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INTRODUCTION

Early morning fog blanketed the town of Knoxville, Tennessee, as hundreds of local Grand Army of the Republic (GAR) members congregated in front of the courthouse on October 15, 1896. As the morning mists gave way to a pleasant fall day, the Union veterans prepared to march through the “Queen City of the Mountains” and dedicate the cornerstone of the soon-to-be erected Union Soldiers’ monument. Romantically associating the veterans’ parade with Unionist sentiment during the Civil War, the editor of The Knoxville Sentinel declared, “from the picturesque valleys and from the rugged hillsides and even out of the mountain wilds the old soldiers poured into Knoxville as in the days of ’61.” As the courthouse clock struck 1 o’clock, the procession of 1600 veterans marched down Gay Street toward the national cemetery. Throngs of onlookers lined the city streets as the old veterans, many clad in “broadcloth and homespun” and proudly displaying their polished GAR badges, paraded through town.¹

Not all of the veterans in the procession that day were white. Black veterans also took part in the parade and cornerstone-laying ceremonies honoring Tennessee’s Union soldiers. A local newspaperman reported that following the white GAR members were nearly one hundred African Americans, all members of the local all-black Isham Young Post 80.² At a time when Lost Cause organizations across the South commemorated those who had attempted to destroy the Union, on this fall day in 1896, black and white Union

² Ibid.
veterans laid the cornerstone to a monument honoring those southerners who helped save it.

In recent years, historians have focused considerable attention on the Civil War’s aftermath in both the North and South—especially on memory, commemorations, and veterans. Whereas some scholars, such as Gaines M. Foster and Charles Reagan Wilson, have examined Confederates’ post-war careers and the Lost Cause movement in the South, others, such as David Blight, William A. Blair, Caroline E. Janney, have not only studied how the war generation commemorated the fratricidal conflict, but also sectional reconciliation and its limits.3

Additionally, a number of scholars have also studied Civil War veterans. Some historians, such as Stuart McConnell, Barbara A. Gannon, and Brian M. Jordan have considered Union veterans and the GAR almost entirely in the North. In particular, historian Donald R. Shaffer provided insight into the lives of black Union veterans in northern states. Paul Coker has shed light onto Tennessee’s African-American veterans, including a chapter-length analysis of black GAR members. Still others—like James Marten, M. Keith Harris, and John A. Casey Jr.—have examined both Confederate veterans in the South and Union veterans in the North. Whereas Marten shed light on the

---

postwar trials and tribulations of Confederate and Union veterans reentering civilian society, M. Keith Harris examined Union and Confederate veterans’ commemorative efforts and the tensions that often arose over reconciliation. Yet, scholars have often considered all southern veterans as Confederates and all northern veterans as federals.⁴

Finally, a host of scholars of southern Appalachia has investigated the Civil War-era in the highland region, especially the complex factors influencing mountaineers’ wartime loyalties and post-war political outlooks. In particular, James Klotter, Tom Lee, Nina Silber, and Kenneth W. Noe illustrated how post-war boosters attempted to attract Northern investment in the mountain South by propagating the notion that the region—especially East Tennessee—proved a unified Unionist stronghold during the Civil War. Klotter persuasively argued that after the “discovery” of Appalachia in the late-nineteenth century, northern philanthropists, social workers, and missionaries redirected their

benevolent efforts from southern blacks to southern Appalachians after accepting the popular notion that the southern highlands was home to impoverished but “pure” Anglo-Saxon mountaineers. Nina Silber also argued that white middle-class northerners were fascinated by the mountain South’s purported racial purity, yet she claims that their efforts were less philanthropic in motive and more focused on postwar reconciliation and economic investments in the region. However, no one has provided an in-depth exploration of the prevalence and significance of Union veterans in the former Confederacy, particularly in the Appalachian South, where they were most prevalent.

---

This dissertation adds to the literature on Civil War-era veterans, memory, and Appalachia by examining the former Union soldiers in East Tennessee who joined the largest Union veterans’ organization—the Grand Army of the Republic. Dr. Benjamin F. Stephenson founded the GAR in Illinois in 1866 and posts quickly sprang up in communities across the country. Membership was solely open to black and white former soldiers and sailors who had received an honorable discharge from the Union army or navy during the Civil War. At the same time that Stephenson was establishing posts in Illinois, F. W. Sparling began founding GAR posts in Tennessee, and by December 1868, there were seventeen posts in the Volunteer State. Yet, after several years, many veterans in Tennessee and across the nation left amid accusations of political partisanship and the establishment of an unpopular grade system that undermined veterans’ wartime ranks. In Tennessee, GAR members became demoralized after being tied to national Reconstruction politics and enduring physical attacks from the Ku Klux Klan.  

The GAR enjoyed a resurgence across the nation in the 1880s. Leaders rebranded the organization as one that emphasized charity, patriotism, and fellowship among Union veterans on both sides of the political aisle. Historian Stuart McConnell has asserted that “the GAR after 1872 wore several masks: fraternal lodge, charitable society, special-interest lobby, patriotic group, political club.”

Although affluent wartime officers generally garnered leadership positions in the order, ordinary members hailed from diverse socio-economic backgrounds. Besides helping to establish and celebrate Memorial Day as a national holiday and to construct countless monuments honoring

---

7 McConnell, Glorious Contentment, xiv.
Union soldiers, members undertook textbook and flag campaigns in northern and southern schools, financially supported widows and orphans, and demanded patriotism to the nation that they had fought and sacrificed to preserve. GAR members coordinated their efforts with several auxiliary organizations—including the Woman’s Relief Corps (WRC) and Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War.8

In the spring of 1883, Edward S. Jones—a Pennsylvania native living in Nashville—reorganized four charter posts in the Volunteer State and by May 1, secured provisional status for the Department of Tennessee and Georgia. One year later, national officials formally recognized the Department of Tennessee and Georgia after state leaders established posts across both states. In the winter of 1888, the two-state department was split up into the separate departments. The Department of Tennessee was one of the ten departments eventually organized in the South.9 Paralleling membership trends at the national level, Tennessee’s GAR mushroomed in the 1880s and reached its height in 1890—boasting 3,697 members. As wartime Unionist, and post-war Republican, sentiment permeated many mountain communities, residents of East Tennessee quickly came to dominate the state GAR. Seventy-five of the 132 total posts that made up the Department of Tennessee, or nearly 58 percent, were located in mountain communities.10

8 Ibid., 15, 83, 126-165. For information on the Women’s Relief Corps, the Sons of Veterans and other societies that coordinated with the GAR, see especially, Beath, History of the Grand Army of the Republic, 659-681.
10 McConnell, Glorious Contentment, xiv; Dearing, Veterans in Politics, 219-266; Beath, History of the Grand Army of the Republic, 634; GAR, Tennessee, Eleventh Encampment (1894), 70. Department of Tennessee and Georgia posts were established in Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama. Interestingly enough, one post—E. O. C. Ord Post 100—was founded in Mexico City, Mexico. For a complete list of posts comprising the Department of Tennessee and Georgia, see GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection.
This dissertation examines East Tennessee’s GAR thematically and chronologically from 1884 to 1913. The veterans’ organization was quite powerful and influential in the region during this nearly thirty-year period. It declined rapidly after 1913. A few questions form the foundation of this study. Who were the GAR members and where were they from? What were their wartime experiences? What were their socio-economic backgrounds? How did local Union veterans remember and commemorate the Civil War in the region? Did they adhere to, and disseminate, the myth of Unionist Appalachia, to promote regional development? What were white veterans’ outlooks on race and how did they commemorate the wartime deeds of African Americans? What was their rapport with ex-Confederates and proponents of the Lost Cause? How did the agenda of East Tennessee’s GAR differ from those elsewhere in the South or nation?

A number of primary sources help answer some of this study’s fundamental questions. The “Descriptive Records, Department of Tennessee G.A.R.” held at the Calvin M. McClung Collection in Knoxville, provides demographic information on GAR members. Unique to the Department of Tennessee, these microfilmed volumes include original membership rosters that list veterans’ personal information—including birthplace, age, residence, occupation, wartime service and rank, and admission date into the GAR. The published journals of the state encampment meetings—between 1885 and 1917—are also invaluable. These pamphlets record each meeting’s minutes, list the names of state leaders and post representatives in attendance, provide organizational, 

---

11 GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” Calvin M. McClung Collection. The McClung collection houses two bound volumes of the original rosters, which provide information on 131 posts from across Tennessee. These volumes have been microfilmed and indexed by post name, number, and location. A number of rosters have been transcribed by Raymond A. Sears and published in various issues of The East Tennessee Historical Society’s Tennessee Ancestors.
financial, and membership data, and include formal reports from various leaders and committees. Additionally, a copy of the department commander’s annual address is reprinted in each booklet, which outlines the myriad issues facing Tennessee GAR members.

The national encampment journals also shed light on organizational issues facing Southern members, and illustrate Tennesseans’ standing in a group dominated by Northerners. The Tennessee GAR’s short-lived newspaper, the *Grand Army Sentinel* is also insightful. Published by Tennessee veterans, the *Sentinel* includes articles recounting the wartime exploits of black and white soldiers, as well as articles relating current departmental news. Advertisements—especially those marketing the South’s natural resources and encouraging Northerners to resettle in local “colonies”—also illustrate how Union veterans attempted to encourage Northern investment in the region. Regional newspapers, including the *Knoxville Daily Journal* and *Chattanooga Daily Times*, provide insight into local GAR members’ public activities. The fourteen volumes of the “Grand Army of the Republic Scrapbooks,” held at the Chattanooga Public Library, include an exhaustive number of national and local newspaper articles that chronicle events before, during, and after the 1913 national GAR encampment in Chattanooga. These primary sources augment the papers of various prominent East Tennessee GAR members housed at the Calvin M. McClung Collection in Knoxville and East Tennessee State’s Archives of Appalachia.

Chapter One introduces readers to Civil War-era East Tennessee and the GAR. Initially, it surveys the secession crisis and the Civil War in the highlands, emphasizing the complex issues shaping wartime loyalties, the ambiguities of Unionism, and the brutal
wartime realities that mountain Unionists and federal volunteers faced. The chapter then outlines the initial rise of the GAR during Reconstruction and the circumstances that led to its revival in the 1880s. It places East Tennessee’s GAR within the larger context of the national organization and underscores the significance of the department in the postwar South.

Chapter Two is a comparative community study that sheds light on East Tennessee’s GAR membership. Though it does not account for every veteran, it provides a comprehensive demographic profile of roughly 5,700 black and white members. After providing insights into region-wide membership trends, it focuses on members in four mountain communities—Chattanooga, Knoxville, Greeneville, and Harriman—that were home to some of the most prominent highland posts. Analyzing posts in these communities highlights the diversity of Appalachian GAR members’ race, class, and nativity in the southern highlands.

Chapter Three brings black GAR members in the mountains to the forefront. It provides a collective profile of 257 African American veterans who joined East Tennessee’s four all-black and twelve integrated posts, along with an assessment of the viability and relative strength of those posts. It not only examines the ways in which white GAR members remembered the significance of emancipation and recognized the wartime service of U.S. Colored Troops (USCT), but it also underscores the complex and nuanced interactions between white and black veterans, debates over race, and black members’ leadership roles.

Chapter Four examines the rapport among mountain GAR members and their ex-Confederate neighbors. It sheds light on Union veterans’ public and private outlooks on
former Rebels, as well as on their interactions during holidays, commemorations, and reunions. Unlike their northern counterparts, white Grand Army men in East Tennessee resided among former Rebels and interacted with them on a daily basis. This chapter supplements the scholarship on postwar reconciliation by analyzing the ambiguities surrounding local Union veterans’ attitudes toward locals who had taken up arms against them and how the war should be remembered.

Chapter Five considers how GAR members remembered and commemorated their own wartime service. Since mountain residents dominated the state organization, it considers how they memorialized the highland region’s wartime Unionism, as well as their contributions and self-sacrifice to the Union war effort throughout the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Members articulated their memories both privately—in closed annual encampment meetings—and publicly. They constructed monuments, hosted Memorial Day commemorations, lobbied for a Union veterans’ home, conducted local educational campaigns, and published memoirs. The chapter also studies the extent to which mountain GAR members put forward a uniquely Appalachian memory of the war, and how their commemorations not only reflected members’ attempts to make certain that future generations honored and understood that they had been saviors of the nation, but also encourage northern immigration to and investment in the region.

Chapter Six focuses on the 1913 national encampment held in Chattanooga. The reunion was the culmination of the GAR’s visibility and stature in the state. Regional and national issues concerning race, reconciliation, commemoration, and veteranhood also came to the fore during the reunion. Contemporaries compared the Mountain City’s
encampment to the famous Blue-Gray reunion at Gettysburg two months earlier, and noted its significance as the only national GAR reunion held in a former Confederate state. The encampment provides a case study on white Federal veterans’ rapport with ex-Confederates and former black soldiers, regional marketing and stereotypes, veteranhood and masculinity, and public commemorations.

The story of the Grand Army of the Republic in East Tennessee is not necessarily one of triumph. Today, only faint traces of the GAR remain in the region. Instead, it challenges scholars’ prevailing view of the Civil War and its legacy in the postwar South. The post-bellum South, like the wartime South, was not united. The Lost Cause and romanticism for the Confederacy did not necessarily pervade the entire region or go unchallenged. Instead, for nearly thirty years, a significant minority of white and black Union veterans in the southern Appalachians celebrated their role in saving the Union and bringing the Confederacy to its knees.
CHAPTER 1

"TIES MADE IN TRIALS OF BLOOD":
THE CIVIL WAR AND RISE OF THE GAR IN EAST TENNESSEE

In 1907, Tennessee’s GAR commander William A. McTeer penned a short letter to fellow Union veteran Colonel Thomas H. Reeves. McTeer, a prominent lawyer in Maryville, implored Reeves to join a GAR post. Reeves had been elected to multiple state leadership positions and was a founding member of Jonesborough’s post in 1885. But the post had recently fallen on hard times and disbanded. McTeer encouraged Reeves to remain active in the veterans’ organization, “not for the purpose of keeping alive the flames of enmity,” but to maintain the “ties made in trials of blood.”

During the Civil War, Unionist sentiment permeated many East Tennessee communities and a significant number of highlanders had taken part in the many “trials of blood” that accompanied the Union war effort. Yet, despite its reputation as a Unionist stronghold, the region was deeply divided. It was also home to prominent and politically active Confederates. The focus of this chapter is two-fold. First, it provides a brief overview of the secession crisis and the Civil War in East Tennessee. It introduces readers to the complex issues shaping wartime loyalties—especially slavery—and surveys the messiness of Unionist sentiment and the wartime realities that mountain Unionists faced. Besides outlining the major military incursions and campaigns in the

---

1 William A. McTeer to Colonel T. H. Reeves, 1907, Will A. McTeer Papers, Calvin M. McClung Collection.
Tennessee highlands—including the battles of Chickamauga, Missionary Ridge, and the Knoxville Campaign—it also recounts the brutal guerrilla warfare that plagued the eastern portion of the state, along with other parts of southern Appalachia. Second, the chapter surveys the rise of the Grand Army of the Republic. It familiarizes readers with the initial development of the Union veterans’ organization during Reconstruction and its resurgence in the 1880s. This chapter pays special attention to East Tennessee veterans’ role within the state and national organization. It also underscores the significance of Tennessee’s GAR among other southern departments.

Antebellum socio-economic and political developments directly shaped East Tennesseans’ divided wartime loyalties. Tennessee, like the South in general, was predominantly rural and agricultural. In contrast to the popular notion that East Tennessee—and other parts of Appalachia—were home to isolated, self-sufficient, and non-slaveowning farmers, mountaineers were relatively integrated into the southern and national market economy. The Cumberland Mountains in the west and the Blue Ridge and Smoky Mountains in the east certainly restricted access to distant markets, but mountaineers overcame the problems of geographic isolation in various ways. Some loaded surplus farm crops onto flatboats and floated them down the Tennessee River to markets in Georgia, northern Alabama, and New Orleans. Others either transported surplus produce—especially corn and wheat—or drove hogs over turnpikes and roads to commercial centers in the plantation districts of Virginia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia. Lowland farmers and plantation owners cultivating cotton found it more
economical to purchase inexpensive pork and foodstuffs from the southern highlands than raising it themselves and shifting valuable land out of cotton production.²

The completion of the East Tennessee and Virginia Railroad in May 1858 further integrated Tennessee mountaineers socially and economically into broader regional and national markets. The railroad connected Knoxville, Chattanooga, Bristol, and the region to lowland commercial centers—like Atlanta, Charleston, Savannah, and Montgomery—as well as Richmond, Washington, D. C., Philadelphia, and New York City. The railroad also encouraged the rise of tourism in the region, and encouraged mountaineers to interact more often with visiting tourists who fled the stifling Deep South each summer. Lastly, it reshaped the region’s economy into one that was a combination of self-sufficient and market-driven agriculture. In particular, the region experienced a wheat and flour boom in the 1850s. According to historian W. Todd Groce, “If cotton was king in the Deep South and West Tennessee, then wheat wore the crown in the Tennessee Valley. Other traditional products, such as butter, corn, and hogs, were still in demand, but wheat was by far the most sought-after commodity.”³

The railroad also shaped the growth and development of regional cities and towns. Knoxville, situated in the center of the Tennessee Valley with roads to cities of the lower South and Virginia, experienced unparalleled growth because of the railroad. Between 1850 and 1860, Knoxville’s population soared from 2,076 to 5,300, and became the principal commercial and transportation center in the region. Chattanooga was also a

modest village of a few hundred residents in 1830, but by the time the railroad was completed it had grown to 2,500 residents and was an important transportation junction. The railroad sparked the development of new mountain towns—like Bristol, Morristown, and Sweetwater.4

As the East Tennessee and Virginia Railroad integrated eastern Tennessee socially and economically with Virginia, the Carolinas, and the Deep South, members of the business-professional middle classes enjoyed upward socio-economic mobility in urban centers. Merchants, lawyers, and physicians thrived in the region’s commercial centers.5 Paralleling other parts of southern Appalachia—especially western North Carolina—most of the slaveowners in the region were mountain professionals and businessmen in cities and towns.6 The lack of a lucrative commercial crop, and an economy founded upon hog raising and corn and wheat cultivation, hampered the incentive to purchase slaves and led to the overwhelming majority of East Tennesseans being nonslaveholders. On the eve of the Civil War, bondsmen represented less than 10 percent of the regional mountain population. In contrast, slaveowners made up more than 20 percent of residents in most Middle and West Tennessee counties. While the median number of slaves per mountain master was three, only one in fifty were planters who owned twenty or more slaves. In middle and western Tennessee the median number of slaves per owner was five and ten, while planters accounted for 6 percent and 27.4

---

4 Groce, Mountain Rebels, 15; Thomas L. Connelly, Civil War Tennessee: Battles and Leaders (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1979), 11; Fowler, Mountaineers in Gray, 4.
5 Groce, Mountain Rebels, 18-20.
percent of local slaveowners, respectively. The eight largest slaveholding mountain counties included Greene, Hamilton, Hawkins, Jefferson, Cocke, Knox, McMinn, and Roane counties, and slaves accounted for only 10.9 percent of the residents.\(^7\)

Not only were there fewer slaveowners and bondmen in East Tennessee than in the middle and western portions of the state, but the region had also garnered a reputation as a haven for antislavery sentiment. In the 1810s and 1820s, several manumission societies were founded in the region, and Jonesborough and Greeneville were home to three antislavery newspapers—the *Manumission Intelligencer*, the *Emancipator*, and the *Genius of Universal Emancipation*. Tennessee mountaineers were also at the forefront of the failed campaign to include a gradual emancipation policy into the 1834 state constitution. Regardless of the region’s reputation, the mountain antislavery societies attracted few followers and the newspapers had limited circulation. Most opponents of slavery in the region were committed to white supremacy, had little sympathy for slaves themselves, and often amalgamated their damning criticisms of the peculiar institution with support for mandatory colonization. Additionally, antislavery advocates’ rhetoric emphasized that nonslaveholding white mountaineers were the principal victims of the peculiar institution. According to historian Noel C. Fisher, “while many East Tennesseans despised large slaveholders and resented their political influence, they firmly believed in black inferiority and had little interest in the fate of slaves.”\(^8\)

---


rise of northern abolitionists in the early 1830s, public criticism of slavery became exceedingly unpopular in the region. The local antislavery movement foundered and the antislavery newspapers moved to the North.\textsuperscript{9} Though antislavery attitudes may have lingered and shaped political leanings on the Civil War’s eve, most white mountaineers shared the same racial outlooks as lowland southerners.\textsuperscript{10}

During the election of 1860 and subsequent secession crisis, most white East Tennesseans advocated moderation and compromise, instead of the radical impulse to secede. With the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, the Whig Party collapsed nationally over the question of slavery and the antebellum Second Party System had splintered. Nonetheless, local political loyalties persisted throughout the rest of the decade. To most East Tennessee voters the election came down to a contest between Southern Democrat John C. Breckenridge of Kentucky and native son John Bell of the Constitutional Union Party, since Abraham Lincoln was not on the ballot and few supported Northern Democrat Stephen Douglas. Whereas local Breckenridge supporters portrayed Bell’s constituents as clandestine abolitionists, Constitutional Unionists blamed southern Democrats for irresponsibly stirring up discontent over the slavery issue and spurring the growth of the Republican Party. Bell men also dubbed Breckenridge supporters as political opportunists who were intent on destroying the Union. Regardless of the partisan claims, constituents of both parties in the mountains staunchly supported slavery and white supremacy. Democrats did not advocate immediate secession and
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Constitutional Unionists did not support unconditional loyalty to the Union. Bell won East Tennessee with majorities in sixteen counties, while twelve counties went for Breckinridge. The Tennessean also secured his home state’s twelve electoral votes because Douglas’s candidacy had divided the Democratic vote. While Tennessee, Virginia, and Kentucky went for Bell, the lower South solidly supported Breckinridge. Regardless, Abraham Lincoln swept the North and won the election. Although he received less than 40 percent of the popular vote, his 180 electoral votes propelled him to the presidency.11

After Northerners elected Lincoln to the presidency and South Carolina seceded in December 1860, most Tennessee mountaineers adopted a “wait and see” stance. A number of factors shaped highlanders’ outlooks, including political affiliation, kinship ties, socio-economic class, and religious denomination. A significant minority supported secession because of their socio-economic connections with the Deep South. The most outspoken proponents of secession included leading residents of Knox County, including William H. Sneed, William A. Banner, William C. Kain, John H. Crozier, William G. Swan, John A. Mabry, and J. G. M. Ramsey. These men were mostly middle-aged slaveholding professionals and Democrats. Throughout December and early January 1861, secessionists across the region held public meetings calling for a state convention to decide Tennessee’s stance on the current secession crisis. They put forward a number of pro-secession arguments in an attempt to persuade more reluctant highland neighbors.

---

Local secessionists claimed that East Tennesseans should stand united with white southerners rebelling in neighboring states, instead of being forced to help put them down by the Lincoln administration. They also asserted that slavery and white supremacy were best protected through secession, and that nonslaveholding mountaineers stood to lose most—socially and economically—from Black Republicans’ plots to destroy slavery. In response, outspoken secessionist Governor Isham G. Harris called on the state legislature to hold a referendum on secession on February 9. The legislators allowed voters to elect convention delegates, and vote on whether they supported even holding a convention.¹²

Secession advocates campaigned for a convention and attempted to persuade the large number of Unionist voters. Unionist and antisecessionist sentiments in the eastern Tennessee highlands spanned a wide spectrum and were quite complex. According to historian Daniel Crofts, several varieties of Unionism developed in East Tennessee, and across the upper South, during secession winter. Secessionists faced their stiffest opposition from unconditional Unionists. These forthright hardliners were completely loyal to the Union, and included Knoxville Whig editor William G. “Parson” Brownlow, Whig Congressman Thomas A. R. Nelson, and Democrat Senator Andrew Johnson. Most East Tennesseans were conditional unionists. They supported keeping the Union together and averting war as long as certain conditions or qualifications were met. According to Crofts, conditional unionists fell into two, and often overlapping, groups—“anti-coercionists” and “extended ultimatumists.” Anti-coercionists rejected secession as long as Lincoln and northern Republicans did not attempt to coerce white southerners through military force. Extended ultimatumists supported remaining in the Union, as long as

compromise remained viable and the Lincoln administration catered to southerners’ demands to safeguard the peculiar institution. If their demands were not guaranteed, they would support leaving the Union peacefully.\textsuperscript{13}

On February 9—the day after Rebel leaders met in Montgomery, Alabama, and drafted the provisional constitution of the Confederate States of America—Tennesseans voted against a secession convention. Highlanders did so overwhelmingly. The proposal to hold a secession convention failed by nearly 9,000 votes—68,282 to 59,449. West Tennesseans supported a convention by 74 percent, while Middle Tennesseans remained divided—48 percent voted for a convention. In contrast, 81 percent of East Tennesseans opposed a convention and decided the statewide outcome. Though the convention electoral returns were a stunning Unionist victory and reflected Tennesseans’ moderate political stance, the Unionist coalition remained fragile and bitter partisan squabbling soon ensued. Additionally, secessionists continued to advocate publicly for separation in the following weeks.\textsuperscript{14}

Roughly two months later, the Confederate bombardment of Fort Sumter on April 12 and Abraham Lincoln’s subsequent call for 75,000 volunteers to put down the rebellion made conditional Unionists’ precarious position in East Tennessee untenable. Most conditional Unionist leaders in western and middle Tennessee condemned Lincoln’s attempt to coerce the South and were pushed into the secessionist camp. The conditional Unionist coalition in the eastern highlands also began to crack. As southern
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banners were raised in a number of mountain towns, a few Unionists changed their stance. Violence nearly erupted on Knoxville’s city streets when Unionists and Confederates held simultaneous political rallies on Gay Street two weeks after the surrender of Fort Sumter. Local Unionists met in front of Sam Morrow’s bank and turned out to hear speeches given by Democrat Andrew Johnson and Whig Thomas A. R. Nelson. According to local reports, a Confederate band and two companies of Rebel infantrymen from nearby Monroe County paraded in front of the stage and interrupted Johnson’s speech. Tempers flared, but prominent Unionists Abner Jackson and John Williams and secessionist Joseph Mabry interceded and pleaded for a peaceful resolution.  

On May 6, state legislators met in a special session to withdraw Tennessee from the Union and authorize representation in the Confederate government. Though the measures were not to be officially ratified by the people until June 8, state leaders immediately began preparing for war. Governor Harris authorized Speaker of the House W. C. Whitthorn to coordinate military preparations with the Confederate War Department. Legislators ratified a “military league” with the Confederacy, which placed state troops under command of Confederate President Jefferson Davis, and granted Harris the power to issue war bonds and raise and equip a state army. Despite the military preparations and secessionist celebrations in many highland towns, unconditional Unionist leaders of the highlands campaigned against the ordinance of secession and began mobilizing mountain Unionists against the Confederacy. Whereas William G. Brownlow attacked state leaders’ actions in the press, respected Unionist leaders such as

---

Democrat Andrew Johnson and Whigs T. A. R. Nelson, Horace Maynard, and John Baxter condemned the Confederacy and the state ordinance in a bipartisan stump speech campaign. Unionists organized rallies and meetings in nearly every mountain county; the most significant was the East Tennessee Union Convention held in Knoxville’s Temperance Hall on May 30-31. During the meeting, over 400 delegates from twenty-six counties endorsed resolutions condemning secession and state leaders’ “hasty, inconsiderate, and unconstitutional” actions.  

Despite Unionist outcries, on June 8, Tennessee voters ratified the secession ordinance and the Volunteer State became the eleventh and final state to join the Confederacy. Secessionists swept the polls in Middle and West Tennessee. However, mountain voters again opposed secession by a 32,205 to 14,095 margin, and the ordinance was carried in only six mountain counties—Meigs, Monroe, Polk, Rhea, Sequatchie, and Sullivan. Some mountain counties had significant pro-secession minorities. Between 41 and 44 percent of residents of Hamilton, Marion, Washington, and McMinn counties supported separation. Secessionists gained support in cities and towns along the railroad. Residents of Knoxville and Chattanooga, the region’s two largest cities, favored secession by 68 and 89 percent, respectively. In more rural counties, such as Scott, Morgan, and Sevier, support for secession was almost negligible. 
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Historians have noted a clear socio-economic correlation with secession sentiment. Secessionist mountain counties had generally enjoyed considerable economic growth over the previous decade, particularly because of railroad expansion. Historian W. Todd Groce found that, in general, mountain Rebels tended to be Democrats who resided in towns and were often financially successful members of town-based commercial and professional ranks—such as commercial farmers, merchants and lawyers. Because they forged economic ties with lowland southerners, highland Confederates tended to have an optimistic view of antebellum East Tennessee as a region “on the rise,” and believed that supporting the Confederacy would not only secure the South’s racial and economic system, but also further integrate the region into the southern market economy and spur greater prosperity locally. In contrast, Unionist counties were generally more remote and had experienced slower growth, or even endured economic decline. While slaveholding patterns among Unionists paralleled Confederates, a number of Unionists in East Tennessee believed the peculiar institution was better protected within the Union. Additionally, Unionists tended to be older than Confederates were, and did not believe the Confederacy would benefit them. They pessimistically viewed their region in decline and socio-economically overshadowed by middle and western portions of the state.

---


On June 17, less than two weeks after the secession referendum, nearly 300 East Tennessee Unionists met again in Greeneville. During the four-day meeting, the delegates broke down into two camps—the radicals and conservatives. Whereas T.A.R. Nelson and William G. Brownlow were spokesmen for the radicals, Oliver P. Temple and John Baxter led the conservatives. The delegates clashed over a list of grievances and resolutions put forward by Nelson and his followers. Nelson deemed the legislature’s declaration of independence and military league with the Confederacy unconstitutional, and warned that if Confederate forces advanced into the mountains then Unionist mountaineers would defend themselves and strike back against Rebel soldiers and sympathizers. After days of debate, conservatives’ arguments won out against Nelson’s radical and veiled threats of armed conflict. Conservative delegates revised Nelson’s resolutions and the convention resulted in three more restrained outcomes. Delegates requested that state legislators grant East Tennessee separate statehood, they elected representatives to a third Unionist convention in Kingston in August, and they established an executive committee to oversee Unionist actions until the Kingston Convention. The Greeneville Convention illustrated East Tennessee Unionist leaders’ conservatism and conciliatory outlooks, as well as the messiness and complexity of Unionism in the region.20

Throughout the summer and early fall of 1861, tensions between Unionists and Confederates increased and violent outbursts erupted; however, there was no significant bloodletting, as neither loyalists nor Rebels sought overt confrontations. While a force of several hundred Rebels “occupied” Knoxville and other mountain communities, some

---
Unionists in mountain communities mobilized paramilitary home guard units and drilled regularly. Among these was John W. Andes, who organized a loyal cavalry company in Sevierville, which would form the foundation of the Second Tennessee Cavalry regiment. After the war, Andes would help establish Sevierville’s GAR post. A small number of Unionists began fleeing Confederate rule in the region and undertook the treacherous journey through the mountains to enlist in the Union Army in Kentucky. Among the most notable of the early volunteers was Edward Maynard—the oldest son of Knoxville’s most prominent Unionist congressman Horace Maynard—and Robert K. Byrd, a slave-owner and Mexican War veteran of Roane County. After making their way to Camp Dick Robinson in Kentucky, Byrd organized the First Tennessee Infantry regiment as a colonel and Maynard enlisted as adjutant. This regiment was made up of mostly Tennessee highland refugees. While Byrd commanded the First Tennessee regiment throughout the war, Maynard was eventually promoted to lieutenant colonel of the Sixth Tennessee Infantry regiment. Many East Tennessee GAR members served with Byrd and Maynard, and afterward named two local posts in their honor—the R. K. Byrd Post 11 in Kingston and the Ed Maynard Post 14 in Knoxville. While large numbers of Unionists eventually made the dangerous trek to Union lines during the war, relatively few did so in the summer and fall of 1861. Historian Robert Tracy McKenzie estimates that only 1,500 Tennessee refugees had enlisted by September 1861, and likely represented only 5 percent of the Tennessee highlanders who would eventually serve in the Union ranks.21

At the same time, East Tennessee Confederates also began mobilizing regiments. Though Confederate enlistment swelled during the spring of 1861, it dipped during the summer, and then picked up again in the fall. Historian W. Todd Groce estimates that throughout the war between 20,000 and 25,000 Tennessee mountaineers served in the fifteen Rebel regiments, seven battalions, and six artillery batteries raised in East Tennessee or organized in neighboring states.22 On August 1, Rebel leaders appointed Brigadier General Felix K. Zollicoffer commander of Confederate forces in the region. Initially, to deal with the twin threats of a Federal invasion from Kentucky and Unionist subversion within the region, Zollicoffer aggressively dispatched Rebel troops along the border with the Bluegrass State and pursued a more conciliatory policy toward local Unionists. Though he promised to be impartial toward mountain Unionists, most of the Rebel troops stationed in Knoxville and the surrounding areas were from the southern lowlands, and viewed all mountain residents suspiciously. Unionists regularly complained of widespread Confederate abuses and persecution. One contemporary asserted that Confederates justified their heavy-handed actions, claiming “Union citizens had forfeited all claims to their homes, that their possessions were no longer theirs, and therefore, that Confederates were justified in robbing Union families, plundering their farms, hunting them through the country like so many wild beasts, and shooting them upon the run like so many robbers and outlaws.”23

Despite Zollicoffer’s official policy, militant highland Unionists began designing plans to strike a blow against the Rebels in the fall of 1861. William B. Carter, a Unionist and Presbyterian minister, slipped through to Union lines in Kentucky and eventually

---
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made his way to Washington D.C. Once there, Carter met with President Lincoln, Secretary of State William Seward and General George B. McClellan, and detailed a plan to cripple the Confederacy. The plan called for a coordinated attack by mountain irregulars and Federal troops. While the Unionist bands destroyed nine crucial railroad bridges from Bristol, Tennessee to Bridgeport, Alabama, Union armies amassed along the Tennessee-Kentucky border would simultaneously advance into the mountain region and rout the disoriented and crippled Confederates. Lincoln approved the plan. On November 8, 1861, the loyalists successfully destroyed five of nine bridges; however, the Union army’s invasion never materialized after the Union commander in Kentucky, William T. Sherman, called off the attack at the last moment. In the weeks after the bridge-burnings, Confederate authorities responded by arresting 1,000 suspected Unionists, calling up Confederate reinforcements, and temporarily placing Knoxville under martial law. Most of those arrested were released after taking a loyalty oath, but seven were found guilty as bridge burners and sentenced to death. Two of the convicted bridge-burners’ death sentences were commuted, but the other five were hanged. Two were strung up near a Greene County railroad bridge, while the other three were hung from gallows in Knoxville. Local Confederates justified the severe response and contemptuously claimed that Unionist neighbors deserved severe punishments for openly challenging Confederate authority. The famous bridge burnings led to a hardening of Confederate policy and many mountain Unionists suffered under Rebel subjugation.24

In the aftermath of the bridge burnings, the character of the war in East Tennessee changed, and Unionists pursued several options. While a few submitted to Rebel authority, others organized guerrilla bands and undertook irregular campaigns against Confederate occupying troops and local Confederate sympathizers. Soon, reports of beatings, shootings, and burnings came from many counties as brutal guerrilla warfare enveloped the region and often blurred lines between combatants and civilians. Still others—including many of those who would later join the GAR—fled their homes and journeyed to the Union Army in Kentucky. The flight was very treacherous. Recruits endured perilous mountainous terrain, were exposed to unrelenting weather conditions, and had to evade Rebel patrols, guerrillas, and sympathizers. Many died during their escape, while others were imprisoned or executed by Confederate authorities. Thus, a complex network was created to smuggle potential recruits to Union lines. Hundreds of individuals—especially white loyalist women, African Americans, and Union officers—aided recruits by providing food and shelter, warning of Rebel patrols, and pointing out safe roads, fords, and mountain passes. Pilots were at the forefront of the network. With expert knowledge of the local terrain and being skillful at evading Rebel patrols, pilots guided many recruits out of the Confederate lines. The groups mostly traveled at night along rough terrain and eluded Confederates by lying concealed in caves and thickets in the day. The most famous pilot—and eventual GAR member—was Daniel Ellis, who claimed to have made fifteen trips to Kentucky and guided thousands of recruits to Union lines. The sacrifices and often-deadly journey through Confederate lines to enlist in the
Union war effort became a key element of East Tennessee GAR members’ Civil War memory in the decades after the war (see Chapter 5).²⁵

A significant number of East Tennesseans enlisted and donned the Union blue during the war, as GAR members made sure to remind the public in the decades afterward. By spring 1862, enough refugees had made their way to Union lines to form five infantry and four cavalry regiments of Tennesseans in Kentucky. That same year, two Tennessee infantry regiments and three cavalry units were organized in Union-occupied middle and western Tennessee. From 1863 to 1865, Tennessee mountaineers formed additional units in Kentucky and occupied East Tennessee. The passage of Confederate conscription acts, as well as the arrival of the Army of the Cumberland in eastern Tennessee, motivated many local Unionists and anti-Confederates those living in East Tennessee, northern Georgia, and western North Carolina, to seek refuge in federal lines and join the Union army—especially at recruiting centers like Cleveland. Some of the recruits included Confederate deserters. Military Governor Andrew Johnson even organized several regiments of mounted infantry units.²⁶ These units included at least twenty infantry and artillery regiments of United States Colored Troops (USCT). By the end of the war, Tennessee provided a total of fifty-three regiments, one battalion, and one independent artillery battery to the Union war effort. In all, 31,092 black and white Tennesseans served in federal units during the war—the overwhelming majority from the eastern highlands. Historian Richard Current notes that the figure does not include an
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estimated 1,500 Tennesseans who served in out-of-state regiments. Almost 40 percent of Tennessee’s military age black male population had enlisted. These troops fought and suffered casualties in the Stones River, Nashville, Tullahoma, East Tennessee, and Atlanta campaigns. They also skirmished with Rebel guerrillas in the Cumberland Mountains and conducted raids against enemy supply lines in neighboring Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Virginia, and North Carolina. East Tennessee provided more soldiers to the Union war effort than any other region in the South.27

Unionist leaders—especially Andrew Johnson, Horace Maynard, William G. Brownlow, and Andrew Jackson Fletcher—left the region and during their lobbying campaigns throughout the North, they often pointed to East Tennessee Union enlistments. In addition to urging the Lincoln administration and military officials to invade and liberate loyalist East Tennessee, they endeavored to create sympathy for mountain Unionists among the northern public. Brownlow established himself as chief spokesman for East Tennessee Unionists. Local Confederates arrested and imprisoned Brownlow in late 1861, and by March 1862 exiled him to the North. He then undertook a yearlong speaking tour throughout various northern cities—including Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Cleveland, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Harrisburg, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New York City. Among northern audiences, Brownlow portrayed mountaineers as Unionist martyrs in an effort to raise relief funds and influence Washington politicians to “liberate the freedom-loving folk of the mountains.” He glossed over how mercurial Unionism in East

Tennessee was, and ignored the many divided highland communities. Instead, Brownlow alleged that the Tennessee highlands was home to unrefined, but deserving lily-white mountaineers who not only despised slavery and the slavocracy, but were uncompromising Unionists. His campaigns helped popularize early Appalachian stereotypes, which GAR members would later touch on as well (see Chapter 5).28

Ironically, Union armies conquered and occupied heavily pro-Confederate Middle and West Tennessee by summer 1862, and it was not until late summer 1863 that Union forces made headway into the eastern highlands. By the end of August, Rebel soldiers and sympathizers abandoned Knoxville, and on September 3, General Ambrose Burnside’s Army of the Ohio entered the city. After the Battle of Chickamauga in September, the siege of Chattanooga from October to November, and James Longstreet’s failed assault on Fort Sanders outside of Knoxville in November, Tennessee was essentially under Federal control. The Army of Ohio’s and Army of the Cumberland’s invasion and liberation of the Tennessee highlands proved a homecoming for a number of East Tennessee soldiers; however, most were Midwesterners and Northerners. Many would resettle in the region after the war and make up a significant portion of GAR members in Chattanooga and Knoxville (see Chapter 2).29

The return of local Unionist leaders, refugees, and Federal volunteers to their mountain homes in the wake of the Federal Army’s control over the region exposed deep divisions within the ranks of loyalist highlanders. In the aftermath of Abraham Lincoln’s
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Emancipation Proclamation, the war evolved from one intended to save the Union to one intended to end slavery, and exacerbated the rift between “radical” Unionists who had fled the region and those proslavery “conservative” Unionists who had remained.

Members of the former group, such as William G. Brownlow and Horace Maynard, had departed the Tennessee highlands. Many others joined the military, where the hardships and toils of such service converted them into pragmatic abolitionists. They returned home advocating emancipation, defending Lincoln, and seeking revenge against Confederates.

In contrast, conservatives who had remained in the Tennessee mountains retained their proslavery ideals and ties to Confederate neighbors. The estrangement came to a head in April 1864. A convention of 160 Unionist delegates met in the Knox County courthouse to discuss the reorganization of a loyal state government outlined by Lincoln’s Ten-Percent Plan. The Ten-Percent Plan was quite lenient and outlined a relatively quick readmission process for southern states. According to the plan, Confederates would be pardoned, except high-ranking military and political leaders, upon taking the oath of allegiance and the South must accept emancipation. Southern states could create new state governments, elect representatives, and return to the Union once 10 percent of the state population took the oath of allegiance and accepted emancipation. The minority “radical” delegation, led by Brownlow, endorsed immediate emancipation and the reelection of Lincoln. The “conservative” majority—led by John Baxter, Thomas Nelson, and Frederick Heiskell—condemned emancipation and repudiated Lincoln’s plan.

Animosities among East Tennessee loyalists reignited in the fall of 1864, as Lincoln’s
reelection portended the demise of slavery in Tennessee and Congress dismissed East Tennesseans’ votes for Democrat George B. McClellan.\(^{30}\)

Not only did political infighting plague prominent Unionists, but they also censured one another over the treatment of former Confederates. Whereas Brownlow and Maynard advocated swift retaliation against Confederates, most local Unionists decried extralegal violence against Rebel sympathizers. In the war’s immediate aftermath, a number of local Unionists brought civil suits against their Confederate neighbors. However, some prominent “radical” loyalists—including Oliver Temple, Thomas Humes, and Perez Dickinson—helped ameliorate the brutal treatment of former Rebels. John Williams even helped claimants of dubious loyalty procure compensation from the federal government. Local Unionists not only came to the aid of their Confederate neighbors because of commercial ties and friendships, but many also sustained kinship ties with outspoken Rebels. Reverend Thomas Humes’s nephew was a Confederate general, Perez Dickinson’s son-in-law was a Confederate major and his chief business partner was prominent Confederate C. J. McClung. Historian Robert McKenzie argued that “to their credit, [local Unionists] were unwilling to condone a policy that treated Rebels more harshly than they themselves had been treated under Rebel rule.”\(^{31}\)

Ironically, Robert E. Lee’s surrender at Appomattox in Virginia and Joseph E. Johnston’s surrender at Bennett Place in North Carolina escalated violence in East Tennessee and underscored the political divisions among residents. In particular, violence erupted in Knoxville’s city streets during the spring and summer of 1865 as large


numbers of former Confederates trickled into town. Discharged Federal soldiers gunned down Confederate sympathizer John Kincaid outside the Knox County courthouse, despite his having taken the loyalty oath. Then, in September 1865, a loyalist mob lynched Abner Baker—a veteran of Ashby’s Second Tennessee Confederate Cavalry—in downtown Knoxville, after Baker had shot and killed Unionist William Hall. During his tour of the South, journalist Whitelaw Reid noted the hostility and divisiveness that pervaded postwar Knoxville society. He recounted that “in no place through the South had the bitterness of feeling, engendered by the war, been so intense, or the violence so bloody in its consequences” than in Knoxville and that “returned Rebels had not unfrequently been notified that they must leave the country…sometimes they were shot.”

Since many Confederates had taken flight from the highlands in the aftermath of the Baker lynching, peace returned to Knoxville by early 1866 and the entire region by 1870. Gregory Scott Hicks argued that economic, political, and social factors encouraged peace to return to Knoxville, before rural areas of East Tennessee. Hicks asserted that “Knoxville’s postwar economic opportunities, especially during the two years following the war, led to prosperity, which created relatively stable political and social conditions…after the war, [O. P. Temple and T.A.R. Nelson] and other leaders saw the chance to enhance Knoxville’s state, regional, and national stature…railroads and industry might offer Knoxville the opportunity to become the New South’s ‘city on the hill.’” While Hicks correctly noted that social and economic issues motivated residents to

---
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forgive past transgressions in the immediate postwar years, he and many other historians have not recognized the impact the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR) would have upon the postwar community and region.33

Dr. Benjamin F. Stephenson and a number of other Union army veterans founded the GAR in Decatur, Illinois in the spring of 1866. Relatively quickly, thousands of black and white Union veterans organized posts across the nation. While Stephenson cast the GAR as a fraternal organization dedicated to benevolence and brotherhood among Union veterans, he allegedly perceived the order would serve both political and charitable functions. With a membership roster larger than that of all other Union veterans’ groups combined, the GAR eventually functioned as one of the most powerful Republican voting machines of the Gilded Age. Not only did the order springboard ambitious soldier-politicians to political prominence—especially Illinois congressman and unsuccessful 1884 vice-presidential candidate John A. Logan, Illinois governor and U. S. Senator Richard Oglesby, and U.S. Congressman Norton P. Chipman; the GAR also effectively delivered the vote for Ulysses S. Grant during his 1868 and 1872 presidential campaigns. By 1900, only one elected president—Grover Cleveland—had not been a GAR member, and Union Army pensions consumed one federal tax dollar of every three.34

In the same year that Stephens founded posts in Illinois (1866), F. W. Sparling began organizing GAR posts in Tennessee. By December 1868, veterans had established seventeen posts in Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama and national leaders organized them into a permanent department—the Department of Tennessee and Georgia. At one time,
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Nashville’s Post 1 boasted a membership of 600 Union veterans. Within a few years, though, many Union veterans in Tennessee and across the nation deserted the organization’s ranks. In the North, as Union veterans successfully readjusted to civilian society, they deemed the organization superfluous and perceived it as merely a vehicle to advance the ambitious partisan aims of Republican politicians.35

During Reconstruction, GAR members in Tennessee and across the South soon became demoralized. They faced ostracism from Rebel sympathizers, were associated with national Reconstruction policies, and endured threats and physical attacks from the Ku Klux Klan (KKK), the para-military arm of the Conservative-Democrat Party. In 1871, national GAR officers noted that Tennessee’s department had been “the best organization of any of the Southern states;” but lamented that it now suffered because the “rebel influence” across the state had “forced the several Posts to disband, and their members either to leave the State or disavow their connection with the Order.” One year later, in 1872, another national GAR official agreed that the order languished primarily because “the intense hatred exhibited against members.” But he also confessed that “internal dissensions in the Posts when in existence, and their attempted use for selfish purposes” made matters worse. The next year, in 1873, yet another national officer claimed that GAR posts in the South faltered because “ex-soldiers are so few and scattered” and that “the public prejudice against the Order is very bitter.” He went on to relate, “In many localities membership in the Grand Army is deemed a sufficient reason even for withholding patronage from a business man….many ex-soldiers will not join our Order and risk total ruin.” He concluded, “those who do join, are compelled to keep their

membership as secret as if it were a capital crime.” KKK Grand Dragon Nathan Bedford Forrest even allegedly related to a newspaper correspondent that the KKK developed in Tennessee to provide “protection against Loyal Leagues and the Grand Army of the Republic.” By 1873, the Department of Tennessee and Georgia’s total GAR membership had dwindled to a mere thirty-eight members, and the organization was entirely defunct a year later.\textsuperscript{36}

Grand Army of the Republic posts across Tennessee and the rest of the nation enjoyed a resurgence in the 1880s, and continued to prosper into the early twentieth century. Former Union soldiers from across the country flocked to the ranks as the order recast itself as a fraternity, benevolent society, special-interest lobby, and patriotic organization. In addition to fostering fraternal bonds among former Union soldiers, it helped veterans navigate the bureaucratic red tape in Washington, D. C. and collect pensions. While GAR members “officially” renounced partisan politics, their overriding political interest was veterans’ pensions. The GAR became the first major lobbying group in Washington D.C. Throughout the 1880s, GAR members lobbied for legislation that would ensure a regular pension to all Union veterans. The GAR’s support of pension legislation directly influenced membership. In 1890, the same year lawmakers passed the Dependent and Disability Pension Act of 1890, which provided standard pensions for veterans and widows, GAR membership across the country skyrocketed to over 400,000 veterans. Demonstrating membership in a GAR post—and validating honorable wartime service upon application—expedited the process of claiming a service pension.\textsuperscript{37}


The GAR consisted of three echelons—post, department, and national. A GAR member—or comrade—belonged to a local post. Similar to modern-day Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) posts, GAR posts generally represented a specific town or community. An annually elected post commander and his staff orchestrated meetings, issued “orders” to comrades, and oversaw the post’s administrative operations. Posts were organized into state departments—such as the Department of Tennessee. Sometimes, especially in the South, departments consisted of posts in more than one state—such as the Department of Virginia and North Carolina. An annually elected department commander governed a department. A senior vice-commander and junior vice-commander aided the commander, and rounded out the top three elected departmental leaders. Aiding the department commander, senior vice-commander, and junior vice-commander, were a number of appointed officials—including a medical director, department chaplain, assistant adjutant-general, department inspector, judge advocate, and members of a council of administration. The commander and officers managed the department by issuing “general orders” to posts, and presided over yearly departmental reunions—called encampments. Delegates and past department officers from posts across the state met at annual encampments hosted in various towns and cities. During department encampments, delegates hobnobbed with comrades, discussed organizational policies or debated issues facing the department, and elected officers for the next year. Department commanders and representatives reported to national GAR leaders at annual national encampments in cities across the country. The national GAR hierarchy paralleled that at the departmental level. The commander-in-chief, senior vice-commander-in-chief, and junior vice-commander-in-chief, were the highest elected
officials. Accompanying these officers were a number of lower-level officers who were elected or appointed. The commander-in-chief and other national GAR officers issued their own orders to departments across the nation, oversaw policies and issues facing the national organization, and coordinated annual national encampment meetings.38

In May 1883, Edward S. Jones—a transplant from Pennsylvania—reorganized Post 1 in Nashville and became Commander of the provisional Department of Tennessee and Georgia. The department included posts in Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama. By February 26, 1884, Jones established additional posts across the three states, and that year national officers officially recognized it as the permanent Department of Tennessee and Georgia. Four years later, in 1888, due to growing numbers, national GAR leaders divided the Department of Tennessee and Georgia into three separate departments—thereafter known as the Department of Tennessee, the Department of Georgia, and Department of Alabama.39

Tennessee’s GAR enjoyed meteoric growth during the formative years of its resurgence and quickly mushroomed into the largest and most active department in the former Confederacy. Whereas the state organization included only 442 members and fourteen posts in 1883 as a provisional department, within a year the number of posts had doubled to twenty-eight and membership had grown by almost 125 percent to include 989 members in 1884. Over the next few years, the number of members and posts grew dramatically and by December 31, 1887 included fifty-five posts and 2,185 black and

38 Ibid., 27.

Department of Tennessee and Georgia posts were established in Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama. Interestingly enough, one post—E. O. C. Ord Post 100—was founded in Mexico City, Mexico. For a complete list of posts comprising the Department of Tennessee and Georgia, see GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection.
white members. Most belonged to posts in mountain communities. When compared to many northern departments, the Volunteer State’s GAR appears rather paltry—the three largest departments in 1887 included Pennsylvania with nearly 41,000 members and the departments of Ohio and New York, each with nearly 39,000 comrades. However, no other department in Dixie either grew as drastically or included a greater number of members and posts. And most of that growth was in East Tennessee.  

Despite its significant growth in its early revival years, the department did endure some growing pains—including internal squabbling and leadership controversy. Hard feelings first arose between members of Chattanooga’s two all-white posts—Lookout Post 2 and Mission Ridge Post 45—over the 1886 Memorial Day observations. A Chattanooga Daily Times article recalled that bad blood developed after members of Lookout sought to celebrate the holiday with “pomp and display, with bands and banners,” while Mission Ridge comrades “regarded it as everything else but a gala day.” Social class resentment may have also played a part. Some of the more affluent members of Lookout likely looked down upon those in Mission Ridge, “composed largely of laboring men, who when their day’s work is finished, seek to pass the evening in rest and repose.”  

To make matters worse, controversy over state leadership flared up a few months later. Department founder Edward S. Jones was reelected department commander for

---

40 See membership statistics in GAR, National, *Eighteenth to Twenty-first Encampment* (1884-1887). Only the Border South states of Kentucky, Missouri, and West Virginia had greater numbers of members and posts in 1887 and throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In 1887, Kentucky’s department included 65 posts and 2,580 members, Missouri boasted 309 posts and 15,392 members, and West Virginia enjoyed 75 posts and 2,985 members. After Tennessee, the next largest GAR departments in the former Confederacy were Arkansas (37 posts and 1,075 members), Virginia (25 posts and 935), and Texas (18 posts and 515 members).  

three successive terms—from 1883 to 1886. But he contracted a cold and died unexpectedly on November 25, 1886. Infighting ensued after members of the state council of administration tapped Edwin E. Winters—a Michigan native and member of Nashville’s Post 1—to serve the rest of Jones’s term as interim commander. This raised eyebrows because Winters was not next in line in the leadership hierarchy. Over the next months, a number of GAR members in the department voiced their displeasure in Winters and claimed he had underhandedly gained control of the organization. The infighting was not lost on the public either. Some veterans openly criticized Winters in the local press. A January 10, 1887 article in the Chattanooga Daily Times dubbed Winters’s ascent as “a disgrace to the Order.” Two weeks later, on January 24, another column beseeched GAR members to “take the reins of the [organizational] government from [Winters’s] disreputable hands” and elect “some one who has the welfare of the Order at heart” at the upcoming state encampment in April. The article went on to quote an alleged member of Nashville’s Post 1, who asserted that Winters’s “sole motive from the day he joined” the GAR “until now has been his personal gain. He condemned Post 1 to h—l last winter (and ought to have been court-martialed for it).” A week later, yet another editorial criticized Winters’s leadership and failure to extinguish the disputes flaring up, asserting, “Instead of trying to ‘pour oil upon the troubled waters,’ this accidental department commander (God save the mark) seems to want to widen the breach.” Several weeks later, another column admitted, “it has been clear to the public for months that the Grand Army of the Republic in Tennessee is not a band of brethren dwelling together in
absolute unity.” The organizational divisions underscored the diversity and differing opinions among East Tennessee GAR members.⁴²

The turmoil subsided after William J. Ramage—a Pennsylvania transplant and member of Knoxville’s Ed Maynard post—was elected commander at the April 1887 state encampment in Knoxville. At the reunion, officials extended an olive branch among those members with hard feelings. Henry F. Temple and Joseph H. Vandeman of Chattanooga’s Lookout post put forward an official resolution vindicating Winters. The resolution apologized for Winters, claiming that he assumed a leadership role “under circumstances of great confusion and embarrassment” and that “he found not only the treasury empty, but the Department greatly in debt.” Temple and Vandeman went on to state that despite being subjected “to harsh and uncalled-for criticism,” Winters “succeeded in placing the finances of the Department in good shape, showing debts paid and a healthy balance in the treasury” and should be publicly lauded by all GAR members. Additionally, because of the veterans’ embarrassing public squabbling, state leaders also passed a resolution stating that when future controversies arose, indignant veterans were to voice their distress privately within the order, instead of publicly. They claimed that public criticisms “tends to create and promote discord among comrades, to bring the Organization into public ridicule and contempt, and are prejudicial to good order and discipline.” The leaders condemned “the use of public prints for the purpose of ventilating real or supposed grievances” against “the character or conduct of officers, comrades or Posts of the Department.”⁴³

⁴² The Chattanooga Daily Times editorials are reprinted in GAR, Tennessee, Third Encampment (1887), 15-17.
⁴³ GAR, Tennessee, Third Encampment (1887), 14-15, 17.
The department was “disorganized” and “dilapidated” when Ramage succeeded Winters. Yet, over the next year, members lauded Ramage for bringing “order out of chaos” by “faithful and comprehensive labor, guided by admirable executive ability.” At the end of Ramage’s tenure in 1888, although three posts had disbanded, membership remained nearly unchanged with 2,184 comrades. Comrades applauded Ramage’s efforts, noting that the state organization was “in a flourishing condition” and “second to no one in the country, and one that each and every officer and comrade looks to with pride.”

Tennessee’s GAR continued to grow and peaked in 1890—across the state and nation as a whole. That year, Tennessee boasted 3,697 members and the national organization as a whole included over 400,000 veterans. As wartime Unionist, and postwar Republican, sentiment permeated many East Tennessee communities, native mountaineers made up the majority of members (see especially Chapters 2 and 3). That year, fifty-five of the eighty active posts (almost 70 percent) were located in mountain communities. Additionally, the five largest posts in the department were all located in East Tennessee and boasted memberships ranging from a whopping 122 to 194 active members. Throughout the state organization’s life, 75 of the 132 local posts in the state were located in the eastern highlands.

While most ordinary members of Tennessee’s GAR were native mountaineers, transplant northerners dominated the leadership, especially during the formative years. Among the seven department commanders who served from 1884 to 1890, only one—William Rule—was a native Tennessean. The others hailed from Pennsylvania,

---

44 GAR, Tennessee, Fourth Encampment (1888), 9, 14.
46 For a complete list of posts comprising the Department of Tennessee, see GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection.
Michigan, and Ohio. This issue was brought to the fore during the 1890 encampment. As members began nominating officers, Halbert B. Case nominated a fellow member of Chattanooga’s Lookout post, Andrew J. Gahagan for departmental commander. Case advocated for Gahagan by noting the need of a native Tennessean to lead the state order. He claimed, “in the seven years, Tennessee’s 32,000 soldiers, the most loyal, brave, heroic men the sun ever shone upon…men who will go down in history as long as time shall last…have been represented in this Department by one Commander [Rule]” from Tennessee. Gahagan, who Case dubbed “the biggest little man in Tennessee,” was actually born in Madison County, North Carolina, had served in the First Tennessee Cavalry, and after the war relocated to Chattanooga (see Chapter 2). Russell Thornburgh of New Market’s Patrick McGuire post agreed with Case and supported Gahagan. He declared, “while we have been represented for seven or eight years, and honored as Department Commanders various gentlemen who hailed from other states, let us have once more a Tennessean for Department Commander.” William Rule of Knoxville later took the floor, and although he nominated another veteran as commander, he asserted that GAR members’ native state mattered little. He acknowledged all “the honors heaped upon the East Tennessee Union soldier,” but claimed “when you come to Grand Army men, it is bounded by no State lines; it matters not whether you come from the icy coast of New England or the flowery shores of Florida, we are Grand Army men; we are comrades, and we don’t stop to inquire what State a man was born in, or what regiment

---

47 For a list of Tennessee’s department commanders, see especially “Past Department Officers” in GAR, Tennessee, *Thirty-third Encampment*, n.p. The department commanders, from 1884 to 1890, and their home states include: Edward S. Jones, Pennsylvania (1884-1886), Edwin E. Winters, Missouri (1886), William J. Ramage, Pennsylvania (1887), William Rule, Tennessee (1888), Augustus H. Pettibone, Ohio (1889), Charles F. Muller, Pennsylvania (1890). See Table 2.
he served in.” Gahagan went on to be elected state commander. Rule’s comments illustrate that northern transplants blended remarkably well with native southern mountaineers and that sectional animosity or jealousy did not develop.48

Rule discounted any sectional bitterness or resentment over the birthplaces of state GAR leaders, and over the next twenty-two years, from 1891 to 1913, northern- and European-born veterans were elected almost as often as native Tennesseans as state commander. Whereas nine commanders were native Tennesseans, ten were northern transplants, two were European-born, and one was from Kentucky. Regardless, it seems that a member’s residence and local post membership trumped birthplace. The overwhelming majority of Tennessee’s GAR department commanders were members of mountain posts. Between 1884 and 1913, thirty of thirty-five state commanders were members of GAR posts in East Tennessee. After William J. Ramage succeeded Edwin E. Winters in 1887, a veteran from a highland post served as commander nearly every year until 1913. The lone exception was in 1895 when W. J. Smith of Memphis was elected.49

Throughout the late 1880s and 1890s, Tennessee’s GAR members took part in local post meetings, state encampments and reunions, and Memorial Day and Fourth of July celebrations; however, after 1890, membership and energy across the state and nation began to dwindle. By 1892, the state organization had lost a little more than 200 members because of old age, disease, apathy, and death. However, the number of active posts had grown to 90 and the 3,468 active members still made Tennessee’s GAR the

48 GAR, Tennessee, Eighth Encampment, 87-94.
largest in the former Confederacy. During the state encampment held in Nashville that year, department inspector Louis C. Mills—a New York transplant and member of Nashville’s Post 1—visited posts across the state and remarked on their general conditions. He asserted that the department “is composed of as loyal, faithful and able members as any,” but he admitted that “conditions” in a former Confederate state “requires greater effort, more moral courage and a deeper fraternal spirit to maintain a progressive attitude” than in northern states. Mills went on to confess that most post activities and efforts are “done by the minority; a few in each Post attending quite regularly and manifesting an interest in its welfare.” He noted that although most meetings were led by “faithful officers in attendance,” the gatherings were “not as profitable as they might be” because “it is hard for the officers to commit to memory the ritual, and it could hardly be expected of them.” He closed by stating, “the honor and privileges of the G.A.R. are not fully appreciated by the members.”

The next year, in 1893, the veterans attempted to grapple with membership issues, and ended up shaping national GAR policies. Commander Frank Seaman and assistant adjutant general Charles A. Ogden of Knoxville proposed the creation of a “picket system” to stem declining membership. They outlined their opinions on that proposal within an April 1893 circular to national commander-in-chief A. G. Weissert and fellow comrades. Members would establish “picket posts,” or satellite GAR meeting places, in the nearby private homes of GAR members so that those elderly veterans unable to attend regular meetings could still remain involved. Those able to attend regular post meetings would report on the condition of the picket posts to leaders, and afterward “bring back a

---

report of what transpired” at the post proceedings to those at picket meetings. Seaman and Ogden supported establishing pickets because “the membership of a number of the Posts in the mountain counties of this Department is widely scattered…as a consequence many, especially those of advanced age, are unable to attend meetings…[which] has materially weakened what were good, strong local Posts, to the detriment of our Department organization.” They also claimed that if local members founded pickets, “comrades would not feel isolated from each other; at these Picket meetings the congeniality of comradeship would be strengthened.”

National Commander-in-Chief A. G. Weissert gave his full-fledged support of the picket system on April 11, 1893. He also encouraged state departments across the nation to institute the East Tennesseans’ initiative, suggesting that the picket system will “prove beneficial in all localities where members of Posts are widely scattered, and I trust other Department Commanders will undertake work in the same line.” Tennessee GAR members welcomed Weissert’s response and predicted the system would help retain members and recruit other veterans.52

Unfortunately, it is difficult to gauge the relative success of the picket post system. National GAR leaders officially adopted the plan and circulated it, with modifications, to other state departments. In 1896, leaders of the national encampment again endorsed the project and recommended the revised “Minnesota plan”—which organized members into resident and non-resident groups. Non-resident members paid

52 Ibid.
one-half the amount of dues and elected a local GAR leader to preside over informal meetings held in private members’ homes.\textsuperscript{53}

Although the national encampment adopted East Tennesseans’ policy, by 1894 membership continued to decline across the state and nation. Tennessee boasted 3,146 active members that year, but one year later it had lost 167 more members. Regardless of the decline in membership, GAR officials established nine additional posts, bringing the departmental total to 94 posts. Furthermore, officials did not deem the picket post system a total failure. Instead, they blamed the decline in membership upon the Panic of 1893—an economic depression that wracked the entire nation. During the depression, large numbers of railroad companies collapsed after overextending themselves, thus fomenting countless bank failures and widespread economic instability. State GAR officials not only declared that “the unusual business and financial depression had much to do with bringing [the loss in membership] about,” but also that “the advanced age of many members was a factor in the result.” Furthermore, they claimed that “there are many on our rolls who have been benefited by uniting with us, who will not bear their share of the light financial burden imposed…this class is being weeded out, and such action will be for the good of those remaining.”\textsuperscript{54}

Tennessee’s GAR leaders regretted the decline in membership that continued to the turn of the century and fostered animosity among mountain Union veterans. Tennessee’s GAR remained the largest in the former Confederacy—even outpacing West Virginia after 1896; however, in 1898, commander Halbert B. Case of Chattanooga was discouraged that “the last two years had brought painfully near a realization of the fact

\textsuperscript{53} Dearing, \textit{Veterans in Politics}, 448.
\textsuperscript{54} GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Eleventh Encampment} (1894), 58.
that the vital energy of the Grand Army of the Republic is disappearing. Old age, disease, death, are asserting their domination.” After noting the significant drop in membership, he resentfully claimed, “the larger portion of the deserters, are men who are drawing liberal pensions” despite the GAR’s lobbying efforts to secure the Dependent and Disability Pension Act of 1890.\(^55\) Two years later at the 1900 state encampment, Frank Seaman of Knoxville echoed Case’s criticism of Union veteran pensioners who were delinquent GAR members. He railed that members “who receive the largest pensions are the ones who never pay” their dues and that “ninety-nine of every one hundred of those on our roll of membership receive pensions, and a majority of them under the 1890 law, placed upon the statute books on the demand of the Grand Army, and it does seem that they should be willing to contribute one percent of their pension to aid in keeping up an organization that has been of so much benefit to them.”\(^56\)

While GAR membership gradually declined in the 1890s, the Woman’s Relief Corps (WRC), the GAR’s official ladies’ auxiliary, slowly became active in the state. Ladies of the WRC had to demonstrate they had been “loyal” to the Union war effort and supported veterans’ welfare. WRC members organized local “corps,” which were affiliated with nearby GAR posts. Members proclaimed their most important duty was charity and relief for veterans, as well as war widows and orphans. In East Tennessee, members typically included the wives and daughters of Grand Army men.\(^57\)

Tennessee’s GAR members had begun advocating for the establishment of WRC corps at the outset, in 1884; however, while the state GAR had grown tremendously in its

\(^{55}\) “Commander’s Address” in GAR, Tennessee, *Fifteenth Encampment* (1898), 46.

\(^{56}\) GAR, Tennessee, *Seventeenth Encampment* (1900), 42-43.

infancy, especially in the highlands, the state WRC languished until the early 1890s. By June 1889, five years after receiving the support of state GAR members, national WRC leaders designated it a provisional department. Tennessee’s WRC department included only three corps and 92 active members. Whereas two corps were located in Chattanooga and associated with the all-white Lookout and Mission Ridge GAR posts, the third was in Knoxville and attached to the all-white Ed Maynard post.\textsuperscript{58} Whereas both Chattanooga corps helped local GAR members decorate graves at Chickamauga National Cemetery in 1889, members of Knoxville’s corps—described as “the best of the Northern women”—also prepared a Thanksgiving meal for Ed Maynard post members and their families.\textsuperscript{59} During the state GAR encampment that year, commander William Rule of Knoxville asserted that the WRC “is a most valuable auxiliary” and that GAR members sought “the association of the wives and daughters of Comrades.” He then beseeched “greater effort should be made throughout the Department to increase the numbers and efficiency of that organization.”\textsuperscript{60}

Two years later, in December 1891, WRC members had organized five more corps, a total of only seven in the state. Six of the seven corps were associated with GAR posts in mountain communities—including two in Chattanooga, two in Knoxville, one in Tazewell, and one in Harriman. One of Knoxville’s WRC corps was made up of black women who were associated with the local all-black Isham Young Post 80.\textsuperscript{61} The next

\textsuperscript{58} “Inspector’s Report,” GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Fifth Encampment} (1889), 30.
\textsuperscript{59} WRC, National, \textit{Seventh Convention} (1889), 60, 208, 99-100, 125-126.
\textsuperscript{60} GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Fifth Encampment} (1889), 19.
year, Tennessee’s WRC included 138 members and on September 6, 1892, national leaders re-designated it a permanent department.  

Throughout the 1890s and into the early 1900s, Tennessee’s WRC remained active, held annual conventions concurrently with annual GAR encampments, and participated in Memorial Day programs and patriotic instruction campaigns (see especially Chapter 6). GAR and WRC members in Tennessee and across the nation undertook patriotic crusades in which they prodded local school boards against using “pro-Confederate” textbooks, championed American flag displays, school military drills, and other nationalistic activities. In 1907, Tennessee WRC members reported that they visited twenty-five schools—presenting flags, handing out patriotic primers, and distributing 100 pamphlets on proper flag etiquette. While Tennessee’s GAR attempted to broadcast their participation and sacrifice for the Union war effort without angering former Confederate neighbors, local WRC members hinted that sectional tensions hindered its growth. During the 1910 state WRC convention, department secretary Janie M. S. Case related,

Our growth has not been phenomenal in adding Corps or membership, as we have worked under some disadvantages...building up prosperous Corps in the South is a different problem from the results of efforts made in the North, East, or West, and yet there is so much to overcome in sectional prejudice that the harvest is ripe for the earnest reaper.

Despite the sectional tensions Tennessee’s WRC faced, between 1901 and 1925, members of the state’s GAR constructed four monuments across the region that commemorated local Union soldiers. State GAR leaders oversaw the fundraising and

---

62 GAR, Tennessee, *Tenth Encampment* (1893), 52; WRC, National *Tenth Convention* (1892), 17, 121.
construction of the most significant monument dedicated in Knoxville’s national cemetery in 1901. Local posts in Cleveland, Greeneville, and Athens built smaller monuments in 1914, 1919, and 1925, respectively (see Chapter 5). Additionally, in November 1915, individual GAR and WRC constructed and dedicated a monument at Andersonville prison in Georgia. The marker commemorated the 712 Tennesseans who died while imprisoned by fellow southerners. These monuments would be some of the only memorials honoring southern Union veterans constructed in the South.65

At the turn of the century and into the early 1910s, the state’s GAR attained national prominence. It was the only department in the former Confederacy to secure multiple national leadership positions and host a national encampment. At the 1900 national encampment in Chicago, Frank Seaman of Knoxville’s Ed Maynard post was unanimously elected junior vice commander-in-chief—the third highest GAR leadership position in the country. Though Seaman admitted a year later, in 1901, that his position was essentially ceremonial and that he had not performed any “specific duties” during his term, only five other GAR members from former Confederate states had previously held the office.66

Three years later, at the 1904 national encampment in Boston, George W. Patten—an Illinois transplant and prominent resident of Chattanooga—was elected junior vice commander-in-chief. Andrew J. Gahagan of Chattanooga nominated Patten and

---

sought electoral support by noting his war record and reminding delegates from across the country of Tennesseans’ wartime sacrifices in the Union war effort. He reminded those in attendance that the state department was “down in the heart of the Confederacy” and that “during the sixties we were surrounded on all sides by the men who wore the grey, yet thirty-one thousand of us came across the line that we might, if necessary, shed our blood in defense of the Flag of our country.” He closed by beseeching fellow veterans to support Patten “in the name of those who have gone there and have given their best services, and their means and energy to build up the South Land.” The other nominees withdrew and Patten was duly elected.67

A few months later, in July 1905, Patten was promoted to senior-vice commander in chief—the second highest office in the national GAR. He replaced John R. King of Baltimore, who stepped down because he was preoccupied with political duties in Washington, D. C. During the 1905 national encampment in Denver, Patten reported on the activities undertaken by members of the GAR in Tennessee and the South. He crowed, “what the comrades in the Southern Departments lack in numbers they make up in earnest patriotic work, all of which is having its effect on the rising generation in that part of the country.” He then related, “all days set apart by the Grand Army of the Republic to be especially observed, such as Memorial Day, both the Sunday preceding and May 30, are more generally observed by the members of the Grand Army of the Republic and auxiliaries in the Southern Departments than in the larger Departments further North.” In addition to explaining that GAR members placed flowers on Union graves in nearby national cemeteries, he noted that because of GAR patriotic education

campaigns, “Flag Day was almost universally observed by the schools. I had the honor of attending, upon special invitation, five or six flag raisings at schools and universities.”
Patten would be one of the only members from a former Confederate state to attain the second highest national GAR office.68

Over the next few years, membership in Tennessee’s GAR dropped significantly and by 1912 included only 604 members and thirty-one posts; however, Chattanooga was selected to host the national encampment in September 1913. This encampment was the only national GAR reunion held in the former Confederacy, and was to coincide with fiftieth anniversary commemorations of the battles of Chickamauga and Chattanooga. Although thousands of Union veterans and visitors from across the nation flocked to southeast Tennessee for the event, sectional and racial tensions did arise (see Chapter 6).69

The 1913 national encampment in Chattanooga marked the Tennessee GAR’s swan song. Within four years, in 1917, the state organization included only 552 members and eighteen posts. By 1935, only fifteen Tennessee GAR members remained active, and in December 1936, the state surrendered its charter.70 Thirteen years later, the national GAR would disband.

Between 1884 and 1913, black and white Union veterans made Tennessee’s GAR the most dominant of any department in the former Confederacy. Not only did the veterans organize posts in communities across the state—especially in the eastern

---

70 GAR, National, *Fifty-second Encampment* (1918), 43; *Seventieth Encampment* (1936), 41; *Seventy-first* (1937), 151.
highlands—but they also held annual state encampments, and coordinated their efforts with WRC members to decorate veterans’ graves and commemorate Memorial Day, promote Flag Day observations, and build monuments. They also elected national leaders and hosted a national encampment. For almost thirty years, GAR members in southern mountain communities maintained the “ties made in trials of blood.”
CHAPTER 2

LOYAL MEN, ALL: GAR MEMBERSHIP IN EAST TENNESSEE

On May 16, 1900, GAR representatives from across the state gathered in the courthouse in Elizabethton for the seventeenth annual departmental encampment. After department commander Henry Crumbliss of Kingston, in Roane County, brought the meeting to order, Reverend David P. Wilcox provided an opening prayer, and leaders proceeded to call roll. Then, Crumbliss took the floor for the annual commander’s address. During his speech, Crumbliss commented on Tennessee’s GAR membership trends since the department had been chartered in 1885. He related, “We were not all soldiers under the banner of Tennessee….but we are all Tennesseans today, if not by birth by adoption, and all feel the pride of true Americans that we are gathered in a section of our State every foot of which is historic and the very air we breathe is laden with inspirations of freedom.” He then associated the veterans with historic Tennesseans—including John Sevier, Andrew Jackson, and Davy Crockett. He remarked on John Sevier’s Overmountain men defeating Patrick Ferguson’s British troops at the Battle of King’s Mountain and claimed that during the Civil War, “here in these mountains was found that loyalty to the old flag which has received the admiration of the world, and from the cabins on the hill-sides and mountain tops went forth men to battle for the Union as brave and heroic as any that live in song or story.” Despite romantically connecting GAR members with Tennessee’s Revolutionary War and frontier past, he
accurately pointed out that not all of the veterans in attendance were native Tennesseans. Quite a few were newcomers to the state. While all were members of Tennessee’s GAR, they were quite a diverse lot.¹

Though a few scholars have studied those who joined the GAR in the North, no one has comprehensively examined the make-up of membership in southern posts. Historian Stuart McConnell provided some insight into northern GAR members. Focusing on the members of three northern posts—in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Brockton, Massachusetts; and Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin—he not only found a predominance of native-born white members, but also argued that most black veterans joined segregated posts. Additionally, he asserted that although GAR membership “cut across class boundaries,” the socio-economic backgrounds of members of particular posts “followed the occupational and ethnic contours of the town in which it was located.” He also concluded that the GAR served as an important networking forum for professionals and businessmen.²

More recently, historian Barbara Gannon has argued that the GAR proved an interracial organization by highlighting the proliferation of African-American veterans in integrated and all-black GAR posts. Yet, her study mostly focuses on black and white GAR members in the North, and only fleetingly touches on southern comrades.³

Examining the wartime and postwar experiences of Tennessee’s black Union veterans,

¹ GAR, Tennessee, Seventeenth Encampment (1900), 33.
historian Paul Coker provided key insights into African-American veterans’ backgrounds and involvement in the GAR. Yet, by focusing on black GAR members alone, Coker does not provide a broad overview of all GAR members in the Tennessee highlands.\textsuperscript{4}

Thomas J. McCrory also provided insight on GAR members in Wisconsin. However, when describing the relative strength of the GAR in the Badger State, he asserted that membership in southern states was “small, of course, since comparatively few residents of these states fought for the Union. G.A.R. members were mostly men who migrated South after the war.” Of those southern members, McCrory claimed that such membership “was usually a detriment to their businesses, in contrast to the comrades in the North. Besides being outsiders, G.A.R. men were perceived—as the G.A.R. was—as part of the radicalism of harsh Reconstruction.”\textsuperscript{5}

This chapter supplements, and in McCrory’s case corrects, the current scholarly literature by examining both white and black GAR members in East Tennessee. In particular, it provides a comprehensive demographic profile of members in the region. First, it highlights more general membership trends throughout the highlands. Then the chapter focuses on white members in four eastern Tennessee communities—Chattanooga, Knoxville, Greeneville, and Harriman. These are ideal study communities as they were home to some of the most prominent and active posts in the entire region and state. Additionally, they provide a snapshot of members in both urban centers and rural mountain hamlets. Studying the GAR at the community level highlights the diversity of

\textsuperscript{4} Paul E. Coker, “‘Is This the Fruit of Freedom?’ Black Civil War Veterans in Tennessee,” (PhD diss. University of Tennessee at Knoxville, 2011).
\textsuperscript{5} Thomas J. McCrory, \textit{Grand Army of the Republic: Department of Wisconsin} (Black Earth, WI: Trails Books, 2005), 324.
Union veterans in the post-war South and underscores the broader postwar demographic and developmental shifts in the Appalachian Mountains.

A number of fundamental questions form the foundation of this chapter. Specifically, who were the members of GAR posts in the Tennessee highlands? To what extent did native mountaineers make up the majority of the rank and file? What were their socio-economic backgrounds? Were most high-status white-collar workers, middle-class proprietors and semiprofessionals, or semiskilled and unskilled laborers?

Several key sources provide insights into these central questions. Relatively unused by previous scholars, the “Descriptive Records,” form the foundation of this chapter. Unique to the Department of Tennessee, these original rosters detail members’ personal information—including their names, birthplaces, ages, residences, occupations, wartime service and ranks, and admission dates into the GAR. Though the descriptive rosters do not account for every member, they afford the most complete enumeration of those who joined Tennessee’s GAR from 1884 to 1897. In particular, they provide an accurate snapshot of roughly 5,700 veterans who joined seventy-nine eastern Tennessee posts from the order’s organization in 1884 through its height in 1890. Correlating this data with that found in the 1880 and 1900 censuses, 1890 veterans’ schedules, and a few published post rosters provides a thorough picture of GAR membership trends in the Tennessee mountains.

---

6 GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” Calvin M. McClung Collection. The McClung collection houses two bound volumes of the original rosters, which provide information on 131 posts from across Tennessee. These volumes have been microfilmed and indexed by post name, number, and location. A number of rosters have been transcribed by Raymond A. Sears and published in various issues of The East Tennessee Historical Society’s Tennessee Ancestors.

7 Bureau of the Census, Tenth Census of the United States, 1880; Bureau of the census, Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900; Roster of Ed. Maynard Post, No. 14, Department of Tennessee GAR (Knoxville, TN: 1890; 1909), Roster of Mission Ridge Post, No. 45, Department of Tennessee GAR (Chattanooga, TN: 1888).
The published journals of annual state encampment meetings between 1885 and 1917, family histories, and biographical directories are also invaluable. Besides including the minutes of each meeting and recording post representatives’ attendance, the journals provide the names of elected and appointed state leaders, and record annual membership. Family histories and biographical directories supplement the statistical analysis by providing life stories of particular members, and human faces on the Grand Army in the region.

Challenging McCrory’s assertion that most GAR posts in the post-war South were made up of transplanted Yankees, most members were southerners in the Tennessee highlands. Of the 5,068 white and black members whose birthplaces were identified, 82 percent were born in the former Confederacy (See Table 1). Native Tennesseans, especially, dominated the order. Nearly three out of every four GAR members (roughly 72 percent) were born in the Volunteer State. Others had resettled from North Carolina, Virginia, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi. Besides Tennesseans, most were from the Tar Heel State—accounting for roughly 5 percent of all members.8 Quite a few of those North Carolinians hailed from mountain counties along the Tennessee border that had been wartime Unionist strongholds—including Madison, Yancey, Ashe, and Mitchell. Still other members were from Border States. Those from Kentucky, Missouri, West Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware accounted for nearly 2 percent of

---

8 GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection; Bureau of the census, *Tenth Census of the United States*, 1880; Bureau of the census, *Twelfth Census of the United States*, 1900. The percentages of GAR members from surrounding southern states, included: North Carolina: 5.47%, Virginia 3.14%, Georgia 1.05%, South Carolina .77%, and Mississippi .04%.
members. These black and white southerners had borne arms against the Confederacy, and publicly reaffirmed their wartime loyalty afterward by joining the GAR.

Yet, quite a few did move to East Tennessee from north of the Mason-Dixon Line. Northern and Midwestern comrades accounted for almost 12 percent of Grand Army men in the highlands. Most of these newcomers were from Ohio, New York, and Pennsylvania. Many had served in the Tennessee highlands as soldiers in either the Army of Ohio or Army of the Cumberland, and resettled in the region afterward. Ohioans were especially prevalent. After Tennesseans and North Carolinians, those born in the Buckeye State were the most common. They accounted for roughly 4 percent of all members.

Slightly fewer New Yorkers and Pennsylvanians migrated to the region after the war. A few foreign-born veterans accompanied northern and Midwestern transplants to the region. They hailed from Europe and Canada, and made up only 3 percent of the order. Most were from Germany and the British Isles. Northern and foreign-born veterans resettled in eastern Tennessee for many reasons after the war, but surely economic opportunities—especially in the region’s booming post-war extractive and

---

9 Ibid. The percentages of GAR members from Border South states, included: Kentucky 1.6%, Missouri .18%, Maryland .08%, West Virginia .06%, and Delaware .04%.
10 See Table 1. GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection; Bureau of the census, Tenth Census of the United States, 1880; Bureau of the census, Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900. The percentages of GAR comrades from northern states, included: Ohio, 4.10%, New York 2.47%, Pennsylvania 1.95%, Indiana 1.22%, Michigan .47%, Illinois .24%, Vermont .24%, Massachusetts .24%, New Jersey .20%, Connecticut .18%, Maine .12%, New Hampshire .10%, Iowa .10%, Minnesota .02%, and Wisconsin .02%.
11 Ibid.
12 Whereas those from Great Britain and Ireland accounted for roughly 1.4 percent of members, Germans made up a little more than 1 percent. A few others hailed from Canada (8), Austria (2), Denmark (1), Iceland (1), Hungary (1), and the Holy Roman Empire (1). GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection; Bureau of the census, Tenth Census of the United States, 1880; Bureau of the census, Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900.
commercial industries—attracted many. GAR posts certainly provided these outsiders with an inviting environment to network with other veterans and to be accepted in their new mountain communities.

Like many others who moved to post-Civil War East Tennessee, most northern, foreign-born, and black Union veterans resettled in regional urban centers—especially Chattanooga. The city had experienced drastic industrial and population growth in the two decades after the Civil War. By the time veterans had established the city’s three GAR posts in the 1880s, Chattanooga was a prosperous New South city. A notable iron manufacturing and transport center by 1880, it was the third largest city in the state with a population of nearly 13,000 residents. The city population was quite diverse. Residents included Confederate and Union veterans, southern and northern merchants, Yankee industrialists, European immigrants, and African Americans. Whereas transplanted Yankees accounted for 23 percent of Chattanooga voters in the 1870s, by 1880 the city was “about equally divided between settlers from the northern and southern states.” Northern expatriates made up such a significant portion of the city population that local newspapers frequently ran advertisements for northern businesses. Additionally, the First Methodist Episcopal Church’s mostly northern congregation prospered, and some even organized an Indiana Club chapter to encourage other Hoosiers to move south. One resident noted the city’s significant Yankee contingent, claiming “Nine-tenths of

---

Chattanooga has been owned by the northern people for years; men from Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and New York have borne its burdens and made the fight. This is really a Yankee city set down in Dixie.”¹⁶ According to one historian, “Modern Chattanooga was built, in large part, by Union army veterans and their Yankee peers.”¹⁷ With such a significant portion of northern-born residents, it is not surprising that Chattanooga’s GAR posts flourished and members played key roles in the city’s development.

Chattanooga was home to two large all-white GAR posts and one more modest all-black post. Members reflected the city’s post-war growth and diverse residents. The two all-white posts were Lookout Post 2, established in February 1882, and Mission Ridge Post 45 founded nearly four years later in January 1886. These two all-white posts boasted some of the most active and diverse members in the region. Between 1887 and 1891, Lookout and Mission Ridge enjoyed an average annual membership of 125 and 139 comrades, respectively. Members of both posts were prominent in the state organization, and quite a few were elected departmental commanders. Among the thirty departmental commanders elected between 1884 and 1913, eight belonged to Lookout Post and were notable Chattanoogans. Charles F. Muller was the only Mission Ridge comrade to be elected departmental commander.¹⁸

Both posts were unique in East Tennessee, because most of the 524 members were newcomers to the city (See Table 1). Nearly 78 percent were northern transplants and European immigrants. Most had moved to Chattanooga from Ohio, New York, and

---

¹⁶ As quoted in Ezzell, 24.
¹⁷ Ezzell, Chattanooga, 1865-1900, 1.
¹⁸ See Table 2. The departmental commanders from Lookout post included, Andrew J. Gahagan (1891), Halbert B. Case (1896-1897), George W. Patten (1902-1903), Walton W. French (1905), and D. Minor Steward (1909). See especially, “Past Department Officers” in GAR, Tennessee, Thirty-third Encampment (1916).
Pennsylvania. Ohioans, especially, dominated both posts. Nearly one-fifth of the posts’ members were originally from the Buckeye State, while New Yorkers accounted for roughly one out of every eight members.\(^\text{19}\) Quite a few either had participated in the battles of Chickamauga and Chattanooga or had been stationed in the city at some point during the war.

Zeboim and George Patten were among the northern and Midwestern veterans who resettled in Chattanooga, became prominent businessmen and manufacturers, and joined the local GAR. The Patten brothers were members of Lookout Post 2, and their business acumen and social activities propelled the family to be one of the most distinguished in Chattanooga, East Tennessee, and the entire South. Born in Wilna, New York, the brothers resettled in Illinois shortly before the Civil War. George served in the 73\(^{rd}\) Illinois Infantry Regiment and took part in the battles of Perryville, Chickamauga and Missionary Ridge, and Atlanta. Zeboim initially enlisted in the 115\(^{th}\) Illinois Infantry regiment and later transferred to the 149\(^{th}\) New York Infantry regiment. He was wounded at the Battle of Chickamauga, and after convalescing in a Chattanooga hospital, he spent the remainder of the war working as a clerk in the local quartermaster’s department.\(^\text{20}\)

Like many other Union veterans stationed in Chattanooga, promising economic opportunities inspired Zeboim to remain and invest in the city immediately after the war.

\(^{19}\) See Table 1. The Northern and Midwestern members of the Lookout and Mission Ridge posts, included: Ohio (95), New York (70), Pennsylvania (46), Indiana (29), Michigan (14), Massachusetts (6), Vermont (6), Maine (5), Illinois (5), New Jersey (3), Rhode Island (3), New Hampshire (3), District of Columbia (2), Minnesota (1), Iowa (1), Wisconsin (1), Connecticut (1), and Delaware (1). Whereas Ohioans accounted for 18.1 percent of members, New Yorkers and Pennsylvanians accounted for 13.4 percent and 8.8 percent of members, respectively. See especially, Lookout Post 2 and Mission Ridge Post 45 rosters in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection; Bureau of the census, *Tenth Census of the United States*, 1880; Bureau of the census, *Twelfth Census of the United States*, 1900.

He initially opened the Patten and Payne store on Market Street, which specialized in stationary and schoolbooks. However, by February 1879 he founded the Chattanooga Medicine Company (the modern-day Chattem Company), which manufactured and marketed a number of lucrative patent medicines, including Black-Draught and Wine of Cardui. Zeboim’s brother, George, moved to town in 1883. He worked in the patent medicine company redesigning the machinery to more efficiently bottle medicinal liquids, as well as helping his brother publish the popular Cardui calendar and *Ladies Birthday Almanac* in 1885. Under the Patten brothers’ oversight, the company prospered. By 1900, it paid dividends of $45,000 on its capital stock of $100,000 dollars.\(^{21}\)

Zeboim was also very active in various other local business ventures. In 1903, he served as president of the Stone Fort Land Company that developed commercial property in downtown Chattanooga. He helped found the Volunteer State Life Insurance Company in 1906, and one year later he constructed the city’s first skyscraper—the Hotel Patten.\(^{22}\)

In addition to being prominent executives, the Patten brothers were also active members of Lookout Post 2. George was elected post commander in 1891 and again in 1899. He also served as the state assistant quartermaster-general in 1897. Three years later, in 1900, he was elected senior vice-commander.\(^{23}\) Then, his fellow comrades elected him departmental commander in 1902 and again in 1903.\(^{24}\) The next year, in 1904, Patten gained further prominence by securing a national leadership position. He served as Senior Vice-Commander-in-Chief, the second highest office in the national


\(^{23}\) GAR, Tennessee, *Seventeenth Encampment* (1900), 57.

\(^{24}\) GAR, Tennessee, *Tenth Encampment* (1893), 34; *Sixteenth Encampment* (1899), 24; *Twentieth Encampment* (1903), 2; *Twenty-first Encampment* (1904), n. p.
order. As an active GAR member, George was an outspoken proponent of the establishment of the Chickamauga Battlefield National Park, and advocated sectional reconciliation. Two family historians claimed that he “bore no hatred for his former foes and harbored no malice to any man on the Southern side of the great conflict. In his business and social relations he knew no line in the least sectional.”

Surely, Patten’s many business connections with former Confederates influenced his outlook.

A few GAR members were immigrants—mostly from Germany and the British Isles. The eighty-seven foreign-born members of the local GAR posts reflected the city’s significant portion of immigrant residents (16.6 percent). Among the Europeans who resettled in Chattanooga—and made up 18 percent of local voters in 1880—many were from Germany. Many labored with working-class whites and African Americans in the city’s iron mills and railroad industries. The German community was so prominent that the city boasted two ethnic newspapers, local churches held services in German, and Germans frequently organized ethnic clubs and social gatherings.

Whereas most GAR members throughout the region were white Tennesseans and southerners, they were in the minority in the Lookout and Mission Ridge posts. Fewer than one of every four members were from the South (nearly 24 percent). Native Tennesseans accounted for only 16.4 percent of members in both posts. Other southerners

---

27 See Table 1. The number of foreign-born members of Lookout Post 2 and Mission Ridge Post 45, included: Germany (37), England (13), Wales (3), France (2), Canada (2), Scotland (2), Russia (1), Hungary (1), Norway (1), Switzerland (1), Holy Roman Empire (1). See especially, Lookout Post 2 and Mission Ridge Post 45 rosters in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection; Bureau of the census, *Tenth Census of the United States*, 1880; Bureau of the census, *Twelfth Census of the United States*, 1900.
were from Georgia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, and Louisiana. A handful were from Border States.\textsuperscript{29}

Despite being outnumbered by northerners and Midwesterners, southern Grand Army men were quite prominent in the order and in Chattanooga. Andrew J. Gahagan was one of them. Gahagan was born in 1844 in Madison County, North Carolina, and when civil war broke out, he was attending Bascom College in Leicester, North Carolina. Believing the dissolution of the Union was wrong, he made his way through Confederate lines and enlisted as a private in Company D of the 4\textsuperscript{th} Tennessee Federal Infantry in January 1862 (later reorganized as the 1\textsuperscript{st} Tennessee Cavalry). Gahagan rose steadily in the ranks, serving as 1\textsuperscript{st} Lieutenant in February 1864. Two months later, in April, he was detailed as the regimental quartermaster, a position he retained until the end of the war. He participated in most of the major battles fought by the Army of the Cumberland—including Chickamauga, Kennesaw Mountain, Franklin and Nashville.\textsuperscript{30}

After being mustered out of service in 1865, Gahagan became a clerk in the quartermaster department, and in January 1866 was transferred to the Chattanooga office. He retained his government position until April 1867, when he opened a mercantile business on the corner of 5\textsuperscript{th} and Market streets. A decade later, in 1877, he became treasurer of the Loomis & Hart Company, Chattanooga’s largest lumber firm. He held this position for thirty-five years. He also took the lead in a number of other enterprises.

\textsuperscript{29} See Table 1. The southern members of Lookout Post 2 and Mission Ridge Post 45 include: Tennessee (86), Georgia (10), Virginia (9), North Carolina (9), South Carolina (5), Alabama (3), Louisiana (3). Those from Border States included: Missouri (2), Maryland (2), and Delaware (2). See especially, Lookout Post 2 and Mission Ridge Post 45 rosters in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection; Bureau of the census, \textit{Tenth Census of the United States}, 1880; Bureau of the census, \textit{Twelfth Census of the United States}, 1900.

He served as the director of the City Savings Bank, vice-president of the Lookout Building and Loan association, and director of the Chattanooga Building and Loan Association.\textsuperscript{31}

In addition to being a prominent businessman, Gahagan quickly became active in Chattanooga’s civic life. As an outspoken Republican, he was appointed the city’s assistant postmaster in 1876, under fellow veteran John T. Wilder. Two years later, in 1878, he was elected treasurer of Hamilton County. Later that same year, with the unexpected death of Mayor Thomas J. Carlisle, Gahagan was appointed interim mayor. After serving as mayor for nearly a month, he returned to serving as county treasurer until 1882. That same year, he was elected assistant cashier of the First National Bank, and served in the position for two years. He served on the Erlanger Hospital’s board of trustees from 1901 to 1914 and helped found the Pine Breeze Tuberculosis Sanitarium.\textsuperscript{32}

As a member of Lookout Post 2, Gahagan was also a well-known GAR member in local, state, and national circles. He was elected post commander in 1887, state senior-vice commander in 1889, and two years later, in 1891 state commander. He continued to serve as a leader after his term as commander. Between 1886 and 1914, he served on the state council of administration ten times. He also obtained a national GAR leadership position, serving on the national council of administration in 1909.\textsuperscript{33}

Gahagan took part in many public Civil War commemorations, and although he was a postwar Republican and GAR member, he was cordial with local Confederate

\textsuperscript{31} Andrew J. Gahagan obituary typescript, folder 1, Gahagan Family Papers, Chattanooga Public Library; “Andrew J. Gahagan,” \textit{East Tennessee: Historical and Biographical}, 236-237.

\textsuperscript{32} Andrew J. Gahagan obituary typescript, folder 1, Gahagan Family Papers, Chattanooga Public Library.

veterans and actively sought to extinguish sectional animosities. On May 30, 1902, Gahagan advocated reconciliation during a public Memorial Day address. He beseeched Union and Confederate veterans in the audience, to “mark off the page of memory every thought of hate or passion, let us make the reunion complete.” He went on to declare, “forget the ills and remember only the better things of that conflict…. [the Union and Confederate soldier] pledged all and sacrificed all to his cause.”

The Chattanooga Daily Times reported on Gahagan’s reconciliationist efforts in 1906. The editorial read, “Capt. Gahagan’s influence and personal example in dissipating the ill-feeling and animosities growing out of the civil war from the day he became a citizen here has been a benefaction to this community.”

Like George Patten, Gahagan undoubtedly supported reconciliation because of practical socio-economic motives.

He also frequently socialized with former Confederate neighbors. On February 24, 1923, a newspaper column reported that a “unique gathering of old soldiers of the sixties of both armies” came together to celebrate Gahagan’s seventy-eighth birthday. According to the article, during the festivities, Gahagan “spoke of the fraternity which existed in those early day[s] between ex-soldiers of the Federal and Confederate armies and how, in Chattanooga, sooner than anywhere else in the country, perhaps, the war may be said to have been truly over.”

Chattanooga’s two all-white posts were not only unique because of the relatively small number of southern members, but comrades’ occupations also set them apart. Members took an active role in the town’s diversified and booming industrial,

36 “Old Soldiers of Blue and Gray,” February 24, 1913 in A. J. Gahagan Scrapbook.
manufacturing, and railroad industries throughout the 1880s and 1890s. Relatively few members undertook agricultural pursuits. Only forty-four members (15 percent) were farmers. Instead, quite a few took part in skilled and semi-skilled trades. Many of these skilled laborers were involved in building vocations, such as carpentry, brick and stonemasonry, painting, and plastering. Others worked as blacksmiths, mechanics, cabinet and shoemakers, tanners, boilermakers, and coopers.37

Others were middling businessmen and entrepreneurs. These included merchants, grocers, druggists, butchers, steamboat owners, and hotelkeepers, among others. Some owned businesses that marketed the local countryside and natural resources—such as lumber, coal, and real estate dealers.38

Quite a few undertook white-collar and professional occupations in Chattanooga. Low-status white-collar professionals included clerks, bookkeepers, salesmen, teachers, and industrial foremen.39 Some were leading white-collar professionals. These affluent GAR members worked as manufacturers, clergymen, engineers, lawyers, and physicians.40 Paralleling Stuart McConnell’s assertions, most business executives and white-collar professional GAR members in East Tennessee resided in city centers and

37 Lookout Post 2 and Mission Ridge Post 45 rosters in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection; Bureau of the census, Tenth Census of the United States, 1880; Bureau of the census, Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900. GAR members who were skilled and semi-skilled workers, included: carpenters (23), brick and stonemasons (5), cabinet makers (5), blacksmiths (3), mechanics (3), painters (2), coopers (2), plasterer (1), boilermaker (1), and tanner (1).

38 Ibid. GAR members who were small business owners included: merchants (18), grocers (4), lumber dealers (4), hotelkeepers (3), book dealers (3), druggists (3), real estate dealers (3), barbers (2), tailor (1), steamboat owner (1), and butcher (1).

39 Ibid. Chattanooga GAR members who were low-status white-collar and semiprofessionals, included: clerk/bookkeepers (10), court clerks (2), teacher (1), traveling salesmen/hucksters (2), publishers (3), railroad clerks (3), journalist (1), pension office clerk (1), store clerk (1), post office clerk (1), water works foreman (1), and sawmill foreman (1).

40 Ibid. GAR members who were high-status white-collar professionals, included: physicians (8), ministers (3), lawyers (7), engineers (5), manufacturers (7), architect (1), capitalists (2), and judge (1).
surely benefited from the networking opportunities and social contacts that urban posts provided.⁴¹

A number of the veterans who resettled in Chattanooga and joined local GAR posts became some of the city’s wealthiest and most powerful residents. Like the Patten brothers and A. J. Gahagan, Hiram S. Chamberlain was also a member of Lookout Post 2 and one of Chattanooga’s leading iron industrialists. Born in Franklin, Ohio in 1835, Chamberlain served as the 2nd Ohio Regiment’s supply officer in Chattanooga during the war. Chamberlain undertook a number of industrial and commercial ventures in post-war East Tennessee. He founded the Knoxville Iron Company—which manufactured railroad spikes, nails, and iron bars—and in 1871, served as vice-president and general manager for fellow GAR member John T. Wilder’s Roane Iron Company. Only nine years later, in 1880, Chamberlain became president of the company. He was very active in the community and quickly became one of Chattanooga’s leading citizens. He founded the Citico Furnace Company in 1882, served as vice-president of the Chickamauga Trust Company, and was vice-president of the First National Bank of Chattanooga for thirty-years. Chamberlain was also an avid education advocate, and served as president of the University of Chattanooga’s Board of Trustees, as well as the president of the local school board.⁴²

Though the Patten brothers, Gahagan, and Chamberlain became prominent Chattanooga citizens, it was John T. Wilder—more than any other Union-veteran-turned-GAR-member—who developed postwar Chattanooga into an industrial center. Born in

---

the Catskill Mountains of New York, Wilder served as lieutenant colonel of the 17th Indiana Infantry, which became known as Wilder’s Lightning Brigade. He distinguished himself at the Battle of Chickamauga, and by war’s end, he was promoted to brigadier general. As an experienced ironmaster, and after recognizing the region’s valuable iron ore and coal deposits during wartime forays through the region, Wilder decided to resume his iron-manufacturing career in Chattanooga in 1866. In 1867, he cofounded the Roane Iron Company with several former Union officers—including Hiram S. Chamberlain—which soon became the city’s largest iron manufacturer and greatest economic asset.

In addition to owning the city’s most lucrative business, Wilder was also a powerful local social and civic leader. Like a number of other Union veterans who became GAR members, Wilder became active in local politics. Wilder was a Republican, and among the eleven GAR members who served as Chattanooga’s mayor between 1869 and 1891. Wilder served as mayor in 1871, but resigned less than a year into office to focus on his business interests. In 1876, he was Chattanooga’s Republican congressional candidate. Though Wilder gained a large number of votes, he lost to Democrat and former Confederate general George G. Dibrell. Six years later, in 1877, Wilder was appointed Chattanooga’s postmaster. He served in this capacity until 1882. Wilder was also a member of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga’s first board of trustees in

---

1886. Like many Union veterans who had resettled in Chattanooga, Wilder was an ardent supporter of the establishment of the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Parks. In 1889, he served as commissioner and president of the Chickamauga Memorial Association.46

As a prominent Union veteran in the region, Wilder was also an active GAR member. Because of his business ventures in various East Tennessee communities, Wilder moved quite often and joined several local GAR posts. In 1897, President William McKinley appointed Wilder to serve as pension agent in Knoxville. He would occupy this position for eight years, until 1905. He was a member of Knoxville’s Ed Maynard Post 14 and later S. K. N. Patton Post 26 in Johnson City. In 1906, as a member of Ed Maynard post, Wilder was elected to lead the state organization as commander.47

Regardless of Wilder’s political affiliations and GAR membership, he was quite popular among his many southern white neighbors—especially Confederate veterans. Challenging Barbara Gannon’s assertion that an overwhelming number of white GAR members rejected reconciliation with former Rebels, Wilder—like Andrew J. Gahagan—was an outspoken supporter of his Confederate neighbors. Wilder was even good friends with the Rebel cavalryman-turned-Ku Klux Klan-leader, Nathan Bedford Forrest. Soon after Wilder had settled in Chattanooga, he personally defended Forrest from federal prosecution and incarceration. Federal officials had issued warrants against Forrest for parole violation and associations with the KKK. Wilder interceded by meeting with

Forrest in Memphis and then traveling to Washington D. C. to convince President Ulysses S. Grant to drop the charges.48

A few years later, in 1877, Wilder came to the aid of former Rebels and helped ease sectional tensions in Chattanooga. In May, former Confederates dedicated a local memorial, but tensions flared after suspected Yankees vandalized it. As a sign of goodwill, Wilder personally paid for needed repairs and helped build a protective wall around the monument.49 Additionally, even though Wilder was a GAR member, members of Chattanooga’s Nathan Bedford Forrest Post of the United Confederate Veterans (UCV) accepted him as an honorary member because they held him in such high esteem. Illustrating the respect and admiration Wilder garnered among former foes, Nathan Bedford Forrest post member Tomlinson Fort publicly exclaimed, “His name is a household word in the South; particularly in all East Tennessee, where he has lived continuously since the close of the war; and no man has done more than General Wilder in bringing order out of chaos.”50

Knox County’s white GAR members shared some similarities with their counterparts in Hamilton County. Members were also quite active and powerful in Knoxville and the state organization. Their socio-economic backgrounds were quite diverse and a number were from the North and Northwest. Nevertheless, outsiders did not dominate Knoxville’s posts as they did in Chattanooga. The local GAR members mirrored the demographic and socio-economic shifts that accompanied the post-war development of Knoxville.

49 Ezzell, Chattanooga, 1865-1900, 24.
50 As quoted in Wilson, Roan Mountain, 82.
Knoxville, like Chattanooga, was a New South city that experienced drastic demographic, industrial, and commercial expansion in the decades after the Civil War. The city’s commercial business elite included both southern elites and northern transplants who advocated unrestrained economic expansion and urban growth. To attract northern investors and entrepreneurs, local boosters touted the city’s rail connections, an abundant labor pool, and sectional cordiality. Additionally, “tub-thumpers” advertised the nearby natural resources that were ripe for exploitation—especially veins of coal and iron, and tracts of virgin timber.\textsuperscript{51}

Local railroad networks were crucial to Knoxville’s growth into an Appalachian commercial hub. The Knoxville and Ohio Railroad and the East Tennessee, Virginia, and Georgia Railroad lines connected the city to national markets. These rail lines not only transported manufactured goods from the Midwest and Northeast to Knoxville, but they also shipped the region’s extracted natural resources to markets across the nation. The major regional resources shipped across the country included coal, marble, lumber, wheat, corn, and livestock. By 1890, Knox County was home to twenty-eight marble quarries, six lumber companies, and coal was mined only thirty miles from Knoxville.\textsuperscript{52}

The railroads also led the burgeoning city to become one of the South’s leading wholesale and distribution centers. In 1882, the city was home to forty-four wholesaling firms that shipped groceries, dry goods, boots and shoes, hardware, and coal across the nation. Wholesale industries were so prosperous that three years later, in 1885, Knoxville proved the South’s fourth leading wholesaling city—behind New Orleans, Atlanta, and


\textsuperscript{52} Wheeler, \textit{Knoxville, Tennessee}, 17-18.
Nashville. Local wholesalers enjoyed annual sales worth between $15 million and $20 million dollars. A little over a decade later, in 1896, Knoxville had become the South’s third largest wholesaler city with annual sales valuing over $50 million dollars.\(^{53}\)

In addition to the city’s commercial successes, Knoxville also enjoyed its greatest manufacturing and industrial boom throughout the 1880s. In addition to the ninety-seven new factories constructed between 1880 and 1887, residents established lucrative iron mills and machine shops, cloth mills, and furniture factories. Amid a coal-producing region, many mining companies established their headquarters in the city. As a result of prospering industry throughout the decade, a number of mill villages—such as Mechanicsville and Brookside Village—cropped up on the northern and northwestern edge of downtown Knoxville.\(^{54}\)

Because of the city’s commercial and industrial development, people flooded into postwar Knoxville seeking better economic opportunities. Between 1880 and 1890, the city population grew from 9,693 to 22,535. A decade later, in 1900, it rose to 32,637.\(^{55}\) These newcomers included African Americans, European immigrants, northern whites, and white mountaineers from neighboring rural counties. Quite a few were European immigrants—especially Germans and Irish—or transplanted Yankees. However, most were from nearby rural mountain communities. The city offered Appalachian mountaineers an escape from the devastating demographic and economic trends affecting mountain towns—especially overpopulation, decrease in farm size, and low life

expectancy. Like African Americans, many white mountaineers took low-wage jobs in Knoxville’s factories, wholesaling houses, and railroad facilities.\footnote{Wheeler, \textit{Knoxville, Tennessee}, 25-27.}

Though New South boosters touted Knoxville’s progress and potential—especially noting the large growth of retailers, merchants, bankers, and factories—serious issues accompanied the city’s drastic growth. Coal use in local factories and private homes left the city looking grimy and sooty. Few roads outside of downtown were paved, and livestock ranged freely on muddy streets. Thus, local residents constantly battled disease and poor roads. Local residential communities also became more and more segregated based on economic class. Many of Knoxville’s more affluent residents moved to West Knoxville, while African-Americans and mountain whites flooded into working-class neighborhoods near mills.\footnote{Ibid., 29.}

It was amid Knoxville’s drastic postwar development that local Union veterans established a number of vibrant GAR posts. They founded nine posts in Knox County, seven of which were all-white posts; one post—Dan Fisher Post 78—was integrated; and one, the Isham Young Post 80, was all-black.\footnote{See Table 3. Knox County’s nine GAR posts included, Ed Maynard Post 14 (Knoxville), Robert N. Hood Post 28 (Fountain City), Concord Post 30 (Concord), James H. Franklin Post 50 (South Knoxville), Graveston Post 57 (Graveston), J. C. Griffin Post 77 (South Knoxville), Dan Fisher Post 78 (Riverdale), Isham Young Post 80, and McKinley Post 106.} The largest and most prominent was the all-white Ed Maynard Post 14—organized in December 1883. Between 1887 and 1917, the post boasted an average annual membership of 149 members. More Ed Maynard post members served as department commander than did those from any other post in the
state. Additionally, throughout the state organization’s life, the Knoxville post hosted seven state encampment meetings.

The backgrounds of 334 white Ed Maynard post members reflect Knoxville’s larger demographic shifts. They included southerners, European immigrants, and transplanted Yankees. However, unlike Chattanooga’s all-white posts, the number of locals and newcomers were more evenly balanced. Whereas native-born Tennesseans were in the minority in Chattanooga, they accounted for a roughly half of Ed Maynard’s members. Those from other southern and border states accounted for roughly 9 percent of members.\(^{60}\)

William W. Rule was one of the most prominent among Knox County’s many native-Tennessee GAR members. He was a member of Ed Maynard Post 14, and in 1888 was elected Tennessee’s departmental commander.\(^{61}\) Born in rural Knox County in 1839, Rule moved to Knoxville in 1858 and operated a general store with his cousin on State Street. A year later, in November 1860, he joined the newspaper staff of William G. Brownlow’s well-known *Knoxville Whig*. Like many other East Tennessee Unionists after the outbreak of civil war, Rule fled to Kentucky and enlisted as a private in the 6\(^{th}\) Tennessee Infantry. In 1865, Rule and his unit accompanied General William T.

---


\(^{60}\) See Table 1. Knoxville’s GAR members from southern and Border States, included: Tennessee (195), Virginia (12), North Carolina (10), Kentucky (5), Georgia (1), Maryland (1), South Carolina (1), and Missouri (1). Ed Maynard Post 14 roster in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection.

Sherman’s forces at Goldsboro, North Carolina. After Appomattox, in April 1865, he mustered out of service as an adjutant and returned to Knoxville.\textsuperscript{62}

Shortly after returning to Knoxville, in 1865, Rule entered local politics. As a staunch Republican, he attained the county court clerkship, which he held until 1870. Rule was elected Knoxville’s mayor three years later in 1873, and again in 1898. As mayor, he spearheaded the establishment of the city water works and the local board of health. He also served as Knoxville’s pension agent for four years, from 1889 to 1893. Though Rule sparred with other East Tennessee Republicans—especially his political archrival and fellow GAR member Leonidas C. Houk—Rule remained an intellectual leader and publicist of the region’s Republican Party throughout the late nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries.\textsuperscript{63}

Rule was also one of Knoxville’s leading postwar newspapermen. In 1870, Rule and Henry C. Tarwater founded the Republican \textit{Knoxville Chronicle}, and successfully published the weekly until 1882. Three years later, in February 1885, Rule established the \textit{Knoxville Journal}, which he edited until his death in 1928. As a tireless advocate of Henry Grady and Henry Watterson’s New South Creed, Rule’s editorials called for improved river transportation and roads, northern immigration, improved education, and a healthy economy founded upon diversified industry.\textsuperscript{64}

As Republicans, advocates of northern immigration, and proponents of industrial development, William Rule and many of his fellow Tennesseans most certainly


\textsuperscript{63} Deaderick, \textit{Heart of the Valley}, 29, 281; Taylor, Jr., “The New South Mind of a Mountain Editor,” 102-104.

\textsuperscript{64} Taylor, Jr., “The New South Mind of a Mountain Editor,” 103-104, 107.
welcomed white northern and Midwestern transplants who relocated to Knoxville and joined the local GAR posts. In contrast to Chattanooga’s white posts, roughly one of every four members was from the North and Midwest (roughly 27 percent). However, like those who had resettled in Chattanooga, most were from Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, and Indiana.  

About 7 percent of Knoxville’s GAR members were from Europe, especially Germany and Ireland. Louis A. Gratz was among the various foreign-born veterans who joined one of Knoxville’s local GAR posts. Born in 1842 and raised by his strict Orthodox Jewish aunt and uncle in the eastern Prussia town of Inowrazlaw (the modern-day Polish town of Inowroclaw), Gratz immigrated to New York City in 1861 seeking overnight riches. However, the nineteen-year-old was forced to become a peddler because he was unskilled and knew little to no English. He lived hand-to-mouth hawking shoelaces, thimbles, and needles along New York’s streets, but zealously studied English and eventually became fluent and literate.

After the firing on Fort Sumter and President Lincoln’s calls for volunteers, Gratz perceived enlistment as an opportunity to get ahead. He volunteered in the 15th Pennsylvania Regiment in the spring of 1861 and by October had received a first lieutenant’s commission in the 9th Pennsylvania Cavalry. Then, in August 1862, the

---

65 See Table 1. The breakdown of northern and Midwestern members’ native states included: Ohio (31), New York (19), Pennsylvania (15), Indiana (9), Illinois (4), Michigan (4), Connecticut (3), Iowa (2), New Jersey (2), Massachusetts (2), Missouri (1), New Hampshire (1), and Vermont (1). Ed Maynard Post 14 rosters in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection.

66 Ibid. The breakdown of foreign-born members included: Germany (8), Ireland (8), Wales (3), England (2), Switzerland (2), and Canada (2).

ambitious Gratz accepted a major’s commission in the 6th Kentucky Cavalry regiment. Throughout the fall and winter of 1862, he took part in scouting expeditions and skirmishes around Cumberland Gap. A year later, while fighting at the Battle of Chickamauga, Gratz successfully led his troops through the encircling Rebels and narrowly escaped back to Union lines. As a result, General Samuel P. Carter appointed him to his personal staff stationed at Knoxville. Gratz eventually took part in General Sherman’s famous March to the Sea, and at the time of Lee’s surrender in April 1865 was serving as assistant inspector general of the Twenty-Third Army Corps’ Second Division. In July 1865, Gratz mustered out of service near Nashville.68

By October, Gratz resettled in Knoxville and became quite well known locally. After earning a law degree, he practiced law and became connected to one of the state’s most prominent families by marrying Elizabeth Twigg Bearden. He earned a comfortable living as a circuit lawyer and eventually represented wealthy clients, such as the Knoxville Water Company and Louisville’s well-known whiskey dealer Samuel Grabfelder, who owned hotel interests in Knoxville. Gratz also became involved in local politics. He was twice elected Knoxville’s city attorney, and served four terms as North Knoxville’s mayor between 1889 and 1892. As mayor, he advocated for local public schools and designed the “Gratz addition” to the city.69

Gratz was an active GAR member and one of the founders of the Ed Maynard post. Throughout 1883-1884, he served as the departmental judge advocate and adjudicated on organizational policies or membership issues that arose in the state.70

69 Ibid., 30.
70 GAR, Tennessee, First Encampment (1884), 4.
Then, in 1888, departmental Commander William Rule, of Knoxville, appointed Gratz to serve on the council of administration. As a Grand Army member, he networked with and befriended fellow German and Jewish veterans—especially Julius Ochs. Ochs, a Bavarian Jew who had served as captain of the 52nd Ohio Reserves, was a member of Chattanooga’s Lookout Mountain Post 2. While Ochs served as a justice of the peace in Chattanooga from 1868 to 1872, where he likely heard cases brought to his court by Gratz, Ochs eventually helped manage the Chattanooga Times with his son Adolph. After Ochs passed away in 1888, Gratz served as a pallbearer at his good friend’s funeral.

Like other foreign-born Grand Army men in Knoxville, Gratz’s story underscores the diversity of GAR members, post-war Knoxville, and the mountain South—long stereotyped as isolated and backward. Instead of southern and ex-Confederate neighbors ostracizing Gratz as a social pariah and outsider, he was fully integrated into Knoxville society.

Reflecting Knoxville’s commercial and industrial growth, Ed Maynard post members undertook quite diverse occupations. However, a number retained their ties to agricultural pursuits. Whereas only a few Chattanooga GAR members were farmers, nearly one-third of Ed Maynard members were farmers or farm laborers (32.4 percent). Almost one of every five worked as semi-skilled or skilled blue-collar laborers. These included carpenters, blacksmiths, mechanics, shoemakers, and masons, among others.

---

71 GAR, Tennessee, *Fifth Encampment* (1889), 5.
72 Marcus, “From Peddler to Regimental Commander in Two Years,” 32. Adolph Ochs would eventually purchase and turn the then struggling *New York Times* into an internationally famed newspaper and revolutionize publishing.
73 Ed Maynard Post 14 members whose occupations were found included 333 members. Members who were skilled or semi-skilled blue-collar workers included, Carpenters (28), Mechanics (11), Stonemasons (5), Shoemakers (5), Blacksmiths (4), Molders (3), Cabinetmakers (2), Brick masons (2), Mason (1), Harness maker (1), Tinner (1), Furniture finisher (1), Saddler (1), Marble Polisher (1). See especially roster for Ed Maynard Post 14 in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection.
A number of others were businessmen and entrepreneurs who were part of Knoxville’s thriving commercial and mercantile industries. These included merchants, hotelkeepers, druggists, butchers, and jewelers, among others (19 percent).74 William W. Woodruff, of the Ed Maynard post, was one of Knoxville’s leading merchants. Woodruff, a Kentuckian born in 1840, served as a captain in the 18\textsuperscript{th} Kentucky Infantry. The regiment not only took part in the Battle of Chickamauga and the siege of Chattanooga, but also witnessed Joseph E. Johnston’s surrender to General Sherman at Bennett Place, in North Carolina. A few months later, in 1865, Woodruff relocated to Knoxville after receiving a business permit from Governor William Brownlow. He opened the W. W. Woodruff and Company hardware store on Gay Street that same year. Woodruff’s store would become one of the city’s longest continually operating businesses, and was commonly referred to as “Knoxville’s Oldest Business.” Woodruff became so affluent from his hardware business and investments in real estate, iron manufacturing, and banking stock, that by 1880 he built a mansion that covered an entire block along Cumberland Avenue.75

Alongside Woodruff and other veterans-turned-businessmen were white-collar professionals. Only a few were low-status white-collar workers—such as clerks or bookkeepers, teachers, postmasters, and accountants (6 percent). Others were affluent

74 *Ibid.* Members who were small businessmen and entrepreneurs included, merchant (32), huckster/traveling salesman (9), butcher (5), miller (2), jeweler (2), real estate dealer (2), coal dealer (2), book dealer (2), beer dealer (1), lumber dealer (1), bookbinder (1), marble dealer (1), pork dealer (1), druggist (1), undertaker (1), icemaker (1).

white-collar professionals (about 12 percent). These included manufacturers, engineers, lawyers, bankers, and medical practitioners.\textsuperscript{76}

Leonidas C. Houk was one of the most prominent white-collar GAR members in Knox County. He was born near Boyds Creek, in Sevier County, in 1836, and his father’s death three years later, in 1839, left the family penniless. As a poor mountain youth, Houk received only a few months of formal education at a country school. He worked as a cabinetmaker and studied law at night. In October 1858, he moved to Clinton, in Anderson County, with his wife Elizabeth M. Smith, and one year later was admitted to the Tennessee bar. During the secession crisis, Houk was an outspoken Unionist. He campaigned for the Bell and Everett presidential ticket during the election of 1860, and served as Anderson County’s delegate to the Knoxville and Greeneville Unionist conventions in 1861.\textsuperscript{77}

After Rebel occupation troops arrived in East Tennessee and began arresting Unionists, Houk made his way to Federal lines in Kentucky. On August 9, 1861, he enlisted as a private in the 1\textsuperscript{st} East Tennessee Infantry regiment. Within a month, Houk was promoted to lieutenant and regimental quartermaster. The next year, in March 1862, Houk organized the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Tennessee Infantry regiment at Flat Lick, Kentucky and served as colonel. Houk’s regiment took part in the battle of Mill Springs, and then, on August 17 1862, Confederate troops nearly captured him at London, Kentucky. As the much larger Rebel force routed Houk’s regiment, he led his men on a brutal fighting retreat. The

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid. Low-status white-collar members included, Clerk/bookkeeper (10), teacher (4), architect (3), postmaster (1), piano tuner (1), accountant (1). Affluent white-collar professionals included, lawyer (12), physician (8), manufacturer (6), minister (5), engineer (3), dentist (3), banker (1), optician (1).

desperate retreat was a success, but it wreaked havoc on his health. He took part in the Murfreesboro campaign, but lingering health problems forced Houk to resign in April 1863.78

After the war, he returned to civilian life and became one of East Tennessee’s—and the South’s—most prominent Republicans. Not only did he serve during the 1865 state constitutional convention that drafted a new constitution, but between 1866 and 1870, he also donned judicial robes as the 17th district’s presiding circuit judge. Though he was an outspoken Republican and supported Ulysses S. Grant’s presidential campaigns in 1868 and 1872, he was moderate in some cases—supporting the enfranchisement of former Confederates in 1869. In 1870, Houk resigned from the bench and opened a highly successful law firm with Henry R. Gibson—a Union veteran from Maryland and fellow GAR comrade—in Knoxville. In addition to practicing law, over the next two years—between 1871 and 1873—he served as a claims commissioner for the Southern Claims Commission and processed the claims of local Unionists who had provided property and material to the Union forces in the late war.79 He served in the Tennessee legislature from 1873 to 1875, before being elected as a U.S. congressman in 1878. For nearly twenty years, until his sudden death in 1891, Houk successfully oversaw a Republican political “machine” and retained his congressional position. According to historian Gordon B. McKinney, he became “the unchallenged boss of the Republicans in East Tennessee’s second district.”80

Though Houk served in the Union Army for less than two years, he joined Knoxville’s Ed Maynard post in the third quarter of 1885, and his Unionist background and military service formed the foundation of his appeal to many local voters. He was widely known as the soldier’s candidate because veterans’ pension benefits proved one of his chief concerns. Many East Tennessee Union veterans’ pension claims were significantly delayed because of bureaucratic red tape in Washington D.C. So, many beseeched Houk to personally expedite their cases. He advocated for his constituents, and by 1887, 1,834 veterans were receiving almost $221,000 in federal benefits each year. Additionally, in 1890, he voted in favor of the Dependent and Disability Pension Act. This legislation made those infirm veterans, who had served at least ninety days, eligible for federal funds worth $72 to $144 dollars annually.\(^8\)

Throughout his congressional career, Houk also regularly reminded his fellow lawmakers of East Tennesseans’ contributions to the Union war effort. He even doubted whether the Union could have been preserved without southern Unionists’ aid, and chided northern representatives by claiming that Tennessee had provided more soldiers to the Federal army than their home states.\(^2\) Houk spoke upon East Tennesseans’ wartime loyalty in 1888, while advocating for John M. Campbell’s pension claim. Campbell had been a Confederate enrolling officer but provided valuable service for Union forces. While on the floor, he declared, “It was an easy thing to be loyal up in Ohio…in Vermont…in Michigan; but when it comes to where we live in East Tennessee, where the power of a great military organization was brought to bear upon us…there the loyal sentiment burned brightly during the entire war. I have the honor, Mr. Chairman, of

\(^8\) Gentry, “The Public Career of Leonidas Campbell Houk,” 95-96.
\(^2\) Ibid., 87.
representing a district in Congress, although it belongs to the solid South, that gave more soldiers to the Union army according to population than any other district in the United States.\textsuperscript{83} Houk, like a number of Knoxville’s white GAR members, was fully integrated into the local community and region. Instead of being ostracized for his wartime record, Houk successfully used it as a tool to further his political career.

In contrast to the more urbane GAR members in Knoxville and Chattanooga, most Grand Army men in the region were native Tennesseans who belonged to “country posts” in rural communities—like those found in Greene County. Local veterans established eight all-white GAR posts in the county seat of Greeneville and surrounding communities.\textsuperscript{84} Among the local posts, Burnside Post 8 in Greeneville was the largest and most prominent. Its members reflect the local community’s postwar development, as well as exemplify the typical Grand Army men in the Tennessee highlands.

Like much of postwar East Tennessee, Greene County was rural and made up of small farming communities. The majority of residents resided on small semi-subsistence farms, but a few were commercial farmers. Large and small farmers cultivated wheat, corn, sorghum, as well as raised cattle, hogs, and sheep. While the average yeoman farmer raised enough crops for home consumption, his annual cash income was roughly $200 dollars. Like many other mountain counties throughout the late nineteenth century, postwar Greene County became increasingly tied to the nation’s rising industrial and economic order. Whereas logging corporations, rural artisans and woodworkers, and

\textsuperscript{83} As quoted in \textit{Ibid.}, 94.

\textsuperscript{84} The eight GAR posts, and their respective communities, established in Greene County include: Burnside Post 8 (Greeneville), Alfred Couch Post 24 (Romeo), William Jackson Post 27 (Greeneville), John F. Sturm Post 48 (Caney Branch), John Baughart Post 51 (Mosheim), Byrd’s Hill Post 52 (Warrensburg), Chucky City Post 83 (Chucky), and Holtsinger Post 90 (Jearoldstown). See Table 3.
merchants profited from the harvest of local virgin timber stands, burley tobacco
cultivation formed the foundation of the local market economy. Within a few years of
burley tobacco’s introduction in 1887, locals established the Greeneville Tobacco Market
Association and Greene County proved a tobacco market center. In 1891, locals
harvested and sold roughly 1,250,000 pounds at market.\textsuperscript{85}

Greeneville was the political, cultural, and socio-economic center of the county.
The county seat had been connected to southern and northern markets by the East
Tennessee, Virginia, and Georgia Railroad since 1850, and was home to 660 residents
and a variety of small businesses. Residents included prominent merchants, carpenters
and woodworkers, tanners and leather workers, bankers, tailors, printers, and hotel
owners. Among Greeneville’s diverse businessmen was Isaac O. Harrell. A member of
Burnside Post 8, Harrell was originally from Indiana and served as a private in John T.
Wilder’s Indiana Light Artillery regiment during the war. Harrell settled in Greeneville
and as a watchmaker, operated a store that sold watches, clocks, and cement.\textsuperscript{86}

As a wartime Unionist and postwar Republican stronghold, Greeneville was home
to one of the most prominent GAR posts in the entire state. Named in honor of General
Ambrose E. Burnside, the Burnside Post 8 was established in the fall of 1883. Besides
being among the first GAR posts founded in the state, it was also one of the last active
posts. It had an average annual membership of 90 veterans between 1887 and 1917, and

\textsuperscript{85} Mitzi V. Bible, ed., \textit{Community in Transition: Greene County, Tennessee, 1865-1900} (Greeneville, TN: Greene County Historical Society, 1986), 27.
\textsuperscript{86} Bible, \textit{Community in Transition}, 33.
at its height, in 1892, boasted 170 veterans.\(^87\) Additionally, the rural mountain post hosted two annual state encampments—in 1894 and 1901. Several post members—including William T. Mitchell, William E. F. Milburn, Oliver T. French, and Augustus H. Pettibone—were elected to head the state organization as either department commander or senior vice-commander.\(^88\) Illustrating the continued wartime bonds among Unionists in East Tennessee and western North Carolina, members also supported and helped organize a post in neighboring Madison County, North Carolina. On January 16, 1889, James F. Kirk mustered in veterans of Brownlow Post 6 in the Big Laurel community, near the Tennessee state line.\(^89\)

The white members of the Burnside post were typical GAR members in East Tennessee. The overwhelming majority—82 percent—of the 241 members were local Tennesseans.\(^90\) William E. F. Milburn was one of the most notable. Milburn was born in 1842, in the Milburnton community of Greene County. Like his father—who was an outspoken Unionist who served as a chaplain in 8\(^{th}\) Tennessee Cavalry regiment—he enlisted as a private in Company B of the 12\(^{th}\) Tennessee Cavalry regiment in November 1862. He was later promoted to 1\(^{st}\) lieutenant and took part in the battles of Stones River, Nashville, and Pulaski. After the war, he received a Bachelor of Arts from East

---

\(^87\) See especially, GAR, Tennessee, Third Encampment (1887), Fourth Encampment (1888), Fifth Encampment (1889), Seventh Encampment (1891), Eighth Encampment (1892), Ninth Encampment (1893), Tenth Encampment (1894), Eleventh Encampment (1895), Twelfth Encampment (1896), Thirteenth Encampment (1897), Fourteenth Encampment (1898), Twenty-seventh (1910), Twenty-eighth (1911), Thirty-first Encampment (1914), Thirty-second Encampment (1915), Thirty-fourth (1917).

\(^88\) Augustus H. Pettibone was elected department commander in 1889, William E. F. Milburn served as department commander in 1894, William T. Mitchell served as senior vice-commander in 1915, and Oliver T. French served as senior vice-commander in 1917. See especially, “Past Department Officers,” in GAR, Tennessee, Thirty-third Encampment (1916).


\(^90\) See Table 1. Burnside Post 8 Roster in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection.
Tennessee Wesleyan University in 1871 and an M.A. from the University of Michigan. He read law for five years and was admitted to the bar in 1876. Four years later, in 1880, he resettled in Greeneville to practice law. He briefly served as an examiner for the pension board in Bowling Green, Kentucky from 1882 to 1885, and in 1903 was a quartermaster of the National Soldiers’ Home in Johnson City. Besides practicing law, he also served as director of the Greene County Bank. Additionally, he was quite active in politics. As a staunch Republican, he was elected to the state legislature in 1886 and again in 1892. As a proponent of temperance, he was a member of the State Temperance Alliance’s executive committee and actively canvassed for the adoption of the 1887 Prohibition amendment. He was also a prominent state and national GAR member. He was appointed state assistant adjutant-general in 1889 and served on the council of administration in 1892. Two years later, in 1894, he was elected to lead the state organization as commander. He also elected Tennessee’s representative of the National Council of Administration in 1890.

In addition to Milburn and other native Tennesseans, roughly 14 percent of Burnside post members were from neighboring southern states, especially North Carolina. Among the Tar Heel members, many were from nearby mountain counties—such as Madison, Yancey, Henderson, Buncombe, and Ashe—and had served in Colonel

---


93 See Table 1. Members from neighboring southern states included, North Carolina (24), Virginia (5), South Carolina (2), Georgia (1), and Kentucky (1). Burnside Post 8 roster in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection.
George W. Kirk’s 2nd and 3rd North Carolina Mounted Infantry regiments. Baxter S. Shelton and David Shelton were among the veterans from Madison County, and were likely related to the victims of the infamous 1863 Shelton Laurel Massacre.94

Only a handful of members of the Burnside post were foreign-born immigrants or Yankee transplants. Whereas one member was Canadian and another German, six northern and Midwestern veterans resettled in Greeneville and joined the post. They were from Ohio, New Jersey, and Indiana.95 These newcomers seem to have been welcomed into their new mountain community by local mountaineers. Among the Yankee transplants was Augustus H. Pettibone who became one of Greeneville’s leading lawyers and residents. Born in Bedford, Ohio in January 1835, Pettibone was educated at Hiram College and later graduated from the University of Michigan in 1859. He relocated to Wisconsin to study law with Hon. Jonathan E. Arnold, and passed the bar in 1861. During the Civil War, he enlisted as a private of the 20th Wisconsin Infantry regiment and by war’s end was a major. Soon after Appomattox, he resettled in Greeneville. Besides practicing law, he was quite active in local, state, and national politics. As a Republican, he served as an alderman of Greeneville from 1866 to 1868. During the 1868 and 1876 presidential elections, Pettibone served as elector for the Grant-Colfax and Hayes-Wheeler tickets, respectively. In 1869, he was elected attorney general of the First Judicial Circuit, and between 1871 and 1880 served as assistant U.S. District Attorney for East Tennessee. After serving as a U.S. Congressman from 1881 to 1887, he represented

95 See Table 1. Burnside Post 8 roster in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection.
Greene County in the state legislature from 1897 to 1899. Like his comrade, William E. F. Milburn, Pettibone was also quite prominent in the GAR. In 1889, he was elected Tennessee’s departmental commander. Yet, Pettibone was unique. Reflecting postwar regional settlement patterns, most northern transplant GAR members relocated to East Tennessee’s commercial centers, not to more rural communities.

Reflecting Greene County’s and the region’s mostly rural landscape, most local GAR members took part in agricultural pursuits. Nearly three-fourths of the 201 post members were farmers. A few others (8 percent) pursued skilled and semi-skilled blue-collar trades. These included blacksmiths, carpenters, cabinet-makers, and brick masons. While five members were middling merchants, eleven were white-collar professionals, and included lawyers, ministers, physicians, and a dentist.

Lafayette W. Tipton was representative of the average GAR member who was a prominent farmer and grocer in the county. Tipton was born in Washington County, Tennessee in 1838 and educated in Burnsville, North Carolina. In 1862, he joined the Eighth Tennessee Cavalry, and in June 1863 transferred to Company A of the 3rd North Carolina Mounted Infantry regiment. He served as a second lieutenant under Colonel George W. Kirk. The next summer, in June 1864, he took part in Kirk’s famous raid upon

---


97 See Burnside Post 8 roster in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection. The occupational breakdown of members includes: Farmers (148), Carpenters (9), Laborer/Farm Laborer (6), Merchants (5), Lawyers (4), Ministers (3), Blacksmiths (3), Physicians (3), Cabinetmaker (2), Miller (2), Dentist (1), Plasterer (1), Constable (1), Gunsmith (1), Fertilizer Agent (1), Engineer (1), Auctioneer (1), Court Register (1), Saddler (1), Postmaster (1), Teacher (1), Watchmaker (1), Wagon maker (1), Capitalist (1), Marble Dealer (1), Brick Mason (1).
Camp Vance, near Morganton, North Carolina.\textsuperscript{98} He mustered out in August 1865, and resettled in Greene County. In addition to farming, he opened and operated a grocery business in Greeneville in 1881. Besides being a Mason and member of the local Baptist Church, he was described as an “intelligent and successful man.” Though he was one of the founding members of the Burnside post, he remained an ordinary member.\textsuperscript{99}

Though most white GAR members in rural East Tennessee communities like Greeneville were native Tennesseans, those in the town of Harriman, in Roane County, were the exception. Most of the members of Harriman Post 94 took part in non-agricultural trades. Harriman Post 94 was unique among rural East Tennessee posts and reflected the small company town’s development, as well as the diversity of the region’s residents and GAR members.

The East Tennessee Land Company (ETLC) established Harriman in spring 1890. Northern capitalists founded the company upon financial and reform principles—amalgamating profit and prohibition. Company officials developed Harriman as a model industrial-temperance town. The town was named after New Hampshire Governor Walter Harriman. Harriman was a Union veteran who had directed Federal wartime operations in the county and was the father of ETLC director, Walter Harriman, Jr. To cultivate an efficient and stable manufacturing labor force, officials adopted a development strategy that would incorporate industrial capitalism with community building and social reform. Harriman had a municipal electricity system, a waterworks and sewage infrastructure, a


\textsuperscript{99} Goodspeed’s History of Tennessee, 1260.
public school, and designated areas for public buildings and parks. Officials also advocated temperance, so the worker-residents would not fall prey to the social ills accompanying industrialization. The company graded the entire town site and established gridded lots, which prevented overcrowding and congestion. However, it also instituted residential race and class segregation years before Jim Crow. Lower-class white laborers and African Americans were relegated to the Walnut Hills and Oak View neighborhoods, respectively, which were a quarter of a mile from downtown. According to John Benhart Jr., the “urban geographic patterns identified in Harriman could be representative of those in other model industrial real estate ventures developed by land companies in the Upper Tennessee River Valley and Southern Appalachia.”

Within two years of Harriman’s founding, the ETLC successfully built an industrial base, as nine industries had relocated to the city. The production facilities built by these companies included a furniture factory, a machine works, a brick works, and an agricultural implement factory, among others. Some of these companies had relocated from Knoxville and Chattanooga, as well as Ohio and New York. The Lookout Rolling Mills, which had relocated from Chattanooga, was the largest company in Harriman, and employed roughly 300 workers. Despite the planned city’s early economic success, the Panic of 1893 drastically affected Harriman’s economy. In mid-1890, the ETLC had taken out a one-million dollar loan and because of the national economic depression, the company filed for bankruptcy in November 1893. Despite the demise of the ETLC and other local industries, the city of Harriman survived the economic downturn. Railroads

and smaller companies remained in business throughout the depression, and local prohibitionists established the American Temperance University in 1894, which bolstered the local economy. By 1900, Harriman boasted roughly sixty businesses, nearly 3,500 residents, and was the largest and most industrially diversified town in the county.\footnote{Benhart Jr., \textit{Appalachian Aspirations}, 100-101, 115-116; Jack Shelley and Jere Hall, ed., \textit{Valley of Challenge and Change: The History of Roane County, Tennessee, 1860-1900} (Kingston, TN: Roane County Heritage Commission), 23-24.}

Roane County was home to six all-white GAR posts—including the Walter Harriman Post 94. The post thrived between 1891 and 1898, boasting an average annual membership of thirty-one veterans. Harriman GAR members also hosted two state encampments, in 1893 and in 1909. While members of Roane County’s five other all-white GAR posts paralleled those in other rural counties throughout the region—mostly Tennesseans who farmed—Harriman’s post membership was unique in the county and among rural communities throughout the region.\footnote{See Table 3. Roane County’s five other GAR posts included, R. K. Byrd Post 11 in Kingston, David Davis Post 54 in Bear Creek Valley, Henry H. Wiley Post 60 in Oliver Springs, R. S. Kindrick Post 63 in Rockwood, and James T. Shelley Post 97 in Guenther. These all-white posts boasted a combined membership of roughly 330 Union veterans. While more than three-fourths were native Tennesseans, northerners and Midwesterners accounted for roughly 14 percent of all members. Members were overwhelmingly farmers (87 percent), but a few were involved in industrial or extractive occupations, such as merchants, mechanics, steamboat pilots, stonemasons, lumbermen, and miners. See especially post rosters in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection.}

The veterans of the small-town Harriman post were mostly from the North and Midwest. They accounted for nearly 61 percent of members. Ohioans were the most prevalent, followed by New Yorkers and Pennsylvanians. Southerners from Virginia, Georgia, and North Carolina made up less than one-third of the post membership. Native
Tennesseans, alone, accounted for a little less than 15 percent of members. A handful were foreign-born immigrants from England and Germany.\textsuperscript{103}

In contrast to most posts in rural mountain communities, Harriman members’ occupations were quite diverse and reflected the local community’s industrial foundation. Among the forty members whose occupations were listed, over one-third were farmers (38 percent). A number of others were mechanics, teachers, realtors, painters, molders, carpenters, and stonemasons.\textsuperscript{104}

One of the most notable, and typical, members of Harriman’s GAR post was Herman W. Veazey. Like many GAR members throughout East Tennessee, Veazey was a notable resident in the local community. Born in Brentwood, New Hampshire, in 1844, Veazey apprenticed as a mason. During the Civil War, he served as a private in Company A of the 11\textsuperscript{th} New Hampshire Infantry regiment under Colonel Walter Harriman. Veazey was wounded during the regiment’s first engagement at the Battle of Fredericksburg in December 1862. Like many northern transplants who joined GAR posts in East Tennessee after the war, Veazey’s regiment served in the Tennessee highlands. The regiment took part in the siege of Knoxville in the winter of 1863, helped repulse the Confederate assault on Fort Sanders, and remained in the region until March 1864. While serving in East Tennessee, the regiment allegedly camped along the Emory River, near the future-site of Harriman.\textsuperscript{105}


\textsuperscript{104} Ibid. The breakdown in members’ occupations included: Farmer (15), Mechanic (6), Teacher (3), Real Estate Dealer (2), Painter (2), Molder (2), Carpenter (2), Engineer (1), Shoemaker (1), Court Clerk (1), Laborer (1), Stonemason (1), Manufacturer (1), Physician (1), Miner (1).

\textsuperscript{105} Walter T. Pulliam, Harriman: The Town that Temperance Built (Harriman, TN: Pulliam, 1978), 122.
Along with many other northerners, Veazey moved to Harriman in spring 1890. He and Fred A. Richardson established the successful Veazey & Richardson building and contractor firm. The company specialized in brick and stonework, and constructed the majority of Harriman’s original brick buildings. In addition to establishing a lucrative business, Veazey was also elected Harriman’s first mayor in June 1891.\(^{106}\) He was quite an active GAR member. He was a founding member of the Harriman post and was elected commander. He also served on the state council of administration in 1891 and 1895. In 1893, he was elected senior vice-commander, the second highest office in the state.\(^{107}\) As a result of the Panic of 1893, new building projects came to a virtual standstill and Veazey moved to Florida around 1895.\(^{108}\)

As a social history of the GAR in East Tennessee, this chapter provided a number of key insights into Union veterans in the post-Civil War South. Challenging the notion that most GAR members were Yankee transplants or carpetbaggers, most members in the region were native southerners. However, post membership trends varied. In general, most northern, Midwestern, and foreign-born veterans resettled in the region’s commercial centers—Knoxville and Chattanooga. Native Tennesseans and southerners dominated posts in more rural mountain communities, like Greeneville. The post in rural Harriman was an anomaly, as outsiders predominated. Just as northern GAR members and southern Unionists came from every social and economic strata, GAR members in East Tennessee had quite diverse socio-economic backgrounds. Instead of being

\(^{106}\) Pulliam, _Harriman_, 122.


\(^{108}\) Pulliam, _Harriman_, 122.
ostracized by Confederate neighbors, many white Grand Army men were notable members of their communities. The rosters of East Tennessee’s GAR posts often read like a “who’s who” of postwar mountain communities’ most distinguished residents. A number of white Grand Army men were affluent lawyers, businessmen, newspapermen, and politicians who attained statewide leadership roles. Others were more humble skilled and semi-skilled workers. Though local color writers and outsiders throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century would stereotype southern Appalachia as home to lily-white and isolated mountaineers, members of the GAR in East Tennessee illustrate the diversity and postwar development of the southern highlands.
CHAPTER 3
“EXTEND THEM THE HAND OF FELLOWSHIP”:
EAST TENNESSEE’S BLACK GAR MEMBERS AND RACE

On February 26, 1885, thirty-five GAR representatives from Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama met in Chattanooga for the first annual departmental encampment. Department Commander Edward S. Jones of Nashville brought the meeting to order and recounted the growth of the state organization over the past two years. Jones, originally from Pennsylvania, had reorganized four charter posts in May 1883 and since then the department had grown to include twenty-eight posts and 989 active members in the three states. Because of the tremendous growth, attracting even more members became the principal issue throughout the meeting.

Some white leaders claimed that black veterans should be encouraged to join. John P. Rea, national GAR leader from Pennsylvania who was visiting, beseeched white members to encourage “all colored ex-Union soldiers to enter the ranks.” A number of white veterans in attendance agreed. Sidney Herbert Lancey, prominent journalist and member of Atlanta’s O. M. Mitchell Post 21, “spoke encouragingly to colored posts.” He claimed that he was “proud of colored Grand Army men” and that “they reflected credit to the Order.” Yet, reflecting many white veterans’ ambivalent racial outlooks, he admitted, “while he may not be fully in accord with [black veterans] on other issues, he was glad to extend them the hand of fellowship.” George W. Whitfield and Mathew J. P. Nesbit—two leaders of all-black posts in Pulaski and Chattanooga, respectively—“made
excellent and appropriate replies” to Lancey’s comments. While Tennessee’s GAR remained a predominantly white organization, a number of black veterans became active members of all-black and integrated posts in the eastern highlands throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

This chapter focuses on black GAR members in East Tennessee and supplements the growing literature on Civil War-era race relations, the postwar lives of black Union veterans, and interracial comradeship among black and white Grand Army members. Mary R. Dearing’s 1952 work, Veterans in Politics, noted the affable rapport among white and black Tennesseans at the 1885 state encampment. Yet, she claimed, “this cordiality, never very strong, soon disappeared” over the next decades. Historian Stuart McConnell’s study Glorious Contentment provided some insights into northern white GAR members, but he argued that the veterans’ organization essentially remained segregated and black veterans were relegated to separate posts. Whereas Donald Shaffer’s work on the postwar lives of black Civil War soldiers, After the Glory, asserted that white GAR members regularly treated black comrades in a “patronizingly racist manner,” historian Barbara Gannon’s The Won Cause argued that the GAR in the North proved a colorblind organization and that white members embraced and honored their black comrades. Paul Coker’s insightful dissertation on Tennessee’s black Civil War veterans also included a chapter-length examination on those who joined the GAR. Coker did present key insights into interracial comradeship in Tennessee’s GAR, but provided demographic information on a relatively small number of black members. He found that although “black veterans seem to have enjoyed a considerable degree of support” from

---

1 GAR, Tennessee, First Encampment (1885), 12, 26.
their white counterparts, white veterans’ posture toward black members was “ambivalent at best” and they “viewed their black comrades as junior partners in the organization.”

This chapter augments the scholarship by providing more nuanced insights into the black GAR members in East Tennessee. In particular, it affords a more comprehensive demographic profile of black comrades in the region. A compilation of original post rosters for Tennessee’s GAR provides key insights into black members’ backgrounds—especially members’ names, birthplaces, occupations, wartime service and ranks. The so-called “Descriptive Records” do not account for every black member, but they afford the most complete enumeration of those who joined from 1884 to 1897. The source provides a snapshot of 257 black members who joined East Tennessee’s four all-black and twelve integrated posts. The chapter also explores the prevalence and strength of all-black and integrated posts. Paralleling historian Robert Hunt’s assertion that white veterans of the Army of the Cumberland remembered their role in enacting emancipation and recalled the wartime deeds of USCT troops, this chapter illustrates that Tennessee’s white GAR members did so, too. It sheds light on how white GAR members recognized the significance of emancipation and remembered their wartime service with USCT troops in published articles and encampment meetings. Lastly, it underscores the complex and ambivalent interactions between northern-born and southern-born white and black

---


GAR members by examining organizational debates over race and the “proper” leadership roles of black members. White Grand Army comrades in East Tennessee accepted black members and remembered their wartime service, but it did not necessarily denote their unconditional support of racial equality. They vacillated on race. Tennessee’s GAR provided black veterans with interracial comradeship; however, it remained an organization led and dominated by whites.

African-American veterans were some of the founding members of Tennessee’s GAR, and half of the state’s all-black posts were in mountain communities. In May 1883, national GAR leaders recognized the provisional Department of Tennessee, which included four charter posts. Nashville’s all-black Lincoln Post 4 was among them. By the department’s third encampment three years later, in April 1887, African Americans had established four more posts. Three of them were in East Tennessee communities, including the Chickamauga Post 22 in Chattanooga, Joshua R. Giddings Post 26 in Athens, and Henry Gillenwaters Post 33 in Rogersville. In October 1889, black veterans in Knoxville established the Isham Young Post 80. The other black posts founded in western and middle Tennessee communities included the Lathrop Post 10 in Pulaski, Johnsonville Post 66 in Clarksville, John Brown Post 84 in Memphis, and the James G. Blaine Post 102 in Columbia. Thus, four of the eight all-black posts eventually established in the state were located in East Tennessee. The Athens and Rogersville posts did falter within a few years, and by 1889, both had been suspended and disbanded. However, it is incredible that half of the all-black posts were located in the eastern

5 GAR, Tennessee, *Third Encampment* (1887), 4-9. The fourth all-black post established outside East Tennessee by 1887 was the Lathrop Post 10, located in Pulaski.
6 GAR, Tennessee, *Fifth Encampment* (1889), 11.
highlands, given the region’s much smaller black population. As historian Paul Coker noted, white GAR leaders did not necessarily mandate racially segregated posts, but, in general, communities with at least twelve black veterans formed separate black and white posts.

Though black membership ebbed and flowed throughout the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Chattanooga’s Chickamauga Post 22 and Knoxville’s Isham Young Post 80 were the most active and largest all-black posts in East Tennessee. African-American veterans established Chickamauga Post 22 in September 1884. The members named their post in honor of the nearby battlefield, though no black USCT troops fought there. The post retained an active membership and remained one of the largest black posts in the entire state. Between 1887 and 1891, the post boasted an average annual membership of forty. At its height, in 1889, the post included forty-three veterans and, that year, was the second largest black post in the state. While quite a few white, black, and integrated posts in the Tennessee highlands disbanded over time,

---

7 GAR, Tennessee, *Sixth Encampment* (1890), 12. The department of Tennessee’s eight all-black posts included: Lincoln Post 4 in Nashville, Lathrop Post 10 in Pulaski, Chickamauga Post 22 in Chattanooga, Henry Gillenwaters Post 33 in Rogersville, Johnsonville Post 66 in Clarksville, Isham Young Post 80 in Knoxville, John Brown Post 86 [unknown location], and James G. Blaine Post 102 in Columbia. For a list of Tennessee’s all-black GAR posts, see especially table of contents in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” Calvin M. McClung Collection; Appendix I in Gannon, *The Won Cause*, 207. Gannon lists a Jonesborough Post 67 in the index, which is not listed in either the “Descriptive Records,” or in the Tennessee Encampment journals.

8 Coker, “‘Is This the Fruit of Freedom?’,” 101. Chattanooga was home to two all-white posts—Lookout Post 2 and Mission Ridge Post 45—and the all-black Chickamauga Post 22. Knoxville was eventually home to the all-black Isham Young Post 80 and all-white Ed Maynard Post 14, Robert N. Hood Post 28, James H. Franklin Post 50, J. C. Griffin Post 78, and McKinley Post 106. Athens was home to the all-black Joshua R. Giddings Post 26 and initially all-white James A. Garfield Post 25. The Garfield Post would eventually become integrated and accept eleven black members, after the local Giddings Post disbanded. See especially, GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection.


10 GAR, Tennessee, *Sixth Encampment* (1890), 22-23. The largest all-black post in 1889 was Clarksville’s Johnsonville Post 66, which included 65 members.
members of the Chickamauga post remained active well into the twentieth century. From 1891 to 1917, the post retained an average annual membership of twenty comrades.\(^{11}\)

In addition to membership numbers, post inspections conducted intermittently from 1887 through the 1890s also shed light on the Chickamauga post’s relative prosperity. During post inspections, the departmental inspector visited and evaluated posts based on a number of standardized questions—such as the number of members in good standing, whether the GAR ritual was memorized and performed, members’ attendance and interest in the post, and whether officers and members were properly uniformed and equipped, among others. Based on his observations, the inspector also “graded” each post’s future prospects as “very good,” “good,” “fair,” or “poor.” Inspectors submitted the reports to departmental leaders, and later published them in encampment journals. Members understood how their post measured up against others.

In 1887, four years after the Chickamauga post was established, the inspector reported that officers and members had not committed GAR rituals to memory, lacked GAR uniforms and regalia, and met sporadically. Yet, members showed interest in post activities, had spent $10 in charity over the previous year, and the inspector deemed the post’s prospects as “good.” The next year, in 1889, the post improved. All members and officers wore membership and rank badges, dues were collected promptly, and the post boasted a general relief fund of $15.50 dollars. Additionally, post leaders had not cancelled a single regular meeting throughout the year. All of the post’s meetings were private, and members did not host any public gatherings or campfires, which was quite

\(^{11}\) Though post membership was not reported every year, Chickamauga Post’s reported membership from 1890 to 1917, see especially GAR, Tennessee, *Eighth thru the Sixteenth Encampment* (1891-1899), *Twenty-seventh Encampment* (1910), *Twenty-eighth Encampment* (1911), *Thirty-first Encampment* (1914), *Thirty-second Encampment* (1915), *Thirty-fourth Encampment* (1917).
unusual when compared to white posts. Again, the inspector judged the post as “good.”

Over the next year, the post suffered. Throughout 1890, officers and members did not attend meetings regularly and were disinterested in post life. The inspector deemed the post’s prospects as “poor.” Despite the poor showing, the post bounced back in 1891.

During the year, members regularly attended meetings, showed interest in post activities, and kept records in good order. Officers and ordinary members continued to lack official GAR uniforms and equipment, and did not commit rituals to memory. Humble socio-economic backgrounds most likely kept many from purchasing official GAR garb and regalia.12

By 1893, post life continued to thrive. Members attended meetings regularly, participated in post activities, and wore GAR badges; however, now members properly performed GAR rituals and had “partly” outfitted themselves in uniforms. Reflecting the modest backgrounds of many black veterans, and black southerners in general, financial insecurity continued to plague members. Twenty-five were too impoverished to pay membership dues. Five years later, in 1898, membership and interest in post activities had waned somewhat. Like posts across the region, and nation, Chickamauga had dwindled to ten members who did not wear uniforms or regularly perform the rituals. However, the inspector reported to state leaders that the post’s future prospects were “very good.” By the state organization’s final encampment meeting in 1917, the Chickamauga post still included ten active members.13

Unlike many of their comrades in local white posts who were northern transplants (see Chapter 2), nearly all of Chattanooga’s black GAR members were from the South. Among the ninety-six post members whose birthplaces were recorded in the descriptive records, thirty-eight (nearly 40 percent) were native Tennesseans. A number of others were born in neighboring Georgia, Virginia, and Kentucky. Only one comrade was a northerner. Veteran of the 1st U.S. Colored Heavy Artillery regiment, George Austell was born in Ohio.14

Local black GAR members were part of Chattanooga’s black working-class community. Among the seventy-three members whose occupations were found, forty-six—or nearly two-thirds—worked as unskilled farm laborers or common laborers. Twenty (roughly 27 percent) were skilled or semi-skilled workers. They worked as blacksmiths, stonemasons, carpenters, tanners, and harness makers. Only three were prominent ministers.15

Like their African-American comrades in Chattanooga, black members of Knoxville’s Isham Young Post 80 were also quite active. Knoxville’s African-American veterans established the Isham Young Post in October 1889, roughly five years after Chattanooga’s all-black post was founded. Unlike many black posts named to honor prominent African-American Civil War-era leaders, Knoxville’s black veterans named

---

14 GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” Calvin M. McClung Collection; Bureau of the census, Tenth Census of the United States, 1880; Bureau of the census, Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900. See Table 1. Black GAR members hailed from: Tennessee (38) Georgia (15), Virginia (11), Kentucky (11), Alabama (7), North Carolina (6), South Carolina (4), Mississippi (2), Ohio (1), and Washington, D.C. (1).
15 See especially, Chickamauga Post 22 roster in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection; Bureau of the census, Tenth Census of the United States, 1880; Bureau of the census, Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900. Whereas forty-six black GAR members were unskilled laborers or farm laborers, one worked as an unskilled drayman and two worked as farmers. Skilled or semi-skilled black GAR members of Chickamauga Post 22 included: brick and stone masons (6), blacksmiths (5), carpenters (3), plasterers (2), tanner (1), molder (1), harness maker (1), and barber (1). The three ministers included, Mason Burt, Louis Sersien, and Anderson Roper.
their post in honor of Colonel Isham Young—a white East Tennessean who helped organize the 11th Tennessee Cavalry regiment. They may have done so to endear themselves to local white Union veterans, and avoid raising too much ire from former Confederates. Though the post had slightly fewer members than the Chickamauga post over the years, it boasted thirty-eight comrades at its height in 1891 and again in 1898. From 1891 to 1917, it enjoyed a stable average membership of twenty-four, and had ten members during the final encampment in 1917.

Annual departmental inspections also illustrate the relative health of the Isham Young Post throughout the 1890s. During 1890, the post’s inaugural year, members memorized and performed GAR rituals, expressed interest in post activities, and regularly attended meetings. Yet, post officers and members had not purchased formal GAR uniforms and accessories. Regardless, the inspector deemed the post’s prospects as “good.” The next year, in 1891, the department inspector noted that post officers and ordinary members did not own official uniforms and regalia, and none memorized or performed the GAR rituals. Yet, members continued to attend meetings regularly and exhibited keen interest in post activities. Additionally, black members of the Woman’s Relief Corps (WRC) established a corps attached to Isham Young post that year. GAR members had spent $10 dollars in relief over the previous year and the inspector deemed the post’s future prospects as “good.”

---

17 GAR, Tennessee, *Sixth Encampment* (1890), 12. The membership of Isham Young Post 80 throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century included: 38 (1891), 17 (1892), 15 (1893), 25 (1894), 25 (1896), 29 (1897), 36 (1898), 38 (1899), 20 (1910), 23 (1911), 13 (1915), 10 (1917).
Over the next year, in 1892, post officers and average members had only “partly” outfitted themselves in formal GAR attire, and they had still not memorized the official rituals. Nevertheless, members continued to attend meetings regularly and interest in post activities remained high. Additionally, the post had provided $15 dollars in charity between January and September 1892. Only four veterans were too impoverished to pay membership dues. The post’s future prospects were “fair.”¹⁹ Five years later, in 1897, the post remained relatively stable. Officers and members continued to attend meetings regularly; however, none owned uniforms and regalia, and they still did not perform GAR rituals. The post’s relief fund had dwindled to $3.25 dollars, and members had doled out only $1 dollar in relief over the previous year. Despite the post’s shortcomings, the inspector deemed the post’s future prospects as “good.”²⁰ Most black members’ lack of formal uniforms and regalia does not necessarily reflect their lack of interest in the GAR. Instead, their modest socio-economic backgrounds and little discretionary income likely explains why many black veterans did not purchase the ceremonial garb. Additionally, members could fully take part in post activities and socialize with fellow veterans at post meetings without memorizing official rituals or wearing uniforms.

Knoxville’s African Americans remained active until the final state encampment in 1917.

In contrast to the city’s diverse and more affluent white GAR members, Isham Young post’s black members were all southerners with modest socio-economic backgrounds. Among the sixty-seven comrades whose biographical information was ascertained, most were Tennesseans (84 percent). A handful of others were from

neighboring Virginia, Kentucky, Georgia, and the Carolinas. Fifty-seven members’ occupations were correlated. Like their black comrades in Chattanooga, nearly three-fourths were unskilled laborers or farm laborers. Eight others were skilled or semi-skilled blue-collar workers, who labored as carpenters, mechanics, machinists, painters, millers, and blacksmiths. A single member, Samuel Clark, acquired a low-status white-collar clerk position.\(^{21}\)

While most African Americans in East Tennessee were members of all-black posts, a few joined white veterans in integrated posts. The state boasted at least twelve integrated posts, all of which were located in mountain towns and communities.\(^{22}\) Black veterans were charter members in a few integrated posts—including those in Dandridge, Ellejoy, and Riverdale (in Knox County). Other posts—including those in Athens, Johnson City, Jonesborough, New Market, Rutledge, and Maryville—were white posts that eventually admitted black veterans.\(^{23}\)

Though these posts included both black and white members, they remained nominally integrated and predominantly white. Not a single post had more than a dozen black members and four posts claimed only between one and three USCT veterans. Among the thirty-six total members of the Dan Fisher Post 78 in Riverdale, Oscar

---

\(^{21}\) See Table 1. Isham Young Post 80 roster in GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection. Forty-two members were unskilled laborers or farm laborers. Three were farmers. Those veterans who acquired skilled or semi-skilled jobs included: carpenter (3), mechanic (1), machinist (1), painter (1), miller (1), blacksmith (1). Two others worked as a coachmen and janitor, respectively.


\(^{23}\) Coker, “‘Is This the Fruit of Freedom?,’” 102.
McMullen was the only African American. Additionally, the S. K. N. Patton Post 26 in Johnson City boasted 105 total members, only two of whom—Thomas Morrison and Thomas White—were black. Dandridge’s William T. Sherman Post 96 had the largest proportion of black members. John Henry, Andrew Carson and Alexander Henderson were three of the sixteen total members (roughly 19 percent). Among all the integrated posts, James A. Garfield Post 25 in Athens boasted the largest number of black members. Garfield’s white post members accepted eleven USCT veterans after the local all-black Giddings Post 26 disbanded. Still, the black members accounted for only 6 percent of the post’s 188 total members.24 It seems astonishing that white comrades accepted black USCT veterans in integrated posts in postwar East Tennessee, given the region’s small number of black residents and the state of race relations in the post-Civil War South. However, integrated posts did not necessarily imply that white mountaineers were outspoken advocates of racial equality. In the post-war South filled with former Confederates, practical white GAR leaders certainly recognized former USCT troops as fellow veterans who could bolster membership, while remaining common members or subordinate leaders who would not challenge white leadership.

The minute books of Athens’s integrated Garfield Post 25 provide some clues into black members’ status and roles in the post specifically, and integrated posts across the region generally. Within the minute books are membership lists from 1896 to 1898, cursory notes and attendance at meetings from 1901 to 1915, newspaper clippings on the

24 See especially, GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records”; Coker, 102. The number and proportion of African American members in integrated posts included: James A. Garfield Post 25 (11 of 188; 6 percent), S.K.N. Patton Post 26 (2 of 105; nearly 2 percent); Milton L. Phillips Post 27 (4 of 92; 4 percent); Jonesborough Post 36 (6 of 109; nearly 6 percent); A.B. McTeer Post 39 (3 of 57 members; 5 percent); Patrick McGuire Post 46 (9 of 129; 7 percent), Calvin M. Dyer Post 47 (4 of 112; almost 4 percent), Dan Fisher Post 78 (1 of 36; nearly 2 percent); William T. Sherman Post 96 (3 of 16; 19 percent).
GAR, and members’ obituaries. White post leaders regularly ordered military tombstones and announced the deaths of black and white members alike. For example, during the October 4, 1905 meeting white post commander William F. McCarron ordered specialized tombstones from Washington, D.C. for ten deceased veterans. Nine were for white veterans, but one was for Jackson Wilson, a black veteran who had served in Company L of the 1st U.S. Colored Heavy Artillery regiment.25

Though white members monopolized the post leadership, a few black members secured minor officer positions in the post. George W. Henderson was elected as the officer of the guard four times between 1901 and 1910. A native Tennessean, Henderson enlisted as a private in Company H of the 1st U.S. Colored Heavy Artillery regiment in 1864. Originally a member of Athens’s all-black Giddings Post 26, he transferred to the Garfield Post 25 after the all-black post disbanded. Serving as officer of the guard, Henderson was responsible for overseeing the admission of members, reporting visitors to leaders, and helping direct the honor guard at local meetings. In January 1908 and January 1909, white post leaders ordered military tombstones for deceased comrades and entrusted Henderson with their care. In addition to Henderson, fellow black veteran Charles A. Evans was appointed sergeant major in December 1907. Evans was born in McMinn County and had served alongside Henderson in company A of the 1st U.S. Colored Heavy Artillery regiment. As sergeant major, Evans assisted the post’s Adjutant and Quartermaster during meetings.26 Even though a few black veterans acquired state leadership positions from the late 1880s to the early 1900s, like Henderson and Evans’s

---

leadership roles at the local level, they were never elected to the highest positions, only minor ones.

Across Tennessee’s highlands, black GAR members in all-black and integrated posts were overwhelmingly native East Tennesseans and southerners. The home states for 225 black GAR members were enumerated in the descriptive records, and only three reported being born outside of the South. Almost two out of every three (63 percent) were native Tennesseans. Slightly more than a quarter were from neighboring Virginia, Georgia, Kentucky, and North Carolina (28 percent). A few, 11 percent, were from South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi. The veterans born outside of the former Confederacy were from Maryland, Washington, D.C., and Ohio, respectively.27

The overwhelming majority of black Grand Army members in the region were native mountaineers. Among the 103 black Tennesseans whose home county was listed in the descriptive records, 90 were from mountain counties. Most were from Knox, Jefferson, and Grainger counties; others were from Blount, Roane, Greene, and Washington counties. Only a few black Tennessee veterans had moved east from the middle portion of the state.28 The prevalence of black GAR members in East Tennessee, especially those born and raised in the highland region, demonstrates the diversity of residents in southern Appalachia and further challenges the stereotypical image of the

27 GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection. The breakdown of the 225 black GAR members by home state, included: Tennessee, 142 (63 percent); Virginia, 22 (9.8 percent); Georgia, 16 (7.1 percent); Kentucky, 14 (6.2 percent); North Carolina, 12 (5.3 percent); South Carolina, 7 (3.1 percent); Alabama, 7 (3.1 percent); Mississippi, 2 (0.89 percent); Washington, D.C., 1 (0.44 percent); Ohio, 1 (0.44 percent); Maryland, 1 (0.44 percent). The GAR comrades born outside of Dixie included Samuel Gregory, Clem Shaw, and George Austell.

28 Ibid. The breakdown of the black GAR members from eastern Tennessee counties, included: Bledsoe (1), Blount (8), Bradley (1), Campbell (2), Grainger (9), Greene (3), Hamblen (1), Hamilton (1), Jefferson (15), Knox (22), Loudon (2), McMinn (4), Meigs (2), Monroe (5), Morgan (1), Polk (1), Roane (6), Sevier (2), and Washington (4). Those from Middle Tennessee, included: Bedford (1), Davidson (2), Giles (4), Jackson (1), Wayne (1), White (2), and Williamson (2).
Mountain South as a static and homogenous region that was home to isolated, but pure Anglo-Saxon mountaineers.

Unlike many white GAR members in the region, whose occupations were quite varied, ranging from affluent white-collar to blue-collar jobs (see Chapter 2), most black comrades worked as modest common laborers or unskilled, or semi-skilled workers. Among the 192 members whose occupations were listed in the descriptive records, 116, or almost two out of every three, worked as common laborers or farm laborers (60.4 percent). These veterans worked land they did not own for someone else’s profit. Only twenty-eight, or nearly 15 percent, were listed as farmers and likely owned their own farms. Those black veterans not engaged as farmers or laborers mostly performed menial labor as skilled or semi-skilled blue-collar workers. Thirty-one, or about one-sixth, worked as carpenters, blacksmiths, brick and stonemasons, and tanners, and other blue-collar occupations.²⁹

Only a few black comrades had acquired low-status white-collar jobs—like clerks, teachers, and preachers. Albert Bailey, who had served as a private in the 1st U.S. Colored Heavy Artillery, was a teacher in Dandridge and member of the integrated Patrick McGuire Post 46 in New Market. Samuel Clark, who had served alongside Bailey in the 1st U.S. Colored Heavy Artillery, was a member of Knoxville’s all-black Isham Young Post 80 and worked as a clerk. Six black veterans were ministers; three of them

²⁹ GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection. The breakdown of East Tennessee black GAR members who worked as skilled or semi-skilled blue-collar workers, included: Carpenter (8), Blacksmith (8), Brick mason (4), Stonemason (4), Plasterer (2), Molder (1), Tanner (1), Painter (1), Harness maker (1), Barber (1).
were active members of the all-black Henry Gillenwaters Post 33 in Rogersville. The other three evangelists belonged to Chattanooga’s all-black Chickamauga Post 22.  

Many of the black veterans had served together during the Civil War, and certainly knew each other personally. Among the 252 members whose service records were listed in the descriptive records, many served in USCT regiments organized in East Tennessee.  

Slightly more than half—137, or 54 percent—served together in the 1st U. S. Colored Heavy Artillery regiment. Organized in Knoxville in 1864 under General Davis Tillson, the regiment participated in operations in Tennessee and Alabama before occupying Asheville, North Carolina in 1865. The black troopers occupied western North Carolina’s social and economic center for roughly a month, until May 18. During the regiment’s occupation, the armed black troopers personified Confederate defeat, emancipation, and an overturning of the antebellum South’s racial hierarchy. Yet, their occupation of Asheville was not without incident. On May 6, 1865, four privates were summarily executed before the entire regiment for raping a local white woman, and

---

30 GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection. The ministers who belonged to the Rogersville post included John Arnold, Archie Monroe, and Otto Petiller. The preachers who belonged to the Chattanooga post were Mason Burt, Lewis Sercene, and Anderson Rapier.

nearly killing the victim’s aunt and uncle. Eventually, the regiment was transferred to Tennessee and mustered out on March 31, 1866.32

A number of others—forty-two, or about 17 percent—had joined either the 42nd or 44th U. S. Colored Infantry regiments. Both regiments were organized in April 1864, in Chattanooga. Whereas members of the 42nd regiment undertook guard and garrison duty in the Scenic City throughout the war, members of the 44th regiment took part in the 1864 battles of Dalton and Nashville, respectively. After seeing action, the black troops spent the rest of the war on garrison duty in Chattanooga.33

Paralleling GAR membership trends across the nation, most black GAR members in East Tennessee served as privates during the war.34 The military ranks of 221 black veterans were listed in the descriptive records, and 172—or approximately three-fourths—mustered out as privates. None served as commissioned officers, but forty-two served as non-commissioned officers, including twenty-three corporals and fourteen sergeants.35 Few black veterans in East Tennessee either served as non-commissioned

---

32 See especially, Tennessee Civil War Centennial Commission, Tennessens in the Civil War, 367-368; E. Raymond Evans, Contributions by United States Colored Troops (USCT) of Chattanooga & North Georgia during the American Civil War, Reconstruction and Formation of Chattanooga (Chickamauga, GA: B. C. M. Foster, 2003).
33 Tennessee Civil War Centennial Commission, Tennessens in the Civil War, 367-368; E. Raymond Evans, Contributions by United States Colored Troops (USCT) of Chattanooga & North Georgia during the American Civil War, Reconstruction and Formation of Chattanooga (Chickamauga, GA: B. C. M. Foster, 2003).
35 GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection. Additionally, Hutsell Clark of the 1st U. S. Colored Heavy Artillery and Jerry Billips of the 44th U. S. Colored Infantry served as 1st sergeant. While Thomas Lillard and Charles King served as quartermaster sergeants in the 1st U. S. Colored Heavy Artillery regiment, Nathan Steele served as commissary sergeant of the same regiment. Four others—including Armstead S. Scruggs, Frank Debose, Samuel McAllister, and William M. Upshaw—served as musicians in the 44th U.S. Colored Infantry, 6th U.S. Colored Cavalry, 1st U. S. Colored Heavy Artillery, and 111th U.S. Colored Infantry regiments, respectively. Three—Jerry Edwards, Frank Bulter, and Charles Burras—were artificers, or artillery workmen, in the 1st U. S. Colored Heavy Artillery regiment.
officers during the war or garnered affluent occupations outside the GAR afterward, but they remained active in all-black and integrated posts throughout the organization’s life.

Yet, white Tennessee GAR members’ posture toward their black counterparts was ambivalent and African Americans rarely obtained leadership positions. White Tennesseans’ wavering attitudes toward USCT veterans first came to the fore during the 1887 national GAR encampment in St. Louis. The national organization’s racial policies came under heated debate after word spread that white leaders of the Department of the Gulf rejected black veterans’ applications for new posts. Phillip J. Cheek, Jr., a delegate from Wisconsin, responded by proposing a resolution that if charter applicants were rejected “because of their color,” they could seek authorization directly from the national commander-in-chief and circumvent state officials. Tennessee’s department commander, William J. Ramage of Knoxville, opened debate on the resolution by openly criticizing black posts. He stated that although his department established five all-black posts, they had languished. He maintained that one post had surrendered its charter, two others had been suspended, and state officials had lost touch with another post. He went on to complain that a white comrade had “kept alive” the fifth post, and that “it is utterly impossible in our Department to find comrades of color who have the ability or the knowledge requisite to keep up their reports.” Ramage did not object to aiding black veterans organize posts, in principle; however, he concluded that establishing all-black posts “has been thoroughly tried and tested and it is the unanimous opinion of all the representatives of the Department of Tennessee and Georgia that it is inexpedient.”
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36 GAR, National, *Twenty-first Encampment* (1887), 250-251. See also, Coker, “‘Is This the Fruit of Freedom?’” 95; Gannon, *The Won Cause*, 28-34.
Ramage was not alone in his sentiments, and tensions mounted as debate among northern and southern delegates ensued. Edgar Allen, national junior vice commander-in-chief from Virginia, supported Cheek’s resolution and argued that black veterans must be admitted into the GAR. He confessed that he could “readily understand” and empathize with white Department of the Gulf veterans who were wary that accepting African Americans may have a devastating “effect upon their social relations with the [white] people amongst whom they live.” He admitted that even white GAR members in his own Virginia department had a “tendency and disposition to ignore the black soldier of the Republic.” However, he asserted that Virginia’s black posts’ “reports have been made as regularly, if not in quite as good shape, as the reports from the white posts” and speculated that the five posts making up the Department of the Gulf would include twenty more posts, if white leaders accepted applications from African Americans. He then claimed that if he was forced to shake hands with either a Confederate veteran who “was battling for the destruction of our Union, or the black men who stood side by side with me, my hand will be outstretched to the man of dusky skin.”

Department of the Gulf commander, A. S. Graham of New Orleans, responded to the criticism by asserting that state department leaders “should regulate themselves” and make membership decisions, since “it is impossible for a man in Maine to say what should be done in California or in Louisiana.” He went on to argue that those who publicly claimed, “the black man stands equal with the white…upon every occasion when applause may be elicited is a piece of claptrap.” He also questioned black veterans’ wartime achievements and declared that many white Union veterans fought to maintain
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37 GAR, National, *Twenty-first Encampment* (1887), 252. See also, Coker, “‘Is This the Fruit of Freedom?,’” 96.
the Union, not to benefit African Americans. He asserted, “the men who formed the
majority of the negro regiments were not soldiers in the same sense that the [white]
volunteers were. When I enlisted in April, 1861, with thousands of others, the black man
was never taken into consideration at all.”

Among the representatives who were unmoved by Graham’s claims was California’s departmental commander, Edward S. Salomon of San Francisco. Salomon took the floor and curtly replied that any department leader who rejected black veterans’ charter “because they are black, ought to be removed from his position” and that “We know no distinction of color, of creed or nationality of the Grand Army of the Republic.” He then noted biting that the white Department of the Gulf members had recently taken part in the unveiling ceremonies for a statue of Albert Sidney Johnston with Confederate veterans, and had even “deposited flowers at the pedestal of the statue.” He claimed, “I would rather shake hands with the blackest nigger in the land if he was a true, honest man, than with a traitor.” The debate abruptly concluded and the encampment adopted Cheek’s resolution, but national GAR leaders refused to strictly enforce it.

Despite Ramage’s misgivings, African-American veterans secured minor state leadership positions in the years after the heated St. Louis debates. White comrades appointed USCT veteran Matthew J. Nesbit of Chattanooga’s all-black Chickamauga post to the council of administration twice, in 1887 and again in 1888. The next year, in 1889, A. W. King of Clarksville’s all-black post succeeded Nesbit and was appointed to the state council of administration. Yet, King did not complete his term because of his untimely death. White leaders elected Oscar Johnson to fill King’s vacancy. Johnson was
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38 Ibid., 254; Coker, “‘Is This the Fruit of Freedom?’,” 96.
39 GAR, National, Twenty-first Encampment (1887), 255.
born in Grainger County, served in the 1st U.S. Colored Heavy Artillery regiment, and was a founding member of Knoxville’s Isham Young post. The next year, at the 1890 state encampment, Johnson was elected to the council again and served as the only black member.\textsuperscript{40}

African-American veterans serving on the council drew little or no comment from white or black members, except one year later, at the 1891 state encampment in Johnson City. As comrades put forward nominations for departmental officers, Charles W. Norwood of Chattanooga’s all-white Mission Ridge post, “objected and called attention to the absence of [a] colored representative” for the council. Woodson A. Weaver, former post commander of Chattanooga’s Chickamauga post, agreed and candidly declared, “we have no [black] representative on the entire list, and I think we are entitled to a representative on the Council of Administration.” Andrew J. Gahagan of Chattanooga’s all-white Lookout post concurred, and reminded those in attendance that African Americans’ wartime service merited at least some voice in state GAR leadership matters. He asserted, “a colored man’s body was as good a material as a white man’s to be shot at, and it is just that at least he be given one member of the Council of Administration.”

White members in attendance acquiesced, but they were initially unsure how to fill five positions among six nominees without “the trouble of a formal ballot.” A native-Tennessean and white member of Mountain City’s post, Kemp Murphy, voluntarily withdrew his nomination and allowed Hardin Greer of Chattanooga’s Chickamauga post to acquire a council seat.\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{40} GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Third Encampment} (1887), 19; \textit{Fourth Encampment} (1888), 41; \textit{Fifth Encampment} (1889), 40; \textit{Sixth Encampment} (1890), 26, 30.
\textsuperscript{41} GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Eighth Encampment} (1891), 101.
After 1893, black veterans rarely secured a position on the state council of administration, but by the turn of the century and throughout the first decade of the twentieth century they dominated a different leadership role—the departmental color bearer. The trend began at the 1901 national GAR encampment in Cleveland, Ohio. During the national reunion, Tennessee’s departmental commander Madison M. Harris of Knoxville’s Ed Maynard post appointed John Talley, a black member of New Market’s integrated post, to serve as Tennessee’s color bearer during the encampment parade. Harris, a native Tennessean who served in the 9th Tennessee Cavalry regiment, recalled the incident in his 1902 commander’s address. Before leaving for Cleveland, Harris brainstormed ways in which the Volunteer State’s delegation “would receive more attention than has been ordinarily bestowed upon it in the grand parade” among northern veterans and civilian spectators. So, Harris constructed a “large banner with the inscription ‘Loyal East Tennessee—’61-‘65’” and tapped Talley to carry it at the head of the delegation. Honored by the proposition, Talley replied, “I will stick to it as long as a piece of it remains.” During the grand review, Tennessee’s twenty-person delegation was met with “cheers and such exclamations as: ‘Hurrah for Tennessee—yes, East Tennessee...The home of Parson Brownlow, Andy Johnson, Maynard’...from one end of the line to the other.” According to Paul Coker, “Talley’s appointment as flag bearer may have originated as a publicity stunt, but it established a new pattern of black involvement in Tennessee’s GAR.”

Throughout the first decade of the twentieth century, white leaders regularly appointed African Americans from the Tennessee highlands as state color bearer. Though
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42 GAR, Tennessee, Nineteenth Encampment, 32-33; Coker, “‘Is This the Fruit of Freedom?’, 111-112.
43 Coker, “‘Is This the Fruit of Freedom?’, 112.
Thomas White of Nashville acquired the position in 1902, William M. Upshaw of Knoxville’s Isham Young Post 80 was appointed the next year. John Talley of New Market resumed the role in 1904 and white leaders reappointed him three subsequent times until 1908. Talley then passed the torch to another African American from East Tennessee. From 1909 to 1910, James Turner of Chattanooga’s all-black Chickamauga post served in the position. Though the appointment of black color bearers may have proved mere tokenism, it certainly illustrates white leaders’ apprehension and ambivalence toward black members.44

White comrades were occasionally patronizing. During the 1892 state encampment held in Nashville, John Ruhm of the host city gained the floor and railed against rumors of pension fraud. He reported, “There are men of whom I know who have been going around this Department under the guise of being Government officers; they get around the colored people; they charge them [fees] under guise of being Government officers.” Ruhm beseeched his fellow veterans to police their neighborhoods for pension swindlers, and considered black veterans susceptible to fraud. In a condescending manner, he stated: “I call especially upon the representatives from the colored Posts to look around in their midst. They have a larger number dependent upon them who have not sufficient knowledge of affairs, and are easily persuaded.” D. S. McIntyre, of Knoxville, sustained Ruhm’s assertions against pension fraud, but claimed the issue was embellished. Asserting that the wartime deeds of all veterans—black and white—warranted monetary reparation, McIntyre stated, “I am in favor of every man that wore

the blue and carried the flag to a successful termination of the war, receiving a pension if he is entitled to it.” His comments were met with applause.45

The issue of pension fraud, and white GAR members’ notion that African Americans were prone to deception, arose again, five years later, in 1897. Among the general orders that department commander Halbert B. Case—an Ohio native and member of Chattanooga’s all-white Lookout post—forwarded to members across the state, was one that specifically alerted black members to an African-American pension shyster. Case specifically warned Knoxville’s all-black Isham Young post against being hoodwinked by “one Walker, a negro, who is said to be circulating among the negro Posts…and pretending to have authority to re-organize Corps and give charters and badges.” He went on to dub Walker “an arrant fraud” and claimed that members of the post “are especially warned to kick the swindler out.”46

White veterans’ racial ambivalence, and black members’ segregated or secondary role in Tennessee’s GAR, also arose over Memorial Day commemorations. Throughout the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, GAR members organized Memorial Day ceremonies in communities across the state. Generally, black and white posts conducted services in national cemeteries at Chattanooga, Knoxville, Nashville, Pittsburg Landing, Stones River, and Fort Donelson. Members of posts located near rivers scattered flowers in local streams to honor deceased sailors and Union soldiers who died in the Sultana disaster.47 Yet, in May 1891, department commander Andrew J. Gahagan
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45 Tennessee GAR, Ninth Encampment (1892), 133-135.
46 GAR, Tennessee, Fourteenth Encampment (1897), 34.
issued a Memorial Day order for Knoxville’s primary white post—Ed Maynard post—to “take charge” of the ceremonies at the nearby national cemetery, and for whites to be “assisted by” the local all-black Isham Young post.\(^\text{48}\)

Racial tensions also arose over Memorial Day services during the 1892 encampment in Nashville. In general, the observances were solemn and reverent occasions, not lighthearted and festive. Veterans typically attended church services, decorated veterans’ graves, and gave somber speeches honoring fallen comrades. During the Nashville encampment, T. G. Balphishweiler of the host city gained the floor and censured “the colored brethren particularly” for their behavior during the previous Memorial Day services at the Stones River National Cemetery in Murfreesboro. He spoke with “deep mortification” while recalling his visit to the cemetery. He decried, “our colored people make of this day a picnic; a colored jollification; a place of barter and trade,” and that upon arriving at the graveyard he noticed, “everything conducted, not in the strict practice of the proprieties of the day, but the place was being one of a religious picnic.” However, some white members in attendance defended their black comrades. L. E. Dyer, a white member from Memphis, retorted, “it is out of order for the brother to lecture” to black veterans from various communities across the state “for something done at Murfreesboro.” Department commander Henry C. Whitaker of New Market’s integrated Patrick McGuire post agreed with Dyer, and the encampment ended abruptly without further discussion.\(^\text{49}\)

The next year, and certainly in response to the previous year’s controversy, the state commander forwarded an order to comrades across the state regarding proper
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\(^{48}\) GAR, Tennessee, *Ninth Encampment* (1892), 15.

\(^{49}\) GAR, Tennessee, *Ninth Encampment* (1892), 155-156; Coker “‘Is This the Fruit of Freedom?’,” 106.
decorum at Memorial Day services. The April 1893 order encouraged veterans to “let no soldier’s grave be undecorated…whether he was great or humble.” Attached to the order was department chaplain W. B. Rippetoe’s circular on Memorial Day etiquette. Reverend Rippetoe, of Shelbyville, encouraged members to “repair to some church and all participate in appropriate service conducted by some clerical comrade, or other loyal minister. This will honor God.” He also cautioned, “let entertainments be avoided, and the day be sacredly devoted to the memory of our fallen comrades.”

Perhaps influenced by the intensifying racial tensions in the South during the mid-to-late 1890s, department commander Halbert B. Case suggested that Chattanooga’s black and white posts take part in segregated Memorial Day activities three years later in 1896. Whereas members of the all-white Lookout Mountain and Mission Ridge posts were to decorate white soldiers’ graves in the nearby national cemetery, black veterans were responsible for graves in “the colored sections.”

Gahagan’s and Case’s orders likely spoke to many white veterans’ racial outlooks on the proper roles of white and black veterans during public GAR activities. The controversies surrounding Memorial Day illustrate that Tennessee’s white veterans welcomed black members to either take part in interracial GAR activities as “junior partners,” or conduct segregated undertakings.

Regardless of white Tennessee GAR members’ ambivalence toward their black comrades, they did remember African Americans’ role in the Civil War and celebrated emancipation as a key outcome of the fratricidal conflict. As early as 1885, the GAR editor of the short-lived Grand Army Sentinel republished portions of Thomas J.
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50 “General Orders No. 3, April 24, 1893,” in GAR, Tennessee, Eleventh Encampment, 7, 9.
51 Tennessee GAR, Fourteenth Encampment (1897), 9.
Morgan’s memoir, “Reminiscences of Service with Colored Troops in the Army of the Cumberland, 1863-5,” as a series of cover stories in the August 5 and August 20 issues. Morgan’s account had just been published earlier in 1885. A white Indiana native, Morgan had initially enlisted in the 7th Indiana Infantry regiment in the aftermath of the attack on Fort Sumter, and was later commissioned first lieutenant in Colonel Benjamin Harrison’s 70th Indiana infantry regiment. In November 1863, he sought an officer’s commission in a black regiment, and traveled to Gallatin, Tennessee to help organize the 14th U. S. Colored Infantry. The regiment initially undertook garrison duty in Chattanooga, before taking part in the battles of Dalton, Pulaski, Nashville, and Decatur. Several of those who served under Morgan would go on to join black GAR posts in East Tennessee.\textsuperscript{52} While the editor may have republished Morgan’s memoir because of its insights into wartime Tennessee, he placed the article on the front page and certainly reminded black and white Union veterans in Tennessee of the centrality of race and slavery in the conflict, as well as the contributions of African Americans in the Union war effort.

Morgan opened his memoir by noting the Civil War’s significance and claiming that emancipation was the most momentous consequence of the war. He asserted that the war “marks an epoch not only in the history of America, but in that of democracy and of civilization” and “affected the course of human progress.” After comparing the conflict’s importance to Alexander the Great’s exploits, the Crusades, and Columbus’s landing in the Americas, he placed slavery’s demise and black citizenship as a key outcome of the

\textsuperscript{52} The black GAR members who had served under Morgan were all members of Chattanooga’s Chickamauga Post 22. They were, Lafayette Browder, David Smith, Morgan Fryar, William Miller, Ed Goodall, Sam Angel, Hilary T. Hayes, and Abraham Elliott. See especially, GAR, Tennessee, “Descriptive Records,” McClung Collection.
war. He asserted that the war “not only enfranchised four millions of American slaves of African descent, but made slavery forever impossible in the great republic, and gave a new impulse to the cause of human freedom.” He stressed the war’s radical result, stating,

Its [the war’s] influence upon American slaves was immediate and startlingly revolutionary, lifting them from the condition of despised chattels, bought and sold like sheep in the market, with no rights which the white man was bound to respect, to the exalted plane of American citizenship, making them free men, the peers in every civil and political right of their late masters. Within about a decade after the close of the war, negroes—lately slaves—were legislators, state officers, members of congress, and for a brief time one presided over the senate of the United States….To-day slavery finds no advocate, and the colored race in America is making steady progress in all elements of civilization.53

He then underscored that USCT troops’ martial prowess during the war justified citizenship. He stated, “The manly qualities of negro soldiers evinced in camp, on the march and in battle…made their freedom a necessity, and their citizenship a certainty.”54

After recalling his initial enlistment after the attack on Fort Sumter, Morgan reminded readers of the heated national debates surrounding Abraham Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation and the mobilization of black troops. Morgan had waded into the argument “with the deepest interest, as I saw that upon its settlement hung great issues.” He remembered that some northern whites rejected mobilizing black troops because it would “put them on the same level with white soldiers, and so be an insult to every man who wore the blue.” Others argued that African Americans were unfit soldiers because they “belonged to a degraded, inferior race, wanting in soldierly qualities….he was too grossly ignorant to perform intelligently, the duties of the soldier” and after being

54 Morgan, “Reminiscences,” Grand Army Sentinel, August 5, 1885, 33.
armed would undertake “acts of revenge and wanton cruelty” against whites. Morgan recollected that some of those white northerners who supported African American enlistment put forward practical and racially patronizing arguments. They asserted, “the republic needed the help of the able bodied negroes; that with their natural instincts of self-preservation, desire for liberty, habit of obedience, power of imitation…acquaintance with the southern country and adaptation to its climate” would make them ideal federal soldiers. Still others claimed that “the negro had more at stake than the white man, and that he should have a chance to strike a blow for himself” and that “he needed just the opportunity white army service afforded, to develop and exhibit whatever of manliness he possessed.” Morgan then declared where he stood on the argument: “The negro was a man worthy of freedom, and possessed of all the essential qualities of a good soldier, I early advocated the organization of colored regiments,—not for fatigue or garrison duty, but for field service.”

While recalling his first interactions with African American volunteers of the 14th U.S. Colored Infantry regiment in Gallatin, Tennessee, Morgan reminded GAR readers of slavery’s harsh realities and black volunteers’ aspirations. Upon arriving in camp, he noted that the African-American recruits were a disorganized and “motley crowd,” many of whom “had on the clothes in which they had left the plantations” and “bore the wounds and bruises of the slave-driver’s lash.” However, he was adamant about black soldiers’ martial abilities. Amidst the chaos of quickly organizing, training, and outfitting the regiment, Morgan recalled “the men, raw and untutored as they were, did guard and picket duty, went foraging, guarded wagon trains, scouted after guerrillas, and so learned

55 Morgan, “Reminiscences of Service with Colored Troops in the Army of the Cumberland, 1863-5,” Grand Army Sentinel, August 5, 1885, 33-34.
to soldier by soldiering.” While conducting physical exams of the recruits, Morgan noted that volunteers were motivated to fight for “very noble ideas of manliness.” One black recruit claimed he volunteered to “fight for freedom,” and discounted the battlefield’s perils because if he sacrificed his life to defeat the Confederacy, at least “my people will be free.” The volunteers’ responses convinced Morgan, and reminded GAR readers, that “these men, though black in skin, had men’s hearts…among them were the same verities of physique, temperament, mental and moral endowments and experiences, as would be found among the same number of white men.”

While recounting the regiment’s organization in early 1864, Morgan continued to speak glowingly of black troopers’ abilities and the radical impact a war for emancipation had upon whites and blacks. Although all the commissioned officers were white and all non-commissioned officers were black, Morgan asserted that the black non-commissioned officers were “very efficient, and had the war continued two years longer, many of them would have been competent as commissioned officers.” He also recalled the drastically altered interactions between white southerners and black troops in camp. While stationed at Gallatin, Morgan’s black troops acted as pickets and he remembered that

Many proud Southern slaveholders found themselves marched through the streets, guarded by those who, three months before, had been slaves. The negroes often laughed over these changed relations as they sat around their camp fires, or chatted together while off duty, but it was very rare that any Southerner had reason to complain of any unkind or uncivil treatment from a colored soldier.
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56 Morgan, “Reminiscences of Service with Colored Troops in the Army of the Cumberland, 1863-5,” *Grand Army Sentinel*, August 5, 1885, 34.
While Morgan fully recognized USCT troops’ claim to manhood and citizenship, he also unfavorably recalled the “great deal of bitter prejudice” some white northerners continued to harbor against black troops, as well as white officers who led African American regiments. Whereas some white troops threatened to desert before serving alongside African Americans, others stigmatized white USCT officers as “‘nigger officers,’ and negro soldiers were hooted at and mistreated by white troops.” Morgan also personally endured white northern officers’ hostility. During an 1864 New Year’s party in Nashville, an acquaintance and white officer from Ohio snubbed Morgan and insultingly remarked that, “he ‘did not recognize these nigger officers.’”58

Morgan reminded GAR readers of black soldiers’ martial prowess by recalling the regiment’s conduct under fire during early military campaigns. After being transferred to Chattanooga, Morgan’s black troops took part in their first engagement at the Battle of Dalton on August 14-15, 1864. Confederate General Joseph Wheeler’s cavalrymen attacked Union forces at Dalton, and Morgan’s regiment was sent from Chattanooga to help successfully fend off Wheeler’s attacking troops. On August 15, Morgan’s regiment formed a “line of battle” along the left side of the 51st Indiana Infantry regiment—a white regiment. Morgan admitted the actual “fight was short and not at all severe,” but emphasized its symbolic significance. He claimed it as “a great battle, and a glorious victory” because of his troops conduct. He recalled, “the regiment had been recognized as soldiers. It had taken its place side by side with a white regiment. It had been under fire. The men had behaved gallantly. A colored soldier had died for liberty. Others had shed their blood in the great cause.” Morgan’s troops also received the respect of fellow white

soldiers who had observed them in combat. After the battle, while Morgan’s men marched through downtown Dalton in a drenching rain, a nearby regiment of white troops “swung their hats and gave three rousing cheers.” Reminding Tennessee GAR readers of African Americans’ wartime sacrifices and efforts in securing their own freedom, Morgan recalled,

Just before going into the fight, Lieutenant Keinborts said to his men: ‘Boys, some of you may be killed, but remember, you are fighting for liberty.’ Henry Prince replied: ‘I am ready to die for liberty.’ In fifteen minutes he lay dead, a rifle ball through his heart, a willing martyr.\(^{59}\)

After fighting at Dalton, the regiment was stationed in Chattanooga for nearly a month, until September 27, 1864, when it was sent to support Major General Rousseau’s Union troops at Pulaski, who were facing General Nathan Bedford Forrest’s Rebel cavalry. Morgan recalled that he and his troops were well aware of Forrest’s infamous massacre of black soldiers at Fort Pillow a few months earlier, in April 1864, and that it was widely rumored that Forrest “offered a thousand dollars for the head of any commander of a ‘nigger’ regiment.” Morgan’s black troops eagerly went toe to toe with Forrest’s veteran cavalry. Morgan recalled that as the fighting intensified and columns of Forrest’s troops advanced,

Pointing to the advancing column I said, as I passed along the line: ‘Boys it looks very much like a fight. Keep cool; do your duty.’ They seemed full of glee, and replied with great enthusiasm: ‘Col’nel, dey can’t whip us; dey nebber git de ole 14\(^{th}\) out of heah, neber.’ ‘Nebber drives us away widout a mighty lot of dead men.’\(^{60}\)

Morgan’s men successfully withstood Forrest’s attack and returned to Chattanooga.

Though Morgan patronizingly reproduced his black troops’ speech patterns, the editorial

\(^{59}\) Morgan, “Reminiscences of Service with Colored Troops in the Army of the Cumberland, 1863-5,” Grand Army Sentinel, August 20, 1885, 50.

\(^{60}\) Ibid., 51.
reminded aging GAR readers of the centrality of race in the war by recalling African Americans’ martial zeal under fire against Forrest’s cavalrmen and one of the most infamous racial atrocities of the war.

Morgan concluded by recalling the Battle of Decatur, Alabama, and reminded GAR readers of the impact his men’s performance in the battle had on white soldiers’ racial outlooks. By the end of October 1864, General John Bell Hood’s Army of Tennessee advanced toward Nashville and attacked Robert S. Granger’s Union forces at Decatur. Morgan’s troops were sent from Chattanooga to reinforce Granger on October 27. The next day, he recalled his regiment’s successful charge against Confederate earthworks, and eventually capturing and spiking a battery of enemy artillery. The regiment’s actions not only “drew forth high praise from Generals Granger and [George H.] Thomas,” but, as at Dalton, white troops who had witnessed the charge afterward “gave us three rousing cheers.” Morgan concluded that his troops’ actions, and white soldiers’ reactions, illustrated “the change in public sentiment relative to colored troops.”

During annual encampment meetings, other black and white GAR members in Tennessee regularly reminded themselves of slavery, African Americans’ martial prowess, and that they had taken part in a war for emancipation. At the 1887 state encampment, in Knoxville, Edwin E. Winters reminded members of the war’s consequences while encouraging them to take part in Memorial Day observances. Winters, a white Michigan native who relocated to Nashville, quoted John A. Logan’s 1868 Memorial Day order, claiming that Memorial Day “should be observed…for
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61 Morgan, “Reminiscences of Service with Colored Troops in the Army of the Cumberland, 1863-5,” Grand Army Sentinel, August 20, 1885, 51.
decorating the graves of the loyal men who died in defense of their country and the liberty of all mankind.” 62 Five years later, at the 1892 state encampment, department commander Andrew J. Gahagan of Chattanooga encouraged members to attend the upcoming national encampment in Washington, D. C. by implying that members participated in Abraham Lincoln’s war of liberation. Gahagan reminded members that the nation’s capital was “where the great Emancipator, the immortal Lincoln, made and demonstrated his capacity as a great leader, and won a fame that will live as long as history lasts.”63 Then, in 1896, departmental chaplain Erastus M. Cravath of Nashville’s all-white post sent out a departmental-wide circular that encouraged members to take part in Memorial Day services by reminding them of the war’s significant issues and consequences. Cravath, a transplant from New York, not only claimed that fellow Union soldiers had “sacrificed and fought to restore the unity and integrity of our beloved country,” but also asserted that “the war resulted in the enfranchising of a race and of making freedom the birthright of every human being within our borders.”64 Five years later, in 1901, the assistant adjutant general Frank Seaman of Knoxville’s Ed Maynard post again beseeched members to take part in Memorial Day services by recalling that they had once helped liberate African Americans. Seaman, an Indiana native who had moved to Knoxville, proclaimed that GAR members should participate in Memorial Day services to commemorate their service in “that invincible army of freedom,” as well as their “ideal of liberty” and “patriotic sacrifice [that] was as clear as the sunlight of heaven.”65

62 GAR, Tennessee, Third Encampment (1887), 11.
63 GAR, Tennessee, Ninth Encampment (1892), 64.
64 GAR, Tennessee, Fourteenth Encampment (1897), 10.
65 GAR, Tennessee, Eighteenth Encampment (1901), 9.
While few photographs of black and white East Tennessee GAR members remain, one saved by William H. Nelson provides some insights into black veterans’ roles in the organization. Nelson was a native of Washington County, member of Johnson City’s post, and 1898 departmental commander. Amid his papers is an undated and unmarked photograph of eighty-nine GAR members gathered for an encampment (See Image 1). The photograph was taken at an encampment held in the eastern Tennessee highlands in the late 1890s, as the veterans are arranged in several rows on a hill, surrounded by dense hardwoods and mountain laurel. Most likely, it was at the 1899 encampment, held in Rockwood, since Nelson oversaw that meeting as commander. Among the eighty-nine Union veterans are five African Americans. However, they are standing along the periphery of the group. White members—especially the most prominent—stand in the center and front rows. Four black veterans stand together in the very last row, behind all the white members, while another stands in the fourth row along the far left margin of the group.66

The image illustrates African Americans’ role in Tennessee’s GAR. White comrades certainly accepted black veterans and the organization provided black veterans interracial comradeship. East Tennessee’s black GAR members were quite active in black and integrated posts. Yet, as shown in Nelson’s photograph, black veterans remained on the fringe. A few black veterans achieved minor leadership positions, but white members remained at the forefront of the organization. White veterans did remember African Americans’ wartime sacrifices and emancipation as a key consequence of the Civil War,

66 See Image 1. Grand Army of the Republic Photograph, undated, in William Henley Nelson Family Papers, Series IV, box 5. Dr. Patricia Hunt-Hurst of the University of Georgia confirmed the photograph is from the late 1890s, based on the veterans’ facial hair, vests, and neckties.
but they were ambivalent on race in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Like the mountain landscape in which they resided, black GAR members remained on uneven ground in Tennessee’s Grand Army of the Republic.
CHAPTER 4

“HELPING EACH OTHER FORGET THE PAST DIVISION AND STRIFE”: EAST TENNESSEE’S GAR AND RECONCILIATION

The morning dawned bright and beautiful in Knoxville on April 14, 1887. By midmorning, black and white GAR members met for the third annual state encampment, and that evening, according to the local press, they took part in a “very remarkable procession.”1 After the formal GAR meetings ended, a crowd of blue and gray-clad veterans formed up at Market Square and began parading up and down Knoxville’s streets “under the one flag of America.” The former foes eventually made their way to the courthouse for a public reception. One editorial gushed, “Here in Knoxville, twenty-two years after the cessation of hostilities between the two great sections…was seen the men who fought under the bonnie blue flag and the men who carried the starry flag of the Union…marching together in peaceful, friendly union and helping each other to forget the past division and strife.”2

Once the veterans arrived at the courthouse, GAR and United Confederate Veteran (UCV) leaders seated themselves on stage next to Knoxville’s wartime mayor James C. Lutrell. One newspaperman estimated that “over five hundred people of every nationality, religion and political creed” crowded into the hall to observe the exercises.

---

After every seat filled and available standing room taken, spectators jostled outside windows to catch snippets of the presentations.\(^3\)

Expressions of reconciliation and fraternal feelings saturated the program. Tennessee’s departmental commander William J. Ramage opened the reception by introducing Confederate veteran H. H. Taylor. Taylor “welcomed the Grand Army boys” to Knoxville, and claimed that “all the scars of sectional strife” had healed and that “we meet as friends and citizens of a common country.” After Taylor’s speech concluded, former state GAR leader Edwin E. Winters took the speaker’s stand and, on behalf of the Union veterans in attendance, echoed Taylor’s sentiments. Winters, a Michigan native who had relocated to Nashville and led Tennessee’s GAR the previous year, attempted to assuage any misgivings former Rebels in attendance may have against the GAR. He assured them that the GAR’s “purpose is not to keep alive the prejudices and animosities of the war, but to heal the scars and promote the peace of the common country.”\(^4\)

The vivacious Henry R. Gibson then took the floor, and welcomed the visiting Union veterans on behalf of local members of Ed Maynard post. Gibson integrated reconciliation with New South boosterism. He claimed, “Here is the New South; and the coal, iron and marble, the stones which the builders of the Old South rejected have become the headstones in the corner of our prosperity…We have made peace with the enemy, and they have divided their rations with us.”\(^5\) Captain Alex Allison, a member of Knoxville’s Felix K. Zollicoffer UCV camp, responded in kind on behalf of local Confederate veterans. He declared, “The ante-bellum sectional differences…have been


forever relegated to the tomb of the Capulets….What is past is past, and now there
abideth for us all but one country, one people, one flag and one destiny.” He admitted,
“there is a subtle, unseen, yet magical and potent bond of sympathy and kinship, between
the Union and Confederate veterans.” However, with a tinge of defiance, Allison
asserted, “I have no apology to offer for the course I pursued in the great struggle of the
factions, to those who differed with me, I most unhesitatingly concede…the same high
and holy convictions of duty and of right.”

General William J. Smith of Memphis concluded the program by emphasizing the
uniqueness of the meeting and number of Union veterans in eastern Tennessee. “It beats
anything I ever saw,” Smith claimed. He asserted that such a joint meeting would be
impossible to hold in the western portion of the state, because “the ex-Federals would be
swallowed up by the ex-Confederates. But we get along all the same.” The speeches
brought down the house in ringing cheers, and afterward the veterans paraded back to
Market Square, where they enjoyed a banquet with guests and family members at
Confederate veteran Peter Kern’s elegant ice cream parlor. The program was just one of
many public events in which Union and Confederate veterans gathered in post-war East
Tennessee.

Recently, a number of historians have argued over the extent to which Union and
Confederate veterans advocated reconciliation throughout the late-nineteenth and early-
twentieth centuries. A number of historians, including David Blight and Nina Silber, have

---
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examined how white northerners re-conceptualized the American family to include former Confederates. Silber, in particular, argued that sectional tensions dwindled as northerners embraced elements of Lost Cause ideology—especially the romanticized antebellum South. However, other historians, such as Barbara Gannon, Caroline E. Janney, and M. Keith Harris have argued that veterans who donned either the gray or blue never fully forgave each other. In particular, Gannon asserted that GAR members, mostly from the North, continued to censure former Confederates for committing treason.\(^8\)

However, no one has examined in-depth the rapport between Union veterans and former Rebels in the postwar South. Thus, this chapter focuses on East Tennessee GAR members’ outlooks on their ex-Confederate neighbors and provides a more nuanced understanding of reconciliation efforts among veterans. Union veterans’ public and private commentary on former Rebels illustrate GAR members’ ambivalence. Grand Army comrades did not forget that Confederates had committed treason in state encampment meetings, local GAR publications, especially the *Grand Army Sentinel*, as well as during holidays, commemorations, and reunions. However, GAR members maintained moral superiority by offering to forgive Confederates’ past transgressions. When commemorating Tennessee mountaineers’ contributions to Union victory, comrades took great pains do so without offending their ex-Confederate neighbors. In particular, they emphasized forgiveness, mutual loss and suffering, and fraternalism. Additionally, members attempted to allay infrequent outbursts of sectional tensions.

White Grand Army men in East Tennessee interacted with former Rebels on a daily basis and pragmatically emphasized reconciliation to a greater extent than their northern counterparts did.

Published articles and editorials in the *Grand Army Sentinel* provide some of the earliest insights into Tennessee GAR members’ attitudes toward their former enemies. The official organ of Tennessee’s GAR, the *Sentinel* was published semi-monthly between 1885 and 1886, first in Chattanooga and then in Nashville. The short-lived newspaper not only published articles detailing cordial wartime and postwar interactions between Union and Confederate soldiers, but also postwar sectional tensions.

The *Sentinel*’s “Creed” illustrated GAR members’ ambivalence toward former Confederates. Published in the opening pages of the inaugural issue of July 5, 1885, as well as in subsequent issues, the Creed unabashedly declared that former Confederates were guilty of disloyalty. The second line asserted that GAR members, “believe secession to have been treason, and that treason is a crime.” However, the Creed immediately attempted to temper the criticism. The third and fourth lines stated, “We do not believe that the penalty of treason should always be death, but that a crime is punishable in proportion to the gravity of the offense” and that “We believe the war is over; that it ended at Appomattox where full pardon was granted to our erring countrymen.” The editors then placed GAR members on the moral high ground by advocating forgiveness. The next lines stated, “We have no axes to grind…We do not believe that it is humane, or Christian-like, to continually flaunt in their faces, the sins of those who have once been freely forgiven.” The Creed concluded, “We do not believe that, in order to wield…power, it is necessary to still wage a war which ended a quarter of a century
The Creed revealed that although GAR members in Tennessee believed that
Confederate next-door neighbors had gone astray, they had done so in the past.
Tennessee Union veterans should endeavor to judge not, lest they be judged.

One month later, in August 1885, the Sentinel attempted to douse sectional
resentments enflamed by a southern newspaperman. An outspoken and anonymous
editor—who used the pseudonym “Critic”—of the Decatur, Alabama News published a
scathing indictment of Chattanooga GAR member and Reverend Thomas C. Warner for
comments made during his Memorial Day address a few months earlier. The Sentinel
defended Warner. Warner had served in the 4th Ohio Infantry regiment during the war
and afterward relocated to Chattanooga and joined Lookout post. He was serving as
departmental chaplain at the time of the speech. According to the Sentinel, Warner had
declared, “Our brethren in the South were, in the main, thoroughly honest in their
convictions; and the principles for which they fought, they held as sacredly as did we of
the North.” However, Warner then claimed, “This honesty of conviction, did not however,
relieve the act of secession from the odium and character of treason.” The editor then
asserted, “That, in its entirety, is the objectionable remark” and added, “There were many
ex-Confederates present and listened to that address, and we did not hear then, nor have
we since heard from them, any expression of dissatisfaction or disgust.” The Sentinel
then reprinted the Critic’s editorial.

The Critic—who the Sentinel editor dubbed an “egotistical ass”—blamed
“radical” Northern Methodists like Warner for reopening wartime wounds. He declared
that Warner’s comments were “insulting to all men and women who revere the memories

9 “Our Creed,” Grand Army Sentinel 2 (July 5, 1885): 1, 5, McClung Collection.
of our dead who wore the grey.” The Critic went on to declare that in the wake of Warner’s speech, “the most conservative ex-Rebel can no longer accord to him that sincere and Christian feeling…and his influence has been totally destroyed, except among the negroes and his own ilk among the whites.” The Critic defiantly concluded that Warner believed that “secession was treason, and that the instigators of it, of course, were traitors” and that if southern statesmen like Jefferson Davis, Alexander Stephens, and Robert Toombs were traitors, then “I was, and so was every other confederate soldier.”

The Sentinel editor responded by reasserting that Rebels had committed treason. The Grand Army newspaperman declared, “Replying to the query if it can be agreed that Walker, Davis, Yancey, Toombs, et al., were traitors, we assume to answer with the most emphatic YES. Not alone they, who were instigators and leaders in the rebellion of states, but the lowest, even down to the ‘Critic’ himself, were all, in the strictest sense of the term, traitors to their country.” However, the GAR editor placed Union veterans on the moral high ground by claiming that they had forgiven their former foes and welcomed them back into the national fold. It declared,

The Sentinel claims amongst its warmest friends, many who bore arms against us, and our true feelings for them are expressed in the words of an honored contemporary: ‘Our heart goes out in full and free forgiveness to the brave and heroic ones who sacrificed so much for the lost cause; we feel no unkind animosities, because of their mistaken opinions; but on the contrary, can, and will extend to them the hand of kindness and sympathy, according to them the same God-given and inherited right of free thinkers, which we claim, and feel they are willing to accord to us.’

12 Ibid., 41.
The Sentinel editor’s attempt to dispel lingering sectional animosities illustrates Tennessee Grand Army members’ understanding of their unique situation in the postwar South. The editor, like many GAR comrades in the Volunteer State, maintained that Confederates had committed treason, but attempted to retain the moral high ground and pragmatically maintain harmony in their communities. Additionally, the editor almost certainly rejected the notion that the Critic spoke for all white southerners in an attempt to reassure those northern readers considering relocating to, and investing in, the South that they would be treated kindly.

The Sentinel also emphasized reconciliation by publishing articles on Union and Confederate veterans’ cordial interactions in East Tennessee—especially at funerals. One article recounted the procession of Knoxville’s most prominent Union and Confederate veterans at GAR member James M. Melton’s funeral on August 8, 1885. William R. Carter, of Knoxville’s Ed Maynard post, related, “at our request, ex-Confederates joined with us and marched side by side with ex-Federals to the National cemetery.” Carter then courteously noted that among the most prominent eulogists was “Rev. W. H. Bays, who was a gallant soldier with General R. E. Lee.”

Four months later, in December 1885, the Sentinel reported on GAR members’ cordial response to the establishment of Knoxville’s Felix K. Zollicoffer Camp of the UCV. According to one editorial, Union veterans passed a resolution declaring, “the old war-time feelings of the comrades of the G. A. R. have long since given place to those of respect and esteem for the brave men who were once our foes.” It went on to state, “be it Resolved, That the kindly greeting of Ed. Maynard Post…be sent to the members of

Zollicoffer Post…with the assurance of our sincere well-wishes for the success and prosperity of their organization.”

The rhetoric of fraternalism even permeated the Sentinel’s subscription advertisements. In a December 5, 1885, advertisement, the Grand Army editors not only pressed readers to purchase subscriptions by claiming that the Sentinel proved the “only Union Soldier-Paper of the South” that kept “posts accurately and early informed of official orders and operations,” but also encouraged “fraternization with us of many thousands of ex-Confederates whose hearts yearn for fellowship with us.” It went on to declare,

The Sentinel truly seeks to heal the wounds of war and not keep them open with festering hatreds and by-gone issues. It believes the war to be actually over. To the Confederate, who honestly as bravely fought on the side of the Rebellion, we advocate amnesty in our sentiments in addition to that which he has already received legally….Can we not, ought we not, to forgive the honest, mistaken, brave Confederate, our fellow citizen, our National if not our natural brother, of the same race with ourself, speaking the same kindly tongue, worshipping the same God, heirs of the same revolutionary forefathers?….let us forgive, though we may not forget.

While the Sentinel editors included articles on contemporary events to advocate reconciliation, they also published wartime reminiscences to promote reunion. In the August 5, 1885, edition, the editor published a letter from one Lucy King. King dubbed herself a “rebel girl,” but recalled amiable feelings between Federal troops and native southerners during her childhood. She claimed that as a little girl, “we were on the best of terms with the [Union] soldiers stationed as ‘guards’ in the different families in our neighborhood and used to have no end of fun with them.”

---
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recounted cordial wartime interactions among Yankees and Rebels, the GAR editors’
were attempting to cultivate those same feelings in postwar Tennessee.

Five months later, in January 1886, Sentinel editors again sought to encourage
reconciliation by publishing a letter from A. S. Johnston of Leavenworth, Kansas, to then
state GAR commander Edward S. Jones. Johnston served as forage master for General
Phillip Sheridan’s Division in 1863 as the unit traveled through eastern Tennessee.
Within the January 12, 1886 letter, Johnston recollected amiable wartime feelings toward
East Tennessee Rebels. He admitted, “I was the unfortunate fellow who had to take
[Confederates’] corn, wheat, oats, and fodder in untold quantities. Yet, thank God, I
never had it in my heart to allow me to treat any one unkindly, nor to strip them of their
all; for I invariably advised them to secrete enough for family use, and for their animals
and darkeys.” After absolving himself of his wartime deeds, he asserted that
contemporary lawmakers in Washington should provide reparations to southerners,
regardless of wartime loyalty. Johnston suggested that government officials should “pay
for all honorable losses for supplies furnished for the support of our armies by non-
combatants, whether loyal or not, and thereby aid the ‘South’ in recuperating her
strength” in order to mend any lingering sectional animosities.17

The Grand Army newspapermen also recounted more painful wartime tales to
readers, while at the same time encouraging reconciliation by emphasizing mutual loss
and pain suffered by all. One article, “Two Tragedies in Knoxville at the Outbreak of the
War,” appeared on the front page of the December 5, 1885 edition and recounted the

---
wartime deaths of Unionist Charles Douglas and Confederate William R. Caswell in Knoxville.

The column initially recalled Douglas’s death— the “first tragedy in Knoxville growing purely out of the war.” On May 12, 1861, a gathering of local Unionists raised the Stars and Stripes on a liberty pole at the corner of Gay and Main streets, and listened to speeches made by Judge Connelly F. Trigg and Colonel John M. Fleming. Charles Douglas was among the crowd. A native Irishman known as a hard-drinking and “violent man,” Douglas was an outspoken Democrat, Unionist, and friend of Andrew Johnson. According to the article, minutes after the flag raising, Douglas exchanged heated words with local Rebel officers—Major Wash Morgan and Captain Morelock. Suddenly, Morgan and Morelock drew pistols and fired at Douglas. Amid the hail of bullets, Douglas fled to his nearby room at the Lamar House, only slightly wounded in the neck. He holed up in his room with a double-barreled shotgun. Though Morgan and Morelock had missed their mark, a civilian bystander named Ball lay mortally wounded from one of their stray bullets.18

The next day, two companies of Colonel John C. Vaughn’s Rebel troops paraded through the streets and drew Douglas’s attention. As he looked out the front window, a stray bullet dropped the Unionist, mortally wounded. The editorial recalled that “there was something of the martyr in the manner of his taking off, and few Confederates realize how much influence his killing had embittered the East Tennessee war Unionists.” The author was careful not to implicate specific Rebels, and potentially anger ex-Confederate

readers. Instead, he vaguely concluded that the incident “was but one of many of like character, which unfortunately occurred to exasperate feelings on both sides.”

The author then recounted the murder of Confederate General William R. Caswell. The editorial glowingly recalled that Caswell was an affable and distinguished lawyer in Dandridge, Tennessee who had served honorably in the Mexican-American War. In the spring and summer of 1861, Governor Isham G. Harris commissioned Caswell to drill and train Rebel troops at a camp near his home—a few miles east of Knoxville. Caswell regularly walked along a wooded path from his home to the camp. In early August, his corpse was discovered along the trail. Caswell had been bludgeoned to death. Initially, Rebel authorities suspected vengeful Unionists, but each suspect brought before a military examination was found innocent.

The editorial then absolved white local Unionists—and implicitly white GAR readers—by alleging that an unnamed runaway slave had murdered Caswell. Employing contemporary racial stereotypes, the author recalled, “At this day comparatively few persons have a just conception of what a runaway negro was or how he was regarded. He was a terror to [white] women and children, and by the men was regarded as an outlawed creature.” Authorities alleged that Caswell likely stumbled upon the fugitive slave and attempted to apprehend him, not realizing he had forgotten his pistols at home. The fugitive waylaid the prominent Rebel and fled. The article declared, “this negro was his murderer,” and that he had struck Caswell who was “unarmed at the time of his death.” The editorial concluded, “The murder of Gen. Caswell was one of the most melancholy and universally deplored early incidents of the war. The Union people themselves

19 Ibid.
deplored his death for the double reason that he was a kind and liberal man, and the occurrence only served to render the situation more disagreeable and perilous for themselves.” Both murders had no distinct perpetrators, just a nameless, faceless stray bullet and an alleged fugitive slave. Thus, white Union and Confederate veterans could reach across the bloody chasm by recognizing the shared wartime loss and suffering endured by all parties.20

In addition to touting sectional reconciliation and fraternalism within the *Grand Army Sentinel*, Tennessee GAR members regularly tendered a rhetorical olive branch to ex-Confederates during many annual state encampments throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Department Commander Edward S. Jones emphasized reconciliation during the first annual encampment of 1885, held in Chattanooga. Jones opened his Commander’s Address by claiming that the state veteran organization’s purpose was not to open old wounds, but “our mission to-day is one of peace.”21 Tennessee native William Rule echoed Jones’s feelings during the next day’s session. When fellow members pressed Rule into speaking, he stated that he “was glad to forget the past with its dead, and hoped all would unite every effort to build up this beautiful southland of ours.”22

During the same meeting, East Tennessee members were even receptive to admitting those conscripted into Confederate service against their will, who later deserted and served honorably in the Union military. Proponents suggested appealing to national GAR leaders to amend the strict membership policy that prohibited anyone from joining

---

who had borne arms against the United States. They sought to distinguish between those who volunteered for the Rebel cause and those who were forced into Confederate service at the point of a bayonet. Charles A. Beckert, of Cullman, Alabama, put forward a preliminary resolution that would allow any “ex-Union soldiers who were forced by conscription, or otherwise, into the Confederate service” to join the GAR. James F. Kirk of Greeneville, Tennessee—and brother of famous Union raider George W. Kirk—noted the precariousness of the issue. He claimed that Beckert’s resolution needed revision because he “knew many who went into the Rebel army of their own accord, and as soon as called further South, deserted and joined the Union ranks.” William F. McCarron of Athens, Tennessee agreed. He asserted that the resolution should explicitly “exclude all voluntary Rebel soldiers, and yet do justice to those who were known to have been forced against their will” into Confederate ranks. Members carried Kirk’s motion to amend the resolution, and bar only those who “voluntarily” bore arms against the Union. Members forwarded the resolution to national GAR leaders for debate, but northern members rejected it.

Despite the setback in 1885, the Tennesseans pressed national GAR officials to admit Confederate conscripts each year between 1888 and 1890. During the 1888 encampment, native Pennsylvanian and member of Knoxville’s Ed Maynard post, William J. Ramage broached the topic. He asserted that national leaders add the prefix “voluntarily” to Article IV, Chapter I of the rules that banned those who bore arms against the Union. Ramage claimed,

it is well known to all of us that we have in our midst men, who in the stormy days of 1861-2, were true to the Union and to the flag of their country,
but...either a prison cell or enforced service in the Confederate army was offered them. Many of them chose the latter, with a firm resolve to use the first opportunity to come into the ranks of the Union army. This, hundreds of them did, and they to-day hold honorable discharges from regiments of the Union army.25

Assistant adjutant general, William A. Gage agreed. Gage, a native Ohioan and lawyer in Knoxville, described the uniquely southern issue facing GAR posts in Dixie—especially those in the eastern Tennessee highlands. Recounting his inspection of various posts across the state, he hyperbolically claimed that “I find that we have a great many old soldiers in this Department who have an honorable discharge for service rendered in the time of our country’s peril, and men who performed some of the most heroic acts of valor...debarred from coming into the ranks.” He then recalled that while attempting to help organize a nearby post,

I learned, to my great surprise, that six out of the eighteen [comrades] had been mustered into the Confederate army. I found upon inquiry, that these men were natives of the county...men who had always been loyal and their loyalty was beyond question; men who left the Confederate army at the first opportunity, and after spending weeks in the hills and mountains without food and shelter, reached the Federal lines and went into our army, and served our country until the end of the war.

He concluded, “this, comrades, is the class of men that I hope you will make an effort in their behalf to the National Encampment...This resolution has got to come from a Southern Department; from those of us who know these men, and what it cost to be a loyal man.”26 Despite the East Tennesseans’ persistent attempts to explain the ambiguity of wartime loyalties in the region, national leaders refused to revise the rules and voted down the resolutions year after year.27
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27 GAR, Tennessee, Fourth Encampment (1888), 69.
Regardless of national leaders’ stringent policies, local Grand Army men circumvented official rules and publicly honor those Union veterans barred from the GAR. During the 1888 encampment, members adopted a resolution that invited Union veterans who had been Rebel conscripts to participate in public gatherings and national holidays—especially Memorial Day exercises. They sought to recognize them “in an informal way as ‘Comrades.’” Additionally, comrades would see to it that these veterans “are officially assigned a place in line” during GAR parades. The resolution also recommended that local GAR members provide the official burial rites upon “the death of any of these Union veterans.”

White East Tennessee GAR members continued to tout reconciliation during state annual encampments throughout the 1890s. During the 1894 encampment in Greeneville, Newton Hacker employed reconciliationist rhetoric within a report submitted to the entire department. Hacker was a Greene County native, judge, and member of Jonesborough’s Post 35. Besides advocating for renewed GAR support of local members of Sons of Union Veterans and Woman’s Relief Corps, Hacker’s resolution claimed, “The bitter feelings of the war are rapidly dying out” and that “those who wore the blue and those who wore the gray are emulating each other in a common devotion to the stars and stripes.”

Two years later, in 1896, department commander W. J. Smith of Memphis claimed that East Tennessee mountaineers were at the forefront of reconciliation efforts in the state. He asserted, “history will record…the early healing of the wounds of the nation” and that “a great example was early and nobly set by the brave men of the

---
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mountain section of our beloved State.” According to Smith, Tennessee highlanders were paragons of national reconciliation, since mountaineers had overcome such deep-seated wartime divisions. Smith claimed that in East Tennessee, “neighbor had fought against neighbor and even families had divided and taken opposite sides in the great struggle.” But, immediately after Appomattox, “those who had been in the field deadly enemies, gathered...there to clasp the hand of neighborly concord and unity once more, to let bygones be of the past and together” Smith alleged.\textsuperscript{30}

GAR leaders’ reconciliationist assertions were not simply idle talk. East Tennessee GAR members and ex-Confederates regularly took part in public demonstrations of good will. In particular, GAR members and ex-Confederates in various East Tennessee communities made reconciliationist overtures during Memorial Day celebrations. During Knoxville’s 1886 Memorial Day ceremonies, the \textit{Knoxville Journal} reported that members of the local Zollicoffer UCV post presented an “American Eagle” flower arrangement to GAR residents. During the festivities, Washington L. Ledgerwood—a native Tennessean and local GAR member of Ed Maynard post—publicly thanked his UCV neighbors for the flowers and claimed the overture “was evident that the most patriotic and kindly feelings now exist between the boys who wore the blue and the boys who wore the gray.” According to the column, Ledgerwood predicted, “if an invader would insult that flag of the two united armies now, the boys of the gray and the boys of the blue would be found side by side defending that old flag and the proud bird of the mountain.”\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{30} GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Thirteenth Encampment} (1896), 45.
During the next year’s Memorial Day services, in 1887, members of the Zollicoffer UCV post again publicly presented a large floral offering to local GAR members. A card of good will accompanied the arrangement. It read, “We beg that you will accept this humble floral tribute…as an evidence of the cordial friendship and chivalric regard we entertain for the brave men who were once our honorable foes…the gentle hands of reconciliation and patriotism should forever bury out of sight the animosities of the war.”

During the 1899 encampment, held in the mountain town of Rockwood, GAR chaplain Isaac A. Pearce noted the amiable feelings among Union and Confederate veterans during Memorial Day celebrations. Pearce was a Pennsylvania native who served as the 139th Pennsylvania Infantry regiment’s chaplain during the war, and afterward relocated to Knoxville and joined Ed Maynard post. He found it “noteworthy” that during local Memorial Day services there was an “absence of a spirit of enmity on these public occasions” and even claimed there were “indications of increased charity and brotherly feeling for those who so bravely confronted [each other] during the years of war.” Pearce noted that the “intermingling of veterans on both sides and by the interchange of flowers on Memorial Day” illustrated “the firmer cementation of the whole citizenship of the Nation. Such conditions are more significant in our State of Tennessee than they could be in more Northern States.”

Like many other contemporaries, Pearce recognized the Tennessee highlands as the frontline of postwar national reunion.

---
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East Tennessee Grand Army members continued to advocate reconciliation into the twentieth century; however, they were persistent that that their Rebel neighbors had erred—in the past. On February 22, 1905, Department Commander Benjamin A. Hamilton issued General Order Number 3, which encouraged comrades across the Volunteer State to conduct themselves with deportment during the upcoming thirty-fourth anniversary of Robert E. Lee’s surrender on April 9. Hamilton, an Ohio native, accountant, and member of Knoxville’s Ed Maynard post, recommended that comrades refrain from gloating and instead “observe this day as one of thanksgiving—thanks that peace came and has reigned since…[and] thanks that the result of the struggle has proved so beneficial alike to us and to our foes.” He went on to assert that Grand Army members should empathize with Confederates, regardless of whether they were guilty of treason. “True, they were fighting for a cause, as we believed, and still believe, was radically wrong, yet we of the Grand Army well know, they were brave and valorous…[but] they were Americans—worthy of the name, and today ninety-nine one hundredths of them stand as firmly as we for the flag,” Hamilton stated. He concluded, “In the words of our great invincible leader [Ulysses S. Grant]—‘Let us have peace.’”

Two years later, in May 1907, Department Commander William A. McTeer also urged comrades to organize public GAR programs as often as possible, but to exhibit discretion. McTeer advised all posts to “let deeds of patriotism and valor be rehearsed…[and] impress these facts upon the minds of our rising citizenship” during public meetings. However, he cautioned, “In doing so, be careful to eliminate any and all tendency toward bitterness. The enemy surrendered in 1865. Let further conquest be with

---
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weapons of love and peace.” He insisted that comrades refrain from recalling tales of wartime atrocities, as it would open old wounds. “Stories of outrages by the few bloodthirsty” bushwhackers and scavengers who “followed the columns of either army ought not to be told as the acts of soldiers,” McTeer counseled. He concluded, “Impress it upon the minds of the present and coming generations” that local GAR comrades championed “the rights of those who fought in Confederate ranks and their descendants as to any other American citizen.”

McTeer, like many other white Tennessee Grand Army comrades, preferred to absolve conventional Federal and Rebel veterans by attributing wartime misdeeds to anonymous and nameless “blood-thirsty” guerrillas.

McTeer maintained his conciliatory stance three years later, in 1910, over the commemoration of the infamous Shelton Laurel Massacre. On January 8, 1863, John L. Kirk—brother of George Kirk, who organized the 2nd and 3rd North Carolina Mounted Infantry regiments, and James F. Kirk who helped found Burnside post in Greeneville—led about 50 Union sympathizers and Confederate deserters on a raid of Marshall, the county seat of Madison County, North Carolina. The raiders seized Confederate salt rations and provisions, and ransacked the home of prominent Rebel Colonel Lawrence Allen. In retaliation, Colonel Allen and Lieutenant Colonel James Keith mobilized a Confederate force that arrested fifteen suspected assailants from Shelton Laurel. Though two detainees escaped, Allen and Keith’s troops summarily executed the remaining thirteen prisoners on January 18, 1863. Among those executed, “seven shared the Shelton name; both the oldest, sixty-five years old, and the youngest, twelve, were named David
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Shelton…the latter watched his father and older brother shot in the first group and put up the most impassioned plea for mercy before he was killed with the second group.”\(^{36}\)

On September 14, 1910, Presbyterian minister and resident of Unicoi County, which borders Madison County, North Carolina, Frederick Lee Webb wrote to McTeer about erecting a monument to commemorate the Shelton Laurel victims. Likely seeking out the support of McTeer and other local GAR members, Webb related that he had “about succeeded in writing the Govt [federal government]” and “gone to the extent of raising interest for the erection of a monument at their grave.” He included a rough sketch of the proposed monument for McTeer’s perusal, which was a pyramid of river rocks with two tablets listing the names of the victims and describing the massacre itself. Webb hoped to have it completed in time for the “anniversary of the massacre,” and concluded, “the war is over but still I believe in teaching many of these things to the rising generation.”\(^{37}\) McTeer responded in a cautioning tone. He admitted that it was “right to hold these massacres in mind, and hand them down. There is a great lesson in them.” However, he concluded, “it is not right to hold the authorities responsible for them unless they have connived at the crimes.” Though modern historians have long recognized that conventional Rebel forces committed the massacre, the pragmatic McTeer did not want to raise the ire of local Confederate veterans by memorializing the Shelton Laurel Massacre. Lacking the support from McTeer and other mountain GAR members, Webb’s monument was never built.\(^{38}\)


\(^{37}\) Frederick Lee Webb to Will A. McTeer, September 14, 1910, Will A. McTeer Papers, McClung Collection.

\(^{38}\) Will A. McTeer to Frederick Lee Webb, September 16, 1910, Will A. McTeer Papers, McClung Collection.
Highland GAR leaders also advocated discretion during controversies over schoolchildren’s textbooks and patriotic education. Since the late 1880s, GAR members across the country undertook a campaign calling for “correct” Civil War history textbooks and instilling patriotic values among school children. Comrades challenged textbooks deemed sympathetic toward the Confederacy—especially those that justified secession, damned Lincoln and Northerners as aggressors, and portrayed Confederate leaders as martyred saints.39 Like their northern counterparts, Tennessee GAR leaders resented Lost Cause proponents and advocated patriotic instruction in mountain schools. At the 1892 state encampment, Louis C. Mills complained, “The sentiment ‘to have been a [Confederate] leader in the Rebellion’ is the highest type of patriotism, goes too much unchallenged, and we are often made to feel that to have been loyal left marks of disgrace upon us.”40 Yet, in 1910, departmental commander D. Minor Steward recognized the sectional tensions that may accompany such efforts in mountain schools, and urged tactfulness. Steward, an Ohio native who relocated to Chattanooga as a manufacturer and member of Lookout post, recognized “the great value of Patriotic Instruction in all communities” and that “flag presentations to all schools should be kept up.” He even suggested that GAR members encourage “the children take part, and teach them to love and defend that dear old flag with their lives, and to honor the memory of the Soldier.” However, Steward insisted the Union veterans “urge upon all school teachers the duty of teaching patriotism, not sectionalism.”41

39 McConnell, Glorious Contentment, 224-226.
40 GAR, Tennessee, Ninth Encampment (1892), 99.
41 “Commander’s Address” in GAR, Tennessee, Twenty-seventh Encampment (1910), n.p.
In addition to their reconciliationist rhetoric, Tennessee GAR members also supported state pensions for Confederates. In January 1893, Department Commander Henry C. Whitaker encouraged members to support increased state taxes to aid Rebel pensioners in his General Order No. 9. Whitaker was a New York native who served in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} New York Cavalry regiment and resettled in New Market. He claimed, “The comrades of the Grand Army in Tennessee make no complaint that they are taxed by the State to pay pensions to the disabled soldiers of the rebel army; on the contrary, many active comrades of our organization have warmly approved giving these pensions.” He concluded, “Brave men bear no malice.”\textsuperscript{42}

Eighteen years later, in 1911, Department Commander Ignaz Fanz reiterated reconciliation and the state GAR’s support of pensions for Tennessee Confederates. Fanz—who was originally from the German state of Baden, served in the 6\textsuperscript{th} Tennessee Infantry, and member of Knoxville’s Ed Maynard Post 14—stated in his Commander’s Address that “Here [in East Tennessee] during the civil war where the bitterest of feeling existed I can truthfully say that the blue and the gray do not live more peacefully in any part of this Union.” He went on to claim, “I am glad of the privilege of paying some taxes towards pensioning ex-Confederate Veterans” and only regretted that state officials were not “more liberal with them and pay them more.”\textsuperscript{43}

White GAR members also took a reconciliatory tone during the 1901 public dedication of the Union Soldiers’ Monument at Knoxville’s National Cemetery. Newton Hacker provided the public address. Though Hacker recounted the causes of the Civil War, and asserted that many white southerners perceived Lincoln’s election as “the doom

\textsuperscript{42} “General Order No. 9,” in GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Tenth Encampment} (1893), 19-20.
\textsuperscript{43} “Commander’s Address,” in GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Twenty-eighth Encampment} (1911), n.p.
of African slavery,” he went on to declare that like many local GAR members, he entertained “no unkind feelings for any man because he differed with me in the great civil war.” He not only recognized that “in the last few years the boys who wore the blue and the boys who wore the grey have fought side by side and under the Stars and Stripes against” Spain in the Spanish-American War, but also noted that the assassination of President McKinley brought northerners and southerners together in mutual mourning. He asserted that in the wake of McKinley’s death, “the tears of the southland and the tears of the northland fell upon his bier in one common sorrow. Sectional lines and sectional distinctions are fast fading out of sight.” He went on to beseech former Confederates, “come, let us be brothers again—let the dead past bury its dead—only be loyal and true…bury forever all sectional hate—only let us in the future stand shoulder to shoulder against any foreign foe.”

Despite Tennessee GAR members’ reconciliationist public rhetoric and demonstrations, privately, sectional tensions simmered just below the surface. At the 1895 annual encampment, department commander William E. F. Milburn of Greeneville recognized the lingering sectional animosities when describing the state organization’s condition. Milburn—a native of Greene County, who served in the 12th Tennessee Cavalry regiment, and resided in Greeneville as a lawyer—acknowledged that Tennessee’s GAR labored under “many disadvantages, and is confronted by many obstacles, which are unknown to the Departments organized in loyal states.” In addition to acknowledging the logistical challenges facing members who lived great distances from posts, Milburn noted that some Union veterans declined GAR membership for fear
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44 “Address of Comrade Newton Hacker on the Occasion of the Dedication of the Monument to the memory of the Union Soldiers of Tennessee, National Cemetery, October 24, 1901, 62, 67-68.
of suffering neighbors’ scorn. He stated, “in many localities, the gibes, jeers, the scorn and the boycotts that are given to men because they wore the blue, and now dare to wear the badge of the Grand Army of the Republic, causes others to forego the honor of belonging to our Order.” He went on to state,

In some localities the old Federal soldier is a stench in the nostrils of his unrepentant neighbors to whom the soldiers do not now seem to ever have been a necessity. To these a Grand Army Post is a horror, a nightmare, an object of contempt; the butt of ridicule and the focus of thirty-five years growth of malice and ever-increasing hatred….These same unmitigated scoundrels and ingrates never let an opportunity pass to indiscriminately taunt soldiers as fraudulent pensioners, as thieves and perjurers, and Grand Army men as frauds and camp followers.45

Yet, Milburn was quick to absolve Confederate veterans of reviving sectional animosity.

“This jealous spirit of hatred toward Federal soldiers and pensioners,” he wrote, “is not often found among the brave soldiers who met us so often on the fields of battle….Both those who wore the blue, and those who wore the gray, have a feeling for each other of sympathy and respect that does not and cannot exist among other men…. brave men always respect brave men.”46

Though Milburn advocated feelings of friendship among Rebel and Federal veterans, at the closed meeting of Union veterans he maintained that reconciliation did not entail kowtowing to Confederates and accepting the Lost Cause ideology. GAR members had fought for the right and Confederate veterans had been wrong. He stated,

We cannot for the sake of mere friendship…afford to sacrifice the truth, or pervert the facts of history. We should not permit, without resentment, any person to minimize the services and patriotism of those who saved the Nation; to exalt the deeds and virtues of those who fought to destroy it…Our, then, enemies fought for a wrong—for secession, to maintain a rebellion, to perpetuate human slavery, to destroy the Union….No lapse of

45 GAR, Tennessee, Twelfth Encampment (1895), 43.
46 GAR, Tennessee, Twelfth Encampment (1895), 43-44.
time, however long, can convert a wrong principle to a right one.\textsuperscript{47}

Lingering sectional animosity also materialized during the 1897 state encampment in Nashville. During the meeting, the proceedings were interrupted unexpectedly after visiting national Women’s Relief Corps (WRC) leaders’ belated arrival. The visiting northerners regretfully blamed their tardiness on “a little friction that existed this morning” on the city streets. The women related that it was “such a disappointment” when they became disoriented on the streets and a number of Nashville residents—including two uniformed policemen and a hotel concierge—could not, or possibly refused to, direct them to the GAR meeting place. However, a member of the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) noticed the bewildered visitors and helped guide them to the meeting. The visiting women thought it odd in the South, because “wherever we have conventions and the Grand Army have their Encampment [in the North], everybody in the city knows something about it.”\textsuperscript{48}

John F. Spence stood and responded to the perturbed visitors. Reverend Spence, an Ohio native and member of the James Garfield post in Athens, Tennessee, attempted to defuse white Nashvillians’ apparent insult by emphasizing wartime loyalty among East Tennessee mountaineers. He claimed that when visiting northern GAR posts, he regularly tells “them something of how [in] the mountains of East Tennessee…there was loyalty; I can tell them how the fiery spirit of Brownlow breathed out from the Knoxville \textit{Whig}, went out into that mountainous country, and set men’s brains and hearts on fire for the old flag, and sixty thousand went into the Union from East Tennessee alone.” Spence went on to encourage the visitors to “come over to East Tennessee” in which residents

\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Ibid.}, 44.
\textsuperscript{48} GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Fourteenth Encampment} (1897), 48-51.
were “men with good Scotch-Irish blood, [and] loyal to the Union.” He also implored the visitors, “Don’t tell your sisters of the North that the South is disloyal. I will say that one of the [mountain] counties of this state had only seven rebel families during the war, and if you will show me a county in Pennsylvania or Ohio in which there was not that many rebels, then I will surrender.”

Next, department commander Halbert B. Case of Chattanooga took the floor and echoed Spence’s sentiments. Case recalled that while attending the dedication of General Grant’s monument in New York City, some others in attendance were “very much surprised when I stated to them that we had 40,000 old soldiers in the Federal army from Tennessee” and that “I want to assure you of one thing, that we have got the bitter and the sweet in Tennessee.” Like Spence, Case distinguished East Tennessee from the central and western sections of the Volunteer State. He related, “It has been said that if loyalty were heaven and rebellion were hell, one could say that they have more heaven in East Tennessee than any other spot on the earth, and more hell in Central Tennessee in any other place.” He concluded, “You will not get much encouragement in Middle…and West Tennessee along the lines of the Grand Army of the Republic, but you will find splendid loyalty in the mountains of East Tennessee.”

Junior-vice-commander William F. McCarron took a more moderate stance and emphasized that although sectional tensions remained in the South, they were fleeting. McCarron was an Ohio native who served in the 12th Iowa Infantry regiment, and had relocated to Athens, Tennessee as a journalist and member of James Garfield post. Like Spence and Case, McCarron reassured the visiting Yankees that “There is more loyalty in
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the South than you have been giving us credit for.” He went on imply that the perceived sectional tensions the visitors encountered were rare, stating, “It is true that adverse things will crop out now and then, but above all, we take it upon ourselves that [the GAR’s] influence has had something to do with bringing back a different condition of things. It is not like was twenty-five years ago….it is different now.”

Historians have argued over the extent to which Union veterans touted reconciliation throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Some argued that GAR members advocated a “Won Cause,” refusing to accept fully the Lost Cause, and deemed former Confederates treasonous. Other scholars assert that by the turn of the twentieth century, because of the Spanish-American War, white supremacy provided an ideological bridge that white Northerners and Southerners were able to cross the bloody chasm and tout reconciliation. However, East Tennessee’s GAR does not fit neatly in either scholarly paradigm. Instead, white comrades’ actions and rhetoric illustrates the complexity and messiness of national reunification throughout the postwar South.

Though white GAR members acknowledged isolated sectional tensions that infrequently erupted, publicly they touted reconciliation from the state organization’s establishment in the early 1880s to the early twentieth century. Comrades occupied a unique status in the postwar South. They were on the front lines of reconciliation efforts and recognized the sectional tensions that pervaded daily life. Unlike GAR members in the North, those in East Tennessee had to be very pragmatic and walk a fine line. They attempted to celebrate East Tennessee’s contribution to Union victory, and recognized Confederates had erred in the past. Though GAR members were willing to forgive, they did not forget.

---

51 GAR, Tennessee, *Fourteenth Encampment* (1897), 54-55.
CHAPTER 5

“MEMORY OF THE LOYAL MEN OF TENNESSEE”: EAST TENNESSEE’S GAR AND CIVIL WAR COMMEMORATION

On the night of April 14, 1896, eleven of Tennessee’s foremost GAR leaders met for a council of administration meeting at the Rossmore Hotel in downtown Chattanooga. The veterans were there to consider “the most important business” facing the organization—financing the construction of a “monument to the memory of the loyal men of Tennessee” in Knoxville. Three years earlier, at the 1893 state encampment, GAR leaders had first broached the idea of constructing a monument honoring Tennessee’s federal soldiers. Now, Halbert B. Case invited the group of veterans to consider “vital questions” on raising funds for the memorial. Whereas members of Knoxville’s white Ed Maynard post had raised only half of the $2,000 pledged, New Market’s integrated Patrick McGuire post had $500 cash on hand, and members had collected $51.70 at the previous year’s state encampment. Before concluding, the leaders suggested forwarding a photograph of the monument’s design to GAR members across the state. They believed it may help loosen their purse strings and underscore to “every old [Union] soldier in the state with the fact that a grand monument will and must be erected.”¹ Six months later, in October, hundreds of GAR members congregated in Knoxville’s national cemetery to dedicate the cornerstone of the Union Soldiers’ monument.

¹ GAR, Tennessee, *Fourteenth Encampment* (1897), 3-4.
In recent years, historians have focused greater attention on Civil War memory throughout the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Some scholars, such as Gaines M. Foster, Charles Reagan Wilson, Anne E. Marshall, and Caroline E. Janney have examined Confederate veterans’ and Ladies’ Memorial Associations’ involvement in Lost Cause movement in the post-war South. Barbara A. Gannon, Stuart McConnell, and Robert Hunt have studied Union veterans’ complex memory in the North. Historian M. Keith Harris has recently examined Union and Confederate veterans’ disparate commemorations, but like other scholars, he too conflates all white southerners as proponents of the Lost Cause and all northern whites as advocates of the Won Cause. A number of Appalachian historians—including James Klotter, Tom Lee, Kenneth W. Noe, and John C. Inscoe—have examined the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century development of a “monolithic Unionism” mythology throughout the southern Appalachian Mountains. Regional boosters attempted to attract northern investment and socio-economic uplift in mountain communities by propagating the notion that mountaineers in the region—especially East Tennessee—were poor, but deserving Anglo-Saxons who had not owned slaves, had despised the lowland slaveocracy, and had remained unabashed Unionists during the Civil War.²

This chapter supplements the previous scholarship by examining the ways in which Tennessee’s GAR members remembered and commemorated their wartime service. Though the department included black and white veterans from across the Volunteer State, most resided in eastern mountain communities and put forward a uniquely regional memory of the war. Throughout the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, GAR members in eastern Tennessee were remarkably consistent in commemorating the region’s wartime Unionism and their own service in the Federal army. Over the years, GAR veterans regularly spoke publicly on the number of soldiers the highlands provided the Union war effort, associated mountaineers with the Founding Fathers and Revolutionary ideals, underscored mountaineers’ personal wartime sacrifices and the dangerous treks they made through the mountains to reach Union lines. These became hallmarks of East Tennessee GAR members’ memory. Very little was said of wartime Unionism and federal troops from middle and western Tennessee.

Members articulated their memories both privately and publicly. Privately, they regularly reminded fellow veterans in closed state and national encampment meetings. Members were preaching to the choir; however, encampment meetings afforded them an environment in which they could express their candid thoughts, without angering former enemies or Lost Cause sympathizers. Publicly, they constructed and dedicated monuments, held Memorial Day parades and speeches, conducted educational campaigns, and published memoirs. In doing so, they often recounted their wartime trials and tribulations. They also linked their wartime triumphs to America’s industrial growth and development into an imperial power in the late nineteenth century. Like regional boosters, they helped propagate the myth that during the Civil War, the mountain
South—especially eastern Tennessee—remained a unified Unionist stronghold. With strains similar to Henry Grady’s and Henry Watterson’s New South Creed, adherents of the Appalachian Unionist mythology portrayed mountain residents as unanimously loyal to the Union during the Civil War, hoping to encourage northerners to immigrate to, and invest in, the mountain region. The GAR could potentially serve as the vehicle by which northerners resettled and integrated themselves into their new highland communities.

Furthermore, since many white GAR members were middle-class businessmen and involved in local industries, they stood to gain financially by encouraging wealthy investors to the region and rubbing elbows with them at GAR meetings. East Tennessee’s GAR was not only intent on reminding fellow Union veterans and their civilian contemporaries of their contributions to Union victory, but it was also concerned that future generations honored and understood that they fought for the right cause.

At the 1884 national encampment held in Minneapolis, Tennessee representatives reminded delegates from across the nation of East Tennessee Unionists’ wartime loyalty. Tennessee’s GAR had just been chartered and state delegates attempted to persuade national leaders to amend membership regulations. Specifically, they wanted to allow into the GAR veterans conscripted against their will into the Rebel army, and later deserted and served honorably in the Federal Army. Only those who voluntarily fought for the Confederacy, they felt, should be barred. William S. Marshall, an Ohio native who had moved to Chattanooga, supported revising the membership regulations because it would allow greater numbers of East Tennesseans to join. He asserted that the issue “particularly affects this organization as it exists in the Southern States” and that “the [northern] framers of that article seem to have forgotten two very important facts; one,
that there were any loyal people in the South” and that Confederate authorities forced many Union men to submit at the point of a bayonet. He attempted to justify his assertions by putting forward specific ideas that would become hallmarks of the Unionist mythology in southern Appalachia. He reminded northerners that Tennesseans made up “over 30,000 soldiers of the Union Army. Those soldiers left their families, their homes, their property, and every thing [sic] that they had in the world…and dodging rebel conscript officers, slipped through their picket lines on their way for hundreds of miles through the mountains to the Union Army, joined with it and staid [sic] with it…to the end.” Marshall’s comments were met by hearty applause. He continued by distinguishing Appalachian mountaineers from lowland southerners, claiming they were humble and deserving. He romantically claimed that the highlanders

   Are mostly poor men. Loyalty was not a general product of the cotton belt. They are the men who drank the pure water and breathed the pure air of the mountain regions. They were poor then and they are poor yet and they always will be poor. They cared nothing for riches, but they did take pride in their loyalty and they stood firm and true as the rocks around their mountain home.3

Despite Marshall’s appeal, national leaders refused to amend membership qualifications. Yet, these notions became common Appalachian stereotypes in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.4

3 GAR, National, *Eighteenth Encampment* (1884), 165-166.
During state encampment meetings, GAR members also regularly reminded each other of their wartime contributions. At the 1885 encampment in Chattanooga, visiting national GAR leader John P. Rea recounted the widespread Unionist sympathies among East Tennesseans while scouting for the 1st Ohio Cavalry regiment. Ignoring the often messy and divided wartime loyalties in the region, Rea recalled, “the loyal spirit evidenced in East Tennessee was superior to anything he ever saw or read of.” Three years later, Rea again commented on Tennessee mountaineers’ wartime loyalty during his visit to the 1888 state encampment in Athens. During his short address, Rea asserted that “he knew of no section of the country where there was more genuine devotion exhibited to the old flag than in East Tennessee…It took courage, and ‘sand,’ and that love of country which makes heroes, to have been loyal to the government in East Tennessee in 1861.”

Certainly, Rea was catering to his audience, which included a large number of mountain veterans. However, his comments at both meetings also illustrate that East Tennessee’s reputation as a bastion of wartime Unionism had gained traction throughout the nation, and the GAR encampment provided an atmosphere in which Rea could openly express his views.

At the 1885 encampment, local members also supported the creation of a state GAR newspaper, the *Grand Army Sentinel*, to not only circulate wartime yarns and remind veterans of their service, but the memory of East Tennessee’s Civil War could serve a more practical purpose—encouraging northerners to relocate to, and invest in, the region. A member named Sholes declared that “there are 50,000 ex-Union soldiers in [East Tennessee]…again, there are thousands in the North and West looking to the South

---

5 GAR, Tennessee, *First Encampment* (1885), 12.
for homes…send *The Sentinel* as a missionary among them, and it must go outside the Department with the highest prestige…we want to build up this country with Northern thrift and energy.” Comrade Warner, a visiting GAR member from Ohio, also spoke up. He claimed, “in his own State, Ohio, which he had but recently left to make his home in Tennessee, he knew of hundreds looking South, and there will be a great emigration if encouragement is given…let [*The Sentinel*] be an arm, and it will help to draw settlers to this country.” Amid the optimistic outpouring, members carried the motion.7

East Tennessee GAR members also touted the region’s Unionist mythology and their contributions to Union victory at other Union veterans’ meetings. William Rule, a member of Knoxville’s Ed Maynard post and department commander in 1888, did so during an address he gave the Ohio Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion in April 1887. Many scholars have recognized William Rule as one of the chief architects and proponents of the myth of Unionist Appalachia, yet no one has placed his ideals within the context of the GAR.8 Rule was born in rural Knox County and served as mayor of Knoxville, in 1873 and 1898, and was the editor of the *Knoxville Journal* in 1885, which merged with the *Knoxville Tribune* and became the *Knoxville Journal and Tribune* in 1888. Imagery of a united wartime Unionist Appalachia permeated his 1887 address to his northern comrades. He recalled that the news of the battle of Bull Run to East Tennessee Union men “was doubly disheartening…there was now no telling when deliverance would come, and the flag they loved again wave in triumph over their mountain homes; but their principles remained unchanged, their purposes inflexible, and their devotion unwavering.” Besides describing East Tennessee as the “Switzerland of
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8 Taylor, Jr., “The New South Mind of a Mountain Editor.”
America” and alleging that mountaineers universally opposed slavery, Rule went on to declare that during the war many Unionist East Tennessee mountaineers “were overtaken by the enemy and some were shot down, their names going to swell the long list of martyrs to the national cause in the rebellious States.” After touting East Tennessee’s unequivocal Unionism, he reassured his northern audience that former enemies had reconciled and that sectional animosities had all but vanished. Most likely attempting to woo potential investors and encourage northern resettlement, Rule emphasized the affable feelings among Union and Confederate veterans in the mountains. He concluded,

happily, the bloody chasm has been bridged over, and the men who wore the blue live fraternally with the men who wore the gray…the music which now greets our ears every hour in the day and night is the shrill whistle of the locomotive, the ponderous blows of the trip-hammer, the clinking of the quarryman’s drill, the rattle of the looms, and the hum of thousands of spindles, making a grand melody.⁹

Grand Army men in the mountains continued to justify their participation in a righteous war during state encampment meetings throughout the 1890s. At the 1892 encampment in Nashville, department commander Andrew J. Gahagan of Chattanooga implored his fellow veterans to remember that they had helped save the nation that the Founding Fathers had established:

If the establishment of the Government by our forefathers, who went by thousands to the field of battle in ’76, and the maintenance of it by the sacrifices and blood of the hundreds of thousands who went to its rescue in ’61, was justified by the results of two bloody wars, is it not reasonable to conclude that we will hand down to prosperity a heritage that will justify those who will fill our places a few generations in the future….On our soil is located seven National Cemeteries, and in these beautiful cities of the dead lie more than 570,000 of our comrades, who gave, or offered, their lives, that a great country might be kept undivided.¹⁰
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¹⁰ GAR, Tennessee, Ninth Encampment (1892), 62.
Other East Tennessee GAR members reiterated Gahagan’s message later in the meeting. After being elected the new departmental commander, New York transplant Henry C. Whitaker called for unity among Union veterans and to remain “conscious of having fought in a sublime and successful cause, that was right in the sight of God and man.”\textsuperscript{11} Two years later, at the 1894 encampment in Greeneville, department commander Frank Seaman linked their sacrifices with those of the Founding Fathers and emancipation. Seaman, a transplant from Indiana and member of Knoxville’s Ed Maynard post, proclaimed, “It was no small thing to have lived in those days of ’61 to ’65, and to have participated in that great struggle on the side of freedom and union….It was a great thing to have founded a nation, but it was as great to have preserved it.”\textsuperscript{12}

Seaman and other East Tennessee GAR members often spoke of mountaineers’ wartime loyalty and service in abstract terms, but he also called attention to specific Unionist leaders from the highlands—especially Andrew Johnson, Admiral David Farragut, and William G. Brownlow. During his 1894 commander’s address, he welcomed the veterans to Greeneville, a “progressive little city, where the very air is filled with loyalty to the old flag; even the stones within its borders contain sermons that would tell of sacrifice and devotion to the cause of the Union.” He went on to remind those in attendance, “Here, too, was the home and the scene of the early struggles of one whose career is an object lesson to every poor boy in this republic….However much men differed with him in political methods, no man ever questioned the loyalty, or charged there was eccentricity in the patriotism of Andrew Johnson.” Ignoring Johnson’s controversial Reconstruction record and impeachment, Seaman asserted,

\textsuperscript{11} GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Ninth Encampment} (1892), 126.
\textsuperscript{12} GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Eleventh Encampment} (1894), 51.
He was one of an illustrious triumvirate whose fame Tennesseans should never let fade: Farragut, ‘old heart of oak,’ who added imperishable renown to the American navy; Brownlow, whose tongue and pen coalesced into solid mass Unionism in these mountains; and Johnson, the great commoner, who never for a moment forgot he was of the people.\textsuperscript{13}

Whereas the first portion of Seaman’s speech was backward-looking, and connected East Tennessee Unionism to America’s founding, he was also forward-looking and went on to link GAR members’ wartime loyalty to contemporary industrial growth in the region and America’s development into an imperial power after annexing Hawaii in late-nineteenth century. Seaman declared,

The music of industry, blended with the paeans of a lasting peace, coming up from a united Nation of freemen, where the clanking of the bondsman’s chains are not heard in the land, voice the results of your loyalty…and when you saved the Nation, you proved to the world that it was possible for a republic to live…we will make a republic of the Sandwich Islands too…we have taught such a lesson in this country that will make a republic of the world.\textsuperscript{14}

Highland GAR members continued to tout the virtue of their wartime loyalty and regional boosterism over the next several years. At the 1895 encampment, hosted by Athens, Reverend Richard S. Sampson, of the local James A. Garfield Post 25, opened the meeting with a prayer. He prayed, “that every comrade who fought so nobly during the great conflict that swept over our land for the perpetuity of the Union, may in the future be engaged on the right in the great spiritual and moral conflict….Time and Providence have proven the righteousness of our cause.”\textsuperscript{15} Later, during his commander’s address, William E. F. Milburn of Greeneville, claimed,

\textsuperscript{13} GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Eleventh Encampment} (1894), 49-50. Farragut was allegedly born outside Knoxville in 1801, but his father moved the family to New Orleans shortly thereafter. In 1900, the local Daughters of the American Revolution constructed a monument commemorating his birthplace. See especially, Kelli B. Nelson, “‘On the Imperishable Face of Granite’: Civil War Monuments and the Evolution of Historical Memory in East Tennessee, 1878-1931” (M.A. thesis: East Tennessee State University, 2011), 39-43.
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We meet in one of the loyal counties of our far-famed loyal East Tennessee. We meet in the midst of a people celebrated for loyalty, courage, patriotism, magnanimous hospitality, high culture and refinement. We meet in beautiful Athens—a city which is fast assuming the relation to the great commonwealth of Tennessee, that the Athens renowned of old occupied toward Attica, and to the ancient republics of Greece; when Pericles led her armies to victory; when Plato, Aristotle and Socrates unlocked to her multitudes the portals of science and philosophy….We meet under the very shadows of a great university [Grant Memorial University, or modern-day Tennessee Wesleyan College]…whose influence has already extended to every part of our great Nation, and whose possibilities for good, for teaching loyalty, and for strengthening the bulwarks of Freedom, can scarcely be predicted. We meet under the eaves of that university which alone has the eminent distinction of bearing the name of that matchless military chieftain, that most distinguished comrade, the hero of Appomattox—Ulysses S. Grant.16

Highland GAR members continued to tout consistently the virtue of their wartime loyalty at the turn of the twentieth century. At the 1899 encampment at Rockwood, in Roane County, department commander William H. Nelson reminded the veterans in attendance of the local county’s wartime Unionism and local Unionist leaders. During his commander’s address, he welcomed the delegates to Rockwood,

In the loyal County of Roane, from within whose borders went into the Union army more men than were enrolled as its voting population. In our presence today are men who followed Col. R[obert] K. Byrd, James T. Shelley, Isham Young, J. W. Bowman, John Ellis, Joe Turner, Major Bowers, and others [who performed] deeds of bravery and daring which have given undimmed luster to American heroism that will be remembered as long as these mountains which surround their homes shall endure.

He went on to reassure those present that they would not be overshadowed by veterans of the Spanish-American War in the nation’s collective memory. He claimed that his fellow Civil War veterans should rest assured that “the bravery of our soldiers in Cuba, Porto Rico [sic], and the Philippines…have demonstrated that the sons of the men of 1861-65
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are worthy sons of worthy sires” and that “the events of the war of 1898 have not thrown
the work of the soldiers who participated in the great War of the Rebellion into eclipse;
on the contrary…[the] unflinching bravery of the veterans of a generation ago have been
more strongly brought to public attention.” He claimed that Americans across the nation
would remember that East Tennessee’s Union veterans, “followed our matchless leader,
Grant, marched with Uncle Billy Sherman from Atlanta to the sea, or rode behind
dashing [Phil] Sheridan as he charged the foe—or obeyed the signals of that grandest of
Tennesseans, Farragut.” He concluded that it was East Tennessee’s contributions to the
Union war effort that “made it possible to bring about the results which have grown and
will grow out of the events of the war of 1898.”

Nine years later, at the 1908 encampment in Maryville, department commander
William A. McTeer of the host city reminded fellow veterans of the significance of their
wartime exploits. Despite the fact that large numbers of Union veterans were passing
away and GAR members now had to share the public spotlight with Spanish-American
War veterans, he reassured them that the nation would remember their deeds. Though
McTeer ignored contemporary Jim Crow laws, disfranchisement, and lynching, he
asserted that fellow GAR members had fought to save the Union and free the slaves,
claiming, “Ours is a rich inheritance…A republican government…when compared with
the condition of the serfs and peasants of other lands, we can but thank God and our
fathers and rejoice. Every citizen has a voice in public affairs.” He went on to underscore
Tennesseans’ sacrifices and efforts in the fratricidal conflict. He claimed, “It was
manifest in a high degree, as shown by our brave boys in Tennessee who left homes,
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loved ones and all that was dear in home ties, making their way through the
lines…enlisted under the stars and stripes, and fought, and bled and so many of them died
in the maintenance of the Union.” He concluded by noting the most significant
consequences of the war, which East Tennesseans had helped bring about. He argued, “It
was the blood of our comrades that paid the price and cemented our States into one
indivisible Union, breaking the shackles of slavery and giving universal liberty.” McTeer
was also forward-looking, and reassured the veterans that “Our nation is now recognized
as one of the first powers of the world….The part we took in our struggle has had much
to do with this.”

In addition to reminding themselves of their wartime actions in private
encampment meetings, East Tennessee Grand Army men also sought to prompt
contemporary mountain residents of the region’s Civil War history and local Union
veterans. They reached out to the public by organizing and participating in GAR campfire
meetings, Fourth of July festivities, and Memorial Day celebrations. The veterans proved
living monuments at these public events. Organizing public parades, decorating Union
graves, and making public speeches were among the most important Memorial Day
activities. GAR posts near Chattanooga, Knoxville, Fort Donelson, Memphis, Nashville,
Pittsburg Landing, and Stones River regularly conducted services at nearby national
cemeteries. On May 31, 1888, the Knoxville Journal recounted the local GAR members’
Memorial Day activities at the nearby national cemetery. The column asserted, “East
Tennessee people remember the heroes who died in their midst,” and recounted that
although delayed by thunderstorms, GAR members paraded from Market Square to the
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national cemetery where they oversaw a public program. Among the various speakers was General M. H. Manson of Indiana. Manson reminded the veterans and civilians in the crowd, “Why did the late war exist? There is no reason why it should be, but certain men of the south believed because Lincoln had been selected president of the United States that ought to be war. Lincoln made all reasonable and just concessions…but [southern] men persisted in their desire for a struggle.” Although he blamed southerners for sparking the Civil War, he conceded, “I thought that the confederate leaders had no cause for action, but all feeling of enmity has vanished, I hope forever.” He closed by beseeching the audience to look upon the GAR members and “study them well, for never again will this country be divided by its people, and no foreign nation dare attack us.”

East Tennessee’s GAR continued to take part in Memorial Day celebrations through the 1890s. During the 1896 Memorial Day ceremonies in Knoxville, the Knoxville Tribune estimated that crowds of 5,000 people “from all over East Tennessee” watched the GAR parade and attended the exercises at the national cemetery. Among the speakers were GAR members Allen Tate and Isaac B. Zeigler. As the program got underway, Zeigler reminded the crowd that Memorial Day commemorated Tennessee’s Union veterans who helped bring about, “the freedom day of a race, emancipated from bondage, and of a nation redeemed from iniquity.” He then pointed to the nearby Union graves and beseeched audience members to acknowledge “their toils, their sufferings, their heroism, their supreme fidelity in camp, in prison, on the battlefield, and in hospital.” He then recalled the actions of notable Union generals in the Tennessee highlands—especially Ambrose Burnside, Ulysses S. Grant, William T. Sherman, and
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William Rosecrans—the battles of Chickamauga, Lookout Mountain and Missionary Ridge. He asserted that the cemetery’s purpose was “so that the generations that may live in after time, in memory of their heroic deeds, and in gratitude for the sacrifices they made for mankind, may come each succeeding year and cover their graves with the sweetest flowers of spring, in token of undying love for them.”

Allen Tate spoke next. Tate was a native Tennessean who had served in the 1st Tennessee Cavalry regiment, and was a member of the Calvin M. Dyer GAR post in Rutledge. He encouraged those in attendance to “turn away for a while from the busy scenes of life, and, forgetting the cares and anxieties of the present” and recall “the men who bore with us and for us, the trials and toils, the dangers and difficulties, the hardships and horrors of the greatest civil war of modern times.” Tate then reminded those in attendance of the more brutal aspects of the war in East Tennessee. He recalled horrific scenes, stating: “Our homes are laid waste, our beautiful fields are trampled beneath the hoof of the war-horse…ruin rides over the land; devastation and death sweeps with the swiftness of a mighty whirlwind over our beautiful country.” He went on to recall the treacherous journey many East Tennessee Union veterans made fleeing to Union lines. He stated,

Throughout the hills of East Tennessee we see grey-haired fathers and mothers, anxious wives and bright eyed children, looking and longing for the return of sons and husbands and fathers who have crossed mountains and rivers, in darkness and danger and dread, and made their perilous way to the banks of the Ohio, where they have found the flag they love, and under its bright stars have turned their faces back toward their mountain homes.  
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During the first decades of the twentieth century, East Tennessee GAR leaders continued to encourage the public to attend Memorial Day ceremonies. Weeks before the 1908 Memorial Day celebrations, department commander William A. McTeer reminded GAR members that the “invitation to join with us should be general, and include everyone.”

In addition to organizing public Memorial Day activities, East Tennessee GAR members were also concerned about their legacy and began to reach out to younger generations. Beginning in the late 1880s, GAR members with ties to mountain colleges began offering scholarships for the children of local Union veterans. At the 1888 state encampment in Athens, the departmental chaplain John F. Spence submitted his report to those in attendance. Reverend Spence, an Ohio native who served in the 48th Ohio Infantry regiment, was a member of Athens’s James A. Garfield post and the president of the local Grant Memorial University (modern-day Tennessee Wesleyan). Spence told the crowd, “the board of Regents of Grant Memorial University, extended the courtesy of a free scholarship to each of the Grand Army Posts in the Department. It is to be hoped that every Post will take advantage of this liberal offer and thereby secure to many of our veterans’ sons a liberal education.” In a GAR circular forwarded throughout the state, leaders stipulated that the scholarships would be strictly given to students “of good moral character,” members of “families of ex-Federal soldiers, and [those] unable to secure a liberal education” without financial assistance. Spence announced Grant Memorial
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University’s scholarship offer to GAR members at encampments over the next two years. Originally, the scholarship was specifically for Union veterans’ sons, but at the 1890 state encampment he related that the financial assistance was open to the son or daughter of a local Union veteran. The scholarship winners received an education, and bore witness to their fathers’ Civil War service to the Union among classmates and colleagues.

East Tennessee GAR members also provided financial assistance for the expansion of Grant Memorial University. At the 1893 encampment in Harriman, Spence reminded his fellow veterans of the university scholarship, and made them aware of the college’s current fundraising campaign. The donations would support construction of a new building that, which would be known as the John A. Logan Science Hall and honor one of the founders of the Grand Army of the Republic. Department leaders pledged $50 dollars toward the construction costs of the building, and an encampment-wide vote was taken. The pledged funds were paid over to university leaders the next year.

By the early 1900s, East Tennessee GAR members also sought to help instill nationalistic ideals among local schoolchildren. In 1903, department commander George W. Patten of Chattanooga encouraged members to help “introduce into our Public Schools Military Instruction and Patriotic Education.” He also added that Riley H. Andes of Sevierville would serve as patriotic instructor and was charged with introducing the work in schools throughout the state. Patten went on to predict that it would be “but a short time will elapse till the flag will be displayed at every schoolhouse in the state, and the boys have an opportunity to learn military tactics.”
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Three years later, in 1906, East Tennessee’s GAR sought to expand its educational efforts. Leaders encouraged each post throughout the state to appoint a patriotic instructor. Each post’s patriotic instructor would coordinate with Riley H. Andes, “in giving instruction to the children of the State, and also arrange for the observance of the birthdays of Washington and Lincoln, the father and preserver of our Union of States” in nearby schools.\footnote{“Circular Letter No. 1,” January 4, 1906, in GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Twenty-third Encampment} (1906), n.p.} During the state encampment that year, department commander Walton W. French of Chattanooga encouraged post patriotic instructors to coordinate their educational efforts with local members of the Women’s Relief Corps (WRC). French beseeched members to “be more arduous in your efforts towards assisting these loyal women, who are sowing the seeds of patriotism all over the United States.”\footnote{“Commander’s Address,” in GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Twenty-third Encampment} (1906), n.p.}

Soon after French’s speech, the departmental patriotic instructor Riley H. Andes took the floor to deliver bad news. He admitted that he had very little success over the previous year: “I have tried various plans…and failed in all but one, and that is to go to a school and give a patriotic address…and I succeeded in raising flags over three school houses.” He did acknowledge receiving aid from two WRC members, and asserted, “if we had a few more such good patriotic, Christ-like women we could move the world for patriotic Christian education…our young people would more than maintain the patriotism of their ancestors of the grand state of Tennessee.” He closed by encouraging GAR members to implore their state representatives to adopt a flag law.\footnote{“Patriotic Instructor’s Report,” in GAR, Tennessee, \textit{Twenty-third Encampment} (1906), n.p.}

The next year, in 1907, John H. Frazee—the newly elected departmental patriotic instructor—wrote to department commander John T. Wilder explaining the significance
of GAR members’ educational efforts on future generations of Tennesseans and newly arrived immigrants. He asserted that the veterans’ campaigns of “instilling and developing a genuine love of country” was “essential to [the] future national welfare.” He claimed that displaying the American flag at schoolhouses across the state, as well as entrusting GAR members to remind schoolchildren of those “who saved the Union and refused to let one star be blotted out from the glorious symbol of an unbroken sisterhood of states” was significant. He concluded that because of GAR members’ efforts, “our children, with intelligent ideas, will be more and more loyal while the alien will understand the newest translation of liberty.”

East Tennessee’s GAR continued their educational efforts into the 1910s. In addition to supporting scholarships to Grant Memorial University and reaching out to schoolchildren, in 1912, mountain GAR members also vowed to support Lincoln Memorial University in Harrogate. Founded in 1897 by Reverend A. A. Myers and Union general and GAR member Oliver O. Howard, Lincoln Memorial University served as a living monument to Abraham Lincoln and symbol of a reunited North and South. The college would also serve the “‘loyal’ mountaineers of East Tennessee, western Virginia, and eastern Kentucky.” Historian Shannon Wilson explained how faculty members at Lincoln Memorial University had contributed to the myth of a monolithic Unionist Mountain South, but he overlooked the GAR’s contribution to the university—also indirectly helping to perpetuate the myth of Unionist Appalachia. In passing, he merely notes that Myers and faculty members endeavored to furnish a school “at a price low enough to be within reach of all, and in part to pay our country’s debt to these
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Highlanders of America by educating the children of the G.A.R…on slave soil.” Yet, the connection between Lincoln Memorial University and Tennessee’s GAR is significant. During the 1912 state encampment, members pledged their support of the university. Members resolved, “we of this Department of the Grand Army of the Republic heartily recommend to the favorable consideration of those having youth to educate and properly fit for the battle of life, the Lincoln Memorial University, Cumberland Gap, Tennessee as a school worthy of patronage and advantageous to the proper upbringing of the country’s youth.”31

The next year, in 1913, department commander William D. Atchley of Sevierville ordered GAR members to encourage schoolchildren to continue taking part in Memorial Day celebrations and remember the wartime actions of Union veterans in their communities. He ordered, “Post Commanders are requested to encourage participation in these exercises by the school children and are urged to confer with the principals of schools and teachers generally and enlist their cooperation in these services of love and duty.”32

Besides their educational campaigns, East Tennessee’s GAR also attempted to remind their contemporaries and younger generations of their Civil War service by constructing several monuments. The Union veterans funded and constructed four monuments in Knoxville (1901), Cleveland (1914), Greenville (1919), and Athens
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While local GAR posts were at the forefront of the monuments in Cleveland, Greenville, and Athens, the entire state department oversaw the construction of Knoxville’s monument. Knoxvilles Union Soldiers’ Monument served as a physical reminder of mountain Union veterans, and GAR members employed the region’s Unionist mythology throughout the eight-year campaign to fund and construct it.

While highland GAR members dedicated Knoxville’s Union Soldiers’ Monument in 1901, they first conceived of the monument at the 1893 encampment in Harriman. After a decade of fundraising and planning, Knoxville’s Confederate veterans and Ladies Memorial Society members had recently unveiled a Confederate monument in Bethel Cemetery in 1892. Although local Union veterans, certainly many who were GAR members, helped fund the Confederate monument, historian Frederick C. Moffatt argued that “the G.A.R.’s organizational apparatus was goaded into action lest the initiative gained by the Confederates should further demoralize the Federal constituency.”

At the Harriman encampment, department commander Henry C. Whitaker of New Market first voiced the need for a monument honoring Tennessee’s Federal soldiers. The New York transplant claimed, “while other States which furnished troops to suppress the Secession Rebellion have built, or are building, monuments in memory of their patriotic dead, thus far no movement has been made to erect a shaft which should tell posterity of the sterling patriotism and heroic sacrifice made by the Union soldiers of Tennessee.” He went on to
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claim that as the Volunteer State contributed 31,000 men to the Union Army and endured a 27 percent casualty rate, which was the highest ratio of losses by any state. “In view of these facts” and because among the objects of the GAR is to “perpetuate the memory and history of our heroic dead,” Whitaker “recommended that the Encampment adopt measures for the erection of an enduring monument in memory of the 4,415 true Tennesseans who fulfilled their pledge to fight or die in defense of the unity and integrity of our heaven-favored Nation.”  

The veterans in attendance agreed and within a few months made plans to bring the monument to fruition.

Less than a month later, in April 1893, members formed a monument committee to oversee fundraising and constructing the memorial. Though various members would rotate on and off the committee over the years, six of the eight original committee members belonged to East Tennessee posts. By summer, the monument committee members printed 15,000 circulars and sent them to posts throughout the nation seeking financial support. The circular recounted that the Volunteer State provided roughly 30,000 troops to the Union war effort, and beseeched Union veterans to support the monument campaign because,

Giving their lives for a cause so just and righteous before God and man, it is pre-eminently fitting that their surviving comrades should attest on enduring bronze or marble their appreciation of the sublime sacrifice—to transmit to future generations our personal testimony of their heroic devotion, and to express our fraternal regard and consolation that they did not die in vain.
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The circular also attempted to drum up donations by noting the unique situation of Union veterans residing in a former Confederate state. Whereas Union veterans in northern states might seek memorial funds from their state legislatures, this was impossible in postwar Tennessee. The circular noted that “Tennessee sent 75,000 men into the rebel army, we cannot reasonably expect that our State government will, at least during the present generation, do anything to honor the memory of her brave sons whose blood was not poised by the virus of secession.”

On July 20, department commander Frank Seaman of Knoxville also attempted to loosen Tennessee members’ purse strings within his departmental orders. Seaman claimed, “It should be a matter of pride to every man living in Tennessee who wore the Union blue to manifest his admiration for, and fraternity with, the true Tennesseans who stood by the Nation’s flag when it was assailed by disloyal neighbors, and aid with his contribution to the monument fund.” To coax friendly competition among the Volunteer State’s posts, Seaman bragged that white veterans of his own Ed Maynard Post 14 in Knoxville had already pledged $1,000 dollars, and an additional $1,000 dollars if the monument was located in the city. As the Ed Maynard post members had raised $600 at July Fourth celebrations weeks earlier, Seaman encouraged comrades to seek donations from fellow veterans or organize “public lectures, picnics, camp-fires, etc. to which a small admission can be charged, will have a wonderful effect in stimulating the growth of the fund.”

After a promising beginning, the East Tennessee GAR fundraising campaign was at a standstill within a few years. The department commander William E. F. Milburn
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enlightened veterans of the project’s troubling financial situation in a May 5, 1894 circular. Milburn complained, “the process of raising money for” the Union veterans’ monument “has generally been slow.” He tried to coax donations by underscoring the significance of Tennessee’s Union veterans, compared to their ex-Confederate neighbors. He questioned, “Do we appreciate the value of the sacrifice that has been made by our comrades for the preservation of our liberties, our homes, and our NATIONAL UNITY, from the hands of rebels, traitors and treason in the days of civil war?” Though Tennessee’s GAR included fewer members than many northern posts, the lack of memorial funds did not illustrate members’ disregard for memorializing their Civil War experiences. Instead, a national economic depression stemming from the Panic of 1893 wracked the nation and stifled donations. Milburn admitted as much at the 1895 state encampment in Athens, but resolutely claimed, “the proposed monument will and must be built” and predicted that the monument’s location “is destined to become the pride of the loyalty of the State, the Mecca of the patriots of the coming ages.”

The monument committee finally decided to construct the monument in Knoxville’s National Cemetery, and in June 1895, department commander W. J. Smith of Memphis underscored the significance of the monument’s location in the Tennessee highlands. In his orders to comrades across the state, he approved of the monument committee’s decision for the monument placement. He claimed, “No section suffered more, and the people of no section of our country displayed greater heroism and fortitude than the section and people of East Tennessee…the monument to be erected in that section of our State, whose stubborn and unquestioned loyalty and devotion to the cause
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of the Union in the dark days of secession, went far to stay the wave of disloyalty and
threatened to submerge our free institutions and dishonor the Flag.” While Smith’s
rhetoric was hyperbole and ignored the divided wartime loyalties in the Tennessee
highlands, it illustrated GAR members’ consistent message of East Tennessee Unionism.

By 1896, only $1,300 dollars had been raised, but GAR members hosted a
cornerstone laying ceremony on October 15. Throughout the cornerstone ceremonies,
GAR members reminded the crowds of onlookers of the significance of the region’s
Union veterans. In the early afternoon, hundreds of black and white GAR members
paraded down Gay Street toward the national cemetery. Local newspapermen reported
that following in the footsteps of the white GAR members, “about forty members of
Isham G. Young camp, colored, followed in command of Jim Sharp. The colored
veterans marched with as patriotic a step as did those ahead of them.” After the veterans
and onlookers arrived at the cemetery, Captain William Rule, a member of Knoxville’s
white Ed Maynard post, provided a short history of East Tennessee’s Union veterans and
noted key elements of the region’s Unionist memory. He opened his address,
proclaiming, “Out of the indestructible marble, quarried from the everlasting hills of their
native State, we will erect a monument that in the decades and centuries to come will tell
of men who made an unique chapter in American history.” He outlined the election of
1860, secession winter, and the East Tennessee conventions in May and June 1861,
before delving into mountaineers’ treacherous flight through the mountains to Union
lines in Kentucky. He recounted, “Beginning about the first of August, 1861, and
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continuing for two years, up to September 1863, there was not a week in which Tennessee Unionists did not leave their homes and seek opportunity, beyond the Kentucky border, to enlist in the Union ranks.” He also recalled the often-hazardous journeys many undertook. Rule reminded those in the audience that “when the time came, and the sun had gone down behind the western horizon, hasty farewells were said, and soon stalwart forms were moving with as little noise as possible, over hill and dale, in quest of an opportunity to fight” and that because Confederates patrolled bridges, the Unionists often “waded, sometimes they swam, sometimes they utilized an old canoe so dilapidated as to have appeared worthless” to ford rivers. He also recalled, “Many of these fleeing men were captured in their flight, some [were] killed while attempting to escape, others apprehended and cast into prison…nothing, however, could check the exodus.”

Rule went on to note the specific number of troops Tennessee provided to the Union war effort to make his point. He noted that eventually, “twenty-one regiments of cavalry and seven companies, nine regiments of infantry and five batteries of artillery had been made up of Tennessee Unionists…a grand total of 31,092 men.” Rule also reminded the crowd that the statistic was low and did not include black veterans. He asserted, “these were white men, the regiments of colored troops enlisted in the State not being included.” He went on to note that still other Tennesseans joined regiments from other states—including Kentucky and Indiana. Rule then reminded the spectators that East Tennessee’s federal troops had participated in some of the war’s most notable campaigns. He claimed that the veterans took part in the battles at Rockcastle and Mill Springs, and

Cumberland Gap. He also proclaimed, “They poured out their blood at Stone River and Chickamauga. They suffered the privations of hunger and cold here in East Tennessee in the winter of 1863-4. They marched with Sherman through Georgia, displaying manly valor on the hard-fought fields….They were with the peerless Thomas at Nashville, where the final blow was struck at the matchless soldiers of the Confederacy, led by the great general, Joseph E. Johnston.”

Despite the pomp and circumstance of the cornerstone laying ceremonies, the campaign made little headway from 1896 to 1897. The GAR memorial committee did award a contract to William B. McMullen of the Tennessee Producers Marble Company for material and construction. They also tapped fellow Knoxville GAR member, William A. Gage to provide engineering consultation. GAR leaders continued to make appeals for veterans’ donations. While members of white posts provided the bulk of donations, black veterans also made modest contributions. On December 1896, black members of Knoxville’s Isham Young Post donated $10. Members of the monument committee recognized that the fundraising campaign stumbled not because of veterans’ apathy, but because GAR members were financially strapped after the Panic of 1897.

The monument campaign continued, and by 1900 encampment, department commander Henry Crumbliss of Kingston, in Roane County, claimed the monument “is practically completed.” During his commander’s address, he asserted that the monument was “unique in design, but solid in appearance, like the mountains of our grand State.”
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Most of the $11,000 dollars raised by the time of the monument’s unveiling had been received in one-dollar donations from GAR pensioners.

After eight years of fundraising and work, GAR members finally dedicated Knoxville’s Union Soldiers’ Monument on October 24, 1901. Among the dedication speakers was Judge Newton Hacker, a native of Green County and member of Jonesborough’s GAR post. Hacker reminded those in the crowd of the Civil War’s causes, its impact on East Tennessee, and its consequences. Hacker recalled that the roots of the war stemmed from the sixteenth century when “two antagonistic ideas found a foothold on the American continent” after one ship landed at Plymouth Rock and another at the mouth of the James River. He stated that while the Puritans were “fleeing from oppression and seeking a larger freedom, the other was introducing and propagating a system of human slavery. The one was right in the sight of God, and the other was eternally wrong.” He went on to note that sectional tensions over slavery became crystallized after the American Revolution. He asserted, “slavery naturally drifted to the South, because it was more profitable there. It was not long until the states South were called ‘slave states,’ and the states North were called ‘free states.’”

After noting key nineteenth century figures involved in the sectional crisis—including William Lloyd Garrison, Harriet Beecher Stowe, James Buchanan, and John Brown—he focused on East Tennessee’s Unionists’ war experiences. He claimed that during the secession crisis, “the great majority” of East Tennesseans “were steadfastly loyal to the Union” and “neither persuasion or force—neither imprisonment nor the threat of death, could induce them to forsake the Stars and Stripes.” Speaking from personal
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experience, he noted that many Unionists were forced to flee their homes and “became exiles for the time being from their mountain homes.”

Echoing William Rule’s assertions at the cornerstone ceremony five years earlier, Hacker went on to note key elements of East Tennessee GAR members’ Civil War memory. Initially, he asserted that East Tennessee Union veterans’ enlistment was nobler than their northern counterparts. He claimed that northern soldiers were “offered enticing bounties” to enlist and that “patriotic songs were sung and stirring speeches were made” as they volunteered. In stark contrast, Hacker asserted, “the poor East Tennessean enlisted” with little to no fanfare, as “crowds secretly and stealthily organized, at night, for the purpose of making their way through the mountains into Kentucky.”

Like Rule, Hacker also reminded those in the crowd of East Tennesseans’ treacherous journey to Union lines. He recalled that many of the highland veterans accompanied “pilots” and “with haversack and staff, they threaded their way, unarmed, in the darkness over trackless mountains. They waded rivers and creeks—sometimes floating with much ice. They went through sleet and rain and snow….They fell down hungry, weary and worn, and slept soundly on old mother earth by day. At nightfall, guided again by the north star…they stole silently along.” He then noted that although thousands of East Tennesseans successfully made their way to Union lines and enlisted at Camp Dick Robinson, Cumberland Gap, and Louisville, many others were not so lucky. He recalled the war’s brutality stating, “hundreds were shot down and their bones left to
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bleach on the mountain sides. Hundreds more were captured and carried off to loathsome Southern prisons.”

Hacker then underscored the significance of East Tennessee’s volunteers by comparing the enlistment numbers and casualties to various other northern and border states. He asserted, “at least 35,000 of these brave men became exiles and joined the Union army. East Tennessee alone furnished as many men as New Hampshire, 9,000 more than Rhode Island, 18,000 more than Delaware and more than any State west of the Mississippi, except Missouri and Iowa.” He went on to note the ultimate sacrifice Tennessee mountaineers paid to save the Union. He recalled, “East Tennessee lost in killed, died and permanently disabled, 27 per cent. of those who enlisted—a greater per cent. of loss than that of any other State.”

He then underscored the significance of East Tennessee’s loyalist women. Hacker proclaimed, “these East Tennessee women, with more than Spartan courage, filled their husband’s haversacks and with tears in their eyes, bade them go and never return until they should come back marching under the Stars and Stripes, to redeem their beloved East Tennessee. God bless the loyal women of East Tennessee!” He went on to note the great wartime sacrifices and conditions mountain women endured. He asserted, “No language can properly portray the sufferings and hardships to which they were exposed. They dressed in plain homespun, ate coarse, scanty fare, worked in the fields and lived in constant dread day and night. They were often insulted, robbed and driven from home. They were true amid it all.”

---
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He then reminded those in the crowd of East Tennessee’s Unionist leaders. He first noted Andrew Johnson, “who stood in his place in the United States Senate, while his Southern colleagues were leaving.” Besides noting that Horace Maynard “never for one moment faltered in his devotion to the Flag,” Hacker also noted William G. Brownlow and proclaimed, “We had our Nelson, Baxter, Netherland and a host of others who stood true to the Stars and Stripes.” He also reminded the crowd of many notable East Tennessee military commanders. He recalled, “As commanders in the Union army we had our Carter, Cooper, Gillam, Spears and a host of others who led our brave Tennessee boys on many a bloody battlefield. Last, but not least, we had our great Admiral Farragut.” Though Hacker concluded with reconciliationist rhetoric, he did proclaim, “I am doubly proud that I was a loyal East Tennessean and wore the blue in defense of the Union.” Hacker’s rhetoric along with the Union Soldiers’ monument itself reminded contemporaries and younger generations of the Union veterans from the region.

However, on August 22, 1904, the statue suffered a direct strike by a bolt of lightning, and part of the foundation was all that remained amid the rubble. GAR members mobilized into action and received federal support for repairs. United States Representative—and one-time member of Knoxville’s Ed Maynard post—Henry R. Gibson attempted to secure federal funds for repairs through a house bill. The bill eventually passed in April 1905, for $5,000. Repairs began the next spring, and the statue was rebuilt on October 15, 1906. The reconstructed statue did have minor alterations. The original Romanesque castle was restored to its original state. However, department
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commander John T. Wilder related at the 1907 state encampment that “Instead of the eagle, which formerly surmounted the structure, the war department has placed a statue of almost heroic size, of an infantry soldier ‘on guard,’ who keeps perpetual watch, night and day, over the peaceful denizens of the city of the dead.”

In 1903, two years after East Tennessee’s GAR unveiled the Union Soldiers’ monument in Knoxville, federal officials opened the ninth National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers in Johnson City. Officially called Mountain Branch, and locally known as Mountain Home, the facility proved a domicile for Union veterans. Although not memorials per se, Mountain Home itself and Federal veteran residents were yet another commemoration of the region’s contribution to the Union during the Civil War. Congress established the system of National Homes for veterans in a March 21, 1866, but it was Congressman Walter P. Brownlow—with the support of Tennessee’s GAR—who employed the notion of Unionist East Tennessee to secure the home in Johnson City.

Brownlow, the nephew of prominent former Unionist and Governor William G. Brownlow, was born in 1851 in Abingdon, Virginia. He received only three years of formal education, and during the Civil War, he unsuccessfully attempted to join the 8th Federal Tennessee Calvary regiment. He eventually purchased and became editor of the Jonesboro Herald and Tribune and then entered politics. He was appointed Jonesborough’s postmaster and secured a number of other state political positions—including the doorkeeper of the House of Representatives and superintendent of the Senate Folding Room—before being elected as a Republican Congressman from the First

---

District in 1896. Throughout his public career, Brownlow secured federal appropriations for his most prominent constituents Union veterans and GAR members.\(^{56}\)

Brownlow proposed legislation to establish a National Soldiers’ Home in Johnson City in 1900. Initially, the eleven-member board of managers of the national soldiers’ homes in Washington D. C. rejected Brownlow’s proposal, but Brownlow secured a five-minute interview to plead his case. During the meeting, Brownlow persuaded the board members by repeating “the oft-told story of East Tennessee’s loyalty during the Civil War,” and after three minutes, they unanimously adopted the proposal and increased the project funding to one million dollars. As the news spread in East Tennessee, the editor of the Johnson City \textit{Comet}, Cy Lyle, lauded Brownlow’s proposal, claiming it was “poetic justice in the proposition that it should be located in East Tennessee, the great mountain union stronghold of the south.” The news also caught the attention of Brownlow’s constituents—GAR members. Brownlow had earlier received roughly 7,000 petitions from GAR members across the nation, which he included in the bill submitted to Congress. At the 1900 state encampment in Elizabethton, department commander Henry Crumbliss lauded Brownlow during his commander’s address. Crumbliss claimed, “It is a matter of gratification to our old comrades that through the efforts of Hon. W. P. Brownlow…it seems almost certain that we will have a branch of the National Home for disabled veterans located in East Tennessee…these Homes are not charities, but the worn-out veteran is as much entitled to their benefits as to a pension.” He then

proclaimed that every Tennessee GAR member should thank and support Brownlow. In January 1901, Brownlow’s bill came before the House of Representatives and passed unanimously.

It took nearly three years to construct Mountain Home. Situated about a mile from downtown Johnson City, the veterans’ home site included 450 acres that had been purchased from four families—including James P. Lyle, a Confederate veteran, and James M. Martin, a GAR member of Jonesborough’s Post 35. Architect Joseph H. Freedlander designed the original thirty-six buildings in the French Renaissance, or Baux Arts, architectural style. The original buildings included eight barracks—which included 1,816 beds—a mess hall, four hospital ward buildings, administration building, laundry, store, chapel, a conservatory, an opera house, a zoo, a tennis court, and a Carnegie library. Mountain Home opened on October 15, 1903, and over the years visitors brought an estimated $30,000 to the local economy, while veteran residents brought more than $40,000 in pensions.

East Tennessee GAR members supported the establishment of Mountain Home, and many served as living monuments while residing at the facility. Jacob Leab, the first veteran admitted to Mountain Home, was a GAR member. Leab had served as a private


in Company I of the 8th Tennessee Cavalry regiment, and had been a member of 
Jonesborough’s Post 35. Almost a month after Mountain Home opened, state GAR 
commander George W. Patten encouraged needy members across the state to apply for 
admittance soon because of great demand. He claimed, “those who desire to become 
inmates of that home should not delay in making application…many veterans from the 
north will be making application for admittance to avoid the rigors of a more northern 
climate.”

It is unclear how many GAR members eventually resided at Mountain Home over 
the years, but they did have a significant presence at the facility. In 1907, four years of 
the establishment of the veterans’ home, the facility hosted the departmental 
encampment. The veterans chose to meet at the Soldiers’ Home, because it was “an 
opportunity for every comrade to visit the Home and see how Uncle Sam cares for the old 
boys.” The encampment not only provided the old veterans an opportunity to scrutinize 
the facilities that many would eventually come to reside in, but for many it also served as 
an opportunity to view a physical symbol of remuneration for their wartime service. 
Department commander John T. Wilder expressed as much in his commander’s address. 
He asserted, “It is a trite saying ‘That Republics are ungrateful’—the United States of 
America…stands out pre-eminently to refute the charge of ingratitude…Witness the 
beautiful home, carried on with military precision, supplied with every necessity to care 
for the declining years of the veteran, without any charge whatever. Every inmate

Collection.
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drawing a pension given him as a grateful acknowledgment of his past services in her behalf.”

Many in attendance agreed. The encampment itself resolved,

it is with great pleasure and gratitude that we behold the buildings and provisions made for the care and comfort of old soldiers, costing millions of dollars, in the Mountain Branch of the Soldiers’ Home, in this mountain section of our country, with its excellent management, its fine sanitary provisions, its cleanliness and good order, and every provision made for the comfort and welfare of the defenders of our country in their decline of life.63

Additionally, by 1907, members of Johnson City’s S. K. N. Patton Post 26 had relocated and regularly met at Mountain Home. Not surprisingly, post membership then skyrocketed. Between 1887 and 1898, the Patton post included an average annual membership of 33 members. By 1910, the post was the largest in the state and boasted 104 active members. Likely to cater to the many infirm and elderly veterans unable to travel, Mountain Home hosted the 1912 departmental encampment. By 1917, the Patton post included 125 members.64

While the GAR residents of Mountain Home served as living monuments to Tennessee mountaineers’ participation in the Union war effort, several other members mythologized East Tennessee’s Civil War through published memoirs and regimental histories. The accounts of Daniel Ellis and William A. McTeer were among the most notable.65 A native of Carter County, Ellis was a farmer, wagon maker, and Mexican-
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American War veteran before the war. At the outbreak of Civil War, he took part in burning the Holston River Bridge in Sullivan County in 1861, acted as a pilot from August 1862 to early 1865, and eventually served as captain of Company A of the 13th Tennessee Cavalry regiment. He was East Tennessee’s most famous civilian pilot, and claimed to have made fifteen treacherous treks, guiding several thousand Tennessee Unionists to Union lines in Kentucky. After the war, Ellis eventually joined the GAR and was a member of Elizabethton’s D. B. Jenkins Post 37. He was also a state Grand Army leader. In 1891, he was elected junior vice-commander—the third highest position in the department.66

Two years after the war, in 1867, Ellis published an account of his wartime experiences, Thrilling Adventures of Daniel Ellis. Ellis most certainly embellished some of his accomplishments, but other sources substantiate the work. It provides key insights into the wartime plight of mountain Unionists, the messiness of regional loyalty and brutality accompanying guerrilla warfare, and the network for smuggling Union recruits to Federal lines.

Ellis opened his memoir with insights into his upbringing and the issues surrounding the Civil War. Ellis was highly critical of the Confederacy, and claimed the war was over three abstract political theories—nullification, secession, and the right to revolution. He made no mention of slavery and the coming of the war. He admitted that citizens had the right to revolt against an oppressive monarchy or aristocratic government, but not in a representative republic. According to Ellis, Confederates had

---

illegally revolted against the Federal government, because “it is a people’s government; and if they wish at any time to change, alter, or amend the principles of government…they are fully at liberty to do so…There is no sense or reason in resorting to the very dangerous and destructive policy of revolution.”67 Like many East Tennessee GAR members, Ellis implied that he primarily contributed the Union war effort to save the Union.

Like other white GAR members, Ellis associated mountain Unionists and recruits to the legacy of the American Revolution. He asserted that Unionist mountaineers “had paid dearly for the boon of liberty which was originally purchased for them by the blood of their forefathers, but was vilely and wickedly suspended by the uprising of the rebels.”68 Whereas Confederates commonly dubbed southern Unionists as “Tories,” Ellis asserted that Confederates were descendants of British loyalists who had betrayed the Revolution. Ellis claimed that South Carolina Confederates have retired quietly back into the swamps of the Peedee and the Santee, which were so thickly inhabited by their illustrious prototypes, the old Tories of the first American Revolution, who fought against their own government at that day, and their sons, as the faithful representatives of the ancient Tory progenitors…fought against their own government in the dark days of the Southern rebellion, not forgetting that their Tory ancestry had fought in the cause of tyranny and aristocracy in the first struggle for American independence.69

Ellis spent the bulk of his memoir recounting his efforts piloting recruits to Union lines, and recalling the treacherous journey through the mountainous terrain. Besides describing attempts to evade Confederate patrols—and many pursuits—he recalls many trips traveling through pitch-black nights, wading through icy rivers, crawling through
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thick laurel groves, and enduring lack of food and water. In particular, he noted the impact the perilous journey had on refugees’ health. While guiding one group, Ellis and his comrades were so exhausted and hungry that they were forced to eat tree bark. He recalled, “we were hungry, cold, and wet, worn out with fatigue, and the sore feet of many of them we bleeding from the severe gashes they had received in their passage through the rugged mountains.”

By underscoring the personal hardships many mountain refugees endured while making their way to Union lines, Ellis ennobled East Tennessee mountaineers’ contributions to the Union war effort.

Ellis also emphasized that many of the refugees and recruits he piloted through the Tennessee highlands enlisted in Union regiments and were ideal soldiers, who distinguished themselves on the battlefield. Besides claiming that every recruit he guided safely to Union lines would be “subtracting that much of the bone and sinew of the South,” he was convinced “that the mountain-men would make the very best of soldiers, and would fight like demons when they would remember how they had been driven away from their families and homes by the rebel miscreants.” He also reminded readers of mountaineers’ martial prowess in a skirmish with Rebels in Johnson County. He recalled leading East Tennessee Union troops in a successful attack against a group of Rebels holed up at a barn. Some of the Rebels fought bravely before being captured, but, according to Ellis, they afterward admitted “they had been in the Southern army for three years, and that they had never been in such a severe encounter on any previous occasion.”

Ellis also implied that East Tennessee’s Union soldiers were comparable to

---
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Yankees, and that the mountaineers had significantly contributed to the Union war effort. Ellis recounted that as George Stoneman’s troops invaded western North Carolina from East Tennessee in 1865, one of Ellis’s men remarked that the Yankees “could not have passed through on this occasion had it not been for our company, who had run the rebels away before them.”73 The many descriptions and subjects within Ellis’s memoir paralleled many of the same themes put forward by other GAR members.

William A. McTeer also published his wartime memoir, *Among Loyal Mountaineers*. McTeer’s wartime reminiscences first appeared serially in the weekly *Maryville Enterprise*, and only after his death in 1925, were they eventually compiled and published in book form. McTeer was born in Ellejoy in Blount County in 1843 and when war broke out, he fled to Kentucky to enlist in the 3rd Tennessee Cavalry regiment. By the end of the war, McTeer was promoted to major and returned to Blount County. Like many white GAR members in East Tennessee, McTeer became an integral member of his post-war community. He was a lawyer, president of the Bank of Maryville, newspaperman of the Maryville *Watchman*, treasurer of Maryville College, and Republican state representative from 1881 to 1883.74 McTeer was also a prominent Tennessee Grand Army man. He was a founding member of Maryville’s Post 28, was elected departmental commander in 1907, and served as judge advocate, a council of administration member and assistant adjutant-general in 1909, 1910 and 1912, respectively.75 McTeer’s account was originally published in the Knoxville *Daily*.
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*Chronicle* in 1879-1880, as a serial column, and like Ellis and other GAR members over the years, McTeer helped mythologize East Tennessee’s Unionism.

McTeer opened his account by recalling the opening salvos of the war, and embellished the Unionist sentiment among Tennessee mountaineers. Instead of explaining the coming of the Civil War and its causes, McTeer began his memoir after the Volunteer State had seceded and declared, “at the outbreak of the civil war, the people of East Tennessee adhered almost solidly to the Union.” He explained that mountain Unionists proved a “menace to the Confederates,” and that Rebel “authorities made the great mistake of endeavoring to force the loyal men of the mountains to the support of the [Confederate] cause.” Though he acknowledged that overbearing Rebels attempting to disarm suspected Unionists created animosity, McTeer did not provide any insight into the complex local factors wartime loyalties and whether Confederates were locals or outsiders.76

Instead, McTeer traced East Tennesseans’ loyalty to the old flag to the unique Appalachian environment and their Revolutionary War forebears. He claimed that local Unionists in Blount County held secret meetings near Little River Gap, and that “a more beautiful place could scarcely be found…inspiring the spirit of patriotism and liberty.” He also implied that local mountaineers’ loyalty was noble because of their humble socio-economic backgrounds. He contended that although the area was sparsely settled and “the inhabitants dwelling in little log mountain houses, but with spirits of loyalty and patriotism as unconquerable as death itself.” Besides describing secret gatherings in which as many as 1,500 mountaineers gathered, including a flag raising, McTeer argued
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that the mountaineers’ Revolutionary heritage influenced their loyalty. Instead of
describing the complex socio-economic, political, and racial issues shaping wartime
loyalty, the veteran insisted it was local Unionists’ “love for the banner that had led their
fathers to victory up the sides of King’s mountain” which led them to renounce
secession.  

McTeer went on to describe Confederates’ occupation of the region and the
imprisonment of suspected Unionists, as well as a key element of the East Tennessee
Unionist narrative—flight through the mountains to Union lines. Creating sympathy for
loyalist mountaineers, McTeer recounted that Confederate oppression “drove men to
leave wife, sweetheart, mother, sister and all that was dear to them, through dangers and
into the jaws of death, that they might find refuge under the stars and stripes and battle
for the cause of truth and right.” Like many other GAR members remembered, McTeer
related that despite roving bands of Rebel cavalry patrols, “Squads of Union men would
leave in the night for the Federal lines, every now and then.” He then described his own
treacherous journey through the mountains to Union lines in Kentucky in the summer of
1862. McTeer, along with his two cousins and several acquaintances ran away from
home, and guided by pilot Thomas Burkhart, made their way to Union lines. McTeer
described the exhausting and dangerous trek—evading Confederate patrols, briefly
getting separated from the group, and traveling at night—and “offering our lives as a
sacrifice on behalf of our country.” Eventually, the band arrived at Cumberland Gap
and enlisted in the 3rd Tennessee Cavalry regiment. By detailing the hardships and
dangers of traveling through the mountains to Union lines, McTeer celebrated

77 McTeer, Among Loyal Mountaineers, 8-9.
78 McTeer, Among Loyal Mountaineers, 16.
mountaineers’ unionism. And, the flight narrative proved a key element of the Appalachian Unionist mythology.

Besides describing various skirmishes with guerrillas and formal engagements—including the Battle of Stones’ River—in Mississippi, Alabama, and near Nashville, McTeer also ennobled Tennessee mountaineers’ contributions to the Union war effort by describing interactions with Yankees. In general, McTeer was quite complimentary of his brothers-in-arms from north of the Mason-Dixon Line. He claimed the 33rd Indiana had “an excellent brass band,” and the 49th Indiana “had be best drummers and fifers I ever heard.” However, he did imply that Tennessee soldiers were superior—or at least equivalent—to northern-born troops. His regiment was being outfitted in Louisville along with the 15th Pennsylvania Cavalry regiment. He considered the 15th regiment “one of the finest regiments in the war, but was raised in the city of Philadelphia, and the men had yet to learn the art of horseback riding.” He explained that while the “Tennessee boys could jump on their horses and go at a gallop or run without trouble…the Pennsylvanians occasionally attempted it, and for a while in turning a corner of the street or road, there would be a separation between man and horse.” He did admit that the mountaineers were green and did chafe under military command at times, but he claimed it was yet another example of Tennessee mountaineers’ innate noble qualities. He related, “it took time to make soldiers with soldiers’ habits…particularly of East Tennesseans.” Again, McTeer romantically claimed that the unique Appalachian environment was the source for mountaineers’ characteristics. He asserted, “raised in the free, pure mountain air of East Tennessee, a spirit of liberty and independence naturally grew in the men of that
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locality until they were hard to discipline.” He claimed that although strict army
discipline required enlisted men to salute or doff their hats, “this East Tennesseans, as a
class, would not do” because of their fierce independence.\textsuperscript{81}

While describing the battles of Nashville and Decatur, Alabama, McTeer also
compared Tennesseans’ and Yankees’ martial prowess. According to McTeer, during the
battle of Nashville, he and Lieutenant Abijah S. Prosser came to the aid of a company of
the 12\textsuperscript{th} Indiana Cavalry regiment. He claimed that as Rebel pickets advanced, the
Hoosiers faltered because they “were inexperienced, especially in bringing on a fight.”
He claimed that he and Prosser—who would go on to be a founding GAR member of
Knoxville’s Ed Maynard Post 14—“rode forward, threw the company out into a skirmish
line, and advanced on the pickets at a trot…upon this we ordered a charge, and rushed
upon them so rapidly that they gave way in confusion.”\textsuperscript{82} Then, on December 23, 1864
near Decatur, Alabama, the Tennessee mountaineers again came to the aid of a regiment
of Indiana cavalrmen. McTeer related that Rebels had dug in along a ridge on the other
side of a creek. The author claimed that Major Williamson, who commanded the 10\textsuperscript{th}
Indiana Cavalry regiment, “was a brave man and a good soldier” but he prepared to
attack the Confederates “in line of battle and stand or advance in order” which would
“have been suicidal.” According to McTeer, “The Tennesseans had had more experience,
so on they came, screaming and yelling, with drawn sabres…The Indianans caught the
spirit, and on they went…Our forces rushed up on them with sabres and their line was
compelled to give way, and when once broken they became badly demoralized.”\textsuperscript{83}
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McTeer likely inflated his accomplishments, and those of his fellow East Tennessee cavalrymen, but his depictions illustrate the ways in which GAR members sought to justify and honor their military service.

East Tennessee GAR members consistently sought to commemorate the region’s Unionism and ennobled their contributions to the Union war effort. They not only reminded fellow veterans during private encampment meetings, but also sought public recognition by giving public speeches, constructing and dedicating monuments, and publishing memoirs. They often recounted their actual wartime trials and tribulations. However, along with non-veteran boosters, they were at the forefront of popularizing the ahistorical mythology that Appalachian mountaineers—especially in eastern Tennessee—were unanimously loyal to the Union during the Civil War. Instead of attempting to explain the complex socio-economic, political, and cultural issues that shaped wartime loyalty, especially the messy realities of Unionist sentiment, GAR members explained that mountaineers’ persistent Revolutionary heritage, their unique Appalachian surroundings, humble socio-economic backgrounds, sacrifice and bravery in the face of danger ennobled their wartime actions. While many GAR members were concerned with cementing their legacy, others certainly perpetuated the myth of Unionist Appalachia for self-interest. By portraying the residents of East Tennessee as unanimously loyal to the Union during the Civil War, middle class businessmen stood to gain financially by encouraging northerners to immigrate to, and invest in, the mountain region and rub elbows with them in GAR meetings. It was Union veterans’ concerns that future generations recognized and honored their wartime actions, and self-interest to a certain extent, which propelled the GAR to the forefront in mythologizing Appalachian memory.
throughout the late-nineteenth and early twentieth century. Strains of the Appalachian Unionist myth remain to this day.
CHAPTER 6

“YANKEES INVADE THE SOUTH AGAIN”: THE 47TH NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT AT CHATTANOOGA, 1913

On September 17, 1913 thousands of GAR members from across the nation converged on downtown Chattanooga, Tennessee. The blue-clad veterans met at the corner of Georgia Avenue and High Street, and prepared to parade through the Mountain City. Intermittent rain showers failed to dampen either the veterans’ spirits or the crescendo of anticipation among the throngs of onlookers lining the city streets. The parade marked the formal opening of the Forty-Seventh National GAR Encampment and fiftieth anniversary of the battles of Chickamauga and Lookout Mountain.

As the rain clouds lifted at 10 o’clock, the parade began. Columns of roughly 10 to 15,000 Union veterans, organized by home state, marched past downtown buildings adorned with red, white and blue bunting. The Sons of Union Veterans acted as official escorts of the gray-haired veterans, while standard-bearers carried post and state department flags. Bands played popular wartime ditties—including “Yankee Doodle,” “The Girl I Left Behind Me,” and even “Dixie.” The Chattanooga News reported, “The spectacle of aged marchers, tattered flags and fifes and drums playing the tunes that stirred the hearts of the boys in blue fifty years ago, though enthusiastically received, carried with it a touch of pathos, visible on every countenance.”

Black veterans marched alongside their white comrades. Whereas newspapermen noted that, “the first colored man seen in the parade” was the New York department’s color bearer, the first contingent of “colored troops was seen in the Kentucky division.” The black and white comrades from the Bluegrass State drew loud cheers from spectators as they sang “My Old Kentucky Home.” Local journalists then remarked that “the Louisiana-Mississippi department, composed mostly of negroes,” was close behind and represented their home states by carrying “stalks of sugar cane, topped with cotton balls.” As encampment hosts, the large contingent of 350 Tennesseans brought up the rear of the parade. According to local reporters, an estimated crowd of 30,000 enthusiastic spectators “frequently interrupted the progress of the parade,” and policemen found it difficult to force back the “hundreds who rushed into the ranks of the marchers to shake hands with the veterans.”

Though white and black veterans marched side by side, some white GAR members spontaneously coaxed a few former Confederate bystanders to take part in the demonstration. Three Confederate veterans in uniform “received a great demonstration in the parade as they marched arm in arm with veterans in blue.” Confederate Colonel G. M. D. Lowry accompanied the Massachusetts column and “appeared to enjoy being with the
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boys in blue and smiled freely and bowed as the crowds cheered.” In the spirit of fraternalism and reconciliation, the Federals had disregarded a strict organizational policy that prohibited all non-GAR members from participating in encampment parades.

The parade lasted a mere two hours; however, participants, spectators, and Americans across the country recognized that the parade marked a truly historic occasion. An Asheville Citizen article remarked that the reunion in Chattanooga “is the first time in history that such an encampment is held in the real south. It is true, one national encampment was held in Louisville, but that city was really too far north and too far removed from the actual seat of the war to be considered as part of the real south.” Others perceived that the Chattanooga encampment, along with the famous Blue-Gray reunion at Gettysburg a few months earlier, symbolically reunited the nation and marked the end of any lingering sectional animosities. The Boston Post noted, “The Gettysburg reunion beautifully typified the reunion of the Union. This Chattanooga encampment of the G. A. R. adds a sort of benediction to the former event.”

Contemporaries understood the significance of the Chattanooga encampment; however, historians have pointed to another reunion, the 1913 Blue-Gray reunion at Gettysburg, as the focal point of national reconciliation, highlighting how Civil War memory evolved in the decades after Appomattox. Historian David Blight has asserted that by the early 1900s America’s collective memory was based on white supremacy and reconciliation. According to Blight, cultural amnesia pervaded the nation’s historical purview. To achieve national unity, white northerners and southerners devalued the
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wartime accomplishments of black troops, and disregarded slavery and emancipation as the war’s major cause and outcome. However, more recent scholars—including Barbara Gannon, Robert E. Hunt, and Caroline E. Janney—have argued that the war generation celebrated emancipation and never fully embraced reconciliation. Gannon’s recent study, *The Won Cause*, draws attention to interracial comradeship within the GAR and asserts that the veterans’ organization enforced color-blind policies. Black and white GAR members advocated the “Won Cause”—a conviction that the Civil War’s purpose and outcome was liberty and union. The Grand Army thereby rejected the Lost Cause, commemorated emancipation and black military service, and continued to censure former Confederates for treason. Gannon’s significant work only briefly touched on the GAR in the South, and no one has examined an individual Union veterans’ reunion—especially the Forty-Seventh National GAR Encampment that took place on September 15-20, 1913.

Thus, this chapter analyzes that momentous gathering in Chattanooga, which took place on September 15-20, 1913. This encampment encapsulates a critical moment in history. This reunion in southern Appalachia was the first and only time the GAR held a national meeting in the former Confederacy and many contemporaries equated it with the Gettysburg commemorations. Throughout the week, an estimated 31,000 to 35,000 Union veterans and guests arrived in the Mountain City. Guests included GAR members and
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their families, as well as members of allied organizations who held concurrent meetings
during the week—including the Women’s Relief Corps (WRC), Daughters of Union
Veterans, Sons of Union Veterans, the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, the
Society Army of the Cumberland, National Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War,
and Andersonville Survivors, among others.12

Examining the 1913 Chattanooga reunion provides fresh insight into Civil War
memory, reconciliation, and race.13 In addition to official GAR documents and travel
writings, fourteen volumes of encampment scrapbooks form the foundation of this study.
Housed at the Chattanooga Public Library, the previously unused scrapbooks include an
exhaustive number of national and local newspaper articles, which chronicle events
before, during, and after the reunion. Employing these sources, it becomes clear that
encampment promoters hoped to showcase a New South and attract northern capital to

12 Auxiliary organizations of the GAR and other Civil War veterans’ organizations holding concurrent
meetings during the Chattanooga encampment included: The National Association of Army Nurses of the
Civil War, Woman’s Relief Corps, Ladies of the G. A. R., Daughter of Union Veterans, Sons of Union
Veterans, Sons of Union Veterans Auxiliary, National Association Union Naval Veterans, National
Association of Union Ex-Prisoners of War, National Association of Civil War Musicians, Society of the
Cumberland, Loyal Legion, U. S. Veteran Signal Corps Association, Turchin’s Brigade Association, and
13 Blight, Race and Reunion; Hunt, The Good Men Who Won the War; Gannon, The Won Cause; Nina
Silber, The Romance of Reunion; The Memory of the Civil War in American Culture, eds. Alice Fahs and
Joan Waugh; Thomas L. Connelly, The Marble Man; Robert E. Lee and His Image in American Society
(New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977); Wilson, Baptized in Blood; Foster, Ghosts of the Confederacy; Blair,
Cities of the Dead; Beath, History of the Grand Army of the Republic; Dearing, Veterans in Politics;
McConnell, Glorious Contentment; Shaffer, After the Glory; Coker, “Is This the Fruit of Freedom?”;
Scott, Blues Empress in Black Chattanooga; Joseph H. Cartwright, Triumph of Jim Crow: Tennessee Race
Relations in the 1880s (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1976); Leon F. Litwack, Trouble in
Mind: Black Southerners in the Age of Jim Crow (New York: Knopf, 1998); Lee, “The Lost Cause that
Wasn’t”; Paul M. Gaston, The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking (New York: Knopf,
1970).

13 Marten, Sing Not War; Gail Bederman, Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and
Race in the United States, 1880-1917 (Chicago, IL: 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, CT: Yale University Press, 1998); E. Anthony Rotundo, American
Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era (New York: Basic
Books, 1993); Peter N. Stearns, Be a Man! Males in Modern Society, 2nd ed. (New York: Holmes and
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the region by touting sectional reconciliation. However, a number of controversies suggest that sectional tensions lingered just below the surface. Additionally, the encampment reveals the complexities of interracial comradeship in the GAR, especially its limits in the South, and that white members’ racial attitudes varied widely. Lastly, analyzing the entertainment attractions—especially the GAR championship foot races—supplements the historiography on Civil War veteranhood, turn of the century athletics and notions of manhood.14

By 1913, the GAR in Tennessee, like the national order itself, was in its twilight. Whereas the national order consisted of 171,335 members and 5,572 posts, Tennessee’s department included 966 members and 32 posts in good standing.15 Death, old age, declining health, and waning interest in the order accounted for the loss of active members.16 Regardless of their declining numbers, Tennesseans remained the most active GAR members in the former Confederacy. Only members from border South states of Kentucky, Missouri, and West Virginia had greater numbers of members and posts.17 East Tennessee mountaineers continued to dominate the state order. In 1913, members of highland posts monopolized every elected and appointed leadership position in the state
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14 Marten, Sing Not War; Bederman, Manliness & Civilization; Hoganson, Fighting For American Manhood; Rotundo, American Manhood; Stearns, Be a Man!
15 GAR, National, Forty-eighth Encampment (1914), 61.
17 GAR, National, Forty-eighth Encampment (1914), 61. The numbers of active members and posts in southern departments in 1913, included: Alabama: 6 posts, 116 members; Arkansas: 22 posts, 405 members; Florida: 22 posts, 656 members; Georgia and South Carolina: 9 posts, 170 members; Kentucky: 64 posts, 1,061 members; Louisiana & Mississippi: 42 posts, 728 members; Missouri: 219 posts, 5,046 members; Tennessee: 32 posts, 966 members; Virginia and North Carolina: 28 posts, 381 members; Texas: 20 posts, 399 members; West Virginia: 34 posts, 1,057 members.
order.\textsuperscript{18} As of December, 84 percent of GAR members in the Volunteer State belonged to mountain posts.\textsuperscript{19}

For years, GAR members in the Volunteer State had actively campaigned to host a national encampment; only in 1913, did officials finally select Chattanooga in a most circuitous manner. In 1912, two Iowa GAR members came up with the idea of holding the 1913 national encampment in Chattanooga. They wanted the reunion to coincide with the semi-centennial of the battles of Chickamauga and Lookout Mountain. The two veterans posed the idea to members of the Chattanooga Chamber of Commerce, and urged representatives from the Mountain City submit a formal invitation at the 1912 GAR encampment in Los Angeles. But, Chamber of Commerce members declined to submit a bid. The city was already scheduled to host the United Confederate Veterans reunion in May 1913, and leaders doubted that Chattanoogans could adequately host two reunions in a single year. The situation changed after GAR officials at the 1912 encampment failed to agree on the next year’s meeting place. In June, national GAR leader Alfred B. Beers traveled to Chattanooga and to negotiate with city officials and Chamber of Commerce members. Local leaders agreed to host the reunion after Beers assured them that the encampment would draw large crowds and be an economic boon to the city.\textsuperscript{20}

Many across the nation were ecstatic with the selection of Chattanooga, and perceived the reunion would symbolically reunite the country. Even before Beers and

\textsuperscript{19} According to state GAR membership reports, Tennessee included 1,005 members and thirty-four posts. Of the 1,005 total members in the state, 845 belonged to posts in East Tennessee. See especially, GAR, National, \textit{Forty-eighth Encampment} (1914), 15-23, 30.
Chattanooga leaders had formalized the encampment plans, the Dayton, Ohio *News* reported that “One hopes it is true that the annual encampment of the G. A. R. is to be held this year at Chattanooga…After the great Gettysburg reunion…there would be a fitting counterpart in the journey of the northern veterans to a southern battleground.” The editorialist’s pen was filled with reconciliationist rhetoric, as the article gushed, “The old fighters of the North and South have forgotten their differences after these fifty years….the northern organization of veterans [would not] consent to gather at a city which for them once meant all that was wicked and hateful in political belief, and where the blood of their comrades in arms had been shed for the cause which they held so dear. But the spirit of hatred is wholly gone.”21 Nearly one month after Chattanooga was formally chosen to host the encampment, veterans from across the nation flooded city leaders’ mailboxes with hundreds of letters expressing their excitement to visit East Tennessee. A letter from Department of Ohio commander, Lieutenant Colonel William R. Warnock, was reprinted in newspapers; in it, he exclaimed, “the old comrades all through Ohio are enthusiastic over the selection of Chattanooga as a place to hold the national encampment this year, and a hearty welcome which we are assured is in store for us.”22

Newspapermen also captured the fervor surrounding the encampment as a symbol of sectional reconciliation. Besides lauding Chattanooga’s fine hotel accommodations, an editorial in the *Watertown [New York] Times* lauded the selection of Chattanooga by claiming that the host-city’s post-war development was a shining example of sectional
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reconciliation. It read, “The population of Chattanooga is made up of both Southern and Northern men, who are members of the same churches, neighbors, partners in business, and all of them are united in the work of entertaining the survivors of the Union army and their friends….No such thing as sectional prejudice exists in Chattanooga.”\(^23\) An article in the Athens, Georgia, Banner, also echoed the reconciliationist rhetoric. It predicted that, like the Gettysburg reunion, the GAR encampment “on Southern soil of the men who wore the blue will help wonderfully to make all forget the bitterness. This can be done, too, without giving up a whit of the loyalty to tradition and truth.”\(^24\)

As members of the Encampment Committee began planning the GAR reunion during the summer, local boosters, newspapermen, and committee members publicly touted the various ways in which the encampment would prove a boon to Chattanooga, East Tennessee, and the South. In June, the Chamber of Commerce drafted a chain letter to leaders in nearby communities to drum up support of the encampment. It claimed the reunion “offers a most unusual opportunity to this whole section of the South,” in two keys ways. First, they asserted, “that many erroneous Northern impressions of the South can be corrected at such a time,” and secondly, “there are thousands of those who will come, who are discontented with the rigors of their own climate, the unfriendliness of their soil, the lack of Opportunity, in short, as compared with the genial climate and numerous advantages” of the South. The members went on to assert that “every live community in the Chattanooga district, or easily reached from Chattanooga, should seize

\(^23\) “G.A.R. Will Meet In Chattanooga: First National Encampment In the South,” Watertown, New York, Times, July 10, 1913. This identical article was also reprinted, in a number of other newspapers across the North. See especially, “South Will Be Host To G.A.R.,” Newark, New Jersey, Star, July 11, 1913; “The Grand Army Encampment,” Holyoke, Massachusetts, Transcript, July 11, 1913; “Boys in Blue Will Meet in the South,” Moline, Illinois, Dispatch, July 11, 1913.

\(^24\) “‘Yankees Invade South Again,” Athens, GA, Banner, August 28, 1913.
this chance to attract home seekers and investors. No section of the country ravaged by
the late war is so rich in historic association or so full of promise for industrial and
agricultural expansion, as that in which you and we live.” The letter concluded by
encouraging community leaders to “start a ‘home coming’ campaign, advertise your
advantages now as never before, use the presence of this enormous crowd and the
existence of the cheap railroad rates to bring visitors to your town.”

Newspapermen also predicted that the encampment would not only provide an
opportunity to showcase the South, but also to mute derogatory regional stereotypes. One
editorial proclaimed,

> It will do the South good to undergo a friendly inspection by those who have
> not had opportunity, in recent years, to view this section in which is more
> of real fulfillment and rich promise than any other portion of the continent.
> What they see of transformation in business and general industrial life in
> Chattanooga will be an index of general conditions in the South, and if the
> old soldiers who wore the blue do not penetrate further into Dixieland than
> Chattanooga at this time they will be justified in reporting back home that
> when they saw Chattanooga they caught a true picture of the South as it is
today.

The local press also noted that large numbers of northerners visiting the South provided
an opportunity to correct many damning regional epithets and demonstrate the South’s
modernity. In response to a letter from one northerner who was unsure of visiting
Chattanooga for fear of contracting malaria, the local press related, “Many amusing
misconceptions of the south, which some people of the north have, will be dispelled by
the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic.”

25 Paul J. Kruesi, Chattanooga Chamber of Commerce chain letter, June 30, 1913, in “Grand Army of the
Republic Scrapbooks”, 1913, Chattanooga Public Library, vol. 1 of 14, p. 31.
26 “The Blue and the Gray In Epoch-Making Era,” in “Grand Army of the Republic Scrapbooks”, 1913,
Chattanooga Public Library.
South from the Deep South, the editorial claimed that northern visitors will see “this is not a jungle with wild tigers tearing through the tropical undergrowth, that it is not a land of huge plantations and old, white ‘goateed’ colonels, and negroes sitting around on cotton bales singing southern melodies, nor a malaria swamp…but a thoroughly wide-awake, hustling country, teeming with progress and inspired by a fine patriotic spirit.”

Other newspapermen predicted the encampment would encourage northern migration to, and investment in, the South. One editorial in the Atlanta American read, “Northwest Georgia, East Tennessee and Northeast Alabama have the finest year-round climate in the world. The G.A.R. encampment in Chattanooga in September….will bring thousands of visitors and many new citizens to our section of country. The South is on the eve of a great commercial and social awakening, such as she has never experienced before.”

Throughout the summer, members of the encampment committee and residents of Chattanooga worked tirelessly to prepare for the encampment. Members of the publicity sub-committee—headed by Paul J. Kruesi—oversaw an advertising campaign that distributed advertising materials throughout the North. In particular, publicity members sent chain letters and advertisements to GAR posts and newspaper editors across the nation. In a July 3 chain letter, Kruesi encouraged Union veterans to help spread the word. He stated,

We trust and believe that the papers in your own town will respond liberally by printing all notices and news of the Encampment to be held in the Mountain City. They will surely do so if you will request it, by formal motion of the Post or informal call on the Editors, who will thus see that you are interested and will be glad to use matter for which they are assured.

27 “Many Misconceptions Will be Dispelled,” Chattanooga News, August 9, 1913.
28 “Real Estate Gossip,” Atlanta American, July 13, 1913.
there is a demand….Chattanooga will eclipse all Encampment records if you will give us assistance.29

Kruesi and members of the publicity sub-committee also sought to entice tourists to the encampment by publicizing the local natural wonders and mountain vistas—especially Lookout Mountain and Moccasin Bend. Marketing the region’s beautiful scenery had been a common element of Appalachian tourism since the antebellum era.30

Kruesi and others sub-committee members mailed a panoramic picture of Lookout Mountain to 771 newspapers across the country for circulation. It was estimated that after being reprinted in national newspapers, over two million readers would be enticed to visit the Chattanooga reunion. In addition to the panoramas, a staggering number of articles on Lookout Mountain and its famous Civil War battle were circulated weekly. One editorial speculated, “something like 1,700 newspapers of the land—practically every newspaper of the name—is receiving such matter.”31

To publicize Moccasin Bend, the publicity sub-committee members mailed panoramic pictures of the natural wonder, with accompanying text, to newspapers and GAR posts across the country. According to one editorial, “between January and the end of May, the local G. A. R. publicity bureau has this week dispatched one of these pictures [of Moccasin Bend]…to each of the 6,000 posts of the Grand Army. Each is accompanied by a special request that it be pasted on the walls of the post meeting room.”32 The publicity committee’s campaign to market the regional scenery gained

32 Ibid.
widespread attention among GAR members. In a flair of hyperbole, one Indiana editorial 
questioned, “What pen can portray the matchless beauties that are unfolded from these 
mountain heights” surrounding Moccasin Bend? When taking an excursion there, the 
article claimed,

At every spot upon the brow, a bewildering panorama of landscape stretches 
forth. There are loftier mountains, more sublime stretches of precipice and 
beetling cliffs, taller peaks and deeper gorges, but there is no spot on this 
western where beauty is so charmingly united to sublimity, or where one’s 
soul is so thrilled without being awed by appalling surroundings; where the 
limpid lyrics of nature are so interwoven with her epics, where the melting 
hazes of purpling landscape dissolve into majestic stretches of tower peaks; 
where nature frowns and smiles, and woos the enchanted beholder, thrilled 
by the glories and majesty of God’s handiwork.33

Editors also lauded Chattanooga’s transportation networks, which would allow 
encampment visitors to take excursions to nearby scenic overlooks for a modest fee. A 
Massachusetts newspaper article read, “Trolley lines and automobiles will convey 
passengers from the city to the mountain in 30 minutes, giving them an opportunity to 
enjoy the mountain scenery and climate at reasonable cost.” “Nowhere in the country is 
finer scenery to be found, consisting of mountain and plain, and both placid and turbulent 
waters,” the editorial claimed.34

In addition to the publicity sub-committee’s marketing efforts, leaders of large 
cities and small communities across the South also sought to benefit financially from the 
reunion—especially those in Knoxville, Atlanta, Nashville, New Orleans, and even 
Griffin, Georgia. Residents of Knoxville especially hoped to benefit. The Queen City of 
the Mountains was hosting a large fair that rivaled the Chattanooga encampment—the

33 “Famous Moccasin Bend of Tennessee River at Chattanooga. National Encampment G. A. R. to be held 
here September 15-20, 1913,” The West Vernon Star [Mt. Vernon, IN], July 31, 1913.
34 “G. A. R. Annual Encampment, Program for Big Event being Worked Out With All Possible Dispatch,” 
Lawrence [MA] Sunday Sun, July 20, 1913.
National Conservation Exposition—from September 1913 to November 1913. The exposition touted the modern notion of conservationism made famous by President Theodore Roosevelt. Within eleven large buildings that reminded visitors of the famous Chicago World’s Fair, exhibits educated visitors on environmental issues facing the nation, including deforestation, erosion, flood control, dissipating fossil fuels, and pollution. To entice veterans to visit, Knoxville promoters mailed out invitations to 25,000 GAR members, but they also established special “G. A. R. Days” in which visiting veterans could not only see the various exposition attractions. They also encouraged visitors to take part in special tours “of the battlefields around and about Knoxville on which, unquestionably, many of them will be able to point out old landmarks of the famous struggles between Burnside and Longstreet in the East Tennessee campaign of 1863.”

Like other boosters, Knoxville promoters employed New South rhetoric to attract visiting veterans and challenge the imagery of a backward and primitive Appalachia. One Ohio newspaper described the exposition grounds and Midway to northern visitors traveling to East Tennessee, claiming that the eleven buildings “are filled with a splendid line of exhibits. These comprise government and state and commercial exhibits….the latter show the wonderful progress the South has made in all lines of commercial and industrial endeavor during the last few years; they sing a paean of triumph of the New South.”

Promoters also attempted to attract northern visitors to Knoxville by amalgamating New South boosterism with the myth of Appalachian Unionism.

Appalachian historians—including John Inscoe, Tom Lee, Ken Noe, and Shannon Wilson—have found throughout the late-19th and early-20th centuries, various individuals and organizations cultivated a “monolithic Unionism” mythology. Proponents hoped to encourage northerners to immigrate to and invest in the southern highlands by ignoring mountaineers’ divided wartime loyalties, and instead portrayed the region as home to a lily-white citizenry who universally despised slavery and remained zealously devoted to the Union.\textsuperscript{37} An editorial in the \textit{Erie} [Pennsylvania] \textit{Times} emphasized that Knoxville “lies in the center of a region that within the next few years will be the scene of the country’s greatest development. It is situated in the very heart of the greatest hardwood timber belt in the country; it lies in the very heart of a district rich in minerals of all kinds; it lies in the heart of a great agricultural and live stock [sic] section.” The column went on to embellish East Tennesseans’ wartime unionism, and disregard those Tennessee mountaineers who fought for the Confederacy, noting that “Eastern Tennessee furnished more soldiers to the Union armies than there were votes in that section of state at the time and it furnished more soldiers to the Union army than any other section of the country in proportion to its area.” The piece concluded by highlighting tourist attractions relating to famous East Tennessee Unionists and Federal soldiers—including the homes of William G. Brownlow, Andrew Johnson, and Admiral David Farragut—and the National Soldiers’ Home for Union veterans in Johnson City.\textsuperscript{38} 

\textsuperscript{37} See especially, Klotter, “The Black South and White Appalachia; Wilson, “Lincoln’s Sons and Daughters; Noe, “‘Deadened Color and Colder Horror’”; Inscoe, \textit{Race, War and Remembrance in the Appalachian South}; Lee, “The Lost Cause that Wasn’t.”

The board of trade members from Griffin, Georgia—near Atlanta—also arranged to publicize their small city, and encourage northerners to relocate and invest in Spalding County. The boosters printed 5,000 pamphlets, which W. B. Royster distributed to visitors throughout encampment week. The cover of the pamphlets proclaimed,

If you are a Home-seeker, Health-Seeker, Pleasure-Seeker, or Wealth-seeker, Come to Griffin. If you want to move South, and not too far south, where you will find swamps and malaria, ill health, and overpowering pests and difficulties; if you want to get away from the deadly chill of the Northern climate and its resultant discomfort and disease and expense; if you are too far south and need an equable bracing climate, and better social conditions; if you live east or west of us and desire a change for the better; if you want to leave floods, and storms, [drought] and disaster behind you; if you want to come to a country where you can work or play as the case may be, twelve months in the year without discomfort; come to Griffin.

Inside the brochure, readers found articles touting the Atlanta suburb’s manufacturing superiority. To encourage businessmen and entrepreneurs to invest, the brochure read, “Griffin invites the closest scrutiny by manufacturers seeking location for industries and offers every possible assistance in organizing and establishing new industries.” It proclaimed that Griffin was the largest manufacturer of Turkish towels in the world, and touted other industries including, “seven immense cotton mills in full operation the year round, representing an investment of $2,500,000 [and] buggy factories [with] an output of 4,500 vehicles per annum valued at $500,000.” According to the brochure, prominent local businesses included, four cottonseed mills, fertilizer mills, and, “one of the largest and best equipped plants in the country for printing, lithographing and book binding, ice, brooms, harness, backbands, cigars, canned goods, roll covering, cots, candy, etc.” To convince members of the fairer sex to relocate, the brochure also touted Griffin’s alleged social, religious, and moral superiority. Besides noting that Griffin was home to “churches of all denominations” and that local “public schools are the best that can be
had,” the brochure proclaimed that the Atlanta suburb “socially is accounted one of the leading cities of the state, and has always maintained the highest possible moral, religious and educational standards.” It concluded that local “women’s clubs are active and take front rank in civic and educational improvement and advancement.”39

The local Griffin newspaper heartily endorsed the pamphlet. One editorial anticipated that the promotional brochure “will be one of the best advertisements ever gotten out of Griffin and Spalding county [sic] goes without saying. The thousands of prominent people [visiting] in Chattanooga will doubtless read the story of Griffin with interest and if they do that they cannot help but sit up and take notice of this city and section.”40

Ordinary Chattanoogans and local merchants also prepared to welcome northern visitors, and capitalize financially. Though local boosters touted the accommodations provided by twenty-six hotels and numerous boarding houses in the city, encampment committee members canvassed the city for residents to open their homes and board tourists. To help locals accommodate northern guests, and potentially profit themselves, local retail furniture dealers offered to sell residents “a special cot with spring, mattress and pillow” for $2.50. The dealers emphasized that those who purchased the cots stood to personally profit from the investment. Dealers claimed that because most encampment visitors would visit for six days—at the average rate of $1 dollar per night—that an ordinary citizen who purchased a cot “would bring a return of $6 for the $2.50 expended for the cot.” Furniture dealers went on to claim that the $3.50 profit “of course does not

39 “Griffin, Georgia Greetings to the Grand Army of the Republic” pamphlet in “Grand Army of the Republic Scrapbooks,” 1913, Chattanooga Public Library.
40 “Griffin To Distribute Literature At Grand Army Republic Reunion,” Griffin, GA, News, September 14, 1913.
consider meals at all, and it is probable that in most private homes which take visitors, breakfast, at least, will be acceptable to the visitors and a fairly good profit can be made in this way also, without charging anything more than a very reasonable price for meals.”41

Though some residents complained that retailers had inflated the price for cots, others were wary of the social stigma associated with profiting from boarding guests. The local press attempted to assuage these fears and reassure residents that benefiting monetarily by boarding guests was reasonable. One editorial read, “No one need fear criticism of this character: ‘She is just preparing to take some encampment visitors to make some money.’ Every household in the city that accommodates any guests…will be doing Chattanooga, the encampment association, and the visiting crowds a big favor. It makes no difference if behind it all there is the desire to make a little ‘pin’ or ‘pocket’ money.”42

A separate encampment sub-committee made up of local African Americans canvassed Chattanooga’s black community to procure segregated accommodations for visiting black veterans and their families. In the late-1880s and early-1890s, the Tennessee legislature passed Jim Crow laws that enforced segregation in public accommodations and disfranchised African Americans.43 A mid-July editorial glowingly related that this subcommittee had secured accommodations for 700 black veterans, and that “all the colored ministers of the city have co-operated in securing the best homes possible for this occasion and their hearty co-operation…speaks of their interest in any

41 “Will Sell Cots Cheap,” Chattanooga Daily Times, July 29, 1913. Members of the encampment committee and the local retail furniture association set the price of cots.
43 See especially, Cartwright, The Triumph of Jim Crow.
work for the common welfare in which they have a part.” Historian Barbara Gannon has argued that the GAR was a fully interracial and “color blind” organization, and that white veterans ascribed greater equality to their black comrades; however, segregated accommodations at the Chattanooga encampment reveals the limits of white veterans’ racial attitudes. White and black GAR members did not board together at this southern encampment. If either white GAR officers or rank and file comrades were uneasy about segregated accommodations and Jim Crow, they did not voice those concerns publicly.

In the days leading up to the encampment, Union veterans and their families from across the country began making their way through the South en route to Chattanooga. National newspaper presses embroidered their editorials with reconciliationist rhetoric when recounting the interactions between northerners and southerners. One New Orleans newspaper described the scene of a group of local former Confederates welcoming a delegation of Union veterans from California at the depot, “A delegation of veterans of the Confederacy greeted the visitors with a characteristic Rebel yell and welcomed them to the chief city of the South. ‘Yank’ and ‘Reb’ were not spoken….the salutation was a word that means more—the word ‘brother.’” Local Confederate veterans also cordially received Union veterans and their spouses stopping over in Atlanta. Seeping with reconciliationist rhetoric, one article recalled that when 100 GAR members from Boston arrived at the train depot, “confederate [sic] veterans and city officials joined with local G. A. R. men in greeting the northern visitors, and extending the hospitality of Atlanta. The morning was spent in touring Atlanta in autos, visiting the sites of the battlefields

44 “Colored Folks Prepare To Receive Veterans: Their Committee Reports Places Provided for 700 If Necessary,” Chattanooga Times, July 19, 1913.  
about Atlanta, the Confederate Soldiers’ home and other points of interest.” The article also claimed that the genial interactions among the former enemies illustrated that “the divisional lines caused by the days of ’61 have been forever wiped from the slate of time.”

As thousands of GAR visitors began arriving in Chattanooga on Saturday and Sunday, many were stunned by the public decorations and many displays of the city’s, and the wider South’s, modernity. Many were overawed by the state of the art electric illuminations displayed at the train terminal and strung along Market Street—an engineering, electrical, and artistic feat that made headlines in New York City’s *Lighting Journal*. An arch in the front of the train terminal displayed the words “Welcome G. A. R.” in red, white, and blue lights, with an illuminated official badge of the GAR hanging from it. The display along Market Street—dubbed the Great White Way—consisted of 114 white lights strung along ornamental poles. In the middle of each streamer of lights, hung a star lit up with red, white, and blue bulbs. According to newspapers, the display made “the entrance to Chattanooga a blaze of electricity.”

Visitors were also certainly awestruck by the improved automobile roads and electrical trolley line ascending to the summit of nearby Signal Mountain. Both the trolley line and highway were examples of the improved transportation networks being constructed as part of the Good Roads Movement, which had been sweeping the South since the turn of the century. The roadway ascended 1,500 feet up Signal Mountain until it crested the top at Signal Mountain Inn. Newspapers across the country proclaimed that

---

the road “is constructed of modern lines, is of an average of forty feet in width, and the heaviest grade is but seven per cent. Heavy touring cars climb the mountain over this road at a speed of 25 miles an hour.” Newspapermen also lauded the trolley line. The eight-mile long track scaling the mountain’s steep slope, cost the Lookout Mountain Railway Company $250,000 dollars, and was completed just days before the encampment opened. The trolley provided guests easy access to the stunning vistas of the Appalachian Mountains and Cumberland Plateau atop Signal Mountain.49

Visitors could also not help but visit the agricultural and mineral exhibit in the basement of the city auditorium—the location of all formal GAR meetings during encampment week. The display exhibited a number of valuable minerals—including lime, copper, coal and coke—and farming products—including sorghum, alfalfa, okra, peaches, apples, and cotton—produced in Chattanooga and the surrounding counties. One newspaper editorial predicted that the display “is bound to result in great financial good not only to the district, but to the manufacturers of mineral products and to the owners of mineral properties.”50

While many visitors were certainly impressed with the improved roads, trolley lines, and agricultural and mineral exhibits, a number of controversial issues arose as the first visitors arrived. One squabble concerned local displays of the Confederate flag. As locals decorated the city in America’s national colors, a few unfurled Rebel flags. Some argued that they were not doing so maliciously and claimed that they had displayed both

48 “Road Improvements in Cumberland Mountains,” Steubenville, Ohio, Gazette, July 28, 1913. This article was reprinted in a number of other newspapers. See especially, Coshocton [Ohio] Daily, July 26 1913; The Antigo [Wisconsin] Daily Journal, August 4, 1913.
the Rebel and American flags during the UCV reunion. However, local newspapers censured the residents. One editorial demanded that “all flags or banners other than ‘Old Glory’” be struck down. It claimed that although most northerners would likely “overlook any show of the flag of the confederacy, they might feel—some of them, at least—that it was intended as disregard for the amenities of the occasion and a breach of hospitality, if not a show of disrespect…this is their show; they are our guests and hospitality and southern chivalry demand that we display none but their flag.” Even W. E. Brock, chairman of the UCV reunion, agreed that encampment week was no time to display the Confederate flag. He asserted that northerners “are our guests and I trust everybody will feel most keenly the responsibility that rests upon all Chattanoogans….everybody, of course, realizes the town should be properly decorated, and I trust that at least every home that was decorated for the confederate reunion will demonstrate the same patriotic spirit in decorating for the G. A. R. encampment with American flags.” The Confederate flags were eventually taken down. Yet, the tensions over displays of the Rebel flag suggest that despite reconciliationist rhetoric and public niceties between former Rebels and Federals, sectional tensions remained just below a veneer of cordiality.

In spite of the housing arrangements made for the African American visitors, controversy arose when black veterans showed up on the doorsteps of white Chattanoogans. Preparations had been made for local members of the Colored YMCA to receive African-American guests and direct them to their segregated quarters with black hosts. However, some black visitors unknowingly made housing reservations, on their

52 “Chairman of U.C.V. Reunion Urges All To Decorate,” Chattanooga Daily Times, September 13, 1913.
own, at whites’ houses. Racial tensions flared when whites refused to board them when they showed up with their suitcases. One local newspaper article showed little sympathy for the black visitors who were an affront to Jim Crow. The editorial began, “civil war was very nearly started again between some of the old [black] ‘vets,’ and one of our [white] Chattanooga men, and really, I think, had war started, our sentiments would have been entirely with the Chattanoogan.” It recalled that during the summer, an anonymous white Chattanooga resident—under the pseudonym “Mr. Citizen”—had made arrangements to house twenty-six black GAR members, without realizing the veterans’ race. Once the veterans arrived at their quarters, “‘Mr. Citizen’ hurried to the door, threw it wide open in true southern style, but somehow his greetings were never given—for the regiment was of negroes.”

Newspapermen did not elaborate on the situation surrounding “Mr. Citizen,” or any other such incidents. However, white GAR members’ public silence over segregated housing is deafening. They made no public outcry in defense of their black comrades. White veterans—from the North and South—may have accepted black veterans’ in the GAR, remembered African Americans’ wartime accomplishments, and commemorated emancipation; however, this did not necessarily prompt criticisms of Jim Crow segregation or endorsements of racial equality outside the post room.

Despite the few quarrels flaring up before the encampment activities formally began, GAR members from across the nation continued to pour into Chattanooga. Throughout the week, between 31,000 and 35,000 Union veterans and guests arrived in

the Mountain City. Guests included GAR members and their families, as well as members of the Women’s Relief Corps (WRC), Daughters of Union Veterans, Sons of Union Veterans, the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, the Society Army of the Cumberland, National Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War, and Andersonville Survivors, among others, also held meetings in Chattanooga during encampment week.

GAR and UCV officials publicly emphasized reconciliation over the next few days. On Sunday morning, September 14, many early arrivals attended patriotic church services. Prominent Union and Confederate veterans gave addresses to congregations during the semi-religious services. That night, many attended a patriotic large meeting held in the Chattanooga auditorium. Not only did both GAR and UCV chaplains give speeches, but GAR Commander-in-Chief Beers also addressed the crowds. Beers “paid a high and enthusiastic tribute to Chattanooga as a commercial city, a beautiful city and a place of rare scenic and historical features,” and went on to declare “the present time is one of the greatest epochs in the history of the country—when a people, forgetful of the past, can entertain so royally at close intervals the survivors of two great parties, which once stood against each other in a long and frightful conflict.”

The next day, many visitors took excursions up Lookout Mountain where guides explained the military movements from the 1863 battle. In the early afternoon, roughly

---

57 “A Day Long Prayed For,” Chattanooga Times, September 16, 1913.
3,000 visitors made their way downtown to Warner Park to witness one of the many unique encampment spectacles—a head-on collision by two passenger trains. Promoters Hayes Burmett and Wallace Bathman purchased two eighty-ton engines and six coaches, and at 3:30pm sent them hurtling down the tracks toward each other at thirty miles an hour. At the moment of impact, the two trains “plunged into each other, reared and plunged again in a mass of steam and flame and crumbled into scrap iron.” Though journalists and spectators considered the spectacle a “scenic success,” the stunt left Burmett and Bathman in the red financially. The two promoters lost several thousand dollars on the venture because threatening rain showers kept crowds away.58

While many guests ventured out to the Chickamauga National Military Park the following day, the Encampment Association’s breakfast for top GAR officials and the semi-official GAR meeting gained much press. Both events proved significant, as they illustrate the extent to which former Confederates and Federals fraternized, and advocated reconciliation, at least rhetorically. At 8:30am, members of the Encampment Association hosted a breakfast, aboard the Tennessee River steamer Trigg, for national GAR officers and heads of the various auxiliary organizations. Newspaper headlines dubbed the breakfast a “veritable lovefeast,” as former Rebels and Federals cordially broke bread together and “vied with each other in expressions of genuine respect and high esteem.”59 One editorial claimed the breakfast exemplified that “sectionalism in this country is at an end.”60

58 “Engines are Scrap Iron,” Chattanooga Times, September 17, 1913.
60 “Lines Break At Breakfast,” Chattanooga Times, 17 September 1913.
Commander-in-Chief Beers opened the breakfast speeches by expressing his appreciation for the courtesies provided by the hosts and introduced Joseph F. Shipp—Confederate veteran, former Hamilton County sheriff, and UCV quartermaster-general. Though in 1908 the United States Supreme Court had convicted the former sheriff to serve a ninety-day jail sentence for criminal contempt in the wake of the 1906 lynching of a black man Ed Johnson in Chattanooga, Beers described Shipp as “a true southern gentleman, American soldier, citizen and friend.” Various ex-Confederates and former Federals then took turns making speeches. Union general, GAR member, and prominent postwar industrialist in East Tennessee, John T. Wilder, proclaimed that “he had learned forty-five years ago that the southern people were just such as the veterans have found on this trip to Dixie” and that “he had known for all these years that the war was over, so far as the southern people were concerned because he had lived among them, done business with them and mingled with them almost to the exclusion of all others.” After breakfast had concluded, prominent Tennessee GAR leader and Chattanooga resident, Andrew J. Gahagan, spoke glowingly about the breakfast to members of the Society of the Army of the Cumberland. He cheerfully related, “I have just come in from the boat ride, and it would have done your hearts good to hear the kindly expressions that were uttered on all sides.”

Public exhortations of reconciliation and fraternalism continued that night at the semi-official GAR meeting. As the meeting was open to the public, the city auditorium was filled to capacity. Not only were Confederate veterans “conspicuous in the audience,  

\[\text{\textsuperscript{61}} \text{Ibid.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{62}} \text{Ibid.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{63}} \text{“Music Feature of G. A. R. Encampment,” Chattanooga News, September 16, 1913.} \]
having come to welcome the men who were their foes while in Chattanooga half a century ago,” but “the warmest welcome of the South was expressed to the veterans of the North and accepted by them with sincere appreciation.” GAR national officials shared the spotlight with former Rebels. Seated behind General Beers on stage, “sat, side by side, Col. Jack Crawford, Union veteran, with his gray hair hanging to his belt, and Gen. Irvine Walker, of the United Confederate Veterans.” Before formally introducing Beers, former Tennessee state senator and chairman of the encampment committee, Newell Sanders took center stage and not only declared that the reunion was “a demonstration as to whether a national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic can be successfully held in the south,” but also that “we are here as Southerners, as well as Northerners, to show that between the states of the Union everlasting peace reigns.”

The speakers taking the podium after Sanders also claimed sectional animosities had dissipated. After being introduced and formally assuming charge of the meeting, Beers underscored the significance of a southern host-city by claiming, “this Encampment, being the first held on a battlefield of the South, would prove a powerful factor in strengthening the bonds of fraternity and unity between the North and South.” After Beers conceded the floor, Chattanooga Mayor Thomas C. Thompson spoke, followed by Tennessee department commander, William D. Atchley of Sevierville. Atchley, who had served in the 6th Tennessee Infantry regiment during the war, welcomed the visiting northerners, saying, “When you came here fifty years ago you met

---

foes who contested every inch of ground, but you came, you saw, and, thank God! You conquered.” He continued, “We bid you welcome to a land…now blessed with peace and prosperity—a land where there is no North, no South, a land where both are one.”

Newspapermen noted that the cordiality exhibited between former Federals and Confederates continued on Chattanooga’s city streets. One article reported that “All up and down Market street can be seen groups of mingled heroes of both the blue and the gray, swapping yarns and giving each other the glad hand. The whole thing is inspiring.” The article went on to note, “The way the heroes of the past are mingling in brotherly love and have forgotten their differences on this occasion is an example of how Americans, when they have settled a thing, can be the best of friends and unite in a common cause.”

While former Rebels and Federals publicly advocated reconciliation, two incidents at the next day’s GAR parade suggested that the rhetoric rang hollow. Racial and sectional tensions simmered just below the surface. On Wednesday morning, September 17, racial tensions boiled over on the streets of downtown Chattanooga, as black and white GAR members were making final preparations to march in the encampment parade. As organizers directed veterans to the order of march, white members of a non-GAR concert band from Jasper, Alabama—one of several ensembles hired to perform in demonstration—objected to their assigned place in the procession. Band members and their leader, Professor D. P. Barber, vehemently refused to march ahead of “the Louisiana department, composed in front ranks exclusively of negro veterans.” Edward K. Russ, the white department commander of Louisiana and

---
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Mississippi, defended his black comrades. He reprimanded the musicians and gave them an ultimatum: either march with the black veterans as directed or forgo participating in the parade. As tempers flared, GAR bandmaster Summers noticed the commotion and interceded. He acquiesced to the white band members’ grievances, and reassigned them to march with a contingent of white veterans away from the black troopers.69 The veterans’ conflicting reactions during the episode reveal white GAR members’ ambivalence toward their black comrades.

Another incident immediately preceding the parade brought lingering sectional feelings to the fore. The seeds of the episode were planted days before the procession. Colonel Henry N. Hansen, commander of the Forsyth post in Toledo, Ohio, invited members of the local Nathan Bedford Forrest UCV camp to march at the head of the Ohio delegation during the GAR parade. The adjutant of the local UCV camp, Captain Lawrence T. Dickinson, accepted the invitation. The local press gushed over Hansen’s impromptu invitation as a symbol of reconciliation. One article noted,

> The marching of these old men—one once enemies, now warm friends—in the column today will be a fascinating picture to the younger generation and will teach them a lesson in American patriotism and bigness of heart and brain that ought to follow them all their days. This happy assurance on this second invasion of the south [sic] by the Grand Army of the Republic of a reunited country and a broad and liberal spirit of mutual esteem between the sections typifies in the most positive and convincing way the enduring quality of American patriotism and guarantees the stability of our governmental institutions for all time.70

While many lauded the overture, Hansen’s proposition violated a strict GAR policy prohibiting everyone, except Union veterans and assigned escorts, from marching in

69 “Alabama Band Declines to March with Negroes,” Chattanooga Times, September 18, 1913.
70 “The Blue and the Gray,” Chattanooga Times, September 17, 1913. See also, “Former Foes Arm in Arm,” Chattanooga Times, September 16, 1913.
encampment parades. Hansen also allegedly failed to inform either the Ohio departmental commander, Colonel W. R. Warnock, or Commander-in-Chief Beers, about the invitation. This led to an incident that would receive national press.

On the morning of the parade, roughly twenty to twenty-five members of the Nathan Bedford Forrest UCV camp, donning their gray uniforms, made their way to Fountain Square to meet the Buckeye State delegation. As the old Confederates plodded past the forming queue, GAR members all along the line began cheering loudly. As the old soldiers in gray and blue fell into formation together, just minutes before the parade was to begin, a messenger scampered up to Colonel Hanson to deliver a note from Ohio departmental commander Warnock. GAR officials had allegedly instructed Warnock to bar all non-GAR members from the parade, so he ordered Hanson to dismiss the Confederates. Hanging his head, Hanson apologetically informed the old soldiers in gray that they would not be permitted in the parade. He and the other Ohio GAR members expressed their deepest regrets over the embarrassing situation. Though visibly distressed by the news, the former Confederates acquiesced and began to withdraw. As the old Rebels filed quietly back to their nearby UCV headquarters, Union veterans along the parade line gave them another resounding ovation.71

---

71 For a detailed account of the incident, see especially, “Southern Troops Barred By G. A. R. From Big Parade,” *Register* [Mobile, AL], September 18, 1913; “Who Issued the Orders That Excluded Forrest Camp From Grand Parade?,” *Chattanooga Times*, September 18, 1913.
The day after the parade, reports of the alleged snub made headlines across the nation. Some GAR and UCV officials—as well as northern and southern presses—attempted to downplay the incident publicly. However, the hiccup unleashed sectional venom that had been lingering below, as well as above the Mason-Dixon Line. In particular, the fallout from the parade incident reveals veterans’ and contemporary society’s continued ambivalence toward reconciliation.

In the immediate aftermath of the parade incident, Commander-in-chief Beers and other GAR officers attempted to downplay the insult. Hours later, Beers justified the GAR’s exclusionary procession policy, stating, “The grand parade at each encampment is intended to be reserved for the Grand Army of the Republic and its official escort…. In the past we have been troubled with all sorts of organizations which wanted to march in the parade.” He explained that in order to ensure that “only veterans of the civil war associated with the Grand Army posts will be allowed in the parade,” he ordered department commanders to prohibit all women and civilians from taking part in the parade. Beers went on to blame Colonel Hansen for the misunderstanding, and tender an olive branch to insulted southerners. He asserted, “I want it emphasized that members of the Forrest camp were not excluded because they were confederate veterans. The Ohio officer’s procedure was in violation of every military rule of the Grand Army…. we

---

deeply deplore the affair brought on by the officer of the department which had received my orders and then allowed them to be disregarded.”  

The next day, UCV adjutant Colonel Dickinson also attempted to disarm the scandal. He stated publicly, “We [Confederates] do not attach blame either to the Toledo post or any member of the rank and file of the Grand Army of the Republic, for the orders served yesterday that we could not march in the parade.” He went on to state, “We will remember with only the kindliest feeling the receipt of the invitation to participate in the parade. I am glad we accepted it, and showed them that we have the most brotherly feeling for each and every man in the rank and file of the Grand Army of the Republic and for the officers of the Ohio posts.” He concluded by inviting members of the GAR to attend a special town-hall meeting at the N. B. Forrest meeting hall and engage in an open dialogue on the incident.  

The next night, hundreds of GAR and UCV members attended the “open campfire” at the local Confederate veterans’ meeting hall. By the time the meeting began at eight o’clock, every seat in the building was occupied and many in the overflowing crowd had to either stand along walls or listen through windows outside. While newspapers claimed it was a “meeting of goodfellowship [sic],” both GAR and UCV leaders chose not to tackle the issue at hand. Only Colonel Samuel W. Burroughs, a GAR member from Detroit, briefly touched on the parade incident. He insisted, “the wounds of the war were not healed at Gettysburg last July as has been insisted by many,” and deemed the order that barred Confederates from the parade a mistake. Major Thomas M.

73 “Who Issued the Orders That Excluded Forrest Camp From Grand Parade?,” Chattanooga Times, September 18, 1913.  
74 Ibid.
McConnell, a Confederate veteran from Chattanooga, then addressed the crowd. Though he lauded the Union soldiers’ martial prowess during the war, he unapologetically claimed, “I believed in the doctrines of the confederacy. What I believe today is nobody’s business.” He concluded by discussing the Reconstruction-era Ku Klux Klan, and defiantly implied he was a former member by telling the crowd, “Whether I was member of the Ku Klux doesn’t concern anyone but me.”

In the days and weeks that followed, members of the National Association of Union Ex-Prisoners of War were among the many northerners and ordinary Union veterans who were outraged that the incident undermined reconciliation efforts. Claiming to speak for his fellow prisoners of war, George A. Todd, former member of the 32nd Iowa volunteers and POW, asserted, “We all feel that an outrage has been committed against a body of gentlemen who represented in their person and particularly their uniform the chivalry and bravery of the south….Once we were mad at the south….[but] we have learned that there is nothing in resentment and if the south can obliterate from mind the bitterness of the defeat in the sixties, we hold that we can afford to forget any wrongs we may have suffered.” Todd concluded that, “Lessons were learned [at the Gettysburg reunion] from the proud southern gentlemen that should have prevented the affront offered to the veterans Wednesday….I and my comrades are ready to take their hands in token of forgetfulness so that the last days of the veterans of both sides may yet see the entire obliteration of Mason and Dixon’s Line.” Whereas Union POW association members submitted a formal petition condemning the exclusion of
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77 “Ex-Prisoners Are Red Hot,” Chattanooga Times, September 19, 1913.
Confederates from the parade, many GAR rank and file also advocated for a formal policy inviting UCV members to participate in all future Grand Army functions.\(^7^8\)

Despite northerner’s overtures, a number of southern presses claimed the incident exposed Yankees’ lingering spitefulness against the South. The editor of the *Orlando Reporter and Evening Star* asserted that because “members of the G. A. R. are disposed to object to fraternizing with their late foemen, worthy in every way of their respect,” former Confederates should refuse to take part in joint reunions with Union veterans. He maintained, “it will be well to omit these fraternizing reunions and let each side enjoy its own,” and resentfully claimed that Rebel veterans “are willing to shake hands across the bloody chasm and to do everything to prove that their bitter memories of the late conflict have been obliterated, but they are not ready to truckle or bend the knee that thrift may follow.”\(^7^9\)

Echoing the invective in the Orlando, Florida article, the editor of the Mobile, Alabama, *Register* placed blame squarely at the feet of GAR leader Beers. The newspaperman decried, “there is not a word of regret that an invitation informally tendered had to be withdrawn; nor any expression that the commander-in-chief would have been pleased to see the Confederate veterans in line….No; it is rather cold-blooded.” The author alleged that Beers enforced policy to its letter because of personal animosity toward Confederates. He claimed, “We remark that he discovered the rule, and applied it, after the Confederate veterans were in line and the parade was ready to start. We suspect that he discovered the veterans and saw it was time to apply the rule.”\(^8^0\)

\(^7^8\) “Confederates Wanted in All Future Parades,” *Chattanooga News*, September 19, 1913.


\(^8^0\) “Chattanooga Incident,” Mobile, AL, *Register*, September 19, 1913.
An editorial in the Paducah, Kentucky, *New Democrat*, rejected Beers’s strict parade policy as an alibi, and blamed a cabal of malicious GAR members for barring the Confederates. The harangue declared, “It is clear, however, the small act is to be placed at the door of a fraction within the G. A. R. management which was in Chattanooga—guests of the men to whom they offered the insult—and not the main body, and only the faction, if it can be uncovered, is to be held responsible.”81

While some southern newspapers spouted sectional venom, Chattanooga’s newspapermen sought to maintain the host-city’s reputation by downplaying the significance of the error. Whereas the editor of the *Chattanooga Sunday Times*, predicted the incident, “will be forgotten very soon,” the editor of the *Chattanooga News* reprinted an article from the *Birmingham [Alabama] Ledger* censuring those who employed the incident to stir up sectional animosity. It noted the blunder “is unfortunate because it gives an opening for bloody shirt wavers on both sides to do a lot of imprudent talking, which has some tendency toward reviving sectional feeling. It appears that the incident was in no way intended as any kind of a slight to Confederate veterans, and a few of them will so regard it….Many of the rank and file of the Union veterans expressed regret over the matter because they realized that it might result in unkind sectional feeling and unwise criticism.” It went on to conclude, “The men who really contributed to the promotion of either cause are willing to bury the sectional spirit for good and discourage anything that tends toward its revision. Happily, only a few bloody shirt wavers continue to stir up feeling, and even they have less influence with either side as the years go by.”82

---

Though the press continued to harp on the parade incident, the next day the GAR athletic championship captured the attention of encampment visitors and newspapermen across the country. Seven GAR members—ranging in age from 65 to 80 years old—were pitted against each other in two foot races, a 140-yard dash and a three-mile race. The athletic events themselves, the veterans’ comments, and the rhetoric surrounding the races provides insight into the Civil War generation and turn of the century notions of manhood.

The annual athletic contests were a popular feature of the national GAR reunions; however, the veterans’ track meets traced their roots to Civil War-era professional pedestrianism. Pedestrianism, or professional foot races, developed into one of the leading spectator sports in antebellum America. The contests were especially popular in northern cities because they provided opportunities for individuals of all socio-economic backgrounds and ethnicities to display their physical prowess. The foot races also often took on a carnival-like atmosphere. Gambling, drinking, and spectator rowdiness was commonplace. The racers often enthralled crowds by engaging in ostentatious showmanship and wearing gaudy costumes. To drum up greater interest and betting, it was common for accomplished runners to accept a variety of handicaps against less talented competitors, such as pitting a single racer against a relay team.83

Sporting fever for foot races spread across America in the wake of the “Great Foot Race” of 1835. The ten-mile race at the Union Race Track in Long Island, was organized after promoter John Cox Stevens offered a $1,000 purse to the runner who beat all his competitors and completed the course in less than an hour. As the race was open to

anyone, regardless of nationality or ethnicity, it drew nine diverse racers. Most were artisans or laborers from New York and the surrounding area, but two were foreign-born—an Irishman and a Prussian. American nationalism and nativism soared after Henry Stannard, a farmer from Connecticut, won the race and finished twelve seconds less than an hour.  

The long-distance running and walking contests enjoyed a resurgence in the post-Civil War period. However, most of the contests were long-distance walking races. Americans were swept up in “pedestrian mania” in 1867, after Edward Payson Weston successfully walked from Portland, Maine, to Chicago in twenty-six days. For completing the feat, Weston won $10,000 and became America’s most famous pedestrian. However, by the 1890s, the popularity of professional running contests slackened for a number of reasons. Whereas widespread suspicion of fixed races dampen enthusiasm for pedestrianism, Victorian sportsmen also criticized the immoral atmosphere at professional foot races. Additionally, the standardization of track and field events, as well as the rise of elitist amateur athletic clubs and intercollegiate track programs, led to pedestrianism’s decline by the turn of the century.  

Though track and field, baseball, and football had supplanted pedestrianism in popularity by 1913, a few of the veterans who toed the line in Chattanooga had previously competed in athletic events held at state and national GAR reunions, and one had been a famous former pedestrian. Reigning champion GAR runner, Colonel James L. Smith of Highland Park, Michigan, organized the athletic contests in Chattanooga.  

---

During the Civil War, Smith served in the 8th New York Heavy Artillery and the 10th New York Infantry regiments. After the war, Smith gained notoriety for his athletic ability. He competed in, and won, foot races and bicycling matches at previous GAR encampments. At the 1912 Los Angeles encampment, Smith wagered $1,000 and became the undisputed long distance GAR running champion after defeating a relay team of fellow Union veterans in a 10-mile race. Another editorial claimed that Smith “is fully as remarkable a figure as Edward Payson Weston the pedestrian, although he has not been so widely advertised.”

Before he organized the GAR encampment races, the sixty-seven year old Michigander had initially sought to race former Confederates in the spring of 1913. Smith sent a telegram to UCV leader, General B. H. Young, challenging any Rebel to a foot race at the UCV reunion, also in Chattanooga. Just like pedestrians had regularly done before a race, Smith offered to post a side bet on the contest and publicly crowed, “If they accept and can produce a Johnny that can beat me, I’ll eat my shirt.” Southern presses ridiculed Smith’s public challenge—illustrating that sectional tensions remained. A barb in the Spartanburg Herald implied that Smith’s notable running ability stemmed from wartime cowardice and flight during battle. It mocked that “after four years’ practice the venerable soldier [Smith] who wore the blue ought to be some sprinter still.” Although
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85 At the 1895 GAR Encampment in Louisville, Kentucky, Smith won the one-hundred yard dash and one-mile race. At the 1900 Encampment in Chicago, Smith won the time prize in the three and three-fourths mile bicycle race. See especially, “Athletics at Louisville,” The Washington Post, September 13, 1895; “Road Race of Veterans,” Chicago Tribune, August 30, 1900.
87 “Would Race All Comers,” Chattanooga Times, September 14, 1913.
89 n.t., Spartanburg Herald, May 25, 1913.
no former Rebel accepted the challenge, Smith reissued the challenge to any veteran—Union or Confederate—at the GAR encampment.

Six GAR members took up Smith’s challenge. Of those, sixty-eight year old Colonel H. Gilbert Barnes of Pittsburgh was Smith’s archrival. A real estate and pension agent, Barnes was a former professional pedestrian who had raced under the stage name “Old Soldier Barnes.” He was the well-known American six-day race champion, and he famously ran from Pittsburgh to the GAR national encampment at Cleveland, Ohio on the day President William McKinley was shot in 1901. Despite his accomplishments, Barnes hoped to unseat Smith at Chattanooga after being defeated by him in a number of previous encampment races. At eighty years old, local locksmith Meredith Wolfe was the oldest racer. Despite his age, one local newspaper described him as “one of the best bowlers in the city, and has always taken an active interest in all sorts of athletic events.” Wolfe was the local favorite and allegedly had beaten Smith during practice trials in the days leading up to the track meet.

As the veterans took to the cinder track at Boynton tent, they wowed the large crowd of spectators. Partaking in showmanship that rivaled their pedestrian forebears, each runner donned a gaudy running outfit. Whereas Smith wore a salmon colored running shirt and blue gymnasium pants, Barnes appeared in a sky-blue colored top, dark
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90 Smith’s six opponents included, Colonel G. W. Howe of Port Huron, Michigan; Colonel William A. Heinsohn of Cleveland, Ohio; Meredith Wolfe of Chattanooga; Captain W. C. Allen of Clinton County, Kentucky; Jacob Hoffer of St. Cloud, Florida; and Colonel H. Gilbert Barnes of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. See especially, “Seven States in Vets’ Meet,” Chattanooga Times, September 18, 1913.
93 “Seven States in Vets’ Meet,” Chattanooga Times, September 18, 1913.
blue britches, and pink socks. Howe was adorned in a tan shirt, blue running pants, and yellow socks.\textsuperscript{94} The costumes generated much excitement among the men and women watching.

Smith retained his GAR championship by handily winning both the 140-yard dash and the three-mile race. Once the starter’s gun fired for the sprint, Smith and Allen jostled for the lead. However, in the final meters Smith sprinted ahead and broke the tape ahead of the Kentuckian. Disappointing many local spectators, Meredith Wolfe did not take part in the race because he false started at the starting line and declined to reenter the race. After a short break, all the runners—except Wolfe and Allen—took to the track once more for the three-mile race. As the starter’s gun fired for the second time that day, Smith and Barnes bolted ahead of the pack. Barnes enjoyed an early lead, but Smith followed closely in his footsteps. For four laps the two rivals jockeyed for first place. Eventually, though, Smith forged ahead and defeated Barnes.\textsuperscript{95} Immediately after the race, Barnes issued an impromptu challenge. Likely to save face after being forced to admit defeat once more, Barnes crowed that he would take on “any man present to run until daylight” the next morning.\textsuperscript{96} Because no one accepted the proposition, Barnes certainly recouped his manhood to a certain extent.

While the track meet was one of many entertaining encampment attractions, it was also surely an opportunity for the aged veterans to exhibit their manhood and vitality.


\textsuperscript{95} According to newspaper reports, Smith won the one hundred and forty yard in seventeen seconds and the three-mile race in sixteen minutes and ten seconds. See especially, “Champion Smith Retains Laurels,” Chattanooga News, September 19, 1913; “War Veterans Sprint Fast in Foot Race,” New York Evening Telegram, September 19, 1913.

\textsuperscript{96} Ibid.
The veterans had already demonstrated their martial prowess during the Civil War. Yet, by partaking in athletic events at reunions, they could once more validate their manhood, to themselves, and to a new generation that employed athletics as a litmus test to judge a proper man. Historian James Marten asserted that throughout the Gilded Age, Union veterans were commonly stereotyped as destitute, debilitated, and sometimes mentally unstable.97 Countering these pejorative stereotypes, an editorial in the New York Evening Telegram claimed that after the Chattanooga races, “no longer is it advisable to picture our veterans of the civil war limping and weak from the effects of old age. Perish the thought! There are in the ranks of the Grand Army of the Republic several Melvin Sheppards and ‘Jim’ Thorpes.”98 Another reporter claimed in astonishment, “that men over 65 years of age should still feel active enough to run footraces seems hardly possible, but such is the case among the veterans of the Grand Army of the Republic.”99

Reporters also commented on the veterans’ athleticism and physique. One editorial read, “the endurance and stamina shown by Smith, Barnes and Howe in the three mile race was truly remarkable. The veterans forged their way lap after lap without the least semblance of exhaustion and when occasion demanded sprinted doggedly.”100 After the race, Smith also compared himself to young athletes in the prime of their careers. He bragged to one reporter, “Well, we told them we’d show them something good, and we did. I bet you won’t see another 70-year-old man run three miles in the time of a young college athlete within a century.”101 While most lauded the veterans’ exhibition of

97 Marten, Sing Not War, 75-123.
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physical prowess, a New Jersey newspaper editor criticized the veterans. He deemed the veteran runners foolish for partaking in activities better suited for young men. The critical editor of the Long Branch, New Jersey, Record was responding to an article in the Camden Post-Telegram. The editor of the Camden paper had claimed, “The Grand Army veteran who won the 140-yard dash in 17 seconds at Chattanooga presents a striking example of well-preserved vigor and knocks a dent in the Osler theory of the uselessness of a man who has passed the 60 year mark.” In response, the editor of the Long Branch newspaper snorted,

The performance might also be said to knock a dent in the theory that age brings discretion. The veterans’ usefulness should be greater in other capacities than in running races. There is a time for all things, and when one’s past sixty years old is not the time for violent physical exercise. Such tests of strength and endurance should be left to younger people.\(^{102}\)

The press continued to harp on the parade incident and foot race, but issues debated at the formal encampment sessions, on Thursday and Friday, further illustrated GAR members’ ambivalent feelings toward former Rebels. As occurred at every encampment, GAR members at Chattanooga held closed meetings in which the veterans debated major issues confronting the order, elected new officers, and discussed the order’s membership and financial standing. During Friday morning’s session, debate became quite heated over a resolution supporting federal pensions for Confederates. Former GAR Commander-in-Chief from Minnesota, Ell Torrence, put forward the resolution, which called upon GAR members to support officially congressional legislation that provided Confederate Soldiers’ Homes with federal funds. In particular, the resolution called for indigent former Rebels residing in Confederate Homes to receive

\(^{102}\) “More Athletic Than Wise,” Long Branch, New Jersey, Record, September 23, 1913.
one hundred dollars annually. Torrence took the floor and implored his fellow GAR members to support the statute. He beseeched, “I appeal to your good judgment, to your fraternal spirit, and to your sympathetic soldierly hearts. There is no old Confederate soldier today, who, if he approached your home hungry, you would not feed. There is not an old Confederate soldier today, who, if he stood at your door helpless, you would not gladly take in and shelter from the storm. To refuse to do either would do injustice to both.”

Other veterans staunchly disagreed with Torrence. Frank O. Cole, of New Jersey, adamantly rejected the notion that former Confederates should receive federal aid, because former Rebels remained guilty of treason. He determinedly claimed, I will give the last dollar I have got to any man who needs food or drink, but I will not put a Confederate soldier on the Pension Roll with my vote as long as I live. I believe there is a difference between patriotism and treason, and I believe that treason is odious, and I believe when we say that no one shall come within our ranks on whom there has been a stain of treason, we mean business.

Cole suggested that GAR leaders table Torrence’s resolution “until the crack of doom.” Officials agreed with Cole and voted to table the motion indefinitely. D. Minor Steward, resident of Chattanooga and past Tennessee Department commander, commended the leaders’ decision. Though Steward sympathized with his ex-Confederate neighbors, he, too, rejected any resolution that equated former Rebels with Union veterans. He claimed that GAR members in Tennessee ungrudgingly pay state taxes to support residents of Confederate homes, “but we forever protest against placing them in a position where they are before the law equal with the men who spent four years and shed
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their blood in the cause of preserving the Union….we will take care of our late enemies, but we will not rest if you place them on an equality with us.”

Some Union veterans were overjoyed with GAR officials’ rejection of federal aid to Confederates; however, local newspapermen perceived it as yet another stumbling block to genuine reconciliation. The day after the meeting, a Chattanooga Daily Times editorial implied that those who criticized the resolution were guilty of continuing to wave the bloody shirt. It railed, the “defeat of action on the [Torrence] resolution was due to the unmerciful attacks on it made by the ‘uncompromising’ Union veterans attending the encampment….Speakers attacked the resolution from the standpoint that its adoption might induce Congress at a later time to grant pensions to Confederate veterans and in that way place them on par in the eyes of the government with the federal veterans already enjoying pensions.”

Despite criticism from the press, Confederate veterans too were divided over receiving federal pensions, which speaks to the limits of reconciliation. According to the Atlanta Constitution, infighting among UCV members in Rome, Georgia arose after George W. Fleetwood forwarded a letter urging GAR members to support Torrence’s resolution. Though Fleetwood’s letter listed the names of several old Confederates who welcomed government annuities, “many members of the camp indignantly assert that they do not want and would not have federal pensions, and repudiate the action of their comrade as not representing the real sentiment” of the UCV. Nearly fifty years after Appomattox, some former Confederates remained unreconstructed.
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In the wake of the formal encampment sessions, Friday night’s entertainment features suggests that although the GAR was officially a “color-blind” organization, members did not advance this notion outside the post door. White GAR members remained ambivalent on race. On Friday afternoon, the local Sons of Union Veterans camp hosted a barbeque for northern visitors at Chamberlain Field—the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga’s stadium—which lasted into the night. Though encampment boosters had sought to undermine pejorative stereotypes of a benighted Dixie by showcasing a fully modernized and industrialized South, the barbeque entertainment included a reproduction antebellum plantation scene and a “real negro cake walk.” A log cabin was constructed on the field, which served as the centerpiece for the plantation scene. To provide a veneer of authenticity to the scene, organizers hired local African Americans to perform. One editorial claimed the entertainers were not “a troupe of blackfaced minstrel men, but…real negroes are to star….Care is being taken to get those with the best voices and those most familiar to the old plantation songs and manners.”108 The black entertainers opened up the show by singing “Massa’s in de Cold, Cold Ground,” and “Old Black Joe” in a minstrel half circle.109 In addition to singing, the performers also acted out “characteristic negro amusements and jokes.”110 Following the minstrel show, the black entertainers took part in a “watermelon feast, and a regular crap game, in which the participants are old timers who are thoroughly familiar with the idiosyncrasies of the ivory bones and know just how to talk to them.”111
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The white audience members then enjoyed the grand finale—the cake walk. One editorial broadcast that “it is to be a real cake walk, something seldom seen north of the Mason Dixon line.” Several local black couples “who claim the championship of graceful dances” entered the contest and performed for the northerners. The show provided northerners with idyllic imagery of slavery in the antebellum South, and white members’ lack of public criticism of the portrayals illustrates their ambivalence, at best, and implicit acceptance of patronizing racial stereotypes at worst.

White and black GAR members and Chattanoogans did not publicly criticize either the plantation scene or men and women put on display as specimens of an exotic culture; however, it is telling that African-American members of the local First Baptist Church hosted an emancipation jubilee for black veterans at the same time as the barbeque. Similar to the meeting of black veterans at Wiley Memorial Church the night before—in which black members of the Women’s Relief Corps and GAR spoke—the jubilee celebrated those African Americans who served in a war for black emancipation. Noted black clergyman, orator, and NAACP corresponding secretary, Dr. Madison Charles Butler Mason’s speech on the “Heroes of ’63” was the principal feature of the evening. Additionally, the host church’s choir entertained visitors by singing “plantation melodies” and “national airs.” It is unclear whether whites attended the jubilee, though all veterans and guests were welcome. Yet, the topic of Mason’s address, and the timing of the jubilee itself, was most certainly a challenge to the racial stereotypes disseminated
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at the barbecue, as well as a symbol of black autonomy and reminder of black service in a war that brought about “a new birth of freedom.”

The next day, Union veterans and their visiting families boarded trains for home and bid adieu to the Mountain City. In the weeks and months after the encampment, local boosters and northern visitors commented publicly on the encampment. Whereas some northerners commented publicly in newspapers, Welthea Miller of Akron, New York, published her observations in a pamphlet. Miller passed judgment on the encampment, Chattanooga, and the wider South. While Miller states that before the encampment, many northern visitors—like herself—were “wondering how they would be received” by Southerners, upon arrival she was pleasantly surprised that “to the everlasting credit of the South, it may be said that no northern city could have welcomed [GAR visitors] more warmly or treated them more rally. The hand of good fellowship was everywhere extended.”¹¹⁴ While she complained of sporadic rain showers throughout the week, she and many other northerners were overwhelmed by the encampment decorations and entertainment venues. She spoke glowingly of “the splendid decorations” and noted that “scarcely a house but displayed something in the way of red, white and blue.” She was also awestruck by The Great White Way, stating, “along both sides of [Market Street] were colored electric lights….at the middle and ends of the cross lines were white stars having electric lights in the center.”¹¹⁵

Though she spoke glowingly of the encampment attractions, she also commented on the encampment controversies. She noted that while GAR and UCV members “can bury their old time differences—but sometimes their families can’t.” When Miller spoke
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to a Texas GAR member about relations between former Confederates and Federals, the Texan related, “the Confederate veteran is all right—it’s his wife or daughter who makes trouble.” She recalled, “One hears remarks of that kind so often that he begins to believe that Kipling may have been right after all when he wrote the ‘Female of the Species.’” She went on to comment on the encampment parade controversy in which Confederates were barred from the procession. She claimed that “the Confederates are said to have taken no offense but the ladies were a different proposition—the ‘Female of the Species’ again.”

While Miller acknowledged that some sectional tensions remained, she recalled the reconciliationist efforts undertaken by both Union and Confederate veterans during the encampment. She claimed that at one meeting, GAR member Corporal Tanner “made the usual hit with the audience” after he “praised the work of the Sons and Daughters of the Confederacy and said they would be cowards if they did not keep in memory the heroism and sacrifices of their fathers. He scored those Grand Army men who seem to fear these organizations so much.” She went on to claim that reconciliation was the source of Chattanooga’s post-Civil War prosperity and industrial development. Echoing the many encampment boosters who spoke of “the New South where the survivors of the terrible struggle have joined hands in building up a future,” Miller proclaimed, “Chattanooga itself is an example, having been built by men who marched to the strains of ‘Yankee Doodle’ and ‘Dixie.’”
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Miller went on to remark on the natural beauty surrounding Chattanooga, which boosters had advertised so profoundly. Recalling her visit to Umbrella Rock, Miller stated, “one has a view which would beggar language describe. It is simply sublime! It is said that upon one occasion a European Prince stood here and involuntarily exclaimed ‘There is nothing like it in all Europe!’” She went on to claim that “travelers familiar with beautiful scenery in America say that [Appalachian vistas are] among the grandest of our country. No description can give any idea of the magnificent expanse of mountain, valley, forest and river. Away to the northwest are the Cumberland Mountains and to the east, Missionary Ridge and the Great Smokies.”

Besides noting the beautiful panoramic scenes while riding the Lookout Incline Railway, she also mentioned interacting with a local African American. She recalled that while visiting Orchard Knob Park with Mrs. Miner—a former resident of Akron who recently moved to Chattanooga with her husband—they spoke with the black caretaker, who was formerly enslaved. The unnamed caretaker claimed that he would voluntarily return to slavery and “go back to his old ‘massa’ in a minute if he had the chance.” Miller recalled that this remark “was a surprise to me.” This is quite a shocking statement. Yet, as the caretaker was speaking with two white women in the Jim Crow South, his comment most likely was an innocuous form of deflection when asked about his background as a former slave.

Miller went on to comment on locals’ speech patterns and foodways. She admitted to northern readers that her descriptions were “not given as an instance of a ‘peculiar’ Southern custom but rather a very ‘commendable’ one.”
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southerners were more polite than northerners, she stated, “one of the very first [expressions] that the Northerner will observe is the use of ‘ma’am’ and ‘sir’ with ‘yes’ and ‘no’…Not only by little folks and school children but by everyone, irrespective of age, color or previous condition of servitude.” She amused northern readers by stating, “the Southerner ‘fetches’ and ‘totes’…He ‘reckons’ where [Northerners] ‘suppose.’ He is ‘mighty glad’ or ‘right glad….Frequent use is made of ‘you all,’ sometimes so run together as to sound like ‘yawl.’” She proceeded to describe southern cooking. While she lauded local foodways, she admitted to her northern audience, “it takes a little time to get used to the unusual combinations.” She recalled, “When I first heard of eating rice with chicken gravy or roast beef gravy, as [northerners] use potatoes, I thought it was a great joke.” She went on to describe grits to northern readers. She stated, “grits is not a chicken feed as might be inferred from the name but a kind of corn meal used with bacon as a breakfast dish and also eaten with brown gravy, in place of potatoes.”

She also recalled the joy of eating watermelon and scuppernong grapes. Employing racial stereotypes, she recalled “I had never eaten ‘real melon’ until I ate them in the South and can now appreciate the strength of the temptation with which the darky has to contend in watermelon time.”

Perhaps speaking to potential northern investors in the South, she went on to discuss local agriculture and lucrative natural resources. Besides noting that corn was a commonly harvested crop, she found that “Cotton is the great crop and a field of it is a pretty site.” She went on to imply that southern farms were inferior to those in the North. She recalled, “there are no silos to be seen on the farms, no corn harvesters, no large
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flocks of cows, no eight-gallon milk cans and no gasoline engines.” While Miller deemed local farms as Spartan and lacking common technological tools, she did observe the plentiful timber in the area. Although timber companies had been exploiting virgin East Tennessee and western North Carolina forests for decades, she noted that “there is much more [local] timber than in the North. The mountains are heavily wooded.”

Miller went on to comment on the Civil War and Reconstruction in the region to her northern readers. Implying that white northerners and southerners shared outlooks on Reconstruction, she claimed that after Appomattox white southerners “were obligated to further submit to the rule of the carpet bagger and the negro. This of course, was not sanctioned by the best men of the North.”123 She went on to celebrate the many southern mountaineers who remained loyal to the Union during the Civil War. She asserted, “From the state of Tennessee 30,000 men enlisted on the side of the Union. So we may conclude that even in sixty-one there was sympathy with the Northern sentiment against secession and slavery and so there is today.”124

Local boosters and northern visitors publicly lauded the encampment a stupendous success by helping mend sectional wounds and symbolically reuniting the nation. A cartoon printed in the Chattanooga News captured this sentiment. The cartoon pictured a white GAR veteran on a train—dubbed the New South Express—bidding farewell to a beautiful white Miss Chattanooga, a female personification of the city. The caption accompanying the sketch read, “Goodbye, you’ve proved to us that there’s no Mason Dixon’s line to pass as we go back.”125 Welthea Miller, a tourist from Akron, New
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York, who visited the encampment and later published her observations in a pamphlet, agreed with the cartoon’s message. Besides dismissing the parade incident as a minor disappointment, she crowed, “on account of the Chattanooga Encampment we are much nearer the realization of that remark than ever before.”\textsuperscript{126} Despite Miller and other encampment visitors’ attitudes, the controversies during encampment week proved those claims unrealized. Despite their public rhetoric and niceties, GAR members remained hesitant to reconcile with former Rebels. Sectional animosities remained just beneath the surface. At the same time, white GAR members vacillated on race. White GAR members did not publicly criticize Jim Crow segregation, rebuke southern whites who refused to associate with African Americans in the parade, or condemn patronizing racial stereotypes displayed at entertainment programs. However, black Union veterans’ participation in GAR activities reminded white comrades and contemporary society of black military service and remained an affront to the Lost Cause. Though white and black GAR members marched side-by-side during the encampment parade, and former Rebels and Federals claimed lingering war wounds had fully healed, it was unclear to perhaps many concerned, how far the nation had yet to advance for both of those idyllic gestures to be fully realized.

\textsuperscript{126} Miller, \textit{The National Encampment At Chattanooga}, 26.
EPILOGUE

“CARRY ON UNTIL THE LAST MAN IS GONE”:
THE TWILIGHT OF TENNESSEE’S GAR

On May 16 and 17, 1934, members of Tennessee’s GAR gathered in Chattanooga for one of the last departmental encampments. The Chattanooga Times reported, “Tennessee’s Grand Army of the Republic, its proud ranks thinned to little more than a dozen, of whom only four attended the annual reunion.” The veterans, along with WRC members, officially opened the reunion on the evening of May 16 with a “campfire meeting” in the sun parlor of the Park Hotel. Music and war poetry orations were followed by a social hour in which the veterans provided guests with impromptu war recollections. The veterans in attendance were James M. Childress, Reverend S. M. Billingsley, Francis M. Underwood, and 97-year old William H. Nelson. All four were members of mountain GAR posts.¹

The next morning, the veterans met in the Pilgrim Congregational Church to conduct their business meeting. Besides electing officers, the only order of business was Nelson’s motion to “issue the last order for the blue regiments of Tennessee to ‘fall out’ and forever disband.” Nelson was a resident of Roane Mountain, had served as Tennessee’s 1898 departmental commander, and in 1934 claimed to be the oldest retired U.S. army officer yet living. He supported disbanding the state department and

discontinuing reunions, asserting, “There can’t be over twenty-five of us left…and not over seven will be able to attend this convention here. Why should we keep on?” The other veterans disagreed and voted Nelson’s motion down. After being elected departmental commander, Underwood declared, “I want to see this organization carry on until the last man is gone.”

After the 1913 national encampment in Chattanooga, old age, apathy, disease and death took a much more serious toll on Tennessee’s ranks than across the nation. The most significant decline occurred between 1916 and 1917. In 1916, the department included 29 posts and 783 members. The next year, the order had dwindled to only 552 members and 18 posts. Whereas the national GAR’s ranks declined by 11 percent that year, Tennessee’s had declined by 30 percent. State GAR leaders consolidated posts as the membership of smaller and more rural posts diminished, and by 1917 most of the remaining members belonged to posts in mountain urban centers. Four of the five largest posts in the state were in the eastern highlands. The largest in the state was Johnson City’s S. K. N. Patton Post 26, which boasted 125 members. The post most certainly thrived since members met at the National Soldiers’ Home, and was very convenient for veteran residents to attend meetings. Posts in Knoxville and Chattanooga endured. While Knoxville’s McKinley post included 100 members, Ed Maynard post boasted 74 members, and ten African American veterans comprised the all-black Isham Young post. Chattanooga’s Lookout post included 78 members and ten black veterans made up the Chickamauga post. The consolidation of posts was a practical response to membership
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losses; however, likely those elderly Union veterans in more rural areas could no longer maintain their membership by making frequent trips to post meetings in urban areas.³

Over the next decade, Tennessee’s GAR declined drastically. Members continued to hold annual encampments; however, members no longer published the once detailed encampment journals. In December 1936, two years after Underwood claimed the organization would continue “until the last man is gone,” Tennessee’s GAR officially surrendered its charter. Thirteen years later, the national GAR disbanded. The last GAR member passed away in 1956.⁴

For nearly thirty years, between 1884 to 1913, Tennessee’s GAR thrived and was the most considerable department in Dixie. GAR members in mountain communities made up greatest number of members, hosted the most state encampments, held the greatest number of leadership positions, constructed some of the only monuments commemorating Union veterans from the South, and in 1913 hosted the only national encampment held in a former Confederate state. While black veterans joined all-black and integrated posts in various mountain communities, white veterans remained ambivalent on race. East Tennessee’s GAR was integrated in principle, but white GAR did not openly challenge Jim Crow and African American veterans remained secondary partners in practice. For nearly thirty years, East Tennessee GAR members challenged Lost Cause proponents and postwar romanticism surrounding the Confederacy. Although they charged that former Confederates had committed treason, they maintained moral

³ The five largest GAR posts in Tennessee included: S. K. N. Patton Post 26 in Johnson City (125 members), McKinley Post 106 in Knoxville (100 members), Ed Maynard Post 14 (74 members), Lookout Post 2 in Chattanooga (78 members), and Douglass Post 86 in Memphis (45 members). GAR, Tennessee, Twenty-second Encampment (1905), 20, 25; Thirty-fourth Encampment (1917); GAR, National, Fifty-second Encampment (1918), 43, 134.
superiority by forgiving ex-Rebel neighbors. Because they lived among former
Confederates, GAR members promoted reconciliation and cautioned against raising
sectional tensions. For nearly thirty years, East Tennessee’s GAR proved a significant
alternative to the Lost Cause and Jim Crow in the South, as well as the Won Cause in the
North. Black and white GAR members reminded northerners and southerners that as
southern mountaineers, they too had struggled, bled, suffered, sacrificed, and waded into
the fray to help turn the tide of the Union war effort.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>E. Tennessee</th>
<th>HAMILTON CO.</th>
<th>KNOX CO.</th>
<th>ROANE CO.</th>
<th>GREENE CO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>3665 (72.32%)</td>
<td>186 (16.4%)</td>
<td>38 (40%)</td>
<td>195 (56.7%)</td>
<td>56 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>277 (5.47%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
<td>10 (2.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>208 (4.10%)</td>
<td>95 (18.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>3 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>159 (3.14%)</td>
<td>9 (1.7%)</td>
<td>11 (11%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>125 (2.47%)</td>
<td>70 (13.4%)</td>
<td>19 (5.5%)</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>99 (1.95%)</td>
<td>46 (8.8%)</td>
<td>15 (4.4%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>81 (1.60%)</td>
<td>15 (2.9%)</td>
<td>11 (11%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>62 (1.22%)</td>
<td>29 (5.5%)</td>
<td>9 (2.6%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>58 (1.14%)</td>
<td>37 (7.1%)</td>
<td>8 (2.3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>53 (1.05%)</td>
<td>10 (1.9%)</td>
<td>15 (16%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>39 (0.77%)</td>
<td>5 (1.0%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>37 (0.73%)</td>
<td>21 (4.0%)</td>
<td>8 (2.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>24 (0.47%)</td>
<td>13 (2.5%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>24 (0.47%)</td>
<td>14 (2.7%)</td>
<td>4 (1.2%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>16 (0.32%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>12 (0.24%)</td>
<td>5 (1.0%)</td>
<td>4 (1.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>12 (0.24%)</td>
<td>6 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>12 (0.24%)</td>
<td>6 (1.3%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>10 (0.20%)</td>
<td>3 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>9 (0.18%)</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>9 (0.18%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td>3 (0.95%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>8 (0.16%)</td>
<td>3 (0.6%)</td>
<td>3 (0.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>8 (0.16%)</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>6 (0.12%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>6 (0.12%)</td>
<td>5 (1.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>5 (0.10%)</td>
<td>3 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>5 (0.10%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>4 (0.08%)</td>
<td>3 (0.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>4 (0.08%)</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>4 (0.08%)</td>
<td>3 (0.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>3 (0.06%)</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>3 (0.06%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>3 (0.06%)</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2 (0.04%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2 (0.04%)</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2 (0.04%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Sea</td>
<td>2 (0.04%)</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>2 (0.04%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>1 (0.02%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Roman Empire</td>
<td>1 (0.02%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1 (0.02%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1 (0.02%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Post &amp; Location</td>
<td>Native State or Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884-1886</td>
<td>Edward S. Jones</td>
<td>Post 1, Nashville</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Edwin E. Winters</td>
<td>Post 1; Nashville</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>William J. Ramage</td>
<td>Post 14; Knoxville</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>William W. Rule</td>
<td>Post 14; Knoxville</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Augustus H. Pettibone</td>
<td>Post 8; Greeneville</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Charles F. Muller</td>
<td>Post 45; Chattanooga</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Andrew J. Gahagan</td>
<td>Post 2; Chattanooga</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>H. C. Whittaker</td>
<td>Post 46; New Market</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Frank Seaman</td>
<td>Post 14; Knoxville</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>William E. F. Milburn</td>
<td>Post 8, Greeneville</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>W. J. Smith</td>
<td>Post 3, Memphis</td>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1897</td>
<td>Halbert B. Case</td>
<td>Post 2, Chattanooga</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>William H. Nelson</td>
<td>Post 26, Johnson City</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Henry Crumbliss</td>
<td>Post 11, Kingston</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>S. T. Harris</td>
<td>Post 26, Johnson City</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Madison M. Harris</td>
<td>Post 14, Knoxville</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902-1903</td>
<td>George W. Patten</td>
<td>Post 2, Chattanooga</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Ben A. Hamilton</td>
<td>Post 14, Knoxville</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Walton W. French</td>
<td>Post 2, Chattanooga</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>John T. Wilder</td>
<td>Post 14, Knoxville</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>William A. McTeer</td>
<td>Post 91, Maryville</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Samuel W. Tindell</td>
<td>Post 97, Harriman</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>D. Minor Steward</td>
<td>Post 2, Chattanooga</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Ignaz Fanz</td>
<td>Post 14, Knoxville</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Charles H. Flournoy</td>
<td>Post 50, Knoxville</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>A. Marion Gamble</td>
<td>Post 91, Maryville</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>William D. Atchley</td>
<td>Post 58, Sevierville</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3: GAR POSTS IN TENNESSEE

*--All-Black Post  
**--Integrated Posts  
Bold--East Tennessee Posts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post No.</th>
<th>Post Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>George H. Thomas</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lookout</td>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lincoln*</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W. O. Rickman</td>
<td>Mt. Zion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wm. P. Kindrick</td>
<td>Waynseboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Farragut</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fielding Hurst</td>
<td>Adamsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Burnside</td>
<td>Greeneville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>Dandridge/Shady Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lathrop*</td>
<td>Pulaski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>R. K. Byrd</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cumberland Gap</td>
<td>Tazewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>James Lane**</td>
<td>Bull's Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ed Maynard</td>
<td>Knoxville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>William C. Carnes</td>
<td>Coal Creek (Lake City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M. M. Floyd</td>
<td>Dowelltown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Joseph A. Beal</td>
<td>Rogersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Albert T. Newton</td>
<td>Shelbyville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Daniel Meader</td>
<td>Fincastle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Oviatt</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>Tullahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chickamauga*</td>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Stones River</td>
<td>Murfreesboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Allen M. Smith</td>
<td>Nettle Carrier (Alpine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Alfred Couch</td>
<td>Romeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>James A. Garfield**</td>
<td>Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Joshua R. Giddings*</td>
<td>Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>S.K.N. Patton**</td>
<td>Johnson City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>William Jackson</td>
<td>Greeneville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Milton L. Phillips</td>
<td>Jacksboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Maryville</td>
<td>Maryville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Robert N. Hood</td>
<td>Fountain City (North Knoxville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>James P. Brownlow</td>
<td>Witts Foundry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Samuel Campbell</td>
<td>Hampton/Allentown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ellsworth</td>
<td>Jamestown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Henry Gillenwaters*</td>
<td>Rogersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>G. L. Williams</td>
<td>Union City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ben Moody</td>
<td>Morristown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Jonesborough**</td>
<td>Jonesborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Robt. L. McCook</td>
<td>Soddy-Daisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Dr. T Moore</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post No.</td>
<td>Post Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>D. B. Jenkins</td>
<td>Elizabethton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>P. P. C. Nelson</td>
<td>Elizabethton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>J. L. McKeethan</td>
<td>Sunbright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>A.B. McTeer**</td>
<td>Ellejoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Harvey Cowan**</td>
<td>Oak Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Samuel Tillery</td>
<td>Westvale/Oak Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lafayette Oaks</td>
<td>Lost Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Maynardville</td>
<td>Maynardville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>James. T. Haun</td>
<td>Russellville/Whitesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Dickson</td>
<td>Dickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mission Ridge</td>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Patrick McGuire**</td>
<td>New Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Calvin M. Dyer**</td>
<td>Rutledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>John. F. Sturm</td>
<td>Caney Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Sequatchie</td>
<td>Dunlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>James N. Nash</td>
<td>Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>James. H. Franklin</td>
<td>South Knoxville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>John Baughart</td>
<td>Mosheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Ephraim Langley</td>
<td>Deer Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Byrd’s Hill</td>
<td>Warrensburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>James G. Spears</td>
<td>Jasper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>David Davis</td>
<td>Bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>John R. Swan</td>
<td>Crossville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Isaac R. Hawkins</td>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Graveston</td>
<td>Graveston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>A.C. Catlett**</td>
<td>Sevierville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>John A. Logan</td>
<td>Erin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Henry H. Wiley</td>
<td>Oliver Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Fulton Jones</td>
<td>Van Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>W. T. Sherman</td>
<td>Friendsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>Loudon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>R. S. Kindrick</td>
<td>Rockwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>U.S. Grant</td>
<td>Byrdstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Nick Pitts</td>
<td>Sardis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Johnsonville*</td>
<td>Clarksville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>P. H. Sheridan</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>T. C. White</td>
<td>Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>McPherson</td>
<td>Erwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Mountain City</td>
<td>Mountain City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>Newport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Jim Grissom</td>
<td>Sandy Flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Samuel Stooksbury</td>
<td>Loy’s Crossroads (Loyston)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>A.C. Baird</td>
<td>Jellico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Meade</td>
<td>Spring City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Albert Cook</td>
<td>Dresden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Albert G. Davis</td>
<td>Ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>J.C. Griffin</td>
<td>South Knoxville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post No.</td>
<td>Post Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Dan Fisher**</td>
<td>Riverdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>James Ross</td>
<td>Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Isham Young*</td>
<td>Knoxville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>G. W. Moore</td>
<td>Lexington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Robert Turner</td>
<td>Sneedville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Chucky City</td>
<td>Chucky City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>John E. Baskett</td>
<td>Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Gordon Granger</td>
<td>Sale Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Birchwood</td>
<td>Birchwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Douglass</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>John Brown*</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>R. K. Lockett</td>
<td>Scarborough (Scarboro/Oak Ridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>William H. Steiner</td>
<td>New Prospect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Adam Wallace</td>
<td>Opossum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Lt. Hugh Neely</td>
<td>Austin Springs/Palmersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Holtsinger</td>
<td>Jeroldstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Lamar McConnell**</td>
<td>Maryville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Alvin C. Gillem</td>
<td>McMinnville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>John Newport</td>
<td>Huntsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Walter Harriman</td>
<td>Harriman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Allen Roark</td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>William B. Stokes**</td>
<td>New Middleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>William T. Sherman</td>
<td>Dandridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>James T. Shelley</td>
<td>Guenther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Lewis Collins</td>
<td>Pikeville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>William Nelson</td>
<td>Liberty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>E. O. C. Ord</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Capt. W. S. Long</td>
<td>Gainesboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>James G. Blaine*</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>U.S. Grant</td>
<td>Covington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>William McKinley</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>Knoxville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>J. N. Hayes</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>J. A. Garfield</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: East Tennessee GAR members gather for a picture at a state encampment. While the white members are in the foreground, five black members are along the periphery of the group. Four black veterans are in the very back row and another stands along the left edge of the group. Grand Army of the Republic Photograph, undated, in William Henley Nelson Family Papers, Series IV, box 5.
Figure 2: “Wiped Out,” a cartoon appearing in the Chattanooga News after the 1913 National Encampment illustrates the widespread reconciliationist sentiment among the visitors. It masks the sectional tensions boiling just below the surface at the reunion. “Wiped Out,” Chattanooga News, September 20, 1913.