see the originals the ability to experience the three-dimensional impact of important sculptures, and for the most part the casts were accepted as reasonable substitutions for the originals. Even as late as 1900, in describing the collection of plaster casts at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Arthur Hoeber asserted, "The plaster casts here are, for all intents and purposes, the originals, for the reproduction is absolutely accurate and, save to the connoisseur, they cannot be told from the sculptor's own creation, so the visitor may study them with the assurance that he loses nothing in being before an imitation."[101] The assertion that the casts *are* the originals is an extraordinary one, and it demonstrates the blurring of lines between original and copy even at the end of the nineteenth century. The function of the casts as primarily didactic mirrors a similar function for the soldier monument – at one level, the soldier monument serves as a teaching tool on virtuous citizenship when placed in a civic space. For both the cast

[100] Alan Wallach, *Exhibiting Contradiction: Essays on the Art Museum in the United States* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998), 52-53.

[101] Arthur Hoeber, *The Treasures of the Metropolitan Museum of Art of New York* (New York: R.H. Russell Publisher, 1900), 27.

and the copied soldier monument, that educational function is more important than a purely aesthetic one.

For American sculptors working in the nineteenth century, copying was more than a teaching tool or democratizing force, but also a basic element of the sculptural market. As discussed above, the expense and difficulty of producing a single model, combined with increasing knowledge of how to produce mathematically exact copies of sculpture, induced many mid-century artists to invent sculptural prototypes that would appeal to a mass audience. These practices took place at all levels of the market. Expatriate artists living in Italy, including Hiram Powers and Harriet Hosmer, produced popular subjects in marble that would entice orders from wealthy patrons. The most successful of these neoclassical productions was Powers' *Greek Slave* of 1846, which was copied six times at full size, several more times at a reduced size, and ad nauseam in small tabletop copies in marble, plaster, porcelain, and bronze. The *Greek Slave*'s success as an erotically-charged political emblem of the abolitionist fueled its replication, and the various sizes and materials of its copies made it accessible to many markets.[102] A copy of the *Greek Slave* now in the collection of the Smithsonian American Art Museum measures forty-four inches in height, about two thirds of the full-scale model (figure 2.34). Even at a reduced size, a marble reproduction like this one would have been an expensive purchase, available only to the wealthy. At the other end of the spectrum, John Rogers made a career out of catering specifically to the middle class with his genre sculptures, produced out of

---

[102] For more information about the reception history of Hiram Powers' *Greek Slave*, see Kasson, "Narratives of the Female Body: *The Greek Slave*," in *Marble Queens and Captives*, 46-72.

plaster and scaled for the average home. Over the course of his career, Rogers sold about eighty thousand copies of about eighty different designs.[103] Ranging from explicitly Union-oriented political themes during and after the Civil War, like *Taking the Oath and Drawing Rations* (1865) or *The Fugitive's Story* (1869), to sentimental scenes of daily life, like *Coming to the Parson* (1870) or *Checkers Up at the Farm* (1875), Rogers' groups became a fixture in American middle-class homes, making the ownership and viewership of sculpture available to a wide audience. In a culture where even elite sculptors sold multiples of their best work, and the average American could afford to order a Rogers group, ordering a soldier monument from a catalogue may have seemed commonplace.

But the availability and circulation of copied art among the middle classes eventually invited a backlash from the art establishment. The popularity of all types of multiplied art, as they had flourished throughout much of the nineteenth century, began to decline as the century came to a close. Throughout the century, critics representing the cultural elite clashed with more democratic elements, each seeking to gain control of America's art market. Even before the Civil War and the resulting outpouring of copied commemoration, this ideological battle raged. In 1855, a writer in the *Crayon* disparaged the inexpensive small-scale copies of European paintings and statues that flooded American marketplaces, seeing the copies as a barrier to any attempts to "improve public taste" for "true and pure Art."[104] For this writer, the education of the public was the duty of the critic, and the direct market for inexpensive

---

[103] Michael Clapper, "Reconstructing a Family: John Rogers's Taking the Oath and Drawing Rations," *Winterthur Portfolio* 39, no. 4 (Winter 2004): 259.

[104] "Sketchings: Cheap Art," *Crayon* 2, no. 16 (October 17, 1855): 248.

copies disrupted the critic's ability to mediate the consumption of art. Writing just after the Civil War, Harriet Beecher Stowe decried such critical mediation. In an essay titled "What Pictures Shall I Hang On My Walls?" for the *Atlantic Almanac* of 1869, she imagines a series of interactions between "honest John Stubbs" and his snooty neighbor, Don Positivo, who sees himself as a great authority in matters of artistic taste and offers pedantic criticism of all images that Stubbs acquires to decorate his home. For Stowe, critics like "Don Positivo" only encourage confusion, and she details categories of pictures that ordinary Americans might prefer to hang on their walls in lieu of reproductions of "high art."[105] By the end of the century, however, as David Lubin notes in analyzing the work of still-life painter William Harnett, art criticism had gained an even greater role in public tastes, emphasizing the painterly hand of the artist as the only marker of quality.[106]

The declining popularity of chromolithography as a mass art form, hastened by the opinions of art critics, serves as a case study for the changing attitudes toward copying during the second half of the nineteenth century. A chromolithograph is a color print produced by applying several layers of color using a series of prepared stones. Manufacturers of chromolithographs such as Louis Prang prided themselves on their ability to produce accurate images of fine art, and often sold the resulting prints in ornate frames, with surfaces embossed with a canvas-like pattern. But chromolithography came under fire toward the end of the nineteenth century for its

---

[105] Harriet Beecher Stowe, "What Pictures Shall I Hang On My Walls?" *Atlantic Almanac* (1869): 41-44.

[106] David Lubin, *Picturing a Nation: Art and Social Change in Nineteenth-Century America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 293.

role in producing artistic copies. Michael Clapper identifies three aspects of chromolithographs that offended critics: for writers critical of the medium, the resulting images were "mechanical, deceptive, and commercial," mechanical because machines were used to replicate paintings that had first been realized by humans hands, deceptive because their producers, especially Louis Prang, claimed that only an expert could distinguish a chromo from a real painting, and commercial because they were explicitly created for a consumer market.[107] No matter the quality of the chromo, critics had a complaint: poor quality prints were dismissed as useless, while better-quality ones were denigrated for diluting the art market with inexpensive copies. As Joni Kinsey has persuasively demonstrated, cultural elites finally defeated the chromolithograph entirely by changing the artistic value system, privileging original works of art exclusively.[108] While the multiplication of two-dimensional images through prints continued to flourish, these images were seen as merely educational tools, with no value in the increasingly exclusive art market.

While art critics denigrated the most common forms of copied art in the postbellum period, artists worried that multiples, especially unauthorized ones, would degrade the value of their original designs. Unauthorized copying of sculpture was a rampant problem in the nineteenth century. An 1861 issue of the *Crayon* recounts an encounter on a New York street between the sculptor Leonard Wells Volk, already

[107] Michael Clapper, "'I Was Once a Barefoot Boy!': Cultural Tensions in a Popular Chromo," *American Art* 16, no. 2 (Summer 2002): 21-26.

[108] Joni L. Kinsey, *Thomas Moran's West: Chromolithography, High Art, and Popular Taste* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, Josslyn Art Museum, 2006), 45.

famous for a bust of Lincoln he had based on a life mask, and an Italian image

peddler, who offered to sell the sculptor a poorly-crafted plaster cast of his own

Lincoln bust. Volk immediately inquired where the casts were made and barged into

the studio, demanding that the molds for the Lincoln bust be broken. When the

counterfeiters refused to comply, he took a mallet and smashed the molds himself, an

action for which he was later fined six and a quarter cents.[109] Less violent but equally

upsetting for the individuals involved was the unauthorized copying of Augustus

Saint-Gaudens' design for the *Adams Memorial*, which Saint-Gaudens had produced

for the grave of Marian Adams, wife of Henry Adams, who had committed suicide.

Saint-Gaudens had failed to copyright his design, and his widow Augusta failed to

obtain the removal of the statue by legal means. Perhaps because of the controversy,

though, the unauthorized Baltimore copy became a target for vandalism and ghostly

urban legends, and public opinion eventually succeeded where the legal system had

failed.[110]

Advances in photography, a medium plagued by its own set of issues

surrounding duplication and authenticity, also fueled concerns about the unauthorized

multiplication of public sculpture. A November 1892 issue of *Monumental News*

advocates the use of photography in advertising the best work of the monumental

industry, but also decries those who photograph the works of other artists in public

cemeteries without permission, possibly to facilitate copying. So prevalent was this

practice that Mount Auburn Cemetery in Boston prohibited photography within its

---

[109] "Sketchings," *The Crayon* 8, no. 7 (July 1861): 151.

[110] Cynthia J. Mills, "Casting Shadows: The 'Adams Memorial' and Its Doubles," *American Art* 14, no. 2 (Summer 2000): 12-17.

grounds altogether.[111] Given these concerns, it seems strange that the magazine only two months later published an advertisement for "Tipton's Photographs of Gettysburg Monuments," guaranteed to "increase the business of anyone using them" (figure 2.35).[112] The advertisement does not specify how the photographs will aid in increasing business, but given that the portfolio is obviously intended for an audience other than the artists directly involved in creating the photographed monuments, the implications are somewhat murky. Whether the photographs are intended to serve merely as inspiration or as templates for unauthorized replicas, they must have created a sense of anxiety for the authors of the works in question.

Unknown agents working under shadowy circumstances were not the only producers of unauthorized copies, however: artists also had to keep an eye out for the foundries and workers charged with converting their plaster models into finished statues. One foundry worker who clearly engaged in unauthorized copying was Melzar Hunt Mosman, who apparently had some association with the Ames Manufacturing Company beginning in the 1870s, probably as a bronze caster, and bought that company's sculpture department in 1898.[113] Before buying the department, it seems that Mosman may have owned his own firm, the Chicopee Bronze Works, as evidenced by ads appearing in the *Monumental News* throughout the 1890s. One such advertisement, from April 1892, identifies Mosman as a founder who executes statues

---

[111] "The Camera as a Helper," *Monumental News* 4, no. 11 (November 1892): 420.

[112] "Advertisement: A Selection of Tipton's Photographs of Gettysburg Monuments," *Monumental News* 5, no. 1 (January 1893): 43.

[113] Lewis Waldron Williams, "Commercially Produced Forms of American Civil War Monuments" (M.A. Thesis, University of Illinois, 1948), 120-122.

by other artists in bronze, but also as an independent artist who "originates designs for Artistic Public and Soldiers' Monuments."[114] The source for those original designs is somewhat suspect. As early as 1874, a design for a Mosman original in Middletown, Connecticut bears a striking resemblance to a statue by Martin Milmore, erected in Woburn, Massachusetts in 1869 and Keene, New Hampshire in 1871 (figure 2.36). Mosman's statue has a different form of facial hair, but many other details of pose and costume, down to the creases in the soldier's pant legs, match Milmore's design exactly. If Mosman worked on Milmore's designs, all of which were cast by Ames, he would have had access to molds that would have allowed him to alter designs for his own purposes. Nine years later, in designing a soldier and sailor for a memorial hall in Northampton, Massachusetts, Mosman exhibits a more free-form type of emulation, this time inspired by the infantryman from the 1869 Soldiers' Monument in Brooklyn's Green-Wood Cemetery, who so imprudently rests his hand on his loaded rifle (figure 2.37). While it is clear that this time Mosman designed his own figure, the bizarre repetition of a clearly non-regulation pose points to his original source.

This chapter has considered the development of the soldier monument in the hands of American sculptors and artisans, the relationship between the soldier monument and the often mortified body of the soldier, the rooting of the soldier monument in a shifting "culture of death," and the copied soldier monument's association with other forms of mid-nineteenth century multiplies. Even as artists worried about the potential for unauthorized reproduction of their work, the American

---

[114] "M.H. Mosman," *Monumental News* 4, no. 4 (April 1892).

middle class became increasingly comfortable with such forms. While the copying of art was common in the nineteenth century, however, the proliferation of soldier monuments and other copied forms prompted a shift in aesthetic opinion, and the soldier monument came to exist in a liminal space between art and commodity. And yet, twenty-first-century landscapes continue to be marked by these copied and commodified nineteenth-century monuments. It is now possible for the modern viewer to see the copied Civil War soldier as a coherent cultural movement in a way that may not have been clear while the monuments were being built, and to connect the monument to the history of the time it commemorated. Indeed the copying of the citizen soldier monument, as a whole project, should be indelibly linked with all of the other copied, prosaic, ritual behaviors connected with the death of soldiers in the Civil War.

Even more to the point, copying as a representational strategy is a particularly appropriate visual response to the war's numbing slaughter. During the Civil War, 750,000 soldiers died of battlefield wounds, illnesses spread in camp, or the exposure that came with imprisonment behind enemy lines. Each individual soldier's death was realized in a unique experience of grief by his loved ones, but to the controlling government powers, these deaths were statistics, and even at the personal level, responses to death followed a pattern. As Drew Gilpin Faust points out, the letters sent home to inform family members of a soldier's death invariably conformed to a formula of "good death," indicating that the soldier was aware of his impending death and had made peace with it, was reconciled with God, and had offered last words of condolence for his family.[115] This formula was often even applied in cases where the

---

[115] Faust, *This Republic of Suffering,* 15-18.

soldier was killed instantly on the battlefield; in these cases, the letter writer made it clear that the soldier had expressed all of the necessary sentiments before heading off to battle. This repetition should not be seen as a lack of originality on the part of the letter writers so much as a way of processing loss by relying upon rituals of mourning. The nineteenth-century expectation of a "good death" enacted in the presence of family was shattered by the realities of war, but the letters kept its basic tenets alive. And while the letters are formulaic, each was written by an individual doing his or her best to do the right thing for the deceased, and upon arriving at its destination, each letter impacted a specific family with grief over a specific soldier.

The soldier monument echoes the work of these letters. The monuments exist because a few local communities in the years immediately following the war were looking for an appropriate visual form for their feelings about the war, and the ritual of commissioning and dedicating a sculpted soldier figure seemed to fit. What started in a few locations became a national trend, always fueled by individual locations and marked by the names of local soldier dead. Like the letters, the soldier monument converted profound individual grief into a palatable and visible form, masking ugly and violent reality with a simpler message.

Likewise, the bronze and granite soldier monuments, as they dominated American landscapes, provided a permanent memory of the ephemeral enactions of mass grief that would have been visible during and immediately after the war. Specifically, the repetition of visually striking rituals of death can also be imagined in considering women's mourning garb. During the Civil War, even with shortages of black fabric, many women fought to keep the traditions of mourning alive. Faust considers the heavy death toll of the Civil War in the context of mourning attire, and

visualizes a landscape of the wives, mothers, daughters, and sisters of fallen soldiers, all clad in black.[116] In her memoirs, the nineteenth-century novelist and advocate for women's rights Elizabeth Stuart Phelps remembers a nation "dark with sorrowing women":

> Our gayest scenes were black with crape. The drawn faces of bereaved wife, mother, sister, and widowed girl showed piteously everywhere. Gray-haired parents knelt at the grave of the boy whose enviable fortune it was to be brought home in time to die in his mother's room. Towards the nameless mounds of Arlington, of Gettysburg, and the rest, the yearning of desolated homes went out in those waves of anguish which seem to choke the very air that the happier and more fortunate must breathe.[117]

This visual sea of women in black would have been most concentrated during the war, when all of the women connected with a dead soldier were wearing mourning for him, but the temporary proliferation of mourning garb that marked the years of the war with a visual index of war death prefigured the later bronze and granite soldiers who would come to symbolize the nation's loss. As a woman wearing mourning during the war years would have immediately evoked meditations on the battlefield, so the presence of a soldier monument indicates the loss of a community's men in the war.

The very simplicity of the soldier monument's iconography has contributed to its effectiveness in propagating remembrance of war. As has been explored in this chapter, the sculpted image of a soldier at parade rest has an almost literal relationship with the bodies of soldiers who fought and died in the Civil War. Injury and loss

---

[116] Faust, *This Republic of Suffering*, 149.

[117] Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, *Chapters from a Life* (Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1896), 96-97.

suffered by actual soldiers' bodies can be read onto these sculpted bodies, and sometimes pictured by these bodies due to vandalism or neglect. The sculpted soldier can be seen as denying war reality or as offering an alternate memory, but the one-to-one relationship between the bronze soldier and the human soldier makes the bronze soldier an effective emblem for the middle-class communities that espoused it. The repetition of these forms, too, has contributed to the clarity of their interpretation, especially in the case of standardized figures like the Monumental Bronze Company's "American soldier," which appeared in locations as diverse as Massachusetts and Nevada. While the exact meanings of the Civil War continue to be contested, and the representation of these white American soldiers continues to be problematic, the fact remains that to see one of these soldier figures is to think of the Civil War in some way. Even that achievement is more than many allegorical statues from the nineteenth century have managed.

As the late nineteenth century progressed, the number of soldier monuments in Northern states erected increased exponentially, and the rhetoric surrounding them became increasingly more triumphant and less elegiac. As decades passed, and discourses of reunion and reconciliation replaced reminders of why the war was fought, the soldier monument lost some of its initial power. Ambrose Bierce's bitter stories about the Civil War, many of which date to the 1890s or later, prove that the war was never over for many veterans, but the national mood changed, and with that mood came an increased standardization and rote repetition of the soldier monument. The meaning of the soldier monument progressed and changed, but at its inception, it served as a powerful lightning rod for the memory of the dead.

Chapter 3

SOLDIER MONUMENTS OF THE CONFEDERACY

For the viewer accustomed to seeing soldier statues on pedestals in town squares, a jarring sight awaits in the Elberton Granite Museum (figure 3.1). In a tiny room off the main display space, a metal dolly carpeted in green bears the remains of the granite statue of a Civil War soldier, lying on its back. The statue is broken into four pieces: the principal section of head and body, two legs, and a base, which still bears the remains of the statue's feet. The soldier, were he able to stand, would be at parade rest, with his rifle held vertically in front of him. He wears a heavy overcoat and a flat-topped foraging cap, or kepi. His mustachioed face bears a somewhat startled expression, perhaps exacerbated by his supine position, so undignified and unexpected for a soldier monument.

This unfortunate statue once served as the Elbert County Confederate Monument, located in front of the county courthouse in Elberton. Carved out of local granite, the statue was unveiled on July 15, 1898 to almost immediate uproar and disapproval (figure 3.2). The townspeople ridiculed the statue for its bizarre, squat appearance. Some compared it to a hippopotamus. Indeed, the monument's stature departed strongly from the noble soldier figures then appearing across the nation, and many pointed out that the figure's kepi and overcoat were much more closely associated with soldiers of the Union army. Finally, something about the statue's face made local residents feel it was "too German," and soon it acquired the nickname "Dutchy."

Poor "Dutchy" stood on his pedestal for more than two years, the laughingstock and embarrassment of his town. But on the night of August 13, 1900, an anonymous group of townsmen placed a rope around his neck and dragged him to the ground, where he broke into several pieces. On finding him the next morning, the people of Elberton decided to bury him where he lay, facedown, in disgrace.[118] The local newspaper summarized the matter as follows:

> We the jury find after due deliberation, that the deceased, "Dutchy," came to his death by falling from his perch on the monument; that said "Dutchy" was afflicted with gout and dropsy and that he died with the marble heart. We also find that he was assisted in his downward fall by unknown persons, and that said unknown persons were justified in their conduct, he being an interloper in the cause, and that he would make a better beer saloon sign than a statue for a Confederate monument.[119]

After the burial of poor "Dutchy," the townspeople of Elberton quickly acquired a new Confederate statue for their memorial, this one wearing the proper slouch hat and bedroll associated with Confederate soldiers. Ironically, this new statue, cast in white bronze, was one of the many stock Confederate soldiers marketed by the Monumental Bronze Company, based in Bridgeport, Connecticut (figure 3.3).[120] In exchanging their Union-appearing soldier carved locally out of local materials for a statue with more appropriate iconography, the people of Elberton replaced a homegrown monument with one of Yankee origin.

---

[118] Frank M. McKenney, *The Standing Army: History of Georgia's County Confederate Monuments* (Alpharetta, GA: W.H. Wolfe Associates, 1993), 56-58.

[119] "'Dutchy' Comes off his Perch," *Elberton Star*, August 16, 1900.

[120] Grissom, *Zinc Sculpture in America*, 529.

The tragic fall of "Dutchy" presents in microcosm three of the key issues necessary for understanding the function of the Confederate soldier monument in the postbellum era: how the shock of losing the Civil War led to the development of the mythology of the Lost Cause; how a specific iconography of the Confederate soldier emerged from the broad visual culture of the Civil War and how that iconography was expressed through sculpture; and how the Confederate monument factored into intense postwar political discussions, including those between white and black Southerners and the passionate emotions that complicated reconciliation with Northern states. While Northern soldier monuments commemorated a costly victory through the body of the citizen soldier, Southern monuments had the much more difficult task of remembering a cause that had been lost and finding a new way to honor the soldiers who had died fighting for it. In procuring monuments, Southern monument committees had to decide whether to deal with Northern monument companies eager to meet their needs or to develop their own industry with help from overseas, both of which they attempted. In grappling with the market demands necessary to create an industry for replicated monumental sculpture, Southerners became involved in industrial processes that belied their emphasis on an agrarian past championed through the Civil War.

To shape these monuments, it was necessary to decide how the Confederate soldier would be depicted, as printed text and imagery offered a vast array of options for attitude and uniform. The reception of "Dutchy" in Elberton reveals that these decisions were not always easy, and three decades after the war, tension between the sections still ran close to the surface. Further, the removal of "Dutchy" carries disturbing resonances with the practice of lynching. The nighttime attack on the

monument that must have been planned more thoroughly than the speculation about drunken men with a rope would allow; in addition, the mock juridical language in the *Elberton Star* blaming "unknown persons" for the attack, and the suggestion that "Dutchy's" appearance or Yankee leanings might have justified his removal, is eerily similar to accounts of actual lynchings from the same era. As a metaphor for all of these themes in Southern war commemoration, the fall of "Dutchy" is a useful lens for considering how the Confederate monument was shaped during and by the postwar period. The issues of representation, monumental process, sectional ambivalence, and underlying violence that mark the story of "Dutchy" are present throughout the history of Confederate soldier monuments.

Fall of a monument

"Dutchy" was not initially maligned. Newspaper articles leading up to and detailing his unveiling reveal the same sort of enthusiasm that normally accompanied the creation of a local soldier monument. The highly anticipated monument was covered in a lengthy story in the *Atlanta Constitution* on January 25, 1898, which outlines the fundraising efforts of Mrs. R.M. Heard of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and names the sculptor as a Mr. P.A. Beiter of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, who had also superintended the construction of a Confederate monument in Cuthbert, Georgia. Accompanying the story is a sketch of the proposed design, credited to C.H. Mayhew of Elberton (figure 3.4). The soldier in Mayhew's design wears the kepi that would eventually appear on "Dutchy's" head, but his costume is markedly different, consisting of a short shell jacket and bedroll slung across the breast.[121]

---

[121] "To the Dead Who Fell in Battle," *Atlanta Constitution*, January 25, 1898.

Upon its unveiling, the statue was hailed by the *Elberton Star* as "a credit to this county and to the ladies of the Memorial Association" and by the *Atlanta Constitution* as a "throne of patriotism."[122] Both newspapers included sketchy illustrations of the monument. The *Elberton Star* repeats the conceptual sketch attributed to C.H. Mayhew, while the sketch in the *Atlanta Constitution*, even in its minimal detail, conveys a hint of the statue's strange squatness (figure 3.5). The *Star*'s reprinting of the Mayhew design was probably due to necessity, as the local newspaper may not have had its own sketch artist, but it also hints that perhaps there was already some uneasiness about the appearance of the Confederate monument. The Atlanta writers, located more than one hundred miles away, would have been less invested in the monument's success. This same discrepancy in tone appeared later when the two newspapers covered the monument's destruction. While the *Elberton Star* concocted an irreverent account of "Dutchy's" fall, the *Atlanta Constitution* called the perpetrators "miscreants" and suggested that the governor of Georgia offer a reward for their capture, dismissing the powerful history of iconoclasm of public sculpture as a political act and casting "Dutchy's" attackers as simple pranksters. The *Constitution* was even diplomatic in explaining the statue's downfall, admitting that "the sculptor in some way made a bad job in chiseling out the soldier," but allowing that he had done "quite a fine one in the rest of the work." No mention was made of any resemblance to a Yankee soldier.[123]

---

[122] "The Confederate Monument Was Unveiled Last Friday," *Elberton Star*, July 22, 1898; "Elbert's Tribute to Boys in Gray," *Atlanta Constitution*, July 16, 1898; "The Fall and Rise of 'Dutchy,' Elberton's First Granite Monument," (Elberton, GA: Elberton Granite Association, 1982), 2.

[123] "Soldier on Monument Gone," *Atlanta Constitution*, August 15, 1900.

"Dutchy's" creator has not fared well in the historical record. Most current accounts of the monument's story, printed in local newspapers and in materials printed by the Elberton Granite Association, give his name as Arthur Beter and speculate that he must have been a German immigrant with little knowledge of the particulars of Civil War uniforms.[124] Researching the "P.A. Beiter" mentioned in the *Atlanta Constitution*, however, suggests a different story. The sculptor of "Dutchy" was probably Peter Arthur Beiter, born in Ohio in 1867 to German immigrant parents Ignatius and Catherine. Beiter was one of eleven children, eight of whom were sons who learned various aspects of the stonecutting trade.[125] If the 1898 article in the *Atlanta Constitution* is correct, he was involved in constructing at least one other Confederate monument for the town of Cuthbert, Georgia, erected sometime between 1896 and 1898 (figures 3.6 and 3.7). Ironically, this monument does not remain in its original state either: the statue was knocked from the shaft in 1909 and broken when a tornado ripped through the town. The people of Cuthbert paid for a new statue in a similar pose to be placed atop their monument, while the original statue, missing his right arm and left hand, was placed in the local Confederate cemetery alongside the remains of the dead.[126] When viewing the Cuthbert figure side by side with "Dutchy," it is difficult to believe that the same hand carved both statues, but the bases of the two extant monuments do bear some similar hallmarks, including a stepped construction

---

[124] "The Fall and Rise of 'Dutchy,'" 6.

[125] John Brainard Mansfield, *The History of Tuscarawas County, Ohio* (Chicago: Warner, Beers & Co., 1884): 740.

[126] McKenney, *The Standing Army*, 97-99.

and arced inscription. The most likely explanation is that Beiter carved the bases of both monuments, but obtained the marble figure topping the Cuthbert monument from another source, possibly one of the many Italian studios involved in producing soldier figures for Confederate monuments. If "Dutchy" was Beiter's first foray into figure carving, he may have swapped the shell jacket for an overcoat to simplify the design.

Beiter left Georgia shortly after the unveiling of "Dutchy." By 1900, he was living in Waco, Texas, one of six stonecutters in the same boardinghouse. By 1912, he was the general manager of the Quality Granite Works, a granite cutting and polishing plant in Llano, Texas. The 1930 census shows him still living in Llano with his wife, and still occupied as a granite cutter in a granite shed.[127] There is no record of whether he heard what had happened to his granite statue for Elberton, or of how he might have felt about it. "Dutchy's" zinc replacement, obtained from the Monumental Bronze Company through the fundraising of the ladies' memorial association, was put in place on April 20, 1905, and dedicated six days later during exercises for Confederate Memorial Day with the usual speeches from local dignitaries.[128] For the new statue, a ten-foot shaft was added to the base to prevent any further intervention by Elberton's citizens, and the replacement's Yankee credentials are never mentioned in accounts of the monument.

As for "Dutchy," he remained buried in Elberton's town square for more than eight decades, a symbolic corpse laid ignominiously to rest to symbolize the

---

[127] 1900 Census; "The Machine Markets: Texas," *The Iron Age* vol. 89, no. 14 (April 4, 1912): 900; 1930 Census.

[128] "New Confederate Monument: Elberton Replaces 'Dutch' Figure Removed Two Years Ago," *Atlanta Constitution*, April 22, 1905.

townspeople's continuing bitterness in the wake of the Civil War.[129] But in 1982, local residents, almost disbelieving the story of "Dutchy's" ignominious end, decided to dig for the statue, and on April 19, he was disinterred, cleaned, and donated to the Elberton Granite Museum. Today, the first Elberton Confederate statue is highly regarded as the first product of a granite industry that became Elberton's main economic success.[130] The political acrimony, racial strife, and iconographical anxiety that prompted Elberton's citizens to remove "Dutchy" are now footnotes to a history that is remembered primarily as an amusing anecdote related to the town's flagship industry.

Confederate Commemoration and the Lost Cause

While the feelings that brought down "Dutchy" are comparatively muted today, the physical and psychological wounds of war were deep and virulent in the 1860s. As the Civil War came to a close in the spring of 1865, the South was a devastated region, reeling from the recent war and struggling to retain a sense of identity in the face of loss. As David H. Donald explains, Southerners were suffering from two severe psychic traumas: first, that battlefield defeat and surrender had come completely unexpectedly, carrying none of the inevitability that has been read back onto the conflict by later generations; and second, that the system of slavery had abruptly ended, and with it white Southerners were forced to acknowledge that their

---

[129] For a meditation on the use of effigies and statue destruction at mock funerals in an American Revolutionary context, see David Waldstreicher, "Rites of Rebellion, Rituals of Assent: Celebrations, Print Culture, and the Origins of American Nationalism," *Journal of American History* 82, no. 1 (June 1995): 47-49.

[130] "The Fall and Rise of 'Dutchy,'" 3.

narrative about docile and contented slaves had been completely off the mark. During

the war, most Confederate loyalists saw individual defeats or privations as setbacks

along the road to ultimate victory, and even as reports of the surrender of the Army of

Northern Virginia at Appomattox began to circulate in April of 1865, many refused to

believe that the war had been lost. And even as this first reality began to sink in, most

white Southerners expected that their newly freed slaves would continue to work as

agricultural laborers with little or no pay, accepting the position of inferiority that had

defined their antebellum role. But as African American Southerners rightly refused to

work in near-slavery, this shift in labor forces triggered a complete reconfiguration of

the regional economy. Difficulty in absorbing these major traumas had a profound

impact on the region's ability to recover in the wake of the Civil War, and

commemorative sculpture of the Confederate cause presented a way to mediate these

issues.[131]

      That need to commemorate the Confederacy arose in part to bridge the gap

between the perception of wartime loss and the Southern code of honor. The South's

antebellum culture was not well adapted to absorbing the reality of wartime defeat.

Before the war, most Southern men operated under a complex code of honor, the

tenets of which are defined by William Thomas as "defending personal and familial

honor, providing for one's family, fighting on a fair field, avoiding enslavement, and

---

[131] David H. Donald, "A Generation of Defeat," in *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader*, Larry M. Logue and Michael Barton, eds. (New York: New York University Press, 2007), 335-338.

above all maintaining one's pride and reputation."[132] This system was not confined to the planter class, but pervaded all levels of white Southern male society, and the defense of honor was a highly charged battleground often paired with violence. To call a Southern man a coward or a liar was to invite the need for redress, and dueling became an established practice that at times helped to bolster a duelist's entrance into the upper echelons of society. Edward L. Ayers contrasts the Southern ideal of honor with the contrasting Northern notion of dignity, a theoretical and idealized belief that all men had the same intrinsic worth. Often violated in practice by class distinctions, the concept of dignity nevertheless encouraged Northerners to ignore the same insults that honor forced their Southern counterparts to resent.[133] These major societal differences contributed to the lack of understanding between the two regions in the years before the outbreak of the war and filtered into soldiers' reasons for volunteering to fight. For the young Southern man, fighting for the Confederacy was an opportunity to seek redress against perceived Yankee insults, protect the honor of family, and gain social standing. With battlefield surrender came the destruction of these hopes.

Bitterness over the outcome of the war and the blow to Southern honor was compounded by Southerners' wartime perceptions of Northern culture and the makeup of the Yankee army as inferior to their own. As Michael Bernath explains, many Southern intellectuals before the war saw the United States as an uneasy alliance of

---

[132] William G. Thomas, III, "'Under Indictment': Thomas Lafayette Rosser and the New South," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 100, no. 2 (April 1992): 209.

[133] Edward L. Ayers, *Vengeance and Justice: Crime and Punishment in the 19th-Century South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 13-21.

two separate nations, and with the founding of the Confederacy, attempts to codify these distinctions increased. For Bernath, the fanaticism of Northern culture, especially when it came to abolitionism, was a major sticking point for Southerners. In addition, many Confederates believed that the high rate of immigration to Northern states resulted in an inferior white race.[134] Further, Southern elites who identified themselves with a "Cavalier" planter ideal of gentle aristocracy came to abhor what they saw as a "Yankee" focus on low-class greed and moneymaking schemes.[135] When the war broke out, these criticisms of the North as a whole were applied to the invading armies. A common criticism was that the flood of immigration made the Northern armies into a horde of mercenaries, fighting only for a paycheck against the noble South.[136] In the early years of the war, especially in the Eastern Theater, these stereotypes of Northern inferiority seemed justified as Robert E. Lee and his Army of Northern Virginia won victory after improbable victory against overwhelming odds, stymieing a rotating cast of Union commanders. But a combination of factors caused this good fortune to wither, and surrender came as a humiliating blow to Confederate forces, even as Union leaders such as Ulysses S. Grant and William Tecumseh Sherman offered generous terms of surrender and discouraged their troops from

---

[134] Michael T. Bernath, *Confederate Minds: The Struggle for Intellectual Independence in the Civil War South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 35-76.

[135] William R. Taylor, "Cavalier and Yankee: Synthetic Stereotypes," in *Myth and Southern History Volume 1: The Old South*, Patrick Gerster and Nicholas Cords, eds. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 139-140.

[136] Larry M. Logue, *To Appomattox and Beyond: The Civil War Soldier in War and Peace* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996), 58.

celebrating unduly before their defeated foe.[137] This Southern perception of superiority over Northern culture must have served as a spur to postwar commemoration, prompting Southern cities to keep up with the pace of their monument-building former enemies.

Initial feelings of Northern goodwill toward the defeated South in the wake of the surrender of Lee's army on April 9, 1865 evaporated with the assassination of Abraham Lincoln on April 14. The shock of Lincoln's death prompted many Northerners to call for revenge, and without Lincoln's moderating influence, postwar policy was suddenly embroiled in a power struggle between Democratic President Andrew Johnson and a Congress controlled by Radical Republicans. Johnson initially advocated an especially lenient policy toward the formerly Confederate states, readmitting the states into the nation under their prewar Constitutions and allowing each individual state to manage its own affairs. By the end of 1866, however, the Republican Congress had wrested control of Reconstruction policy from the president. The Republicans passed the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution, banning slavery, bestowing rights of citizenship onto all Americans regardless of race, and extending the right to vote to all male citizens. The new Reconstruction policies also divided the former Confederacy into five military districts, each administered by a government-appointed official, and mandated that all states must pass the three new Constitutional amendments in order to be readmitted into the Union. From 1866 until 1877, when Reconstruction was officially ended in a

---

[137] Paul A. Cimbala, *Soldiers North and South: The Everyday Experiences of the Men who Fought America's Civil War* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2010), 199-201.

compromise over the contested presidential election of Rutherford B. Hayes, there was an intense power struggle in the South between Northern and Republican forces, newly freed African Americans, and the formerly Confederate white Southerners who resented any change to their way of life.[138]

One of the most significant causes of conflict during the Reconstruction era was the strong resistance that most white Southerners expressed for the redefinitions of citizenship that came with the close of the war and the passing of the Reconstruction amendments, especially in regard to the status of African Americans. Under Andrew Johnson's first phase of Reconstruction, Southern states led by Mississippi and South Carolina moved to pass stringent Black Codes that limited freedmen's ability to work in professions other than farming or domestic service, travel from place to place, terminate work contracts with employers, and enjoy other rights.[139] Radical Reconstruction and the new Constitutional amendments nullified most of these laws and placed Southern race relations into limbo. Suddenly granted the right to vote and participate in government, Southern freedmen enthusiastically took part, and for the brief years of Reconstruction, African Americans were elected to positions of power throughout the South, culminating in the election of Hiram R. Revels as a U.S. Senator from Mississippi, a seat once occupied by Jefferson Davis. Years before Reconstruction ended officially with the election of President Rutherford

---

[138] The merits and shortcomings of post-Civil War Reconstruction continue to be debated by scholars. For one comprehensive account of the period that has defined much recent Reconstruction literature, see Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution* (New York: Harper Collins, 1988, reprint Perennial Classics, 2002).

[139] Foner, *Reconstruction*, 199-201.

B. Hayes, white Southerners began to take steps to reclaim their state governments. As Stephen Budiansky notes, the very fact of black male suffrage and the way it was imposed via the U.S. Constitution was seen as tyranny by Southern whites, and the attempt to restore antebellum race relations was often advanced by clandestine violence.[140] In order to restore white supremacy and home rule of Southern states and to get past the outcome of the war, it was necessary to adopt a strategy to glorify the past and to improve Northern perceptions of Southern culture. A redefinition of the history of the Civil War helped to achieve these aims.

White Southerners responded to the psychological scars caused by defeat in the war and the political struggles of the Reconstruction era by developing a set of mythologies that has come to be known as the Lost Cause. First coined by Edward A. Pollard in his 1867 book, *The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates*, the term came to refer to a Southern view of how the war and its aftermath should be remembered.[141] As William A. Blair writes, the Lost Cause is "the southern interpretation of the conflict as the agrarian South conducting a hopeless fight for states' rights against the industrial North."[142] In the Lost Cause view, slavery had little or nothing to do with the reasons for fighting the war, being no more than an occasion for a conflict based on differences in interpreting the Constitution. The South's soldiers were brave and noble, operating under dire conditions with few

---

[140] Stephen Budiansky, *The Bloody Shirt: Terror After the Civil War* (New York: The Penguin Group, 2008), 7.

[141] See Edward A. Pollard, *The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates* (New York: E.B. Treat and Company, 1867).

[142] Blair, *Cities of the Dead*, 2.

supplies or provisions, and their battlefield loss came about only by the overwhelming might of the North's industry and population. For this reason, ultimate military loss did not lead to dishonor; instead, Southern armies were commendable for their tenacity in continuing to strive against such insurmountable odds.[143] As an element of Lost Cause strategy, most former Confederate rejected the official Federal designations of "Civil War" or "War of the Rebellion" for the conflict, arguing that since the South had seceded and built its own nation for the five years of the war, the conflict was not a civil war. Instead, many adopted "War Between the States" as the official name, with more incendiary versions such as the "War for Southern Independence" or "War of Northern Aggression" as alternatives.[144]

The Lost Cause was codified and defended by a vast array of organizations and individuals. While writers like Edward A. Pollard and former Confederate politicians like President Jefferson Davis and Vice President Alexander Stephens put their thoughts on paper, much of the organizational work of memorialization fell to women. In a sense, women's memorial societies grew naturally out of women's organizations that formed during the Civil War to provide material or spiritual aid to the soldiers, but

---

[143] The Lost Cause has received a great deal of scholarly attention over the last several decades. For a series of perspectives, see Gaines Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865 to 1913* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 3-10; Charles Reagan Wilson, *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1980), 1-17; and Blight, *Race and Reunion*, 37-38. For an analysis of primary documents detailing the shifting justifications given for secession before, during, and after the Civil War, see James W. Loewen and Edward H. Sebesta, *The Confederate and Neo-Confederate Reader: The "Great Truth" about the "Lost Cause"* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2010).

[144] Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 118.

women's involvement in Southern commemoration had even deeper implications. As Caroline E. Janney has suggested, women in the South had a unique ability to memorialize the Confederate cause in a tense postwar environment without attracting the accusations of treason that would have followed their male counterparts. While men who had served in the Confederate army had to swear an oath of loyalty to the United States in order to restore their citizenship rights, their wives, sisters and mothers had no such oath and no similar concerns about citizenship. Because they operated outside the legal sphere, Southern women paradoxically had more agency than their male counterparts in shaping postwar commemorative practices. Women could also couch their interest in giving soldiers proper burials and decorating their graves in the language of domesticity, adopting grief and mourning as the prerogative of women. In this way, Confederate commemoration received less scrutiny from Northerners during the first decades after the war than it would have if primarily handled by men, as Northern leaders underestimated the women's ability to develop a commemorative and political landscape.[145]

In the years after the war, many of the former Confederate leaders and even women's organizations who advocated for Lost Cause thinking engaged in heroicizing certain individuals, including Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson, sometimes at the expense of other army officers or even the rank-and-file enlisted men. This tendency

---

[145] Caroline E. Janney, *Burying the Dead but Not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 60-68. For other perspectives on the role of women in Confederate commemoration, see Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 38-45; and Cynthia Mills and Pamela H. Simpson, eds., *Monuments to the Lost Cause: Women, Art, and the Landscapes of Southern Memory* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2003).

was most pronounced in the memorial efforts of a group of veterans, mostly from

Virginia, to further the reputation of Lee. In early November 1870, less than a month

after Lee's death, these veterans gathered to form the Association of the Army of

Northern Virginia, or AANVA, and elected former Confederate general and Lee

subordinate Jubal A. Early as their first president. As Gaines Foster has demonstrated,

Early proved to be a controversial leader. In his zeal to prove that his former

commander had committed no wrong in guiding the Confederate cause, he smeared

the reputations of many fellow veterans, most notoriously James Longstreet, who he

blamed for the loss of the battle of Gettysburg in response to Longstreet's postwar

support of Northern Reconstruction policies. Early was also not opposed to

denigrating the common Confederate soldier in order to increase Lee's stature, arguing

that Lee would have been successful if his army had not become worn down and

demoralized by the war.[146] Rank-and-file veterans sometimes expressed their

displeasure with this type of selective war memory. As E. Merton Coulter notes, the

Confederate monument in Athens, Georgia was at one point chastened by an "Old

Soldier" in a newspaper editorial who insisted that all names of fallen soldiers listed

on the monument be given equal billing, with no distinction given in regard to rank.

For this particular soldier, it was extremely important to recognize that Confederate

privates had sacrificed just as much and fought just as bravely as their officers.[147]

---

[146] Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 52-60. For more information about Early and Longstreet from Longstreet's perspective, see Budiansky, *The Bloody Shirt*, 149-162.

[147] E. Merton Coulter, "The Confederate Monument in Athens, Georgia," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (September 1956): 241-242.

Southern society betrayed class conflicts both before and during the war that foreshadowed the reverence for aristocratic officers that permeated postwar memory. As Michael Bernath has pointed out, one of the major criticisms that Southern intellectuals before the war leveled on their Northern counterparts was a belief in "agrarianism," used as a catchall term for any policy that would lead to increased social equality, including moves toward universal suffrage, increased immigration, the weakening of property rights, workers' rights movements, and other perceived evils. Universal white male suffrage, especially, was seen as dangerous, as it gave a voice to disaffected populations of Northern workers.[148] With the coming of the war, Southern elites brought their disdain for the working classes into the development of their new government. Many scholars have suggested that the elitist and slaveholding basis on which the Confederacy was founded was a major force in undermining the cause as lower- and middle-class privates rebelled against their aristocratic officers through desertion. Aaron Sheehan-Dean argues that this is not the case: even though less privileged Southerners did bear the brunt of military service, and although they were denied means of avoiding service such as hiring a substitute or securing an exemption based on the need to control a slave population at home, these soldiers did not generally express their grievances in terms of class. Although desertion was a consistent problem that continued to plague the army, a general lack of interest in reuniting with the North and a near-unanimous belief in the righteousness of slavery gave Confederate soldiers an incentive to submit to military discipline and to continue

[148] Bernath, *Confederate Minds*, 42-44.

fighting the war.[149] The soldiers' commitment formed the basis of postwar memorialization.

Despite the elite-centered nature of much of Confederate culture, the enlisted man found an important place in Lost Cause mythology. Ragged and ill-equipped, but with a remarkable ability to secure victory in the face of overwhelming odds, the rank-and-file Confederate soldier became an important cultural type. Southern accounts of the war often emphasized his material disadvantages, as in the 1886 poem "Only a Private," which points out a military hierarchy while simultaneously honoring the soldier:

> Only a private! To march and to fight,
>   To suffer and starve and be strong;
> With knowledge enough to know that the might
> Of justice and truth and freedom and right
>   In the end must crush out the wrong.[150]

The anonymous writer highlights the Confederate private's strength in the face of want and assures the reader of the just nature of the Confederate cause, while at the same time repeating that the individual recognized by the poem is *only* a private. Moses Drury Hoge expressed a similar sentiment in an 1892 speech advocating for a citizen soldier monument to be built in Richmond. Hoge evokes the soldier's "matted hair and mendicant's rags," but also brings to mind Robert E. Lee's pronouncement

---

[149] Aaron Sheehan-Dean, "Justice Has Something to Do with It: Class Relations and the Confederate Army," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 113, no. 4 (2005): 366-371.

[150] "Only a Private," dated October 24, 1886, in Mrs. B.A.C. Emerson, ed., *Historic Southern Monuments: Representative Memorials of the Heroic Dead of the Southern Confederacy* (New York: Neale Publishing Company, 1911), 325.

that he was never ashamed of the appearance of his men while they were on the field of battle.[151] The common soldier in Confederate myth who did his duty without the goal of fame or honor strengthened the perception of that soldier as a gentleman who gave himself selflessly to his country and his Cause.[152]

Those soldiers who gave their lives for the Lost Cause were honored by monuments that first and foremost grieved their passing. The relationship between monuments and mourning culture is complex and ever-present in a Southern context. In the North, communities mourned a great loss of life as families lamented the faraway or unknown graves of loved ones, but victory in the war served as a balm for grief. But in Southern towns, where much greater percentages of the male population had participated in the war, grief over individual loss was coupled with the need to cope with a cause that had been lost. As both Gaines Foster and William A. Blair have observed, many Southerners who spoke out on the subject of monuments in the earliest decades after the war either stressed the funerary nature of memorials or warned against them entirely. Robert E. Lee, who turned down all invitations to attend, speak at, or provide financial support for monument associations or commemorative ceremonies, worried that monuments might unnecessarily preserve the reasons for sectional conflict and invite criticism from Northerners, thus producing memories of the war that would only resurrect bad feelings. Even the Ladies'

---

[151] Moses Drury Hoge, "The Private Soldier: An Address before the Mass-meeting held in the interest of the Monument on Libby Hill, Richmond, Va., Nov. 30, 1892," in Peyton Harrison Hoge, *Moses Drury Hoge: Life and Letters* (Richmond, VA: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1899), 461-462.

[152] Wilson, *Baptized in Blood*, 54.

Memorial Association of fiery Charleston, South Carolina saw the appropriateness of placing a Lost Cause monument in the cemetery, where it would honor the dead in a properly subdued mood.[153] Immediately after the war, then, most Southern memorial efforts were focused on burying the dead and dealing with the grief of loss.

As the war ended and peace was declared, debates over how or whether to rebury Confederate soldiers in special cemeteries became a major point of contention between the two formerly warring sections. While Union soldiers were elaborately reinterred in a new system of national cemeteries specifically laid out to honor the war's Northern dead, the federal government made no provision for Confederate soldiers. Indeed, burial parties paid special attention to the clothing and other accoutrements found with the deceased to prevent mixed reburials. The creation of these federal cemeteries in close proximity to battlefields across the South and their exclusion of Southern dead caused considerable bitterness among the residents of the former Confederacy, many of whom resented the fact that federal tax dollars were applied to the creation, beautification, and staffing of cemeteries that honored individuals from only one section of the country. Catherine W. Zipf suggests that the presence of carefully manicured national cemeteries, often in proximity to burial sites for Confederate soldiers, served as a propaganda tool to communicate Northern belief in the righteousness of the Union cause.[154] Southern women took up this challenge

_____

[153] Blair, *Cities of the Dead*, 84-85; Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 40-41; *A Brief History of the Ladies' Memorial Association of Charleston, S.C.* (Charleston, SC: B.P. Cooke & Co., 1880), 8-9.

[154] Catherine W. Zipf, "Marking Union Victory in the South: The Construction of the National Cemetery System," in *Monuments to the Lost Cause*, Mills and Simpson, eds., 40-42.

and proceeded to arrange for the burial of their own soldier dead, raising funds to purchase property and to pay workers to perform the grisly exhumations.[155]

The role of women in facilitating the postwar mourning process is made evident in *The Burial of Latané*, an 1864 painting by Virginia artist William D. Washington that was engraved by A.G. Campbell and published by William Pate of New York in 1868 (figure 3.8). The print became more popular than the painting, bought for homes all over the South. In the image, a group of women preside over the funeral and burial of Captain William D. Latané, a Virginia doctor and cavalryman killed during a skirmish associated with the 1862 Peninsular Campaign. As the story goes, the young Latané was the only man to fall in the attack. After the battle was over, Latané's brother, John, entrusted his body to the care of a group of local women who promised to give the remains a proper burial. Unable to procure a minister in the war-torn countryside, one of the women, Mrs. Newton, read the Episcopal funeral service, and others attended the body.[156] When Washington decided to paint the event, he enlisted women from Richmond's elite social circles to sit for the individual portraits. In the print, Mrs. Newton is portrayed looking beatifically toward heaven, as the young ladies weep delicately. At left, the recumbent form of the dead captain is discernible through a heavy shroud, and a group of four slaves looks on solemnly. A little while girl with golden curls waits to strew the hero's grave with flowers.

---

[155] For an overview of the issues surrounding Civil War exhumations and reburials, see Michael Kammen, *Digging up the Dead: A History of Notable American Reburials* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 100-106.

[156] Mark E. Neely, Jr., Harold Holzer, and Gabor S. Boritt, *The Confederate Image: Prints of the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), ix-x.

This print became popular as expressive of the sacrifices and devotion of Southern women during the years of the Civil War, and their participation in memorial work after the war had ended. As Drew Gilpin Faust has noted, the original painting may have served as an exemplar for increased participation of women and slaves in the war effort, but in the postwar years it became a symbol of the nostalgic view of women's role in the war.[157] Even more striking, the print in its postwar context highlighted the role of elite women in Confederate commemoration, especially through participation in Ladies' Memorial Associations. The only white man in the image is dead, his body ghosted through his burial shroud. Four African American mourners, two men and two women, presumably slaves, are segregated at left. One of the men leans on a shovel after digging the grave, and all four bow their heads piously, illustrating the white Southern trope of the faithful slave at a safe distance from the white ladies at right. A white woman is at the apex of the composition, serving as intercessor for the dead man's soul, just as women were the primary actors in communicating the Confederate cause in the immediate postwar years. The imagery in the print further illuminates the relationship between Confederate women and the soldiers they mourned in ways that Washington may not have intended. In her study of Ladies' Memorial Associations in Virginia, Caroline E. Janney observes that the majority of women who participated in these associations were from elite families. In addition, many of these women did not have a close relative who had served in the Confederate army, and among those who did, few had suffered a loss on the

---

[157] Drew Gilpin Faust, "Race, Gender, and Confederate Nationalism: William D. Washington's *Burial of Latané*," in *Southern Stories: Slaveholders in Peace and War* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press: 1992), 158.

battlefield.[158] Washington's image, with its portraits of elite Richmond ladies standing in for the women who had attended Latané's funeral, none of whom were actually related to him, prefigures these memorial associations. For the women who buried Latané and their later compatriots who focused on burying soldiers, mourning the Confederate dead was a permissible female avenue for political expression.

After the Ladies' Memorial Associations had completed the important work of finding the bodies of Confederate soldiers and interring them in proper cemeteries, they were able to use their resources to erect sculpted memorials. Several Southern cities and towns have claimed their monument as the first Confederate monument, and it is perhaps impossible to determine which is correct. But what seems clear is that for many locations, some form of monument was always part of the plan, with completion dependent on the availability of funds and someone to complete the work of carving. This is captured in Henry Timrod's "Ode Sung on the Occasion of Decorating the Graves of the Confederate Dead," written for a ceremony that took place on June 16, 1866 at Magnolia Cemetery in Charleston, South Carolina. In the first few stanzas, Timrod explains that a monument will soon watch over the deceased in their sleep:

> Sleep sweetly in your humble graves,
> Sleep, martyrs of a fallen cause;
> Though yet no marble column craves
> The pilgrim here to pause.
>
> In seeds of laurel in the earth
> The blossom of your fame is blown,
> And somewhere, waiting for its birth,

---

[158] Janney, *Burying the Dead but Not the Past*, 52-58.

The shaft is in the stone![159]

Timrod makes clear that while the soldiers' cause is lost, their fame carries on, and he reassures the sleeping soldiers that their marble monument is already planned, lying in wait in a stone block like one of Michelangelo's unfinished slaves. Soon, just as the finished shaft will be born from the uncut stone block, its memorial function will grow in the visitor's mind from the presence of the monument. In the last stanza, Timrod praises the holy ground in which "defeated valor lies" and the "mourning beauty" that consecrates it. The poem recalls the political cause for which the soldier fought while cloaking any sectional intentions in the language of mourning and femininity.

The relationship between politics and mourning carried over into early designs for soldier monuments. Even more than in the North, most of the earliest Confederate monuments were erected by companies that were grounded in the gravestone business, with designs that strongly evoked the funerary sphere. While the earliest non-figural Northern monuments tended to consist of plain obelisks, sometimes topped with an eagle, globe, or some other nationalistic symbol, their Confederate counterparts were specifically designed for mourning. Two early examples from Romney, West Virginia (1867) and Cynthiana, Kentucky (1869) make this especially clear (figures 3.9 and 3.10). The Romney monument is at first glance almost indistinguishable from a gravestone of the same era. The urn and shroud at the top of the stepped base were both common elements in funerary designs. Only the bas-relief directly beneath the urn, depicting a winged female figure crowning a dead soldier with a laurel wreath,

---

[159] Henry Timrod, "Ode Sung on the Occasion of Decorating the Graves of the Confederate Dead," in *Poems of Henry Timrod with Memoir and Portrait*, Kate Lloyd, ed. (Richmond, Va.: B.F. Johnson, 1901), 164-165.

and an inscription evoking "Southern Rights" set the monument apart from the rest of the cemetery. The memorial at Cynthiana, probably the first Confederate monument by the Muldoon Monument Company of Louisville, goes even further.[160] The tall marble shaft draped with a shroud has only its inscription to mark it as a monument to a group of soldiers. This stock motif is easily adapted from mourning a single individual to honoring the passing of a Cause. Through the 1870s, these funerary motifs formed the bulk of iconography employed in Confederate soldier monuments.

The Confederate Soldier in Print and Sculpture

As the initial grief at the end of the Civil War began to subside, white Southerners increasingly were interested in figural soldier monuments, and artists began to work out a representational strategy for depicting former Confederate soldiers in sculpture. By 1900, the citizens of Elberton had a clear enough picture of how a Confederate soldier should appear that they were able to identify their "Dutchy" statue as a Yankee interloper who needed to be removed. However, an examination of the extremely varied visual history of the Confederate soldier in print and sculpture during and after the Civil War complicates assumptions that seemed to have crystallized by the end of the century. While the mustachioed Confederate infantryman in slouch hat, shell jacket, and bedroll might have eventually emerged as the archetypal Southern soldier type, artists during and after the war tried myriad representational strategies. These were sometimes influenced by variations in uniform, because personal preference and the privations of wartime shortages meant that a

---

[160] Young Ewing Allison, *The City of Louisville and a Glimpse of Kentucky* (Louisville, Ky.: Louisville Board of Trade, 1887), 127.

single Confederate soldier might go through several changes of costume during the course of the war. Politics, too, played a role, as the personal allegiances of the artist determined the elements he would employ. Finally, with varying styles of representation for officers and enlisted men and differing opinions on whether the standard Confederate should be young or old, a son of planters or a yeoman farmer, the deep class divisions present in Southern society manifested themselves in how the soldier was remembered.

For both Northerners and Southerners, wartime printed images would have played an important role in shaping a visual imagination of the war and later, a context for commemorative statues. Unlike in the North, where a robust printing industry provided countless wartime images of the soldiers in blue, the Confederate soldier was featured in relatively few printed images during and immediately after the Civil War. The fledgling Confederacy did not produce many printed images at all during the war years. In the antebellum period, Southerners imported most of their images from Europe or from the North, with the only two centers of printing in slaveholding states operating in Baltimore and New Orleans. With the outbreak of war, the South was quickly isolated from these two printing cities, as Maryland remained tenuously in the Union and New Orleans was captured and occupied by Union forces in 1862. Cut off from these two sources of printing, Southerners relied on occasional images from England and France smuggled through the Northern blockade of Southern ports, sporadic access to Northern periodicals, and a budding printing industry that was quickly overwhelmed by official government needs.[161] One of the only pictorial

---

[161] Neely et al., *The Confederate Image*, 3-9.

116

weekly news magazines to survive for at least a portion of the war in the South was the *Southern Illustrated News*, printed in Richmond from September 13, 1862 to October 19, 1864, when exigencies of the war forced it to close. For the most part, the images in the *Southern Illustrated News* were crude woodcuts of the South's military leaders, often taken from out-of-date prewar photographs, such as an image of Robert E. Lee printed in the January 17, 1863 issues that gives his name as "Robert Edmund Lee" and shows him with dark hair and without the beard he had grown by the start of the conflict (figure 3.11).[162] With scant resources for producing images, the *Southern Illustrated News* proved chiefly interested in promoting war heroes.

A rare image of a Southern common soldier is the engraving "A Confederate Picket" that appeared in the magazine during 1862 (figure 3.12). Attributed to G.W. Chapman, who may actually be the Confederate soldier-artist Conrad Wise Chapman, the print depicts a seated Confederate soldier, presumably pausing for a moment as he guards his camp on picket duty. He cups his hand to his ear, perhaps listening for signs of trouble. The soldier is plainly but neatly dressed in a shell jacket and slouch hat, with pant legs tucked into his woolen socks. His full, shaggy beard and blousy costume serve as a marked contrast to the formal images of military leaders that appeared in so many issues of the *Southern Illustrated News*, with generals appearing in carefully tailored and detailed dress uniforms. The figure also strongly resembles the frontiersman type identified by Elizabeth Johns in paintings such as Charles Deas' *Long Jakes* of 1844 or William Ranney's *The Trapper's Last Shot* of 1850 as a figure who provided a dangerous but alluring alternative to the Yankees of the Northeast

---

[162] Ibid., 23-30, 61.

(figures 3.13 and 3.14).[163] Like the explorer of the frontier, the Confederate picket

faces the dangers of the surrounding woods alone, as a rugged and brave figure who

cares less about his physical appearance than about standing up to life's perils. By

making the typical Confederate soldier into a frontiersman hovering on the

borderlands of civilization and identity, this image contrasts the enlisted man not only

with his business-obsessed Northern enemy but also with his own aristocratic military

leaders. This suggested dichotomy persisted in Southern memory after the war, both in

images and in writing.

In the absence of a strong national printing industry, some Southerners may

have relied on images smuggled from the Northern press. While it is not known

exactly how often Northern newspapers trickled into Southern hands, it happened

often enough that some Union generals, including William Tecumseh Sherman,

forbade the presence of newspaper artists in their commands altogether for fear of

leaking sensitive military information. Northern papers were clearly slanted toward a

Unionist vision of the war, and often the resulting images were not complimentary to

the Southern cause. For instance, two illustrations in *Harper's Weekly* picture

Southerners as hapless hayseeds. In "Bivouac of Confederate Troops on the Las

Moras, Texas," published on June 15, 1861 and purportedly submitted by a member of

the group represented, Confederate soldiers in sloppy uniforms smoke pipes, drink

liquor, butcher hogs, and sharpen weapons, all while cavorting around a line of stolen

United States supply wagons (figure 3.15). With their coarse features, many of the

figures are reminiscent of country bumpkin types that are a hallmark of antebellum

---

[163] Elizabeth Johns, *American Genre Painting: The Politics of Everyday Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 60-66.

genre painting.[164] Even more damning is the cartoon "Wanted – An Oedipus,"
published on October 10, 1863 and featuring a dull, savage-looking Confederate
fingering a bowie knife and listlessly pondering the fate of slavery as an African-
American woman looks on, gazing boldly at the soldier while wearing the costume of
a sphinx (figure 3.16). Her question, "Now, Massa Confederate, what are you gwine to
do with me?" stresses the perilous relationship between the Confederacy and its
African American population in the wake of the Emancipation Proclamation and the
Union's recruiting of black troops for the war effort. As the soldier ponders the riddle,
the "sphinx" awaits his answer, ready to kill or be killed. But not all Confederate
illustrations in *Harper's* editorialized on the merits of the Cause; some are chiefly
informational. An example is "Uniforms of the Confederate Army," which appeared in
the August 17, 1861 issue (figure 3.17). This image illustrates the wide variety of
uniforms utilized by the Confederate army at the outset of the war using the
longstanding convention of a costume book depicting several modes of dress. The
array of uniforms presented in this early drawing foreshadows the difficulties that
artists would have after the war in sorting through timelines, unit preferences, and
other concerns to pinpoint the "authentic" costume of a Confederate enlisted man.

One of the largest caches of images from a Southern perspective produced
during the war came from Frank Vizetelly, a reporter and illustrator for the *Illustrated
London News*. In the spring of 1861, Vizetelly sailed from London to Boston in the
hope of capturing a few images from a conflict that he believed would be of short
duration. During the first year of the war, he followed the Federal armies, first in

---

[164] Ibid., 146-147.

Virginia and then in the west, sending frequent dispatches back to London. During this time, Vizetelly engendered the enmity of Secretary of War Edwin Stanton for his brutal coverage of the Union defeat at the First Battle of Bull Run, which he described to his London readers as a "disgraceful rout," with an accompanying illustration of fleeing Federal troops. Stung by this account, Stanton did his best to thwart Vizetelly at every turn, refusing him permission to accompany the Army of the Potomac on its campaigns. In July of 1862, Vizetelly decided to cross the battle lines to accompany the Southern armies, hoping to get closer to the action. He stayed with the Confederacy through the end of the war, even accompanying Jefferson Davis on his flight from Federal authority after the surrender of Lee's army. Vizetelly's sympathy with the Confederate cause makes his illustrations a valuable contribution to the development of the soldier's image.[165]

Two of Vizetelly's illustrations, one dating before his decision to cover the war from a Southern perspective, and the other after, show his changing views. The first, titled "The Civil War in America: Jefferson Thompson's Guerrillas Shooting at Federal Boats on the Mississippi," was included in a letter to his London newspaper dated May 14, 1862 (figure 3.18). It dates to his period following Federal troops in the Western Theater, and depicts a ragtag band of Confederate soldiers firing from a tree-lined bank into the Mississippi River. There is no hint of uniformity in the costume of these soldiers. At lower left, a frock-coated soldier with almost simian features pauses at the base of a tree to converse with a companion in ragged trousers. The soldiers who

---

[165] Douglas W. Bostick, *The Confederacy's Secret Weapon: The Civil War Illustrations of Frank Vizetelly* (Charleston, SC: The History Press, 2009), 13-14, 35-39, 67-69, 79-88.

rush to the embankment behind them are poorly groomed, with ragged facial hair, torn

garments, and crushed and floppy hats. At the fair left, a dapper officer with a well-

trimmed mustache and cavalier's hat looks on placidly. In this image, Vizetelly seems

content to mirror the stereotypical images of Confederate soldiers so common in the

Northern press. Contrast this image with the soldiers appearing in "The War in

America: Confederate Sharpshooters Firing on a Federal Supply-Train on the

Tennessee River, taken from an incident on September 14, 1863 and printed in the

Illustrated London News on December 5 (figure 3.19). The situation is almost the

same as the earlier image, with a band of Confederate soldiers firing across a river, but

here the attitude has greatly shifted. No longer skulking behind trees, the central figure

leaps upon a rocky bluff, exposing himself to heavy fire.[166] While the soldiers wear

simple clothing, their garments are more uniform than in the earlier image, and they

seem to be in better repair. Gone are the ragged beards and simian faces: these soldiers

may not have dapper uniforms, but they convey dignity. Clearly, Vizetelly had

become more respectful of Confederate soldiers.[167]

      While these images show the Confederate soldier in the archetypal slouch hat,

bedroll, and shell jacket or blouse, other images by Vizetelly complicate this type. One

[166] This central figure bears a curious resemblance to the shadowy figure waving his hat who appears at the apex of Emanuel Leutze's fresco *Westward the Course of Empire Takes its Way*, completed in the U.S. Capitol at the end of 1862. While it is unlikely that Vizetelly would have seen the painting *in situ* as he was embedded with the Confederate army, it is possible that he encountered either a print source or a written description of the painting, or that both European artists had another precedent in mind for their similar figures. Further research is necessary to determine the connection between these two works.

[167] William Stanley Hoole, *Vizetelly Covers the Confederacy* (Tuscaloosa, AL: Confederate Publishing Company, Inc., 1957), 39-41, 99-101.

example, "Night Amusements in the Confederate Camp," published in the *Illustrated London News* on February 14, 1863, shows a motley crowd of Confederate soldiers standing around a campfire, looking on as a heavily caricatured African American man dances to banjo music (figure 3.20).[168] The soldiers display all sorts of dress. There are some in slouch hats, such as the bearded man who leans casually against the left side of the tent, his shell jacket unbuttoned to reveal a military blouse underneath. His casual attitude is contrasted with the formal military bearing who faces him across the fire with his back to the viewer, at the extreme left of the composition. With his dark frock coat and kepi, this figure could easily be mistaken for a Union soldier. Several other figures on the outskirts of the picture sport the befeathered Hardee hats that were worn by both armies, but made especially famous by the Army of the Potomac's Iron Brigade.[169] Vizetelly's relaxed image of a Confederate camp reveals the complexity of the Southern soldier's dress, dependent as it was on the availability of supplies, the given point in a campaign season or in the timeline of the war, or personal or unit preference. All of these factors combined to create a number of possibilities for representing the Confederate soldier, a multiplicity that was reflected in illustrations and fine art in the years immediately following the war.

When the war ended, several major Northern printing houses immediately began producing prints in memory of the Confederacy, looking to take advantage of a newly reopened Southern market. A large number of these new images were portraits lionizing Confederate leaders such as Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, and Jefferson

---

[168] Hoole, *Vizetelly Covers the Confederacy*, 55-57.

[169] Francis A. Lord, *Uniforms of the Civil War* (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 1970), 43-45.

Davis, but there were also representations of the citizen soldier and allegories of the Lost Cause. Several printers marketed pairs of prints featuring a Southern soldier, in the first leaving for war filled with hope, and in the second returning to find his home and family decimated. An example of the latter scene is Currier and Ives' *The Lost Cause*, printed in 1871 (figure 3.21). In the image, a Confederate soldier pauses along an overgrown lane in front of two wooden crosses, probably marking the graves of his loved ones. A little further down the lane, a ramshackle farmhouse with great holes in the roof reveals the effects of war. The soldier holds his kepi in his hand and presses his handkerchief to his mouth, overcome with emotion. In the sky above the crosses, the stars have arranged themselves into a ghostly outline of the Confederate battle flag, providing both admonishment and benediction for the graves below. A Northern viewer might see the print as placing blame on the veteran and the flag for the loss of innocent lives, but the elegiac nature of the scene also had appeal for Southern buyers.

Several Southern soldier-artists who had sketched battle and camp scenes during the war also worked to market their reminiscences in the postbellum period. One of the most prominent of these was Conrad Wise Chapman, a painter and son of painter-illustrator John Gadsby Chapman, who had spent most of his early life in the American artists' colony in Rome before running away to join the Confederate army at nineteen. He served first in the western theater, where he was seriously wounded in the scalp at Shiloh, and was later transferred to a quieter position within the defensive lines at Charleston, South Carolina, largely through the meddling of his father. After the war, both father and son attempted to capitalize on Conrad's vast collection of war

sketching, producing several engravings based on his images.[170] While sketching his experiences in the west, Chapman generally seems to have represented his fellow soldiers as ragged but hearty, as is clear in two lithographs produced after the war from his designs. His most famous image is probably *Confederate Camp, 3ʳᵈ Kentucky Infantry at Corinth, Mississippi*, lithographed in 1871 after a sketch made in 1862 (figure 3.22). In this image, Confederate soldiers in plain butternut uniforms lounge in camp, cooking dinner, smoking and chatting, whiling away the long hours between military engagements. While the content is similar to the *Harper's Weekly* illustration of Texan Confederates mentioned above, the execution is much more sympathetic to the Confederate cause. Similarly, Chapman painted a self-portrait, *Picket Post*, in 1874, based on a sketch he made during the war (figure 3.23). In it, the artist appears as a Confederate infantryman on picket duty, in garments much the worse for wear. His trousers have a giant hole in the knee, and his civilian's jacket and flannel shirt show the difficulty of obtaining new official garb during a hard campaigning season. Behind him, two additional soldiers continue the theme of non-matching outfits, with the standing soldier sporting a kepi and shell jacket while the recumbent soldier wears a slouch hat and coat that are almost black. Chapman's images clearly bolster the postwar image of the battered but honorable Confederate soldier, relaxed and vigilant at the same moment.

The postwar illustration career of Allen Christian Redwood, who also served in the Confederate army during the war, offers another perspective on representation of Southern soldiers. Born in Virginia and educated in Baltimore, Redwood fought in

---

[170] Ben L. Bassham, *Conrad Wise Chapman: Artist & Soldier of the Confederacy* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1998); Neely et al., 209-213.

Virginia and Maryland regiments. After the war, he moved to Baltimore and later to New York, where he made his greatest contribution to postwar imagery with several illustrations for *Century Magazine*'s popular series "Battles and Leaders of the Civil War," which began as a sequence of essays written by former Union and Confederate military commanders in the early 1880s and later morphed into a multi-volume book series. One of these illustrations, "Confederate Types of 1862," typifies Redwood's output (figure 3.24). In the image, a neatly dressed Confederate artilleryman stands in front of a cannon, wearing a kepi. Over his right shoulder stand an infantryman and a cavalryman on a horse, both of them in rougher garb. Much like the *Harper's Weekly* illustration of 1861, Redwood's image provides a taxonomy of soldiers. Even the title, "Confederate Types," suggests a scientific study, with the specificity of the year implying that the "types of 1864" might look very different. The use of the word "types" also suggests that individual soldiers' personalities are less important than the ability to classify them. In picking a "type" of soldier to represent, then, each postwar artist had many choices based on the phase of the war, the position of the soldier represented in Southern society, the audience consuming the image, and the intended political message in reference to the Lost Cause. From dapper cavalry officers hailing from planter families and flush with the first thrill of battle to war-weary veterans of the Army of Northern Virginia laying down their weapons at Appomattox and longing to return to their homes in Appalachia, the Confederate soldier's image could be manipulated to fit any message.

With the variety of representational strategies for depicting Confederate soldier in print in mind, it is now possible to consider how sculptors of monuments navigated the postwar memorial landscape. As Gaines M. Foster has noted, Confederate

monuments appeared more slowly than their Union counterparts, and for the first

twenty years after the war, funereal monument types such as obelisks were much more

common than soldier monuments, with both types much more likely to appear in

cemeteries than in civic settings.[171] These monuments came from a variety of sources:

local cemetery carvers who might provide the base and the figure, or might order the

figure from an Italian studio; Northern bronze or white bronze foundries; or large

Southern monument companies that dealt almost exclusively with figures sourced

from abroad. Borrowing from a range of options in earlier visual culture, this

decentralized field of artistic agents engaged in the project of Confederate

memorialization. The Inventory of American Sculpture currently lists ten Confederate

monuments featuring soldiers erected between 1865 and 1880, many of which might

not have been recognized in 1900 by the citizens of Elberton as representing the

"typical" Confederate soldier. They are located in Wilmington, North Carolina (1872);

New Orleans, Louisiana (1874); Savannah, Georgia (1875-1879); Holly Springs,

Mississippi (1876); Selma, Alabama (1878); Augusta, Georgia (1878); Macon,

Georgia (1879); Columbia, South Carolina (1879); Winchester, Virginia (1879); and

Camden, Alabama (1880). Of these, the Macon and Columbia monuments can be

traced to the Muldoon Monument Company of Louisville, Kentucky. The Savannah

and Augusta monuments are elaborate civic memorials with multiple artists and

contractors. The Wilmington monument is a copy of the Union infantryman found on

the *City of New York Civil War Monument* in Queens, New York, notably leaning

precariously on a rifle that is probably loaded for guard duty.[172] And the New Orleans,

---

[171] Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 40-41, 273.

[172] Grissom, *Zinc Sculpture in America*, 500-501.

Holly Springs, Selma, Winchester and Camden monuments seem to be the work of local carvers.

Possibly the first Confederate monument to feature a figure of a soldier, the 1872 monument in Oakdale Cemetery in Wilmington, North Carolina, demonstrates the involvement of Northern manufacturers in the Confederate monument industry (figure 3.25). The statue is a nearly exact copy of a very early Union infantryman prototype that first appeared on the *City of New York Civil War Monument* in Queens in 1866 (figure 3.26). Cast by New York bronze founder Maurice J. Power and possibly designed by German-born sculptor Caspar Buberl, the original statue features a Union infantryman wearing a kepi and the caped cold-weather overcoat issued only to Union soldiers, standing on guard duty and improbably resting his hand on his loaded rifle.[173] The North Carolina version, also cast by Power, is altered only in the belt buckle, which has been changed to read "CS" rather than "US," and medallions by young Southern sculptor William Rudolph O'Donovan, depicting Generals Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson, adorn the base. The expediency of applying minor changes to an existing statue in order to adapt it for Southern purposes stands in startling contrast toward the insistence on particular iconography that would later prompt the citizens of Elberton, Georgia to reject their Confederate statue. And yet, the statue served as a powerful emblem for the Southern cause, with speeches at its dedication focused on lionizing the Old South and criticizing Reconstruction policies.

---

[173] This figure also appears as a Union soldier in Brooklyn, NY (1869); White Plains, NY (1872); Clinton, MA (1875); Lawrence, MA (1881); and Ossining, NY (1887), and as a Confederate soldier in Greensboro, NC (1888). Grissom, *Zinc Sculpture in America*, 489-490, 500-501.

The keynote speaker, Confederate veteran and North Carolina state senator Charles W.

McClammy, railed against the "violence" that Northerners had committed against the

"plain and primitive principles of liberty" and praised Southern soldiers whose "proud

heads never bowed beneath a degrading yoke."[174] McClammy's fiery dedication

speech and the performance of civic ritual naturalized this "Union" statue form as a

Southern symbol.

Not all early Confederate monuments looked to Northern figural sources. The

complex monuments in Savannah and Augusta, both dedicated in the latter half of the

1870s, paid meticulous attention to the soldier figures topping their columns,

searching for a distinctly "Southern" type. Unlike so many soldier monuments, which

feature universal figure types with generic features, both of these soldier statues were

based on portraits of specific individuals. Savannah's monument was drastically

altered from its original form to its present appearance after the initial dedication

ceremony in 1875. The first design was conceived and fabricated by Canadian sculptor

Robert Reid and his family's business, the Montreal Marble Works (figure 3.27). This

monument featured a towering column dripping with baroque decoration, topped by a

female allegorical figure of Justice and housing a similar figure of Silence.[175] Soon

---

[174] Tom Vincent, "'Evidence of Womans Loyalty, Perseverance, and Fidelity':
Confederate Soldiers' Monuments in North Carolina, 1865-1914," *North Carolina
Historical Review* 83, no. 1 (January 2006): 74-75.

[175] The pairing of "Justice" and "Silence" is an uncommon one for a monument and
particularly strange for a war memorial purported to honor the dead of a cause that had
been lost. The inscription on the monument's base is little help in interpreting this
choice, consisting only of the war's dates and a cryptic phrase: "Come from the four
winds, O Breath, / And breathe upon these slain, that they might live." Further
research would be necessary to determine Robert Reid's intention in choosing these
particular attributes, but anecdotal evidence suggests that his intentions, no matter

after the monument was unveiled, however, Savannah residents began to complain that the design was uncomfortably ornate, and a proposal was put forward by local resident George Wymberly Jones DeRenne to remove the female allegorical figures, wall off the niche where Silence had stood, and replace the figure of Justice with a Confederate soldier (figure 3.28). DeRenne gave the commission for the new statue to David Richards, a Welsh-born sculptor working in the North, and local Confederate veteran Captain Hamilton Branch was invited to pose for the figure.[176] Richards and DeRenne were particularly concerned with producing a figure in "war-torn garments," representing the "typical" soldier even if the sculpture was modeled on a portrait likeness. DeRenne later wrote:

> It represents him as he was – in feature, form and raiment – a man who chose rather to be than to seem, to bear hardship than to complain of it; a man who met with unflinching firmness the fate decreed him: to suffer, to fight, and to die in vain.[177]

what they were, went over the heads of most Savannah residents. For instance, an 1875 letter to the editor in the *Atlanta Constitution* dismisses the statue as a "very pretty" mistake bought from Canada when the money should have been spent on a Georgia-made product, and identifies the allegorical figures as "the goddess of liberty" and "another figure, holding in her hand a torch to throw light over the names that feel in darkness and gloom." See "Savannah Correspondence," *Atlanta Constitution*, May 13, 1875.

[176] Frank Wheeler, "'Our Confederate Dead': The Story Behind Savannah's Confederate Monument," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* vol. 82, no. 2 (Summer 1998): 385-387, 393-394.

[177] Terry Parent, "Letter Sheds New Light on Confederate Statue Here," *Savannah Morning News*, September 29, 1952.

For DeRenne, the statue's costume was deeply significant in representing his notion of the Confederate soldier who sacrificed everything and endured great privations for the Lost Cause. The Savannah monument fulfilled this notion.

Also based on a real soldier, Augusta's soldier figure is more casually dressed than the figure on the Savannah monument, but with a dapper air (figure 3.29). The model was Private Berry Benson, a native of South Carolina and resident of Augusta, who became famous for escaping from two different Union prisons during the war, but the statue is intended to represent all citizen soldiers of the Confederacy. Carved out of Carrara marble by Antonio Fontana under the auspices of Van Gunden and Young of Philadelphia, the statue of Benson atop the column is joined at the base by figures representing Generals Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, Thomas R.R. Cobb, and William H.T. Walker.[178] The figure's kepi is cocked at a jaunty angle, and the jut of his right hip pushes the traditional "parade rest" stance toward classical contrapposto.

Clearly more reserved and more humbly made than their counterparts in Savannah and Augusta, the Confederate monuments of Holly Springs, Selma, Winchester, and Camden share a motif that would soon disappear in Confederate commemoration: the soldier with reversed arms, or with a rifle held so that the barrel is pointing at the ground (figures 3.30-3.32). The command to "reverse arms," first appearing in infantry drill manuals around the time of the Civil War, was employed at solemn occasions, such as soldiers' funerals or military executions, to symbolize mourning, respect, and even surrender – all three would have been appropriate in a

---

[178] Edward J. Cashin, *The Story of Augusta* (Augusta, Ga.: Richmond County Board of Education, 1980), 148.

Confederate context.[179] A connection between soldier monuments and "reverse arms"

is evoked in the first verse of the song "Brave Battery Boys", composed for the

dedication of a monument to the Bridges Battery at Rose Hill Cemetery in Chicago on

May 30, 1870:

> We come with reversed arms, O comrades who sleep,
> To rear the proud marble, to muse and to weep,
> To speak of the dark days that yet had their joys
> When we were together –
>   Brave Battery Boys.[180]

In the poem, joy and sorrow are merged in front of the marble monument,

which is honored by the ceremonial rifle gesture. The gesture is appropriate for the

monuments of Holly Springs, Selma, Winchester, and Camden, all of which appear in

cemeteries, and its appearance in the 1870s points to the still-complicated position of

Southern memory at the end of Reconstruction. Produced so close to the end of the

war, these monuments were more funereal than celebratory. Funerary traits are

especially present in the Holly Springs Monument. The soldier figures on either side

of the shaft stand with bowed heads, with the infantryman holding his rifle at reversed

arms. The shaft itself, an obelisk draped by a shroud, is a standard motif used in

Victorian cemetery sculpture and related to the draped column. This monument clearly

---

[179] While it seems that "reverse arms" was employed throughout the Civil War, there was no formal description of it in drill manuals. A proposal for a uniform method of enacting "reverse arms" appeared in the *Army and Navy Journal* in 1866. See "Method for Reversing Arms," *United States Army and Navy Journal and Gazette of the Regular and Volunteer Forces* vol. 3, no. 36 (April 28, 1866): 569.

[180] "Brave Battery Boys," in Angie C. Beebe, ed., *An Original Collection of War Poems and War Songs of the American Civil War* (Red Wing, Minn.: The Argus Press, 1903), 62.

expresses the death of Confederate soldiers, the deep mourning of their loved ones, and the defeat of the cause for which the war was fought. By the beginning of the 1880s, however, these mournful statue types would be replaced by more triumphal concepts embraced by large monument companies in the North and the South.

By the time Southern towns had begun erecting the first figural soldier monuments in the 1870s, a robust monument industry had been growing in the North for about a decade. In the Northern states, sculptors trained abroad and within the United States looked to gravestone carvers, weapons factories, and foreign carvers and foundries for assistance in producing finished works of sculpture. Without an established industrial base and with a depleted postwar economy, Southern states had fewer resources with which to produce stone and metal statues, and as a result, many soldier statues for Confederate monuments were produced elsewhere. A few large Southern monument companies emerged, including the Muldoon Monument Company, which dominated the latter nineteenth century, and the McNeel Marble Works, which came into prominence in the first decade of the twentieth century. Both of these firms had their own operations for carving bases of monuments, while statues were sourced overseas, generally marble from Italy and bronze from Germany. Many Northern firms also began marketing statues to Southern towns.

The first monument firm to focus its energies on Southern soldier monuments was the Muldoon Monument Company of Louisville, Kentucky. While the slaveholding Kentucky remained in the Union during the war, many residents had Southern sympathies, and today there are more Confederate soldier monuments in the state than Union ones. The firm was founded in 1857 by Michael Muldoon, who had emigrated from Ireland to the United States in 1849 at the age of thirteen. Muldoon

specialized in procuring and finishing raw materials for cemetery monuments and other architectural purposes, and when a need arose for Confederate soldier monuments in the wake of the Civil War, he was well positioned to take advantage of the new market. By the 1880s, the Muldoon Monument Company owned an interest in quarries in Barre, Vermont; worked closely with a studio and workshop in Carrara, Italy; and partnered with a bronze foundry in Munich, Bavaria; all while maintaining a polishing and finishing shed in Louisville where fifty workmen were employed. In 1902, an ad in *Confederate Veteran* magazine claimed that the company had "erected nine-tenths of the Confederate Monuments in the United States," a claim that may or may not be true. What is fairly clear is that the Muldoon Monument Company worked primarily as a contractor for major monuments, meeting with memorial associations to obtain commissions and then working with an international network of suppliers to obtain a suitable statue. This business model seems to have been adopted by most Southern companies that became involved with the monument industry.[181]

Most of the single-figure Confederate soldier monuments erected by the Muldoon Monument Company sport marble figures that can generally be attributed to the studio of Carlo Nicoli, a master sculptor and professor who operated a major studio in Carrara. The earliest of these appears to be the 1878 monument in Macon, Georgia (figure 3.33). Placed on a stepped base of thirty-one feet, the more than ten-foot statue makes an imposing impression. The figure is a fierce and flamboyant

[181] Allison, *The City of Louisville and a Glimpse of Kentucky*, 127; "Mike Muldoon: He Corresponds to the Highest Estimate of True Christian Manhood," *Kentucky Irish American*, 22 April 1899; "Muldoon Monument Company, Louisville, Ky.," *Confederate Veteran* 3, no. 6 (June 1895): xv; "Muldoon Monument Company, Oldest and Most Reliable House in America," *Confederate Veteran* 10 (1902): 95.

Confederate soldier, holding his upright rifle to his right side while twisting his head to the left, glowering toward the horizon. He wears a slouch hat jauntily tilted to one side and a full overcoat that flaps open at both shoulder and knee, as if in a strong breeze. The full mustache, curly hair, and flamboyant costume, with voluminous drapery folds in the coat's cape and skirt, give the figure a romantic and mature air, consistent with the archetype of the aristocratic Confederate cavalier. This particular Confederate type became a hallmark of the Muldoon marble designs, and appeared in several variations through the 1880s and 1890s. It seems that the type was popular enough that it may have been copied by sculptors and monument companies not associated with Muldoon or the Nicoli studio, as may be the case with the 1885 monument in New Bern, North Carolina (figure 3.34). The common practice of borrowing freely from competitors marked the nineteenth-century monument industry.[182]

---

[182] Tracking down a list of monuments by the Muldoon Monument Company has been a somewhat laborious process. The Smithsonian's Inventory of American Sculpture lists only six Confederate monuments that are clearly attributed to Muldoon and some combination of collaborators, located in Macon, Georgia (1878); Columbia, South Carolina (1879); Columbus, Georgia (1879); Sparta, Georgia (1891); Dalton, Georgia (1892); and Lexington, Kentucky (1893). Of these, only the South Carolina statue is also credited to Carlo Nicoli, and while it is of the "cavalier" type, it varies markedly from the Macon statue. However, printed advertisements in the *Confederate Veteran* magazine also make it possible to identify Muldoon statues in Cynthiana, Kentucky (1868); Nashville, Tennessee (1889); Helena, Arkansas (1892); Louisville, Kentucky (1895); Raleigh, NC (1895); Shelbyville, Tennessee (1899); Franklin, Tennessee (1899); Lynchburg, Virginia (1900); and in Frankfort, Kentucky; Memphis, Tennessee; Thomasville, Georgia; and Columbia, Tennessee, all of uncertain date but before 1902. Of these, the Nashville statue is credited to Nicoli in SIRIS, and is an exact match to the Macon statue. Several of the other statues in this list resemble the "cavalier" type in some way, but vary enough to make attribution to Nicoli's studio difficult. It is possible that future research will uncover more examples of monuments by the Muldoon Monument Company.

While the vast majority of soldier monuments that can be attributed to Muldoon feature statues carved from Italian marble, the company also worked with at least one bronze foundry, the Royal Foundry of Munich, Bavaria. The Confederate monuments in Louisville, Kentucky and Raleigh, North Carolina, both dedicated in 1895, are collaborations between Muldoon and the Royal Foundry, a Bavarian bronze foundry that had been in operation since at least 1824 and by 1873 was owned and operated by a father and son team of sculptors, both named Ferdinand von Miller (figure 3.35). This foundry was responsible for the statue atop the first known figural Civil War soldier monument produced by either section, the Union soldier statue in Cleveland, Ohio sculpted in 1864 by Randolph Rogers (see Chapter 1). After the father's death in 1887, the son took control of the family business, and Ferdinand von Miller II sculpted the figures for several monuments in the United States, including the Confederate monument in Charleston, South Carolina that eventually watched over the sleeping soldiers immortalized in Henry Timrod's "Ode".[183] The von Miller-designed Confederate infantryman that appeared atop the Raleigh and Louisville statues is markedly different from the Muldoon "cavalier" type designed by the Nicoli studio. Instead of the caped overcoat, the bronze statue wears a military frock coat that was definitely more popular with Union than Confederate soldiers, overlaid with the bedroll that most Confederates used to carry their few possessions. Like the Nicoli statue, this figure wears a slouch hat and a dapper mustache, but his pose and demeanor are calmer and less aggressive.

---

[183] Justus Bier, "A Forgotten Work by Ferdinand von Miller the Younger, a Contribution to the History of Confederate Monuments," *Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* 4 (April 1956): 125-133.

This soldier figure is responsive to the increasing calls for reconciliation between Northern and Southern veterans that marked the 1880s. The softening of demeanor that marks Muldoon's soldier figures for Raleigh and Louisville took place during an era in which the market for Confederate monuments was increasingly opened to competition. In the wake of Muldoon's success, several Northern monument companies began operating in the South, offering specifically Confederate designs and in some cases adapting Union designs for a Southern context. The most prominent of these was the Monumental Bronze Company of Bridgeport, Connecticut, introduced in the second chapter of this dissertation, which began marketing its zinc soldier statues in the 1870s and remained active well into the twentieth century. The Monumental Bronze Company's most prolific design for either North or South was the "American soldier," a Union infantryman standing at parade rest incorporated into monuments in at least eighty-six separate towns. Intriguingly, this Union-specific prototype was the first company design to be adapted for a Confederate context, appearing in Goldsboro, North Carolina in 1883 (figure 3.36). Like the statue cast by Maurice J. Power for Wilmington in 1878, the Goldsboro statue resembles its Yankee cousins in almost every aspect from kepi to mustachioed face to caped overcoat, varying only in the initials "NC" for North Carolina, rather than "US" for United States, on the belt buckle. This exact variant on the "American soldier" was later reused in Windsor, North Carolina in 1895, only with the letters "CS" for Confederate States, just three years before "Dutchy" was unveiled in Elberton, Georgia to so much dismay.[184] It is significant that all three of these almost-Northern soldiers, two from the Monumental Bronze Company and one from Power, were erected in an Upper South state that was

[184] Grissom, *Zinc Sculpture in America*, 534.

nearly the last to join the Confederacy. A perfectly acceptable memorial strategy in North Carolina may not have played as well in the Deep South.

While the reworked "American Soldier" satisfied a few commissions, most of the former Confederate customers of the Monumental Bronze Company sought a design that was more distinct from Northern counterparts. Beginning in 1886 in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, the company began offering a white bronze Confederate soldier complete with slouch hat, shell jacket, and bedroll. Between 1886 and 1914, at least twenty-two of these statues were erected in locations across the South, including Elberton, Georgia in 1905.[185] These statues were installed at varying heights and in varying situations, some on bases carved out of local stone and others on elaborate shafts also cast from white bronze. An example of the latter is the Confederate monument of Columbia, North Carolina, installed on the front lawn of the Tyrell County Courthouse in 1902 (figure 3.37). The stepped base of the monument drips with decoration and inscription, including casting to imitate the texture of rusticated stone, columns, garlands, attributes of the various branches of the armed forces, names of significant Confederate officers hailing from North Carolina, and even a bust of Robert E. Lee. The Monumental Bronze Company's Confederate statue designs set a new standard for representing the Confederate soldier that was distinctly recognizable as Southern rather than Northern. The figure does not represent any particular hardship, such as illness, starvation or ragged clothing, but the costume elements differed from those generally used for Union soldiers. The short jacket, bedroll, and slouch hat quickly became the markers of a new Southern iconography.

---

[185] Ibid., 529-533.

Other Northern monument companies also jumped at the chance to market their wares to Southern clients, often borrowing from the representational model established by the Monumental Bronze Company. The W.H. Mullins Company of Salem, Ohio began offering Confederate designs in the mid-1890s. A page from their 1913 catalogue, *The Blue and the Gray* shows two models for Confederate infantrymen at parade rest (figure 3.38). With the statues placed side by side, it is clear that both have the same body, clad in a costume that should now be familiar: shell jacket, bedroll, canteen and musket. However, they sport different heads: on the left, a younger-appearing model with mustache and rakishly tilted slouch hat, and on the right, a slightly older face with a goatee and headgear that more closely resembles a Hardee hat. The catalogue's foreword includes language that would be appropriate for the "Blue and Gray" reunions that took place with increasing frequency toward the end of the century, suggesting a justification for a Northern company's interest in producing materials for Confederate memorialization. As explained by the Mullins catalogue in an introduction that was part reconciliation message and part sales pitch, "Time heals all wounds and banishes all differences to naught. But the memory of men and deeds—men who gave their lives in deeds for a cause in which they honestly believed—goes on into indefinite generations. Those now living, on either side of the civil conflict of half a hundred years ago, once foes, are now friends; for each knows the sounds and scenes of battle; each knows the heroism of the other."[186] This introductory material reflects fairly common reconciliation rhetoric, suggesting that the substance of each side's cause in the Civil War was less important than the fact

---

[186] W.H. Mullins Company, *The Blue and the Gray: Statues in Stamped Copper and Bronze* (Salem, OH: W.H. Mullins Company, 1913), 7.

that causes existed, and that men fought bravely to support them. By referring to the war as a "civil conflict" rather than Civil War, and calling the span of years "half a hundred" rather than fifty, the text characterizes the conflict as a minor dispute long past but "remembered with advantages." Of course, this position was also a lucrative one for the W.H. Mullins Company, encouraging all to purchase monuments.

The reconciliationist rhetoric of the Mullins catalogue reflects a major shift in the relationship between North and South that came with the end of the nineteenth century and the Spanish-American War. Civil War and Spanish-American War memory articulated as reconciliation served the commercial ends of Northern manufacturers hoping to serve a Southern market. For both North and South, the Spanish-American War offered a chance for soldiers from formerly warring sections to fight together under a common banner, with officers from both the Union and Confederate armies leading mixed coalitions of troops. While the Cuban war for independence from Spain, the imperialist and expansionist thrust of the war, and the later suppression by the U.S. government against a Filipino rebellion created uncomfortable dissonances with the way Southerners viewed their Lost Cause, most young Southerners jumped at the chance to prove their prowess in battle and their allegiance to the reconciled United States. The Spanish-American War, which progressed swiftly toward United States victory, provided just this chance.[187]

Into this changed memorial environment stepped the McNeel Marble Works, the first major Southern challenger to the Muldoon Monument Company's control of the market for Confederate monuments and the largest company producing these

---

[187] Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 145-159.

monuments ever to operate on former Confederate soil. The Smithsonian's Inventory of American Sculpture lists thirty-eight Confederate monuments erected between 1904 and 1922. Of these, twenty-seven appear in Georgia, McNeel's home state and the source of the raw granite for many Southern memorials. Both the availability of materials and the proximity to the monument company spurred this surge in Georgia monument building. It is possible that there are other Confederate monuments by McNeel that have not been identified yet, as a 1914 article in *Confederate Veteran* magazine suggested that at time of publication the McNeel Marble Works had already been in operation for twenty-one years, putting its founding around 1893.[188] During its heyday, McNeel advertised heavily in *Confederate Veteran*, and the magazine also covered the unveiling of monuments by the company and published its designs, providing additional publicity. The company was also favored by local chapters of the United Daughters of the Confederacy in their campaigns to erect monuments. While the Yankee provenance of monuments by firms such as the Monumental Bronze Company or the W.H. Mullins Company are almost always forgotten in histories of Confederate monuments written by Southern organizations, attributions to McNeel have survived, suggesting pride in a homegrown company's contribution to Confederate memory.[189]

---

[188] "Builders of Southern Monuments," *Confederate Veteran* 24 (1916): 309.

[189] For example, see S.L. Smith, *North Carolina's Confederate Monuments and Memorials* (Raleigh, N.C.: North Carolina Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1941), 85. This book generally leaves out any reference to the sculptor or monument company responsible for each monument, except in the case of Franklin, North Carolina, whose monument is identified as the work of the McNeel Marble Works.

The McNeel Marble Works secured a great deal of its business through full-page advertisements placed in the *Confederate Veteran*, and these advertising pages are now one of the key primary sources for piecing together the history of the company. A sampling of advertisements dating between 1912 and 1916 gives an idea of how the company operated. While some of the advertisements employ pictures of McNeel designs, others rely on text alone. An advertisement from early 1912 headed "Many Monuments to be Unveiled on Memorial Day" implores "chapters and camps" throughout the South who are interested in procuring a monument to be dedicated on Memorial Day to submit their orders. The ad reveals that like the Muldoon Monument Company, the McNeel Marble Works procured all of its marble statues from Italy, and puts the timing for securing one of these imports at about five to six months. Consequently, during the busy spring season of 1912, the company decided to keep twelve of its most popular soldier designs in stock for the convenience of patrons. A typical advertisement from 1913, simply titled "Confederate Monuments," shows a typical monument design and reveals that monuments could be obtained for as little as $500 (figure 3.39). Also in 1913, several advertisements reveal the company branching out from soldier monuments into designs honoring the women of the Confederacy, with examples erected in Florida and Arkansas. Paradoxically, these statues may have arisen from a desire to suppress the women's suffrage movement, as Southern men rewarded their women for war efforts that reinforced traditional feminine virtues.[190] Also from 1913 is an ad titled "To the United Confederate

---

[190] For more on these political ramifications, see Cynthia Mills, "Gratitude and Gender Wars: Monuments to the Women of the Sixties," in *Monuments to the Lost Cause: Women, Art and the Landscapes of Southern Memory*, Mills and Simpson, eds., 183-202.

Veterans," welcoming the veterans to their reunion in Chattanooga and suggesting that McNeel's new monument on the Chattanooga battlefield might be an interesting tourist site. The ad does not explicitly advocate for additional purchase of monuments, but demonstrates how intimately monument businesses relied on good relationships with veterans' organizations. An ad from the following year shows the company strategizing to make procuring a monument seem easy to buyers, offering several fundraising ideas such as a "Confederate Souvenir Plan," "Stock Certificate Plan," "One Dollar Plan," or "School Children's Card Plan." And finally, ads from 1916 list towns that have recently purchased monuments and showcase new designs.[191]

The soldier figures marketed by the McNeel Marble Works combine the previous tradition of depicting the Confederate soldier with new ideas, perhaps influenced by the visual culture of the recent Spanish-American War. The vast majority of known monuments by McNeel sport marble figures supplied by Italian carvers, and these figures vary in age, pose, and costume. A typical figure design that appeared in several locations – including Eatonton, Georgia in 1908 and Statesboro, Georgia and Madison, Georgia in 1909 – depicts a Confederate soldier standing at textbook parade rest, with eyes forward, left knee bent, and rifle held directly in front

---

[191] "Many Monuments to be Unveiled on Memorial Day," *Confederate Veteran* 20 (1912): 96; "Florida and Arkansas Honor Their Women," *Confederate Veteran* 20 (1912): 192; "Florida's Tribute to the Women of the Confederacy," *Confederate Veteran* 21 (1913): 192; "To The United Confederate Veterans," *Confederate Veteran* 21 (1913): 320; "Arkansas' Monument to her Women of the Confederacy," *Confederate Veteran* 21 (1913): 416; "Confederate Monuments," *Confederate Veteran* 21 (1913): 512; "Building Confederate Monuments is Made Easy by the Use of Our Plans," *Confederate Veteran* 22 (1914): 240; "Great Interest in Confederate Memorials," *Confederate Veteran* 24 (1916): 336; "Confederate Memorial Drinking Fount," *Confederate Veteran* 24 (1916): 432.

of the body (figures 3.40-3.42). With his walrus mustache, slouch hat, shell jacket, bedroll and canteen, this soldier figure is almost exactly like the most popular zinc type marketed by the Monumental Bronze Company, rendered instead in marble. Clearly not averse to copying popular designs by other companies, McNeel also evoked the Muldoon "cavalier" in at least one instance in Perry, Georgia in 1908 (figure 3.43). The McNeel figure is not an exact replica of any known version of the Muldoon statue, with a younger face and toned-down drapery on the cape of the overcoat, but is similar enough to make the source profoundly evident.

In addition to repeating some of the most popular designs for Confederate soldier statues from previous decades, McNeel also introduced new figure types with young faces and slight but recognizable shifts in costume. For instance, a youthful soldier that appeared in Jackson, Georgia in 1911 and Graham, North Carolina in 1914, among other locations, wears the same slouch hat, bedroll and shell jacket that are by this point synonymous with Confederate infantrymen, but there are a few subtle adjustments (figures 3.44-3.45). First, rather than standing with his rifle in front of him in accordance with parade rest, he holds his rifle at his side. Also, the legs of his trousers do not fall to the tops of his shoes, but are instead bunched and tucked into his socks. Civil War soldiers did employ this technique in the field, but through the nineteenth century it was not a feature of Union or Confederate soldier monuments. The same modification appears on the 1907 monument in Thomaston, Georgia (figure 3.46). This time, the figure holds his rifle in front of him, but there is another change in the collar of his jacket. Rather than the rounded collar of the traditional Civil War shell jacket, this figure sports a pointed, turned-down collar that would not but out of place on a modern dress shirt. These slight variations in costume and pose may speak

to the influence of the Spanish-American War on already-malleable Confederate imagery. By the early twentieth century, the first Spanish-American War figures were already being commissioned. Theo Alice Ruggles Kitson unveiled her first *Hiker* statue in Minneapolis, Minnesota in 1906, and by 1913 the W.H. Mullins catalogue had a Spanish-American War infantryman in its catalogue (figures 3.47-3.48). In this tropical war, open collars and puttees or tall boots to protect the lower legs were more common, and the Mullins figure holds his rifle in the same pose as the McNeel figure mentioned above. Confederate iconography changed with the requirements of the times, adapting to the needs of the Southern political situation and the region's role in domestic and foreign policy.

The Confederate Monument in the Southern Political Landscape

The soldier monuments of the former Confederate states were physical manifestations of the shifting political landscape during and after the Reconstruction years. The vast array of economic and social changes that marked the postbellum era are generally discussed as the concept of the New South, a phrase that gained currency during Reconstruction and has since become a major target for scholarly study. As Paul Gaston notes, the term "New South" began appearing in print toward the end of the Civil War, but it became closely associated with Henry W. Grady, who began advocating for social change in his newspaper, the *Atlanta Constitution*, in the 1870s. Grady also gave a famous speech on the subject to the New England Society of New York in 1886.[192] Proponents of the New South encouraged Southerners to look both

---

[192] Paul M. Gaston, *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), 17-19.

forward and backward, drawing strength from antebellum and Confederate heritage while taking advantage of Northern advances in technology and economic policy to make their fortunes in a new way.[193] For Edward L. Ayers, the New South represents a period in which industrial capitalism and relations with the national government engendered a series of "backlashes, countercurrents, unexpected outcomes, and archaicisms" that defined the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[194] New South culture embodied the contradictions of the postbellum South, and the Confederate monument, rooted in both the memory of the past and in the factory reproduction of the monument industry, can be deeply identified with this changing era.

The celebration of the rank-and-file Confederate veteran that was so encouraged and supported financially by elite Southerners may have played a key political role in uniting all classes of white society to support the one-party governments that sprang up in all of the former Confederate states after the failure of Reconstruction. As this chapter has already demonstrated, the initial focus of Lost Cause commemoration was the heroism of particular Southern leaders, including Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson. But beginning in the 1870s and continuing into the 1880s and 1890s, average veterans were increasingly given major participatory roles in memorial ceremonies and called on for political support. W. Scott Poole examines this phenomenon in the 1876 governor's race in South Carolina, in which

---

[193] David Goldfield, *Still Fighting the Civil War: The American South and Southern History* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 22.

[194] Edward L. Ayers, "Narrating the New South," *Journal of Southern History* 61, no. 3 (August 1995): 559.

Democrat and former Confederate general Wade Hampton ultimately prevailed in what basically amounted to a coup d'état. Hampton's strategy relied heavily on the support of Confederate veterans, and Poole points out the inconsistencies between Hampton's elitist policies and populist rhetoric. Ultimately, celebration of the Lost Cause served as a tool of direct opposition to Yankee Republican rule in the South.[195] Likewise, James C. Cobb recognizes that Lost Cause rhetoric was key to forming unified coalitions of Southern whites in the face of other political movements, most significantly the Populist uprising of the 1880s and 1890s. Populists, who looked for increased government regulation to protect small farmers and sharecroppers, attracted the interest of both black and white working-class Southerners, threatening to form a broad-based interracial movement that would challenge white elites.[196] A similar strategy was employed in Virginia in the late 1870s and early 1880s, when a political faction called the Readjusters, led by former Confederate general and veteran of Petersburg's Battle of the Crater William Mahone and consisting of black and white working class Virginians, briefly wrested power from the elites and took control of the state's government. In speeches on Confederate Memorial Day, Virginia conservatives recast poor whites' political options as a choice between white supremacy and the Lost Cause on the one hand, and African American supremacy and amalgamation on the other.[197] By memorializing the common soldier as a hero and promoting causes that

---

[195] W. Scott Poole, "Religion, Gender, and the Lost Cause in South Carolina's 1876 Governor's Race: 'Hampton or Hell!'", *Journal of Southern History* 68, no. 3 (August 2002): 579, 597-598.

[196] James C. Cobb, *Away Down South: A History of Southern Identity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 84-85.

[197] Blair, *Cities of the Dead*, 130-133.

would appeal to veterans, upper-class whites could win the favor of men who might otherwise participate in these new political movements.

In order to assure the support of Confederate veterans, Southern politicians used the Lost Cause and veterans' affairs as powerful tools of allegiance. As the nineteenth century drew to a close, politicians in power pushed increasingly for financial allocations for pensions to support needy Confederate veterans or soldiers' homes to house disabled veterans who could no longer take care of themselves. Throughout the postwar years, state government programs funded the purchase of artificial limbs to give disabled veterans a sense of wholeness and ability. Confederate monuments, first placed in cemeteries, appeared more and more often in prominent locations on courthouse lawns, the most powerful civic spaces in Southern country towns. And by placing the Confederate soldier's sculpted body at the center of civic life, Southerners unwittingly associated it with the terrible practice of lynching. This opens new avenues of discussion on whole and dismembered bodies in a Southern context.

In her study of the function of pain and injury in war, Elaine Scarry notes that when comparing the wounded bodies of a Union and Confederate soldier in the Civil War, "nothing in those wounds themselves would indicate the differing political beliefs" and posits that once the war ended, injuries to either side that had once been tallied as an indicator of which side was "winning" and which was "losing" were in the aftermath all counted together in measuring the cost of a conflict that had ended slavery and preserved the Union.[198] But even if this is partly true—the wounds did

[198] Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 114-117.

appear the same, and historians today are more likely to evoke the 750,000 total dead in the Civil War than the figures for Union or Confederate dead—Confederate veterans who had lost a limb or suffered other debilitating injuries in the war faced a much different postwar reality than their Union counterparts. Unlike Northern veterans, who enjoyed a host of postwar benefits, disabled Confederate veterans could not count on the support of the federal government through pensions or programs to cover the purchase of artificial limbs. Northern veterans who had suffered disabling or disfiguring injuries achieved a kind of visibility in the record of history through the efforts of the Army Medical Museum, which collected painstaking written and photographic records of veterans' injuries in the interest of medical knowledge. While the resulting images have only recently begun to receive scholarly attention, they did have some limited visibility in postwar society through visits to the Army Medical Museum, which operated out of Ford's Theater in Washington, D.C. through the nineteenth century; through the publication between 1870 and 1880 of the six-volume *Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion*, which was at the time the largest medical reference book ever published; and through occasional display at major exhibitions and fairs, most famously at the 1876 Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia, where edited photographs with fig leaves covering exposed genitals appeared in the same room as Thomas Eakins's landmark painting *The Gross Clinic*.[199] Confederate veterans and their injuries did not receive the same sort of

---

[199] Robert I. Goler and Michael G. Rhode, "From Individual Trauma to National Policy: Tracking the Uses of Civil War Veteran Medical Records," in *Disabled Veterans in History*, David A. Gerber, ed. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000), 163-184.

documentary attention, and photographs of disabled veterans are much rarer. While Northern veterans trusted that their images would aid future scientific endeavors, Southerners coped with loss of health or limb without this added comfort.

However, even if disabled Southerners are less visible in the record that has been handed down through history, they enjoyed a certain dignity through the postwar era. As William A. Blair suggests, the image of the crippled Confederate veteran was a potent one for Southerners as Reconstruction governments were replaced in the 1870s by Democratic coalitions of former Confederate leaders. For politicians working to shore up coalitions of white veterans to support their candidacy, the "empty sleeve" became a convincing counterpoint to the North's "bloody shirt." Like the "bloody shirt," by which Northern voters were reminded of the causes for which their Civil War dead had fought and of the violence committed by Southern vigilantes during Reconstruction, the "empty sleeve" as a metaphor pulled at the heartstrings of Southern citizens, suggesting, for instance, that no crippled Confederate veteran who had given a limb for his country should be pushed aside for employment in favor of an able-bodied African American man.[200] Also, unlike in the North, where seeing a disabled veteran might jar a disconnect between the experience of victory in making the Union whole and the wounded body, as Robert Goler has suggested, the loss of a limb in a Southern context shared an affinity with the Lost Cause.[201] The Confederate veteran who had lost a limb carried about with him a reminder of his service

---

[200] Blair, *Cities of the Dead*, 127-134.

[201] Robert I. Goler, "Loss and the Persistence of Memory: 'The Case of George Dedlow' and Disabled Civil War Veterans," *Literature and Medicine* 23, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 167; also see Chapter 2.

protecting his home and defending his honor, always able to prove his sacrifice. Indeed, as Gaines Foster points out, a Civil War veteran running for office in the South with an empty sleeve would be assured victory in most cases, unless of course his opponent had lost a leg.[202]

But even as the disabled Confederate veteran became a potent symbol for Southern politicians, actual disabled veterans faced a host of concerns. One out of every four surviving Confederate veterans suffered disability from battlefield injuries or disease, and these soldiers and their families often lived at the poverty line, unable to find enough work to survive. Southern state governments and private institutions mobilized to meet these needs, building a pension system that became a major boon to disabled veterans and a major drain on state budgets. State efforts could not match the reach of the federal government, however, and benefits provided for former Confederate soldiers fell far behind those of their Union counterparts. At the end of the nineteenth century, several bipartisan attempts were made to shift responsibility for the care of Confederate veterans from the state to the federal government, but all of these attempts were met with hostility, much from the veterans themselves, who felt that accepting aid from a former foe would be a blow to their pride.[203]

This sting was also felt when procuring artificial limbs. As was true of so many other Southern needs in the Reconstruction years, most of these limbs were developed

---

[202] Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 195.

[203] R.B. Rosenburg, "'Empty Sleeves and Wooden Pegs': Disabled Confederate Veterans in Image and Reality," in *Disabled Veterans in History*, Gerber, ed., 204-228; Elna C. Green, "Protecting Confederate Soldiers and Mothers: Pensions, Gender and the Welfare State in the U.S. South, a Case Study from Florida," *Journal of Social History* 39, no. 4 (Summer 2006): 1095-1096.

and manufactured in the North. In choosing whether to purchase Northern-made limbs, Southern veterans had one more choice to make about the intrusion of their former adversaries into their postwar lives. For Lisa Herschbach, the Northern manufacture of limbs for Confederate veterans mirrors the imposition of Yankee notions of economy and capitalism in the postwar South, with the newly re-limbed Confederate soldier suddenly made useful for industrial labor. In Herschbach's analysis, some Confederate veterans resisted this incursion, preferring to make their own artificial limbs or to obtain prosthetics from European markets, or even to reject prosthesis overall as an attempt to forget the war by masking their injuries, when they chose instead to remember it.[204]

But even as some disabled veterans took a stand against prosthesis, others embraced it as practical, and some Southern companies also got into the business of providing supplies to veterans. Karen L. Cox demonstrates how the *Confederate Veteran* magazine lumped together all sorts of materials that might interest its veteran readers in advertisements for replica uniforms for reunion ceremonies, caskets covered with Confederate gray cloth, artificial limbs, and even monuments. In the magazine's pages, Southern veterans could find all the materials they needed to clothe, support, bury, and memorialize their soldier bodies.[205] An ad for the Dixie Artificial Limb Company from the November 1905 issue of *Confederate Veteran* offers "Latest Improved Willow Wood Limbs" sold out of Nashville, Tennessee (figure 3.48). While

[204] Herschbach, "Prosthetic Reconstructions," 47-50.

[205] Karen L. Cox, "Confederate Defeat and Cultural Expressions of Memory, 1877-1940," in *Defeat and Memory: Cultural Histories of Military Defeat in the Modern Era*, Jenny Macleod, ed. (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), 185-186.

the North remained the nation's industrial powerhouse, veterans' dollars also enriched Southern manufacture. As Southern veterans went about the business of becoming whole and integrating into a changed postwar life, their sculpted images took on as much political significance as their fractured bodies had done. Increasingly, the Confederate soldier monument appeared at the center of Southern life.

The placement of the Confederate monument in the center of a town or courthouse square gives it strong associations with Southern civic life, with both the legal machinations of government and the extra-legal practice of lynching. As Gaines Foster has demonstrated, by the 1880s Confederate monuments were increasingly placed in Southern town squares rather than in cemeteries, and soldier monuments became much more common than more funerary designs.[206] The courthouse square in a Southern county seat was an important place to see and be seen, to receive news, to gather, and to express opinions. As J.B. Jackson has explained:

> I would say the smaller the town, the more effective as a gathering place the courthouse has been. The square around it was usually occupied by small, locally owned retail stores; the movie theater, the small hotel, the barbershop, the café or restaurant where the town businessmen ate their lunch were all there and there was always a corner bank. Idle men, many of them old, sat on the courthouse steps or on benches in the shade of trees … There were monuments on the lawn surrounding the building, and no matter how shabby or how uninspired architecturally it might have been the courthouse dominated its setting.[207]

---

[206] Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy*, 273.

[207] John Brinckerhoff Jackson, *Discovering the Vernacular Landscape* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), 75.

While Jackson's observations mention twentieth-century features such as movie theaters, the square would have performed a similar function in the nineteenth century as a locus for a community spread out for miles on surrounding farms and plantations. Visitors to town could conduct business, purchase needed goods, and catch up on local news, all while meeting and operating underneath the watchful eye of the county's legal and justice system. With so much important business conducted within its confines, the courthouse square was a natural location for placing monuments to a city or county's heroes.

Even as the courthouse square served as an important community space, however, many Southerners remained ambivalent about the centralized power that it connoted. As Philip Dray notes, in the years before the Civil War, Southern communities were not particularly interested in copying the complicated, multi-layered Northern justice system. Instead, law enforcement was more casual and accessible, with the sheriff, jail and courthouse all lodged within the same imposing building or at the very least surrounding the same public square.[208] Through the antebellum periods, large swaths of Southern territory were considered to be the frontier, and a sense of frontier justice emerged. Crimes were generally regarded as personal affairs, and the time spent on providing a jury trial and sentencing a criminal was often perceived as a delay of justice. Edward Ayers has also traced a Southern ambivalence toward law to codes of honor, suggesting that many felt that an offense against honor could not be fully addressed through legal means.[209] Before the Civil

---

[208] Philip Dray, *At the Hands of Persons Unknown: The Lynching of Black America* (New York: Random House, 2002), 30.

[209] Ayers, *Vengeance and Justice*, 31.

War, lynching emerged as a means of bypassing the legal process and expediting the often lethal punishment of both blacks and whites suspected of committing crimes. In the South, the threat of extralegal violence bolstered the institution of slavery and served as a deterrent to slave uprisings, although most slave owners preferred to see their slaves through the legal system, as the state usually compensated owners for slaves executed for capital crimes.[210] When the war ended and the Reconstruction era began, mob terror perpetrated in the middle of the night against newly-freed blacks, white Republicans, and other Northern transplants proved to be an effective tool of political resistance, and groups like the Ku Klux Klan formed to carry out this violence.[211] In light of the role that lynching played in deterring the policies of Reconstruction, the mock lynching of "Dutchy" in Elberton, Georgia as a Yankee interloper takes on ominous shades of meaning.

With the rise of lynching, the courthouse lawn was convenient as a public space near the jail from which the victim was so often abducted. But the space also had deeper associations. As Sherrilyn Ifill has argued, lynching on the courthouse lawn was a deliberate attempt to rebel against a legal system that was considered an elitist imposition. The victim's charred corpse sent a message to the nation that Southern whites would not be controlled.[212] The courthouse lawn could be incorporated into the lynching ritual in a number of ways. First, it served as a

---

[210] W. Fitzhugh Brundage, *Lynching in the New South: Georgia and Virginia, 1880-1930* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 3-6.

[211] Budiansky, *The Bloody Shirt*, 1-10.

[212] Sherrilyn Ifill, *On the Courthouse Lawn: Confronting the Legacy of Lynching in the Twenty-first Century* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2007), 8-9.

gathering space where a mob could form and communicate its intentions, and subsequently collect the intended victim from his jail cell. This is clearly demonstrated in a chillingly tongue-in-cheek piece describing a "lynching bee" that was published in the *Washington Post* on August 21, 1910. In the piece, the anonymous author details the scene in an unnamed small town. Identifying himself as a newspaperman to the hotel clerk, he is informed that a lynching is to take place that evening, and is invited to participate and observe. Intrigued, the writer adjourns to the courthouse square, where he sets the scene:

> I strolled around town and out to the courthouse square, but didn't notice anything unusual. It was a bright moonlight night. Lovers idled carelessly around the lawns; the balance of the population in the residence district seemed to be enjoying itself on the front porch. From lighted drawing rooms came the sound of music, mirth, and laughter. I mention this circumstance because it developed afterward that about everybody in town knew a certain man was to be taken out of jail at midnight and hanged. But at the time the apparent nonchalance of the people made me doubt the authenticity of the clerk's information.

Soon, however, the scene changes. As the writer watches, the courthouse square becomes more crowded, and when the gathering crowd reaches a critical mass, the people storm the jail, led by a man with a rope. Meeting little resistance from town officials, they soon bring out the "little, swarthy and contemptible looking" prisoner, who is borne to a nearby bridge and summarily hanged, with the writer of the piece helping to tie the rope. The next day, an inquest is held, and the writer is shocked to see prominent members of the lynch mob sitting among the jury. Unsurprisingly, the verdict comes back that the prisoner "had either come to his death by falling off the

bridge or had been hanged by parties unknown."[213] This account demonstrates how the courthouse square was implicated in both the breakdown of order and in the appearance of its resolution, with the same pillars of the community participating in night mobs and daytime law.

The courthouse lawn was also at times an even more direct site for the enactment of lynching. While many lynchings began with abduction at the courthouse but quickly proceeded to fields or woods outside town, the lynching of Jesse Washington on May 15, 1916 took place entirely in broad daylight and in the public eye. Convicted in a peremptory trial that included almost no case presented by the defense for the rape and murder of Waco resident Lucy Fryer, Washington was seized by an angry mob before the judge could record the sentence handed down by the jury, which had deliberated for all of four minutes. Dragged outside, Washington was beaten, stabbed and kicked repeatedly, then borne aloft to the lawn in front of City Hall, where he was chained to a tree, castrated, and burned alive. The burning went on for more than two hours, and afterward witnesses to the lynching collected parts of Washington's body as souvenirs.[214] In Washington's case, the entire spectacle from sham trial to display of the brutalized remains took place within view of Waco's most important civic structures. That last element of display was also a feature of lynching often enacted on the courthouse lawn, where the savaged bodies of lynching victims

---

[213] "The Voice of the People: Jury Which Helped in a Lynching Bee Knew the Kind of Verdict to Bring In," *Washington Post*, August 21, 1910.

[214] James M. Sorelle, "The 'Waco Horror': The Lynching of Jesse Washington," in *The African American Experience in Texas: An Anthology*, Bruce A. Glasrud and James M. Smallwood, eds. (Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University Press, 2007), 183-191.

could serve as a warning to all others hoping to challenge the white supremacist hold on Southern life. The lynching of Claude Neal near Marianna, Florida in 1934, one of the last and most notorious spectacle lynchings, took place in a remote area well outside of town. Over a period of ten to twelve hours, Neal was stabbed, sliced, punched, burned with irons, castrated, forced to eat his own genitals, choked repeatedly, and finally hanged, after which his body was tied to the back of an automobile and dragged through the dirt, giving the thousands of spectators further opportunity to desecrate his corpse. The nude body was then taken to the Marianna town square and hung from a tree where it could be viewed by all.[215]

While neither the Washington nor the Neal lynching took place in direct view of the statue of a Confederate soldier, the space of the courthouse lawn and its significance in Southern life link their mutilated forms to these white sentinels of stone. The usually-sublimated connection between the lynching spectacle, the courthouse lawn as a central space for Southern small town life, and the presence of the Confederate in that square was made even more explicit in a fictional account written by NAACP leader and lynching investigator Walter Francis White. In his 1924 novel *The Fire and the Flint*, White imagined a brutal lynching and burning of a body at the feet of the Confederate monument in Central City, Georgia, a fictional town meant to stand in for Macon. The central square of Macon, home to the Muldoon Monument Company's mustachioed infantryman, may have been on White's mind. The lynching victim, Bob Harper, is the younger brother of protagonist Kenneth Harper, a veteran of World War I and doctor. After his sister Mamie is raped by two

[215] Christopher Waldrep, ed., *Lynching in America: A History in Documents* (New York: New York University Press, 2006), 229-232.

white men, Bob kills the men responsible and goes on the run. He hides in an abandoned barn and engages in a gun battle with the lynch mob gathered to capture him, and, rather than giving the mob the satisfaction of killing him, takes his own life. Upon finding him dead, the mob drags him back into town. White writes:

> Back to the public square. In the open space before the Confederate Monument, wood and excelsior had been piled. Near by stood cans of kerosene. On the crude pyre they threw the body. Saturated it and the wood with oil. A match applied. In the early morning sunlight the fire leaped higher and higher. Mingled with the flames and smoke the exulting cries of those who had done their duty – they had avenged and upheld white civilization…
>
> The flames died down. Women, tiny boys and girls, old men and young stood by, a strange light on their faces. They sniffed eagerly the odour of burning human flesh which was becoming more and more faint.
>
> … Into the dying flames darted a boy of twelve. Out he came, laughing hoarsely, triumphantly exhibiting a charred bone he had secured, blackened and crisp … Another rushed in … Another … Another … Here a rib … There an armbone … A louder cry … The skull … Good boy! Johnny! … We'll put that on the mantelpiece at home … Five dollars for it, Johnny! … Nothin' doin'! … Goin' to keep it myself! …
>
> The show ended. The crowd dispersed. Home to breakfast.[216]

In White's fictional lynching, the Confederate monument serves as backdrop and witness to the event that "[avenges] and [upholds] white civilization." Even more, the statue's stern gaze authorizes and legitimizes the event, directing spectators to approve the scene. The reader can picture a white marble figure, standing tall, whole, and immovable, contrasted with the charred remains of the black man, pulled apart as souvenirs for the savage crowd. Unlike the Northern soldier monument that masked

---

[216] Walter Francis White, *The Fire in the Flint* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1924), 236-237.

the reality of the veteran's injured body in the interest of healing the war's psychic wounds, the Confederate monument in White's imagined scene stands in deliberate contrast to the dismembered victim.

A real lynching that took place in Monroe, Georgia on June 27, 1911 includes some of the same hallmarks as White's fictional lynching but betrays the complicated relationship between Confederate memory and racial violence. The victims were Tom Allen and Joe Walls, both accused of assaulting Mrs. Leila Knight in April 1911, with Tom Allen as the main instigator and aggressor. Mob violence was threatened and expected in the case, and at first, Walton County officials took pains to protect Allen's safety. In an article dated May 26, the *Atlanta Constitution* boasted of the involvement of the state militia in guarding the prisoner while camped on the courthouse lawn "at the very base of the tall marble monument to the confederate soldiers erected by the loyal women of the county." A few days later, the newspaper continued its praise of the discipline and training of the troops, "as rigidly disciplined, as perfectly organized, and as efficient, almost, as a body of United States regulars in service for years," and of the "moral effect" the troops had in preventing a "demonstration," concluding that both militia and townspeople had benefited from coming into contact with one another. By the end of the month, however, the situation had changed drastically. Apparently resentful of the interference of state militia in the earlier instance, Sheriff Stark and Judge Brand of Walton County both refused to call for troops when bringing the prisoner from Atlanta to Monroe for trial, both insisting that it was the other's prerogative to make the decision. The result was tragic but not unexpected: Tom Allen was pulled from the train that brought him to Monroe for trial, "tied to a telegraph pole

and shot to pieces." The mob then proceeded to county jail, kidnapped Joe Walls, and subjected him to the same fate.[217]

While the courthouse, the state militia, and the Confederate monument briefly served as a symbol of law and order and a deterrent to mob violence in the case of Tom Allen, a lynching in Sherman, Texas in May 1930 shows how even these symbols were not enough to prevent the complete breakdown of legal order. When George Hughes, a black farm laborer, was accused of raping his employer's wife, a crime that may not even have taken place, a mob quickly assembled demanding his life. Prevented from entering the Grayson County Courthouse to seize Hughes, the mob set fire to the courthouse instead, burning the building to the ground and killing Hughes in the process. Hughes' corpse was then dragged through town by an automobile.[218] A Confederate soldier monument erected in 1897, topped by one of the Monumental Bronze Company's walrus-mustached soldiers, survived the burning of the courthouse. In this case, ambivalence about the process of justice was enacted upon the courthouse structure itself, and the burning divorced the structure from the monument. While the symbol of white manhood survived, the symbol of law did not.

The presence of the Confederate monument at sites also associated with the practice of lynching sets up a strange comparison between the white monumental body

---

[217] "Four Companies to Guard Negro: Threats of Lynching Move Governor Brown to Order Troops," *Atlanta Constitution*, May 26, 1911; "Large Sum Spent by State of Georgia in the Protection of Negro Prisoner," *Atlanta Constitution*, June 4, 1911; "Tom Allen Goes Back to Monroe: Sheriff Has Not Yet Appealed to Governor Brown for Troops," *Atlanta Constitution*, June 27, 1911; "Two Lynched in Georgia: Failure of Officials to Furnish Guard May Be Probed," *Washington Post*, June 28, 1911.

[218] Dray, *At the Hands of Persons Unknown*, 229.

and the black body destroyed through mob violence. One is imposing and complete, placed on a towering pedestal as an example of civic virtue, while the other is twisted, pained, and often pulled apart to provide macabre souvenirs for its torturers. And yet, both are commodified. Harvey Young points out the commodification of the literal black body through lynching, in which pieces of the body after the event became the most potent souvenirs to be bought and sold, along with pieces of chain, rope, trees, fence posts, and any other objects associated directly with the ritual murder. He connects these souvenirs with the commodification of the black body through mass-produced stereotypical images of African Americans, and suggests a connection between the possession of a piece of a black body with the desire to return to chattel slavery, when the entire body could be owned.[219] At first, the Confederate soldier monument seems to be the complete opposite of this. But the soldier statue is a mass-produced object to be bought and sold, a generic face meant to represent the collective army. While actual physical pieces of a real person were converted into symbolic relics through the horror of lynching, the soldier monument employed standardized features that would allow any Confederate veteran to project his own identity onto its form.

The Confederate soldier monument cemented white supremacy and white dominance of postwar power structures in one other key way. In the years immediately following the Civil War, African Americans in the South had a lot of new anniversaries and holidays to celebrate: the anniversary of the enactment of the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1; Memorial Day in honor of Union soldiers at

---

[219] Harvey Young, "The Black Body as Souvenir in American Lynching," *Theatre Journal* 57, no. 4 (December 2005): 646-647.

the end of May; the Fourth of July, which was not celebrated by most white Southerners for a long time after the war; and myriad other celebrations coinciding with dates relating to the passage of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments or days when slaves in a particular state or region first heard of their freedom. In Richmond in 1866, black Virginians even held an elaborate ceremony on June 3 to mark the fall of Richmond to Union troops the previous year, incensing the local white population.[220] For the first time, black Southerners had the freedom to claim civic spaces for their own and to enact ceremonies in those spaces. But this was not to continue. As Kathleen Clark demonstrates, celebrations by African Americans in Augusta, Georgia started out with great gusto immediately after the war but diminished in size and scope as the nineteenth century waned, eventually disappearing indoors to churches and schoolhouses. During the late 1860s and 1870s, black Augustans marched through the main streets of town, taking particular pleasure in marching down Broad Street, the town's main artery and a former locus of the slave trade, now turned over to celebrations of freedom. But in 1878, the white-dominated Ladies' Memorial Association placed the Confederate monument discussed earlier in this chapter right in the center of Broad Street, forcing future parades of black Augustans to thread around it.[221] With the placement of Confederate monuments in significant public spaces, white Southerners were able to reclaim these spaces for

---

[220] Blair, *Cities of the Dead*, 35-41.

[221] Kathleen Clark, "Making History: African American Commemorative Celebrations in Augusta, Georgia, 1865-1913", in *Monuments to the Lost Cause*, Mills and Simpson, eds., 51-55.

themselves, giving one more indication that the changes brought by Reconstruction were unwelcome to them.

Let us return once more to the story of "Dutchy" and his rejection by the people of Elberton, Georgia. At its most basic level, the removal of "Dutchy" is a particularly violent form of art criticism, a reaction to a piece of sculpture that is unequivocally poor workmanship. But the stories that have been passed down about the night that "Dutchy" met his demise reveal that the act was much more than a simple removal of a piece of objectionable public sculpture. Carried out in the dead of night and with the use of ropes, and then hushed up in the daytime, the act is a symbolic lynching, recalling the terroristic beatings and killings of countless African American Southerners and the Northerners who championed their cause. The objectionable Yankee interloper is replaced with a figure that appears properly Confederate, or at least Confederate as interpreted by the people of Elberton after the influence of thirty years of visual culture deciding on the images of North and South. And yet, even this narrative is complicated by the fact that the new Confederate monument obtained by Elberton's residents to replace "Dutchy" is the product of the Monumental Bronze Company, a Northern firm. Like the boosters of the New South who invoked the Confederate cause while at the same time offering a new vision of the Southern economy, Elberton's citizens looked to Northern-made goods and processes to codify their memories. Even with his clunky overcoat and misshapen facial features, "Dutchy" is a one-of-a-kind work of art executed by a small-town artisan. His replacement, while looking the part of a proper Confederate soldier, is

mass-produced and made of zinc, at that point a forward-looking material in monumental sculpture.

As is the case for Union monuments, where the proliferation of copied soldier monuments ultimately mirrors the sameness of war deaths, the process of reproducing Confederate monuments speaks to the enormity of the war. The changing iconography of Southern soldier monuments reveals the long process of forming a dignified and acceptable Confederate memory of the war. And in the case of "Dutchy," the destruction of a single monument unveils the deep contradictions of the last decades of the nineteenth century, when a desire to maintain a Southern identity and memory of the Civil War clashed with the nation's future.

Chapter 4

THE REVOLUTIONARY SOLDIER AND THE UNITED STATES CENTENNIAL

Daniel Chester French's bronze *Minute Man*, erected in Concord, Massachusetts in 1875, is one of the most recognizable works of nineteenth-century American sculpture, an icon that has been used for postage stamps and commemorative coins and adopted as a symbol of the armed forces in the United States (figures 4.1-4.3). The statue is now so familiar: a young man in colonial garb strides forward to answer the call of his country, clutching a musket in his right hand while pushing off from the handle of a plow with his left. The plow is a nod to the legend of Cincinnatus, the Roman general who left his farm to serve his people, only to return to it when he was no longer needed. The figure is almost impossibly graceful, with long, lithe limbs and a torso thrust forward in pride and determination. The statue's rolled shirtsleeves reveal lean, sinewy forearms hardened by farm work and ready for the task at hand. From a twenty-first century standpoint, the success of the statue and its sculptor seem to be inevitable. But a closer look at the circumstances of the *Minute Man*'s commission and the early career of Daniel Chester French reveals how precarious the statue's situation was, and how closely it is related to the industry that was beginning to produce Union and Confederate Civil War monuments at about the same time.

French's *Minute Man* could have easily endured the same fate as another statue of a Minute Man that stands in a corner of an upper conference room in the Isaac Cary

Memorial Hall in Lexington, Massachusetts, almost never seen by members of the public. This figure, designed by Carl Conrads and fabricated from granite by James Batterson's New England Granite Company, is paired with a figure of a Union soldier in a kepi and regulation overcoat, which stands in the opposite corner of the long room and is also a product of Batterson's firm (figures 4.4-4.6). Downstairs in the lobby of this auditorium building, marble statues of *John Hancock* by Thomas Gould and *Samuel Adams* by Martin Milmore, Revolutionary leaders rescued by Paul Revere just before the battle of Lexington, rhyme visually with the soldier figures in the upper room (figures 4.7-4.9). Indeed, these four figures were originally conceived as a set and placed in four niches in the town's Memorial Hall. The two citizen soldiers, paired with two Revolutionary leaders rescued by Paul Revere just before the battle of Lexington, comprised a memorial program honoring Lexington's history. The figures were dedicated on April 19, 1875, the hundredth anniversary of the battles of Lexington and Concord and the same day that Concord unveiled French's *Minute Man*. But almost immediately, the national press seized upon French's statue at Concord as a symbol of Centennial fever, while Lexington's four statues were widely ignored. Concord's statue, sculpted by a twenty-three year old artist who had never before designed a full-length figure, eclipsed the work of several men who had already distinguished themselves as experts in making soldier monuments in the decade following the end of the Civil War. This surprising historical result can be explained both through circumstances of the two competing statue commissions and by their unique moment in history, poised between the end of the Civil War and the celebration of the Centennial.

That specific historical moment is crucial to the conception and reception of these monuments. Lexington and Concord's *Minute Man* statues were conceived in the first wave of post-Civil War remembrance, as the American monument industry grew to meet increasing demand. The statues were dedicated at the end of the Reconstruction era, when a strong rhetoric of reconciliation between Northern and Southern whites could not completely erase lingering sectional discord. In this context, statues that recalled a Revolutionary past when North and South had worked together appealed to the national mood. But at the same time, for the people living in Lexington and Concord in 1875, the distant Revolutionary past and the recent Civil War were deeply intertwined, and minute man imagery in this context was heavily imbued with memories of how the latter conflict had created a new generation of war veterans. The resonances between Revolutionary War and Civil War that played out in the celebrations of these two cities were felt again a year later on a national scale in the context of Philadelphia's Centennial Exhibition.

The fate of the *Minute Man* statues in Lexington and Concord is thereby closely tied to issues of memory, materiality, and place. But whereas the Lexington memorial statues relied on the mechanics of the burgeoning Civil War monument industry and conformed to the niches of a memorial hall, the Concord statue transcended that mold, placing the citizen soldier in the realm of fine art and in the context of a battlefield. Meanwhile, while nominally "about" the Revolutionary War, the image of the minute man was conceived, interpreted, copied, and disseminated as an icon of Civil War memory as well as the Centennial. As a prelude to that material and memorial history, this chapter begins with the minute man, an emblem of American military readiness.

The Minute Man, the Revolution, and the Civil War

The minute man, a figure born of the American Revolution, became a military archetype in the United States even before the Civil War, and its first appearances in sculpture within the first decade after the Civil War speak to the character's topical resonance to the recent conflict. The concept is fairly simple: a minute man is a local soldier trained to defend his home or town at a moment's notice, equipped in constant readiness for danger. In the colonies before the American Revolution, the term "minute man" was a specific military designation, denoting a subset of soldiers within a local militia unit, usually about one quarter of the whole, trained in rapid response. Minute men are most strongly associated with Massachusetts and with the battle of Lexington and Concord, where they were highly visible and effective, but there were minute men in all thirteen colonies, indicating that the figure took on national in addition to regional significance. In the early national period, the minute man developed further meaning as a symbol of the American belief in a volunteer army; by the beginning of the Civil War, he served as a clear precedent for the citizen soldiers of North and South who flocked into the warring armies. Thus, the minute man can be understood as a central figure to the battles of Lexington and Concord, a regional symbol of New England, a military volunteer in various regional contexts across the United States, and ultimately, a national icon of the American volunteer army. This progression from local to regional to national symbol is key to the success of French's *Minute Man*.

The concept of the minute man arose from the situation of the seventeenth-century North American colonies, where relentless, violent clashes between Native Americans and European settlers necessitated a state of constant preparedness. The earliest English settlers in New England armed themselves against attack and

eventually formed a colonial militia. As John R. Galvin has shown, these armed

militiamen participated in many major conflicts with Native American tribes of New

England and with settlers from other European nations in the decades prior to the

outbreak of the Revolutionary War. Some of the most notable clashes were King

Philip's War of 1675-1678 and the French and Indian War of 1754-1763. Through

these years of conflict, New England colonists learned the benefits of preparing for

war in a climate of constant aggression, training that would later prove essential to the

Revolutionary cause.[222]

Contrary to popular mythology, the American militiamen who repelled British

forces at the battle of Lexington and Concord were more than a ragtag band of untried

farmers. Long before the opening shots of the Revolution were fired on the Lexington

Green, American politicians and colonists began to prepare for war. Several events,

including the Boston Tea Party on December 16, 1773 and the successful seizure of

government power by colonists in many of the counties near Boston over the course of

1774, indicated that armed revolution might soon become a reality, and many

colonists were determined to prepare for it. Beginning in the summer of 1774,

Massachusetts militiamen began drilling with greater frequency and seizing stockpiles

of gunpowder and ammunition belonging to the British army. Under orders of the

Massachusetts Provincial Congress, subsets of each Massachusetts militia unit were

organized into companies of minute men specifically charged with the responsibility

of responding quickly to threats and "equipped with an effective Fire Arm, Bayonet,

---

[222] John R. Galvin, *The Minute Men: The First Fight: Myths and Realities of the American Revolution* (Washington: Pergamon-Brassey's International Defense Publishers, Inc., 1989), 1-5.

169

Pouch, Knapsack, Thirty Rounds of Cartriges and Ball, and … disciplined three Times a Week, and oftener as Opportunity may offer."[223] During this time, the people of Concord became increasingly involved in rebellion against the Crown, and Concord's town green became a space for political demonstrations.[224] By the beginning of April 1775, the militia in Massachusetts was at least as prepared for armed conflict as were the green British troops who had recently been recruited into the Regulars to keep order in the towns surrounding Boston. The battle that would ensue involved both minute men and the regular militia, and it was fought on more equal terms than is usually assumed in national memory of the day.[225]

The events of April 18-19, 1775, have become burned on the popular imagination. On the evening of April 18, Lieutenant Colonel Francis Smith left Boston with a mixed company of about seven hundred infantry, light infantry, and grenadiers, under orders from Massachusetts Governor Thomas Gage to march to the town of Concord and destroy all military equipment found there. In addition, British troops were hoping to capture and imprison Revolutionary leaders, especially Samuel Adams and John Hancock, who had fled Boston together for the relative safety of Lexington. Unfortunately for Smith, the Sons of Liberty, a group of American patriots committed

---

[223] "In Provincial Congress, Cambridge, December 10, 1774," *Boston Gazette* December 12, 1774.

[224] Robert A. Gross, *The Minutemen and Their World* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1976), 42-67.

[225] Ray Raphael, *Founding Myths: Stories that Hide Our Patriotic Past* (New York: The New Press, 2004), 74-97; Michael C.C. Adams, *Echoes of War: A Thousand Years of Military History in Popular Culture*, (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2002), 83; Galvin, *The Minute Men*, 51-58, 244-247.

to protesting the British government, had organized a system of riders to alert the countryside in case of danger. Paul Revere, William Dawes, and Samuel Prescott were among the riders to warn surrounding towns of the troops' advance; Revere was responsible for warning Hancock and Adams in time for them to make their escape. By the time British troops reached Lexington at dawn, about eight miles short of Concord, Captain John Parker had assembled his company of seventy-six Minute men on the Lexington Green. Ordered to disperse by British Major John Pitcairn, and facing a force of much greater strength, the Lexington minute men began to leave the Green. Differences of opinion exist about what happened next; someone fired a shot, and the British regulars opened up with a volley of fire against the retreating minute men, leaving eight dead and ten wounded. With these opening shots, the battle of Lexington and Concord began.[226]

Leaving behind a scene of devastation in Lexington, the British troops marched on toward Concord, arriving at the town's limits at about half after seven. Initially, the 250 minute men under the command of Colonel James Barrett retreated before the advancing soldiers, taking up a position on a hill across Concord's North Bridge, just outside of town. From this vantage point, the minute men watched as British regulars searched the town, their ranks growing as militia companies from surrounding towns joined them. Most of the militia's supplies had already been moved or hidden, and the colonists had little to fear in that regard. But when the minute men saw white smoke rising from the town, they feared that Concord would be burned, and resolved to take a stand. By this point totaling about 400 men, about four times the

---

[226] Gross, *The Minutemen and Their World*, 116-118; Galvin, *The Minute Men*, 99-100, 106-128.

number of British soldiers left at the North Bridge to guard them, they marched across the bridge and were fired upon by the small British force. Two American soldiers and three British regulars were killed, and the British soldiers retreated from Concord. For the rest of the day, the British retreat to Boston was a running firefight, as more and more companies of local militia joined the ranks of their neighbors. In the course of the day, the British troops suffered a total of seventy-three killed and more than two hundred wounded and missing, while the colonists saw forty-nine killed and about forty wounded and missing. With the opening shots of this violent day, it became clear that the differences between the British government and the American colonists would not be solved by diplomacy alone.[227]

Responses to the battles of April 19, 1775 in the colonies outside Massachusetts were swift and decisive. In the Philadelphia papers and in many other cities, the fight on Lexington Green was essentially reported as a massacre of innocents, with brave militia throughout the countryside responding throughout the day to the British outrage.[228] Three months after the battle, and about a month after the battle of Bunker Hill, the Continental Congress passed a resolution recommending that all thirteen colonies form militia companies consisting of all able-bodied men between the ages of sixteen and fifty, that these men should be armed and trained in combat, and that one quarter of the troops raised should be specially designated as

---

[227] Gross, *The Minutemen and Their World*, 123-130; Galvin, *The Minute Men*, 135-155, 232-237.

[228] "Extract of a letter from Boston, dated April 20, 1775," *Pennsylvania Evening Post* (Philadelphia, Penn.) April 27, 1775.

minute men.[229] With this order, the minute man was elevated from a regional symbol of Massachusetts' struggle against British authority into a model of readiness for the entire country. In the August 21, 1775 issue of *Dunlap's Pennsylvania Packet*, a writer calling himself "Caractacus" extolled the virtues of the Continental Congress plan, stating that any nation where each citizen was a soldier was a nation that could not be subdued, and stressing that these militiamen should not become paid mercenaries, but should offer their services as proof of their love of country.[230] This anonymous writer's vision was not fully realized, as the system of statewide militias was largely folded into the Continental Army under George Washington as the war progressed, but the issues he raised formed the basis of debates about military preparedness during and after the Revolution.

After the war ended and the United States gained its independence as a new nation, the concept of the minute man continued to resonate as citizens across the United States considered how to prepare for defense or war in the context of democracy. Across the fledgling nation, populations in different regions grappled with the concept of defense and equipped militias to meet their needs. Even as the British Army surrendered, the white residents of towns and farms continued to face conflict with Native Americans and with Spanish and French colonists in territories bordering the United States. Moreover, the dark shadow of chattel slavery brought with it the

---

[229] "In Congress, July 18, 1775," *Dunlap's Pennsylvania Packet* (Philadelphia, Penn.) July 24, 1775; "New-York, July 27," *Connecticut Courant* (Hartford, Conn.) July 31, 1775.

[230] Caractacus, "For the Pennsylvania Packet," *Dunlap's Pennsylvania Packet* (Philadelphia, Penn.) August 21, 1775.

constant threat of slave insurrection. And in the first years after the Revolution, as the new national government was still in formation, insurrections such as Shays' Rebellion in 1786 and 1787 and the Whiskey Rebellion in 1794 caused further need for armed defense. With the War of 1812, minute men were called to defend the nation, with one writer from the *Columbian* in New York City reminding readers that "*To be unprepared* is to invite danger, *to be always ready* is to keep danger away."[231] The minute man was responsible for that heightened sense of readiness in response to the war with England.

Minute men in newly-settled regions were deployed not only in cases of organized rebellion or warfare, but also to counter the everyday conflicts of America's frontier. Newspaper accounts throughout the early national and antebellum periods evoked minute men as the local militia ready to respond to any sign of danger, especially those involving the nonwhite populations of North America. In 1787, South Carolina's *Columbian Herald* reported on the efforts of a "company of minute men" to suppress the rebellion of a group of runaway slaves, in which four members of the company were killed.[232] As reported by the *Kline's Carlisle Weekly Gazette* in 1808, a troop of militia was called up to oppose a band of Creek warriors who had raided a boat on the Tennessee River. These men were commanded to "be in readiness and on the alert, as they will be considered as minute men, if emergency should require."[233]

---

[231] "Elizabethtown, N.J. Dec. 1," *Columbian* (New York, N.Y.) December 3, 1812.

[232] "Savannah, May 3," *Columbian Herald* (Columbia, S.C.) May 10, 1787.

[233] "Further Confirmation. Brigade Orders. Maury County, April 27, 1808," *Kline's Carlisle Weekly Gazette* (Carlisle, Penn.), June 3, 1808.

In 1822, the *Augusta Chronicle and Georgia Advertiser* reported on the role of minute

men in putting down the famous slave rebellion led by Denmark Vesey, which

resulted in the execution of thirty-five men of African descent.[234] And by 1841, the

"minute man" model of dealing with conflict had spread to Texas, with the *Austin City*

Gazette reporting on a raid by Texas minute men on an encampment of men from an

unspecified Native American tribe, in which several horses were stolen and the chief

and seven other Native Americans were killed.[235] Through the first eight decades of

American nationhood, while so much territory operated under lax frontier rules, the

minute man, ready at a moment's notice, was often employed in sudden armed

conflict. That many of these conflicts arose between white Americans and nonwhite

populations, who also resisted threats to their life and liberty, speaks to the deep racial

animus ever-present in early America. In this context, the minute man symbolized

white authority.

The white cultural authority represented by the minute man was bolstered by a

symbolic link with ancient Rome. In the early decades of the United States, American

soldiers and their leader, George Washington, came to be identified with Cincinnatus,

the Roman farmer, general, and politician. As the story went, Cincinnatus was a

beloved Roman patrician who reluctantly gave up the farm work he loved in order to

serve his country, and he returned to that farm work as speedily as possible when the

---

[234] "An Account of the Intended Insurrection among a Portion of the Blacks in
Charleston," *Augusta Chronicle and Georgia Advertiser* (Augusta, Ga.) September 5,
1822.

[235] "News! News!! News!!! Battle with the Indians - death of their Chief and recovery
of stolen horses," *Austin City Gazette* (Austin, Tex.), April 7, 1841.

crisis had passed; this basic story, first learned from Pliny, was repeated with variations in histories of Rome through much of the nineteenth century. According to legend, Cincinnatus was a patrician who had recently been reduced to poverty after pledging his fortune to save his law-breaking son, Cæso, from prison. After losing his fortune, Cincinnatus retired to a small farm, where messengers from the Senate induced him to return to Rome as consul to assist in negotiating the defeat of a disputed law. Cincinnatus performed this task and returned to his farm, only to be called up again to lead the Roman army as dictator against an invasion by the Volsci, a nearby hostile nation. After defeating the uprising, Cincinnatus retired as dictator after fourteen days in office, and returned to his farm.[236] In *Stories from Roman History, by a Lady* of 1823, Cincinnatus' tale is illustrated by a pair of copper-plate engravings, the first showing Cincinnatus reluctantly leaving his plow, and the second illustrating how he humiliated Rome's attackers after their defeat (figure 4.10).[237] The first illustration is particularly related to the *Minute Man* statues, showing Cincinnatus as the subject of an agrarian idyll, with shirtsleeves rolled up to reveal forearms hardened by farm work. He gestures to his plow and ox, clearly unwilling to leave this farmer's paradise for the pressing concerns of state. Only the greatest concerns of life or country could stir Cincinnatus or the minute man to leave his ideal landscape.

---

[236] There are many sources, both ancient and dating to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, that would have informed citizens of the early United States about the story of Cincinnatus. One influential example that was printed in several editions on both sides of the Atlantic is Oliver Goldsmith, *Goldsmith's Roman History: Abridged by Himself for the Use of Schools* (Trenton, NJ: Wilson and Blackwell, 1802).

[237] *Stories from Roman History, by a Lady* (London: Harvey and Darton, 1823), 17-21.

The legend of Cincinnatus was commonly associated with George Washington, the gentleman farmer turned general and the President who constantly asserted his desire to retire to his beloved Mount Vernon.[238] But the Roman general was also the emblem of the Society of the Cincinnati, a hereditary organization for the officers of the Continental Army and their descendants, established in 1783. As Maurie McInnis has demonstrated, the founding of the Society of the Cincinnati and its adoption of Cincinnatus as a symbol caused great controversy in the early years of the nation, as many of the founding fathers expressed concern that the organization was instituting a self-imposed aristocracy. In McInnis' view, the statue of *George Washington* sculpted by Jean-Antoine Houdon, depicting the general as Cincinnatus, was intended to separate Washington as Cincinnatus from the organization of the officers.[239] What, then, should one make of the use of Cincinnatus imagery in representations of the minute man?

In practice, in early national America's largely agrarian society, the everyday Americans who served as militiamen leapt from the cornfield to the battlefield and back again when danger had passed. The agrarian roots of the minute man were often emphasized in texts, as in 1819 when the *Columbian Centinel* reported on the death of Captain Samuel Payson, a veteran of the Revolution who was one of the men who responded to the threat at Lexington and Concord. Like Cincinnatus, Payson "was at

---

[238] For instance, see Garry Wills, *Cincinnatus: George Washington and the Enlightenment* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984).

[239] Maurie D. McInnis, "Revisiting Cincinnatus: Houdon's *George Washington*," in in *Shaping the Body Politic: Art and Political Formation in Early America*, Maurie McInnis and Louis P. Nelson, eds. (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011), 145-155.

his plough, in Sharon, when he received the intelligence of the slaughter at Lexington; [then] he immediately took his horse from the plough, and proceeded to muster the minute men he commanded, and marched to drive in the enemy."[240] Thus, the imagery of Cincinnatus belonged not only to Washington or to the officers of the Society of the Cincinnati, but to the rank-and-file soldier as well. In practice, any man who left his usual pursuits to fight for the American cause could identify with the ancient Roman statesman. This linkage between military pursuits and agrarian ideals would later reappear as a major aspect of post-Civil War commemorations of the minute man.

Indeed, it informed the first proposed sculptural monument to a minute man. On the eve of the Civil War, the minute man was proposed as the subject of a never-erected monument intended for the Lexington Green. This unrealized statue could be considered the first abortive attempt at a figural monument to citizen soldiers in the United States. The citizens of Lexington who conceived the monument specifically intended to make a monument of a "national character" that would "do honor, not to one man who happened to be in command, but to the common soldiers, on whom the labor falls, and to whom the honor of victory generally belongs."[241] Architect and illustrator Hammatt Billings designed the monument in 1858 with the assistance of sculptor Thomas Ball and architect Gridley J.F. Bryant. Billings imagined a statue of a minute man at colossal size, placed upon a tall and ornate granite base decorated with *bas-reliefs* of scenes of the Lexington battle. The statue is now chiefly known through an engraved certificate issued by the Lexington Monument Association to encourage

---

[240] "Deaths," *Columbian Centinel* (Boston, Mass.) July 14, 1819.

[241] *Proceedings at the Centennial Celebration of the Battle of Lexington, April 19, 1875* (Boston: Lockwood, Brooks, & Co., 1875), 167-169.

donations to the fund for building the monument (figure 4.11).[242] The certificate,

engraved by A.C. Warren after a drawing by Billings, is organized into three registers.

At the top inside an oval frame is a rendition of the monument as imagined on the

Lexington Green, with human figures to suggest the vast scale of the structure.

Supporting this frame on either side are assemblages of objects pertaining to the

Revolution, including documents such as the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of

Rights, and the Stamp Act; a liberty cap; several muskets, cannons, swords and other

implements of war; and notably, a plow to suggest the agricultural origins of

American soldiers. Below this is a shield bearing the names of members of the

Lexington Monument Committee, and below that is a rendering by Billings of the

Battle of Lexington, possibly intended as a potential relief panel for the monument.

The rendering of the monument at the top of the certificate reveals that in the

hands of Billings and Thomas Ball, the statue crowing the plinth would have been a

dynamic figure of a minute man. Dressed in a farmer's plain clothes, he points

dramatically with his right arm while gazing backwards over his left shoulder,

encouraging unseen comrades to join in the fray. In his left hand he holds his musket,

and at his right knee is a suggestion of the ubiquitous plow, emblem of Cincinnatus.

This design demonstrates clearly that the cultural imperative of leaving one's

agricultural life for the battlefield was an important element of the minute man's

legend long before the statues in Lexington or Concord put the idea into plastic form.

When plans for the minute man monument in Lexington were first announced,

the proposal attracted a good deal of national attention. News of the statue reached as

---

[242] James F. O'Gorman, *Accomplished in All Departments of Art: Hammatt Billings of Boston, 1818-1874* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998), 194-195.

far as California, where the *San Joaquin Register* reported in 1859 that Lexington would erect a statue "of a 'minute man' leaving his plow, seizing his musket, ball pouch and powder horn and hurrying to obey the call of duty."[243] On the same day, the *New York Tribune* speculated that "the favoring sympathy of the country at large may be anticipated for the [monument]," which would be "a monument more in keeping with the importance and grandeur of the [Battle of Lexington]."[244] But circumstances would quickly turn national attention away from the planned Lexington monument, as the outbreak of war in 1861 commanded all resources and emotions. As Thomas Ball later recalled about his role in the project,

> this colossal was not to be begun until [the monument committee] should feel quite sure that the money would be forthcoming to pay for it, — which, as it turned out, was very proper and prudent on their part; for shortly after this the Great Rebellion broke out, rendering it impossible to raise money for any other object than to keep the country together, and to provide sustenance for the glorious defenders, too many of whom — it was found at the close of the war — had laid down their lives in the struggle for her defence [sic]. These must be honored with statues and monuments before indulging in any abstract idea connected with the more remote past.[245]

In Ball's analysis, his failed commission for a national monument recognizing the importance of the minute man was later realized in the form of Daniel Chester French's *Minute Man* for the battlefield at Concord. But the other outcome of this project was the collection of statues in the Memorial Hall at Lexington, to which the

---

[243] "The Minute Man," *San Joaquin Register* (Stockton, Cal.) November 19, 1859.

[244] Edward Everett, "The Mount Vernon Papers, No. Forty-seven: The Nineteenth of April, 1775," *New York Tribune* November 19, 1859.

[245] Thomas Ball, *My Threescore Years and Ten: An Autobiography* (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1891), 215-216.

Lexington Monument Committee turned its attention after the Civil War had ended. In placing a minute man of the Revolution alongside a volunteer of the Union army, Lexington would eventually merge its original monumental plans with the nation-changing events that disrupted them. In honoring minute men and Civil War soldiers jointly, this assemblage of statues articulated the national mood and acknowledged the importance of minute man imagery during the Civil War.

Before, during, and after the Civil War, the minute man as a military and political concept appealed to Americans on all sides of the sectional conflict, serving as an impetus to organize and fight for principles, no matter what those principles were. This metaphor exploded in American newspapers in the final two years leading up to the outbreak of war, as all sides called for the arming of citizens. The use of the term in the lead-up to sectional strife had some basis a few years earlier, when Northern abolitionist emigrants to "Bleeding" Kansas represented themselves as minute men in the struggle to win the territory for antislavery.[246] As sectional cooperation broke down in the last years of the 1850s, mentions of minute men abounded. In late 1859, the *Charleston Mercury* reported on a band of minute men forming in Rome, Georgia to "tender their services to the country in case of invasion of Virginia or other Southern States by Northern fanatics."[247] A month later, the entire state of Virginia followed suit, as the state's Governor John Letcher advocated for a

---

[246] "Serious Work in Kansas – Collision Between the New Englanders and Missourians," *North American and United States Gazette* (Philadelphia, Penn.) October 25, 1854; "The Future of Kanzas [sic]," *Vermont Journal* (Windsor, Vt.) November 3, 1854.

[247] "Minute Men," *Charleston Mercury* (Charleston, S.C.) December 3, 1859.

national convention to discuss the constitutionality of slavery and secession while at the same time advising his state to arm militia companies for war.[248] This rhetoric became even more pronounced as partisan political clubs formed in anticipation of the presidential election at the end of the year. In the Northern states, young Republican men formed groups called "Wide Awakes," paramilitary clubs trained in marching maneuvers to participate in political rallies, and they often thought of themselves as minute men in a "peaceful revolution" designed to bring a Republican president into office.[249] In response to the perceived threat of Northerners arming themselves against Southern interests, young South Carolinians formed their own armed bands, specifically called "Minute Men." These organizations were expressly intended "for the preservation of the interests and institutions of the South, and the formation of a Southern confederacy."[250] And to make matters even more confusing, partisans of the Constitutional Union Party of John Bell and Edward Everett, running on a platform designed to preserve the Union by upholding the Constitution, also referred to themselves as "Minute Men."[251] No matter whether they were advocating the use of arms to preserve or divide the Union, or pleading for reconciliation between the sections, young voting Americans felt an affinity with the first responders of the

---

[248] "Message of Gov. Letcher of Virginia," *Boston Courier* January 9, 1860.

[249] "The Grand Wide-Awake Excursion to Hudson," *Albany Evening Journal* (Albany, N.Y.) August 17, 1860; "A Word to the Wide-Awakes!" *Albany Evening Journal* (Albany, NY) September 5, 1860.

[250] "Political Intelligence," *The New York Herald* October 20, 1860.

[251] "The Union and Constitutional Party," *Boston Courier* April 16, 1860.

Revolution. For the young white men of North and South, the minute man rhetoric held expressive power.

With the election of Abraham Lincoln to the presidency, the secession crisis proceeded quickly. South Carolina seceded in December 1860, followed by Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, North Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee. The war began when South Carolinians fired on the Federal-held Fort Sumter, which fell on April 14, 1861. In the first tense days of mobilization for war after the surrender of Fort Sumter, President Lincoln's chief concern was the fortification of the city of Washington, D.C. At the beginning of the Civil War, the United States had an army of less than 16,000 men, most of whom were fighting for land with Native American tribes in the frontier west, and many of these abandoned their posts to serve the Confederacy as their states seceded. With the fall of Fort Sumter, the nation's capital vibrated with rumors that Confederate General P.G.T. Beauregard was planning to march on the city, which was at that point virtually undefended. Thankfully for Lincoln, several militia companies in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and New York had begun drilling daily as the secession crisis unfolded, and Lincoln was able to summon them immediately to defend Washington. On April 15, 1861, Lincoln issued a proclamation calling for 75,000 soldiers to defend the Union, and further called on these three states to send their already-prepared militias.

Most of the soldiers who made up the Sixth Massachusetts, the first militia regiment to respond, came from the towns that had heard and answered Paul Revere's midnight alarm in April 1775, and many had grandfathers who had fought in the battles of Lexington and Concord. On April 19, 1861, the eighty-sixth anniversary of the beginning of the Revolution, the Sixth Massachusetts was attacked by an angry

mob of secessionists while passing through Baltimore and suffered casualties, including four men killed outright and several seriously wounded. Despite the riot, the regiment reached Washington on that same day, and for their speedy response to danger, they began to think of themselves as the "Minute Men of '61." In abbreviating the date, the adopted nickname itself was a rhetorical revival of Revolutionary language.[252]

Shortly after the riot in Baltimore, Currier and Ives issued a color lithograph titled "The Lexington of 1861," illustrating the plight of the Massachusetts volunteers as they fought their way through the city streets (figure 4.12). In this pro-Union image, the Sixth Massachusetts is a well-trained company of fighters, firing en masse into an unruly crowd of red-shirted secessionists and demonstrating their cool response to a difficult situation. A Northern-sympathizing viewer would probably be heartened by this image of seasoned troops ready to quash the Southern rebellion. But the print also shows the tensions inherent for both North and South in drawing parallels with the Revolutionary past. The Sixth Massachusetts men are the direct descendants of the patriots of Lexington and Concord, and they fight to preserve the Union that their grandfathers helped to create. But in playing the role of the disciplined military force restoring order to a rebelling mob, they are visually associated with the British soldiers who marched on their grandfathers.

A patriotic envelope from the collection of the American Antiquarian Society, printed in 1861, further problematizes this relationship (figure 4.13). The envelope is

---

[252] John Lockwood and Charles Lockwood, *The Siege of Washington: The Untold Story of the Twelve Days that Shook the Union* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 3-22, 111-125.

printed with two vignettes in oval surrounds that are linked by heraldic banners extending toward one another. The vignette on the left, dated April 19, 1775, is labeled "LEXINGTON," while the image on the right, dated April 19, 1861, is marked "BALTIMORE." The Lexington vignette is probably inspired by Hammatt Billings' sketch of the battle, with an indistinct line of British regulars firing through a haze of smoke at the massed minute men in the foreground, encouraged by an officer on a horse (see figures 4.18 and 4.19). In the foreground, the supplicant wounded man lying on the ground and the minute man holding his rifle at the front of the group seem drawn specifically from Billings' sketch. In the Baltimore scene, it is the rioters who appear distinctly in the foreground, hurling rocks and aiming rifles at the Massachusetts troops. Firing back, the "Minute Men of '61" do their part to protect themselves and to make their way toward the train that will transport them to Washington. Once again, the Massachusetts men protect the nation founded by their grandfathers while taking on the role of the British at Lexington.

The men of the Sixth Massachusetts were not the only Northerners to take on the identity of minute men in responding to the secession crisis. Throughout the Northern states, the notion of preparing for an immediate response to national disaster was widely embraced. A lithograph celebrating the "Squirrel Hunter's Discharge," issued in September 1862, commemorates the swift response of "Minute Men of the State" to a threat of Confederate attack on the city of Cincinnati, Ohio (figure 4.14). Upon hearing that Confederate Brigadier General Henry Heth was planning to lead an army northward to menace the city, a force of 22,000 Union soldiers and 50,000 militia volunteers (the "Squirrel Hunters") assembled to dig fortifications. Their quick action ultimately discouraged a Confederate attack. The lithograph celebrating this

response to danger shows a rugged frontiersman with a long rifle, crouched as if ready to spring upon the enemy. This "minute man," somewhat removed from New England's colonial ideal, shows how the concept was reimagined in the West.

Even as the Northern men who marched to Southern battlefields or protected their home cities saw themselves as descendants of the minute men, however, their Southern counterparts undervalued and denigrated them. A cartoon printed in *Harper's Weekly* on May 25, 1861 satirizes the descriptions of Union troops in Southern newspapers, illustrating how the soldiers were viewed by Southerners and how they viewed themselves (figure 4.15). As quoted by *Harper's*, the *Mobile Advertiser* characterizes Northern soldiers as "white-slave, peddling wretches, small change knaves and vagrants, the dregs and offscourings of the populace; these are the levied 'forces' whom Lincoln suddenly arrays as candidates for the honor of being slaughtered by gentlemen."[253] The accompanying image shows a motley line of slack-jawed, simian-faced troops, many of them with facial characteristics often employed to caricature Irish immigrants. They are dressed in an array of bedraggled uniforms, their heads capped variously with fezzes, kepis, shakos, and other headgear; only some carry rifles, while the rest are armed with rakes and shovels. Their commander rides a scrawny nag and wears a bicorn hat tied down with a woman's kerchief. Rather than a disciplined militia unit that has been drilling in preparation for battle, this group of "minute men," hastily assembled from the dregs of society, is unable to pass muster. The contrasting image, depicting the men of the Sixth Massachusetts returning to Baltimore on May 14, 1861 to subdue the city officially for the North, shows an

---

[253] "What They Say of Us and What We Are," *Harper's Weekly* 5, no. 230 (May 25, 1861): 336.

orderly and smartly dressed company trampling secessionist forces. But the inversion

of the minute man trope as exemplified by the *Mobile Advertiser* and its illustrating

cartoon packs a solid rhetorical punch, calling into question the virtue of military

readiness. These cartoons point to the existence of the minute man as an easily

recognizable visual trope, available for parody in the press but also eventually for

symbolic elevation in the form of post-Civil War statues.

Even as some Southern newspapers ridiculed Northern soldiers for thinking of

themselves as minute men, however, the minute man concept and other allusions to

Revolutionary history proved to have resonance across the South. In forming the

Confederacy, many white Southerners saw themselves as enacting a second

Revolution to prove that they were the true inheritors of 1776. It helped that so many

Revolutionary leaders, including George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, hailed

from Virginia and other Southern states. Washington's image in particular was

adopted by the Confederate cause in writing and in song and evoked by politicians

including Jefferson Davis, and his equestrian statue in Richmond eventually adorned

the Confederate national seal (figure 4.16).[254] This identification with the

Revolutionary generation also affected the rank-and-file soldiers, and many units

specifically identified as minute men. One such unit was the Culpeper Minute Men of

Culpeper County, Virginia, who assembled for war in the wake of Virginia's secession

on the same spot where the original Virginia Minute Men had met in 1775. They

carried a flag of the same design that their Revolutionary grandfathers had carried, and

---

[254] Drew Gilpin Faust, *The Creation of Confederate Nationalism: Ideology and
Identity in the Civil War South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988),
14.

demonstrated clearly that the minute man was meaningful to soldiers on both sides of the Civil War.[255] When the time came later to memorialize the Revolutionary generation at the Centennial, Southerners had a stake in that commemoration.

As the Civil War drew to a close, the people of Lexington and Concord led the way in interpreting the conflict through the lens of the Revolution, as they would eventually lead the nation into Centennial commemorations. Four years after the Sixth Massachusetts had marched into Baltimore, the date of April 19 resonated sadly as the date of Abraham Lincoln's funeral after his death on April 15, 1865, just six days after the surrender of Robert E. Lee's Confederate forces at Appomattox. Instead of the usual celebrations accompanying this anniversary, both towns were plunged into mourning. A 1913 *History of the Town of Lexington* poignantly describes how the townspeople gathered at the Church of the First Parish to mourn their fallen leader. In grieving for Lincoln on the anniversary of their town's most famous event, Lexington's citizens cemented their mental link between the promise of the Revolution and its test in the Civil War, and between George Washington as father and Abraham Lincoln as savior of the nation.[256]

These resonances between Civil War and Revolution continued to occupy the same April date in peacetime commemoration. On April 19, 1867, the town of Concord dedicated a Civil War monument to honor the soldiers from the town who had died in the war (figure 4.17). The monument itself is a sturdy granite obelisk

---

[255] Timothy S. Sedore, *An Illustrated Guide to Virginia's Confederate Monuments* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2011), 173.

[256] Charles Hudson, *History of the Town of Lexington* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1913), 277-279.

constructed of rough-hewn stones, fairly typical for Union monuments erected in the first years after the end of the war. One notable feature connecting the Civil War and the Revolution is a stone from the Old North Bridge where Concord men first resisted British forces, a tangible reminder of the past. During the course of the dedication ceremony, several speakers further hammered this point home. An ode sung to the tune of Auld Lang Syne and written by George B. Bartlett juxtaposed the two events:

> Beneath the shadow of the elm, where ninety years ago
> Old Concord's rustic heroes met to face a foreign foe,
> We come to consecrate this Stone to heroes of to-day,
> Who perished in a holy cause as gallantly as they.

The ode goes on to point out that the "patriot preacher's bugle call" remains alive in the "silver tones of him who speaks to you," probably a reference to Ralph Waldo Emerson and his grandfather, preacher William Emerson, who was present at the Battle of Concord.[257] The Emerson family had lived in Concord for several generations, and Ralph Waldo Emerson, perhaps not unlike the young men of the Sixth Massachusetts at the riot in Baltimore, felt a connection with the Revolutionary past that resonated through ancestral lines. At important commemorations of the town's history throughout his life, Emerson often offered meditations in speech or verse.

In his keynote address at the dedication of the Civil War monument, Emerson furthered the association between Revolution and Civil War that had marked songs and remarks throughout the day. Most tellingly, he argued that the Civil War was necessary to correct one fatal flaw in the actions of the Revolutionary generation: the

---

[257] *Ceremonies at the Dedication of the Soldiers' Monument, in Concord, Mass.* (Concord: Printed by Benjamin Tolman, 1867), 11.

continued existence of slavery. For Emerson, the "subtle poison" of slavery corrupted the entire nation, making the war necessary.[258] In interpreting the relationship between the soldiers of the Revolution and of the Civil War, Emerson did not allow his listeners to escape easily into thoughts of universal honor and glory, but instead challenged them to remember the reasons these conflicts had been fought and to take action to assure freedom and liberty for all. In the centennial celebrations to follow at Lexington and Concord and later in Philadelphia, however, Emerson's challenge was not always answered.

Lexington and Concord: Commemoration and Rivalry

As the horror and slaughter of the Civil War began to fade into the recent past, and as towns across the United States began to consider ways to memorialize their fallen soldiers, the eyes of the nation also began to turn toward 1876 and the celebration of the nation's Centennial. Just as the Battles of Lexington and Concord had served as an opening act to the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, the centennial celebrations of that battle were to set the tone for the national celebration to follow. Both Lexington and Concord took this responsibility seriously, and both towns planned elaborate celebrations that centered around the unveiling of memorial statues. Notably, although the towns were indelibly linked in the eyes of most Americans, they held separate celebrations. In so doing, Lexington and Concord each utilized the battle's centennial as an opportunity to argue how their part in history should be remembered.

---

[258] Ibid., 31-32.

While the nation was embracing the history of the minute men and finding resonances between the Revolution and other conflicts, and even as Lexington and Concord were reconciling their early history with the more recent Civil War, the two towns were developing a bitter rivalry over their respective roles in the events of April 19, 1775. Both Concord and Lexington declared their town to be the birthplace of the Revolutionary War, and both resented the other's claim to the title. Neither town disputed the fact that the first shots of the day were fired on the town green at Lexington; nor did they question the deaths of the eight Lexington minute men as the catalysts for the rest of the day's events. But because the minute men of Lexington failed to repel the advance of the British, people of Concord began to suggest that the "massacre" at Lexington had been only a prelude to the real fight at Concord's North Bridge. As Concord's argument went, the revolution truly began when citizens of Concord, as they watched British soldiers ransacking their town, chose to rise up and resist, and successfully repelled the soldiers from town. Concord's view is espoused in the first stanza of Emerson's "Concord Hymn," which was sung to the tune of "Old Hundredth" at Concord's dedication ceremony for her monument to the battle, held on April 19, 1836:

> By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
> Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
> Here once the embattled farmers stood,
> And fired the shot heard round the world.[259]

---

[259] "Concord Hymn: Sung at the Completion of the Battle Monument, April 19, 1836," in *Poems by Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company, 1885), 139.

These words, especially the final line, became indelibly associated with the Battle of Lexington and Concord, and with them Emerson claimed the highest honor for his Concordian ancestors. For Emerson, the day's crucial moment was the one in which American minute men chose to fire en masse at the British soldiers. This led to a move by Lexingtonians to prove that members of their militia, too, had fired back piecemeal at British soldiers, not waiting for a command to do so. Increasingly as the pre-Civil War decades wore on, the conversation about the Battle of Lexington and Concord became dominated by debates about who had fired, when, and why. By the time the battle's centennial appeared on the horizon, this historical rivalry was strongly and bitterly established.

The conflict between Lexington and Concord over the interpretation of their respective towns' actions in the battle played out in print culture. In the early twentieth century, Harold Murdock published an investigation of the day's events that included an examination of the trouble with Lexington. Murdock traces how the Lexington fight was depicted in print, pointing out that early prints showed an all-out massacre by British troops on fleeing Lexingtonians, while later examples showed the farmers returning spirited fire. The wide discrepancy in presentation over the course of the decades after the battle can be seen in the comparison of two prints, the first an engraving by Amos Doolittle after a sketch by Ralph Earl in 1775, and the second after a sketch by Hammatt Billings in 1859 (figures 4.18 and 4.19). In the Doolittle image, the British regulars are depicted in strict formation, firing mechanically against a crowd of Lexington militiamen obeying the order to disperse, as several Americans fall wounded and dying. By contrast, the Billings print shows the Americans rallying

together and putting up a spirited fight.[260] The Billings sketch, originally intended as a possible relief panel for Lexington's unrealized monument commemorating the battle and the minute men, understandably presents a view of the conflict that would appear favorable to the townspeople paying for the potential monument.[261]

Even though the two towns clashed over the meaning of their participation in the events of April 19, 1775, there was some consideration of a possible joint celebration of their centennial. In November of 1873, Lexington's centennial committee reached out to the town council of Concord, offering to host a joint celebration wherein the two towns could join to celebrate their shared history.[262] Concord had hosted a similar joint celebration at the seventy-fifth anniversary in 1850, and it apparently took place without controversy or acrimony.[263] But the committee at Concord refused, citing a previous commitment to a celebration in Concord based on the planned dedication of Daniel Chester French's *Minute Man* statue. In fact, Concord's response to Lexington went further than its plans to erect a memorial statue, explaining that "the people of Concord desired and expected to have in their own town a celebration which should appropriately commemorate the deeds of the men whom they delight to honor." In other words, a celebration of "Concord fight"

---

[260] Harold Murdock, *The Nineteenth of April, 1875* (Boston: Riverside Press for Houghton Mifflin Company, 1923), 6-9.

[261] O'Gorman, *Accomplished in All Departments of Art*, 36.

[262] *Proceedings at the Centennial Celebration of the Battle of Lexington, April 19, 1875* (Boston: Lockwood, Brooks, & Co., 1875), 111.

[263] "Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord," *Salem Register* (Salem, Mass.) April 22, 1850.

was out of the question in any location but Concord itself. Once the notion of a joint celebration had been thoroughly debunked, the two towns negotiated over a possible schedule of events that would allow visitors to attend the most important aspects of the ceremonies of both Lexington and Concord, but these talks also broke down, and the towns determined to develop their celebrations completely independently of one another.[264] After this, any relationship between the towns and their citizens in reference to the centennial grew increasingly acrimonious, as both towns vied to outdo one another in preparations and to prove their unique importance to the beginning of the Revolution.

A few days before the centennial celebrations were to occur, the *New York Herald* published a summary of the disagreement between Concord and Lexington that aptly historicized where matters stood at this particular historic juncture. The intrepid *Herald* reporter, interpreting the dual celebrations as illustrating "the idea of each town that the war began within its limits," set out to speak to prominent citizens in both Lexington and Concord to determine the truth of the matter. First, he interviewed Charles Hudson of Lexington, who pointed out that the first blood of the war was shed in his town, and suggested that Lexingtonians returned fire against the British as they retreated from the village green. Concord's rejoinder was that men were indeed killed at Lexington, but that other Americans had been killed by British troops before, as at the Boston Massacre in 1770, and that it therefore was the resistance of the Concord Minute Men that started the Revolution. Asked to weigh in on the controversy, George William Curtis, set to deliver the keynote address at Concord a

---

[264] *Proceedings at the Centennial Celebration of Concord Fight, April 19, 1875* (Concord, MA: Published by the Town, 1876), 24.

few days later, offered a plea for peace between the two towns, intimating that both deserved patriotic honor. But then he fanned the flames of the conflict, maintaining that the massacre at Lexington was "a very insignificant affair" in comparison to the resistance offered at Concord. The article then quotes accounts of the battle written by Washington Irving and George Bancroft, both concerned with ascertaining whether the British or Americans fired the first shot at Lexington, and whether the Lexingtonians returned fire after the initial British volley.[265] Ultimately the *Herald*'s reporter was unable to reach a satisfactory answer to these questions. But whether or not these questions are answerable, and whether or not they are even the right questions to ask about that day in 1775, their specters affected both towns' preparations for celebration and memorial activities. In planning their ceremonies and commissioning their statues, a spirit of competition spurred both towns toward finding the best possible means of memorializing history. The statues that resulted shaped the iconography of the Revolutionary soldier for the nation.

In choosing how to memorialize Lexington's soldiers and its place in history, Lexingtonians envisioned a civic structure that would contain a hall devoted to monumental statuary. While the Town Hall in Lexington that originally housed its four statues is no longer standing, it was at the time a rather unique response to the need for memorial and civic space in the years immediately following the Civil War. As discussed in Chapter 2, during the first years after the war, some debate occurred over whether memorials to the war's dead should take the form of purpose-built monuments or useful civic buildings, with individuals such as Charles Eliot Norton of

---

[265] "Who Fired It? We Mean 'The Shot Heard Round the World,'" *New York Herald* April 16, 1875.

Harvard strongly advocating for the latter. While most towns quickly turned toward outdoor sculpture for their memorial needs, Lexington's Town Hall is exemplary of this other impulse. The Town Hall was conceived as a structure to house the functions of Lexington's government, a Memorial Hall in remembrance of the dead of the Revolution and the Civil War, a Masonic Lodge, and the town's library – it replaced a small wooden building that could not accommodate all of these varied uses (figure 4.20). The project began in November 1869 with the donation of $6,000 by Maria Hastings Cary, who also pledged $1,000 to found the library that would occupy the building. Her financial support eventually grew to $20,000, and the building was ready for dedication on April 19, 1871, another evocation of the town's most important date.[266]

At the dedication of the Town Hall, the keynote speaker was Dr. George B. Loring, a Massachusetts Republican who served in various political offices throughout his career, including in the United States House of Representatives. In his speech, Loring repeated the types of sentiments that should now be familiar for Lexington and Concord ceremonial occasions, linking the Revolutionary generation with Massachusetts Civil War veterans at great length and in elevated language. He begins by recalling the events and major players of the Battle of Lexington, and then moves

---

[266] Maria Hastings Cary was a native of Lexington who moved to Brooklyn, NY following her marriage to William Harris Cary, a wealthy importer of fancy goods. The couple lived most of the year in New York, but maintained the Hastings homestead as a summer residence in Lexington. After her husband's death in 1861, Mrs. Cary made a donation to Lexington for a library due to her "desire to increase the opportunities for culture among its inhabitants." Hudson, *History of the Town of Lexington*, 290-291, 405; Henry Grosvenor Cary, *The Cary Family in America* (Boston: Seth Cooley Cary, 1907).

into the Civil War, vividly evoking the various experiences of young men volunteering for the army. His most telling imagery comes when he explains the purpose of the Town Hall. For Loring, the new building is "a design which in combining historical emblems and records, with the culture of books, and accommodation for the exercise of the rights and privileges of independent citizens, represents the genius as well as the kindly affections of our people." In other words, by combining civic functions with historical memory, Lexington has increased the resonance of both. Loring further imagines a young student in the new Cary Library reading a history book and experiencing the Memorial Hall:

> Now, indeed, may the humblest student sitting within this sacred hall, remember that for the freedom of thought which gives an inestimable value to the volume in his hands, the youthful blood of two generations of men in this town has been freely shed. As he turns with pride to the history of his country and learns there the great virtues and the social and civil principles, which make a people truly powerful, contemplating also the statues of the illustrious men who practiced these virtues in the beginning, and fixed these principles, he can turn then to the tablets which adorn these walls, and learn the price which you have paid for the preservation of the blessed institutions transmitted to us by the fathers.[267]

In Loring's view, the student's pursuit of the truth of history in the library is enriched by the plaques and statues of the Memorial Hall, which serve as a reminder of duty to nation in a setting devoted to civic responsibility and learning. Through the names of Lexingtonians who fell in the Revolutionary and Civil Wars, their

---

[267] George B. Loring, *An Oration Delivered at Lexington on the Dedication of the Town and Memorial Hall, April 19, 1871* (Boston: T.R. Marvin and Son, 1871), 24-25.

representatives in stone, and the images of Samuel Adams and John Hancock, the student of history finds his study animated.

On the day that the Town Hall was dedicated, Memorial Hall was not yet completed, as its four niches were not yet filled with the sculptures intended for them. The first two statues were installed a few months after the dedication of the Town Hall in 1871. These were the granite *Minute Man* and *Union Soldier* modeled by German-American carver Carl Conrads and manufactured by James Batterson's New England Granite Company, one of the first monument firms to convert successfully from funerary displays to soldier memorials. They were joined on April 19, 1875 by Martin Milmore's *Samuel Adams* and Thomas Gould's *John Hancock*, both manufactured in Italy out of Italian marble and shipped just in time for their dedication ceremony at the centennial of Lexington's Revolutionary battle. When all four statues were installed, they constituted a memorial program set in an octagonal room in the Town Hall, nestled into the center of the building just beyond the entrance and stair hall (figure 4.21). Approaching the Memorial Hall from the stair hall, the viewer first encountered an archway marked by the inscription, "LEXINGTON / consecrates this hall and its emblems / to the memory of the / founders and sustainers of our free institutions." After passing through this archway, the viewer would have seen the *Minute Man* in the niche in the diagonal wall to his left, and the *Union Soldier* in the niche to his right. Opposite the *Minute Man* and across the hall stood *John Hancock* and opposite the *Union Soldier* stood *Samuel Adams*. Between the *Minute Man* and *John Hancock* statues and above a corridor door was a plaque giving the names of Lexington militiamen who died at the Battle of Lexington on April 19, 1775. Opposite this, a matching plaque gave the names of men of the town who died during the Civil War.

Between *Hancock* and *Adams*, a far door led into the Cary Library, allowing the imaginary scholar of George Loring's dedication speech to commune directly with both the history and memories enshrined in the hall and the fount of learning beyond.[268]

The octagonal space of the Lexington Memorial Hall constructed an experience of Revolutionary and Civil War memory for the visitor. Passing through the entrance, the viewer was flanked by a timeline of the citizen soldier in the United States, progressing from left to right. The citizen soldier was represented first by a pair of ideal figures, mirroring one another in stable *contrapposto*, and then by lists of names of the actual Lexingtonians who died in war. Across the hall, the figures of Samuel Adams and John Hancock, probably the most immediately visible aspects of the room, stood as famous exempla of the Revolutionary generation. These two individuals, bound to the town of Lexington through their escape from capture on the night of April 18, 1775, strengthened Lexington's insistence on its role as the birthplace of the Revolution. The statues and carved tablets in Lexington's Memorial Hall presented a hierarchy of visual representation, with the town's citizen soldiers present in carved names but illustrated through idealized stock figures; meanwhile, the two famous founders were given portrait statues. In this, the statues recall both the Roman tradition of portraiture and the early American emulation of it, culminating in the museum of Charles Willson Peale, where painted portraits of illustrious Americans appeared at the top of a hierarchy of nature. Together, the "founders and sustainers" of American democracy as they appeared in Lexington's Memorial Hall illustrated the

---

[268] *Proceedings at the Centennial Celebration of the Battle of Lexington, April 19, 1875* (Boston: Lockwood, Brooks, & Co., 1875), 164-165.

virtues and sacrifices of citizenship to the visitor, signaling their interpretation through visual cues that would have resonated with informed viewers.

The two figures of American citizen soldiers supplied by Batterson and Conrads resonate with then-emerging trends in memorializing soldiers (see figures 4.4 and 4.5). The *Union Soldier* is similar in style to many other Civil War figures marketed by the New England Granite Company in the immediate postwar years. He wears the regulation kepi and overcoat, and affects a stance modified from parade rest, with the head turned to the right and rifle grasped with both hands to the left of the body. His mustachioed face suggests that he is slightly beyond the bloom of youth, and he is resolute in expression. A tree trunk behind the right leg both stabilizes the statue and refers to models of Roman figures that used similar devices to the same ends.

Across from the *Union Soldier*, the *Minute Man* was something of an innovation, as Revolutionary soldiers did not make common subjects for memorial sculpture before this point in time. Dating a few years before French's *Minute Man* for Concord, the statue demonstrates that iconography for representing soldiers of the Revolution was already deeply familiar (indeed, one wonders whether French ever made an unrecorded visit to see the Lexington statue). This statue is clothed in the work shirt, breeches, and tricorn hat of a colonial farmer, shirtsleeves rolled up for work or action. His pose is slightly more animated than that of his mate, with head turned to his left, in the same direction as his striding leg and the musket that he holds in his left hand. Draped across the musket is his coat, perhaps grabbed in anticipation of a cold, clear morning in an early New England spring. In his right hand he holds a hunting horn, ready to sound the alarm, and behind him sits a plow, nearly forgotten in

the excitement but serving as a reminder that this farmer leaves his plow to serve his country, the very picture of the story of Cincinnatus. Overall, the contrast between these two figures, with the *Minute Man* springing to action and the *Union Soldier* in a more sober and contemplative pose, suggests the feelings of Lexingtonians, who cherished their Revolutionary past but harbored a sense of loss about the more recent conflict.

The *Samuel Adams* and *John Hancock* statues in the niches across from the *Minute Man* and *Union Soldier* are more conventional figures in the tradition of representing great men (see figures 4.7 and 4.8). Their presence in the room remembers their role on the night before the battle of Lexington and Concord, when they managed to escape capture in Lexington after being alerted to danger by Paul Revere. Both statues are elegantly dressed in eighteenth-century costume, and both carry scrolls to indicate their status as learned men and politicians. Gould's *Hancock* wears a form-fitting dress coat over a waistcoat and breeches, and is supported by a classical column. Milmore's *Adams* is more heavily draped in a voluminous traveling cloak that is gathered under one arm and serves as both a support for the stone statue and a reference to classicizing drapery. The garments on both of these statues display deep undercutting and variegated approaches to rendering drapery folds and lace, highlighting the skill of the Italian carvers who would have rendered the sculptors' models in stone. These statues are respectable renderings of their subjects, modeled by two artists well known in Boston by the 1870s.

Together with the Batterson statues, these portraits encompass Lexington's novel approach to memorial space and sculpture. Rather than a purpose-built monument in an outdoor setting, the people of Lexington chose to combine memorial

sculpture with civic function, and paired famous luminaries of the Revolution with allegorical representations of the common man at two important moments in the town's history. The statues they commissioned telegraph stability, with solid, self-contained poses that fit well into the niches where they appeared and necessitated only a single viewing point. In executing this unusual scheme, Lexingtonians looked to some of the most competent monument-makers then available in New England, and the resulting statues were respectably on par with similar statues that were beginning to appear across the United States at the same time.

Given the novelty of Lexington's memorial program, it is rather surprising that the statues were quickly eclipsed in fame by a single figure erected outdoors in a field, sculpted by an unknown, untried young artist in nearby Concord. The commission, modeling, iconography, and marketing of the Concord *Minute Man* by Daniel Chester French and the residents of Concord would inspire a soldier monument that would transcend the typologies of the citizen soldier statues known up to that point in history.

The project to commission and erect a statue of a minute man for the Concord Battlefield began like many similar projects in towns across the United States in the immediate postbellum years. In October 1871, longtime Concord resident and Revolutionary descendent Ebenezer Hubbard died at the age of 89, leaving behind a will that included a bequest of one thousand dollars for the erection of a monument at Concord's North Bridge on the spot where American soldiers first resisted British aggression, along with a further six hundred dollars to reconstruct the North Bridge, which had been torn down. The following March, at a town meeting, a committee of ten was appointed to "procure a statue of a Continental Minute-man, cut in granite, and erected on a proper foundation, on the American side of the river." It was further

decided that the monument should have the first verse of Emerson's "Concord Hymn" carved on its base, and that the commission should be carried out by young local artist Daniel Chester French, as long as he could produce a suitable model.[269]

Choosing Daniel Chester French was a bold decision for the committee, and one of many that would prove fortuitous for the sculptural commission. Born in 1850 in Exeter, Massachusetts, young Dan was the son of Henry Flagg French, a lawyer, and Anne Richardson, both of old New England families. His mother died when he was six, and his father married Pamela Prentiss a few years later. When the Civil War came, French was much too young for service, like many sculptors who later succeeded in the postwar monument business. While Dan was in his youth, the family lived in several Massachusetts towns as a result of his father's business endeavors, including Amherst and Cambridge, and in 1867, they moved to Concord, at about the time when the town put up its Civil War memorial that was so tied to the Revolutionary past. Shortly afterward, Dan spent a year in college at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, but as he failed several subjects and performed poorly in the others, his career as a scholar came to an abrupt halt. Thankfully, another career possibility emerged around the same time.[270]

---

[269] *Proceedings at the Centennial Celebration of Concord Fight, April 19, 1875*, 11-12; Michael Richman, *Daniel Chester French: An American Sculptor* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art for the National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1976), 39.

[270] Margaret French Cresson, *Journey Into Fame: The Life of Daniel Chester French* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947), 3-38; Michele Bogart, *Public Sculpture and the Civic Ideal in New York City, 1890-1930* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997), 35-36.

Many American sculptors claimed a Vasari-style inspiration for their talent, a story whereby the young artist's ability is suddenly discovered as the result of some mundane activity. Young Dan French had two of these. According to his wife, French's talent first became evident when he and his brother sculpted two lions out of snow in their front yard in Cambridge, to the delight of their neighbors. But his other biographers generally point to a frog wearing clothes, carved from a turnip, as the first instance where his parents recognized his artistic talent. His father, Henry Flagg French, encouraged him to study sculpture, and he received further support from May Alcott, the artist sister of Louisa May (and inspiration for Amy March in *Little Women*), who provided him with modeling clay and tools and gave him his first lessons on how to use them. Alcott also taught a drawing class in Concord, mostly attended by young ladies, and it was here that Dan received his first formal art training, although his daughter recounts that he was initially uncomfortable at the prospect of attending class with so many girls (a situation that was the opposite of what many women sculptors experienced when first learning their craft). Their relationship as teacher and student was of brief duration, but French always alluded to Alcott's early kindness when reflecting on his art training later in life.[271]

After a few weeks of drawing instruction from Alcott, Dan French moved on to the Boston drawing and anatomy classes of artist-doctor William Rimmer. Rimmer is one of the great enigmas of nineteenth-century American art, a painter, sculptor and

---

[271] Mary Adams French, *Memories of a Sculptor's Wife, by Mrs. Daniel Chester French* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1928), 28-29; Lorado Taft, "Daniel Chester French, Sculptor," *Brush and Pencil* 5, no. 4 (January 1900): 146; Cresson, *Journey Into Fame*, 41-42, 45-52.

physician who was well regarded by his fellow artists but was never able to make a successful living through his art. His drawing classes at the Massachusetts Normal Art School were deeply informed by his knowledge of anatomy and strongly focused on drawing the human body, often with the racializing ethnographic characteristics unfortunately popular at the time. Rimmer published two influential drawing books: *Elements of Design* in 1864 and *Art Anatomy* in 1877, both of which relied heavily on the rendering of racial types. From him, Dan French would have learned to appreciate and draft classical forms, and he later showed an interesting in preserving Rimmer's artistic legacy.[272]

A few sculpted works from this early stage of French's career survive, and they carry no hint of the later grand trajectory of his career. His earliest works are humble in scale, designed to be marketed as inexpensive parlor sculptures for the middle class. Two of these, *Matchmaking Owls* of about 1870 and *Joe's Farewell* of 1872-1873, exemplify the early work (figure 4.22 and figure 4.23). Each is reproduced in parian porcelain (the total number of these works is unknown). *Joe's Farewell*, depicting a scene from Charles Dickens' *Barnaby Rudge*, is almost indistinguishable from a John Rogers group in its narrative setting, literary subject, and fine attention to genre detail. *Matchmaking Owls* goes even further into anthropomorphic

___

[272] Cresson, *Journey Into Fame*, 54-57; Elliot Bostwick Davis, "William Rimmer's 'Art Anatomy' and Charles Darwin's Theories of Evolution," *Master Drawings* 40, no. 4 (Winter 2002): 345-359; Sarah Burns, *Painting the Dark Side: Art and the Gothic Imagination in Nineteenth-Century America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 129-130; see also Daniel C. French to George F. Kunz, June 25, 1921, Daniel Chester French letters, 1908-1921, Archives of American Art, in which he advocates for the Metropolitan Museum of Art's purchase of Rimmer drawings.

sentimentality, as the two owls snuggle together on a branch, the male owl extending a wing over his mate and delicately taking her claw in his. French's daughter recalls that he sold the rights to the owl group to a Boston porcelain firm for fifty dollars, and that he continued to produce similar small groups over the next few years.[273] These small works of popular art, copied over and over and easily accessible to the middle class, provided French with a platform from which to launch his career in producing a much different kind of sculpture.

Support from his family and sheer good fortune put Dan French into the sphere of celebrated sculptor John Quincy Adams Ward at an important point in his life. While staying with an aunt in Brooklyn, French visited Ward's New York studio in March of 1870 and convinced the sculptor to take him on as a student, even as Ward protested that he did not have the time or the space in his studio to train the younger artist. French's letter to his father to describe the meeting indicates the depths to which his family took an interest in his career. After distracting his father with anecdotal details of his trip to New York, French begs for money to study with Ward, laying out a case for the potential impact on his career.[274] That his father paid the money shows the supportiveness of French's familial background.

---

[273] Cresson, *Journey Into Fame*, 58-59.

[274] In the letter, young French rattles on for several pages about his train trip from Chicago to New York, the pretty girl he met on the train, his impressions of viewing Niagara Falls, the visit he made to his Aunt Sarah, and the news of his cousins. Only after all of these preliminaries does he get to the point: he in is New York, he has just persuaded John Quincy Adams Ward to take him on as a student, and he needs to pay his new teacher fifty dollars. The son dwells on this sum in several ways: first rationalizing about the amount of Ward's time he will take, then estimating that Ward should probably have charged him twice as much, then pointing out that the instruction from Ward would be worth at least four times that amount in terms of

With merely the brief instruction from May Alcott, William Rimmer and John Quincy Adams Ward, and only a few busts, animal figures and genre scenes to recommend him, French was chosen to model the statue that would become the centerpiece of Concord's highly visible centennial celebration. The choice of French may have had something to do with a tradition among Concord citizens to support their own writers, artists, and thinkers; the Emerson-led intellectual community had long provided material support to members in dire pecuniary straits, and Emerson was one of French's most prominent supporters in winning the commission for the statue. In April 1873, French took a room in Boston's Studio Building and began working on his small-scale model of the *Minute Man*, which was formally approved by the Concord committee in November of that year. French then went to work on the seven-foot figure, finishing it at the end of July 1874. A month later, he set off for Florence to further his training in sculpture, choosing the opportunity for further study over an appearance at the Concord centennial.[275]

While French was working on enlarging his *Minute Man* model, the committee at Concord was beginning to rethink the material for the statue. The original suggestion to cut the statue in granite made sense initially, as granite was widely and inexpensively available in New England, but as the quality of French's model became apparent, the stone seemed inappropriate, as granite was difficult to carve finely and

---

benefit to his career, and finally offering some of his own savings if his father still thinks the sum too much. Young Dan ends the letter by promising to come home soon and help pick the strawberries. His father paid the money, and thus French received the instruction. Letter from Daniel Chester French to Henry Flagg French, March 26, 1870, The Daniel Chester French Family Papers, Library of Congress.

[275] Richman, *Daniel Chester French: An American Sculptor*, 40-41.

not usually associated with fine art sculpture. At some point, Concord committee members also suggested zinc as a possible alternative for casting the monument, as this metal was rising in popularity as a sculptural material, but French demurred, pushing for bronze instead. Here, he was strongly encouraged by John Quincy Adams Ward, who returned Henry Flagg French's investment in his son's education several times over when he exclaimed in a letter to the young man, "Go for the bronze! Make your model so fine and soul-stirring that all the ladies in the land will bring their jewelry and copper pans to have them melted up to cast the 'Minute-Man.'"[276] French took Ward's advice, and through an act of Congress pushed forward by the efforts of Concordian U.S. Representative Ebenezer Hoar, ten retired Civil War cannons were appropriated for casting the statue.

Notably, the cannon as material inverted the narrative presented by the *Minute Man*: machines of war were used for the peacetime purpose of making a statue that symbolized a young man in peacetime preparing for war. Cast in bronze by the Ames Manufacturing Company of Chicopee, Massachusetts, French's *Minute Man* was well received and wildly successful, an elegant calling card for the young artist's continuing instruction in Europe.

In order to understand why the *Minute Man* was so popular, it is important to consider how French conceived of and marketed the sculpture. Particularly significant in this regard is the source material that he used to develop the statue, the works that he quoted, and those he left unmentioned in later accounts. The most commonly cited source of inspiration for French's *Minute Man* is a cast of the *Apollo Belvedere*, which

---

[276] Ibid.

he visited at the Boston Athenaeum while working on his model in Boston's Studio Building (figure 4.24). French's daughter Margaret cites the *Apollo* as a substitute for the lack of nude models available in Boston, and asserts that her father supplemented his studies of the classical statue with scrutiny of "his own not unattractive form" in his studio mirror. Lorado Taft also points to French's work with the *Apollo* and praises the young artist's ability to conceal his use of the model by clothing the statue in contemporary dress, flipping the pose of the *Apollo* to its mirror image in his own statue, and impressing the *Minute Man* with his youthful personality. Michael Richman provides further evidence of French's use of the *Apollo* by citing a sketch the artist made of the *Apollo's* legs, but expresses discomfort with Taft's notion that the *Minute Man* is chiefly an emulation of the classical statue (figure 4.25). For Richman, French's clear reversal of the *Apollo's* stance in his statue indicates a major departure from the famous model.[277]

Indeed, when placed side by side, the resemblance between the *Minute Man* and the *Apollo Belvedere* is not necessarily evident. While both figures stride forward, the *Minute Man's* stance mirrors that of the *Apollo*, with the left leg forward rather than the right. The *Minute Man* is overall a more slender and ethereal figure, and the trajectory of both gaze and rifle contribute to a more pronounced forward motion than is present in the *Apollo*. If French did indeed draw inspiration from this classical statue, he hid it well.

---

[277] Cresson, *Journey Into Fame*, 78; Taft, "Daniel Chester French, Sculptor," 147; Michael Richman, "The Early Public Sculpture of Daniel Chester French," *American Art Journal* 4, no. 2 (November 1972): 99-101.

Even if the resemblance between the *Minute Man* and the *Apollo Belvedere* is superficial, however, the fact that French chose to cite it as his main inspiration speaks volumes about his ambitions in the art world and for the statue. By the late nineteenth century, the reputation of the *Apollo Belvedere* as one of the most famous and revered works of classical sculpture was widely understood. In the United States, the statue's fame even made it a target for satire, as in William Sidney Mount's 1838 painting *The Painter's Triumph*, which depicts a young painter showing his canvas to a country bumpkin with great fanfare, while a chalk drawing of the *Apollo* placed at upper right looks away in disgust.[278] As Mount's painting shows, the *Apollo Belvedere* was, by the middle of the nineteenth century, nearly synonymous with the highest aspirations of art and culture and the people who pursued them. Much of the credit for the reputation of this statue can be given to Johann Joachim Winckelmann, who repeatedly rhapsodized about the *Apollo* through the course of his eighteenth-century writing career. As Alex Potts demonstrates, it is significant that among the classical male nudes that Winckelmann championed, only the *Apollo* is rendered in an active pose, focused on the aggressive act of shooting an arrow while at the same time offering his sensual nude body for the viewer's gaze.[279] This dichotomy between sensuality and action is also present in French's *Minute Man*, a finely modeled youth representing the hopes of a young nation. In claiming the *Apollo* as a source for a statue that is clearly different in key ways, French showcased his knowledge of the

---

[278] For a historiography and fuller interpretation of the painting, see Elizabeth L. Roark, "Paint for the Many? Rereading William Sidney Mount's *The Painter's Triumph*," *Prospects* 28 (October 2004): 155-184.

[279] Alex Potts, *Flesh and the Ideal: Winckelmann and the Origins of Art History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 123-129.

antique while claiming a marked ability to produce a highly original statue inspired by a famous work.

It is also important that the *Apollo Belvedere*'s reputation in art circles made it a target for the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century pseudo-scientists who hoped to create a taxonomy and hierarchy of human races based on the study of physiognomy. Winckelmann's writing encouraged this development, as he used his observations on the forms of Greek sculpture to draw conclusions about the perfections of the physical bodies of ancient Greeks and thus to place Greek society above all ancient civilizations, including the Egyptians, Phoenicians, and Etruscans.[280] By placing ancient Greek art and culture at the top of his hierarchy, Winckelmann elevated the society that most Europeans saw as a common ancestor. Borrowing from Winckelmann's writings for his *Essays on Physiognomy* of 1789, Johann Caspar Lavater, one of the pioneers of the field of physiognomy, placed the *Apollo Belvedere* at the pinnacle of his progressive evolution of humankind. For Lavater, the statue's classical cranial shape and healthy, muscular body represented the height of racial development.[281] In the 1770s, Petrus Camper used the *Apollo Belvedere* similarly to illustrate his theory of "facial angles," the measurements that resulted from drawing a certain series of prescribed lines onto the face (figure 4.26). Camper intended these drawings to indicate that there was not much variation in human skulls of varying

---

[280] David Bindman, *Ape to Apollo: Aesthetics and the Idea of Race in the 18ᵗʰ Century* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002), 79-92.

[281] Fae Brauer, "The Transparent Body: Biocultures of Evolution, Eugenics, and Scientific Racism," in *A History of Visual Culture: Western Civilization from the 18ᵗʰ to the 21ˢᵗ Century*, Jane Kromm and Susan Benforado Bakewell, eds. (Oxford, UK: Berg, 2010), 90-92.

races, but in his charts, he placed the African head next to the orangutan and the European head next to the *Apollo Belvedere*, and in the nineteenth century his studies were used as evidence for scientific racism.[282] The illustrations of both Lavater and Camper proved useful to artists, and thus racial theories surrounding the *Apollo Belevedere* trickled into the art world. By associating his *Minute Man* with the *Apollo*, then, French evoked not only the highest form of classicism but also the pinnacle of representations of whiteness.

That idealized whiteness is an important element of French's conception for the *Minute Man*. The *Minute Man* commemorates a battle that occurred in 1775, and at that time the population of Concord would have been overwhelmingly Anglo-American. In this, the statue reflects the people it commemorates. But the statue is also the product of the racially-obsessed postbellum era, and by aligning his sculpture with the *Apollo Belvedere*, French placed it in dialogue with all of the other uses of that statue occurring at the same time. Later in his career, with allegorical statues of the Four Continents for the World's Columbian Exposition in 1893 and the United States Custom House in 1904, among other sculptures, French demonstrated that he was influenced by the racializing theories of his time.[283] And in the context of the national memorial efforts in the wake of the Civil War, which overwhelmingly focused on white, able-bodied men, French's *Minute Man* reflects the racial sensibilities held by many in the late nineteenth century.

---

[282] Nell Irvin Painter, *The History of White People* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2010), 64-67.

[283] Bogart, *Public Sculpture and the Civic Ideal*, 118-134.

In addition to the *Apollo Belvedere*, Margaret French Cresson cites the

Écorché of 1767 by Jean-Antoine Houdon as an important source of anatomical study

for French's preparation of the *Minute Man* (figure 4.27). According to Cresson,

French bought a three-foot plaster reduction of the statue, a figure of a man with the

skin removed to allow for study of the musculature, and set it up in his studio as an

anatomical model.[284] Like the *Apollo Belvedere*, the *Écorché* was an important

cultural touchstone for young sculptors of the nineteenth century. Sculpted when

Houdon was twenty-five, not much older than French was when he began the *Minute*

Man, the statue was first intended as a study for the sculptor's *Saint John the Baptist*,

but it soon took on a life of its own. Houdon's contemporaries recognized the work as

an excellent tool for teaching anatomy to artists, and Houdon quickly began selling

plaster copies of the statue.[285] French would have first encountered the *Écorché* in his

drawing classes with Rimmer, where he learned about human anatomy through the

Houdon statue, numerous anatomical drawings and sketches, and works by Rimmer

himself.[286] Once again, as in the case of the *Apollo Belvedere*, the resemblance

between the *Minute Man* and the supposed model is superficial at best. The relaxed,

stable *contrapposto* and the upraised arm of the *Écorché* present a different set of

musculoskeletal issues than the forward-leaning stance and dynamic forearms of the

---

[284] Cresson, *Journey Into Fame*, 78.

[285] Anne L. Poulet, *Jean-Antoine Houdon, Sculptor of the Enlightenment* (Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, 2005), 63-65; H.H. Arnason, *The Sculptures of Houdon*
(London: Phaidon Press Limited, 1975), 13-14.

[286] Jeffrey Weidman, "William Rimmer," in *William Rimmer: A Yankee Michelangelo*
(Hanover: University Press of New England, 1985), 9.

Minute Man. But by citing this famous work as a source, French was able to highlight his knowledge of anatomy and important sculptural prototypes.

A more plausible model for French's *Minute Man* from his days of instruction with Dr. Rimmer can be found in the pages of *Elements of Design*, Rimmer's 1864 drawing manual. The manual offers strategies for presenting the human form in motion and includes plates of the body in many different postures (figure 4.28). One of these, a "Three-quarter view foreshortened," bears an uncanny resemblance to the *Minute Man*. The schematic drawing shows a figure with a torso mostly frontal, but tilted slightly to the right. The pelvis is thrust forward, and the right leg points gracefully behind, while the left bears the weight of the body. The text accompanying the illustration sheds further light on the relationship with French's statue:

> In drawing figures in whole quantities, let it be explained that as much of one part as lies behind another cannot be seen; and that one side of the body cannot be turned towards you, without turning the other from you. In which case, taking the arms and body as an example, the parts will be situated as follows: first, the arm turned toward you; then, the body behind it; and lastly, the further arm behind the body. See all the previous drawings of whole quantities; and as it is impossible to make profile or three-quarter drawings without placing one part behind another, so it is impossible in these drawings to show as much of one limb as another.[287]

Rimmer's text translates a sculptor's understanding of three-dimensional space onto the two-dimensional page. Like Rimmer's drawing, the *Minute Man* is a careful rendering of the body in space, with some parts in view and others in shadow, depending on the viewer's position in relation to the statue. When the viewer faces the

---

[287] William Rimmer, *Elements of Design, Book First, for the Use of Parents and Teachers* (Boston: John Wilson & Son, 1864), 20.

statue's torso and pelvis, the left shoulder and arm recede into the background, as in Rimmer's illustration. One can imagine the young artist working through this problem of representation using his teacher's designs.

If French did find his chief inspiration for his *Minute Man* in a two-dimensional example from a drawing manual, that would explain some of the inconsistencies in the figure's composition when viewing the statue in the round on the Concord battlefield. The angle of the statue that corresponds to the drawing by Rimmer, seen when standing at the statue's southeast corner, resolves into a view of forward-looking fortitude. But when viewed from other angles, such as from the northeast corner or from the rear, the figure is less successfully balanced, with limbs, rifle and plow lining up in ways that are not exactly pleasing to the eye (figures 4.29 and 4.30). This may have been the defect that Truman H. Bartlett saw a few years later when reviewing the statue; he praised the young artist for responding to "the spirit of the moment" with a statue successful in conveying "the sincerity of its execution," but lamented the fact that French had produced his statue to meet a deadline rather than spending years to study in Paris before attempting it.[288]

But what appeared as a flaw when walking around the statue in Concord was not necessarily a problem when publicizing the statue to the nation and the world. Most people learned about the statue through prints or photographs, and comparatively few made the trip to see the monument in person. In using Rimmer's sketch as a basis for the chief view of the *Minute Man*, French designed a statue ready for successful reproduction in print.

---

[288] Truman H. Bartlett, "Civic Monuments in New England – IV," *American Architect and Building News* 10, no. 289 (July 9, 1881): 16-17.

Another drawing in *Elements of Design* strikingly resembles the *Minute Man*'s head and again calls attention to a racialized reading of the statue as suggested by French's evocation of the *Apollo Belvedere*. This "Male head in Profile" demonstrates Rimmer's conception of an ideally proportioned head (figure 4.31). In his accompanying text, Rimmer explains that the various lines, letters, and numbers indicate the exact proportions of elements when drawing a head: how far from the bridge of the nose to the ear, where the nostril should sit in relation to the eye, how the angle of the jaw should relate to the mouth, etc.[289] A comparison with the head of French's *Minute Man* reveals distinct correlations in the arched eyebrow and eye socket, the almond-shaped eye, the straight nose, the full lips, and the jawline, with separate lines demarcating the prominent jawbone and the soft jowl beneath. Rimmer's drawing indicates what he felt were the ideal proportions for a Caucasian head, and the fact that French followed these guidelines so closely suggests that he created his statue – consciously or unwittingly – as a representation of ideal whiteness. Like so many of the statues erected in honor of Civil War soldiers, this monument represented a distinct racial type elevated one racial group at the expense of the others that also participated in America's wars.

One other sculpted figure of a single standing male that should be considered as a possible source for French's *Minute Man* is the statue of George Washington by Jean-Antoine Houdon, sculpted for the Virginia State Capitol between 1784 and 1792 and delivered in 1796 (figure 4.32).[290] The statue, based on a life mask that Houdon

---

[289] Rimmer, *Elements of Design*, 28-29.

[290] The Gorham Company, *George Washington, Jean-Antoine Houdon, Sculptor: A Brief History of the Most Famous Sculpture Created of America's Immortal Patriot*

took of Washington in 1785 and informed by detailed measurements that the sculptor

took of Washington's body, was at that time one of the most famous single figure

statues in the United States, and young French would have had access to a plaster copy

of it at the Boston Athenaeum, which he definitely visited to consult the cast of the

Apollo Belvedere. The Athenaeum's cast of Houdon's *Washington* was executed by

Francesco Cecchi and gifted to the collection in 1847, where it was greatly

appreciated.[291] The statue depicts Washington in transition between his life as

commanding general of the Continental Army and his welcome retirement at Mount

Vernon. He still wears his army uniform, but he has removed his coat and sword and

has draped them over the column of fasces that supports his weight. Behind him, a

plow symbolizes his return to agriculture, and he holds a gentlemanly walking stick,

indicating the life of leisure to come. Depictions of minute men tend to show young

men leaving the plow, while Washington is at the other end of the Cincinnatus

journey, renouncing war for peaceful pursuits. But the presence of this statue must

have inspired the young French as he worked through the problem of how to sculpt the

spirit of the Revolutionary generation.

All of the designs and preparations for statues in both Lexington and Concord

contributed to the most lasting and visible souvenirs of the centennial celebrations that

marked one hundred years since the famous battles. Taking place more than a year

---

Issued to Commemorate the Bicentennial of his Birth (Providence, RI: Gorham
Company, 1932); Arnason, 72-77.

[291] Jonathan P. Harding, *The Boston Athenaeum Collection: Pre-Twentieth Century
American and European Painting and Sculpture* (Boston: Northeastern University
Press, 1984), 84.

before the nation would turn its eyes to Philadelphia for the Centennial Exhibition there, these regional celebrations attracted considerable attention from the national press and ushered in an era of Revolutionary commemoration and colonial revival. This renewed interest in the Revolutionary era served as a distraction from the failure of Reconstruction and the political tension that it engendered. The centennial celebrations at Lexington and Concord brought together statesmen from North and South and provided an opportunity to test the theory that commemorating the Revolution could bring about reconciliation between the combatants in the more recent conflict.

However, the divided nature of the celebrations caused by the towns' inability to compromise also created logistical nightmares for the visiting dignitaries who hoped to attend both ceremonies without offending anyone in either town. No visitor to Massachusetts was more affected by this than President Ulysses S. Grant, who more than anyone else symbolized Union victory in the Civil War. Grant split his time between the two towns, attending about half of the festivities of each. He arrived in Concord on the evening of Saturday, April 17, and stayed in town through the parade and speeches on Monday morning, after which he departed for Lexington for the afternoon. Of course, Lexingtonians complained that the president would only be visiting their town for a few hours, and argued for more time, to no avail.[292] On April 19, at about ten minutes to one o'clock, Grant left the Concord ceremonies for Lexington only to find that the train he was intending to take was hopelessly behind schedule. Instead, he traveled with his entourage by carriage along seven miles of

---

[292] "The Approaching Centennial – Movements of the President," *Boston Daily Journal* April 13, 1875.

traffic-clogged roads to Lexington, arriving well after the time he had intended but in time to review Lexington's ceremonial procession and attend the state dinner. The day was unusually cold for early spring, and all activities were held in tents placed outdoors. At Concord, the platform on which President Grant and other dignitaries sat collapsed during the speeches, and at Lexington, nothing could be done to keep the dinner warm. Nevertheless, despite the day's hardships, Grant's presence served as a reminder of the link between America's present and its past, and the continuing resonance of Revolutionary themes in more recent conflicts.[293]

Concord's centennial celebration began with a procession that led through the town and over the recently rebuilt North Bridge to the site of the American resistance to British aggression on April 19, 1775. This was the site of French's *Minute Man* statue, and a tent had been erected on the spot to shield spectators from the cruel wind. After an opening prayer by the Reverend Grindall Reynolds, the septuagenarian Ralph Waldo Emerson addressed the crowd in a voice that only reached those nearest the speakers' platform. His topic was French's *Minute Man* statue, and he offered a brief history of the town's decision to erect a monument and to offer the commission to French. He praised the statue for its "proper emblems of the patriot farmer, who, at the morning alarm, left his plough to grasp his gun," and stressed French's youth as a thrilling backdrop to the statue's merit. In the rest of his short address, Emerson detailed some of the causes of American rebellion against British rule and lauded the town of Concord for its "first victory" as the location where "the British army was first

[293] David B. Little, *America's First Centennial Celebration: The Nineteenth of April 1875 at Lexington and Concord, Massachusetts* (Boston: The Club of Odd Volumes, 1961), 28-36; Cresson, *Journey Into Fame*, 96-97.

fronted, and driven back." Emerson's interpretation of the town's meritorious conduct during the Revolution dovetailed with the need for a memorable statue to commemorate it.[294]

After Emerson's speech, James Russell Lowell read a poem, and then George William Curtis rose to deliver the morning's keynote address. Curtis was a founder of the Republican Party and a prolific writer and editor of *Harper's Weekly*, and he had strong ties to Concord. In his oration, Curtis drew a particularly powerful visual connection between the veterans of the Civil War attending the ceremony and their fathers and grandfathers who had served at the battle of Concord. Early in the speech, Curtis evoked the fact that at the battle's centennial, no living veterans survived as tangible links to the past, unlike at the fiftieth or even seventy-fifth anniversaries. For the young residents of Concord who had attended the earlier celebrations, these veterans seemed "a little group of tottering forms, eyes from which the light was fading, arms nerveless and withered, thin white hairs that fluttered in the wind" – no resemblance, thus, to the brave minute men of history. But at the Centennial celebration, just ten years after the Civil War, suddenly the landscape of attendees had changed. War was no longer in the memory of a few old men, but lived in the minds and hearts of all present, and the young Civil War veterans in the crowd suddenly allowed for a new understanding of the passions of the men of old. As Curtis put it:

> We do not count around us a few feeble veterans of the contest, but we are girt with a cloud of witnesses. We are surrounded everywhere by multitudes in the vigor of their prime… whose glory it is that they were minute-men of American liberty and union. These men of to-day

---

[294] *Proceedings at the Centennial Celebration of Concord Fight, April 19, 1875*, 77-81.

interpret to us with restless eloquence the men and the times we commemorate. Now, if never before, we understand the Revolution. Now we know the secret of those old hearts and homes. We can measure the sacrifice, the courage, the devotion, for we have seen them all.[295]

Curtis deliberately named the Civil War veterans the Minute Men of America's most recent conflict, fighting to keep the country together and to ensure the liberty of all living within the nation's borders. And through the actions of these young men, the Revolution took on new meaning. It seems clear that the appearance of the Revolutionary Minute Man in the person of a virile youth cast in bronze or carved in granite sprang from a similar sense of clarity: in going off to war to fight for their country, the youth of Massachusetts made it possible to imagine the youth of the earlier conflict doing the exact same thing.

While the citizens of Concord were listening to their speakers and unveiling French's *Minute Man*, the people of Lexington were attending their own ceremonies and unveiling the *John Hancock* and *Samuel Adams* statues that would complete the collection in the town's Memorial Hall. If one of the major themes of the Concord celebration was the relationship between the Revolutionary minute man and the Union soldier, Lexington chose instead to focus on post-Civil War reconciliation and the ways in which a shared Revolutionary heritage provided common ground for the formerly warring North and South. Throughout the day, speakers and visual elements of the celebration focused especially on the relationship between Massachusetts and South Carolina, stressing the Southern state's enthusiasm in responding to

---

[295] George William Curtis, "19th April 1775-1875: An Oration Delivered at Concord, Massachusetts, on the 19th of April, 1875, the One-Hundredth Anniversary of 'Concord Fight'," *Harpers Weekly* (May 1, 1875): 369.

Massachusetts' call for the forming of a Continental Congress in 1764, and later in decrying the bloodshed of Lexington and Concord and leaping immediately to arms. During the morning's exercises, the speakers on the platform were flanked not only by the *Hancock* and *Adams* statues, but also by a palmetto tree and a pine tree, representing South Carolina and Massachusetts, respectively. And later in the afternoon, at the ceremonial dinner, after recognizing the presence of President Grant, the next two toasts offered were in honor of these two states, and each was marked by short remarks from that state's governor.[296] No bolder call for reconciliation could be imagined than the ceremonial pairing of these two states, both generally regarded as the most radical in their prospective sections. The committed abolitionists of Massachusetts and the ardent secessionists of South Carolina generated much of the rhetoric that led to the Civil War, and their juxtaposition at Lexington's centennial celebration speaks to at least a verbal commitment to an end of sectional conflict.

Lexington's celebrations began early in the morning on April 19 with exercises in a pavilion set up on Lexington Green at the site of the Revolutionary battle. The most significant aspects of the morning session were the unveiling of the *Hancock* and *Adams* statues and the keynote address by the Hon. Richard Henry Dana. The unveiling of the statues was conducted by town historian Charles Hudson, who stressed that "the gallantry of the soldier and the wisdom of the statesman" were both important aspects of Lexington's memorial plan.[297] Dana's address followed the unveiling of the statues, and during the hour or more that he spoke, he never once

[296] *Proceedings at the Centennial Celebration of the Battle of Lexington*, 50-56, 119, 132-133.

[297] Ibid, 39.

alluded to the Civil War. Instead, Dana set out to reframe the importance of the Battle of Lexington: first, by characterizing the British government as the true revolutionary aggressors in their sudden revision of established relations with the American colonies; and second, by stressing the notion that the men of Lexington who fell in the British massacre consciously chose to draw fire and to die for their beliefs as martyrs, thus breaking the spell of tense negotiations and ushering in open war. In Dana's eyes, the heroic stand at Concord could not have been made without the sacrifice at Lexington, because the unprovoked British aggression at Lexington gave the minute men assembled at Concord permission to respond in kind.[298] While no citizen at Concord was present to hear Dana's speech, his message was clearly intended to address the historic competition between the two towns. And in addition to the local competition, both towns looked to establish their significance in the process of national founding and national reconciliation. After the morning's exercises, there was a parade followed by a state dinner in the afternoon, where the lengthy remarks of the military and political dignities who attended stressed the reunion of North and South in honor of their shared Revolutionary history.[299] Lexington's celebration offered a message of reconciliation that would be a major part of Philadelphia's Centennial Exhibition.

Anniversary celebrations in Lexington and Concord attracted national interest through the one hundred intervening years between the original event and its centennial, and thus it is no surprise that the centennial celebrations warranted similar

---

[298] Ibid, 26-28.

[299] Ibid, 49-69.

attention.[300] In the days before the centennial, newspapers were filled with preparations and with debate over the meaning of the Revolutionary battles. On March 15, 1875, a writer for the *Salem Register* offered a lengthy summation of the planned events at Concord, a glowing review of French's *Minute Man*, and a summary of planned publications on Concord's part of the battle, and then added:

> The Lexington version of the day's business there and at Concord will also be published somewhere, I suppose, and the old wrangle about the glory due to the respective towns that took part in the fight will go on for another hundred years. Well, there is glory enough for them all.[301]

Meanwhile, the *Indianapolis Sentinel* took Lexington's part, arguing that minute men did fire back at the British on the Lexington Green and pointing out that the death of the men at Lexington was necessary to awaken the colonies to arms.[302] But in the aftermath of the celebrations, both towns received plenty of nationwide newspaper coverage for their speeches, statues, and dinners, with newspapers from New York to California recounting the day's events and talking over the meaning of the Revolution and of the minute man.[303] The *Salem Register* may have summed up

---

[300] For instance, see "Lexington Battle," *Hampshire Gazette* (Northampton, Mass.) May 5, 1824; "Tale of the Revolution," *Rhode Island American* (Providence, R.I.) February 16, 1830; "Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord," *Salem Register* (Salem, Mass.) April 22, 1850; "The Minute Man," *San Joaquin Republican* (Stockton, Cal.) November 19, 1859.

[301] "Concord and Lexington," *Salem Register* (Salem, Mass.) March 15, 1875.

[302] "The First Drawn Battle – Reminiscences of the Revolution," *Indianapolis Sentinel* April 18, 1875.

[303] For instance, see "April 19, 1775-1875: To-Day's Celebration at Lexington and Concord," *Albany Evening Journal* (Albany, NY) April 19, 1875; "The Battle of Lexington," *Cincinnati Daily Gazette* April 19, 1875; "One Hundred Years," *Daily Nebraska Gazette* (Nebraska City, Neb.) April 19, 1875; "Centennial Preludes –

the mood of the nation in characterizing the celebrations at Lexington and Concord as just one commemorative step along the way toward the ultimate centennial on July 4, 1876, which promised to be "a spectacle…such as has never been witnessed from the beginning of time, and never can be equaled until another hundred years have rolled away."[304] The celebrations at Lexington and Concord produced great national interest, but for most outside the immediate towns, they served mainly as the opening act to the great pageant to come.

When it came to pictorial depictions, French's Concord *Minute Man* had a clear advantage. Most newspapers covering the centennial celebrations did so without illustrations, but the few that provided them invariably chose the Concord statue, as did the *New York Herald* on April 15, 1875 (figure 4.33).[305] This spare, simple line drawing is from an angle that corresponds closely to the sketch by William Rimmer that so clearly resembles the *Minute Man*, demonstrating how the statue came to be viewed in print (see figure 4.28). French's statue was given even further exposure when it appeared alongside George William Curtis's keynote address in the May 1, 1875 edition of *Harper's Weekly* and as the frontispiece of "The Concord Fight," a story by Frederic Hudson that appeared in *Harper's Monthly* in the same month

Preparations for the Festivities at Lexington," *New York Tribune* April 19, 1875; "The Centennial Celebration of the Battles of Concord and Lexington," *Boston Daily Journal* April 20, 1875; "Who Was the Minute-Man?" *Evening Bulletin* (San Francisco, Cal.) May 3, 1875.

[304] "The First Centennials of the Great Republic," *Salem Register* (Salem, Mass.) April 22, 1875.

[305] "The First Blood – Opening of the Centennial Anniversaries," *New York Herald* April 15, 1875.

(figure 4.34).[306] Both of these publications saw widespread national circulation, and Curtis's relationship with *Harper's* as a key political editor and with Concord as a former resident, member of the Transcendentalist community, and centennial speaker assured preferential coverage both for French's statue and for Concord's view of Revolutionary history.

Exactly eleven months later, Thomas Nast cast the *Minute Man* as Uncle Sam in a political cartoon celebrating the triumph of the Republicans in a New Hampshire gubernatorial election (figure 4.35). Nast and Curtis had a close but sometimes contentious working relationship, as they espoused very similar political views but differed on the amount of decorum that should be exercised in expressing them.[307] Given that Curtis and *Harper's* had endorsed French's *Minute Man* so strongly, it is not surprising that Nast assumed his readers would understand his allusion to it. In the cartoon, Uncle Sam strides forward in the exact stance of the *Minute Man*, with his left leg gracefully bent and his weight on his right. His forearms are visible due to rolled shirtsleeves, and he holds a musket in his right hand. His left is balled in a gesture that reads as defiance in this image but refers back to the hand resting on the plow in the original sculpture. His top hat is adorned with several plumes decorated with text that Nast attributes to the Republican Party platform: "Honest Press," "Civil Service," "Free Public Schools," "The People," "The Union As It Is," and "Honest Money."

---

[306] George William Curtis, "19th April 1775-1875, An Oration," *Harper's Weekly* 19, no. 957 (May 1, 1875): 369; Frederic Hudson, "The Concord Fight," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* 50, no. 300 (May 1875): 777.

[307] Baird Jarman, "The Graphic Art of Thomas Nast: Politics and Propriety in Postbellum Publishing," *American Periodicals* 20, no. 2 (2010): 157-163.

With his left foot, he treads on and breaks "The New Democratic Slate," emblazoned

with the name of "Jeff Davis." Beside him frolics a lamb wearing a scarf celebrating

the "New Hampshire Victory." In several cartoons of the 1870s, Nast depicts the

Republican Party as a meek and retiring lamb menaced by the fierce tiger of the

Democratic Tammany Hall, but here the lamb triumphs with the help of Uncle

Sam.[308] Nast clearly links the politics of the Centennial year with both the Civil War

and the Revolution, invoking the date of 1776 on a shield behind Uncle Sam and

casting Uncle Sam as the already-recognizable *Minute Man*, while at the same time

reminding his readers that many in the Democratic Party were supporters of the

Confederacy. Never one to mince words, Nast explicitly claims Revolutionary

memory and centennial fervor for his party and for those who had remained loyal to

the Union during the Civil War. Copies of French's *Minute Man* and the Lexington

Minute Man and *Union Soldier* were headed to the Centennial in Philadelphia, and

Nast's cartoon foreshadowed the varied uses of Revolutionary memory at this national

event.

Centennial and Beyond: Displaying, Copying and Emulating the *Minute Man*

        Nast's partisan evocation of French's Concord *Minute Man* appeared in

Harper's Weekly just over a month before the opening of the grand Centennial

International Exhibition in Philadelphia on May 10, 1876. The first World's Fair to be

held in the United States, it followed in the footsteps of earlier exhibitions such as the

---

[308] For several examples of cartoons by Nast using similar political imagery to this cartoon, see Albert Bigelow Paine, *Thomas Nast: His Period and His Pictures* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904), 319-327.

Crystal Palace Exhibition in London in 1851, the Exposition Universelle in Paris in 1867, and the Weltausstellung in Austria in 1873. Serving as an announcement of America's aspirations toward worldwide economic and political power, the fair was a showcase for American and, to a lesser extent, worldwide innovation in industry, agriculture, the sciences, and the arts.[309] The Exhibition featured more than two hundred structures in an area of four hundred fifty acres in Philadelphia's Fairmount Park, with some of the most impressive being the Main Building, the Art Gallery in Memorial Hall, Machinery Hall, Horticultural Hall, and Agricultural Hall. Nominally referencing the nation's Revolutionary past, the fair was mainly focused on the future, and the Centennial Exhibition presented a vision of industrial and economic dominance that was strongly linked with the aims of Unionists in winning the Civil War. Beside the might of the grand Corliss Engine and the vast displays of American ingenuity in the Main Building, there was little room for Southerners still pining for an agrarian past and rebuilding their homes after the devastation of war. But in the rhetoric surrounding the war, there was much talk of reuniting the warring sections and finding peaceful ends to the causes of war.[310]

The desire for peace often played out in imagery surrounding the Centennial, as in several lithographic trade cards advertising the fabric notions of J.W. LeMaistre

---

[309] For an account of the history and development of the Centennial Exhibition, see Bruno Giberti, *Designing the Centennial: A History of the 1876 International Exhibition in Philadelphia* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2002).

[310] As was the case with many attempts at reunion following the Civil War, peace among white Americans came at the cost of othering nonwhite Americans and foreign visitors. For an analysis of multi-racial participation at the Centennial, see Robert W. Rydell, *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 22-32.

of Philadelphia and circulated during the fair. These cards are highly concerned with the theme of reconciliation, not only between the North and South but between the United States and Britain as well. In one of these trade cards, a Union soldier, Confederate soldier, and sentry of the Queen's Guard join hands and dance in a circle around an obelisk bearing the inscription "Bunker Hill" (figure 4.36). The obelisk is decorated with the American flag, a somewhat distorted Red Ensign of the British Merchant Navy, and the Confederate "Stars and Bars." Beside the frolicking soldiers are several gravestones decorated with flowers and labeled with the word "Hatchet," an obvious invitation to bury the offending item. At left, three gold rings contain the dates "1776," "1861," and "1876," evoking the Revolution, Civil War, and Centennial. These three former enemies reach across history to clasp hands, suggesting that the Centennial year is a time for such reconciliations. Two other trade cards for the same firm point specifically to American and British concord (figures 4.37 and 4.38). In "Sacred to the Memory of Bygones," an anthropomorphic eagle and lion representing the United States and the United Kingdom, respectively, shake hands across a plinth to express their warm friendship. Another card illustrates the different relationship between the two nations in 1776 and in 1876. In 1776, Britain is represented as a matronly warrior woman, scolding a tiny Uncle Sam, who holds up his fists in protest. In 1876, the British matron is much older, and Uncle Sam has matured. But in this panel, the two share a spirited beverage and a joke. For a merchant like J.W. LeMaistre, hoping to sell his products to all visitors to the Centennial, the reconciliation theme may have been an appealing one to reach the broadest possible clientele. And for a dealer in fabrics, especially, the trade connections between North, South and England were particularly important.

But even in the face of imagery and exhortations promoting the Centennial as a celebration of peace, reconciliation and progress, the specter of the Civil War continued to haunt exhibition-goers and to suggest that all was not well in the United States. Even with the move toward reunion and an official ban on Civil War subjects in the art exhibition, reminders of the war and of the Union victory were everywhere. In the art exhibit, one of the largest and most controversial paintings was Peter F. Rothermel's gigantic *Battle of Gettysburg: Pickett's Charge* of about 1870, which offended critics with its graphic depiction of the battle (figure 4.39). Fairgoers complained that the gruesome painting made unpleasant viewing for both Northern and Southern veterans, and worried about the impropriety of displaying a recreation of one of the Confederacy's most crushing defeats.[311] Also, as Eleanor Harvey has recently suggested, many of the landscape and genre scenes displayed in the art exhibition's American section that have until recently not been thought of as war paintings may actually have had Civil War overtones, as many American painters dealt with their feelings about the war's violence by painting stormy weather and ruined nature.[312] Even the art gallery's name, Memorial Hall, was a reference to the Civil War, as the building, not unlike the town hall in Lexington, was dedicated to the memory of fallen soldiers. Outside the art exhibition, Civil War memory permeated the displays at the U.S. Government Building, which offered exhibits of the military-industrial materials that made Union victory a reality. Near the Government Building, the Army Post Hospital recalled advances in military medicine and included images of

[311] Susanna W. Gold, "'Fighting It Over Again': *The Battle of Gettysburg* at the 1876 Centennial Exhibition," *Civil War History* 54, no. 3 (2008): 277-310.

[312] See Harvey, *The Civil War and American Art*.

injured Union veterans alongside Thomas Eakins' *Gross Clinic*.[313] Any visitor hoping

to attend the Centennial Exposition without encountering the recent Civil War might

find such a wish impossible.

A cartoon in *Going to the Centennial: A Guy to the Exhibition* by Bricktop

(pen name of New York humorist George G. Small) illustrates the dark side of the

presence of all this Civil War imagery. In the book, Bricktop relates a tongue-in-cheek

tale of two amputees, one from the Union and one from the Confederate Army,

engaging in fisticuffs in from of Rothermel's *Battle of Gettysburg*. The vignette is

accompanied by an illustration by Thomas Worth that depicts the two hapless

veterans, both in disheveled versions of their respective army uniforms, gesticulating

wildly at the huge canvas (figure 4.40). Both men have suffered an amputation just

above the knee, and their respective truncated limbs mirror one another in pointing

wildly outward. The accompanying text satirizes the painting and the veterans'

response:

> Two one-legged relics of the late war, both of whom claimed to have
> taken part in the original, stood before it, wrangling and almost fighting
> over it again. This shows that the painting has some merit.[314]

Bricktop slyly references the controversy over whether the painting was deserving of a

place in the Centennial by suggesting that the soldiers' passionate response is proof

enough that it is a work of art. Further, he highlights the possible inappropriateness of

the painting's subject by casting its two critics as men who have been visibly

---

[313] James D. McCabe, *The Illustrated History of the Centennial Exhibition*
(Philadelphia: National Publishing Co., 1876), 573-587.

[314] Bricktop (George G. Small), *Going to the Centennial and a Guy to the Exhibition*
(New York: Collin & Small, 1876), 31-33.

mutilated by the Civil War. While many aspects of the Centennial Exhibition were focused on the brighter aspects of America's past and future, the war's injured veterans carried undeniable visual proof of the recent conflict. Their presence at the Exhibition, although used to comic effect by Bricktop, encouraged contemplation of the issues that still divided the nation.

Southern response to the Centennial Exhibition further highlighted the deep fissures that continued to plague the nation. During preparations for the Centennial in the early 1870s, Southern politicians often opposed appropriations of government funds to cover expenses for the fair, citing privations in their section and decrying what they perceived the unfairness of sponsoring an event that would primarily benefit the state of Pennsylvania.[315] In early 1876, a bill to divert $1,500,000 in government funds to the Centennial was held up as Congress debated whether or not to pass a bill granting amnesty to all former Confederates. These sessions were bitterly acrimonious and hinged on the conduct of the Confederacy in managing Andersonville, the notorious camp for Union prisoners of war. In the end, the Centennial bill passed, but only barely, and the fair could not claim total national support.[316] Several Southern states, including Virginia, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas, refused to send any sort of exhibit of state goods to the fair, and many Southerners felt the whole enterprise was based on Yankee ideals.[317] But on the other hand, there were some Southern displays

[315] For instance, see "The Centennial Subsidy," *Georgia Weekly Telegraph* (Macon, Ga.) January 18, 1876; "Forty-Fourth Congress," *Georgia Weekly Telegraph* (Macon, Ga.) January 25, 1876.

[316] William Peirce Randel, *Centennial: American Life in 1876* (Philadelphia: Chilton Book Company, 1969), 240-246.

[317] McCabe, *The Illustrated History of the Centennial Exhibition*, 858-859.

at the fair that attracted positive attention, with the Mississippi State Building, hung with Spanish moss and composed of timbers from several varieties of state trees, receiving many plaudits (figure 4.41). And many Southern newspapers provided generally positive and non-partisan coverage of the fair through the months that it was open, breathlessly reporting on the myriad exhibits and encouraging readers to make the trip if at all possible.[318] Philadelphia witnessed a particularly astounding display of inter-sectional warmth on the Fourth of July, when a parade honoring the nation's birth included a "Centennial Legion" that included companies of soldiers from each of the original thirteen colonies marching together.[319] While the Centennial Exhibition offered plenty of opportunities for discord, it also featured spectacles such as the sight of former Union and Confederate veterans marching abreast on the streets of Philadelphia to celebrate their shared history. How did the statues of the Lexington and Concord centennials signify within this exciting, fraught, wild exhibition?

At the Centennial Exhibition, both Lexington and Concord had copies of their statues represented, with French's *Minute Man* displayed in the art galleries and Batterson's *Minute Man* and *Union Soldier* in prominent locations outdoors. French's *Minute Man* appeared as a small-scale replica in the Art Gallery Annex, which was built behind Memorial Hall after it became apparent that the submissions by American artists would exceed the available space. This small model was produced at the

---

[318] For instance, see "Latest Telegraph – The Centennial," *Daily Picayune* (New Orleans, La.) May 10, 1876; "The Centennial Rush," *Georgia Weekly Telegraph* (Macon, Ga.) May 23, 1876.

[319] "Letter from Philadelphia," *Daily Columbus Enquirer* (Columbus, Ga.) July 13, 1876.

bequest of Henry Flagg French, who ordered the statue through the Doll and Richards Gallery of Boston as a means of generating income and publicity for his son's career.[320] The small *Minute Man* was placed in Gallery 28, a gallery of works by Boston artists, along with four other works of sculpture and sixty-seven paintings (figures 4.42 and 4.43). French may have had an easier time getting his work accepted for the Centennial than some of his fellow artists in painting, as the committee for selecting sculpture consisted solely of Henry Kirke Brown and John Quincy Adams Ward, with a simplified set of requirements for submission.[321] Ward's presence on the committee probably helped the young artist's chances of selection, as French's former teacher had already lavished the *Minute Man* with praise. Among the other sculptures in Gallery 28, three of which were portrait busts, one in particular may have served as an intriguing counterpoint to the *Minute Man*: a small marble version of Anne Whitney's *Roma*, now unlocated (figure 4.44).[322] A far cry from the vigorous portrayals of the city of Rome as a young woman from the classical and Renaissance eras, Whitney's *Roma* is an elderly, decrepit woman in tattered costume, sitting on the ruins of a Corinthian column and ruminating on her former glory.[323] In contrast,

---

[320] Richman, *Daniel Chester French: An American Sculptor*, 45-47.

[321] Kimberly Orcutt, "'Revising History': Creating a Canon of American Art at the Centennial Exhibition" (Ph.D. dissertation, City University of New York, 2005), 102.

[322] The three busts were a sketch of Charles Sumner by Whitney, an unidentified portrait bust, and a portrait of the poet John Greenleaf Whittier by David M. French, no relation to Daniel Chester French. See *Official Catalogue of the International Exhibition of 1876* (Philadelphia: Centennial Catalogue Company, 1876), 42.

[323] For more information about this statue and Whitney's politics, see Lisa B. Reitzes, "The Political Voice of the Artist: Anne Whitney's 'Roma' and 'Harriet Martineau,'" *American Art* 8, no. 2 (Spring 1994): 44-65.

French's *Minute Man* is a young soldier, striding forward and gazing into the future. If both of these sculptures represent national identities, *Roma* is the collapse of a decayed empire, while the *Minute Man* is full of youthful vigor and hope for things to come. In the packed galleries of the Centennial's art exhibition, arranged more by location and available space than by theme, the juxtaposition of these two sculptures offered an opportunity to meditate on the course of empire as understood in the nineteenth century.

While French's *Minute Man* offered a meditation on nationhood and empire to discerning visitors to the indoor art exhibit, James Batterson's *Minute Man* and *Union Soldier* were both featured outside on the exhibition grounds. In order to fit inside the gallery space, French's monumental sculpture was presented in miniature, but outside, Batterson's statues had room to grow. His *Minute Man*, listed as the *Minute Man of '76* in the official catalogue, stood at approximately life size on a seven-foot pedestal, just southeast of Machinery Hall (figure 4.45). A stereoview of the statue *in situ* shows a corner of the Main Building in the background, and confirms that this statue was placed in the courtyard between the Main Building and Machinery Hall, just inside the main entrance where all visitors to the Centennial would have passed into the fairgrounds. Here, visitors would have encountered Batterson's interpretation of the citizen soldier of the Revolution almost immediately, while they would have had to search through the art galleries for French's tiny model. However, even in such a prominent outdoor location, the *Minute Man of '76* had to fight for attention with several other visual displays. The most prominent of these was *Bartholdi's Fountain*, a multi-figure fountain of bronzed iron designed by Frédéric Auguste Bartholdi, who also modeled the colossal Statue of Liberty, the arm and torch of which were

displayed at the Centennial. In addition to this major piece of sculpture, the *Minute Man* also appeared alongside nine other works by Batterson's New England Granite Company that demonstrated the breadth of the company's ability to produce architectural and funereal monuments. These included columns, fountains, canopies, and plinths in classical and Gothic styles and various types of granite. One of these, a forty-foot granite canopy topped with a cross, encapsulated an allegorical figure of *Memory*, imagined as a seated woman gazing downward and clutching a wreath of roses (figure 4.46). Never one to miss a business opportunity, Batterson used his exposure at the Centennial to advertise all his firm's wares.

If Batterson's Lexington *Minute Man* appeared at the Centennial at life size and surrounded by the fruits of the monument industry, his *Union Soldier* was blown up to a colossal scale. A version of the Lexington statue was carved at a total height of twenty-one and a half feet and placed at the northern entrance of the Main Building, looking across one of the fair's major thoroughfares toward Memorial Hall (figure 4.47). Called the *American Soldier* in all printed material associated with the Centennial, the statue first appeared at the fair, and then was transported to Antietam National Cemetery, where it stands today (figure 4.48). The statue appeared in several independent reviews and guides to the exhibition, and was generally discussed in flattering terms. In his *Souvenir of the Centennial Exhibition*, George D. Curtis offered a particularly glowing review. In Curtis's estimation, the *American Soldier* was "one of the finest colossal figures of ancient or modern times," and he seemed particularly impressed by the firm's assertion that the statue was carved from a single massive

block of granite.[324] Whether or not this was indeed true of the *American Soldier*, the suggestion that it was connected it with the classical history of colossal sculptures as described by Pliny the Elder in his *Natural History*. Even some of the statues designated as such by Pliny were later found to be carved from several pieces of stone – for instance, the *Laocoön* was actually composed of seven cleverly joined blocks of marble.[325] But in evoking this litmus test for virtuosity in colossal sculpture, Curtis and Batterson connected the massive *American Soldier* with the classical past.

Curtis's review includes a description of the statue that sympathizes with Batterson's project in memorializing soldiers of the Civil War, but also hints at what may have made Daniel Chester French's *Minute Man* such a huge departure from these figures. In considering the effect of the *American Soldier*'s costume, Curtis writes, "The overcoat gives, in its voluminous cape and drooping folds, a grace and dignity to the figure that offsets the rigidity of the military position, and adds to the repose and self-sustained power of the statue."[326] In Chapter 2, I explored how sculptors of soldier monuments often misunderstood military drill postures when attempting to produce soldiers at "parade rest," and the *American Soldier* is no exception – with slight turn of the head to the right offset by the rifle held to the left of the body, the statue does not resemble any military posture that would appear in a drill manual. But the ponderous weight of the overcoat does allow for a certain stillness

---

[324] George D. Curtis, *Souvenir of the Centennial Exhibition: or, Connecticut's Representation at Philadelphia, 1876* (Hartford, CT: George D. Curtis, 1877), 150.

[325] Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most, and Salvatore Settis, *The Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), 870.

[326] Curtis, *Souvenir of the Centennial Exhibition*, 150.

appropriate for such a large figure. And the balance of head turned to the right, gun held at left with two clasped hands held gently in line with the left shoulder, right knee slightly bent, and weight on the rearward left leg all contribute to a statue that projects stability and strength. Curtis pointed this out as a way of praising the *American Soldier*, but his praise illustrates how different the statue is from French's *Minute Man*, which almost seems to leap off its pedestal by comparison.

A two-volume set titled *Masterpieces of the Centennial International Exhibition* and printed in 1877 hints that the presentation, material, outdoor location and staid iconography of the *American Soldier*, the *Minute Man of '76*, and Batterson's other displays may have inflected how they were interpreted. The first volume of this work is subtitled *Fine Art* and is written by Edward Strahan, while the second volume by Walter Smith is subtitled *Industrial Art*. Batterson's contributions to the Centennial are split across the two volumes, with the *American Soldier* appearing among the works of fine art, and the *Minute Man* and the allegorical figure of *Memory* identified as industrial art. In reviewing the *American Soldier*, Strahan refers constantly to the statue's size and heft, characterizing the statue as a "colossus," a "monster," and a "titanic image," hewn from a "shapeless mass of stone," and with draped "folds of adamant" covering his "inflexible loins." He compares the statue to works by ancient Egyptians, suggesting that while the ancients took decades to shape enormous sculptures, the *American Soldier* could be hewn quickly with the benefit of American industry. Strahan does not think much of the statue's "artistic delicacy," but he seems in awe of the brute process of creation.[327] In the volume on industrial art,

---

[327] Edward Strahan, *The Masterpieces of the Centennial International Exhibition, Volume I, Fine Art* (Philadelphia: Gebbie and Barrie, 1877), 62-63.

Walter Smith introduces Batterson's allegorical *Memory* by stating, "Our next illustration is drawn from one of the Fine Arts – that of Sculpture – which becomes Industrial only by its adaptation to machinery and susceptibility of reproduction." The distinction here could not be stated more plainly: because they are machine-made and mass-produced, Batterson's sculptures cannot be considered fine art. Smith allows that machined sculpture can be pleasing "when the shaping hand of the artificer is allowed to give the final touch," and he goes on to praise *Memory* as a fine and thoughtful piece. But the message is clear: because Batterson's granite sculptures required machine tools to achieve fine carving, and because they were intended for sale in multiples, they must by definition be classified as industrial products rather than fine art.[328]

Smith's characterization is supported by the treatment, display and reception of the French and Batterson statues at the Centennial Exhibition. While French's *Minute Man* was part of the overwhelmingly large art exhibit, which most critics agreed was bafflingly extensive, it clearly appeared in a fine art setting alongside other works of painting and sculpture, and is listed as such in the fair's *Official Catalogue*. On the other hand, Batterson's monuments for Lexington are listed in a different area of the catalogue under "Out-Door Works of Art." The name of sculptor Carl Conrads does not appear; instead, the works are credited to the New England Granite Company.[329] Due to their high visibility and sheer size, Batterson's statues attracted a great deal of notice from visitors reviewing the Exhibition, while French's *Minute Man* as it

[328] Walter Smith, *The Masterpieces of the Centennial International Exhibition, Volume II, Industrial Art* (Philadelphia: Gebbie and Barrie, 1877), 33-34.

[329] *Official Catalogue of the International Exhibition of 1876*, 146-147.

appeared in the bewildering art galleries is scarcely mentioned. But in exhibiting a small copy of his first major monument at the Centennial, French earned the right to have his name forever associated with this grand national event. To be anyone in the American art world in 1876, one had to have a piece in the Centennial's art gallery, and French achieved that goal.

The reception of the Lexington and Concord statues at the Centennial Exhibition foreshadows their efficacy as models for replication in the later postbellum years. Both the *Minute Man* and the *Union Soldier* designed by the New England Granite Company for Lexington's Memorial Hall entered into the company's stable of designs available for copying in other locations seeking monuments, just as many monument firms copied their most successful Union and Confederate soldier statues. The *Union Soldier* was replicated exactly as a Civil War monument in at least six Northern cities, and reproduced with variations in the turn of the head in at least three locations.[330] At this time, the only other known replica of the *Minute Man* is located in Elizabeth, New Jersey, where it was erected in 1905; the location of the version displayed at the Centennial is unknown.[331] While the Batterson *Minute Man* was not as popular as the *Union Soldier*, and indeed the total number of Revolutionary citizen

---

[330] According to the Smithsonian's Inventory of American Sculpture, the exact replicas are in Easton, Pennsylvania (1872); Portland, Connecticut (1872); Meriden, Connecticut (1873); Braintree, Massachusetts (1874); Lancaster, Pennsylvania (1874); and Guilford, Connecticut (1887). Statues that are clearly related to this type appear in Williamstown, Massachusetts (1868); Norwich, Connecticut (1875); and Manchester, Connecticut (1877).

[331] The base of the statue in Elizabeth indicates that it commemorates the location of a Revolutionary War skirmish that took place on June 7, 1780. The monument was dedicated on April 21, 1905, just before the battle's 125th anniversary.

soldiers lags far behind their Civil War counterparts, the copying of these monuments follows a familiar pattern. These statues, intended as calm, solid representations of American soldiers, fulfilled their primary purpose as didactic exemplars of civic virtue, but in their replication as large-scale monuments in several locations, they were eventually denigrated by the fine art world.

French's Concord *Minute Man* was subjected to a different kind of replication that reflected the subtle hints of its high status as an art object, as conveyed during the Centennial Exhibition. The statue was never replicated at full size as an outdoor monument in any location other than Concord, but it was reproduced often at a small size. As previously mentioned, the small-scale Centennial cast of the statue was lent to the Exhibition by the Doll and Richards Gallery, a prominent art gallery in Boston. The *Minute Man*'s appearance at the fair was in part intended to create publicity for the sale of these casts, which were small in scale, produced in plaster, and painted after the fashion of groups by John Rogers. Emulating Rogers was not an unfamiliar strategy for the young French, who had sold tabletop-sized genre sculptures to support himself while he modeled the *Minute Man*. However, the Doll and Richards cast did not sell particularly well, although a few examples do survive in private collections.[332]

A second opportunity to replicate the *Minute Man* came in March 1889, when French was asked by a committee of Concord citizens to donate a small-scale copy of the work to the U.S.S. Concord, a gunboat named in honor of the Revolutionary town.

---

[332] Richman, *Daniel Chester French: An American Sculptor*, 45-47; Thayer Tolles, "The Minute Man," in *Selections from the American collections of the Museum of Fine Arts and the George Walter Vincent Smith Art Museum* (Springfield, MA: Springfield Library & Museums Association, 1999), 223-225.

Rather than providing a precise reconstruction of the *Minute Man* in Concord or offering a bronze cast of the Doll and Richards model, French made a new model, considerably reworking elements of surface texture and expression.[333] French's retouching of the statue suggests a mature sculpture's discomfort with his earliest work; in later life, he often looked back on the statue as a learning experience that he might have executed differently with more knowledge. His daughter Margaret French Cresson returns to this theme several times in her biography of him, placing him in front of Raphael's tomb in Rome just after the turn of the twentieth century, and thinking about how, when working on the *Minute Man*, he "had known so little. But he had *felt* so much and had somehow been able to express so much." Much later, on a visit to Concord, he confided to his daughter that he still thought it was "a pretty good statue."[334] But in reworking the statue for the U.S.S. Concord, French was able to produce a model that was free of youthful blemishes, presenting his monumental idea as it should have been, and not as it was. This new version of the *Minute Man* became the model for several more series of small-scale replicas of the work, licensed first to the Jno. Williams Foundry in 1913 and later to the Gorham Manufacturing Company in 1917 (figure 4.49).[335] Rather than diminishing the impact of the original statue, as large-scale copies of Civil War soldier monuments were seen to do, these reduced

[333] Ibid.

[334] Cresson, *Journey Into Fame*, 195-196, 251.

[335] Tolles, "The Minute Man," 223-225. French's relationship with the Jno. Williams Foundry and the Gorham Manufacturing Company played into a professional rivalry between the two foundries; this rivalry will be explored further in Chapter 5 in relation to the Spanish-American War *Hiker* figures executed by Allen George Newman and Theo Alice Ruggles Kitson.

copies increased the prestige of the original work, allowing the buyer to own a piece of American history and of the by-then meteoric fame of the monumental sculptor. And in studying a copy that was in fact subtly better than the original, owners of these works participated in a mental revision of sculptural history.

Lexington, too, chose to revise its monumental program. While the idea for a Memorial Hall adorned with statues and located within the town's key civic structure was an exciting and early nod to the concept of living memorials, in actuality the space demonstrated a key flaw in these types of memorials: they are subject to the structure's continuing usefulness for its main purpose as meeting space. By 1883, Lexington's town government and library collections had outgrown the space available in the 1871 Town Hall, and the library had actually expanded into Memorial Hall. By 1906, the library had a new building of its own, and the Town Hall was slated for demolition. The statues were placed into storage and eventually installed in the new Cary Memorial Hall, where they remain today, no longer displayed as a cohesive group.

Anticipating the loss of this key memorial space, and with the success of Concord's *Minute Man* in mind, the people of Lexington commissioned a new *Minute Man* statue from Henry Hudson Kitson, an English-born sculptor living in Boston. Kitson and his wife, Theo Alice Ruggles Kitson, were key players in a group of young sculptors living in the shadow of the success of Daniel Chester French and Augustus Saint-Gaudens. Kitson's new *Minute Man* was dedicated at the apex of the Lexington Green on April 19, 1900 (figure 4.50). It was placed atop an arrangement of boulders that once enclosed a memorial fountain, now converted into a flower garden.[336]

[336] Hudson, *History of the Town of Lexington*, 301.

Kitson's statue for Lexington borrows some elements from French's Concord *Minute Man* but takes the idea in a different direction. Like French's statue, this figure is young and slender, with an idealized expression and form-fitting costume that reveals the musculature beneath it. Also like the Concord *Minute Man*, the Lexington statue has rolled shirtsleeves that expose the young farmer's sinewy arms. But in this statue, the standard plow is no longer present. Unlike French's statue, which pushes off from the plow to stride forward into battle, this figure stands resolute, one foot raised and planted on the outcropping of rock beneath him, gazing steadily into the future. This pose calls to mind a frontier hero such as Davy Crockett as much as it does any Revolutionary figure. Sculpted twenty-five years after the statue in Concord, this monument is no longer explicitly tied to the agrarian past, and the Cincinnatus legend is no longer the driving force of American military prowess.

Conclusion: The Soldier Monument in a Changing Art World

In sculpting and marketing his *Minute Man*, Daniel Chester French took an ordinary commission for a soldier monument and made it into a launching pad for a long and illustrious career. The humble origins of the statue are reflected in the statues prepared for the Lexington centennial celebrations: these were sturdy, respectable works of sculpture that responded to and obeyed the artistic conventions them emerging that dictated how soldiers should be remembered. Concord's project could have followed the same path, and indeed its earlier Civil War monument of 1867 was an unassuming obelisk that broke no new memorial ground. But in choosing Dan French to model the statue, Concord's monument committee tapped a young, ambitious artist with a well-connected New England family and a personality well-equipped for winning the respect and admiration of individuals ready and willing to

provide assistance. Concord's elite citizens supported the ascent of their young sculptor, and the *Minute Man* proved that it was possible to make a monument to the average American soldier that would be accepted by the fine art community as an important work.

For the most part, the soldier monument industry diverged from the path illuminated by French's *Minute Man*, as the statues were increasingly industrialized and produced from inexpensive, modest materials. But in the 1890s, French's elevation of the common man would be joined by Augustus Saint-Gaudens' *Shaw Memorial*, often seen as the greatest citizen soldier monument in the United States for its depiction of the African-American infantrymen of the famed 54th Massachusetts Regiment, marching alongside their mounted commander, Colonel Robert Gould Shaw (figure 4.51). Saint-Gaudens took the gauntlet thrown by the *Minute Man* and reinterpreted it, breaking completely out of the mold of the single figure at rest and combining marching troops with an equestrian statue. French and Saint-Gaudens engaged in a respectful rivalry through their careers that led both to produce great sculptural work, and their meditations on the citizen soldier rank as extraordinary interpretations of what was generally a middle-class type. In the years to come, sculptors responding to the newly global aims of the Spanish-American War would have to decide whether to follow French and Saint-Gaudens, or choose another path.

Chapter 5

MODELING THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

In a small triangular park surrounded by three busy streets in Morristown, New Jersey, a bronze statue of a Spanish-American War soldier stands on a granite plinth (figure 5.1). This monument, erected in 1948 to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the war, is one of many examples of Theo Alice Ruggles Kitson's *Hiker*, a memorial statue that first appeared in 1948. The figure stands with his feet about shoulder width apart, with the left foot slightly forward, holding his bolt-action Krag-Jørgensen rifle horizontally across his body. For the viewer familiar with American military uniforms of the Civil War, this figure's costume displays a marked shift toward a more casual and utilitarian style, with a field blouse open at the neck, baggy trousers tucked into leather leggings, and a slouch hat worn at a slightly jaunty angle. The figure's sleeves are rolled at the elbow to reveal brawny forearms and massive hands gripping the barrel and trigger mechanism of the rifle. This muscular strength is echoed in the figure's broad chest, square shoulders, and steady, wide-set stance. Even the ammunition belt at the soldier's waist enhances this appearance of square solidity. An inscription on the base of the statue informs the viewer that the monument serves "In Honor and Memory / Of Those Who Served / in the / Spanish-American War / 1898-1902," and a cross-shaped emblem above the inscription recognizes that the Army and Navy served in the Philippines, Cuba and Puerto Rico.

Overall, the monument gives the impression of manly stability and historic truth, with a heroic soldier figure looming over dates and locations set in stone. But

the reality of one of America's least-understood wars and the crisis in manhood that it precipitated cannot be so easily summarized. The monuments to the Spanish-American War capture a moment when notions of American manliness became increasingly focused on physical athleticism as a marker of moral character. Many young men volunteered for the war with Spain in order to prove their worthiness under this new rubric. But most of these young volunteers never saw combat, languishing instead in disease-ridden stateside camps. The monuments to the Spanish-American War borrow from a new language of ideal physical masculinity to bridge the war that the young soldiers experienced with the war they had imagined.

This chapter will consider how the War of 1898 manifested itself in soldier monuments, especially in the *Hiker* monuments by Theo Alice Ruggles Kitson and Allen George Newman that were copied in so many locations across the United States. Called "*Hikers*" in reference to long marches in the rugged terrain of the Philippines, these soldiers in bronze grew out of a complicated series of wartime experiences. The iconography of their weapons and uniforms is shaped by a shift in military attitudes toward soldiers' garb, reflecting the warm climates of imperial warfare. With their relaxed realism and casual poses that refer to art world precedents rather than military drills, the statues reflect the sensibilities of the successful early-twentieth century artists who produced them. But in the ideologies of ideal masculinity and whiteness that they espoused, and in the processes of replication through which they spread across the United States, the *Hiker* monuments clearly refer back to their Civil War counterparts. At a moment of intense change in both United States foreign policy and the art world, these statues look both forward and backward, remembering the Civil War but anticipating greater changes to come.

The Spanish-American War marked the emergence of the United States as a major world power with strong imperial aspirations, and the memorials to the conflict embody the nation's changing relationship with the world, the war's complicated geopolitical aims, and the resulting shift in the identity of American citizen soldier. War between Spain and the United States broke out in April of 1898 after decades of tension between the two nations over Spain's relationship with its colonies in the Caribbean, especially in Cuba and Puerto Rico. In the United States, months of warmongering in the late 1890s came to a head on February 15, 1898, when the USS *Maine* sank in Havana Harbor after a mysterious explosion, resulting in the deaths of 266 American sailors. Conflict between the United States and Spain lasted only a few short months, from the declaration of war on April 21 to the cessation of hostilities on August 12. As a result of the war, Spain ceded almost all of its colonies in the Caribbean and the Pacific, including the Philippines, Guam, and Puerto Rico, to the United States. But citizens of the Philippines were no more interested in American colonial rule than they were in that of the Spanish, and hostilities there continued officially until 1902, and unofficially until 1913.

While the Spanish-American War and its monuments looked forward toward America's maturation as a world power and to the quest for power that would lead to a twentieth century dominated by world wars, the conflict also nodded toward the nation's past. White Americans in the North and South used the war as an opportunity to stage ceremonies and other visual representations of unity in the wake of the Civil War. Prominent former Confederates became war heroes anew in Cuba, and the sons of veterans from both sides volunteered together under a single banner. The lines of discord were not buried entirely, but the war's aims were cloaked in the rhetoric of

reunion. And in this show of white sectional unity, the African American men who saw the war as an opportunity to assert their manhood and worthiness of citizenship in the United States saw their goals once again suppressed in the interest of the nation's broader goals. That the presentation of whiteness was key to America's imperial goals, too, should not be overlooked. In this context, the monuments to the Spanish-American War should be interpreted as yet another body of memorials to white manhood erected in honor of a war won through multiracial efforts. The story of the American soldier monument is once again a story of whiteness.

Overview of the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars

America's war with Spain took place over a few explosive months, as fighting in the Caribbean and in southeast Asia dominated newspaper headlines. The official start of war between the two nations was preceded by years of advocacy in various circles for the United States to intervene in Cuba, beginning even before the American Civil War. One of the questions that continues to plague scholars of the War of 1898 is the role played by the popular press in inciting public opinion toward war. While some have blamed the "yellow journalism" of newspapers such as William Randolph Hearst's *New York Journal* and Joseph Pulitzer's *New York World* for starting the war, others have argued that the role of the press in the conflict has been overstated. For instance, W. Joseph Campbell has convincingly demonstrated that a popular anecdote about a telegraphic exchange between Hearst and artist Frederic Remington probably never occurred. As the story goes, at some point in the months before the outbreak of war, Frederic Remington, on assignment in Cuba, telegraphed Hearst, "Everything is quiet. There is no trouble here. There will be no war. I wish to return," to which Hearst replied, "Please remain. You furnish the pictures, and I'll furnish the war." But as

Campbell explains, the circumstances of Remington's lone pre-war visit to Cuba in January 1897 made such an exchange unlikely if not impossible.[337]

All of the tension between the United States and Spain over affairs in Cuba came to a head on the night of February 15, 1898 with the explosion and sinking of the U.S.S. *Maine* in Havana Harbor. The *Maine* had been sent to Cuba in January 1898 at the bequest of Fitzhugh Lee, former Confederate general and nephew of Robert E. Lee who had been appointed consul-general at Havana during the administration of President Grover Cleveland. Lee felt that a show of American military might was necessary to protect American citizens living in Havana. At the time, the sinking of the *Maine* and the deaths of 266 American seamen were attributed to an attack by a Spanish submarine mine, although more recent investigations have suggested that the cause of the sinking was probably accidental. After the ship's sinking, two months of tense political negotiations brought the two nations quickly toward war. On April 25, the United States Congress issued a declaration of war retroactively dated to April 21, proclaiming that a state of war had existed since that date. Just five days later, on May 1, Admiral of the Navy George Dewey surprised everyone by delivering America's first victory in the Philippines, destroying the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay with the loss of only one American life. Naval operations continued in the Philippines and in the Caribbean through May and June, as the U.S. Navy established a blockade of Cuban ports.[338]

---

[337] W. Joseph Campbell, *Yellow Journalism: Puncturing the Myths, Defining the Legacies* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2001), 71-73.

[338] Bonnie M. Miller, *From Liberation to Conquest: The Visual and Popular Cultures of the Spanish-American War of 1898* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011), 55-86; Charles H. Brown, *The Correspondents' War: Journalists in the*

Meanwhile, the regular army and new volunteers in the mainland United States mobilized for war. The first American troops landed at Daiquiri in Cuba on June 22, and several skirmishes over the ensuing days led to pitched battles on July 1, including the famous charge of American forces at San Juan Hill. Two days later, a naval battle in Santiago Bay resulted in the destruction of another Spanish fleet, and a two-week siege of Santiago ended the Spanish surrender on July 17. In the ensuing two weeks, American forces landed in Puerto Rico and quickly dominated the island, and on August 12, Spanish and American forces agreed to an armistice. The next day, Spanish forces in the Philippines surrendered to the American army after a mock battle meant to preserve their honor. Peace talks over the next several months resulted in the Treaty of Paris of 1898, signed on December 10 and ratified by the United States on February 6, 1899, in which Spain relinquished control to the United States of all of its colonies outside of Africa, including the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and Guam. Cuba was granted its independence, but a complicated political relationship continued. Meanwhile, the people of the Philippines were no more interested in foreign rule by the United States than they were in the rule of Spain, and on February 4, 1899, Filipino forces began their attempt to wrest independence from American control. That bloody imperial conflict would continue for several more years. President Theodore Roosevelt declared the war officially ended on July 4, 1902, but hostilities among various guerrilla groups continued until 1913.[339]

Spanish-American War (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967), 103-128, 182-201.

[339] David Traxel, *1898: The Birth of the American Century* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998), 171-213; Ephraim K. Smith, "William McKinley's Enduring Legacy: The Historiographical Debate on the Taking of the Philippine Islands," in *Crucible of*

Previous chapters have explored the historic conflict in American military culture between the notion of a regular army trained in peacetime to prepare for war, and the volunteer militia raised at home to provide defense at times of need. During the Spanish-American War, both of these systems for raising an army came into play, and the need for constant military readiness became apparent. At the outbreak of conflict with Spain, the United States had 25,000 regular troops in the army, mostly stationed in Western locales to participate in the ongoing conflict with Native American populations over rights to land use. These trained regulars were immediately mobilized for war. To augment this regular force, President William McKinley issued a call for 125,000 volunteer troops on April 23.[340] All of these troops were ordered to assemble at various locations in Georgia and Florida, including Camp Thomas, which was located on the newly-created Chickamauga National Military Park in southeastern Georgia. The regular troops who arrived at these camps were equipped and transferred to locations in the Caribbean or the Philippines relatively quickly, as they already had most of the supplies and training they need to enter combat. But for the volunteers, patriotic enthusiasm for war service quickly turned to boredom and dejection, as the vast influx of new soldiers overwhelmed scant army resources and volunteer units languished in camp for months with no hope of seeing the front

---

Empire: The Spanish-American War and Its Aftermath, James C. Bradford, ed. (Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute Press, 1993), 205-250; H.W. Brands, *The Reckless Decade: America in the 1890s* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 287-335; Owen J. Lynch, *The U.S. Constitution and Philippine Colonialism: An Enduring and Unfortunate Legacy* in *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*, Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano, eds. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009), 353-364.

[340] Lewis L. Gould, *The Spanish-American War and President McKinley* (Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas, 1982), 69-70.

lines.[341] While the volunteer units waited in vain for the order to muster out, the war with Spain was almost completely carried out by regulars.

President McKinley's calls for volunteer soldiers were met with an overwhelmingly enthusiastic response from both white and black Americans. Young men who volunteered for the war were in search of a chance to prove themselves, to serve their country, or to seek adventure. For many who had grown up with veterans of the Civil War, the wartime service of their fathers encouraged them to enlist, as was the case with the young students of the Twenty-second Kansas Volunteers, who left college to fight in the war.[342] Others may have been looking to escape a decade of economic and social tension at home, a period marked by economic depression, debates over the handling of the nation's currency, and ongoing racial conflict.[343] And for young African American men, the war seemed to be an opportunity to prove their loyalty to the United States and their worthiness to enjoy the freedoms granted to them after the Civil War but slowly denied through legislation. Even as many African American leaders and journalists expressed concern that an imperialist war overseas would only further racism at home and that the war would not improve the case for

---

[341] Gregory Dean Chapman, "Army Life at Camp Thomas, Georgia, During the Spanish-American War," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 70, no. 4 (Winter 1986): 633-656.

[342] Justin Dragosani-Brantingham, "'Proud Are We': Private Rhinehart and the College Company of the Twenty-second Kansas Volunteers," *Kansas History* 22, no. 2 (1999): 102, 106-107.

[343] John Maxwell Hamilton, Renita Coleman, Bettye Grable and Jaci Cole, "An Enabling Environment: A Reconsideration of the Press and the Spanish-American War," *Journalism Studies* 7, no. 1 (2006): 80.

racial equality, the young men who volunteered hoped for the possibility of change.[344] These varied aims that led young American men to volunteer for war service met with mixed levels of success when confronted with war's reality.

For most of the volunteer units that formed in the weeks after the explosion of the *U.S.S. Maine*, both white and black, the general outline of their war service follows a similar pattern. Each unit formed with great enthusiasm, left home with fanfare and celebration from the local community, and made its way to one of the War Department's camps in Georgia, Virginia, or Florida. But as the volunteer units languished in camp, life quickly became a hellacious ordeal of boredom, privation, and disease. Camps quickly became overcrowded, and poor sanitation, contaminated water, and lack of drainage led to the spread of disease, particularly typhoid and dysentery. Soldiers of the Second Nebraska, stationed at Camp Thomas on the Chickamauga battlefield, wrote home to complain of maggot-infested latrines, nearly inedible food, beds made with blankets on the ground and soaked by constant rain, and uniforms too heavy for warm weather.[345] Likewise, the Second Kentucky, also camped at Chickamauga, had 175 men on its sick list by August 1, and Private E.P. Moore told his sister about the boredom of drilling and lack of food, and lamented

---

[344] Willard B. Gatewood, Jr., *Black Americans and the White Man's Burden, 1898-1903* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975), 1-21; Ann Field Alexander, "No Officers, No Fight! The Sixth Virginia Volunteers in the Spanish-American War," *Virginia Cavalcade* 7, no. 4 (1998): 179-180.

[345] J.R. Johnson, "The Second Nebraska's 'Battle' of Chickamauga," *Nebraska History* 32 (June 1951): 83-85.

signing his life over to the army so thoughtlessly.[346] Camp Thomas was not the only

location to experience such difficulties; Texan soldiers stationed at Camp Coppinger

in Alabama were subjected to poor nutrition that caused diarrhea and went weeks

without receiving payment from the army for their services.[347] And these difficulties

were not confined to camps in the eastern United States: California's Seventh

Regiment experienced terribly unsanitary living conditions at Camp Merritt in Golden

Gate Park, San Francisco, a site that had previously been used as a pauper cemetery.

Their stay began with an outbreak of German measles and grew worse and worse.[348]

For most of the young men who volunteered for the Spanish-American War, then,

wartime experience consisted of a long wait in camp exposed to disease and

malnutrition, with no hope of seeing the battlefield in a conflict that ended as quickly

as it began. Eventually, monuments to this wartime experience would have to find a

way to put a heroic spin on a monotonous ordeal.

African American volunteers experienced the same boredom in camp as their

white counterparts, with the added indignities of entrenched racism that undermined

the high ideals that had motivated them to offer their services. While many young

African American men had joined the army hoping that their service would give them

---

[346] Jeff Patrick, "Nothing but Slaves: The Second Kentucky Volunteer Infantry and the Spanish-American War," *Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* 89, no. 3 (1991): 292-294.

[347] John Leffler, "The Paradox of Patriotism: Texans in the Spanish-American War," *Hayes Historical Journal* 8 (1989): 40-42.

[348] Louis A. Di Donato, "The Forgotten Regiment: The Seventh California and the Spanish-American War," *Southern California Quarterly* 83, no. 4 (Winter 2001): 368-370.

access to the protection of manly citizenship and to an increased sense of brotherhood with their fellow white soldiers, the opposite was usually true. Most of the army camps associated with the mobilization for fighting in the Caribbean were located in Southern states, and the white populations of these areas especially were hostile to the sight of so many armed and uniformed African American men. Racial tensions also existed between soldiers, and these tensions sometimes bubbled over into rioting and violence. One of the most horrifying incidents occurred in early May 1898 in Tampa, Florida, when a regiment of white Ohioans snatched a black toddler from his mother and proceeded to fire their weapons as closely as possible to the terrified child without hitting him. Outraged black soldiers responded by clashing with white troops and civilians and damaging local businesses. In most newspaper accounts, the black soldiers were blamed for the rioting.[349] Even when outright violence did not occur, hazing rituals caused tension between black and white soldiers. One such practice was "blanketing," in which several soldiers held tightly to the edges of a blanket and tossed new arrivals in camp into the air. When black soldiers were forced to participate in these rituals, fighting often ensued.[350] The boredom and frustration of a long wait in camp for deployment orders that would never arrive further inflamed racial tensions between white and black soldiers.

In addition to these disturbing incidents with fellow soldiers, black recruits also faced systemic racism that hampered their efforts to perform their military service

---

[349] Piero Gleijeses, "African Americans and the War Against Spain," *North Carolina Historical Review* 73, no. 2 (1996): 194-197.

[350] Christopher Lovett, "'To Serve Faithfully': The Twenty-Third Kansas Infantry and the Spanish-American War," *Kansas History* 21 (1998-1999): 264.

honorably. One of the most depressing forms of discrimination was the thinking that prevented many black militia units from entering the United States intact with their own black officers. A few individual units, including the Eighth Illinois and the Twenty-Third Kansas, were allowed to serve with officers they had selected themselves, but most were forced by either state or federal regulations to accept white officers. Some black units protested this discrimination, and in particular the Sixth Virginia clung so closely to its cry of "No officers, no fight!" that its soldiers gained a reputation as mutineers.[351] This systemic discrimination also extended to orders for deployment. While some white volunteer regiments did manage to serve alongside army regulars for the brief duration of fighting in Cuba, the only black volunteers to reach the island were sent for garrison duty after the war had ended, and then because of the unfounded belief in their "immunity" from tropical disease.[352] Neither black nor white volunteers had the experience of war they expected when they signed up to serve in Cuba. Further, as the rhetoric of Civil War sectional reconciliation would soon prove, black Americans could not even expect to enjoy the war's symbolic benefits.

One of the themes that appeared continuously in written and visual culture related to the Spanish-American War was the conflict's potential to offer an opportunity for Northerners and Southerners to move past the scars of the Civil War in pursuit of a common goal. This notion was explored earlier on a national scale in the

[351] Alexander, "No Officers, No Fight," 186-190.

[352] Eleanor Hannah, "A Place in the Parade: Citizenship, Manhood, and African American Men in the Illinois National Guard, 1870-1917," *Journal of Illinois History* 5, no. 2 (2002): 100-102.

context of the Centennial celebration in 1876, in which outward symbolic gestures of reconciliation were undermined by deep sectional distrust at the end of the Reconstruction era. Tensions at this point were so high that several Southern states refused to send exhibits to the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia. But in 1898, when more than thirty years had passed since Appomattox and more than twenty years had passed since white Northerners had given up the fight to force Southern governments to recognize their African American residents as equal citizens under the law, the time was right for open displays of post-Civil War reunion. One of the reasons for this may have been the high number of Civil War veterans, both Union and Confederate, among the military and political leaders who coordinated the Spanish-American War. Most of the highest-ranking military commanders had served in the Union Army during the Civil War, including Secretary of War Russell A. Alger, Major General Nelson A. Miles, who was appointed Commanding General of the United States Army, and Major General William Rufus Shafter, who was in charge of land operations in Cuba.[353] Even President McKinley was a Civil War veteran: he had volunteered as a private in the 23rd Ohio Infantry, and was promoted to brevet major by the end of the war. McKinley was the last Civil War veteran to serve as President of the United States.

Among the former Confederates, Major General Fitzhugh Lee and Major General Joseph Wheeler achieved the greatest degree of prominence. Lee, a former Confederate cavalry commander and nephew of Robert E. Lee, became the United States consul at Havana and later a major general of volunteers. Nina Silber has noted

[353] Traxel, *1898*, 159.

that various contemporaries saw him as an embodiment of Southern honor and chivalry and a knightly figure on horseback.[354] A widely circulated stereograph sold by Underwood and Underwood of New York shows Lee on a horse entering Havana in triumph on January 1, 1899, and it is easy to see the image of his famous uncle in his bearded visage (figure 5.2). Only the color of the uniform reminds the viewer that this is a different General Lee. Another former Confederate to don the blue United States uniform, Joseph Wheeler, gave up a seat in Congress to assume command of the cavalry in Cuba. Sixty-one years old, Wheeler had also served in the Confederate cavalry, and President McKinley saw his appointment in explicitly political terms, wanting a Southern general as a symbol of sectional reunion. Wheeler's appointment proved a popular one, and his adjustment to the blue uniform spawned several oft-repeated and possibly apocryphal tales, as when he supposedly cried during a rout of Spanish troops at the Battle of Las Guasimas, "We've got the damn Yankees on the run!"[355] Stereographs of General Wheeler proved just as popular as those of Lee, as in an example that shows him standing with other famous commanders from the war, including Colonel Theodore Roosevelt (figure 5.3). For Southerners, the presence of Lee and Wheeler among the ranks of the war's top commanders fostered a sense of sectional pride in the region's ability to respond to the nation's military needs.[356]

---

[354] Nina Silber, *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 183.

[355] Traxel, *1898*, 144, 180-181.

[356] Paul T. McCartney, *Power and Progress: American National Identity, the War of 1898, and the Rise of American Imperialism* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006), 150-151.

While Civil War veterans led the fight against Spain, the rank-and-file soldiers who followed them were often the sons of veterans, hoping to win glory equal to the stories told by their fathers. In many Northern towns, the Grand Army of the Republic, the main Union veterans' organization, was an important locus for social interaction, with pageants and displays that kept Civil War memory alive. For instance, in April of 1898, the GAR chapter in Washington, Iowa held a campfire meeting encouraging attendees to make connections between the war with Spain and the glorious battlefields of the Civil War, but also to see Southern soldiers as partners in fighting for American interests.[357] In Kansas after months of army encampment without seeing the front, a regiment of college students returned home to great fanfare. The sight of these young men in their blue uniforms must have been poignant for the GAR veterans who escorted them on their parade through town.[358] Meanwhile, young white Southerners were motivated by similar desires to live up to the deeds of their fathers, and, further, to prove that Southern soldiers could be loyal when their nation needed them. Former Confederates and their sons also felt an affinity with the cause of the Cuban insurrectionists fighting for freedom from the rule of Spain: they saw the Cubans' struggle as related to the American Revolution and to their interpretation of the Civil War as a war for Southern independence. That enthusiasm was somewhat

---

[357] George William McDaniel, "Martial Sons of Martial Sires," *Palimpsest* 70, no. 1 (1989): 33-34.

[358] Dragosani-Brantingham, "Proud Are We," 115.

tempered by the fact that so many Cubans were not white, but in the months before the outbreak of war, the rhetoric of freedom prevailed.[359]

The legacy of the Civil War was carried not only by the individuals who were connected with it, but also the locations where battles had been fought or soldiers had been remembered. With the Spanish-American War, some of these sites took on a new layer of memory. One of these was the battlefield at Chickamauga, which became the site of Camp Thomas, one of the most notoriously disease-ridden stateside army camps for volunteers. The Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park was dedicated in 1895, and it quickly became a site for new memorials to the events of the Civil War, with monument industry trade journals and veterans' magazines buzzing about the park's possibilities. A year later, Congress authorized the army to use Chickamauga and other military parks as training and camping grounds for troops, with the reasoning that the terrain of famous Civil War battles could serve important instructional aims.[360] When war with Spain broke out, the battlefield's rolling hills and access to important rail lines made it a desirable location for the concentration of regular army units for deployment to Cuba, and Camp Thomas was formed under the command of Brigadier General Henry V. Boynton to serve this purpose. The newly-established camp proved adequate for the assembly and deployment of regulars, but

---

[359] Marshall Schott, "East Texas and the Coming of the Spanish-American War: An Examination of Regional Values," *East Texas Historical Journal* 37, no. 2 (1999): 46-48; Susan S. Wolfe, "Arkansas and the Spanish-American War," *The Ozark Historical Review* 2 (1973): 40.

[360] Richard A. Sauers, "From Hallowed Ground to Training Ground: Chickamauga's Camp Thomas, 1898," *Civil War Regiments: A Journal of the American Civil War* 7, no. 1 (2007): 129.

conditions broke down when the camp was crowded with volunteers unfamiliar with the principles of military sanitation and hygiene.[361] The layering of Civil War and Spanish-American War memory on the Chickamauga site can be seen in ephemera from Camp Thomas, including a postal envelope issued for soldiers' correspondence (figure 5.4). The design on the envelope depicts a soldier in Spanish-American War uniform standing at parade rest beneath crossed flags of the United States and Cuba. Behind him floats the U.S.S. *Maine*, reminding viewers of the immediate cause of the war. Beneath the scene is an inscription: "Camp George H. Thomas, Chickamauga Park, Lytle, Georgia." While the Civil War is not explicitly referenced, the very medium of the patriotic postal envelope, which saw its heyday during the Civil War but declined in popularity during the postbellum years, would have recalled soldiers' letters from an earlier time.[362] Further, the name of the famous Chickamauga battlefield would have evoked the earlier conflict, and the soldier's resting pose connects the volunteer of the more recent war to the Civil War soldier monuments that were already dominating the American landscape.

Camp Thomas on the Chickamauga battlefield is the most obvious geographical intersection between the wars of the 1860s and of 1898, but other resonances occurred as well. Most of the army mobilization camps were located in Southern states, giving Northern and Midwestern farm boys their first taste of

---

[361] Gregory Dean Chapman, "Army Life at Camp Thomas, Georgia, During the Spanish-American War," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 70, no. 4 (Winter 1986): 634-636, 639-644.

[362] See Steven R. Boyd, *Patriotic Envelopes of the Civil War: The Iconography of Union and Confederate Covers* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2010), 104-106.

Southern culture. Traveling through the pathways of the Civil War, these sons of Union veterans revisited ground on which their fathers had trod thirty years earlier. During the months of war and in the celebrations of victory over Spain that followed, civic spaces that had been set aside for Confederate memory became locations for white soldiers from the North and South to congregate. One of the most significant events of this type occurred on June 16, 1898, when Northern and Southern soldiers from Camp Cuba Libre in Jacksonville, Florida jointly participated in a ceremony to dedicate a Confederate monument in a downtown park. Fitzhugh Lee attended the festivities alongside a grandson of Ulysses S. Grant, and speakers at the dedication took up the theme of reconciliation in their remarks.[363] A photograph of the downtown plaza taken about a decade after the unveiling shows a tall column topped by a soldier in kepi and overcoat, similar to so many monuments that were erected in Northern and Southern cities in the decades after the Civil War (figure 5.5). Meanwhile, in December of 1898, President McKinley went on a speaking tour through Georgia and Alabama to raise support for the ratification of the treaty with Spain. While on his tour, he spoke in front of Confederate monuments in several cities, including Macon, Georgia, where the stern, walrus-mustached statue erected by the Muldoon Monument Company served as a backdrop for a scene where confederate veterans waved both the Stars and Stripes and the Confederate flag (see Chapter 2). All of this recognition of Confederate memory was not lost on the editors of black newspapers, who worried what all this reconciliation between white Americans would mean for their struggle for civil rights.[364] Indeed, several black regiments assigned to encampments near the

---

[363] McDaniel, "Martial Sons of Martial Sires," 40-41.

[364] Gleijeses, "African Americans and the War Against Spain," 205-206.

city of Macon encountered deep antipathy from the local white population, and it is fitting to remember that Macon was the model for the fictional town in Walter White's novel *The Fire in the Flint*.[365] Symbolic gestures of sectional reunion in the context of the Spanish-American War were for white Americans only.

A photographic tableau staged by Fritz W. Guerin illustrates how the potential for reunion and cooperation among white Americans was visualized through the Spanish-American War (figure 5.6). Guerin was a St. Louis photographer and Civil War veteran who enlisted in the army at the age of fifteen and won a Congressional Medal of Honor for bravery during the siege of Vicksburg in 1863.[366] His military experience may have influenced his desire to illustrate the potentially restorative properties of the war with Spain. Staged in 1898, the photograph shows two grizzled old soldiers of the Civil War, one Union and one Confederate, meeting to shake hands in front of a girlish Cuba. The men mirror and complement one another in costumes that are nearly identical save for the color scheme: the Confederate's light uniform and dark whiskers invert the white whiskers and dark raiment of his Union counterpart. Both men wear double-breasted frock coats, the formal uniform for officers, and each carries a saber at his right side. And each man is similarly capped in the Hardee hat that was much more common in a Confederate than a Union context. Despite their symbiotic costumes, the men do not meet each other's eyes; while the venerable Union general looks directly into the face of his former foe, the Confederate gazes off

---

[365] Alexander, "No Officers, No Fight," 188-189.

[366] "Capt. F.W. Guerin," *St. Louis and Canadian Photographer* 27, no. 1 (January 1903): 23; "Obituary: Fritz W. Guerin," *The Photographic Times Bulletin* 35, no. 9 (September 1903): 407.

to his right. Their handshake is blessed by a slim blonde girl, whose long ringlets are capped with a crown labeled "Cuba." The broken manacles dangling from her wrists symbolize Cuba's freedom won through white Northern and Southern reconciliation. And behind the trio, two draped American flags part to reveal the flag of Cuba dangling between them. No longer identified by the Confederate flag, the Southern veteran joins his Northern counterpart in a new conflict.

This photograph has rightly been cited by many scholars as a visual illustration of the concept of sectional reunion as understood during the Spanish-American War. David Traxel includes it alongside a discussion of the appointment of Confederate veterans to important military posts.[367] Nina Silber uses it in her study of how the reunion between the North and the South was often understood in the context of marriage and gender, and points out that the Spanish-American War was a moment in which Northerners gained a new respect for white Southerners' views on manliness, honor, and military valor.[368] Bonnie Miller interprets the photograph as part of a larger discussion of the war propaganda that visualized American intervention in Cuba as the rescue of a helpless white female. In Guerin's image, the pretty blonde angel who blesses the reunion of North and South would have been a particular target for the affection of sentimental viewers.[369]

---

[367] Traxel, *1898*, 144-145.

[368] Silber, *The Romance of Reunion*, 178-185.

[369] Bonnie M. Miller, *From Liberation to Conquest: The Visual and Popular Cultures of the Spanish-American War of 1898* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011), 118-119.

But perhaps unwittingly, the photograph also betrays some of the underlying tensions in this moment of reunion. As previously noted, the eyes of the former adversaries do not meet, betraying the sectional divisions that marked even this moment of reunion. And the soldiers who shake hands in this tableau are from an earlier era, too old and stout for military service. It is up to their sons to provide the blood sacrifice necessary to bring these two relics to accord. The monuments to this generation's sacrifice would build on the memorial ideas from the Civil War, reflecting changing conditions of warfare and evolving conceptions of American manhood.

Monuments to the Conflict – Conception and Iconography

The war with Spain broke out at the end of a decade that saw increasing numbers of civic monuments to Civil War veterans dedicated throughout the United States each year, honoring the soldiers of both the North and the South. As the veterans of the conflict grew older, and as more and more of them passed away, the drive to commemorate their service became more and more imperative. Gettysburg was declared the first National Military Park in 1895, and more battlefields quickly followed, inviting veterans' organizations to place monuments within their confines. Augustus Saint-Gaudens' monument to Robert Gould Shaw and the Massachusetts 54th Regiment, the first Civil War monument to black soldiers, was dedicated on May 31, 1897, less than a year before the outbreak of war. William James, the orator on that occasion, was an outspoken anti-imperialist who went on to oppose the war with

Spain and the acquisition of the Philippines.[370] And this surge in monument building was seen in the South as well as the North – Elberton, Georgia unveiled its ill-fated "Dutchy" two weeks after Theodore Roosevelt and his Rough Riders made their famous charge at San Juan Hill. All of this commemorative activity meant that there was an industry that was well prepared and equipped to meet the memorial needs of a new conflict, and the soldiers who returned home from the Caribbean, the Philippines, and camps within the United States had many options to consider in procuring memorials to their service.

One of the earliest monuments to the Spanish-American War was erected in Los Angeles, California on May 30, 1900 (figure 5.7). Designed to honor the twenty-one volunteers from California's Seventh Regiment who died of disease while waiting to deploy from the Presidio in San Francisco, the all-granite monument employs the visual tropes of citizen soldiers' memorials established after the Civil War. The sculpted infantryman stands at perfectly precise parade rest, with his eyes facing directly forward and his right foot slightly in front of his left. His head and face, with full moustache, generalized features, and broad-brimmed hat, look very much like the features of the Civil War statues popularized by firms such as the Monumental Bronze Company. The monument was designed by S.M. Goddard of the local architectural firm Goddard and Kilpatrick, with the base manufactured from California granite and the statue sculpted from Vermont granite. This monument was the first of many to memorialize soldiers from a regiment that had experienced a much different war than

---

[370] Michael Patrick Cullinane, *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism, 1898-1909* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 156; Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves*, 204-207.

it expected, fighting the demons of boredom and disease rather than Spanish or Filipino forces.[371] As was true of most monuments for volunteer units in the Spanish-American War, the Los Angeles monument uses the same martial imagery as expected for soldiers' memorials, leaving the reality of the Seventh Regiment's wartime service to written sources. This is not entirely unprecedented, as the soldier monuments of the Civil War honored not only the battlefield dead but also the soldiers who died of disease in hospitals or in enemy prison camps. But like so many volunteer regiments in the Spanish-American War, the Seventh Regiment never saw combat at all. For these volunteers, the traditional soldier monument placed a normalized heroic representation on their unexpected and disappointing wartime experience.

Other monuments quickly followed the Los Angeles statue, as sculptors and foundries who had gained experience through Civil War memorials turned their attention to the needs of the new conflict. One of these individuals was Melzar Hunt Mosman, the foundry worker turned sculptor who began his career casting bronzes for the Ames Manufacturing Company in Chicopee, Massachusetts before opening his own foundry and marketing "original" designs for Civil War monuments, several of which were suspiciously similar to works by Martin Milmore and others (see Chapter 2). In 1902, Mosman teamed with the Boston foundry T.F. McGann and Sons to provide a Spanish-American War monument for the town square in Clinton, Massachusetts (figure 5.8). The Clinton men were members of the Ninth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, one of three volunteer units from Massachusetts

---

[371] Di Donato, "The Forgotten Regiment," 355-376.

that saw action in Cuba.[372] The monument depicts a soldier in uniform on the march, striding forward with his rifle over his shoulder and his bedroll slung across his chest. Like the *Hiker* statues that Theo Alice Ruggles Kitson and Allen George Newman would later produce, the figure displays a casualness of dress and pose that is a departure from earlier Civil War monuments. The assertive forward step of Mosman's figure is reminiscent of Daniel Chester French's *Minute Man*, which was cast by the Ames Manufacturing Company while Mosman was working there. This nod to French's statue, which was rooted in both Revolutionary War and Civil War commemoration, ties the soldiers of the Spanish-American War to the full history of the citizen soldier. This moderately successful design elicited at least six copies, all of which are in nearby towns that also contributed troops to the same Massachusetts regiment.[373]

Highly successful monument firms that had marketed mass-produced and relatively inexpensive statues through the late nineteenth century also turned their attention toward the Spanish-American War. The W.H. Mullins Company included a Spanish-American War infantryman in their 1913 catalogue *Statues in Stamped Copper and Bronze*, although no examples of this statue in a memorial setting have been located (figure 5.9).[374] While this prototype wears a uniform with specific

[372] Mark R. Barnes, *The Spanish-American War and Philippine Insurrection, 1898-1902: An Annotated Bibliography* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 166.

[373] The Smithsonian's Inventory of American Sculpture lists six other examples of this statue, erected in Springfield, Mass. (1906); Gardner, Mass. (1915); Leominster, Mass. (1929); Lawrence, Mass. (1941); and Lowell, Mass. (1958).

[374] *The Blue and the Gray: Statues in Stamped Copper and Bronze* (Salem, Oh.: W.H. Mullins Co., 1913), 60.

hallmarks of the campaign in Cuba, especially the drill blouse with two breast pockets and the H-shaped cartridge belt, the buttoned-up formality and stiff posture of the figure owe more to the Civil War than the naturalistic poses that Newman and Kitson would adopt for their figures. Meanwhile, in Spearfish, South Dakota in 1900, the Western White Bronze Company premiered a ramrod-straight Spanish-American War soldier at parade rest in formal uniform that may have looked backward even more explicitly (figure 5.10). This company, a Midwestern subsidiary of the Monumental Bronze Company and purveyor of zinc sculpture, may have worked quickly to adapt existing stock to the needs of the new conflict. As Carol Grissom has suggested, the figure's mustachioed head is rather eerily similar to the head of the most popular Confederate statue marketed by the Monumental Bronze Company.[375]

In both iconography and means of production, these two statues reflect a nineteenth-century sensibility. Never particularly prestigious, the companies that produced public monuments from stamped bronze or zinc lost their hold on the monument market within the first few decades of the twentieth century, as the outcry against inexpensive statuary from the elite art world received more and more attention. In addition, the backward-looking and stuffily formal uniforms depicted by these statues would soon be replaced by more practical and casual wear. Even the heavy mustaches worn by the figures would soon fall out of favor – the last President of the United States to wear facial hair, William Howard Taft, was out of office by 1913. The clean-shaven, square-jawed faces of the monuments designed during the same

---

[375] Grissom, *Zinc Sculpture in America*, 540, 663.

years by Theo Kitson and Allen Newman would signal a change in the conception of the ideal American male.

The case against mass-produced memorials and for unique works of art, often argued by art critics, can be seen in a few fine examples. As was the case after the Civil War, the Spanish-American War provided opportunities for established sculptors to secure commissions for major works of outdoor sculpture. One of these was Bela Lyon Pratt, who sculpted a soldier figure in 1902 that was cast by the Henry-Bonnard Bronze Company and dedicated in Concord, New Hampshire on June 6, 1906 (figure 5.11). Born in 1864, Pratt was a sculptor and teacher living in Boston who was known for his abilities in portraiture, ideal sculpture, and architectural decoration. As a young artist, he studied at the Art Students' League in New York and the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris, returning to the United States in time to contribute sculptural decoration to the World's Columbian Exposition in 1893. Pratt's monument for Concord was placed at St. Paul's School, a college preparatory school for the sons of the Northeast's most elite businessmen and politicians. When the Spanish-American War broke out, the school responded with enthusiasm, and one hundred and twenty of the school's students and alumni volunteered for the war. The sculpture honoring them shows a pensive, beardless young officer standing with arms folded and hat in hand, gazing directly forward into the distance. An article in *New England Magazine* by art critic William Howe Downes on Pratt's career praised the statue as a "manly, athletic, adventurous young soldier, precisely such a type of the American volunteer as might be supposed to come from the universities and higher schools of the country in response to the call of the nation in war time." Perhaps it was this aristocratic air that further encouraged Downes to laud the sculpture as an example of the sort of

271

memorial statuary that artists in the United States should be producing in honor of American soldiers. He writes:

> How infinitely superior are monuments of this caliber to the countless mediocrities that do duty in the guise of soldiers' memorials in nearly every city and town of the land. How much better it would have been to wait until a generation of artists should arise to fitly commemorate the great deeds of their fathers. The time must come when it will be universally realized that it is doing scanty honor to brave men to erect paltry and pitiable monuments to them, but that the quality of the art in the memorial must match the quality of the heroism to which it is a testimony and of which it is a symbol.[376]

The voices of critics like Downes who discouraged mass-produced soldier monuments in favor of unique commissions by highly trained artists became increasingly clamorous through the early decades of the twentieth centurywith the establishment of the National Sculpture Society and the resulting professionalization of American sculptors.[377] Pratt's memorial is an example of the kind of monument that they wanted. As the nation's taste in art changed through two catastrophic world wars and the resulting exposure to European modernism, these critics had their way. But in the wake of the Spanish-American War, a transitional system for providing war memorials took shape, combining the name recognition of respected artists with the replicative processes of the nineteenth century.[378]

---

[376] William Howe Downes, "The Work of Bela L. Pratt, Sculptor," *New England Magazine* 27, no. 6 (February 1903): 770-771.

[377] Bogart, *Public Sculpture and the Civic Ideal*, 47-55.

[378] Wayne Craven, *Sculpture in America* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1968, reprint: 1984), 495-497; Lorado Taft, *The History of American Sculpture* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1903, reprint: 1930), 491-494.

Two sculptors, Theo Alice Ruggles Kitson and Allen George Newman, dominated the market for Spanish-American War monuments through this combination of name recognition and replication. Both well-regarded young sculptors associated with fine art circles in Boston and New York, respectively, their *Hiker* designs account for more than seventy-five of the existing monument to the War of 1898 nationwide. These artists produced well-regarded statues for individual locations that were later adopted by commercial foundries and sold throughout the United States. The statues are a step above the products of the Monumental Bronze Company and other companies that dominated Civil War memorial work; the monuments are produced in bronze rather than the cheaper zinc or granite, and they are almost always stamped with the name of the artist. Further, the statues were always marketed with the artist's identity intact. With these features, the statues are odd hybrids of the mass-production of the nineteenth century and the focus on individual works and artists that came to dominate the art world of the twentieth century.

In some ways, Theo Alice Ruggles Kitson was an unlikely candidate for a career in military-themed public sculpture. Born in Brookline, Massachusetts in 1871, she experienced a New England girlhood that might have been familiar to many of the women sculptors of an earlier generation, including Harriet Hosmer and Anne Whitney, who tried their luck at an artistic career abroad. When Theo was fifteen, her mother, Anna Holmes Ruggles, attempted to enroll her in the Boston Museum School to study sculpture, only to be turned away due to her age and gender. Anna Ruggles then enlisted the tutelage of Henry Hudson Kitson, a twenty-one year old English sculptor just beginning his career in Boston. In 1887, young Theo and her mother went to Paris to further her education, and Henry Kitson went with them, setting up his own

studio in Paris. Over the next few years, Theo exhibited several works at the Paris Salon and the Universal Exposition of 1889, and in 1890 her sculpture *Young Orpheus* won an honorable mention at the Paris Salon. In 1891, Theo Ruggles and Henry Kitson announced their engagement, and they were married on June 29, 1893 in a wedding that attracted significant attention in the Boston society papers. The story of a handsome, successful sculptor falling in love with his pretty young pupil proved an attractive one for area readers.[379]

Through her early career and marriage, Theo Ruggles' artistic character was shaped through a series of newspaper articles that combined tales of innate "genius" reminiscent of Vasari with specific allusions to her identity as a young lady. Her youth and femininity were particular targets of lavish press attention detailing her accomplishments. An article in the *Boston Globe* from November 1889, titled "A Boston Girl's Genius," described Theo's education and early career, attributing her inspiration to take up sculpting to an afternoon when she discovered an embankment of malleable clay while on a visit to the beach with her family. The article's author especially lauded her "rare genius and skill as a sculptor, combined with a seriousness and enthusiasm in her art remarkable for one so young in years." These stories of sculptural precociousness link the young Theo with her male counterparts, including Daniel Chester French, with his lions molded from snow and frogs carved from turnips (see Chapter 4). But as Wendy Bellion has demonstrated in her work on wax sculptor Patience Wright, "genius" in a woman could also be problematic. Often considered to be the prerogative of men, a woman's "genius" could be masculinizing,

---

[379] Charlotte Streifer Rubinstein, *American Women Sculptors: A History of Women Working in Three Dimensions* (Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1990), 102-103.

and Wright's gender was often discussed in ambiguous terms.[380] But the *Boston Globe* writer took pains to highlight Theo Ruggles' girlhood as well as her genius, in both word and image. Accompanying the article was a wood engraving showing Theo in the midst of modeling a bust (figure 5.12). With chisel in hand, the slim young lady with unpinned dark hair turns a serious eye toward the viewer.[381]

Another article from about the same time, titled "A Girl Sculptor," employs a similar strategy in describing the young sculptor's appearance: "She is a graceful girl with very striking features. Her dark, curly hair is usually tossed over one shoulder, and her eyes are dark and piercing."[382] For this writer, Theo Ruggles' image as a beautiful young woman carries as much weight as her achievements in art. That interest carries over into articles concerning her engagement and marriage to Henry Kitson. Many of the articles stress that the wedding unites "the pupil with the master," although they also recognize Theo's abilities as a sculptor in her own right. One clipping that appeared shortly after their marriage recognizes the Kitsons as one of a series of "Real Love Stories" and opens with a particularly flowery statement (figure 5.13):

---

[380] Wendy Bellion, "Patience Wright's Transatlantic Bodies," in *Shaping the Body Politic: Art and Political Formation in Early America*, Maurie McInnis and Louis P. Nelson, eds. (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011), 29-30.

[381] "A Boston Girl's Genius: Miss Theo Alice Ruggles and Her Work as a Sculptor," *Boston Globe*, November 10, 1889.

[382] "A Girl Sculptor," undated article from Kitson family scrapbook, Henry Hudson and Theo Alice Ruggles Kitson Papers, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Since time immemorial masters have fallen in love with their pupils, yet never in a more romantic way or with more speedy results than when Henry Hudson Kitson fell in love with Theo Ruggles and wooed and won her within a few weeks of the time when she first came to his studio to learn to be a sculptor.[383]

Throughout her career, the newspaper coverage of Kitson's efforts juxtaposed her identity as a sculptor of note with her identities as a woman and wife. Occasionally, her position as the former pupil of her sculptor husband caused some sources to cast doubt on her authorship of certain works, and attribution of statues can become murky. It is possible that some of these issues may have caused tension in the Kitsons' marriage: the two sculptors eventually separated in 1909.[384]

After she married Henry Kitson, Theo Kitson continued to build her career and to receive accolades for her public monuments and other sculptural works, becoming the first woman elected to the National Sculpture Society in 1895. In 1902, she embarked on her first foray into the sculpting of citizen soldier monuments, the field for which she would be most widely remembered. This first soldier memorial was a

---

[383] "Real Love Stories, No. 8: The Kitsons," undated article from Kitson family scrapbook, Henry Hudson and Theo Alice Ruggles Kitson Papers, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution. See also "Miss Ruggles Affianced to H.H. Kitson," *Boston Globe* December 2, 1889; "The Pupil Weds the Master: Miss Theo Alice Ruggles the Wife of Sculptor Kitson," *Boston Herald*, June 20, 1893; "Sculptors Wed: Theo Alice Ruggles Now Mrs. Henry H. Kitson," *Boston Globe*, June 30 1893.

[384] For instance, the *Minute Man* in Framingham, Massachusetts, depicting a blacksmith leaving his forge to go to war, is sometimes credited to both Kitsons, even though only Theo Kitson is listed as the author on the base of the sculpture. See Rubinstein, *American Women Sculptors*, 105; Taft, *History of American Sculpture*, 490; Laurie Evans-Daly and David C. Gordon, *Images of America: Framingham* (Charleston, S.C.: Arcadia Publishing, 1997), 42; David B. Dearinger, *Painting and Sculpture in the Collection of the National Academy of Design* (Manchester, Vt.: Hudson Hills Press, 2004), 335.

Civil War monument for the town of Newburyport, Massachusetts (figure 5.14). Titled *The Volunteer*, it depicts a Union soldier in the informal sack coat worn by most Civil War infantryman, with trousers tucked into his socks, trudging along on a march with his rifle slung across his proper right shoulder. Instead of the customary granite pedestal, the statue stands upon a rough-cut boulder, a trope that the Kitsons used again and again in their Revolutionary, Civil War, and Spanish-American War figures. This portrayal of a Union soldier is a clear departure from the Civil War soldier monuments erected during the previous decades, adopting instead the active posture of Daniel Chester French's *Minute Man*. While most soldier statues featured sentinels standing quietly at parade rest in smoothly tailored uniforms, Kitson's soldier could easily be imagined on the march in the midst of a difficult military campaign, his garments creased and rumpled after weeks of sleeping on the ground and rushing into skirmishes with the enemy. Upon its unveiling, the statue was positively received as a more naturalistic alternative to the typical soldier monument, and the *Boston Globe* in particular praised Kitson for choosing to "completely ignore the conventional type of the private…nearly always seen standing at parade rest," and to include anecdotal details such as the tucked trousers and rumpled blouse.[385] With the Newburyport *Volunteer*, Kitson clearly places herself within the trend toward naturalism in sculpture, and her approach to costuming her Civil War soldier is reminiscent of Saint-Gaudens' statue of Admiral Farragut and especially the trudging men of the 54th Massachusetts Regiment as seen in the *Shaw Memorial*. Kitson's soldier is a man of duty, dressed practically for the march.

---

[385] "Has Great Genius: Mrs. Theo Ruggles Kitson One of World's Best Sculptors," *Boston Globe,* July 4, 1902.

But even while praising Kitson for her work, the *Boston Globe* also assured its readers that the young artist was too modest to give a speech at the unveiling of her statue, and that "although her artistic work is known for its rugged, masculine strength, if there is one thing more…for which she is loved by those who know her, it is the distinctively feminine character of her whole personality."[386] Again, Kitson's artistic "genius" was couched in language that clearly identified her as a lady. Kitson sometimes traded on public perceptions of her femininity, giving interviews about her happy home life or dispensing fashion advice in newspaper columns, but she also played with ambiguity, sometimes signing her works T.A.R. Kitson to conceal her gender. Her sometimes precarious position in the art world is made evident by commentary published by Lorado Taft a few years after the unveiling of *The Volunteer*. He writes:

> In the presence of this spirited and ably composed work one is almost compelled to qualify the somewhat sweeping assertion that no woman has as yet modeled the male figure to look like a man. If not a powerful man, the "Volunteer" is at least a most satisfactory representation of adolescent youth.[387]

In choosing to sculpt soldier monuments, Kitson faced many of the same gendered prejudices that her predecessors in earlier decades had suffered. But her performance of proper womanhood must have reassured her potential clients, because she was invited to return to the theme of men at arms again and again. With her design

---

[386] Ibid.

[387] Taft, *History of American Sculpture*, 490-491.

for a Spanish-American war monument, she created an icon that encapsulated notions about white American masculinity at the turn of the twentieth century.

Kitson's first *Hiker* figure was dedicated on Memorial Day, 1906 at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis (figure 5.15). The monument was erected in honor of 218 young men from the university, nine of whom lost their lives, who enlisted in the fight against Spain. Many of these joined the Thirteenth Minnesota, a unit that served out the war in the Philippines. Like many volunteer units, the Thirteenth Minnesota saw little in the way of front-line action. Organized in May 1898, shortly after President McKinley's massive call for volunteers, the regiment was quickly sent to San Francisco in preparation for embarkation to the Philippines. From San Francisco, they traveled to Hawaii and then on to the Philippines, reaching Manila by July 31. But by the time they arrived, hostilities with Spain had all but ended, and they played only a small part in the Philippine conflict that followed.

Agitation for a monument to the student veterans of the conflict began shortly after the war ended, led by Professor Arthur E. Haynes, and by 1904, the university had enlisted Kitson's services in designing a statue.[388] In the years leading up to the statue's unveiling, Professor Haynes worked tirelessly to raise the $5000 necessary to erect the monument and to advance Theo Kitson's reputation as an accomplished sculptor of military figures.[389] In March 1906, he penned a report for the *Minneapolis Journal* detailing his recent visit to the Kitson studio in Quincy, Massachusetts. On

---

[388] Tim Brady, *Gopher Gold: Legendary Figures, Brilliant Blunders, and Amazing Feats at the University of Minnesota* (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 2007), 141-148.

[389] "Money is Raised for Memorial," *Minneapolis Journal*, April 19, 1905.

seeing the *Hiker* for the first time, he writes: "It is a beautiful, inspiring figure which I hope may long stand to teach that there are some things better than life, and that it is only as one dedicates himself to these, he wins an immortality of righteous influence."[390] Kitson's Minnesota monument was received with favorable commentary, and the design would go on to become the most replicated statue of the Spanish-American War. It would be more than fifteen years before the copying of Kitson's *Hiker* would begin in earnest, however, and in the intervening years, another soldier monument dedicated to the war with Spain came to national prominence.

The sculptor of the era's other highly successful Spanish-American War soldier figure was Allen George Newman. Born on August 28, 1975 to hardware manufacturer Allen George Newman, Sr., and his wife Ada E. Hinde, young Newman grew up in New York City and attended City College and the National Academy of Design. When war with Spain broke out in the wake of the Maine explosion, Newman was twenty-two years old and eligible for military service. But while other young men of his generation volunteered for the army and languished in stateside camps, Newman stayed in New York, taking advantage of a rare apprenticeship in the studio of John Quincy Adams Ward. Newman apprenticed with Ward from 1897 until 1901, during which time Ward worked on several public commissions, including the Dewey Arch, cast from staff in New York's Madison Square in honor of Admiral George Dewey's victory at the Battle of Manila Bay and featuring sculpture by several of the city's most celebrated artists. Observing the enthusiastic collaboration that produced this monument must have served as an opportunity for the young sculptor to consider how

---

[390] Arthur E. Haynes, "The Work of Two Famous Artists," *Minneapolis Journal*, March 2, 1906.

he would make his own contribution to the shaping of Spanish-American War memory.[391]

Newman first sculpted his *Hiker* for the rotunda of the New York State Building at the Jamestown Exposition in Norfolk, Virginia in 1907 (figure 5.16).[392] Organized along the same vein as the multitude of world's fairs and universal expositions that had occupied cities in the United States and France for decades before the turn of the twentieth century, the Jamestown Exposition marked the tercentennial of the founding of the Jamestown colony in Virginia in 1607. More than most fairs, the exposition focused especially on the accomplishments and spectacle of America's armed forces, and as such a *Hiker* from the Spanish-American War was an appropriate choice of iconography. For his contribution to the fair, Newman designed a lone soldier figure on a low pedestal, with eyes cast downward. Clad in what one period writer called "the regulation uniform of the State's militia," the figure wears garments that would have been common for all Spanish-American War soldiers, not just New Yorkers.[393] These included a khaki blouse, slouch hat creased in a modified Montana peak, trousers, boots, leggings, and a cartridge belt with the distinctive H-shaped buckle. The blouse is open at the neck by several buttons and creased outwards,

[391] "Allen G. Newman, 65, Sculptor, Is Dead," *New York Times*, February 4, 1940; David B. Dearinger, ed., *Painting and Sculpture in the Collection of the National Academy of Design* (New York: Hudson Hills Press, 2004), 368; "Striking Soldier Statue. Mr. Newman's Fine Work for New York Building at Jamestown," *Washington Bee*, August 10, 1907; Bogart, *Public Sculpture and the Civic Ideal*, 97-110.

[392] "Striking Soldier Statue. Mr. Newman's Fine Work for New York Building at Jamestown." *Washington Bee*, August 10, 1907.

[393] Cuyler Reynolds, *New York at the Jamestown Exposition, Norfolk, Virginia, April 26 to December 1, 1907* (Albany, N.Y.: J.B. Lyon Company, 1909), 197.

suggesting the exigencies of army service in tropical heat. Likewise, the sleeves are rolled up, revealing burly and sinewy forearms. The figure's stance is casual, with the left hand placed on the hip with arm akimbo, balanced by a forward step with the right foot that gives the soldier's body a slouching and stylized S-curve. In his left arm, the figure cradles his Krag-Jørgensen rifle, with the barrel pointed diagonally up and to the figure's right. From the front, the rifle barrel's angle echoes the jaunty slant of the slouch hat, and from the side, a similar effect occurs, with the rifle emphasizing the statue's downward gaze. The rough surface treatment of the figure's clothing and skin and the meticulous delineation of muscles and veins speak to a style of realism that was not prevalent in many of the smoothly modeled soldiers of the Civil War era. Newman's rugged soldier is the product of a moment in which the artist's individuality in producing a soldier monument was increasingly desired and valued.

On its appearance at the Jamestown Exposition, Newman's Spanish-American War soldier received a fair amount of positive press attention that may have bolstered its later success as a stock figure. Several newspapers, including the *Washington Bee* and the *Kansas City Star*, ran versions of article praising Newman for his achievement and offering a wood engraving of the statue. The *Washington Bee*'s version of the illustration shows the statue against a mottled black background, possibly suggesting trees, and surrounded by a laurel-decorated oval frame (figure 5.17). In the drawing, the dramatic S-curve of the body and the downcast gaze are tempered somewhat into an erect figure that seems to stare outward at the viewer. Both articles end by praising Newman's statue for "a quality that is very valuable in sculpture subjects of this kind –

repose, which yet suggests ample capacity for action."[394] Looking back at New York's presence at the Jamestown Exposition a few years later, Cuyder Reynolds remembered that the statue was the centerpiece of a "spacious, square hall" and that it "never failed to receive flattering comment."[395] Years later, Lorado Taft remembered that critics had called Newman's *Hiker* "the best bronze soldier in America," although Taft, not uncharacteristically, failed to name his source.[396] This early enthusiasm paved the way for later success in marketing the figure.

Newman's *Hiker* at the Jamestown Exposition appeared in an environment filled with displays dedicated to American military and imperial might, which had been strongly reinforced in the recent war with Spain. The United States' naval power had been extremely important in forcing Spain to surrender, and the Navy was on view at the fair, with demonstrations of lifesaving techniques and ships docked at the fairground for review. Military displays also looked back to the Civil War past, with entertainments and assemblages depicting the battle between the *Merrimac* and the *Monitor* and the battle of Gettysburg.[397] On the opening day of the fair, President

---

[394] "A Striking Soldier Statue: Mr. Newman's Fine Work for the New York Building at Jamestown, *Kansas City Star*, June 19, 1907; "Striking Soldier Statue. Mr. Newman's Fine Work for New York Building at Jamestown." *Washington Bee*, August 10, 1907.

[395] Reynolds, *New York at the Jamestown Exposition*, 197.

[396] Taft, *History of American Sculpture*, 570.

[397] Carl Abbott, "Norfolk in the New Century: The Jamestown Exposition and Urban Boosterism," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 85, no. 1 (January 1977): 88; Frederic W. Gleach, "Pocahontas at the Fair: Crafting Identities at the 1907 Jamestown Exposition," *Ethnohistory* 50, no. 3 (Summer 2003): 425.

Theodore Roosevelt, himself a war hero of the Rough Riders, was greeted by three lines of warships, each successively offering up a twenty-one gun salute.[398]

In fact, the militarism at the Jamestown Exposition was so pronounced that it inspired vociferous protest in the *Advocate of Peace*, the official journal of the American Peace Society. In the months leading up to the exhibition, broadsides advertised the fair as the "greatest military spectacle the world has ever seen" with "international races by submarine warships" and "magnificent pyrotechnic reproductions of war scenes," among other wonders.[399] Repudiating this jingoistic exercise, the American Peace Society lobbied to block appropriations of state and federal funds for the exhibition, failing to prevent this funding but drawing attention to their cause.[400] By the time the exhibition had been open for a few months, the American Peace Society was able to point to the fair's failure to attract as many military exhibits or as many fairgoers as originally predicted as a possible sign of success, interpreting this lack of enthusiasm for the fair as a sign of a change in the national mood toward war.[401] Whether or not this explanation was naïve, to Society

---

[398]Robert T. Taylor, "The Jamestown Tercentennial Exposition of 1907," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 65, no. 2 (April 1957): 196.

[399] "Shall Militarism Run Rampant at Jamestown," *Advocate of Peace* 69, no. 1 (January 1907): 1.

[400] "Glorification of Justice, Not of War," *Advocate of Peace* 69, no. 4 (April 1907): 87-89.

[401] "The Jamestown Fiasco," *Advocate of Peace* 69, no. 7 (July 1907): 153-154. For more information on the American Peace Society's protest of the fair, see "Militarism at the Jamestown Exposition," *Advocate of Peace* 69, no. 2 (February 1907): 34-39; "Protests Against the Overshadowing Militarism of the Jamestown Program," *Advocate of Peace* 69, no. 3 (March 1907): 61-62.

was correct in pointing out the relatively low numbers of attendees at the fair. For the most part, visitors fell far below the numbers expected, and ultimately the fair lost money. In retrospect, the Jamestown Exposition is not considered to be nearly as significant a festival as some of its nineteenth-century counterparts, such as the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition in 1876 or Chicago's World's Columbian Exposition of 1893. This may have been at least in part to successful efforts by New Englanders in the nineteenth century who located Plymouth, rather than Jamestown, as the place where "America" began.

Another display at the Jamestown Exposition offered a poignant counterpoint to the bronze statue honoring white soldiers of the Spanish-American War. As was true of so many world's fairs held in the United States during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the contributions of African American citizens at the Jamestown Exposition were relegated to a Negro Building located on the outskirts of the festivities. One of the centerpieces of this exhibition space was a series of fourteen dioramas designed and executed by Meta Warrick (later Fuller) and installed in specially designed display cases in an underground passage within the building. These dioramas, representing a rough chronology of the progress of African Americans in the United States, were peopled with numerous wax figures, approximately two feet in height and wearing hand-sewn clothes. Educated in artistic circles in Philadelphia and Paris, Warrick initially resisted incorporating African themes into her work, but conversations with W.E.B DuBois and experiences of institutionalized racism convinced her otherwise. As Renée Ater has demonstrated, Warrick's dioramas for the Jamestown Exposition both reinforced and subverted the white supremacist organization of the fair, showing African American history as a progression toward

respectability and equality but using the visual language of racializing ethnographic museum displays. Today, these no-longer-extant dioramas are known mainly through photographs in *The Industrial History of the Negro Race of the United States*, a 1911 text by Giles B. Jackson and D. Webster Davis that continued the educational aims of the exhibit at Jamestown. They offer an important counter narrative to the American history presented at the Jamestown fair.[402]

One diorama in particular contrasts strongly with Allen Newman's Spanish-American War soldier. In *Response to the Call to Arms*, Warrick sculpted eight African American soldiers standing at attention before an officer, also African American, who reads to them from a sheet of paper (figure 5.18). Wearing khaki uniforms and standing in a sandy landscape dotted with tropical vegetation, these soldiers are probably meant to illustrate a scene from the Spanish-American War. Their black commanding officer is a moving reminder of the fact that many of the black militia units that volunteered for the Spanish-American War were stripped of their commissioned officers and placed under the command of whites. Indeed, the whole tableau calls to mind the underrepresentation of black soldiers in sculpted representations of America's nineteenth-century wars. As W. Fitzhugh Brundage explains, this illustration of black military readiness was a political act, arguing for the fitness of African Americans for citizenship in an era in which their military service

---

[402] W. Fitzhugh Brundage, "Meta Warrick's 1907 'Negro Tableaux' and (Re)Presenting African American Historical Memory," *Journal of American History* 89, no. 4 (March 2003): 1368-1400; Giles B. Jackson and D. Webster Davis, *The Industrial History of the Negro Race* (Richmond, VA: Negro Educational Association, 1911); Renée Ater, *Remaking Race and History: The Sculpture of Meta Warrick Fuller* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), 37-72.

was all but ignored or outright maligned by white leaders.[403] For young black men who had volunteered for the army hoping to gain respect for their rights as citizens, the Spanish-American War had been a disappointment, promoting an era of good feelings among white Northerners and Southerners while advancing a rhetoric of imperialism that was by necessity racially coded. The white soldiers of the Spanish-American War were remembered with bronze statues that emphasized their heroic manhood. Meanwhile, Warrick's ephemeral wax figures, two feet high and placed in a marginalized display at a minor American world's fair, may have been the only sculpted memorial to the service of African American men in the war of 1898.

While the whiteness of the soldier statues from the War of 1898 went unquestioned, the costumes and weapons selected to equip the statues presented meaningful considerations. Just as the artists who sculpted statues of Union and Confederate soldiers had to sort through numerous possibilities in costuming their soldier figures, the sculptors of Spanish-American War monuments had to decide what uniforms to memorialize in a rapidly-changing conflict. The ground war in Cuba progressed quickly, faster than the pace at which the beleaguered War Department could order supplies and equip and train volunteers. New recruits hoping to outfit themselves in military apparel quickly found that the army did not have enough uniforms to clothe them, and that few private sources that could provide the necessary garments existed. As a result, most of the Cuban engagements were fought almost entirely by regular army units with outdated uniforms and equipment. The lack of standardization in garments was quickly exacerbated by shoddy construction and poor

---

[403] Brundage, "Meta Warrick's 1907 'Negro Tableaux,'" 1390.

dye lots that caused blue uniforms to fade to purple or green in the hot tropical sun. And even as the War Department rushed to meet the needs of the soldiers, many complained that the blue wool uniforms that had served the United States Army for decades were too formal for everyday wear and too hot for warfare near the Equator. Attempts were made to meet these concerns and to supply the troops with khaki uniforms, but again, the pace of the war far outstripped the procurement of supplies. But supply chains caught up during the fighting in the Philippines, and the new equipment intended for fighting the Spanish was used against Filipino insurgents instead.[404] During the weeks of war with Spain in the Caribbean, even the highest-ranking general officers reflected the confusing shift in uniforms, as a photograph of Commanding General Nelson of the United States Army Nelson A. Miles with his staff shows **(figure 5.19)**. The tonal gradations of the black and white photograph clearly indicate the color differences between the old navy wool and the new khaki uniforms, paired with a motley array of slouch hats and British-inspired summer helmets. The Spanish-American War was a war of transition for the United States Army in uniform and in purpose, and this photograph shows those seismic shifts in the midst of taking place.[405]

Several stereographs of soldiers on duty during the conflict with Spain and the Philippines illustrate the change in uniform style and sensibility through the war years.

---

[404] John Philip Langellier, "From Blue Kersey to Khaki Drill: The Field Uniform of the U.S. Army, 1898-1901," *Military Collector & Historian* 34, no. 4 (1982): 148-153.

[405] Ron Field, *Brassey's History of Uniforms: Spanish-American War, 1898* (London: Brassey's Ltd., 1998), 32.

A photograph of troops preparing for a march at Camp Alger, Virginia, published by M.H. Zahner, shows at least nine soldiers standing at attention in their formal blue uniforms (figure 5.20). They wear the M1883 sack coat that was standard issue for the regular and volunteer armies through the end of the nineteenth century, with sky blue kersey trousers, cotton duck leggings, and walking shoes. On their heads, they wear the felt campaign hat, the crown of which could be folded according to each wearer's personal preference along a single groove or into the fashionable four-part Montana peak. Their belts bear a distinctive H-shaped buckle, and they carry their gear in heavy backpacks.[406] These unidentified soldiers drilling in a stateside camp were probably among the large majority of volunteer soldiers who never made it out of the United States and onto the battlefield, and their equipment reflects the end of an era in which much military display was given over to practicality. An unattributed stereograph of North Dakota soldiers in the Philippines reflects a transitional stage in this process (figure 5.21). Gone are the heavy blue wool sack coats, replaced by lighter khaki campaign blouses, but the felt hats with stylish folds remain a useful companion in the heat of the sun. A third stereograph of Oregon soldiers on campaign in the Philippines by B.W. Kilburn shows the eventual reality of military costume for soldiers on active duty (figure 5.22). These soldiers are not neatly attired in coats or blouses fully buttoned to the chin. Instead, as they wade across the Norzagaray River, their garb reflects the hard realities of physical exertion in a hot climate. With blouses open at the neck, sleeves rolled up, and gear slung about their shoulders to keep it out of the water, these soldiers are far removed from the neatly attired statues of Union and

---

[406] Alejandro de Quesada, *The Spanish-American War and Philippine Insurrection, 1898-1902* (Oxford, UK: Osprey Publishing, 2007), 11-17.

Confederate soldiers that had come to symbolize the American military for most civilians. Eventually, the statues sculpted to memorialize this war would reflect this change in sensibility.

The weaponry employed by the soldiers followed a similar trajectory to the change in uniform styles. Beginning in 1893, the Regular Army had decided to adopt the Krag-Jørgensen rifle, a 30-caliber, five-shot bolt-action weapon that used smokeless powder. This weapon was developed in Norway between 1886 and 1889, and was favored by the United States for its efficiency. In the intervening years before the outbreak of war with Spain, U.S. manufacturers at the Springfield Arsenal produced several improved versions of the weapon, and by 1898 all units in the Regular Army were equipped with this rifle. But just as the sudden outbreak of war and influx of new volunteers taxed the manufacturers of soldiers' uniforms, suppliers of arms were not able to produce enough Krag-Jørgensen rifles to outfit the new recruits. Thus, Secretary of War Russell A. Alger decreed that the new volunteer units should be provided with Model 1873 "Trapdoor" Springfield rifles, single-shot breechloading weapons that used black powder. Thus, a hierarchy of service weapons was created, as less-experienced units were provided with out-of-date, inefficient weapons that produced clouds of white smoke when fired. Production of the Krag-Jørgensen rifle increased as the war with Spain ended and the struggle for Philippine independence began, but many volunteer units continued to see service with the old weapons. In choosing which rifle to place in the hands of a bronze soldier, sculptors of Spanish-American War monuments referred to this hierarchy of combat units.[407]

---

[407] Field, *Brassey's History of Uniforms*, 34-37.

These shifts in uniform and weaponry in the United States and other Western

nations reflected two new realities of nineteenth-century warfare: the growing

awareness of theories of camouflage and the increasing interest in imperialist ventures

that required military service in hot climates. The development of smokeless powder

for firearms meant that a soldier could fire upon his enemy without betraying his

position, and thus uniforms that could conceal their wearer from harm became

absolutely essential. In the early days of the conflict with Spain, American soldiers

who carried the old Springfield rifles felt this especially strongly, when the smoke

from their black powder made it easier for their Mauser-carrying opponents to pour

withering and accurate fire into their ranks.[408] Thus, the new khaki uniforms that

became increasingly common as the United States descended into guerilla warfare in

the Philippines responded to new developments in modern warfare. But the new color

was also an immediate visual reminder of the shift in America's military goals toward

an imperialist vision. In choosing a light colored drill cloth for uniforms suitable to

tropical warfare, Americans turned toward the example of the European nations that

had already spent decades on imperial occupations in Asia, Africa and the Caribbean,

especially Great Britain. British troops in India began experimenting with khaki

uniforms as early as the 1840s, and the practice was widespread by the 1880s, as was

Britain's influence in colonies abroad.[409] American troops had used their blue

uniforms for almost all conditions in the continental United States through the

---

[408] Ibid.

[409] Langellier, "From Blue Kersey to Khaki Drill," 148; de Quesada, *The Spanish-American War and Philippine Insurrection*, 12-13.

nineteenth century, but this new war in search of territory in hotter climates forced the change to imperial garb.

Thus, the monuments that stand in the nation's town squares, clothed in these updated uniforms, refer explicitly to the advent of empire. The most prominent sculpted soldiers from the Spanish-American War by Kitson and Newman wear the new uniforms, but not all monuments to the conflict adopted the new equipment entirely. Many of the monuments include figures that show some transitional equipage, perhaps to indicate the status of the soldiers memorialized or to reflect the retrograde sensibilities of the designer. For instance, the *Seventh Regiment Monument* in Los Angeles, one of the first Spanish-American War monuments, carries one of the 1873 Springfield "Trapdoor" rifles, rather than the new Krag-Jørgensen rifle (see figure 5.7). Given that the regiment in question was a volunteer regiment that never deployed for war and thus never would have received the newest army weapons, this iconographical choice is appropriate. The Springfield rifle is also visible in the Spanish-American War statue designed by Julius C. Loester for the town of Mount Vernon, New York, dedicated in 1927 (figure 5.23). This statue wears the casual, modernized uniform of the Philippines, reminding the viewer that some volunteer units continued to use outdated weapons through the Philippine War. The Spanish-American War soldier marketed by the W.H. Mullins Company takes the opposite tack, as the soldier holds a Krag-Jørgensen rifle but wears his formal uniform buttoned to the neck (see figure 5.9). Monument companies used to the formal sensibilities of Civil War military wear may have been slower to adjust to the changes in military style and fashion.

Like the uniforms worn by the statues, the name *Hiker* for monuments to the Spanish-American War soldier seems to have roots from a later point in the war. Most authors who mention the statues by Kitson or Newman claim that the statues were called *Hikers* because this was the informal name for soldiers who tramped on long jungle marches in search of the enemy.[410] But the real story seems to have been a bit more complicated. As James Loewen has observed, "hiking" was a term usually associated with the soldiers of the Philippines, who trudged through mountainous terrain in search of guerilla fighters who eluded them.[411] While the fighting in Cuba was over quickly after a few decisive battles, some of which took place at sea, the American attempt to conquer the Philippines was fought mostly in small skirmishes against Filipino freedom fighters who knew their homeland well and used it to their advantage. This style of fighting was unfamiliar and alienating to the American soldiers, and they often complained bitterly. As one soldier told war correspondent Frederick Palmer, "You can't wrestle when you can't lay hands on the other fellow… It's hike, hike, hike (march) till you stick in the mud, and then you hike back again a little slower than you went, 'cause you're tired and ugly, and mebbe you're sick. With every hike there's a few laid out with their hands crossed – and no gugu's (native's)

---

[410] For instance, see Rubenstein, *American Women Sculptors*, 103-104; Donald Martin Reynolds, *Masters of American Sculpture: The Figurative Tradition from the American Renaissance to the Millennium* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1993), 154; and Spencer Tucker, ed., *The Encyclopedia of the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars: A Political, Social, and Military History* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2009), 988.

[411] James W. Loewen, *Lies Across America: What Our Historic Sites Get Wrong* (New York: The New Press, 1999), 138.

blood atones for that."[412] For many of Palmer's readers, "hiking" would have been a relatively new concept, as illustrated by the author's parenthetical remarks defining some of the soldier's terms. (Hiking as a form of recreational walking would not become a popular concept until the early twentieth century.)

Soldiers' frustration with the Filipino guerrillas and the jungle marches to find them are reflected in several of the army songs that arose from the conflict. The "Army Hiking Song," set to the Civil War tune "Tramp, Tramp, Tramp," makes these emotions so brutally clear that the song was eventually banned as offensive to America's Filipino allies. Again the culture of the Civil War informed the experience of Spanish-American War soldiers, this time providing the tune for an explicitly racist screed. The song's verses complain about "hiking day and night" and fighting in a land where "all the ladies smoke and chew" and the people "live on fish and rice," traits that make the Filipinos seem foreign and savage. And the refrain drives the point home:

> Damn, damn, damn the Filipinos, cross-eyed kakiack ladrones,
> Underneath our starry flag civilize 'em with a Krag,
> And return us to own beloved homes.[413]

---

[412] Frederick Palmer, "White Man and Brown Man in the Philippines," *Scribners Magazine* 27, no. 1 (January 1900): 76.

[413] Albert Shelby, "The Army's Songs of the Philippines," *Harper's Weekly* (March 5, 1910): 16-17. A slightly less offensive version of the song published in 1903 in the New York observer replaces the first lines of the refrain with "Tramp, tramp, tramp, 'tis weary marching, / Hiking after Philippine ladrones." John Bancroft Devins, "An Observer in the Philippines VI: Incidents of the Transpacific Trip on the Logan – Rest and Pleasure," *New York Observer* (October 15, 1903): 485-486.

The explicitly racist imagery and references to the soldiers' standard-issue weapons make the troops' emotions clear. Another marching song, "Hiking in the Philippines," takes a more cheerful approach to the conflict's hardships, advising a young recruit to fortify himself for the long day's march ahead: "At your breakfast don't you hurry / Eat another dish of beans; / For you'll need it – don't you worry / Hiking in the Philippines!"[414] Hiking, then, was an activity specifically associated with the veterans of the Philippine-American conflict and with the style of warfare practiced there, and the term was not applied to all soldiers of the Spanish-American War until much later.

Neither Kitson's nor Newman's *Hiker* was referred to as such in its first iteration. Newman's statue, first sculpted in 1904 and unveiled at the Jamestown Exposition in 1907, is variously referred to in its first press accounts as a "Spanish War Veteran," a "Spanish War Soldier," and the "American Volunteer."[415] Likewise, newspapers called the first version of Kitson's statue at the University of Minnesota "the soldiers' monument for the University of Minnesota," "the memorial statue at the university," and the "Volunteer Memorial Statue."[416] The generic names, especially,

---

[414] W.E. Christian, *Rhymes of the Rookies* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1917), 28-31.

[415] "Striking Soldier Statue. Mr. Newman's Fine Work for New York Building at Jamestown." *Washington Bee*, August 10, 1907; Reynolds, *New York at the Jamestown Exposition*, 197.

[416] Arthur E. Haynes, "The Work of Two Famous Artists," *Minneapolis Journal*, March 2, 1906; "Monument to Students Who Died in War with Spain to be Unveiled May 30," *Minneapolis Journal* May 13, 1906; "Lasting Tribute to Student Dead – State University Soldiers' Monument is Unveiled and Dedicated," *Minneapolis Journal* May 30, 1906.

linked the soldiers of the recent conflict with their predecessors in earlier American

wars. By the middle of the following decade, however, the "Hiker" terminology began

to appear frequently, probably due to proactive action taken by Newman to protect and

market his design specifically as a figure of the War of 1898. On November 23, 1911,

Newman was granted a copyright for his figure that read in part, "Hiker. Statuette of

U.S. soldier of the Spanish American war, standing holding gun."[417] Between 1912

and 1916, five of Newman's *Hikers* were erected: two in New Jersey, two in New

York, and one in Pennsylvania. The Jno. Williams Company promoted Newman's

statue through advertisements in trade magazines, offering the statue at full size and in

29-inch reductions, several of which remain extant today (figures 5.24 and 5.25).[418]

Meanwhile, the Gorham Manufacturing Company of Providence, Rhode Island

acquired the copyright for Kitson's *Hiker* and began erecting copies of the statue in

1921.[419] Michael Shapiro has noted that the Gorham Manufacturing Company and the

Jno. Williams Company were both up-and-coming bronze foundries at the turn of the

twentieth century who competed for business and courted famous clients, including

Daniel Chester French.[420] Their respective relationships with Theo Kitson and Allen

---

[417] *Catalogue of Copyright Entries, Part 4: Works of Art, Reproductions of a Work of Art; Drawings or Plastic Works of a Scientific or Technical Character; Photographs; Prints and Pictorial Illustrations* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1911), 538.

[418] "Advertisement: 'The Hiker,'" *American Institute of Architects Quarterly Bulletin* 13, no. 1 (1912): 116.

[419] John D. Meakin, David. L. Ames, and Donald A. Dolske, "Degradation of Monumental Bronzes," *APT Bulletin* 23, no. 4 (1991): 58.

[420] Shapiro, *Bronze Casting and American Sculpture*, 88-89.

Newman in the manufacture of monuments to the Spanish-American War are evidence of this professional rivalry.

One final sculptural element that warrants careful consideration is the pose. Through the decades following the Civil War, some variation on parade rest was the most popular pose for both Union and Confederate statues. As has been discussed in previous chapters, this military drill stance, usually seen on ceremonial occasions in an army context, was a fitting and relatively non-threatening pose for soldier statues placed in a civic setting. Although the strict position of head, eyes, limbs and torso was often lost in translation when recreated by artists without military experience, the stance was easily recognized and named. It also had the added benefit of lending itself well to a figural design that could be economically carved from a slender granite block. This made the parade rest pose particularly useful for large monument firms employing artisan carvers who were more concerned with quantity than quality of figures. Parade rest remained a part of military drill in its Civil War form through the Spanish-American War, and some of the first monuments to the War of 1898, including the monument to the Seventh Regiments in Los Angeles (see figure ##) illustrated the pose.

By the first decade of the twentieth century, however, the parade rest pose seemed passé, and both Kitson and Newman chose to avoid it entirely. Kitson's *Hiker* stands solidly with his feet about shoulder width apart and his rifle held diagonally across his hips, in a pose reminiscent of some of Henry Kitson's designs for minute men executed a few years earlier (see Chapter 3). Seen frontally, the statue is the image of stability, with the wide stance balancing the broad chest and muscular arms (figure 5.26). This soldier is the image of beefy American manhood. Meanwhile,

Newman's statue looks for inspiration in a different direction, turning to the sensuous S-curves prevalent in classical and Renaissance figures, such as Praxiteles' *Hermes* from the second century AD or Donatello's *David* of 1408-1409 (figures 5.27 and 5.28). Newman's figure differs somewhat from these famous models, with the body's weight shifting toward the hand on the left hip rather than torqueing in the opposite direction. But the soldier's languid pose sets Newman apart from most sculptors of Civil War monuments, showing his knowledge of the history of art and offering a sensual take on the lone infantryman. The individuality of both Newman's and Kitson's choices in presenting their soldier figures indicates a shift in how soldier monuments were conceptualized. The statues also signal the preoccupations with manhood and manliness that fueled the Spanish-American War and its memorial forms.

Memorializing American Imperialism through Manliness

The War of 1898 and the memorialization of its soldiers took place during a period of intense change in the ways that manhood and manliness were visualized in the United States. During the 1890s, opportunities for American men to prove their manliness in a traditional sense were on the wane. Before war broke out with Spain, Americans had experienced three decades without a major military conflict. Ongoing wars with Native American populations to decide the fate of the American West had been a feature of much of the nineteenth century, but during a speech at the World's Columbian Exposition in 1893, Frederick Jackson Turner declared the frontier closed, and with it disappeared an element of American mythology.[421] As Eleanor Hannah

---

[421] Turner's essay, titled "The Frontier in American History," is a cultural touchstone that has influenced much scholarly writing on the American West. See William

has suggested, the Spanish-American War came about at a time marked by changing definitions of maleness and citizenship. Before the Civil War, citizenship and voting rights were the spheres of white men. But the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments gave black men at least nominal access to these rights, and the women's suffrage movement was threatening to dilute them further. The citizen soldier remained a paragon of manliness, and both white and black men rushed to prove themselves in this arena when war broke out against Spain.[422] The war with Spain was especially appealing as an opportunity for sons of Civil War veterans and other men who had been too young to volunteer for service in the 1860s to acquire the military experience that seemed so character-defining for the Civil War generation. The reality of wartime service did not meet expectations for most volunteers, but the monuments erected after the war upheld a manly ideal.[423]

Cronon, *Nautre's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great* West (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1991), 31-32; Martin Ridge, "The Life of an Idea: The Significance of Frederick Jackson Turner's Froniter Thesis," *Montana: The Magazine of Western History* 41, no. 1 (Winter 1991): 2-13; Michael Steiner, "From Frontier to Region: Frederick Jackson Turner and the New Western History," *Historical Review* 64, no. 4 (November 1995): 479-501.

[422] Eleanor Hannah, "A Place in the Parade: Citizenship, Manhood, and African American Men in the Illinois National Guard, 1870-1917," *Journal of Illinois History* 5, no. 2 (2002): 86.

[423] See Gail Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); Kristin L. Hoganson, *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); and Donald J. Mrozek, *Sport and American Mentality, 1880-1910* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983).

Even before the war began, several prominent politicians and writers were already speaking out in favor of manliness based on physical exercise and hard work. One of the most conspicuous of these was Theodore Roosevelt, whose lectures and writings on the connection between manliness and imperial policy came to define his era. Roosevelt did not codify his philosophy on manhood as the "strenuous life" until a speech in 1899 extolling the virtues of imperialism, but obsessions with manliness and manly behavior shaped the course of much of his life. As a young boy growing up in a wealthy and politically connected New York family, Roosevelt was sickly and nearsighted. His father encouraged him to spend as much time outdoors and in athletic pursuits as possible to combat his various illnesses, and this early commitment to an active lifestyle became an important part of Roosevelt's personal mythology.[424] When he first entered public life as a New York State assemblyman in 1882, Roosevelt was ridiculed as an effeminate dandy for his high-pitched voice and fancy clothing, but he worked quickly to change these public perceptions. In 1884, his young wife, Alice Lee, died suddenly, and Roosevelt dealt with his grief by moving out to the Badlands of South Dakota, buying a cattle ranch, and turning himself into a cowboy of sorts. The rehabilitation of his image was a success, and his constituents began to see him as a rough and ready authority on masculinity and frontier toughness.[425]

A drawing of Roosevelt from his frontier period illustrates his self-presentation as an ideal American hero (figure 5.29). The sketch appeared as the frontispiece to Roosevelt's *Hunting Trips of a Ranchman* of 1885, a compendium of the lands and

---

[424] Edward N. Saveth, "Theodore Roosevelt: Image and Ideology," *New York History* 72, no. 1 (January 1991): 45-47.

[425] Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*, 170-177.

people he saw and the animals he hunted while living in the West.[426] In the drawing, Roosevelt is clad in a buckskin suit and fur cap, the iconic garb of a frontier hunter. He stands with his entire body oriented frontally, with his rifle held diagonally across his chest. On his feet are practical walking boots, and he wears a handkerchief knotted around his neck. He does not wear his trademark spectacles, but instead meets the viewer's gaze with a confident stare. A wooded backdrop locates the scene as some unnamed wilderness paradise waiting for Roosevelt to conquer it. It is interesting to note that this entire scene was constructed, based on a series of studio photographs taken in New York City by George Grantham Bain far from the frontier West (figure 5.30). In that, it was not unlike many of the Western scenes produced during the same decades by the likes of Frederic Remington or Charles Schreyvogel. Roosevelt's image also shares these artists' emphasis on frontier garb, weaponry and locations. But Roosevelt's pose also owes something to the soldier monument, that other symbol of manly citizenship that became so prevalent during the years when he came of age. His frontal orientation, determined expression, broad chest, planted feet, and weapon held across his body all anticipate Theo Kitson's design for a Spanish-American War monument. As *Hunting Trips of a Ranchman* was a widely-circulated account of Roosevelt's life on the frontier, it is conceivable that Kitson would have known this image, and certainly he loomed large in the mythology of the War of 1898. Roosevelt's wilderness-conquering activities during the 1880s looked forward to the shift in American military policy that would bring about the war in the Caribbean and the Philippines.

---

[426] See Theodore Roosevelt, *Hunting Trips of a Ranchman: Sketches of Sport on the Northern Cattle Plains* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1885).

After he returned to New York from his years living in the West, Theodore Roosevelt began speaking more frequently about the condition of men in America and about the virtues of manly behavior. In an 1894 article exploring the manly virtues as applied to politics, he explained the matter as follows:

> If we wish to do good work for our country we must be unselfish, disinterested, sincerely desirous of the well-being of the commonwealth, and capable of devoted adherence to a lofty ideal; but in addition we must be vigorous in mind and body, able to hold our own in rough conflict with our fellows, able to suffer punishment without flinching, and, at need, to repay it in kind with full interest.[427]

For Roosevelt, then, manly citizenship involved both mental and physical strengths: it was necessary for a man to think and behave morally, but also to possess the ability to fight for his honor physically and to maintain his bodily health. As Nina Silber points out, this definition of manliness had much in common with the Southern concept of honor, and indeed Roosevelt enjoyed a warm welcome when he led his Rough Riders through Southern states on his way to Cuba.[428] The need to redress any offenses to honor that motivated much of Southern culture and Roosevelt's definition of manliness played a huge part in the reaction of the United States to the explosion of the U.S.S. *Maine* in early 1898. Many congressmen and other Americans saw the sinking of the *Maine* as a blow against the honor of the United States, one that could only be redressed through war.[429] After the war with Spain had ended and the long

---

[427] Theodore Roosevelt, "The Manly Virtues and Practical Politics," *The Forum* 17 (July 1894): 555.

[428] Silber, *The Romance of Reunion*, 182. For a further discussion of Southern honor in a pre-Civil War context, see Chapter 3 of this dissertation.

[429] Hoganson, *Fighting for American Manhood*, 69.

conflict in the Philippines had begun, Roosevelt expanded his thoughts on manliness

and honor to make imperialism a key element of his manly ideal. In an 1899 speech,

he codified these thoughts into the concept of the "strenuous life," or the need for

white American men to maintain their dominance by honing their physical strength

and conquering other lands and peoples.[430] What began as a lament over the

increasingly sedentary lives of American men became a justification for a complete

revolution in the foreign policy of the United States.

Theodore Roosevelt was not the only individual thinking about American men

in the latter decade of the nineteenth century; he was merely one of the most visible

spokesmen for a far-reaching cultural current. During these same years, many artists

used their work to meditate on the changing nature of American manhood. Art

historians have particularly noted these themes in the art of Thomas Eakins, Winslow

Homer, and Frederic Remington, whose paintings, sketches and occasionally

sculptures took on the themes of sport, ruggedness, and the archetypal American hero

that also animated the writings of Roosevelt and others. In his images of Philadelphia

sportsmen engaged in rowing, boxing, and other pursuits, Thomas Eakins explored the

virtue of outdoor pursuits for men leading increasingly sedentary lives. In paintings

such as *Max Schmitt in a Single Scull* of 1871, a portrait of a rowing champion who

was his close friend, Eakins showed idealized sportsmen in the midst of outdoor

pursuits (figure 5.31). As Elizabeth Johns has noted, rowing was seen by many

nineteenth-century city dwellers as the perfect antidote to office jobs that left them

with higher pay and more leisure time to enjoy it, but kept them indoors all day.

---

[430] Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*, 192-196.

Rowing allowed practitioners to enjoy time outdoors while teaching them three kinds of discipline: physical, to stick with a grueling training regimen and strict diet; mental, to understand the strict body mechanics required to row efficiently; and moral, to control himself in the midst of a race even when unexpected obstacles occurred.[431] But other scholars have found ambivalences within the painting that complicate this heroic narrative. In the painting's portrayal of Schmitt during a lull in his rowing, William J. Clark sees a moment of stasis that may refer to the passing of time and to the eventual end of Schmitt's ability to compete as a rower.[432] And Martin Berger suggests that the entire body of Eakins' paintings of heroic Philadelphia men may have been an attempt to offset his own inability to live up to the manly ideal of the late nineteenth century. After avoiding service in the Civil War and failing to find a spouse until later in life, Eakins may have painted sportsmen to work through his own gender identity.[433] This need to prove one's manhood is an important concept to keep in mind when considering the young men who served in and later memorialized their experience in the Spanish-American War.

Winslow Homer's rugged seascapes and perilous ocean scenes have also been considered through the lens of masculine identity. As Sarah Burns has pointed out, Homer's paintings of splashing ocean waves off the shore of Prout's Neck in Maine or

---

[431] Elizabeth Johns, *Thomas Eakins: The Heroism of Modern Life* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983), 24-29.

[432] William J. Clark, "The Iconography of Gender in Thomas Eakins Portraiture," *American Studies* 32, no. 2 (Fall 1991): 7-9.

[433] Martin A. Berger, *Man Made: Thomas Eakins and the Construction of Gilded Age Manhood* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 7-48.

jagged mountain peaks from the Adirondacks or the White Mountains served as a portable visual summary of the kinds of outdoor experiences that doctors urged neurasthenic city dwellers to experience. During Homer's era, treatments of nervous disorders usually involved trips to the countryside for outdoor exercise, and Homer's paintings reminded some viewers of those experiences.[434] Meanwhile, his sailors and lifesaving teams could be interpreted in the same heroic vein as some of Eakins' portraits of Philadelphia sportsmen. But not all of Homer's maritime paintings could be interpreted as supporting the nineteenth-century ideal of manhood. One of his most famous canvases, *The Gulf Stream* of 1899, depicts the dark side of white American manly supremacy (figure 5.32). Set in the Caribbean, the painting shows a black man floating adrift on a wildly churning sea, his sailboat disabled by a broken mast. Weakened from hunger and exposure, with only a few stalks of sugar cane to eat, he lies in a stupor, resigned to his fate. In the water beneath him, sharks circle hungrily, waiting for the boat to capsize. Almost immediately after it was first displayed, many viewers interpreted the painting as an allegory for the black man's experience in America, beset from all sides by racist policies and legally prevented from fighting for his own manhood.[435] Albert Boime in particular has noted how closely the painting's date coincides with the Spanish-American War, suggesting that Homer intended to illustrate a moment when white supremacist thinking was used to justify imperial

---

[434] Sarah Burns, "Revitalizing the 'Painted-Out' North: Winslow Homer, Manly Health, and New England," *American Art* 9, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 25-29.

[435] H. Barbara Weinberg, "Cosmopolitan and Candid Stories," in *American Stories: Paintings of Everyday Life, 1765-1915*, H. Barbara Weinberg and Carrie Rebora Barrett, eds. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 159-161.

policy and black men were denied recognition for their exemplary military service in Cuba and the Philippines.[436] Like the stranded sailor left without the means to pilot his craft to safety, the African American soldier was denied the path to manly citizenship usually guaranteed through military service.

While Winslow Homer explored the dark side of American manhood, Frederic Remington unapologetically celebrated it in both painting and sculpture. Given his commercial success as a sculptor during the same period as the *Hiker*'s success, Remington's example is particularly instructive. His cowboy images and illustrations of Spanish-American War scenes combine several themes in the study of American manhood at the end of the nineteenth century. In his paintings and sculptures of the American West, Remington depicted a world of manly endeavor that was coming to a close as railroads, telegraph lines, and other innovations raced across the continent.[437] His famous paintings and small-scale bronzes of cowboys, troopers, and Native Americans locked in combat or sitting around campfires captured a complex world of Western mythology. Some of Remington's works can be interpreted as bridging the gap between the rugged frontier activities of the nineteenth century and their conversion to leisure pursuits in subsequent decades. For instance, his *Bronco Buster*, first sculpted in 1895 and cast many times afterward, shows a cowboy in the act of training a spirited horse (figure 5.33). This was certainly an important task in frontier life, but by the time Remington produced this sculpture, the bronco buster was

[436] Albert Boime, *The Art of Exclusion: Representing Blacks in the Nineteenth Century* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1990), 36-46.

[437] Edward Buscombe, "Painting the Legend: Frederic Remington and the Western," *Cinema Journal* 23, no. 4 (Summer 1984): 17.

increasingly associated with the sport of rodeo rather than ranch life. What was once a necessary and difficult job became a source of entertainment.[438] Meanwhile, Remington's scenes from his weeks in Cuba during the height of the war with Spain blur martial and sports imagery, explicitly linking the war with wider discourses about American manhood. Several scholars have pointed out that his most famous Spanish-American War scene, *The Charge of the Rough Riders at San Juan Hill* of 1898, looks more like a football play than a battle scene (figure 5.34). Alexander Nemerov in particular teases out these associations, pointing out that many of the Rough Riders were college football stars before they joined Theodore Roosevelt's famous regiment. Football, like imperialism, was a game of forward progress, and before the war began, the sport was associated with constant hand-wringing about how dangerous it was. War was also often associated with sports metaphors. Remington's paintings of Cuba are closely implicated in this type of rhetoric.[439]

It is not surprising that Remington's paintings of fighting in Cuba were inspired by college sports, considering how popular sporting events had become as a means of training the bodies of privileged young men. College sports could provide an opportunity to train the body but also to develop moral character, with various sports offering lessons in discipline, courage, alertness, and other virtues.[440] These benefits

---

[438] Michael Allen, "The Rodeo Cowboy in Art: A Sampling," *The Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 87, no. 1 (Winter 1995/1996): 38-44.

[439] Alexander Nemerov, *Frederic Remington and Turn-of-the-Century America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 54-62.

[440] Mrozek, *Sport and American Mentality*, 36-37.

could be achieved not only through organized sports, but also through calisthenics and proper diet.

One of the most highly regarded promoters of a healthy physique through these means as an element of college life at the end of the nineteenth century was Dr. Dudley Allen Sargent, professor of physical education at Harvard University. Dr. Sargent was a well-known proponent of the importance of exercise and nutrition to overall health, and he advocated for the notion that physical health was increasingly important for a turn-of-the-century society that had turned almost entirely toward indoor occupations and intellectual pursuits. Before accepting a professorship at Harvard in 1879, Dr. Sargent operated a Hygienic Institute and School of Physical Culture in New York City and lectured widely on his recommendations for maintaining bodily health.[441]

Cultural enthusiasm for bodily health and physical measurement deeply impacted two of the sculptors who would soon become known for their soldier monuments. In the spring of 1893, just a few months before their marriage, Henry Kitson and Theo Ruggles received a commission from Dr. Sargent to model figures of a *Typical Man* and *Typical Woman* for Sargent's display at Chicago's World's Columbian Exposition (figure 5.35). The sculptures were based on the averages of years of measurements taken by Dr. Sargent of the students who passed through his gymnasium at Harvard, and while Henry modeled the male figure, Theo worked on

---

[441] Thomas J. Finnegan, "Dr. Dudley Sargent's Summer at Chautauqua: Evangelizing the Gospel of Physical Culture," *New York History* 86, no. 1 (Winter 2005): 29-30.

the female (figures 5.36 and 5.37).[442] Plaster casts of the resulting figures, painted to resemble bronze, now survive in Harvard's Peabody Museum, arms removed to allow them to be stored easily. Both are slight, youthful figures, supple and slender in form. Describing his system of physical examination and bodily measurement in his autobiography, Dr. Sargent stressed that the individuals examined came to him through their voluntary interest in physical health. The examination consisted of a questionnaire assessing the subject's heritage and health history, an exhaustive series of bodily measurements, and various strength and muscular tests, including an assessment of the performance of the heart and lungs before and after exercise.[443] Thus, the measurements for Sargent's "typical" man and woman came almost exclusively from college students interested in their physical health who elected to volunteer their bodies as physical specimens: definitely not a "typical" group of individuals. For the sculptors, the parameters of the commission made it difficult to find models for their sculptures, as they discovered that no one individual came close to matching all of Dr. Sargent's averaged measurements. The faces, too, were composed with average measurements, this time using composite photographs of male and female college students.[444]

---

[442] Marianne Kinkel, *Races of Mankind: The Sculptures of Malvina Hoffman* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2011), 9-10; Arlo Bates, "Literary Affairs in Boston," *The Book Buyer* 10, no. 2 (March 1893): 61.

[443] Ledyard W. Sargent, ed., *Dudley Allen Sargent: An Autobiography* (Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger, 1927), 173-174.

[444] Milton J. Stone, Jr., "The Typical Man and Woman of America: Dr. Sargent Incorporates in Two Beautiful Statues the Characteristics of the Ideal Man and Woman as the Result of Thirteen Years of Experiment," *The Illustrated American* 13, no. 174 (June 17, 1893): 710. The use of composite photographs to compose the faces of the sculptures is itself a highly charged practice with roots in the physiognomic and

One of the most surprising visual elements of Henry Kitson's *Typical Man* is how markedly it differs in physical stature from the statues of soldiers that both Kitsons later developed for town memorials (figure 5.38). While the *Typical Man* does possess an impressively detailed and well-defined musculature, his overall physique is lithe and slender rather than broad and stocky. His narrow chest, slim torso, and willowy limbs recall the youthful college students who offered their bodies for Sargent's system of measurements. One would think that the Kitsons would employ a similar body type for their war memorials. Since the Civil War, soldier monuments had been understood as generalized representations of the men who volunteered for service, somewhat idealized but recognizable icons of the sons, husbands and fathers who fought American wars. But both Henry and Theo veered markedly from the Sargent type: Henry's 1900 *Minute Man* for Lexington, Massachusetts is a tough, heroic character, while Theo's Spanish-American War *Hiker* is even more muscular. Part of this discrepancy can be attributed to the statues' intended purposes; while the *Typical Man* was sculpted for a scientific display, the *Minute Man* and *Hiker* were meant to encompass civic and heroic ideals in a monumental outdoor setting. There is also the difference between "typical" and "ideal": while the former is meant to represent everyday life, the latter is aspirational. But even given Sargent's flawed methodology in choosing subjects to measure for his "typical" man, the beefy proportions of Theo Kitson's *Hiker* may have been out of line with the average

phrenological practices of the nineteenth century. Among other things, composite photographs were used to search for possible facial traits that would mark an individual as a criminal. See Allan Sekula, "The Body and the Archive," *October* 39 (Winter 1986): 3-64.

American male who volunteered for the Spanish-American War. That discrepancy is key when considering why the Kitson *Hiker* was effective as a memorial to these particular soldiers.

The army also had a physical ideal, and recruits in 1898 struggled to meet it. They signed up to prove their physical athleticism and moral courage on a field of battle, but most volunteers were stymied in their attempts to reach the battlefield, and many also found that their bodies did not measure up to the army's specifications. Themes of body size, conditioning, and racial identity appear over and over again in the literature surrounding the mobilization of troops for the Spanish-American War. One in five soldiers, both white and black, was rejected from service for failure to meet the army's physical requirements. Reasons for failure included eye disease; poor physique, including failure to meet height and weight requirements; various other debilitating diseases, including venereal disease; and mental deficiency or illiteracy.[445] Soldiers accepted for service had to stand between 5'4" and 5'10" in height and weigh at least 125 pounds. While seemingly conservative, these requirements proved especially difficult in areas where regular visits to a physician were uncommon for most members of the population, as in South Carolina, where more than thirty-eight percent of volunteers failed the physical examination.[446] To get around exams, volunteers sometimes convinced healthy stand-ins to take their place at the

---

[445] Vincent J. Cirillo, *Bullets and Bacilli: The Spanish-American War and Military Medicine* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2004), 9-11.

[446] Harris Moore Bailey, Jr., "The Splendid Little Forgotten War: The Mobilization of South Carolina for the War with Spain," *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 92, no. 3 (June 1991): 202-203.

examination, and many militia companies that volunteered en masse worried about new leadership when their officers were found unfit for service.[447] For instance, Company D of the 50th Iowa Volunteer Regiment was lucky enough to see all its officers pass the physical examination, but it was the only company of its regiment to achieve this distinction.[448] Many other militia units who volunteered for the war saw their number curtailed and their officers turned away by the inability of many men to meet the physical requirements for army service.

An 1898 wash drawing titled "Examining Recruits" by illustrator Walter Granville-Smith shows an idealized version of the physical exam that disqualified so many from the fight (figure 5.39). The drawing depicts a young recruit stripped to the waist in the medical examiner's office, standing straight and tall as an older doctor leans close to his chest to listen to his heart. The young man is tall and broad-shouldered, and the nudity of his torso allows for observation of his well-developed biceps and pectoral and abdominal muscles. His naked chest gleams pale in the sunny office, but his tanned forearms and hands suggest a man accustomed to strenuous activities outdoors. His head, turned in a near-profile view, bears a classical nose and forehead. In sum, this idealized young man is perfectly suited to serve the United States overseas, and there is no question in his noble and athletic physique that he will easily pass the medical examination. Many of his contemporaries who signed up for war service would not pass so easily. It is unknown whether this particular illustration was published, but Granville-Smith did supply illustrations to many periodicals of the

---

[447] James M. McCaffrey, "Texans in the Spanish-American War," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 106, no. 2 (October 2002): 264-265.

[448] McDaniel, "Martial Sons of Martial Sires," 36.

day, and a notation on the drawing indicates a possible reduction in size, perhaps for a particular publication.[449] Whether it appeared in print or remained in the artist's portfolio, the drawing captures the significance of the physical exam in the life of an army recruit and the ideal situation in which most volunteers hoped to find themselves. In stature, this strapping young man is not unlike the *Hiker* monuments that would later memorialize the war.

The prewar condition of potential recruits for the armed forces was not the only problem at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War. The war with Spain would be fought in tropical climates with diseases particular to those areas, such as malaria and yellow fever, and concerns arose that soldiers who had not been exposed to these diseases would suffer greatly. These conditions led to the formation of "immune" regiments in the regular army, made up of soldiers supposedly unlikely to contract tropical diseases. On May 10, 1898, Congress called for the formation of ten regiments totaling 10,000 volunteers for the United States Volunteer Infantry (USVI), specifying that the soldiers in the regiments should possess immunity from the fevers prevalent in the war's tropical climes. The first six regiments were populated by white men, mostly from Southern states, who claimed to have previous exposure to the diseases, and the last four were reserved for African Americans.[450] The notion that

---

[449] Peter Harrington and Frederic A. Sharf, *"A Splendid Little War": The Spanish-American War, 1898, The Artists' Perspective* (London: Greenhill Books, 1998), 40, 83.

[450] Roger D. Cunningham, "'A Lot of Fine, Sturdy Black Warriors': African American 'Immunes' in the Spanish-American War," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 108, no. 3 (January 2005): 346; McCaffrey, 272; Gatewood, *Black Americans and the White Man's Burden*, 87-88.

African-Americans could naturally withstand diseases such as malaria or yellow fever better than their white counterparts was an old one, long used as a justification for slavery before it was abolished, and both white and black leaders supported the notion of forming regiments of black "immunes."[451] The belief in African American immunity also influenced the decision to send black regiments in state volunteer units to Cuba: both the Eighth Illinois and the Twenty-third Kansas were mobilized at least partly for this reason.[452] While the thinking behind the creation of the immune regiments was faulty, many African American soldiers welcomed the chance to prove themselves overseas.

Predictably, the experiment with immune regiments did not turn out as well as hoped, as the soldiers in these regiments proved to be no less susceptible to disease than their counterparts in other units. Men of the all-black Twenty-Third Kansas began showing signs of yellow fever and malaria almost immediately upon reaching Cuba.[453] White soldiers from Florida who made up Company C of the Third USVI likewise fell victim to disease as their claims of immunity proved false.[454] And the Ninth USVI, the fourth "immune" regiment deployed to Cuba and the first such African American unit, was hit with an epidemic of tropical fevers within the first

---

[451] Gatewood, *Black Americans and the White Man's Burden*, 87-89, 98-99.

[452] Hannah, "A Place in the Parade," 100-102; Christopher Lovett, "'To Serve Faithfully': The Twenty-Third Kansas Volunteer Infantry and the Spanish-American War," *Kansas History* 21 (1998-1999): 271.

[453] Lovett, "To Serve Faithfully," 272.

[454] William Schellings, "Florida Volunteers in the War with Spain, 1898," *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (July 1962): 57.

week of arrival that killed nearly thirty men.[455] The soldiers assigned to immune regiments due to their supposed insusceptibility suffered through disease-filled deployments. Meanwhile, no amount of immunity could protect any regiment from typhoid, the other deadly killer in the war with Spain that was spread through terrible sanitation practices. As Vincent Cirillo has explained, the war of 1898 led to major breakthroughs in the understanding of how typhoid, malaria, and yellow fever were spread, and subsequent changes in policy saved many young lives in future conflicts around the world.[456] But in the meantime, the men of 1898 suffered terribly, wasting away from disease while dreaming of battlefield glory that would never come.

It is probably not surprising that references to the deleterious effect of the war on the soldier's body appeared in visual media. Newspaper illustrations and editorial cartoons were especially damning in their condemnation of the War Department's inability to keep American troops safe and healthy while in camp or on campaign, calling attention to the ill effects of bad food and poo sanitation. In a cartoon from the *Denver Evening Post*, published in August 1898 and titled "Three Months Ago and Today," A.W. Steele visualizes the harm done to a soldier's body after three months in military service (figure 5.40). The main image shows the soldier as he appears "today:" a gaunt, withered figure clinging to a fence post and gazing out at the viewer with a haunting expression. His uniform is wrinkled, torn, and missing buttons, and his hat is full of holes, the once-jaunty brim crushed out of shape. With his haggard face and unkempt clothing, this wraith has more in common with the visual trope of

---

[455] Cunningham, "A Lot of Fine, Sturdy Black Warriors," 357.

[456] Cirillo, *Bullets and Bacilli*, 111-135.

the hobo than the soldier. But what a change has been wrought! A roundel in the upper left corner of the cartoon shows the soldier as he was three months earlier, striding through the front yard of his home and waving goodbye to his wife and child. In the earlier image, his face is full and square-jawed, and his uniform is fresh and new. This strapping young man is the picture of an ideal military recruit, but the army's mishandling has left him a shell of himself. Both the soldiers who went to the Caribbean or the Philippines and the volunteers left behind in stateside camps were vulnerable to this sort of drastic change, and images like this one made that fact a national scandal.[457]

Another political cartoon published in the *Chicago Tribune* a day after "Three Months Ago and Today" offered an even bleaker view of the War Department's mishandling of American troops (figure 5.41). This cartoon, titled "Shall This Be the National Memorial of the Spanish-American War?" shows a shrouded, skeletal figure with glowing eyes, labeled "DISEASE," looming over a fresh grave at the edge of a grassy seashore. The gravestone's epitaph makes the cartoon's point clear: "KILLED by Spaniards 200 – by Official Negligence and Incompetency 2,000." The skeleton is tied to the gravestone with "red tape."[458] Already thinking ahead to the war memorials sure to result from the latest American military conflict, the cartoonist imagines a chilling specter of disease and recrimination instead of the healthy sentinel that had become the monumental standard since the Civil War. The gravestone's inscription highlights the shocking discrepancy between the number of battlefield deaths and the

---

[457] Miller, *From Liberation to Conquest*, 163-165.

[458] Ibid., 164-166.

rate of deaths by disease, suggesting that the majority of the mortal sufferers from this particular conflict did not have a chance to experience the manly, glorious charges that men like Theodore Roosevelt had envisioned on the eve of war. This cartoonist's imagined soldier monument highlights the discrepancy between dream and reality in the wake of this imperial war. Instead of a strong, healthy body, this monument places its soldiers underground, with the spectral image of death standing sentinel over them. This is not a triumphal monument listing the names of fallen heroes; instead, it is a mass grave with the victims of military ineptitude reduced to statistics. No longer Kitson's fantasy of American manhood and military readiness, this monument confronts harsh reality.

In this context of disease, death, and loss, the Spanish-American War monuments sculpted by Theo Kitson, Allen Newman, and others clearly represent an idealized memory of the conflict. The statues do not allude to rampant disease, long months of boredom in camp, or failed physical examinations. They represent only white soldiers, once again erasing the hopes and aspirations that drove thousands of African American men to volunteer to serve their country. These hale and hearty soldiers in bronze illustrate a war stripped of its troubling associations with racial and military atrocities and inadequate response to disease. The *Hiker* statues represent the war that the young recruits of 1898 thought they were fighting, rather than the one they experienced. These are the monuments to the conflict that announced the United States as a major player in international imperial warfare, and they reflect Theodore Roosevelt's manly ideal and foreshadow America's self-conception on the world stage

through much of the twentieth century. The steely-eyed, broad-shouldered *Hiker* is a prototype for twentieth-century American mythology.

Chapter 6

CONCLUSION

On November 13, 1982, more than 150,000 Vietnam veterans, their families, and their supporters gathered in Washington, DC for the National Salute to Vietnam Veterans, a belated coming-home ceremony that also served as the unveiling of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.[459] The memorial, designed by Yale architecture student Maya Lin, had become a lightning rod for both effusive praise and vociferous criticism. The now-famous black granite walls, arranged in a wide V-shape and bearing the names of all of the American soldiers killed in Vietnam in the chronological order of their deaths, were initially maligned as a "black gash of shame and sorrow" that failed to honor the veterans who served in the war (figures 6.1-6.3).[460] These protests resulted in significant changes to Lin's original design, including the addition of a flag and figural sculpture of three Vietnam veterans placed at a slight remove from the wall. But immediately upon the monument's unveiling, it became apparent that the wall of names met the needs of surviving veterans and their families who desired a site where they could gather, mourn, and make sense of their experience of a particularly fraught American conflict. Maya Lin's design for the

---

[459] Patrick Hagopian, *The Vietnam War in American Memory: Veterans, Memorials, and the Politics of Healing* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2009), 140-150.

[460] Tom Carhart, "Insulting Vietnam Vets," *New York Times*, October 24, 1981.

Vietnam Veterans Memorial offered a reinvigorated concept for the citizen soldier

monument, one that met the realities of modern warfare in the late twentieth century

while at the same time crystallizing notions of remembrance that had been part of the

memorial landscape since the Civil War. Like the monuments to the Civil War,

Revolutionary War, and Spanish-American War, the Vietnam Veteran Memorial

allows the viewer to look both backward and forward, reconceptualizing notions of

earlier American wars through the lens of modern experience.

Between the end of the Spanish-American War and the groundbreaking for the

Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the twentieth century was a time of decreasing interest in

the traditional citizen soldier monument in the United States. First, World War I

invited a new crop of increasingly standardized memorials, some of which were

marketed on an even more commercial scale than the *Hiker* statues designed by Theo

Alice Ruggles Kitson and Allen George Newman. The most popular of these, the

Spirit of the American Doughboy by Ernest Moore Viquesney, exists in more than 130

full-size examples and many small-scale figurines and even lamps (figure 6.4). As

Jennifer Wingate has suggested, statues like Viquesney's fostered a sense of

community among locals who gathered in front of them for speeches and parades. The

monuments also served to deter anti-American thought. But at the same time, the

statues met with increasingly loud complaints from the established art world.[461] This

art world criticism, combined with the nation's generalized fatigue with figural soldier

---

[461] Jennifer Wingate, "Over the Top: The Doughboy in World War I Memorials and Visual Culture," *American Art* 19, no. 2 (Summer 2005): 29-31. See also Jennifer Wingate, *Sculpting Doughboys: Memory, Gender, and Taste in America's World War I Memorials* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013).

monuments, contributed to a landscape of post-World War II commemoration that consisted largely of living memorials: highways, hospitals, bridges, auditoriums and other structures that included the word "memorial" in their names but were also intended for a completely functional purpose.[462] Kristin Hass has argued that this impulse sprang not only from statue fatigue, but also from a "postwar nationalism" that saw many Americans wanting to "reap the benefits of the free world" through leisure activities. Thus, memorials to World War II took the form of civic and cultural structures made possible through postwar prosperity.[463]

But with the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, Americans returned to the notion of purpose-built soldier monuments. In many ways, Lin's design is radically different from the Civil War, Revolutionary War, and Spanish-American War monuments that have been the subject of this dissertation. Her memorial is horizontal, not vertical, sunk into the ground rather than protruding above grade. Rather than white marble or patinated bronze, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is carved from polished black granite that reflects the faces of visitors and the surrounding landscape. The original conception for the memorial included no figural elements and no inscriptions beyond the names of the dead, and even with these additions, the monument refuses to comment on the politics of the Vietnam War. As Kirk Savage has explained, Lin's Vietnam Veterans Memorial is an "antimonument," using the visual language of minimalism to create a space where the dead of the Vietnam War can be mourned as

---

[462] See Andrew Shanken, "Planning Memory: Living Memorials in the United States during World War II," *Art Bulletin* 84, no. 1 (March 2002): 130-147.

[463] Kristin Ann Hass, *Carried to the Wall: American Memory and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 59.

victims without either positive or negative cues to direct that experience.[464] With its minimalist structure, the memorial provides therapeutic release in the wake of an unpopular, confusing, and divisive war.

But even with these strong formal elements denoting a shift in perspective, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial remains deeply rooted in the traditions of the citizen soldier monument active in the United States since the Civil War. As Kristin Hass has pointed out, Lin's design, with its exhaustive collection of names of the dead, is the crystallization of an impulse that began at places like Gettysburg, where the American government first began to make provisions to honor its soldier dead with purpose-built cemeteries. Before the American Civil War, the rank and file soldiers who fell in battle across the Western world were usually buried in mass graves and left unnamed and unrecognized. The dedication of the first national cemetery for soldiers and the memorable address given by Abraham Lincoln changed all this.[465] It is not surprising that citizen soldier monuments began appearing at around the same time. The naming of the dead, such a key feature of Lin's memorial, was also an incredibly important aspect of the soldier monuments of the nineteenth century. First and foremost, these monuments were accounts of the sacrifice that a particular town or city had made for its country, and places where family members could remember a son or husband who had not returned home from the war. As the Vietnam Veterans Memorial serves today's survivors, the Civil War monuments were also a sort of reckoning.

---

[464] Kirk Savage, *Monument Wars: Washington, D.C., the National Mall, and the Transformation of the Memorial Landscape* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 266-267.

[465] Hass, *Carried to the Wall*, 43-53.

Both the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the soldier monuments of the nineteenth century also suggest a level of interaction with the memory of the viewer. Marita Sturken has usefully identified the Vietnam Veterans Memorial as a "screen," meaning both "a surface that is projected upon" and "an object that hides something from view." Much has been made of the memorial's polished black surface, which reflects the faces of visitors and the surrounding landscape, including nearby monuments and the cycles of land and sky (figure 6.5). For Sturken, this reflective surface both serves as a mirror and as a plane where visitors can project their own memories related to the Vietnam War. At the same time, the memorial's lack of overt political message allows visitors to "screen out" aspects of the war that they do not wish to see.[466] The memorial's minimalist visual language and flat vertical walls lend themselves easily to this kind of reading. But both definitions of "screen" also apply to the nineteenth-century soldier monument. The faces of the soldier statues chosen to top the monuments were deliberately generalized, making it possible for as many people as possible to identify them with a missing loved one. Even though they had a specific iconography, these statues invited the projection of identity. And in choosing an unabashedly heroic view of American military conflict, these statues "screened out" unpleasant truths about the wars: the suppression of Native American populations in order to make room for the founding of the United States; the abandonment of the quest for African American rights in favor of post-Civil War white reconciliation; the continued struggles of veterans struggling to assimilate into post war life; and in the case of the Spanish-American War, a prolonged quagmire in Southeast Asia that

---

[466] Marita Sturken, *Tangled Memories: The Vietnam War, the AIDS Epidemic, and the Politics of Remembering* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 44-45.

prefigured America's involvement in Vietnam. The nineteenth-century soldier monuments and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial vary widely in iconography, both products of the artistic preferences of their time. But no matter the era, war memorials navigate a balance between remembrance and forgetting; celebration and mourning; inclusion and exclusion; and the long view of history.

On the point of inclusion, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial represents an improvement over the racial, gender, and body politics of the nineteenth century. While the local soldier monuments of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War sometimes listed the names of nonwhite soldiers, the memorials were always topped by idealized white male soldiers, whole in body and imposingly heroic. While these monuments were meant to represent all of the soldiers of a particular area, the men who did not conform to this visual and racial type were ultimately excluded. Lin's wall, in contrast, is inclusive. Many scholars have pointed out that the names of the soldiers listed on the memorial read as a recognizable American melting pot, with names from all creeds and cultures, and that the chronological listing of names without regard for military rank gives the memorial an egalitarian spirit.[467] Even the *Three Soldiers* statue by Frederick Hart and the *Vietnam Women's Memorial* by Glenna Goodacre, usually denigrated as unnecessary figural graffiti tacked onto Lin's design, play their part in demonstrating that the American military, and memorials to it, have become more inclusive since the nineteenth century (figure 6.6-6.7).

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial also offers a better response to the body of the wounded veteran than the citizen soldier monument of the nineteenth century ever

[467] Sturken, *Tangled Memories*, 58-60; Hass, *Carried to the Wall*, 14-15; Hagopian, *The Vietnam War in American Memory*, 145-148.

could. Maya Lin has explained how her design stemmed from a desire to "cut open the earth," to commit an "initial violence that in time would heal."[468] This is a fitting metaphor for the loss of a loved one in war: the friend or relative is lost through violence, and that loss is felt deeply, but with time that emotional hole is healed, leaving a scar behind to indicate absence. But this is also literally the process through which a wounded body recovers from the horrors of war. The wound heals, and life continues, but the body is never the same as before. It is perhaps understandable that the first American war memorial to provide a profound visual metaphor for the wounded body was not erected in honor of a conflict in which the United States was victorious. Unlike in Northern cities following the Civil War, the wounded Vietnam veteran is consistent with the nation's memory of the war.

Finally, the most important connection between the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the nineteenth-century is the participation of all war memorials in a dynamic view of history. This entire dissertation has been concerned with monuments that look backwards and forwards, reconceptualizing earlier American wars in the context of current events or connecting a recent conflict with the past. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial also allows for this. It is now more than thirty years past the date when the wall was first dedicated. When the memorial was first put in place, it was the site of many expressions of raw grief, when family members and wartime comrades with recent memories of loss saw their loved ones' names on the wall for the first time. Visitors made rubbings of the carved names, and more visitors joined them. People began leaving items at the wall: flowers, flags, letters, medals, and other

---

[468] Sturken, *Tangled Memories*, 54-55.

articles of a more personal nature. The National Park Service began collecting these items, and the collection grows every day, with visitors to the wall now leaving items with the conscious knowledge that they are contributing to a significant mass of objects.[469] Thirty years after the dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the performances of memory at the wall are choreographed by tradition. The veterans and families who remember the soldiers listed on the wall are becoming older or dying, and the memorial traditions are being passed down to new generations. In time, there will be a sesquicentennial of the Vietnam War, and future Americans will look back with questions shaped by their specific moment in time.

But also, this recent experience with war, loss, and memory allows for a reimagination of those same processes at earlier moments. Through our recent observation of loved ones grieving at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, we can empathize with the pain of parents, brothers, sisters, and spouses who gathered to dedicate monuments to their lost loved ones after the Civil War. Those early years would have been just as raw and filled with emotion. And just as a memorial like Daniel Chester French's *Minute Man*, a young, virile soldier of the Revolutionary War, was made possible through the experience of seeing young men mobilizing for the Civil War, recent experiences in Vietnam or in the Middle East have prompted new questions about wars of the past. The relatively recent identification of post-traumatic stress disorder has prompted studies that have found those same patterns of psychic trauma in the Civil War.[470] The power of the names listed on the Vietnam

---

[469] Hass, *Carried to the Wall*, 21-33.

[470] Eric T. Dean, Jr., *Shook Over Hell: Post-Traumatic Stress, Vietnam, and the Civil War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).

Veterans Memorial makes it clear that those lists of names on earlier memorials would have held similar weight for the individuals who knew the soldiers they represented. On goes the cycle of remembering, forgetting, and reimagining, as new conflicts and new experiences create new opportunities for empathy and identification with the past.

FIGURES

Figures removed due to copyright.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Selected Archival Collections

Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Bentley Historical Library
  Randolph Rogers Papers

Chicago, IL: Art Institute of Chicago
  Monumental News print run

Madison, WI: Wisconsin Historical Society

Newark, DE: University of Delaware Special Collections

Providence, RI: Brown University Library
  Gorham Company Records

Washington, DC: Archives of American Art
  Daniel Chester French Letters, 1908-1921
  Henry Hudson Kitson and Theo Alice Ruggles Kitson Papers, 1870s-1979
  Randolph Rogers Papers, 1848-1964

Washington, DC: Library of Congress
  Daniel Chester French Papers

Washington, DC: Smithsonian American Art Museum
  Inventory of American Sculpture

Williamstown, MA: Chapin Library, Williams College
  Chesterwood Archives (Papers of Daniel Chester French and family)

Winterthur, DE: Winterthur Museum, Garden, and Library

Worcester, MA: American Antiquarian Society

Selected Primary Sources

Adams, Adeline. "War Memorials in Sculpture," *Scribners* 65 (March 1919): 381-384.

"American Studios in Rome and Florence," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine* 33, no. 193 (June 1866): 101-105.

Allison, Young Ewing. *The City of Louisville and a Glimpse of Kentucky.* Louisville, KY: Louisville Board of Trade, 1887.

Ball, Thomas. *My Threescore Years and Ten: An Autobiography.* Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1891.

Bartlett, Truman H. "Civic Monuments in New England, IV," *The American Architect and Building News* 10, no. 289 (July 9, 1881): 15-17.

Beers, Ethel Lynn. "All Quiet on the Potomac Tonight," *Harper's Weekly* 5, no. 257 (November 30, 1861): 766.

Beauley, William Jean. "A Peculiar Type of American Art," *Art and Progress* 4, no. 11 (September 1913): 1101-1105.

Beebe, Angie C., ed., *An Original Collection of War Poems and War Songs of the American Civil War.* Red Wing, MN: The Argus Press, 1903.

Bierce, Ambrose. *The Devil's Dictionary*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999, originally published 1911.

Bierce, Ambrose. *Shadows of Blue and Gray: The Civil War Writings of Ambrose Bierce*. New York: Tom Doherty Associates, 2002, originally published 1891.

Bricktop (George G. Small), *Going to the Centennial and a Guy to the Exhibition.* New York: Collin & Small, 1876.

A Brief History of the Ladies' Memorial Association of Charleston, S.C. Charleston, SC: B.P. Cooke & Co., 1880.

Bullet, Emma. "What French Sculptors Think of American Sculptors," *Monumental News* 7, no. 5 (May 1895): 305.

Ceremonies at the Dedication of the Soldiers' Monument, in Concord, Mass. Concord: Printed by Benjamin Tolman, 1867.

Christian, W.E. *Rhymes of the Rookies*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1917.

Curtis, George D. *Souvenir of the Centennial Exhibition, or Connecticut's Representation at Philadelphia, 1876*. Hartford, CT: George D. Curtis, 1877.

Curtis, George William. "19th April 1775-1875: An Oration Delvered at Concord, Massachusetts, on the 19th of April, 1875, the One-Hundredth Anniversary of 'Concord Fight'," *Harpers Weekly* (May 1, 1875): 369.

Downes, William Howe. "Monuments and Statues in Boston," *New England Magazine* 11, no. 3 (November 1894): 353-372.

Downes, William Howe. "The Work of Bela L. Pratt, Sculptor," *New England Magazine* 27, no. 6 (February 1903): 770-771.

Emerson, Mrs. B.A.C., ed., *Historic Southern Monuments: Representative Memorials of the Heroic Dead of the Southern Confederacy.* New York: Neale Publishing Company, 1911.

Four Men of the Travelers. Hartford, CT: Travelers Insurance Company, 1944.

Hoeber, Arthur. *The Treasures of the Metropolitan Museum of Art of New York*. New York: R.H. Russell Publisher, 1900.

Hoge, Peyton Harrison. *Moses Drury Hoge: Life and Letters.* Richmond, VA: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1899.

Hosmer, Harriet. "The Process of Sculpture," *Atlantic Monthly* 14, no. 86 (December 1864): 734-737.

Hudson, Charles. *History of the Town of Lexington.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1913.

Howells, William Dean. "Question of Monuments," *Atlantic Monthly* 18 (May 1866): 646-649.

Jackson, Giles B. and D. Webster Davis. *The Industrial History of the Negro Race.* Richmond, VA: Negro Educational Association, 1911.

Kuhn, Eleanor. *The Town Rhine Monument to Civil War Dead*. Sheboygan: Sheboygan County Landmarks, Ltd., 1976.

Loring, George B. *An Oration Delivered at Lexington on the Dedication of the Town and Memorial Hall, April 19, 1871.* Boston: T.R. Marvin and Son, 1871.

McCabe, James D. *The Illustrated History of the Centennial Exhibition.* Philadelphia: National Publishing Co., 1876.

McKenney, Frank. *The Standing Army: History of Georgia's County Confederate Monuments*. Alpharetta, GA: W. H. Wolfe Associates, 1993.

"Method for Reversing Arms," *United States Army and Navy Journal and Gazette of the Regular and Volunteer Forces* vol. 3, no. 36 (April 28, 1866): 569.

Official Catalogue of the International Exhibition of 1876. Philadelphia: Centennial Catalogue Company, 1876.

Paine, Albert Bigelow. *Thomas Nast: His Period and His Pictures.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904.

Phelps, Elizabeth Stuart. *Chapters from a Life*. Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1896.

Pollard, Edward A. *The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates.* New York: E.B. Treat and Company, 1867.

Proceedings at the Centennial Celebration of the Battle of Lexington, April 19, 1875. Boston: Lockwood, Brooks, & Co., 1875.

Proceedings at the Centennial Celebration of Concord Fight, April 19, 1875. Concord, MA: Published by the Town, 1876.

Proceedings at the Dedication of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Monument by the City Council of Charlestown, June 17, 1872. Charlestown: Chronicle Office, 1872.

Reynolds, Cuyler. *New York at the Jamestown Exposition, Norfolk, Virginia, April 26 to December 1, 1907.* Albany, NY: J.B. Lyon Company, 1909.

Rimmer, William. *Elements of Design, Book First, for the Use of Parents and Teachers.* Boston: John Wilson & Son, 1864.

Robinson, Frank T. "Sculptured Monuments of Boston," *Monumental News* 6, no. 7 (July 1894).

Roosevelt, Theodore. *Hunting Trips of a Ranchman: Sketches of Sport on the Northern Cattle Plains.* New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1885.

Sargent, Ledyard W., ed., *Dudley Allen Sargent: An Autobiography.* Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger, 1927.

Shelby, Albert. "The Army's Songs of the Philippines," *Harper's Weekly* (March 5, 1910): 16-17.

"Sketchings: Cheap Art," *Crayon* 2, no. 16 (October 17, 1855): 248.

Smith, J.E.A., ed., *The Proceedings at the Dedication of the Soldiers' Monument, at Pittsfield, Mass., September 24, 1872, including the Oration of Hon. Geo. Wm. Curtis*. Pittsfield, MA: Chickering & Axtell, 1872.

Smith, Walter. *The Masterpieces of the Centennial International Exhibition, Volume II, Industrial Art.* Philadelphia: Gebbie and Barrie, 1877.

"Soldiers' Monuments," *Harper's Weekly* 9, no. 431 (April 1, 1865): 198.

Stowe, Harriet Beecher. "What Pictures Shall I Hang On My Walls?" *Atlantic Almanac* (1869): 41-44.

Strahan, Edward. *The Masterpieces of the Centennial International Exhibition, Volume I, Fine Art.* Philadelphia: Gebbie and Barrie, 1877.

Thayer, George A. *The Braintree Soldiers' Memorial: A Record of the Services in the War of the Rebellion of the Men of Braintree, Massachusetts, whose Names are Inscribed on the Braintree Soldiers' Monument.* Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1877.

"The Empty Sleeve at Newport; or, Why Edna Ackland Learned to Drive," *Harpers Weekly* vol. 9, no. 452 (August 26, 1865): 534.

"The Gettysburg Monument," *Harper's Weekly* 13, no. 655 (July 17, 1869): 457-458.

The Volunteer's Hand Book: Containing an Abridgement of Hardee's Infantry Tactics, adapted to the use of the percussion musket in squad and company exercises, Manual of Arms for Riflemen, and United States Army Regulations as to parades, reviews, inspections, guard mounting, etc. Richmond, VA: West & Johnson, 1860.

von Mach, Edmund. *Greek Sculpture: Its Spirit and Principles*. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1903.

White, Walter Francis. *The Fire in the Flint.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1924.

W.H. Mullins Company, *The Blue and the Gray: Statues in Stamped Copper and Bronze.* Salem, OH: W.H. Mullins Company, 1913.

Selected Secondary Sources

Abbott, Carl. "Norfolk in the New Century: The Jamestown Exposition and Urban Boosterism," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 85, no. 1 (January 1977): 86-96.

Adams, Adeline. *Daniel Chester French, Sculptor*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1932.

Adams, Michael C.C. *Echoes of War: A Thousand Years of Military History in Popular Culture*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2002.

Alexander, Ann Field. "No Officers, No Fight! The Sixth Virginia Volunteers in the Spanish-American War," *Virginia Cavalcade* 7, no. 4 (1998): 178-191.

Allen, Michael. "The Rodeo Cowboy in Art: A Sampling," *The Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 87, no. 1 (Winter 1995/1996): 38-44.

Arnason, H.H. *The Sculptures of Houdon.* London: Phaidon Press Limited, 1975.

Ater, Renée. *Remaking Race and History: The Sculpture of Meta Warrick Fuller*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.

Ayers, Edward L. "Narrating the New South," *Journal of Southern History* 61, no. 3 (August 1995): 555-566.

Ayers, Edward L. *Vengeance and Justice: Crime and Punishment in the 19th-Century South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Bailey, Harris Moore, Jr., "The Splendid Little Forgotten War: The Mobilization of South Carolina for the War with Spain," *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 92, no. 3 (June 1991): 189-214.

Barnes, Mark R. *The Spanish-American War and Philippine Insurrection, 1898-1902: An Annotated Bibliography.* New York: Routledge, 2011.

Bassham, Ben L. *Conrad Wise Chapman: Artist & Soldier of the Confederacy*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1998.

Bederman, Gail. *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Berger, Martin A. *Man Made: Thomas Eakins and the Construction of Gilded Age Manhood.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Bernath, Michael T. *Confederate Minds: The Struggle for Intellectual Independence in the Civil War South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.

Bier, Justus. "A Forgotten Work by Ferdinand von Miller the Younger, a Contribution to the History of Confederate Monuments," *Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* 4 (April 1956): 125-133.

Bindman, David. *Ape to Apollo: Aesthetics and the Idea of Race in the 18th Century.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Blair, William A. *Cities of the Dead: Contesting the Memory of the Civil War in the South, 1865-1914*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Blight, David W. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001.

Bogart, Michele. *Public Sculpture and the Civic Ideal in New York City, 1890-1930*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997.

Boime, Albert. *The Art of Exclusion: Representing Blacks in the Nineteenth Century.* Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1990.

Born, Pamela. "The Canon is Cast: Plasters Casts in American Museum and University Collections," *Art Documentation: Bulletin of the Art Libraries Society of North America* 21, no. 2 (2002): 8-13.

Bostick, Douglas W. *The Confederacy's Secret Weapon: The Civil War Illustrations of Frank Vizetelly*. Charleston, SC: The History Press, 2009.

Boyd, Steven R. *Patriotic Envelopes of the Civil War: The Iconography of Union and Confederate Covers*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2010.

Bradford, James C., ed. *Crucible of Empire: The Spanish-American War & its Aftermath.* Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1993.

Brady, Tim. *Gopher Gold: Legendary Figures, Brilliant Blunders, and Amazing Feats at the University of Minnesota*. Minneapolis: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 2007.

Brands, H.W. *The Reckless Decade: America in the 1890s*. New York: St. Martins Press, 1995.

Brody, David. *Visualizing American Empire: Orientalism and Imperialism in the Philippines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Brown, Charles H. *The Correspondents' War: Journalists in the Spanish-American War.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967.

Brown, Dee. *The Year of the Century: 1876*. New York: Scribner, 1966.

Brown, Thomas J. *The Public Art of Civil War Commemoration: A Brief History with Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2004.

Brundage, W. Fitzhugh. *Lynching in the New South: Georgia and Virginia, 1880-1930.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.

Brundage, W. Fitzhugh. "Meta Warrick's 1907 'Negro Tableaux' and (Re)Presenting African American Historical Memory," *Journal of American History* 89, no. 4 (March 2003): 1368-1400.

Buscombe, Edward. "Painting the Legend: Frederic Remington and the Western," *Cinema Journal* 23, no. 4 (Summer 1984): 12-27.

Budiansky, Stephen. *The Bloody Shirt: Terror after the Civil War*. New York: Plume, 2008.

Burns, Sarah. *Painting the Dark Side: Art and the Gothic Imagination in Nineteenth-Century America.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

Burns, Sarah. "Revitalizing the 'Painted-Out' North: Winslow Homer, Manly Health, and New England," *American Art* 9, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 20-37.

Caffin, Charles H. *American Masters of Sculpture*. Doubleday, Page, and Co., 1903.

Campbell, W. Joseph. *Yellow Journalism: Puncturing the Myths, Defining the Legacies.* Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2001.

Cashin, Edward J. *The Story of Augusta.* Augusta, GA: Richmond County Board of Education, 1980.

Chapman, Gregory Dean. "Army Life at Camp Thomas, Georgia, During the Spanish-American War," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 70, no. 4 (Winter 1986): 633-656.

Cimbala, Paul A. *Soldiers North and South: The Everyday Experiences of the Men who Fought America's Civil War.* New York: Fordham University Press, 2010.

Cirillo, Vincent J. *Bullets and Bacilli: The Spanish-American War and Military Medicine.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2004.

Clapper, Michael. "'I Was Once a Barefoot Boy!': Cultural Tensions in a Popular Chromo," *American Art* 16, no. 2 (Summer 2002): 16-39.

Clark, William J. "The Iconography of Gender in Thomas Eakins Portraiture," *American Studies* 32, no. 2 (Fall 1991): 5-28.

Clapper, Michael. "Reconstructing a Family: John Rogers's Taking the Oath and Drawing Rations," *Winterthur Portfolio* 39, no. 4 (Winter 2004): 259-278.

Cobb, James C. *Away Down South: A History of Southern Identity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Cosmas, Graham A. *An Army for Empire: The United States Army in the Spanish-American War.* Shippensburg, PA: White Mane Publishing Co., 1994.

Coulter, E. Merton. "The Confederate Monument in Athens, Georgia," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (September 1956): 230-247.

Craven, Wayne. *Sculpture in America.* Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1968, reprint: 1984.

Cresson, Margaret French. *Journey Into Fame: The Life of Daniel Chester French.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Cullinane, Michael Patrick. *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism, 1898-1909* (New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2012.

Cunningham, Roger D. "'A Lot of Fine, Sturdy Black Warriors': African American 'Immunes' in the Spanish-American War," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 108, no. 3 (January 2005): 344-367.

Dabakis, Melissa. *Visualizing Labor in American Sculpture: Monuments, Manliness, and the Work Ethic, 1880-1935*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Davis, Elliot Bostwick. "William Rimmer's 'Art Anatomy' and Charles Darwin's Theories of Evolution," *Master Drawings* 40, no. 4 (Winter 2002): 345-359.

Dean, Eric T., Jr. *Shook Over Hell: Post-Traumatic Stress, Vietnam, and the Civil War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Di Donato, Louis A. "The Forgotten Regiment: The Seventh California and the Spanish-American War," *Southern California Quarterly* 83, no. 4 (Winter 2001): 355-376.

Doss, Erika. *Memorial Mania: Public Feeling in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Dowling, Linda C. *Charles Eliot Norton: The Art of Reform in Nineteenth-Century America*. Lebanon: University of New Hampshire Press, 2007.

Dragosani-Brantingham, Justin. "'Proud Are We': Private Rhinehart and the College Company of the Twenty-Second Kansas Volunteers," *Kansas History* 22, no. 2 (1999): 100-131.

Dearinger, David B. *Painting and Sculpture in the Collection of the National Academy of Design.* Manchester, VT: Hudson Hills Press, 2004.

de Quesada, Alejandro. *The Spanish-American War and Philippine Insurrection, 1898-1902.* Oxford, UK: Osprey Publishing, 2007.

Dray, Philip. *At the Hands of Persons Unknown: The Lynching of Black America.* New York: Random House, 2002.

Faust, Drew Gilpin. *The Creation of Confederate Nationalism: Ideology and Identity in the Civil War South.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988.

Faust, Drew Gilpin. *Southern Stories: Slaveholders in Peace and War.* Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press: 1992.

Faust, Drew Gilpin. *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008.

Field, Ron. *Brassey's History of Uniforms: Spanish-American War, 1898.* London: Brassey's Ltd., 1998.

Finnegan, Thomas J. "Dr. Dudley Sargent's Summer at Chautauqua: Evangelizing the Gospel of Physical Culture," *New York History* 86, no. 1 (Winter 2005): 29-49.

Foner, Eric. *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution*. New York: Harper Collins, 1988, reprint Perennial Classics, 2002.

Foster, Gaines M. *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865-1913.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

French, Mary Adams French. *Memories of a Sculptor's Wife, by Mrs. Daniel Chester French*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1928.

Galvin, John R. *The Minute Men: The First Fight: Myths and Realities of the American Revolution.* Washington: Pergamon-Brassey's International Defense Publishers, Inc., 1989.

Gaston, Paul M. *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.

Gatewood, Willard B., Jr. *Black Americans and the White Man's Burden, 1898-1903.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1975.

Gerber, David A., ed. *Disabled Veterans in History.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000.

Gerster, Patrick and Nicholas Cords, eds. *Myth and Southern History Volume 1: The Old South*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989.

Giberti, Bruno. *Designing the Centennial: A History of the 1876 International Exhibition in Philadelphia*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2008.

Gillette, William. *Retreat From Reconstruction, 1869-1879*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1979.

Glasrud, Bruce A., and James M. Smallwood, eds. *The African American Experience in Texas: An Anthology*. Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University Press, 2007.

Gleach, Frederic W. "Pocahontas at the Fair: Crafting Identities at the 1907 Jamestown Exposition," *Ethnohistory* 50, no. 3 (Summer 2003): 419-445.

Gleijeses, Piero. "African Americans and the War Against Spain," *North Carolina Historical Review* 73, no. 2 (1996): 184-214.

Gold, Susanna W. "'Fighting It Over Again': *The Battle of Gettysburg* at the 1876 Centennial Exhibition," *Civil War History* 54, no. 3 (2008): 277-310.

Goldfield, David. *Still Fighting the Civil War: The American South and Southern History.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002.

Grissom, Carol. *Zinc Sculpture in America, 1850-1950*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2009.

Gross, Robert A. *The Minutemen and their World*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1976.

Goldfield, David. *Still Fighting the Civil War: The American South and Southern History*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002.

Goler, Robert I. "Loss and the Persistence of Memory: 'The Case of George Dedlow' and Disabled Civil War Veterans," *Literature and Medicine* 23, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 160-183.

Goler, Robert I. and Michael G. Rhode, "From Individual Trauma to National Policy: Tracking the Uses of Civil War Veteran Medical Records," in *Disabled Veterans in History*, David A. Gerber, ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000.

Gould, Lewis L. *The Spanish-American War and President McKinley*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1982.

Green, Elna C. "Protecting Confederate Soldiers and Mothers: Pensions, Gender and the Welfare State in the U.S. South, a Case Study from Florida," *Journal of Social History* 39, no. 4 (Summer 2006): 1079-1104.

Greenspan, Robert E. *Medicine: Perspectives in History and Art*. Alexandria, VA: Ponteverde Press, 2004.

Hacker, J. David. "A Census-Based Count of the Civil War Dead," *Civil War History* 57, no. 4 (December 2011): 307-348.

Hagopian, Patrick. *The Vietnam War in American Memory: Veterans, Memorials, and the Politics of Healing.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2009.

Hamilton, John Maxwell, Renita Coleman, Bettye Grable and Jaci Cole, "An Enabling Environment: A Reconsideration of the Press and the Spanish-American War," *Journalism Studies* 7, no. 1 (2006): 78-93.

Harding, Jonathan P. *The Boston Athenaeum Collection: Pre-Twentieth Century American and European Painting and Sculpture.* Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1984.

Harris, Emily J. "*Sons and Soldiers*: Deerfield, Massachusetts and the Civil War." *Civil War History* 30, no. 2 (June 1984): 157-171.

Hannon, Helen. "Built to Honor, Not to Mourn: The Soldiers and Sailors Monument on Boston Common." *Nineteenth Century* 24, no. 2 (Fall 2004): 32-38.

Hannah, Eleanor. "A Place in the Parade: Citizenship, Manhood, and African American Men in the Illinois National Guard, 1870-1917," *Journal of Illinois History* 5, no. 2 (2002): 82-108.

Harrington, Peter and Frederic A. Sharf. *"A Splendid Little War": The Spanish-American War, 1898, The Artists' Perspective.* London: Greenhill Books, 1998.

Harvey, Eleanor. *The Civil War and American Art*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

Hass, Kristin Ann. *Carried to the Wall: American Memory and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998

Herschbach, Lisa. "Prosthetic Reconstructions: Making the Industry, Re-Making the Body, Modelling the Nation," *History Workshop Journal* 44 (Autumn 1997): 22-57.

Hills, Patricia. "The American Art-Union as Patron for Expansionist Ideology in the 1940s," in *Art in Bourgeois Society, 1790-1850*, Andrew Hemingway and William Vaughan, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Hirschler, Erica E. et al. *A Studio of Her Own: Women Artists in Boston 1870-1940.* Boston: MFA Publications, 2001.

Hoganson, Kristin L. *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Hoole, William Stanley. *Vizetelly Covers the Confederacy.* Tuscaloosa, AL: Confederate Publishing Company, Inc., 1957.

Ifill, Sherrilyn. *On the Courthouse Lawn: Confronting the Legacy of Lynching in the Twenty-first Century.* Boston: Beacon Press, 2007.

Jackson, John Brinckerhoff. *Discovering the Vernacular Landscape.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.

Janney, Caroline E. *Burying the Dead but Not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

Jarman, Baird. "The Graphic Art of Thomas Nast: Politics and Propriety in Postbellum Publishing," *American Periodicals* 20, no. 2 (2010): 156-189.

Johns, Elizabeth. *American Genre Painting: The Politics of Everyday Life.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.

Johns, Elizabeth. *Thomas Eakins: The Heroism of Modern Life.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Johnson, J.R. "The Second Nebraska's 'Battle' of Chickamauga," *Nebraska History* 32 (June 1951): 77-93.

Kammen, Michael. *Digging Up the Dead: A History of Notable American Reburials*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Kammen, Michael. *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991.

Kasson, Joy S. *Marble Queens and Captives: Women in Nineteenth-Century American Sculpture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Kinsey, Joni L. *Thomas Moran's West: Chromolithography, High Art, and Popular Taste*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, Josslyn Art Museum, 2006.

Klein, Rachel N. "Art and Authority in Antebellum New York City: The Rise and Fall of the American Art-Union," *The Journal of American History* 81:4 (March 1995): 1534-1561.

Langellier, John Philip. "From Blue Kersey to Khaki Drill: The Field Uniform of the U.S. Army, 1898-1901," *Military Collector & Historian* 34, no. 4 (1982): 148-158.

Le Beau, Bryan F. *Currier and Ives: America Imagined*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2001.

Lee, Anthony W. and Elizabeth Young. *On Alexander Gardner's* Photographic Sketch Book *of the Civil War*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Leffler, John. "The Paradox of Patriotism: Texans in the Spanish-American War," *Hayes Historical Journal* 8 (1989): 24-48.

Leja, Michael. *Looking Askance: Skepticism and American Art from Eakins to Duchamp*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Linden, Blanche M.G. *Silent City on a Hill: Picturesque Landscapes of Memory and Boston's Mount Auburn Cemetery*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007.

Little, David B. *America's First Centennial Celebration: The Nineteenth of April 1875 at Lexington and Concord, Massachusetts*. Boston: Club of Odd Volumes, 1961.

Lockwood, John and Charles Lockwood. *The Siege of Washington: The Untold Story of the Twelve Days that Shook the Union.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Loewen, James W. *Lies Across America: What Our Historic Sites Get Wrong.* New York: The New Press, 1999.

Loewen, James W. and Edward H. Sebesta. *The Confederate and Neo-Confederate Reader: The "Great Truth" about the "Lost Cause."* Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2010.

Lovett, Christopher. "'To Serve Faithfully': The Twenty-Third Kansas Infantry and the Spanish-American War," *Kansas History* 21 (1998-1999): 256-275.

Logue, Larry M. *To Appomattox and Beyond: The Civil War Soldier in War and Peace.* Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996.

Logue, Larry M. and Michael Barton, eds. *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader*. New York: New York University Press, 2007.

Lord, Francis A. *Uniforms of the Civil War*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 1970.

Lubin, David. *Picturing a Nation: Art and Social Change in Nineteenth-Century America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Macleod, Jenny, ed. *Defeat and Memory: Cultural Histories of Military Defeat in the Modern Era*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

McCaffrey, James M. "Texans in the Spanish-American War," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 106, no. 2 (October 2002): 254-279.

McCartney, Paul T. *Power and Progress: American National Identity, the War of 1898, and the Rise of American Imperialism.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006.

McCoy, Alfred W. and Francisco A. Scarano, eds. *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009.

McDaniel, George William. "Martial Sons of Martial Sires," *Palimpsest* 70, no. 1 (1989): 32-48.

McDowell, Peggy and Richard E. Meyer. *The Revival Styles in American Memorial Art*. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Press, 1994.

McInnis, Maurie and Louis P. Nelson, eds. *Shaping the Body Politic: Art and Political Formation in Early America.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011.

McKenney, Frank. *The Standing Army*. Alpharetta, GA: W. H. Wolfe Associates, 1993.

Meakin, John D., David L. Ames, and Donald A. Doske. "Degradation of Monumental Bronzes." *APT Bulletin* 23, no. 4 (1991): 58-63.

Miller, Bonnie M. *From Liberation to Conquest: The Visual and Popular Cultures of the Spanish-American War of 1898.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011.

Mills, Cynthia J. "Casting Shadows: The 'Adams Memorial' and Its Doubles," *American Art* 14, no. 2 (Summer 2000): 2-25.

Mills, Cynthia and Pamela H. Simpson. *Monuments to the Lost Cause: Women, Art, and the Landscapes of Southern Memory*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2003.

Mrozek, Donald J. *Sport and American Mentality, 1880-1910*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983.

Murdock, Harold. *The Nineteenth of April, 1875*. Boston: Riverside Press for Houghton Mifflin Company, 1923.

Musicant, Ivan. *Empire by Default: The Spanish-American War and the Dawn of the American Century*. New York: H. Holt, 1998.

Nawrocki, Dennis Alan. *Art in Detroit Public Places*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1980.

Neely, Mark E., Jr., Harold Holzer, and Gabor S. Boritt, *The Confederate Image: Prints of the Lost Cause*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

Neff, John R. *Honoring the Civil War Dead: Commemoration and the Problem of Reconciliation*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2005.

Nelson, Charmaine A. *The Color of Stone: Sculpting the Black Female Subject in Nineteenth-Century America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.

Nemerov, Alexander. *Frederic Remington and Turn-of-the-Century America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

O'Gorman, James F. *Accomplished in All Departments of Art: Hammatt Billings of Boston, 1818-1874*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998.

Orcutt, Kimberly, ed., *John Rogers: American Stories*. New York: Philip Wilson Publishers, 2010.

Painter, Nell Irvin. *The History of White People*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2010.

Patrick, Jeff. "Nothing but Slaves: The Second Kentucky Volunteer Infantry and the Spanish-American War," *Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* 89, no. 3 (1991): 287-299.

Poole, W. Scott. "Religion, Gender, and the Lost Cause in South Carolina's 1876 Governor's Race: 'Hampton or Hell!'", *Journal of Southern History* 68, no. 3 (August 2002): 579, 573-598.

Potts, Alex. *Flesh and the Ideal: Winckelmann and the Origins of Art History.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Poulet, Anne L. *Jean-Antoine Houdon, Sculptor of the Enlightenment.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Randel, William Peirce *Centennial: American Life in 1876.* Philadelphia: Chilton Book Company, 1969.

Raphael, Ray. *Founding Myths: Stories that Hide Our Patriotic Past.* New York: The New Press, 2004.

Reitzes, Lisa B. "The Political Voice of the Artist: Anne Whitney's 'Roma' and 'Harriet Martineau,'" *American Art* 8, no. 2 (Spring 1994): 44-65.

Reynolds, Donald Martin. *Masters of American Sculpture: The Figurative Tradition from the American Renaissance to the Millennium.* New York: Abbeville Press, 1993.

Richman, Michael. "The Early Public Sculpture of Daniel Chester French." *American Art Journal* 4, no. 2 (November 1972): 96-115.

Richman, Michael. *Daniel Chester French, an American Sculptor*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art for the National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1976.

Roark, Elizabeth L. "Embodying Immortality: Angels in America's Rural Garden Cemeteries, 1850-1900," *Markers: The Annual Journal for Gravestone Studies* 24 (2007): 56-111.

Roark, Elizabeth L. "Paint for the Many? Rereading William Sidney Mount's *The Painter's Triumph*," *Prospects* 28 (October 2004): 155-184.

Rogers, Millard F., Jr. *Randolph Rogers: American Sculptor in Rome*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1971.

Rosenheim, Jeff L. *Photography and the American Civil War*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2013.

Rubinstein, Charlotte Streifer. *American Women Sculptors: A History of Women Working in Three Dimensions*. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1990.

Rydell, Robert W. *Fair America*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000.

Samuels, Shirley. *Facing America: Iconography and the Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Sauers, Richard A. "From Hallowed Ground to Training Ground: Chickamauga's Camp Thomas, 1898," *Civil War Regiments: A Journal of the American Civil War* 7, no. 1 (2007): 129-143.

Savage, Kirk *Monument Wars: Washington, D.C., the National Mall, and the Transformation of the Memorial Landscape.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.

Savage, Kirk. *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Saveth, Edward N. "Theodore Roosevelt: Image and Ideology," *New York History* 72, no. 1 (January 1991): 45-68.

Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Schantz, Mark S. *Awaiting the Heavenly Country: The Civil War and America's Culture of Death*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.

Schellings, William. "Florida Volunteers in the War with Spain, 1898," *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (July 1962): 47-59.

Schott, Marshall. "East Texas and the Coming of the Spanish-American War: An Examination of Regional Values," *East Texas Historical Journal* 37, no. 2 (1999): 44-52.

Sedore, Timothy S. *An Illustrated Guide to Virginia's Confederate Monuments.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2011.

Shanken, Andrew M. "Planning Memory: Living Memorials in the United States during World War II." *The Art Bulletin* 84, no. 1 (March 2002): 130-147.

Shapiro, Michael Edward. *Bronze Casting and American Sculpture, 1850-1900*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1981.

Sharp, Lewis I. *John Quincy Adams Ward: Dean of American Sculpture, with a Catalogue Raisonné*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1985.

Sheehan-Dean, Aaron. "Justice Has Something to Do with It: Class Relations and the Confederate Army," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 113, no. 4 (2005): 340-377.

Silber, Nina. *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865-1900.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993.

Smith, S.L. *North Carolina's Confederate Monuments and Memorials.* Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1941.

Sturken, Marita. *Tangled Memories: The Vietnam War, the AIDS Epidemic, and the Politics of Remembering.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Sweet, Timothy. *Traces of War: Poetry, Photography, and the Crisis of the Union*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Taft, Lorado. *The History of American Sculpture*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930.

Tatham, David. *Winslow Homer and the Pictorial Press*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2003.

Taylor, Lou. *Mourning Dress: A Costume and Social History*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1983.

Taylor, Robert T. "The Jamestown Tercentennial Exposition of 1907," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 65, no. 2 (April 1957): 169-208.

Thomas, William G., III. "'Under Indictment': Thomas Lafayette Rosser and the New South," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 100, no. 2 (April 1992): 207-232.

Tolles, Thayer. *Selections from the American collections of the Museum of Fine Arts and the George Walter Vincent Smith Art Museum.* Springfield, MA: Springfield Library & Museums Association, 1999.

Trachtenberg, Alan. *The Incorporation of America: Culture and Society in the Gilded Age*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1982.

Traxel, David. *1898: The Birth of the American Century.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998.

Truettner, William and Roger Stein. *Picturing Old New England: Image and Memory.* Washington, DC: National Museum of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, 1999.

Vincent, Tom. "'Evidence of Womans Loyalty, Perseverance, and Fidelity': Confederate Soldiers' Monuments in North Carolina, 1865-1914," *North Carolina Historical Review* 83, no. 1 (January 2006): 61-90.

Waldrep, Christopher, ed., *Lynching in America: A History in Documents.* New York: New York University Press, 2006.

Waldstreicher, David. "Rites of Rebellion, Rituals of Assent: Celebrations, Print Culture, and the Origins of American Nationalism," *Journal of American History* 82, no. 1 (June 1995): 37-61.

Wallach, Alan. *Exhibiting Contradiction: Essays on the Art Museum in the United States.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998.

Weeks, Jim. *Gettysburg: Memory, Market and an American Shrine.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Weinberg, H. Barbara and Carrie Rebora Barrett, eds.*American Stories: Paintings of Everyday Life, 1765-1915.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Wheeler, Frank. "'Our Confederate Dead': The Story Behind Savannah's Confederate Monument," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* vol. 82, no. 2 (Summer 1998): 382-397.

William Rimmer: A Yankee Michelangelo. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1985.

Wills, Garry. *Cincinnatus: George Washington and the Enlightenment.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984.

Wilson, Charles Reagan. *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920.* Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2009.

Wilson, Richard Guy et al., eds. *Re-creating the American Past: Essays on the Colonial Revival.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006.

Wingate, Jennifer. "Over the Top: The Doughboy in World War I Memorials and Visual Culture." *American Art* 19, no. 2 (2005): 27-47.

Wingate, Jennifer *Sculpting Doughboys: Memory, Gender, and Taste in America's World War I Memorials.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013.

Susan S. Wolfe, "Arkansas and the Spanish-American War," *The Ozark Historical Review* 2 (1973): 27-47.

Young, Harvey. "The Black Body as Souvenir in American Lynching," *Theatre Journal* 57, no. 4 (December 2005): 639-657.

Zeller, Bob. *The Blue and Gray in Black and White*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005.

Zenzen, Joan. *Bridging the Past: An Administrative History of Minute Man National Historical Park*. Boston: National Park Service, 2010.