Civil War Memories and “Pardnership Forgittin’,” 1865–1913
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Author's Note
What I Didn't See at Shiloh:
Musings on the Civil War

At Shiloh I had an epiphany. It was a spring day in April 2000, and the rain was gentle, not coming in torrents as it had in April 1862. I walked around the Bloody Pond, looked over the Hornet's Nest, and stood at the peach orchard. I tried, as tourists do at such sacred sites, to imagine what it had been like in that other April. I walked the cemetery rows and looked for Indiana's dead. But the epiphany came as I read and photographed the Indiana regimental and unit monuments. Shiloh's survivors had placed these massive limestone memory aids there decades after the battle. "Sermons in stone," Shakespeare called such monuments. But what was the sermon those Hoosier veterans were preaching to me? What did they want me to remember about Shiloh, Gettysburg, Chickamauga, and all the other battles? And were there other sermons not carved in stone? What didn't I see at Shiloh?

The Civil War has been with me as long as I can recall. I grew up twenty miles from Gettysburg and attended college in that town during the years of the Civil War centennial. I confess to unchaperoned carousing on the battlefield as well as to more academic study of it. Not fully aware of the privilege at the time, I was fortunate to have met Bruce Catton and John Hope Franklin, historians who became models for an impressionable history major. I went in different directions in graduate school and in my later teaching and writing. But the war was always there, a gash in the nation's history and in my memory.

My epiphany at Shiloh came as well from my interest in America's struggle with race. Growing up in the tight enclave of the Pennsylvania Dutch, the only diversity I knew was among several brands of German Protestantism. I completed my formal education before most history

*James H. Madison is Thomas and Kathryn Miller Professor of History at Indiana University Bloomington. He wishes to thank readers of earlier drafts of this essay: Darrel Bigham, Richard Blackett, David Buchanan, George Clark, Wilma Gibbs, Suellen Hey, Bill Munn, Alan Nolan, Richard Skidmore, Stephen Towne, editor Eric Sandweiss, and two anonymous readers for the IMH.
professors had much to teach students about race and so learned less about Frederick Douglass or W. E. B. Du Bois than about nineteenth-century secretaries of state. It took a long time to develop, but eventually I wrote a book about America's color line.**

As I was finishing that book I stumbled onto Shiloh. Years of reading and thinking about color lines had made me alert to the issue of race. I didn't see race at Shiloh. What I saw instead was silence. I could find no Indiana monument to the bravery and sacrifice that had freed the slaves. There was only one sermon carved on those monuments: Indiana's heroes had helped save the Union. But hadn't they also ended slavery, the nation's greatest tragedy? What happened to that redemption won with the blood of the 179 Hoosiers who died at Shiloh
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and the 25,000 who died between Fort Sumter and the peace of Appomattox?

The day after walking the Shiloh battlefield I toured a former cotton plantation. Slavery was absent there too. Young tour guides in full skirts were eager to show me tapestries and chairs, verandas and smokehouses, but not slave quarters or any real glimpse of the men, women, and children who worked on this plantation. I could understand that silence, but not Shiloh’s, not at a place of Union victory over a pretender nation built on the foundation of slavery. Don’t victors decide how history will be written?

History is often about seeing the things that are not there. In Arthur Conan Doyle’s story “Silver Blaze,” Sherlock Holmes solves the mystery by recalling that the dog did not bark in the night. American history is filled with dogs that should be barking but are not. They are silenced not by censors, at least not the kind that functioned under Stalin or Hitler, but by ignorance and complicity. We Hoosiers often are ignorant about our past, and when we do think about our “history” we tend toward stories and heroes coated with sugar.

This notion struck me anew when I helped create what is now the Colonel Eli Lilly Civil War Museum, opened in 1999 to visitors at the Soldiers and Sailors Monument in Indianapolis. Many people worked hard to build that museum, and I’m proud of what we accomplished. But the process brought home for me the large degree to which some Hoosiers, even those who know a good deal about battles and camps, rifles and hard tack, boots and cannon, preferred silence about slavery and the war. I wanted to protest: it was a war caused by slavery—not sectionalism, not economic differences, not states’ rights, not different ways of life, and not Yankee aggression. It was about slavery—and slavery was about race. How could we not talk about this subject at the very center of the Civil War and of our history?

If there is blame for our silences about slavery and race, it belongs in part to the historians of the first two-thirds of the twentieth century. For several generations historians like Indiana’s Claude Bowers wrote slavery out of the story, wrote their history to reunite North and South and to proclaim the glory of the nation state. And as they wrote, they covered their ears so they would not hear the barking dogs of slavery, emancipation, and justice for all.

Walking the battleground of Shiloh I thought about bringing together all these threads of my past and America’s past and tying them to the place about which I know and care most. Why were Indiana’s battlefield monuments silent about race and emancipation? What happened to those thousands of Hoosier voices that had sung the Battle Hymn of the Republic: “As He died to make men holy, Let us die to make men free”?

This essay is my effort to answer those questions. It is far from the last word. It focuses narrowly on a few issues, keeps close to
Indiana, and offers possibilities but no solutions to the mystery of silence. There is much history yet to be done, and it will likely be different from mine. I take pleasure in imagining youngsters living today near Gettysburg or Shiloh or the Soldiers and Sailors Monument in Indianapolis, walking those places, filing away thoughts and questions, and years from now connecting their particular present with our shared past, adding their voices to the nation’s memory. Perhaps they will be able to explain the silences over slavery and race. Perhaps they will see things at Shiloh I did not.

J.H.M.

One of the great ironies of American history is what Americans remembered and what they forgot about the Civil War. They remembered their bloodiest tragedy in parades, speeches, and monuments that celebrated peace and reunion. In their eagerness for healing they sought to suppress memories of the bitterness of the war, its bloody carnage, its complex causes, and its troubling results. During the fifty years following Appomattox they created silences that denied the central essence of the war. Into those vacant spaces formed by selective forgetting they placed revised memories that have endured with disturbing consequences down to our own time.

Hoosier poet James Whitcomb Riley made a case for selective memory in “Thoughts on the Late War,” written in 1890:

I was for Union—you, ag’in’ it.
'Pears like, to me, each side was winner,
Lookin’ at now and all 'at's in it.
    Le’'s go to dinner.

Le’’s kind o' jes' set down together
And do some pardnership forgittin’—
Talk, say, for instance, 'bout the weather,
    Or somepin’ fittin’.

The war, you know, 's all done and ended,
And ain't changed no p'ints o' the compass;
Both North and South the health's jes' splendid
    As 'fore the rumpus.

The old farms and the old plantations
Still ockipies the'r old positions.
Le’’s git back to old situations
    And old ambitions.
Le’s let up on this blame’, infernal
Tongue-lashin’ and lap-jacket vauntin’,
And git back home to the eternal
Ca’m we’re a-wantin’.

Peace kind o’ sort o’ suits my diet—
When women does my cookin’ for me;
Ther’ wasn’t overly much pie et
Durin’ the army.¹

Riley’s views were widely accepted by 1890. Both sides had won; the nation endured; the people, including those on the “old plantations,” were in splendid shape. Let’s talk about the weather, not the war. Let’s agree to be silent. Let’s forget, together.

This essay explores the process of forgetting and remembering as it was experienced by Hoosiers in the half century after 1865.² In placing their stone monuments at Shiloh, Gettysburg, and elsewhere, Hoosiers displayed a powerful desire for sectional reconciliation. In their postwar parades and commemorations they showed too a need for silence about the brutality of the war and especially about the divisive issues of race: the place of slavery in the coming of war, the victory of emancipation, the early goals of Reconstruction, and the vision of racial justice implicit in Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address. Forgetting such difficult matters facilitated the reunion of North and South and nurtured a flag-waving patriotism that flourished by the time of the “splendid little war” of 1898. Indianans may have been even more inclined than most northerners to forget that the war had been about slavery, since Hoosiers had been particularly divided by issues of
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race in the 1850s and 1860s. As always, however, there were some, especially the state's African Americans, who were reluctant to forget.

The war of 1861–1865 was the worst kind of war a people can endure, a civil war. And it was a modern war, with carnage so horrendous that its reality is beyond comprehension. Approximately 620,000 people died, 25,000 of them Hoosiers. Virtually all were Americans killed by other Americans. Bodies were so maimed that they were buried in graves marked by stones without names. Many who fought were heroes, but the horror of combat also caused some men to desert or to shirk or feign illness and some to go crazy. Americans afterward told romantic stories of heroism and valor on
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both sides. They repeated tales of sharing between boys in blue and
in gray, of exchanging tobacco for salt pork, of singing campfire songs
and telling jokes across the picket lines. Such fraternization did
indeed occur, but this was also a nasty war, one darkened by heinous
war crimes, such as the Confederates’ murder of black soldiers
attempting to surrender as prisoners of war (including several Hoosier
troops at the Battle of the Crater).5

The horrible events of this war did not simply fade gently into
memory’s twilight as its survivors aged and died. Their forgetting
seems to have been more deliberate and the remembering more
consciously selective. As Alan Nolan writes, many of the aging Civil
War generation were “moved to manufacture a history of the event,”
so as to convert “their tragedy into a Victorian melodrama, a mawkish
romance.”6

Many veterans showed slight interest in publicly remembering
the war in the years immediately after Appomattox.7 As they aged,
however, and began to realize their own mortality, they turned to
the past of 1861–1865 and recalled what many believed was the
central event of their long lives. They sat with fellow veterans and
reminisced about camp life, marches, and battles. They began to tell
their stories at formal reunions. The men of the Nineteenth Indiana,
part of the Iron Brigade, first gathered for a reunion in 1871; the
Fourteenth Indiana in 1872; Wilder’s Brigade in 1882; the Forty-
fourth in 1880 at Kendallville, where they marched proudly behind
their regimental flag on the eighteenth anniversary of the Battle of
Shiloh. In 1912, seated around a long table set up in a Franklin yard,
the old survivors of Company F of the Indiana Seventh ate their
dinner and retold their stories of Second Bull Run, Chancellorsville,
and Gettysburg. They also came together for funerals of comrades,
even on one occasion that of a former slave buried in a Rochester
cemetery in 1905 by some thirty survivors of the Eighty-seventh.8
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The most effective institution for bringing these veterans together was the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR). Indiana veterans played a leading role in organizing the GAR, and Indianapolis was the site of the first national encampment in 1866. The GAR soon became the most powerful veterans' organization in the state and nation. After growing slowly in the 1870s, the body expanded rapidly in the late 1880s, reaching a peak in 1890 of 25,173 members in 529 posts across the state. Although claiming to be non-partisan, the early GAR maintained close ties to the Republican party, whose candidates "waved the bloody shirt" to remind veterans to vote for the Union, just as they had fought for the Union at Chickamauga and Antietam. Republican politicking helped keep war issues alive and spurred the GAR's growth, but by the late 1870s Indiana Democrats were also active in the organization.\(^9\)

As they aged, some of Indiana's GAR members continued to express bitterness toward the old enemy. While the GAR advocated national reconciliation, it was adamant in asserting the essential wrongness of the Confederate causes of states' rights and secession. To the GAR it was not the "war between the states" but rather "the War of the Rebellion," as Hoosier veterans insisted on calling it.\(^10\) The Indianapolis *American Tribune*, one of the nation's most prominent GAR weekly newspapers, let its readers know whenever former rebels claimed too much for their lost cause. Rumors in 1892, for example, about a planned reunion of Union and Confederate veterans at the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago prompted a tirade from the *American Tribune* editors about the possibility of rebel flags flying on the shores of Lake Michigan. "There will be but one flag," they warned. Southerners "do not seem to understand that the Rebel flag and the cause it represents was knocked out twenty-seven years ago." The Confederate flag issue returned a year later when the Chicago


\(^10\)J. L. Reetz to J. Frank Hanly, February 8, 1905, Folder 7, Box 64, J. Frank Hanly Papers (Indiana State Archives, Indiana Commission on Public Records, Indianapolis); Charles H. Myerhoff to David E. Beem, March 13, 1909, Folder 8, Box 75, Thomas R. Marshall Papers (Indiana State Archives). That too changed. One Hoosier who reported on his attendance at the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg could nonchalantly write of "the Civil War, or the War between the States, as you will." James W. Fosler, "The Commemoration at Antietam and Gettysburg," *Indiana Magazine of History*, XXXV (September 1939), 296.
fair managers talked of holding a “Confederate Day.” Again, the Tribune expressed its outrage at the thought that “rebel flags are to fly and treason is to reign rampant in memory of the good old days when a Rebel was a patriot, and a patriot was a ‘Lincoln dog.’” Only “when wrong is acknowledged and reparation is made, by open confession of error, and a desire is expressed to atone for treason by future patriotism and support of the old flag and all it represents” would the Tribune “hold out its hand of brotherly love.” There would be no blue and gray reunion at the World’s Fair.¹¹

Other bitter Civil War memories flared up from time to time, especially in political campaigns. When President Grover Cleveland proposed returning the rebel battle flags captured by Union troops, the American Tribune sounded the alarm for its readers. This was in 1888, an election year, with Benjamin Harrison, a Union veteran and Republican, challenging the incumbent Cleveland, the Democrat who had never worn a uniform. The GAR’s views were clear. In 1892, when the same candidates were again running for president, the Tribune ran a series of articles reminding its readers about Indiana’s treasonous copperheads, its Sons of Liberty, and the widespread disloyalty of the Democratic party in 1861–1865. It was these same men, wrote the editors, who now supported the shirker Cleveland against the war hero Harrison.¹²

But by the 1890s hard feelings against the South were fading, as was the use of the bloody shirt in campaigns. Other issues emerged as more important for many Hoosier veterans. At or near the top of their list was government care for aging comrades who bore scars of battle. Veterans pushed hard for federal pensions and for state support of the soldiers’ home in Lafayette and the home for their comrades’ orphaned children in Knightstown.¹³ In these and other areas the state generally responded, not only because Hoosiers were grateful for veterans’ service and sacrifice, but also because so many men elected to political office were themselves veterans.¹⁴

The self-interest evident in pushing for pensions and care and some lingering bitterness over Confederate rebellion were understandable reactions for Union veterans. More interesting was their growing
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eagerness to embrace and to preach the gospel of American patriotism during the 1890s and after.15

Central to the veterans' more visible patriotism was their emerging concern to be remembered, a wish that intensified as they aged. Though they still referred to themselves as "boys," by the 1890s they were growing stooped and gray. At the GAR national encampment held in Indianapolis in 1893, fewer than one-third of the veterans were able to march in the grand parade that wound through the city. They were too old—so old that the American Tribune suggested regretfully that this should be their last parade on foot. By the turn of the century, at reunions and in their letters, veterans spoke of sick and feeble comrades and listed those who had died. As one wrote, "thus, we go, one by one."16

The aging veterans exhibited the normal human desire to pass something on to the next generation and to be remembered for their sacrifices in ways that would constitute moral lessons for all. They fixed on two related goals: creating detailed and accurate records of their war service and encouraging a patriotic attachment to the American nation. They believed their sacrifice and valor on the battlefield had saved the Union and that it was the duty of all Americans to understand that sacrifice and to glory in the nation they had saved from rebellion. At their reunions they told the old stories again and again, taking much joy in "recalling incidents of camp life."17 But telling stories at unit gatherings under shade trees in summer and in stuffy GAR rooms in winter was sharing only with their own. To be remembered they needed to reach a wider audience.

State and national encampments provided veterans with an opportunity to do just that. In its national meeting in Indianapolis in 1893 the GAR filled the city with red, white, and blue bunting and with stories and speeches at gatherings of brigades and regiments. Across the state, local campfires offered the aging veterans occasions to retell their tales to children, grandchildren, and neighbors. An Indiana GAR official wrote a veteran in 1905 to arrange such a gathering in Bedford and urged him to "drum up a good crowd of the old boys and citizens, and we will come down there and have a rousing good camp fire."18

16Indianapolis American Tribune, September 28, 1888, September 14, 1893.
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Hundreds of Indiana veterans wrote down their stories, and many of those stories survive in handwritten and printed accounts in libraries today. For example, at their thirteenth annual reunion in Madison in the fall of 1891 the Eighty-second Indiana Volunteer Infantry decided to commission a detailed history of their unit "for the perusal of generations yet unborn, and to teach them the patriotism, valor and heroism of their ancestors." Published in time for the national GAR encampment at Indianapolis in 1893, this account, like dozens of others, described in detail the particular part its subjects played in each engagement.

Veterans also attempted to gather up and preserve the relics of their war. The flags they carried were most important and became more so as they began to fade and fray. In 1908 Civil War veterans convinced the Indiana General Assembly to create a commission "to re-enforce and encase all regimental flags carried by Indiana regiments." Over the next two years the commission saw that the flags were reinforced with wool bunting but failed to raise funds to purchase airtight cases to store them in.

The most dramatic and costly act of remembering was to build monuments. Most Civil War monuments were placed in public spaces, visible to all. Indiana's veterans located their greatest Civil War monument in the center of the state, in the center of the capital city. The General Assembly approved construction of the Soldiers and Sailors Monument in 1887. Within a few years the Indianapolis Commercial Club could boast that the rising structure, ultimately nearly 300 feet high, would be "the greatest soldiers monument in the world"; the club used the monument as part of the successful campaign to attract the GAR national encampment to the city in 1893. When the GAR boys marched past the massive but still unfinished monument, the Indianapolis News reported that "many of them glance upward at 'Miss Indiana'... and raise their hats." When the monument on the Circle was finally completed and dedicated in 1902, a grand parade of 3,672 veterans marched behind their battle flags as tearful spectators packed the streets.

A few years later the state legislature built a second Civil War monument in Indianapolis, at the prompting of the many veterans who wanted to celebrate Oliver P. Morton as the soldiers' friend and
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war governor. The General Assembly in 1905 approved an appropriation of $35,000 to erect a monument to Morton and appointed a commission to oversee both additional private fundraising and construction. In 1907 thousands of spectators gathered in the hot sun on the east side of the statehouse to watch Morton's grandson unveil the new monument. As flags flew, Vice President Charles W. Fairbanks and Governor J. Frank Hanly praised the great Civil War leader. The Morton monument dedication was unusual for Civil War commemorations in Indiana because it opened a small place for women. Morton Monument Commission president William King told the audience that it was "a lamentable fact that there is no adequate history of the work and sacrifice of the women of Indiana during the war." He pointed with pride to the bas-relief on the south balustrade near the Morton statue, which acknowledged women's support of the cause. What King did not say publicly was that this small acknowledgment was made to repay the Women's Relief Corps of Indiana, the GAR's women's auxiliary, for assistance in raising funds for the project.22

Civil War monuments cropped up across the state. While the General Assembly in 1865 had authorized county commissioners to oversee and finance monuments in each county seat, most were not built until much later, between the late 1880s and World War I. Some were located in cemeteries, honoring those who had died. Many others were placed on town and courthouse squares. The styles varied, but among the most frequently chosen was an image of a common soldier standing at parade rest.23 Veterans also began to urge the placement of monuments on the fields where they had fought. The Civil War battlefields became sacred ground and major sites of commemoration—consecrated, as Lincoln said at Gettysburg, by "brave men, living and dead." Along with other northern states in the 1880s Indiana placed small monuments at Gettysburg to honor its own combatants on that field, six Hoosier regiments.24 It was a modest beginning to a campaign that during

22Indiana, Commission on Oliver P. Morton Monument, Dedication Ceremonies of Morton Statue and Monument, and Report of Commission 1907 (Indianapolis, 1908), 3-4, 17-18; Indianapolis News, July 22, 23, 24, 1907; Board of Commissioners of Oliver P. Morton Monument to Women's Relief Corps, circular, July 12, 1905, Folder 7, Box 64, Hanly Papers; Warren R. King to Hanly, October 3, 1905, ibid. For women's increased role generally see O'Leary, To Die For, 70-109.
24The state appropriated $3,000 for the Gettysburg markers. Celebrants at the fiftieth anniversary of the battle, in 1913, found them inadequate and "not in keeping with what the [federal] Government and other states have done at Gettysburg to preserve the memory of the heroes who fell there." Indiana, Gettysburg Anniversary Commission, Indiana at the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, Report, 1913 (Indianapolis, 1913), 109-10. For general contexts of this and other battlefield monuments see Michael Wilson Panhorst, "Lest We Forget: Monuments and Memorial
the 1890s took on large scope and expense and revealed not only those memories veterans treasured most and wanted to preserve but also those they had by this time forgotten or suppressed.

Chickamauga was the first. Not only was it the first national military park established, it was also of special importance to Hoosiers because so many had fought and died there. Indiana was well represented at the dedication of the battlefield itself in September 1895 by over a thousand people from the state, most of them veterans and their families. Governor Claude Matthews, Gen. James R. Carnahan, and Gen. Lew Wallace, the widely known author of *Ben Hur*, honored the bravery and heroism of the Union boys generally and Hoosiers particularly. The soldiers of Indiana “loved the Union,” Wallace said. “They loved the flag; every star on it symbolized a State, and secession meant an unholy mutilation of the flag.” The Confederacy was “wrong,” Matthews agreed. Yet Confederate boys were “equally brave, honest and sincere.” Wallace concurred: the southern soldier died for his cause and thereby showed “proof of his honesty.” Carnahan joined the praise of both sides: there was “no other field where both armies stood out so conspicuously for deeds of valor.”

Orators Matthews, Wallace, and Carnahan were all troubled by the soldiers’ lingering bitterness over the war. This concern ran through each of their speeches at Chickamauga as though they had scripted them together. Carnahan admonished that “he is the best surviving soldier of Chickamauga to-day who can bury all bitterness of heart. . . . Those who fought here,” he said, “whether from Indiana or Virginia, from Georgia or Ohio, from Illinois or Tennessee, from whatever State they came, were *all* Americans.” Wallace cited the magnanimous Lincoln, who throughout those dark days of agony never ceased to recognize “the Confederates, even those in arms, as his countrymen.” Thus, “to say truth,” Wallace admitted, “I am unable to understand the Northern soldier who would persecute a soldier of the Confederacy.”

The Indiana speakers at Chickamauga thus honored the Confederate veteran even as they condemned what Carnahan insisted was the “war of the Rebellion.” They urged veterans and their families to set aside harsh feelings and to become reconciled with the South. Again and again they celebrated the greatness of the American nation. Wallace warned that foreign powers (specifically, England, Spain, and Japan) threatened war and claimed, “United, we can stand single-handed against the world.” And should war come, he predicted, “all


—*Ibid.*, 103, 90, 105, 104.
the differences, jealousies and prejudices engendered by the recent Civil War will be laid forever.\textsuperscript{27}

Hoosiers eventually provided more than speeches to remember Chickamauga. In 1893 Governor Matthews had appointed a commission to study the battlefield and mark the exact positions of Indiana troops. But the process was so long and tedious that Indiana's monuments were not ready for the 1895 dedication ceremony; not until late 1897 were they in place. In addition to these thirty-nine large limestone monuments, the Indiana commission also placed seventy-six markers that noted positions held by Indiana units and precisely stated the day and time at which they were engaged in action. This project was also delayed because, in 1898, 50,000 United States troops were encamped on the old Civil War battlefield to be made ready for war with Spain, a vision that undoubtedly thrilled Lew Wallace.\textsuperscript{28}

Finally, Indiana returned to Chickamauga to dedicate its monuments in September 1899. Governor James Mount, who had taken part in the battle as a Union sergeant, paid homage to "our gallant boys" and noted that Indiana lost more men at Chickamauga than the entire nation had lost in the recent Spanish-American War. He then expressed thanks that "this nation, with its unified energy, will now move on to a higher destiny God has ordained for it."\textsuperscript{29}

In addition to stone monuments, the Chickamauga commission prepared a handsome published volume of its activities, dedication speeches, and unit histories. The histories, like the inscriptions on the monuments, listed the units' engagements fought, numbers lost, and officers. They also included a general synopsis of marches and battles covering the entire war, from the unit's organization to its mustering out, and then a close account of its actions at Chickamauga, ending with the text of each unit's monument and marker there, accompanied by a photograph of the monument.\textsuperscript{30}

These detailed, precise histories were so very important because they were part of the legacy the aged survivors were leaving generations to come. They support historian Stuart McConnell's observation that veterans "tended to understand the war as an accretion of local actions by small units of known individuals"; they paid little attention to the larger shape of the war and rarely recognized its possible causes and consequences. Except for stark casualty numbers, the histories offer

\textsuperscript{27}Ibid., 103, 108.
\textsuperscript{28}Ibid., 114, 113-27; Laurence D. Conley, “The Truth about Chickamauga: A Ninth Indiana Regiment’s Perspective,” \textit{Indiana Magazine of History}, XCVIII (June 2002), 113-43. Among those troops being trained at Chickamauga in 1898 were two companies of black Hoosier soldiers. Their presence prompted considerable hostility from local residents; Willard B. Gatewood, Jr., “Indiana Negroes and the Spanish American War,” \textit{ibid.}, LXIX (June 1973), 133-34.
\textsuperscript{29}Indiana Commissioners, \textit{Indiana at Chickamauga}, 314-16.
\textsuperscript{30}Ibid., 314-16.
\textsuperscript{31}McConnell, \textit{Glorious Contentment}, 21.
few suggestions of gore and suffering but instead show one march, bivouac, and engagement after another.

Chickamauga was only the first of the battlefield commemorations that Hoosiers would repeat in similar patterns and purposes over the next dozen years. In each case monuments and markers had to be precisely located with the consensus of the veterans. Speeches at dedication ceremonies emphasized reunion and overcoming hatred of the former enemy. Seldom in these orations, unit histories, or monuments did the veterans reveal the brutality and carnage of the war. Rather, at the turn of the century, thirty-five years and more after the war, they spoke of valor and heroism on both sides as they celebrated the reunited nation.

After Chickamauga, Indiana commemorated the Battle of Shiloh, organizing the Indiana National Shiloh Park Commission in 1901. Commissioners ordered twenty-one limestone monuments and wrote text for the inscriptions—"a hard and annoying work," one of them reported—so that "the future historians could write Indiana's history of Shiloh correctly." They published a handsome book of 310 pages detailing the battle in carefully prepared histories of actions around Bloody Pond, the Hornet's Nest, and at the Pittsburg Landing. Again there were only hints of the violence of war; for example, the Thirty-sixth Infantry was said to have "replenished their cartridge boxes and continued to fight," and "the woods in front caught fire and many dead and wounded were burned."32

This official way of marking and recording the past was very different from that of another Indiana Shiloh veteran who survived the long war to become one of America's most distinctive writers. In "What I Saw of Shiloh," published in 1881, Ambrose Bierce offered few precise details of the battle he experienced, none of the clarity suggested by stone monuments and bronze markers, and little praise for the willing sacrifice so celebrated in dedication ceremonies decades later. Instead, Bierce wrote of the fog of war, the surreal confusion, its indignity and absurdity, the reality of soldiers deserting and of bodies butchered and scorched. The eighteen-year-old Hoosier enlistee had eagerly left his Warsaw home in 1861 for service in Indiana's Ninth Regiment. He fought bravely and well, but his life was marked forever by what he saw at Shiloh, Chickamauga, and dozens of other fields of battle. Unlike many of his comrades Bierce offered no words of flowery patriotism or heroic sacrifice. He abhorred the hero worship of veterans, North and South, that swept the nation at the end of the century: "I would rather be a dead dog among buzzards than a dead hero among admirers," he wrote in 1885. He refused to attend the dedications and reunions,
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though he returned late in life to the battlefields of his youth to walk the ground and to brood. He “practically drowned” in the blood of the Civil War, Daniel Aaron wrote: “for the remainder of his life it bubbled in his imagination and stained his prose.” Bierce’s hard memories were ones few of his fellow Hoosiers publicly acknowledged.35

Occasionally, however, some of the war’s acrimony surfaced, even in official sources. In its published report of 1904 the Shiloh Commission included Confederate Gen. Albert Sidney Johnston’s order to his men before the battle. In 1862 Johnston had urged his troops to turn back “the invaders of your country” and to win “a decisive victory over the agrarian mercenaries sent to subjugate and despoil you of your liberties, property and honor.” Johnston died at Shiloh; his successor, Gen. P. G. T. Beauregard, took command as the tide turned and in retreat told his men, the enemy’s “insolent
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presence still pollutes your soil, his hostile flag still flaunts before you. There can be no peace so long as these things are."

But emotions such as Bierce's disgust at the slaughter and Confederate officers' fury at invading Yankees were not much on display at Shiloh forty-one years after the battle. The dedication of Indiana's monuments on April 6 and 7, 1903, attracted nearly five hundred Hoosiers, who heard Indiana's greatest orators celebrate national unity and urge the renunciation of past bitterness and division. Indiana senator Albert Beveridge paid tribute to those who had been "fortunate to die for an undying cause, . . . for the American people undivided, indivisible." Beveridge urged Hoosiers to forget sections of North and South and asked all states to forget their own flags "and remember only the colors of the Republic!" Gov. Winfield T. Durbin promised that the Shiloh monuments "shall speak to generations yet unborn," as (quoting Shakespeare) "sermons in stones"—sermons of national unity and patriotism.

Two Confederate veterans spoke at Indiana's 1903 Shiloh monuments ceremony. Former Confederate Col. Josiah Patterson, of Memphis, pointed out that the monuments were erected so as not to "give offense to any veteran, or the descendant of any veteran, no matter under which flag he fought." Patterson pronounced "a malediction on all men who would cherish or revive the animosities of the Civil War." Former Confederate Gen. George W. Gordon, representing the state of Tennessee, reminded his audience that in 1862 "Tennessee saluted Indiana upon this field, with the blast of bugles" but that now "the past is behind." And yet Gordon could not resist speculating that if Johnston, the Confederate commanding general, "had survived three brief hours longer, the Confederate flag would now be floating on the banks of the Ohio river." A vision that hardly squared with Beveridge's ideal of a great nation, it was a small ripple in the tide of the South's growing romanticization of the lost cause, which imagined what might have been. Nonetheless, the hundreds of Hoosiers in the audience politely offered a "prolonged applause" as General Gordon and Governor Durbin joined hands, a small step in Indiana's growing willingness to forget and forgive, perhaps even a step toward accepting the Confederate version of the past.
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The pattern was repeated at Vicksburg. The Indiana Vicksburg Military Park Commission published a 474-page volume, grander even than those for Chickamauga and Shiloh. At the dedication of Indiana’s sixteen monuments and fifty-three markers at Vicksburg on December 29, 1908, Governor Hanly celebrated the Union victory but also asserted that “the past is remembered without bitterness.” Former Governor Durbin recalled the hostility he felt as a young soldier at the Vicksburg siege and contrasted it with the joy of reconciliation he now felt in “a union of adoration of the stars and stripes forever.” Durbin also celebrated Indiana women, who as mothers, wives, and sweethearts gave the soldiers love, courage, and patriotism. (“In the thickness of the fight—you felt the little locket wherein was a likeness of her sweet face pressing your heart.”)37

Again Indiana invited southerners to the platform. Vicksburg’s school children sang “America” and then “Dixie.” Mississippi Gov. F. F. Noel welcomed the Hoosiers as “fellow citizens of a happily reunited country, the grandest and best of earth.” All now joined, the governor claimed, “to blot out and to forget all that might excite or perpetuate bitterness on account of the late unpleasantness.” The governor’s wife presented flowers to the Indiana veterans and also spoke—the only woman to be heard at these major battlefield ceremonies. Mrs. Noel honored her own family’s Confederate fighting men but praised also the heroism and bravery of “the invaders” from Indiana; “all alike were patriots and heroes.” We southerners, she said, “rejoice to be a part of our great united country, the greatest on which the sun ever shone.”38

Antietam was next. Following the now established recipe, the state created a commission of veterans to plan the commemoration. The commissioners broke slightly with the past by deciding to construct one grand monument rather than one each for the five Indiana regiments that fought there. Gathering in front of the fifty-foot granite monument on September 17, 1910, veterans and state officials offered...
MEMBERS OF THE INDIANA VICKSBURG MILITARY PARK COMMISSION, AT VICKSBURG FOR THE DEDICATION OF INDIANA'S MONUMENTS, PROBABLY DECEMBER 29, 1908.

Vicksburg National Military Park
in music, poetry, and oratory their praise for the bravery and sacrifice that had saved the Union.  

National reconciliation and collective forgetting reached their apex at the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg. The GAR and state officials mustered a large force to represent the Hoosier state at the little town in Pennsylvania. There, on Indiana Day, July 2, 1913, Gov. Samuel Ralston celebrated “the absence of sectional hatred.” True, he admitted, it was a war “between men of the same country—heirs of the same traditions—men who loved liberty.” These were men now “no longer designed as the Blue and the Gray, but as the joint guardians of the Stars and Stripes.” There were other speakers and patriotic songs, references to Lincoln’s “mystic chords of memory,” and tears at the clasping hands of blue and gray. Under the shade of a lone tree in the Indiana camp, veterans retold their stories and lined up for newspaper photographs. Fifteen survivors of the Seventh Indiana tramped through the July heat to Culp’s Hill, and “hundreds of Hoosier veterans,” the reporter for the Indianapolis News wrote, “arm in arm with new-made southern friends, hiked across to the Bloody Angle.” The emotional force of the occasion was enhanced because “the boys” were now so old and their “feeble condition” so visible. One veteran from the Fourteenth Indiana died on the way to Gettysburg despite the care of two physicians who accompanied the delegation.  

There were 552 veterans from Indiana among the 56,000 gathered at Gettysburg. As the Hoosiers packed their bags in late June the GAR assistant adjutant general, John Fesler, advised an associate that he was leaving Saturday for Gettysburg “with the other boys that put down the rebellion.” It was an ironic comment. Not only was the war seldom remembered by this time as a “rebellion,” but among the 552 Hoosier veterans in the Indiana delegation were 57 rebels, men who had fought for the Confederacy. The state legislation of 1911 and 1913 had created a Gettysburg Anniversary Commission, charged to identify all current Indiana residents who had fought at Gettysburg and had been honorably discharged from “either the Northern or the Southern army.” All were eligible for free transportation to Gettysburg and provisions while en route and in camp, to be paid from a $20,000 state appropriation. So, in a gesture of national unity, the state paid travel expenses for 280 men from Indiana regiments, another 215 Union veterans who had served in units from other northern states, mostly Ohio and Pennsylvania, and 57 who had
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served in the Fourth Virginia, Second North Carolina, Thirty-fifth Georgia, and other rebel units.  

Although many of the Confederate veterans who went to Gettysburg lacked the sort of documentation of their service that most Union veterans had been given, the Indiana Commission opened its arms to the former rebels. In response to an inquiry about one undocumented veteran, GAR official Fesler said, “our Ex-Johnny, Albert L. Bagby” had only to make “affidavit that he was in battle. The committee is going to be very liberal with all Johnnies, knowing that they were not given discharges, and all that will be required of them will be the affidavit as I suggested.” Bagby, who was living in Fort Wayne, claimed he had served in the Eighteenth Virginia and attended the great reunion of blue and gray at Gettysburg at Hoosier taxpayer expense.

Indianaans placed other Civil War monuments away from battlefield sites in these early years of the new century. One was at Andersonville, the notorious Confederate prisoner of war camp, where over 700 Hoosiers had died of disease and malnutrition. The Indianapolis American Tribune in the early 1890s had offered to its readers a five-foot-by-three-foot print of the Andersonville camp, a massive reminder of the cruelty of war. One Indiana veteran wrote in 1900 that “I can forgive everything else but rebel treatment of our prisoners of war.”

By 1907, when the state legislature decided to place a monument at Andersonville, the passions of most veterans had apparently receded. While battlefield monument dedications were normally occasions deemed appropriate for manly commemoration, the 1908 ceremony dedicating Indiana's Andersonville monument featured speeches by two women: Elizabeth Crisler, on “The Work of the Woman's Relief Corps at Andersonville Prison Park,” and Susan L. Brown, on “Work of Ladies of the Grand Army.” None of the speakers, not even former Andersonville prisoner George Musson, spoke critically of the Confederacy. They were content to focus on the suffering and death of Union prisoners without considering who and what caused them.
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In placing monuments at Andersonville and on battlefields and courthouse squares, Hoosiers remembered the valor of soldiers and celebrated the nation. Veterans led the surge of patriotism of the 1890s. They focused their attention on the American flag, as when local GAR members purchased a flag for a rural Marion County school and then made "addresses filled with patriotic sentiments" for the school children—an example that the Indianapolis American Tribune urged on all veterans. The Terre Haute delegation in the Indianapolis GAR parade of 1893 carried banners with the slogans "One country, one language and one flag" and "Teach patriotism in the public schools." Such sentiments, symbolized by a new veneration for the flag, intensified during the Spanish-American War, as Americans acquired a new empire to display the valor of the Anglo-Saxon race and new battlefields that allowed former Confederates to fight again under the red, white, and blue. Such assertive patriotism ascended to lofty heights by the time of World War I.

Civil War memories could still provoke occasional tensions. As late as 1914 the Indiana GAR was fretting about a rumor that the Confederate battle flag would be incorporated into the United States flag. At their thirty-fifth annual meeting that year they voted unanimously against such recognition to "that battle flag under which the enemies of the Republic fought to destroy it." By this time, however, such strong language was unusual. At this same 1914 meeting the Indiana GAR's "Patriotic Instructor" could report that "the Johnnies" are all "proud of this great Union." Those who had worn gray, he continued, were now thankful to the Union soldier, for "how could they have been in the Union if you had not gone south fifty years ago?" The war of rebellion, the brutal and bloody war, the war of ferocity and hatred was gone. The 1914 GAR delegates had mostly forgotten such a war, at least publicly, and remembered instead the lofty cause of union and of nation as they discussed efforts to place flags in public schools and to preserve Memorial Day from the desecration of baseball games, horse racing, and other amusements.

This way of remembering the war, conflating it with union and nation, required veterans to do some forgetting. Two things had to be lost from public memory. First, it was necessary to forget that the Civil War was a savage and gruesome war of rebellion that nearly destroyed the nation. Hints of this war grew more and more rare as time passed. The anxiety expressed by Indiana speakers at Chickamauga
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in 1895 about the persistence of sectional hatreds seemed gone a
decade later. The children and grandchildren of the veterans saw
only glimpses of such bitterness or of the bloody war that had caused
it. Few could imagine, for example, why back in April 1865 a mob of
outraged Delaware County Hoosiers had tarrd and feathered a
visiting Virginian after he spoke approvingly about the assassination
of President Lincoln. What later generations saw instead was a
glorious war in which, for reasons seldom specified, brother fought
brother with heroism and valor. There were no bad guys in the South,
only honorable Johnnies who did what they thought right as surely
as did the boys in blue.

The other central feature of the Civil War lost to public memory
by the early twentieth century was the trinity of slavery, emancipation,
and race. Many believed that the goal of national unity required that
Americans forget that slavery had been the central cause of the Civil
War and that emancipation was among its most significant results.
These were ambiguous and contested issues by 1900, sources of division
and conflict. Most white Americans wanted their history and their
historic commemorations neat and clean, heroic and resolved, fixed and
sacrosanct for all time, just as the simple battlefield monuments
seemed to be. North joined South in this whitewashing; historians in
the North forgot about the centrality of slavery right along with the
Daughters of the Confederacy in the South. The hope of African
Americans and Radical Republicans for racial equality that marked
the decade after 1865 was a dim memory. A generation after the war
black Americans still encountered all manner of discrimination and
segregation, not only in Mississippi or South Carolina but in Indiana
too. At Indiana's many monument dedication ceremonies the issues
of slavery, emancipation, and race hung over the speakers like a dark
thundercloud no one wanted to notice in hopes it would move away.
The desire to immortalize in sermons of stone a certain kind of
straightforward military history and to proclaim in speeches of
reconciliation a certain kind of patriotism impeded Hoosiers' engagement
with such conflicted and ambiguous issues as race.

An occasional monument dedication speaker tiptoed toward a
mention of slavery. Senator Beveridge alluded furtively to the issue
at the Shiloh dedication in 1903, when he explained that Hoosier

---

47Erich L. Ewald, “War at the Crossroads,” Indiana Magazine of History, XCII
(December 1996), 357-58.

48One of Indiana's famous sons became the leading popularizer of history highly
favorable to the southern view of the war and Reconstruction. Claude G. Bowers, The

Identity (Princeton, N.J., 1994), especially 16; Jim Cullen, The Civil War in Popular
Culture (Washington, D.C., 1985), 9-28; Silber, Romance of Reunion, 124-58; Nolan,
Lee Considered, 163-71.
blood “was shed to make of the American people a single Nation, and not for any lesser purpose. . . . Other results of our civil conflict were incident to that.” While Beveridge did not specify the “other results,” surely he meant emancipation, though he did not say the word. Indeed at the Shiloh dedication, as at most others, there was not a single mention of emancipation in any of the printed remarks.

Race issues were not completely absent from ceremonies remembering the war. At the laying of the cornerstone for the Soldiers and Sailors Monument in Indianapolis in 1889, popular Indiana poet Benjamin Parker delivered a long celebration of freedom that included emancipation: “For peace is only peace when men are free.” At the Chickamauga ceremony in 1895 two Indiana orators made vague references to equal rights, but only Lew Wallace actually mentioned slavery. “In the beginning, like Lincoln,” he recalled, Indiana’s soldiers “would have left slavery alone; but after while, like Lincoln again, they saw it must go.” Wallace went even further. He asserted that now all “citizens are equal before the law,” and even claimed that “every ballot lawfully cast should be counted.” This reference was almost certainly to the discrimination that by the mid-1890s was making it increasingly difficult for African Americans in the South to vote or to exercise other rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Governor Hanly also provided an exception to the general forgetting. At the dedication of the Morton statue in front of the statehouse in 1907 Hanly spoke proudly of “a race set free” and “of slavery abolished by constitutional enactment.” And again, at Andersonville the following year, Hanly celebrated the victory over slavery by characterizing the agony and patriotism of the prison martyrs as noble sacrifices “to end the traffic in human flesh and blood.” Governor Marshall, too, at Antietam in 1910, spoke of slavery as “national sin” and even of “the equality of all men before the law.”

Sometimes local orators reminded their audiences of emancipation. In his Decoration Day address before a Greene County audience in 1885, David E. Beem, a veteran of Antietam, Chancellorsville, and Gettysburg, celebrated the emancipation of millions of slaves and deplored the “unholy cause” of slavery and rebellion: “a line should be drawn, deep and long and wide; all on the side of the Union was right, and all on the side of the rebellion was wrong.”
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PORTION OF THE SOLDIER AND SAILORS
MONUMENT, INDIANAPOLIS, DEDICATED 1902,
SHOWING THE FREED SLAVE.

Indiana War Memorial Commission

On rare occasions the importance of emancipation was acknowledged in art and in historical writing. The carved figure of the freed slave on the Indiana Soldiers and Sailors monument was one visible reminder that the war had been about slavery. This limestone image of a black man with broken chains reflected the understanding of emancipation held by most whites. The slave was seated, submissive and grateful that white men had freed him. He was not asking for equality, not suggesting that emancipation might bring change to the old pattern of white dominance. Still, on the Circle in Indianapolis, in stone and for all time, a slave was made free.55
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Notable too was an Indiana regimental history published in 1893. Author Alfred G. Hunter, a veteran of the Eighty-second Indiana and a Ripley County farmer, noted that "[t]he negro" was "the innocent cause of the rebellion." But the great accomplishment of the war, he said, was that "slavery, the Nation's greatest curse, was wiped from existence after four years of hard service." Hunter was not disposed to forget either slavery or rebellion. "I see but one mistake made by the [Union] army, i.e., while we were victorious and yet organized we should have demanded that the leaders of the rebellion should have paid the penalty of treason." The penalty, of course, was death. In urging death to Jeff Davis, Robert E. Lee, and Nathan Bedford Forrest and in naming slavery as cause of the war and emancipation as result, Hunter's was one of a very few voices—voices drowned out by a growing clamor for national greatness.

By the beginning of the twentieth century public expressions of such sentiments about slavery and emancipation were increasingly rare and restrained in public oratory about the war for the Union. In waving the American flag, which came to stand for sectional reconciliation as the key to national greatness, most white Hoosiers and other northerners willingly forgot about slavery.

By allowing former Confederates to participate in dedication ceremonies, Indiana not only welcomed them into a reunited nation but also gave them a platform upon which to voice their versions of the war. Even the occasional denials by Hoosiers that the southern cause was just did not overshadow the honor they paid to the former Confederates. At the 1908 Vicksburg ceremony to honor Indiana's veterans, Mississippi Governor Noel, standing in the heartland of Jim Crow segregation enforced by lynch mobs, referred to the war of rebellion as "the late unpleasantness," while his wife made the occasion's only recorded reference to slavery when she recalled her "black mammy"—a "faithful old servant"—who joined the Yankees in front of Vicksburg in 1863 but then willingly and wisely returned home because, she told Mrs. Noel's family, "home de best, honey."

While many Hoosiers came to think back on slaves as "servants" and to forget their enslavement, it was more difficult to forget that African Americans had themselves fought in the war. But it happened. Governor Ralston's assertion at Gettysburg in 1913 that this had been a war "between men of the Anglo-Saxon race" reflected both his generation's notions of "race" and the invisibility of African Americans to whites. Like most white Hoosiers, Ralston either did not know about or did not wish to acknowledge that among the Union's many veterans were African Americans. Nor did white Hoosiers want to remember
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the massacre of black Hoosiers at the Battle of the Crater, a memory that might stain the national reconciliation of North and South.

Occasionally a white Hoosier remembered the past differently. William H. Armstrong, who in 1890 read a paper before an Indiana veterans group on "The Negro as Soldier," not only praised the valor of black troops but asserted that slavery was the cause of the war. For Armstrong the North's commitment to liberty and justice produced "the grandest proclamation ever signed by human hand—that of the emancipation." Those who in 1863 had opposed emancipation were "half-hearted patriots." But few shared Armstrong's war memories, just as few shared his war experience: as an officer in the Eighth U.S. Colored Heavy Artillery he had led black men in battle. His effort in 1890 to place those memories in the public eye was distinctive for its rarity.59

Whites' amnesia about the key place of race in defining the Union cause occurred despite the presence of black Union veterans throughout the state. Most had served in the Indiana Twenty-eighth United States Colored Troops (USCT). Most, like Corp. William Gibson of the Twenty-eighth, believed that their service in uniform gave them the right to "ask to be made equal before the law."60 Some marched proudly with white Union veterans in the Decoration Day parade in Indianapolis in 1887, for example. In 1890 a few Kokomo veterans of the Twenty-eighth USCT urged a reunion of their regiment. Fort Wayne comrades soon echoed the call, and on September 25 about twenty black veterans from around the state gathered at the Franklin Hotel in Indianapolis, "the first re-union of a colored regiment ever held in Indiana," according to the Indianapolis World, a black-owned newspaper. The group chose officers, appointed a women's committee to procure a flag, and agreed to meet again. Like their white counterparts, they adjourned "with a feeling of emotion long to be remembered." Though the 1891 and 1892 reunions were longer and more elaborate, with speakers, songs, and prayers, whites forgot the Twenty-eighth. This all-black Hoosier regiment was not among the units that paraded at the dedication of the Soldiers and Sailors Monument in 1902.61

The exact place of African Americans in the Indiana GAR and in other veterans' activities is unclear. There were some separate black posts, such as the Martin R. Delany Post in Indianapolis and

60Quoted in Blight, Race and Reunion, 30.
Civil War Memories

the John F. Grill Post in Evansville. And undoubtedly there were some black members of predominantly white posts. Nationally, the GAR insisted on a color-blind admission policy. The Indianapolis American Tribune castigated white GAR members in Louisiana who objected to mixing with members of black posts in such activities as decorating the graves of soldiers. The Indiana GAR publication claimed that white veterans in the North “did not object to the colored members honoring their dead comrades and mingling with them freely on such occasions.” But the coexistence of separate black and white posts offered evidence that here, too, color lines were drawn. When he was asked how to organize a GAR post at the National Home for Disabled Soldiers in Marion, the Indiana GAR executive had only one piece of advice: “arrange for the organization of two Posts, one white and one colored.” “By having one colored, there would be more congeniality and they could office their own post, something they could not expect, if they were in a white post.”

Celebrations of Emancipation Day offered another opportunity for all Hoosiers to recognize the larger meaning of the Civil War. The date varied but was often in January or September. In Indianapolis African Americans marked the anniversary on January 3, 1865, with a grand parade of banners and flags led by a marching band. In 1869 Evansville’s large black community followed a brass band to a picnic grove for speeches and commemoration. In Terre Haute in September 1888, a grand parade featured the distinguished black leader, Frederick Douglass, who continued to remind Americans of “the difference between those who fought for liberty and those who fought for slavery.” The Indianapolis community celebrated emancipation on New Year’s Day in 1907 at Simpson’s Chapel and in September 1908 in Tomlinson Hall. In September 1912 Indianapolis black citizens had a two-day gala: the first day’s events, hosted by the Martin R. Delany Post of the GAR, took place at the Mt. Zion Baptist Church, where Cruzia Duncan, a black veteran, spoke on “The Negro as Soldier” and Pauline Battles read Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation. The next day at the State Fairgrounds visiting groups from Terre Haute, Kokomo, and Connersville joined in a parade, followed by motorcycle, automobile, and horse races, as well as a band concert and patriotic speeches.
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White Hoosiers attended and participated in some of these emancipation commemorations. Governor Hanly spoke to a large audience celebrating the end of slavery at the State Fairgrounds in 1905, for example. But emancipation was seldom acknowledged in the official state commemorations of Indiana's role in the Civil War. For most white Hoosiers Emancipation Day belonged to black people. This view is reflected in a diary entry by a southern Indiana employer in September 1872: "Most of the men off—the niggers taking holiday," he lamented, "in honor of the emancipation proclamation." In Terre Haute in 1891 officials dismissed teachers and children in the "colored schools" for the day. The white schools remained open.64

Undoubtedly most whites would have felt uncomfortable celebrating emancipation and the particular memories of the Civil War that it evoked. When African Americans gathered to commemorate their freedom from enslavement they highlighted what one scholar has called "the tension between the is and the ought," between the reality of Jim Crow and the ideals of justice and equality. Black voices spoke of black men fighting in Union blue, sang the Battle Hymn of the Republic, read the Emancipation Proclamation, and described the progress of their people in the years since slavery.65 Intensely aware that parks, restaurants, hotels, and schools were closed to them, they could celebrate slavery destroyed but not equality achieved. Knowing so well the tension between "is" and "ought," black Hoosiers were careful not to push too hard. Their emancipation celebrations almost always featured Lincoln as well as Douglass, linking the two men, just as the celebrants hoped all white and black Americans would be linked in working toward what ought to be.66
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From the other side of the color line whites were silent about slavery and emancipation, not only to facilitate national reunion but also to justify what was—intensified racial discrimination and segregation across the state and around the nation. For Jim Crow to flourish in early twentieth-century America, whites had to distance themselves from the memories of the Civil War that were most meaningful to African Americans. The Indianapolis Star’s editorial about Emancipation Day in 1905 called attention to the difference in the ways black Americans and whites thought about Lincoln: “the people he set free regard him with a love and veneration that white men scarcely comprehend. To them he is a being half divine and they picture his spirit clothed in glory and seated close to the throne.” The writer also noted that while white historians argued that the war was waged “to establish a principle of government, not to free the slaves” African Americans believed “that it was a war for liberty and that Lincoln was sent of God to carry out that divine will.” As a Republican paper that courted black voters in election years, the Star was relatively polite.
about this racial difference in interpreting the war. The Marion Leader, a Democratic paper that spoke only to white readers, had demonstrated no such constraints in covering the local Emancipation Day celebration the previous year and employed vicious racial stereotypes to mock the ceremonies.67

Black Hoosiers were unable to attract white Hoosiers to their versions of Lincoln, much less of Douglass. Emancipation, slavery, black men in Union blue—these were Civil War memories that sank into near oblivion among whites, drowned by the hearty chorus of a great nation united.68

These acts of forgetting took place as Indiana and the nation moved to an intense and more restricted definition of patriotism and Americanism, one that was hardened in the great crusade of World War I and carried onward by the Ku Klux Klan of the 1920s. By the time Klan-supported Governor Jackson spoke at the dedication of the Morton statue at Vicksburg in 1926, Morton’s position on emancipation and equality would probably have been unimaginable to most of the audience. No one recalled that when Morton had accepted the Indiana battle flags from Lew Wallace on July 4, 1866, he had spoken at length about slavery because, he asserted, the Confederacy had “for its chief corner stone the institution of human slavery.” Nor did anyone in 1926 refer to Morton’s speech at Gettysburg a half century earlier when he had called the South’s rebellion “madness” and “a delirium” “brought on by the pernicious influence of human slavery.”69

Not until the centennial of the war of the rebellion, in the 1960s, did issues of slavery and emancipation, of the proposition that all men are created equal, much trouble governors or most white citizens of the Hoosier state.70 And even in the early twenty-first century

67Indianapolis Star, September 23, 1905; Marion Leader, July 30, 1905. Of course white Hoosiers during the Civil War, like other northern whites, were divided over emancipation. The subject requires far more study. See McPherson, For Cause and Comrades, 117-30; Emma Lou Thornbrough, The Negro in Indiana before 1900: A Study of a Minority (Indianapolis, 1957), 183-205; Thomas E. Rodgers, “Liberty, Will, and Violence: The Political Ideology of the Democrats of West-Central Indiana during the Civil War,” Indiana Magazine of History, XCII (June 1996), 133-59.


69Presentation of Indiana Battle Flags,” in Indiana Battle Flag Commission, Indiana Battle Flags and a Record of Indiana Organizations in the Mexican, Civil and Spanish-American Wars (Indianapolis, 1929), 653; William Dudley Foulke, Life of Oliver P. Morton, Including His Important Speeches (2 vols., Indianapolis, 1899), II, 133. One can only imagine what the Civil War governor would have thought about being honored by the 1925 General Assembly and Governor Jackson, who were in league with the Ku Klux Klan.

70In 1961 Matthew E. Welsh, an unusually progressive Hoosier governor, instructed members of the Indiana Civil War Centennial Commission not to participate as state representatives in the national meeting of the Civil War Centennial Commission in Charleston, South Carolina, because the hotels in that city were segregated.
people interested in the Civil War sometimes ignored or misrepresented the place of slavery, the promise of emancipation, the meaning of a "new birth of freedom" for all the American people. Some remained content to go to dinner, "do some pardnership forgittin'," and talk about the weather.¹¹

Matthew E. Welsh to Donald F. Carmony, March 29, 1961, Folder 4, Donald F. Carmony Papers, Indiana Civil War Commission Papers (Indiana State Archives). I am grateful to Richard Gantz for this reference.

America's commemorations of the hundredth anniversary were generally more focused on national unity, popular amusement, and celebration of the Confederacy than on issues of slavery, emancipation, and race. See John Hope Franklin, "A Century of Civil War Observation," *Journal of Negro History*, XLVII (April 1962), 97-107. For an example of the neglect of slavery, emancipation, and race in Indiana scholarship at the time see John D. Barnhart, "The Impact of the Civil War on Indiana," *Indiana Magazine of History*, LVII (September 1961), 185-224.