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**FIGURE 1.** Historic view of grave markers in Andersonville National Cemetery, undated. (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site, image D-2-2477)

**Project Overview**

This Historic Resource Study (HRS) records the cultural history of Andersonville National Historic Site, a unit of the National Park System located within southwest Georgia. Andersonville National Historic Site protects, honors, and interprets Civil War-era events and activities associated with use of the site as a Confederate prison from 1863 through 1865, the subsequent development of the Andersonville National Cemetery (Figure 1), and several eras of protection and commemoration leading to park establishment in 1970. Today, the park is also home of the National Prisoner of War Museum, a significant place of public remembrance and education.

The HRS is the primary document used by the National Park Service to identify and manage the historic resources within a park. It forms the basis for understanding their significance and interrelationships, a point of departure for the development of interpretive plans, and a framework for identifying additional research needs. Historic resource studies also document and assess surviving physical evidence of the historic cultural activities associated with a property within relevant historic contexts, and identifies their eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The goal of the HRS in this regard is to develop relevant thematic contexts sufficiently that the historical, aesthetic, technical, or scientific associations of structures within the...
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park can be evaluated. The HRS also includes sufficient information about the developmental history or evolution of each structure to enable assessment of its integrity. Finally, the HRS contains sufficient information about the contributing environment of each structure to enable National Register boundaries to be defined and possible overlaps with cultural landscapes and archeological or ethnographic resources to be identified. This information is intended to support protection of a park’s cultural resources for the enjoyment of future generations.

Andersonville National Historic Site was established on October 7, 1970, through “An Act to authorize the establishment of the Andersonville National Historic Site in the State of Georgia” to:

...provide an understanding of the overall prisoner-of-war story of the Civil War, to interpret the role of prisoner-of-war camps in history, to commemorate the sacrifice of Americans who lost their lives in such camps, and to preserve the monuments located therein, the Secretary is hereby authorized to designate not more than five hundred acres in Macon and Sumter Counties, Georgia, for establishment as the Andersonville National Historic Site.

The park incorporates two areas previously administered by the War Department: Andersonville Prison Park and Andersonville National Cemetery. The national cemetery is still an active cemetery, one of only two active cemeteries administered by the National Park Service. Additionally, the park is home to the National Prisoner of War Museum, which tells the story of prisoners of war throughout American history. As the enabling legislation states, the park should be a “memorial not only to those who struggled there in those times, but to all Americans who have served their country, at home and abroad, and suffered the loneliness and anguish of captivity.”

The National Cemetery was established on July 26, 1865, for the burial of Union soldiers who perished at Camp Sumter, and continues to provide a permanent resting place for deceased veterans.

**Report Organization**

The Andersonville National Historic Site HRS is divided into ten chapters. This, the first chapter, conveys the purpose and goals of the report. The subsequent five chapters address the specific historic contexts that relate to the park’s extant cultural historic resources as follows:

- Settlement and occupation of Andersonville; farming and other means of subsistence (prehistoric through 2017)
- The Civil War and military prisons (1861–1865)
- The national cemetery system (1861–2017)
- Civil War commemoration and interpretation (1861–2017)
- Civil War military site preservation (1861–2017)

The seventh chapter is a resource inventory that provides a brief history, physical description, and significance and integrity evaluation of each surviving historic cultural feature.

The eighth chapter consists of a description of the park’s cultural landscapes, ethnographic resources, archeological resources, and museum collections.

---


The ninth chapter offers recommendations for additional research, physical resource protection, management, and interpretation, as well as the stewardship of the park’s museum and archival collections. This chapter also identifies the cultural resources that are at-risk and merit special consideration.

The tenth and final chapter is the report bibliography.

Scope and Purpose of Study

A historic resource study provides a historical overview of a park or region and identifies and evaluates a park’s cultural resources within historic contexts. It synthesizes all readily available cultural resource information from all disciplines in a narrative designed to serve managers, planners, interpreters, cultural resource specialists, and interested public as a reference for the history of the region and the historic resources within a park. Entailing both documentary research and field investigations to determine and describe the integrity, authenticity, associative values, and significance of resources, the HRS supplies data for resource management and interpretation. It may recommend preparation of National Register nominations for any qualifying resources that have not been designated. The HRS also identifies any need for special history studies, cultural landscape reports, or other detailed studies and may make recommendations for resource management and interpretation as appropriate.

Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 requires inventory and evaluation of all cultural resources. These resources should be evaluated according to National Register of Historic Places criteria found in the National Register Bulletin, How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. The study will enhance and broaden existing National Register documentation as well as provide historical context for any future National Register work.

The HRS contains historic contexts with sufficient historical background information to identify and evaluate previously unidentified and/or unevaluated extant structures that are more than fifty years old and structures of exceptional importance that are less than fifty years old. Primary and secondary sources related to the history of the park were consulted to inform the aforementioned historic contexts. Archeological resources were not evaluated as part of this study.

Description of Andersonville National Historic Site

Most of the National Historic Site is located in Macon County, Georgia, east of the town of Americus, Georgia (Figure 2). State Route 49 runs through the western third of the site and its centerline serves as the border between Macon County and adjacent Sumter County. Of the entire park area of 515.61 acres, 75.54 acres at the western edge of the park lie within Sumter County. The site is located within an area of gently rolling terrain that comprises the upper reaches of the East Gulf Coastal Plain as it approaches the Georgia Piedmont region.

The most dominant physical characteristic of this landscape is the valley of the stream, now known as Stockade Branch. The National Prisoner of War Museum, national cemetery, and the road that connects the two are located atop the ridge that forms the northern edge of the stream valley.

Just across Georgia State Route 49 from the historic site is the town of Andersonville, which existed prior to the development of the prison and the cemetery. The town, which was established because of its location on the railroad, continued to grow after 1864 in response to its role as a depot for prisoners, supply center for the prison, and Confederate base.

---

FIGURE 2. Andersonville National Historic Site is located in southwest Georgia between the towns of Oglethorpe and Americus. (Source: WJE/JMA, Andersonville National Historic Site Cultural Landscape Report, 2014)
The small town now contains a cluster of residences, as well as a post office, restaurant, museum, and other small retail and service operations associated with nearby industry as well as visitors to the park. A memorial to Capt. Henry Wirz is located on Church Street in the center of Andersonville.

Andersonville National Historic Site is surrounded primarily by farmland on the north and west sides and by kaolin mines and processing plants on the east and south sides.4

The boundaries of this landscape have expanded since the historic site was established in 1970. The National Park Service has since acquired a number of acres surrounding and joining the prison park and cemetery sites. In 1970, the total area of the park totaled 466.22 acres. In 2014, gross overall acreage of the park was 515.61 acres, and has not been expanded further as of 2017.5 Most of the park land falls to the south and east of Georgia State Route 49, although a limited area of the park does extend to the west of the highway. Sweetwater Creek forms much of the park’s southern boundary (Figure 3).

The Andersonville National Historic Site landscape contains historic buildings, structures, and monuments; historic roads and road traces; pre-historic and historic archaeological sites; and modern visitor amenities, including the National Prisoner of War Museum/visitor center with parking lot. Access to the museum/visitor center is from Georgia State Route 49 by means of a winding asphalt road that was installed in 1997.

The spatial organization of the Andersonville National Historic Site landscape is characterized primarily by hilly terrain that varies from a high point within the national cemetery that measures 435 feet above mean sea level (AMSL), and a low point along the Stockade Branch stream valley at 330 feet AMSL. Most of the built features of the site, including the national cemetery, the National Prisoner of War Museum, and the site entrance road, are located on the elevated ridge that forms the northern edge of the stream valley.

South of the ridge lies the site of the prison camp, today a broad expanse of mowed lawn framed by woodland that slopes toward Stockade Branch. The site is surrounded by a tour road established in the 1890s to follow the remnants of the prison’s protective earthworks. The most prominent physical characteristic of the prison site landscape is the stream valley of Stockade Branch. Both Stockade Branch and its parent stream Sweetwater Creek, which forms the southern boundary of the National Historic Site, have well-defined channels that flatten into broad wetlands approaching their confluence to the east of the site. Stockade Branch was a major factor in the selection of the site as the location of the Camp Sumter prison, as it was hoped the stream would meet water and sanitation needs. The swampy wetland, however, proved inadequate for the large number of prisoners and soon became contaminated with human waste, contributing to the misery of life in the prison. In upland portions of the prison site, some prisoners dug wells by hand to find water. Providence Spring, which according to veterans’ accounts flowed after a storm event in the summer of 1864, became a source of drinking water for many prisoners. As noted above, the woods that edge the open lawn that characterizes the prison site are generally quite young, as much of the site was cleared for agricultural purposes following the Civil War and as recently as the 1970s.

---

4. Kaolin is a soft white clay consisting primarily of the mineral kaolinite. It is used in the manufacture of paper, as well as china, porcelain, rubber, plastics, paint, and many other products.

5. Acreage information provided by the National Park Service, Southeast Region, Land Resources Division, December 2014.
FIGURE 3. Map of Andersonville National Historic Site. (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site Foundation Document)
Andersonville National Historic Site is composed of four distinct areas:

**Context Landscape.** The context landscape is composed of two discontinuous parcels that provide the setting for the cemetery, prison site, and museum areas. It is generally characterized by mature woodland and also includes features associated with circulation, the picnic area, and the 1930s-era Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) camp west of Georgia State Route 49, now the site of a primitive camping area.

**Prison Site.** The prison site encompasses the site of Andersonville Prison and is bounded by Georgia State Route 49 to the west, the park boundary to the south and east, and the woodland and National Prisoner of War Museum to the north. The one-way vehicular tour road leads visitors through this character area in a loop around the prison site, past the earthworks, Providence Spring, and stockade reconstructions, before exiting the park through Pecan Lane.

**National Cemetery.** The area where the U.S. soldiers who died at Camp Sumter were buried was established as a national cemetery in 1865. Andersonville National Cemetery is bounded by Georgia State Route 49 to the west, and by the cemetery perimeter wall to the north, east, and south. Two axial drives provide access to the cemetery from the west and the south, and a brick perimeter wall encloses the cemetery. The cemetery itself is generally characterized by mowed turf set with rows of marble headstones and dotted by larger memorials and shade trees.

**Prisoner of War Museum.** The National Prisoner of War Museum includes the park’s visitor center, main park drive, Ex-POW memorial grove, and entrance from Georgia State Route 49. It is generally bounded by Georgia State Route 49 to the north, woodland to the east and west, and the prison site to the south.

**Historical Overview**

In late December 1863, Confederate Capt. W. Sidney Winder selected a site in Sumter County (now part of Macon County), Georgia, for a new site to hold Union prisoners of war. The site was formally named Camp Sumter but later commonly known as Andersonville. Construction of a prison camp at Andersonville began in January 1864, and the first 500 prisoners arrived on February 24, 1864. The prisoners were initially housed in an unfinished stockade with limited food and equipment. An influx of up to 400 prisoners per day followed, resulting in deteriorating conditions in the camp. By June, the population exceeded 20,000 and Confederate officials decided to enlarge the prison to accommodate the ever growing number of prisoners. By August, nearly 33,000 Union prisoners were held in the expanded prison. Contaminated water, contagious diseases, inadequate hospital facilities, exposure, poor sanitation, short and deficient rations, and overcrowding led to illness and death of thousands of prisoners. In September, some of the healthier prisoners were moved to other locations; the Confederates feared that following Sherman’s occupation of Atlanta, his next objective might be Andersonville. Following the March to the Sea, the prison population again rose as the population of Camp Lawton near Millen, Georgia, was relocated. By late December the number of prisoners was approximately 5,000 persons and remained at this level until the war ended.

On April 19, 1865, Confederate Col. George Gibbs left Andersonville to exchange prisoners at Baldwin, Florida. The last prisoner death at Andersonville was recorded on April 28. Although Gibbs returned to Andersonville, he abandoned his post on May 4, at which time five prisoners remained in the hospital and seventeen

---


in the stockade. Capt. Henry Wirz remained on duty and was arrested on May 7, 1865, at which time the last Union prisoners held at Andersonville were released.\textsuperscript{9}

Andersonville National Cemetery was established in 1865. Interments of those who died in the nearby prisoner of war camp had already begun in February 1864. In the summer of 1865, a 50-acre square plot was enclosed using salvaged lumber. The graves were marked with wood markers painted with the name, company, regiment, and date of death (Figure 4). Signage was placed at the gates and along the pathways in the cemetery to guide visitors. By 1868, additional interments from central and southern Georgia increased the total of U.S. soldiers buried from 12,920—the number who died in captivity at Camp Sumter—to 13,669.\textsuperscript{10}

Wesley W. Turner and Benjamin B. Dykes owned the land rented by the Confederate government for the prison and associated burial site.\textsuperscript{11} After the war, the prison and burial grounds were appropriated by the United States.\textsuperscript{12} In 1868, Dykes claimed a portion of the remaining land that had been occupied by the Confederate government in connection with the prison.\textsuperscript{13} The government eventually purchased title to 120 acres of land at the cemetery site for $3,300 in 1875.\textsuperscript{14}

\textbf{FIGURE 4.} Wooden headboards, painted white with black lettering, placed to mark graves, 1867. Note the entrance gate to the cemetery in the background. (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site, image F-7-659)

The War Department built a Superintendent’s lodge for the cemetery beginning in 1871. Also built during the late nineteenth century were a stable, tool house, and other structures to support the needs of maintenance and administrative personnel. Also, in 1877–1879, replacement began of the wood grave markers with permanent marble markers, and the perimeter fence was replaced by a brick masonry wall.\textsuperscript{15} By the 1880s, the prison site was overgrown and partially under cultivation.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{9} United States War Department, \textit{The War of the Rebellion: a Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies} (O.R.) Series II (Vol. 8), 537–538.
\item \textsuperscript{12} Andersonville National Historic Site, Georgia, \textit{Foundation Document, Appendix A}, Superintendent’s Report 91-1258, March 5, 1970, 4.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Hamilton W. Pierson, “A letter to Hon. Charles Sumner with ‘statements’ of outrages upon freedmen in Georgia, and an account of my expulsion from Andersonville, Ga. by the Ku Klux Klan” (1870), 6.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Wood markers were replaced with marble headstones on a piecemeal basis until a standard style of grave markers was adopted in 1873 by Secretary of War William W. Belknap that included the so-called Union Shield. National Cemetery Administration, \textit{History of Government Furnished Headstones and Markers}, https://www.cem.va.gov/history/hmhist.asp, accessed September 15 2017.
\end{itemize}
and the stockade had mostly fallen down. In 1891, the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR) of Georgia acquired a 73-1/2 acre parcel at the prison stockade site. The GAR made improvements including clearing undergrowth, while leaving large trees standing. They also graded a belt roadway around the outer limit of the property, built two bridges, flushed the creek, and graded a central avenue and a roadway leading from the avenue to Providence Spring.\textsuperscript{16}

By 1896, recognizing that more funding would be required to develop the prison park, the GAR offered the site to the National Woman’s Relief Corps as an unencumbered gift. The Corps arranged to purchase the remaining 14-1/2 acres of the original site from its owners in 1896. The transaction was completed in 1897. During the year following acquisition of the property, the Corps had the property enclosed with a wire fence and gate, erected a caretaker’s residence and stable, and planted the stockade enclosure area with Bermuda grass (\textit{Cynodon dactylon}) (Figure 5). In 1898, the Corps also erected a flagpole and constructed a memorial arch on the west boundary of the park, and a granite pavilion over Providence Spring.\textsuperscript{17} In the early decades of the twentieth century, ten states erected monuments in the national cemetery or within the stockade. The prison site was donated by the Woman’s Relief Corps to the United States Army in 1910.

Two CCC camps were located at Andersonville during the 1930s. Company 1411 set up a tent camp on the north slope of the prison site during September 1934 while constructing a more permanent camp west of Highway 49. Company 1411 ceased operations in December 1935 and was replaced in January 1936 by Company 4455. Company 4455 worked at Andersonville for a year, departing on January 1, 1937. During this time, the CCC constructed a stone gateway at the entrance to the park, stone and concrete features marking the prison stockade location, a series of stone and concrete culverts, and the tour road around the prison site (Figure 6). In 1941, the cemetery was expanded eastward with a new rostrum and curving perimeter walls.

\textit{FIGURE 5}. Entrance gate to the prison park, circa 1900. (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site, image D-1-142)

\textit{FIGURE 6}. Roadway and entrance gate to the Prison Park, circa 1930s. (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site, image D-1-2478)

Andersonville National Historic Site was established in October 1970, incorporating the two areas previously administered by the United States Army: Andersonville Prison Park and Andersonville National Cemetery. In 1978, the property was listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Andersonville National Historic Site interprets prisoner of war camps in history and commemorates the sacrifice of Americans who lost their lives in such camps. As part of this effort, the park interprets the history of the site, events that occurred there during the Civil War, and the history and experiences of American prisoners of war at other locations and during


\textsuperscript{17} Averill, 14-16.
other conflicts. In 1987, the park opened a prisoner of war exhibit in a 1928 brick storage building north of the prison site (now the Volunteer Guest House) to interpret the American prisoner of war experience from wars other than the Civil War.¹⁸ In 1998, the National Prisoner of War Museum was opened at the National Historic Site.

Today Andersonville National Cemetery contains more than 20,000 interments. The cemetery is open for further burials in accordance with national cemetery guidelines.

**Historic Contexts Addressed by the Study**

Historic contexts are patterns and trends in history and prehistory that can be used to understand a specific occurrence, property, or site, and to make clear its meaning and importance. For historic properties, meaning and importance can be translated into National Register of Historic Places significance, which is one of the essential components of eligibility for listing in the National Register. Historians, architectural historians, folklorists, archeologists, and anthropologists use different words to describe this phenomena such as trend, pattern, theme, or cultural affiliation, but the concept remains the same. The National Register of Historic Places significance of a historic property can be judged and explained only when it is evaluated within a historic context.¹⁹

As evident in the overview of the region’s history provided above, the Andersonville National Historic Site has witnessed a long-standing and varied history, with activities and events falling within a broader context of regional and national trends in history. Subsequent chapters of this study address the various historic contexts associated with the park that provide a foundation for evaluating and interpreting the park’s historic resources. The five thematic historic contexts addressed in this HRS include:

- Settlement and occupation of Andersonville; farming and other means of subsistence (prehistoric through 2017)
- The Civil War and military prisons (1861–1867)
- The national cemetery system (1861–2017)
- Civil War commemoration and interpretation (1861–2017)
- Civil War military site preservation (1861–2017)

The first historic context considers European-American settlement and occupation of the Andersonville region, and the agricultural and other practices that supported life in the area between prehistory and 2017. This context provides an overview of early European-American settlement, including the development of the region’s transportation infrastructure and agricultural economy, which was the primary engine of community development during the antebellum period. The chapter also discusses these themes as they evolved during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, including changes in farming practices, the development of industrial activities and mineral extraction efforts, and the influence of demographics and transportation systems on the viability of agriculture during the twentieth century.

The second context considered by the HRS is the effect of the Civil War on local lifeways, particularly the establishment of Camp Sumter in 1863, which had a profound impact on local residents, the Confederate and Union armies, and the issue of humane treatment of prisoners. Although this period had far-reaching influence, the time frame for this context is relatively brief: 1861–1865.

Immediately following the Civil War, prison burials at Andersonville were honored through the establishment of a national cemetery, part of a

---


nationwide system of burial grounds designed to honor fallen Union soldiers and veterans. The third context considered by the HRS addresses Andersonville National Cemetery within the larger context of the National Cemetery System between 1861 and 2017.

The fourth context addresses the long-standing history of the Andersonville Prison site, as well as the Andersonville National Cemetery, as commemorative landscapes that honor and recognize the sacrifices of military personnel and the events of the Civil War. At Andersonville, commemorative and later interpretive activities span the period immediately following the war through the present, 1861–2017.

The fifth and final context considers the National Historic Site at Andersonville within a broader context of American military site preservation between circa 1861 and 2017.

**Historic Resources Associated with the Contexts**

Several historic resources survive intact within, and adjacent to, Andersonville National Historic Site that can be tied to each of the five historic contexts explored within this HRS.

**Historic Context One: Settlement and Occupation of Andersonville; Farming and Other Means of Subsistence (prehistoric through 2017)**

- Norfolk Southern Railroad rail line
- Andersonville railroad depot
- Town of Andersonville
- Georgia State Route 49 corridor

**Historic Context Two: The Civil War and Military Prisons (1861–1865)**

- Norfolk Southern Railroad rail line
- Andersonville railroad depot
- Town of Andersonville
- Wells dug by prisoners
- Earthworks
- Burials

**Historic Context Three: The National Cemetery System (1861–2017)**

- Andersonville National Cemetery Landscape
- Perimeter wall
- Headstones
- Section markers
- Andersonville National Cemetery Lodge (Administration Building/Park Headquarters)
- Road system
- Rostrum
- Cultural Resources Building (former chapel)
- New Jersey Monument
- Main Monument
- Pennsylvania Monument
- Connecticut Monument
- Iowa Monument
- Indiana Monument
- Illinois Monument
- New York Monument
- Minnesota Monument

**Historic Context Four: Civil War Commemoration and Interpretation (1861–2017)**

- Prison Site Road
- Stockade Branch bridges
- Drainage channels and erosion control systems
- Providence Spring landscape
- Providence Spring pavilion
- Monument landscape
Introduction

- Massachusetts Monument
- Ohio Monument
- Rhode Island Monument
- Michigan Monument
- Wisconsin Monument
- Lizabeth A. Turner Monument
- Sundial Monument
- Clara Barton Monument
- Tennessee Monument
- Lincoln-Logan Monument
- Monument to Eight States
- New Jersey Monument
- Maine Monument
- Pennsylvania Monument
- Connecticut Monument
- Iowa Monument
- Indiana Monument
- Illinois Monument
- New York Monument
- Minnesota Monument
- Wrought iron fences around well sites
- Pecan Lane landscape
- Pecan Lane walls
- Stockade wall corner markers
- Stockade and deadline markers
- Post marking the raider hanging site
- East and west storage buildings (Carriage House and Guest House)

**Historic Context Five: Civil War Military Site Preservation (1861–2017)**

- East and west storage buildings (Carriage House and Guest House)
- Providence Spring pavilion
- Prison Site Road
- Stockade Branch bridges
Historic Context One: Settlement and Occupation of Andersonville, Farming and Other Means of Subsistence (Prehistory through 2017)

**FIGURE 7.** Town of Andersonville from the railroad, no date. (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site, image A-3-2467)

**Pre-European-American Settlement; Archaic and Woodland Period Occupation**

Paleo-Indians are believed to have occupied most of North America, including the area that would become the southeastern United States, by 12,000 BCE. Evidence of these hunters of the Ice Age was found on the Macon Plateau in the form of the “Clovis” spear points.\(^{20}\)

During the Archaic Period (9600 BCE – 1000 BCE), archeological evidence suggests a hunting and gathering society was present in the region. It is

also believed that base camps were seasonally occupied along bodies of water.\textsuperscript{21}

During the Woodland Period (1000 BCE – 900 CE), semi-permanent villages began to appear in the region as stone effigy mounds and earthen burial and platform mounds were also constructed. Corn, beans, and squash arrived in the region via trade from present-day Mexico. Connections to the Adena/Hopewell Cultures to the north, and to Weeden Island to the south, were made during this period.\textsuperscript{22}

The Mississippian people arrived in the area circa 900 CE and constructed villages. During the Mississippian Period (900 CE – 1600 CE), large ceremonial centers consisting of earthen temple, burial, and domiciliary mounds were built.\textsuperscript{23}

Circa 1350 CE, the Lamar Culture became widespread in the southeast. In this culture, chiefdoms were marked by smaller and more numerous villages.\textsuperscript{24}

Early contact between native persons in the region and European explorers occurred when a naval expedition led by Lucas Vázquez de Ayllón in 1526 attempted to establish a permanent settlement in present-day McIntosh County, in the southeast portion of the state. The colony, San Miguel de Guadalete, only lasted six weeks, as hunger, disease, and constant conflict with the native residents took their toll on the early settlers.\textsuperscript{25}

Another Spanish explorer, Hernando de Soto, led an expedition through the region between 1539 and 1543.\textsuperscript{26} De Soto landed on the Florida coast with a fleet of vessels and a contingent of 600 men, planning to conquer the Gulf region and search for gold.

The first written description of the Lamar Culture was documented by members of de Soto’s expedition. The expedition brought with it a number of European diseases, which are believed to be responsible for the death of three-quarters of the Mississippian population.\textsuperscript{27}

Archeological investigations of the Andersonville National Historic Site by the National Park Service Southeast Archeological Center in 1978 found that the area was used to make tools of chert for much of the prehistoric period.\textsuperscript{28}

**The Muskogee (later Creek) and Euchee Tribes from Contact through Early European-American Settlement**

At the time of initial contact with European explorers, the inhabitants of the area included the Muskogee and the Euche tribes.\textsuperscript{29} The Muskogee, later also known as the Creek, are descendants of the Mississippian culture.

In the late eighteenth century European traders were among the first non-natives to visit the region.

**Early Settlement, 1700–1830**

Gen. James Oglethorpe began the Georgia colony in 1733. Shortly after its establishment, a number of traders began to settle in the new colony and in the area around Andersonville. Timothy Barnard

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{26} John Ricks, *Andersonville National Historic Site Administrative History*, (National Park Service, 1986), 2. According to a 1990 Statement for Management Document, the Administrative History was deemed inadequate and needed revision. The Administrative History has been used as a reference in this report only where other source documents for the information cited have not been identified.
\textsuperscript{27} “People, Ocmulgee National Monument.”
\textsuperscript{28} Ricks, 2.
\textsuperscript{29} The name of this tribe is variously spelled Euche, Uchee, and Yuchi.
was one of the traders who settled in the area during the late eighteenth century. Shortly after his arrival, Barnard married a Euchee girl, and opened a trading post along the Flint River in present-day Macon County.  

The Euchee tribe inhabited the Andersonville region as well as other portions of Georgia and Alabama. By the late 1700s, the Euchee joined the Muskogee Confederacy, which was composed of nearly fifty autonomous tribal towns.  

Barnard, who came from an influential English family, was appointed by Col. Benjamin Hawkins as Principal Temporary Indian Agent for the Indians South of the Ohio River in 1798. Barnard would later be responsible for connecting trails used by the native tribes with those built and used by the European settlers throughout the southeast. The construction of these trails, some of which were used as stagecoach routes, led to further development throughout Georgia.

**The First Seminole War (1818) and the Treaty of Indian Springs (1825)**

Following the American Revolution, Spain gained control of Florida. Under Spanish rule, members of the Seminole Tribe established farms in the territory. Florida also served as a safe haven for escaped African American slaves.

The First Seminole War began when United States military forces, under the leadership of Gen. Andrew Jackson, invaded areas of Florida and southern Georgia following failed attempts by United States authorities to capture escaped African American slaves living among the Seminoles. The invasion resulted in the burning of Seminole towns and the seizure of the Spanish-controlled cities of Pensacola and St. Marks. Following the war, Spain ceded the Florida territory to the United States under the terms of the Transcontinental Treaty of 1819, also called the Adams-Onís Treaty or Purchase of Florida.

The Creeks began signing treaties handing portions of their land over to European settlers in 1763. By the early nineteenth century this practice was halted. In 1821, the First Treaty of Indian Springs (also referred to as the Treaty with the Creeks) was signed. Talks for the treaty involved representatives of the federal government, Georgia, and Creeks led by Creek chief William McIntosh. This treaty required the Creeks to cede their remaining land east of the Flint River in Georgia to the United States, and resulted in the Creek National Council becoming more determined not to cede its land in the future. However, four years later McIntosh signed the Treaty of Indian Springs with the United States of America. The treaty ceded all Creek lands in Georgia, which was defined as the land between the Chattahoochee and Flint rivers, to the U.S. government. The 1825 treaty was replaced in the following year by the 1826 Treaty of Washington, which represented a compromise between the Creek and the U.S. government; in the new agreement, the Creek retained about three million acres along the Coosa and Tallapoosa River drainages that had been promised to the state of Alabama in the Treaty of Indian Springs.

Believing that the Indian Springs Treaty was not agreed upon in good faith, President John Quincy Adams had a second treaty drawn, which was signed on January 24, 1826. The second treaty resulted in more money being given to the Creeks for their land while also obligating the federal government to purchase the tribal lands west of

30. Ricks 2–3.
32. Letter from Col. Benjamin Hawkins to Timothy Barnard, March 7, 1797.
the Mississippi. The Creek who lived in the Andersonville area were moved from their land in Georgia in 1827.

Following the removal of the Creek from Georgia, the state used the land grant system to open the area for settlement. Surveys were completed in the area now occupied by Andersonville National Historic Site between 1826 and 1828. This land was described as containing two American Indian trails, several creeks, a portion of the Flint River, and a mature forest of oak and pine.\(^{35}\)

**Land Lotteries and the Establishment of Sumter County (1831) and Macon County (1837)**

Between 1805 and 1833, Georgia held eight land lotteries to distribute among settlers land taken from the Cherokee and Creek nations.\(^{36}\) The first land lottery was authorized by the state legislature in 1803. The first land lottery, held in 1805, allowed eligible participants to purchase large pieces of land for a fee of $0.04 an acre.\(^{37}\) Names of the participants were placed in one drum, while available lot numbers were placed in a second drum. The number of times a participant’s name was entered reflected age, marital status, war service, and years residing in the state. The seven subsequent lotteries followed a similar system. Over the twenty-eight years in which the lotteries were held, approximately three-quarters of the land in the state was sold to as many 100,000 individuals, resulting in much of the land throughout the state being owned by yeoman farmers, as opposed to aristocratic planters who had controlled much of the land in colonial times.\(^{38}\)

At the same time the land lotteries were being held, the Georgia State Legislature began to organize counties in the region. Sumter County was established in 1831 and named for Thomas Sumter, a Revolutionary War hero from South Carolina. The county was located in a region previously occupied by the Creek. The Creek vacated the area after the land was acquired by the state as part of the 1825 Treaty of Indian Springs, which opened land between the Flint and Chattahoochee Rivers for settlement.\(^{39}\) Macon County was established in 1837 and named for Nathaniel Macon, a former congressman and senator from North Carolina.\(^{40}\) Each of the newly formed counties was divided into land districts, with each land district divided into square lots containing 202-1/2 acres each.\(^{41}\)

William McClendon and John Wilson were awarded lots 380, 381, and 382 through a land lottery. This land makes up the present-day portion of the park east of Highway 49. Lots 180, 181, and 151, which comprise the portion of the park west of Georgia State Route 49, were awarded to Ehraim Price, Isham Lowery, and Joseph Rashford, Sr., respectively.
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35. Ricks, 4, citing Park Files, Andersonville National Historic Site.
37. Ibid. Eligible participants included every white male who had resided in the state for at least one year; families consisting of a husband, wife, and at least one child; and any widow with children.
40. Most of Andersonville National Historic Site is located in present-day Macon County, Georgia, while the western portion of the site is located in Sumter County. During the Civil War era, the county boundaries were configured differently, and the prison site and cemetery were located entirely within Sumter County.
41. Ricks, 4.
The Second Seminole War, 1835–1842

The Second Seminole War (1835–1842) began following the refusal of Seminoles to move from the reservation established for them north of Lake Okeechobee to land west of the Mississippi River. Led by their chief Osceola, Seminole families hid in the Everglades, while the warriors fought to protect their homeland, often using guerilla tactics. The fighting, which lasted nearly seven years, resulted in the death of nearly 2,000 U.S. soldiers. The war ended following Osceola’s capture, at which time most Seminoles agreed to be moved.42

Following the Second Seminole War and the Creek War of 1836, the last native inhabitants of Georgia were expelled and Euro-American farm settlement in the area increased.

Railroad and Community Development, 1840s–1861

The Southwestern Railroad, chartered in 1845 to build a railroad from Macon through southwestern Georgia to the lower Chattahoochee River, began construction around 1848. By 1852, the rails had been laid from Macon as far as the Flint River at Oglethorpe. In the next year, aided by a $75,000 investment by the citizens of Americus, the line was extended from Oglethorpe to Americus. The line was extended to Columbus in 1853, when the Southwestern Railroad acquired the Muscogee Railroad. By 1860, branches were constructed to Cuthbert, extending to Eufala and to Fort Gaines.43

As with most railroads in the region at the time, constructed was primarily completed by slaves. In 1850, the Southwestern Railroad was the third largest slaveholder in the state.44

When the railroad line reached Americus, residents formed a town around one of its stops. The new town was named Anderson after Southwestern Railroad superintendent John W. Anderson. The name Anderson only lasted two years and in 1855, the name was changed to Andersonville (Figure 7). This change was made to avoid confusion with the town of Anderson, South Carolina.45

On March 23, 1857, B. B. Dykes, who came to Georgia from South Carolina in 1821, purchased lots 381 and 382 in the Andersonville area from Senus H. Clark. On the same day he also purchased lots 151 and 180 from James Stewart for $1,000. Dykes purchased land lot 181 from Virgil Powers on July 2 for $1,600. In all, Dykes purchased over 1,400 acres of land in the Andersonville region in 1857, including all of the present day Andersonville National Historic Site, with the exception of lot 380.46

Antebellum European-American Settlement Patterns and Farming Practices

The rich, black, and fertile soil of the region suggested its eventual name—the “Black Belt.” The area rapidly developed with cotton farms and plantations. Slavery was an integral part of the farm economy in the 1840s and 1850s, and by 1860, the enslaved population totaled more than 4,800 of the total 9,428 residents of Sumter County. At this time, the slave population of the “Black Belt” was almost ten times greater than the slave population in the coastal counties of the state. In fact, nearly three-quarters of Georgia’s slave population lived on cotton plantations in the “Black Belt.”47

42. “Seminole Wars.”
44. Ibid.
45. Ricks, 4.
46. Ibid, 5.
Despite the large number of slaves in Georgia, less than one-third of the white male population in the state owned slaves. In addition, only 15 percent of the more than 40,000 slaveholders in the state owned twenty or more slaves, with the majority of slaveholders possessing fewer than six slaves. The typical slave, however, was likely to have lived on a plantation with a larger number of other slaves, as almost half of Georgia’s slave population lived on a plantation with more than thirty slaves.\(^{48}\)

While only one-third of the white male population were slaveholders, more than two-thirds of the state legislature in the 1850s and 1860s owned slaves, giving slave owners a disproportionately large voice in state government. During the antebellum period, state laws restricting the rights of slaveholders to free individual slaves were strengthened.\(^{49}\)

Although law prohibited the abuse and murder of slaves by their owners, whites were rarely prosecuted or convicted for these crimes. Law prohibited slaves from testifying on the actions of whites, but did not prohibit slaves from testifying against fellow slaves.\(^{50}\)

**Participation by Slaves, Free African Americans, Immigrants, and Others in Farming Workforces**

The slave population of Georgia increased significantly in the early portions of the nineteenth century. In 1800, the slave population in Georgia was 59,699. By 1810 the number of slaves in the state had nearly doubled, to 105,218. The slave population continued to increase despite the ban on the slave trade in 1808 by the United States Congress.\(^{51}\) By 1860, more than 90 percent of the slave population were involved with farming.

While the slave population made up much of the farming workforce in antebellum Georgia, almost 75 of the adult white male population of Georgia was also involved with farming.\(^{52}\)

Farming was also performed by tenants in antebellum Georgia. During this time, tenant farmers in Georgia were generally white.\(^{53}\) By 1860, nearly half of the white male population did not own land, and many of these individuals were farm tenants. Following the conclusion of the Civil War, most tenant farmers and sharecroppers were former slaves.\(^{54}\)

In 1850, nearly 99 percent of the white population in Georgia was born in the United States. However, over the next decade the number of foreign-born residents increased, particularly in Chatham County, where Savannah is located. In 1860, almost one-third of the free residents of Chatham County were born overseas, including Irish laborers and German Jews. It is unclear what role, if any, these groups played in farming.\(^{55}\)

**Community Development, 1860s**

By the 1860s, Andersonville contained approximately twelve houses, a train depot, a church, a store, and a cotton warehouse.\(^{56}\)

The Southwestern Railroad, as well as a public road constructed in the 1840s, positively influenced the decision to locate the prison camp

---

48. Ibid.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid. The Act Prohibiting Importation of Slaves (2 Stat. 426, enacted March 2, 1807) was enacted on March 2, 1807, and prohibited importation of any new slaves into the United States. Trade of slaves within the south was no prohibited, and the children of slaves automatically became slaves, however.
54. Inscoe.
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in Andersonville. During the period in which the camp was in operation, additional trains were operated by the railroad, allowing for the movement of prisoners to and from Andersonville.

The Civil War, 1861–1865

Abraham Lincoln was elected President of the United States in November 1860. By December 20, the state of South Carolina had seceded from the Union. A few days later, on December 26, U. S. Army Maj. Robert Anderson moved the small garrison under his command from Fort Moultrie on Sullivan’s Island in Charleston Harbor to nearby Fort Sumter, which was situated near the center of the harbor. The movement of troops, which Anderson ordered due to fear of attack, infuriated the people of Charleston and eventually citizens throughout the southern United States.

On January 2, 1861, the state of Georgia held an election for a special state convention to consider secession from the Union. The state convention opened on January 16, 1861, with a majority of delegates favoring immediate secession. On January 19, delegates voted 208 to 89 to adopt an ordinance of secession. The ordinance was signed in a public ceremony on January 21.

Following the passage of the ordinance of secession, delegate Eugenius Nisbet made a report to the convention outlining the reasoning behind Georgia’s secession from the United States of America. The report begins:

For the last ten years we have had numerous and serious causes of complaint against our non-slave-holding confederate States with reference to the subject of African slavery. They have endeavored to weaken our security, to disturb our domestic peace and tranquility, and persistently refused to comply with their express constitutional obligations to us in reference to that property, and by the use of their power in the Federal Government have striven to deprive us of an equal enjoyment of the common Territories of the Republic. This hostile policy of our confederates has been pursued with every circumstance of aggravation which could arouse the passions and excite the hatred of our people, and has placed the two sections of the Union for many years past in the condition of virtual civil war. Our people, still attached to the Union from habit and national traditions, and averse to change, hoped that time, reason, and argument would bring, if not redress, at least exemption from further insults, injuries, and dangers. Recent events have fully dissipated all such hopes and demonstrated the necessity of separation.

On February 8, Georgia became one of the founding states of the Confederate States of America. Early in the morning of April 12, 1861, a Confederate mortar at Fort Johnson fired a shell that burst over nearby Fort Sumter. With this attack on Fort Sumter, the Civil War began.

Andersonville Prison Camp

During the early part of the war, the Union and Confederacy engaged in a prisoner exchange program where captured soldiers could be traded in kind and returned to their own army. Some of the camps created to hold prisoners awaiting exchange later became permanent prisoner of war camps when the system broke down due to differences of opinion regarding the treatment of African American soldiers. Some examples include the northern prisons of Camp Douglas in Chicago, Johnson’s Island and Camp Chase in

61. Bearss, 11-12.
Ohio, and the southern prisons of Libby Prison and Belle Isle in Richmond. Through the latter part of 1863, the two prisons in Richmond became overcrowded and severe food shortages occurred. Confederate officials began to look for another prison location farther south.

Gen. Robert E. Lee suggested that an appropriate location would be in North Carolina, on the Danville Railroad, where wood for construction was inexpensive and provisions abundant, and from which prisoners could be relocated readily if exchanges were resumed. However, efforts to obtain suitable land in North Carolina failed, and in November 1863 Confederate Secretary of War James A. Seddon ordered Capt. W. Sidney Winder to proceed to identify an appropriate site in southwest Georgia.62

Captain Winder initially considered locations including Blue Springs (later called Radium Springs) near Albany, Georgia, and Magnolia Springs, between Americus and Plains, Georgia.63 He then learned through Uriah Harrold, a purchasing agent for the Commissary Department in Americus, of a possible site at Andersonville near the Southwestern Railroad line that had access to a water supply. In late December 1863, Winder selected a site in Sumter County, 5 miles west of the Flint River and 1,600 feet east of the Andersonville Depot.64 The small population of Andersonville (less than twenty persons) also meant that there was little local resistance to development of the prison. The site was selected and named Camp Sumter, but the prison became commonly known as Andersonville.

Wesley W. Turner and Benjamin B. Dykes owned the land rented by the Confederate government for the prison and associated burial site.65 (After the war, the prison and burial grounds were appropriated by the United States.) In 1868, Dykes claimed a portion of the remaining land that had been occupied by the Confederate government in connection with the prison.66 The character of the land was marginal. The Confederate Quartermaster Department leased the property from Dykes and Turner for $50 and $30 a month, respectively.67

Construction of a prison camp at Andersonville began in January 1864, with enslaved labor from local farms digging ditches and felling trees.68

**Bauxite and Kaolin Mining**

Bauxite, an amorphous rock that is the chief commercial ore in aluminum, was discovered in Andersonville in 1912 approximately 1-1/2 miles west of the Flint River on the south edge of Sweetwater Creek. The Republic Mining & Manufacturing Company began mining in the area in May 1914.69

Additional deposits were discovered nearby on the south edge of Sweetwater Creek, approximately 3-1/2 miles west of the Flint River. This property was mined intermittently by its owners, the Easterlin family, beginning in 1916.70 Production at the mines dropped following World War I, with only a small amount mined annually.71

The mining in the area was largely done by open-pit methods, although some underground mining occurred.72
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Bauxite mining ceased in 1949, however, by 1952 mining resumed. Today, the mining of bauxite continues in and around Andersonville, with the Easterlin mine still in operation under the ownership of C. E. Minerals.

In addition to bauxite, kaolin mining is also prevalent in the Andersonville area. Kaolin is used in the manufacture of ceramic wares and is also used as a filler in rubber and paper manufacturing. Kaolin is mined in the Andersonville area by C. E. Minerals, which operates four pits.

**Historic Resources Associated with Historic Context One**

Several resources located outside current park boundaries are related to this historic context, including the following:

- Norfolk Southern Railroad rail line
- Andersonville railroad depot
- Town of Andersonville
- Georgia State Route 49 corridor

**Significance**

Although the settlement period is meaningful as background to events that occurred in the Andersonville areas preceding the Civil War, there are no aboveground extant resources within the park that relate this this context. It is therefore not relevant to the significance of Andersonville National Historic Site.
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**Georgia Secession and the Outbreak of Civil War**

Abraham Lincoln was elected President of the United States in November 1860. By December 20, the state of South Carolina had seceded from the Union. A few days later, on December 26, U. S. Army Maj. Robert Anderson moved the small garrison under his command from Fort Moultrie on Sullivan’s Island in Charleston Harbor to nearby Fort Sumter, which was situated in the center of the harbor. The movement of troops, which Anderson ordered due to fear of attack, infuriated the people of Charleston and eventually citizens throughout the southern United States.

For more than two decades during the mid-nineteenth century, the sectional conflict over the future of slavery grew within the United States. Secession was posed as a political option within the southern states as early as 1820, during the
crisis that followed passage of the Missouri Compromise. After Abraham Lincoln was elected in 1860 with a platform that suggested prohibition of slavery, southern states again began to threaten secession. On January 2, 1861, the state of Georgia held an election for a special state convention to consider seceding from the Union. In the vote held on January 19, the delegates passed a secession resolution with 208 for and 89 against. On February 8, 1861, Georgia became one of the founding states of the Confederate States of America. Early in the morning of April 12, 1861, a Confederate mortar at Fort Johnson fired a shell that burst over nearby Fort Sumter. With this attack on Fort Sumter, the Civil War began.

**Military Traditions Regarding Prisoners of War and the American Civil War**

Many American military traditions are based on Western European practices, including standards of conduct regarding the treatment and status of individual members of an opposing military force captured during combat. At the time the Civil War broke out in the United States, these standards continued to stem from traditions of chivalry that may date to the Late Medieval period. Codes of chivalry suggested that a captured soldier could not be used against his own forces, and that prisoners could not simply be executed upon capture, although many were. These traditions and codes stemmed from practices arising from decrees by kings and other leaders regarding ordinances of war. Although generally not codified in any formal or meaningful way, they were practiced by many armies in Europe, and adopted by American military personnel. Despite a general reliance on tradition and code, there were no international bodies in a position to evaluate the compliance of any individual army. The codes remained difficult to enforce until the late nineteenth century when the Hague Convention on the Laws and Customs of War on Land (Hague II), promulgated in 1899, was adopted as the international convention on the subject. Prior to the Hague Convention, an international agreement to address the condition of soldiers on the battlefield was adopted in 1864 as part of the Convention on the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded on the Field of Battle, referred to commonly as the Red Cross Convention. This agreement resulted from the aftermath of a battle that occurred in Soleferino, Italy, where tens of thousands of soldiers were left wounded and dying on the battlefield.

At the beginning of the Civil War, both the Confederate and the Union governments lacked a formal process for retaining prisoners. Because leaders of both the Union and Confederate Armies expected the Civil War conflict to be short and relatively bloodless, neither side planned for capture and imprisonment of the opposing side’s soldiers. During the mid-nineteenth century, most western nations followed a traditional European system of parole and exchange of captured soldiers. A prisoner who was placed on parole vowed not to fight again until he was “exchanged” for a prisoner on the other side. Once the exchange was made, both men could join their units. While awaiting exchange, prisoners were briefly confined to camps. During the Civil War, however, the massive battles soon led to an influx of thousands upon thousands of prisoners, and challenged the ability of either side to adequately administer the exchanges. In the First Battle of Bull Run on July 21, 1861, for example, nearly 1,000 Union soldiers were captured by the Confederate forces.

The first prisoners held by the Union Army were sent to military fortifications along the Eastern
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Seaboard, such as Fort Delaware, Fort McHenry, and Point Lookout. In 1862, recognizing the extent of the problem, the Union expanded the facilities for holding prisoners, converting several Woman's Relief Corps volunteer muster camps into prison compounds at such locations as Alton and Douglas in Illinois, Camp Morton in Indiana, and Camp Chase in Ohio. Camp Parole was established in Maryland, while Benton Barracks in Missouri were designated as parole and exchange facilities for federal prisoners released by the Confederacy and returned to Union lines. In June 1862, the administration of Union prisoner of war operations was placed under the direction of William Hoffman, who worked to centralize the system, establish regulations for camps, and decide where prisoners should be held.

Union prisoners were initially held in Richmond, Virginia, and Charleston, South Carolina, in prisons established in confiscated buildings, such as tobacco warehouses. The Confederate prison system was placed under the direction of Brig. Gen. John H. Winder in June 1861. Winder's role grew as the prison system expanded. He remained in charge of the Confederate prison system until his death in February 1865.

**Prisoner Exchange Programs during the American Civil War**

As the war progressed, Union and Confederate forces exchanged prisoners sporadically, usually due to the leadership of the opposing field commanders. Support for prisoner exchanges continued to grow in the North as articles were regularly published in newspapers calling for an increase in the practice. Petitions from prisoners in Southern captivity also contributed to the pressure felt by the Lincoln administration to amend its initial approach. Finally, on December 11, 1861, the U.S. Congress passed a joint resolution calling on President Lincoln to "inaugurate systematic measures for the exchange of prisoners in the present rebellion."

During the winter of 1862, Union Maj. Gen. John E. Wool and Confederate Brig. Gen. Howell Cobb met on February 23 and March 1, 1862, to reach an agreement on prisoner exchanges. They discussed many of the provisions that would later become part of the Dix-Hill agreement. However, differences over which side would cover expenses for prisoner transportation led to an end to the negotiations before an agreement could be reached. Due to the informal prisoner exchange system in use by both sides, there were few prisoners in the limited camps associated with either side in mid-1862.

**Dix-Hill Cartel of 1862**

Because both sides wished to formalize the exchange program, negotiations resumed in July 1862 when Maj. Gen. John A. Dix, an appointee of the Union army, met with Confederate Maj. Gen. D. H. Hill. Together, they established a cartel agreement that involved the establishment of a scale of equivalents to manage the exchange of military officers and enlisted personnel; for example, a general officer could be exchanged for sixty enlisted men, a colonel for fifteen privates, a lieutenant for four enlisted men, and a sergeant for three privates. The cartel consisted of six articles intended to establish a relatively simple and functional exchange system. Interestingly, the cartel avoided recognizing the Confederacy as a belligerent. The cartel stipulated that personnel of equal ranks would be transferred man for man. Each government was to appoint an agent to handle the exchange and parole of prisoners. The cartel agreement also addressed the exchange of non-combatant prisoners (such as citizens accused of disloyalty) and civilian employees of the
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military, and allowed the continued exchange or parole of captives between the commanders of two opposing forces. Authorities were to parole any prisoners not formally exchanged within ten days following their capture. The terms of the cartel prohibited paroled prisoners from returning to the military in any capacity including “the performance of field, garrison, police, or guard, or constabulary duty.”

The Breakdown of the Exchange Programs and the Establishment of Military Prisons

By 1863, both the Union and Confederate Armies had begun to place thousands of prisoners in ad hoc prisons. Little attention was paid to the prisoners, who were expected to eventually be paroled. Reports of poor treatment began to emerge, and both sides threatened retaliation in response.

It is possible that if both sides had followed the provisions outlined in the Dix-Hill Cartel, the prisoner of war situation would have been far less gruesome and more humane, and there would not have been a need to establish the massive prison compounds that emerged beginning in 1863. The system, in fact, operated as anticipated between July 1862 and May 1863, with 20,000 Confederate and 12,000 Union prisoners exchanged. However, allegations of deliberate mistreatment of thousands of prisoners due to the overwhelming influx and the enlistment of African American soldiers beginning in late 1862 contributed to the breakdown of the system.

Exchanges were formally ended on May 25, 1863, under the order of General Halleck. In addition to the problems surrounding the imprisoning of hundreds of thousands of prisoners in an impromptu system, the exchange system collapsed in mid-1863 when the Confederacy refused to treat captured African American prisoners in the same manner as white prisoners, claiming that these men were most likely ex-slaves who should be returned to their masters and not serve the Union Army. Confederate response to the Union enlistment of African American regiments consisted of shock and outrage, and swift policy decisions enacted by CSA President Jefferson Davis. In order to stave off a potential general slave insurrection in the South, Davis “announced that white officers commanding black troops were subject to trial and execution for inciting a servile insurrection. Any black troops taken prisoner were to be delivered to state control and punished according to the state laws for slaves caught bearing arms.”

On July 30, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln followed Confederate declarations by announcing that “any soldier of the United States who was executed by the enemy in violation of the laws of war would result in the execution of a Confederate prisoner of equal rank. For any black troops placed into slavery, an equal number of Confederates would be placed at hard labor.” In his proclamation, Lincoln sought to use the threat of retaliation as a way to ensure that all Union troops were treated equally should they be taken prisoner. Unfortunately, the Confederates were not willing to comply, and black troops faced execution and slavery if captured. In effect, Confederate authorities determined to refuse
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quarter or exchange for black troops. Several examples of captured black soldiers being executed, employed in constructing Confederate fortifications, canals, and other infrastructure, or being returned to slave owners were noted by Union officials.91

Discussions regarding the issue continued until October 23, 1863, when Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton directed that all commanders of places of confinement be notified that there would be no more exchanges.92 This followed a request by Confederate exchange commissioner Robert Ould that all prisoners of war be exchanged in conformance with the cartel on October 20, 1863. His request specifically targeted the troops that had been captured at Vicksburg following the siege of spring and summer 1863.

Nonetheless, the Union offered to conduct specific mass exchanges on several occasions in order to alleviate the suffering of the prisoners. For example, Maj. Gen. Henry Hallock offered to exchange Federal prisoners of war held in Richmond prisons for an equivalent number of Confederate prisoners on December 7, 1863. General Lee, however, refused on the grounds that the offer did not meet the terms of the cartel. Later, in September 1864, Lt. Gen. John Bell Hood offered to release to Maj. Gen. William T. Sherman “. . . the prisoners at Andersonville in exchange for the soldiers taken from Hood in the Georgia campaign.”93 Sherman, however—concerned that receipt of a large number of prisoners, who were already weak from disease and malnutrition, would slow his army and prolong the war—refused to exchange more than a few men.94

Accusations followed for some time that the exchanges promised by either side had not been made. In May 1864, Maj. Gen. Benjamin Butler finally declared, “The Cartel is entirely annulled.”95

Following the end of the exchange system, prison populations soared and the number of prisoners grew to accommodate them. After the 1863 decision, Northern and Southern prison camps created to hold prisoners awaiting exchange became permanent prisoner of war camps, as did some training camps.96 Between 1863 and the end of the war, numerous major prisons were established by both sides. The situation was less challenging for the North due to its superior manpower reserves, while for the Confederacy the loss of soldiers to Northern prisons was especially damaging to the Southern economy and war effort due to a smaller pool of men to choose from.

**Lincoln’s General Order 100**

On April 24, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln signed the Instructions for the Government of Armies of the United States in the Field, also known as General Order 100 or the Lieber Instructions. These instructions were directed to the Union forces of the United States Army and dictated how soldiers were to conduct themselves during the Civil War conflict. Franz Lieber, a German-American legal scholar and political philosopher, authored the instructions. The Lieber Code, as the instructions are sometimes known, addressed several areas of ethical concern, such as the humane treatment of populations in occupied areas.97 The code included instructions to field commanders for the proper treatment of captured enemies. Article 56 specifically addressed the treatment of prisoners of war, stating:

> A prisoner of war is subject to no punishment for being a public enemy, nor is any revenge wreaked upon him by the intentional infliction of any suffering, or disgrace, by cruel
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imprisonment, want of food, by mutilation, death, or any other barbarity.98

The instructions also addressed the issue of slavery and treatment of black prisoners of war. It is believed that the Lieber Code was commissioned by Lincoln to address the problems arising from the Emancipation Proclamation, which the Confederates considered to be in violation of the customary rules of warfare. Confederate President Jefferson Davis also declared that the Confederate Army would treat black Union soldiers as criminals, not as soldiers. As such, they would be subject to execution and re-enslavement. The Lieber Code would form the basis for the Hague Convention of 1907 and international treaty law.

Expansion of Prisoner of War Camps

In 1864, Maj. Gen. Ulysses Grant, noting a distinct difference in the numbers of Confederate and Union prisoners—Union camps held far more prisoners than Confederate camps—assumed that this afforded him a decided military advantage. He therefore opposed additional prisoner exchanges until the end of the war was in sight. In a letter to Gen. Benjamin F. Butler, Grant noted:

It is hard on our men held in Southern prisons not to exchange them, but it is humanity to those left in the ranks to fight our battles. Every man we hold, when released on parole or otherwise, becomes an active soldier against us at once either directly or indirectly. If we commence a system of exchange which liberates all prisoners taken, we will have to fight on until the whole South is exterminated.99

However, the Union also allowed approximately 5,600 captured Confederates to join the Union Army. These troops were known as “Galvanized Yankees.” They were typically stationed in the West and tasked with fighting Native Americans. At the same time, approximately 1,600 former Union troops are known to have joined the Confederate army.100 Although international law did not allow captors to force the enlistment of prisoners, it remained legal to encourage soldiers to voluntarily switch allegiances. Such a choice, however, could lead to trial and execution for desertion if the soldier was recaptured. Several factors likely contributed to the decision by those imprisoned to join the ranks of the enemy. In some cases, prisoners agreed to sign the Oath of Allegiance to the opposing side out of desperation to escape the horrors of prison life. In other cases, they may have sought an opportunity to disrupt the operations of the enemy army. While Confederate prisoners were enlisted in the Union Army as early as 1862, it was not until 1864 that President Lincoln officially allowed the enlisting of former Confederates.101

Six regiments of comprised of ‘galvanized’ soldiers were formed with recruits from Union prison camps at Point Lookout, Maryland; Rock Island, Illinois; Alton, Illinois; Camp Douglas, Illinois; Camp Chase, Ohio; and Camp Morton, Indiana. These galvanized units were sent west where they garrisoned frontier forts that were low on manpower. By the time the galvanized units reached their posts, the Civil War had ended. The final galvanized unit disbanded in November 1866.102

In 1865, as the war was ending, the Confederates sent 17,000 prisoners northward, while receiving 24,000 men from Union prisons.103 On April 27, after the war had ended, the riverboat SS Sultana, exploded as it was traveling northward on the Mississippi River. At the time of the explosion, the steamboat was a few miles north of Memphis,
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Tennessee, and was carrying more than 2,400 people. Most were Union soldiers who were returning home from Southern prisons. More than 1,800 on board died in the explosion.104

It is believed that about 2.75 million soldiers fought in the Civil War—2 million for the Union and 750,000 for the Confederacy. Over the course of the war, approximately 409,000 soldiers were captured by the opposing side.

In 1901, the Record and Pension Office reported that approximately 211,000 Union soldiers had been captured during the war. Between 1861 and 1863, most of those captured were paroled—considered to be approximately 17,000 men—on the battlefield. After the parole exchange system was effectively abandoned in 1863, an estimated 194,000 captured Union soldiers were sent to prison camps.105

Historian Paul Springer estimating that more than 674,000 soldiers were taken prisoner during the Civil War. Of these, his estimate for the number of individuals sent to prison camps is approximately 400,000, with potentially 56,000 dying while in captivity.106 The overall mortality and morbidity rates of the prisons of both sides were similar, and higher than that faced by soldiers on the battlefield.107 Among those incarcerated in Union and Confederate prisons were citizens accused of disloyalty, spying, aiding the enemy, desertion, and other crimes. Prisoners included men and women, and were of different backgrounds and races, including white, African American, American Indian, and Hispanic.

Overall, approximately 150 locations served as military prisons during the Civil War. Most were not designed to accommodate the increasing numbers of prisoners assigned to them and suffered extreme overcrowding. Prison facilities were initially make-shift assemblages, sometimes designed as temporary locales, or fashioned from adapted existing buildings. Prison facilities ranged from county jails and penitentiaries, to coastal fortifications, converted commercial buildings, warehouses, barracks, and stockades, often characterized by open fields enclosed by a perimeter fence and a cadre of guards. Tents were sometimes the only shelter available to prisoners, although some included buildings or other structures to shelter the men. Prison enclosures varied and included formidable walls and barricades, fencing, earthworks, and guard towers.108

Officers and enlisted men were typically separated to prevent the officers from planning and executing escapes. In Richmond, Virginia, for example, the officers were imprisoned at Libby Prison, while the enlisted men were sent to Belle Isle. When both officers and enlisted men were sent to the same prison, they were placed in separate areas. Prisoners were often shifted from one prison to another in response to overcrowding or the approach of enemy forces.

The two prisons with the highest mortality rates were Confederate Camp Sumter near Andersonville, Georgia, and Union Elmira Prison in New York State. Elmira, with a death rate of 25 percent, is often compared to Camp Sumter, where the death rate was 29 percent. However, the number of prisoners confined in each of these prisons, and the number that died, are substantially different. At Elmira, about 12,000 Confederate prisoners were held over a period of a year, and nearly 3,000 of them died. At Camp
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Sumter, nearly 45,000 Union prisoners were held over a period of fourteen months, and nearly 13,000 of them died. The cause of death in these, and other Civil War prisons, included smallpox, typhoid fever, dysentery, diarrhea, scurvy, exposure, and their wounds and post-battle medical treatment, including amputation. At Camp Douglas in Chicago, Illinois, for example, 10 percent of the Confederate prisoners died from exposure during a single bitterly cold winter month. Others died trying to escape or due to the actions of fellow prisoners; within the prisons, many unlawful activities ranging from theft to assault and even murder were common. In addition, most soldiers suffered due to depression, unsanitary conditions, unclean water, an inadequate and unhealthful diet, and lack of clothing, shelter, and medicine.

Many Southern prisons had high disease rates and were routinely short of medicine, doctors, food, and clean water. In the North, many believed that their troops were being deliberately weakened and killed in Confederate prisons, and demanded that conditions in Northern prisons be equally harsh.

The Establishment and Development of Federal and Confederate Prisons

In the north, the prison system was under the command of Col. William H. Hoffman, who himself had been a prisoner for a brief period in 1861 before being exchanged.

While in Texas, Lieutenant Colonel Hoffman was one of those captured when Union General David E. Twiggs surrendered his forces to the Confederacy in February of 1861. Twiggs was dismissed, so he joined the Confederate States of Army and was appointed major general. Hoffman was paroled but not exchanged until August 1862. While on parole,

Hoffman could not serve in the field, but he could accept a nonmilitary position. He was appointed commissary general on October 23, 1861. Once appointed, Hoffman reorganized the prison system. He was a methodical, budget-minded administrator who pinched every penny. His policy was that if a prisoner had “clothing upon him,” no matter what its condition, he would be issued nothing else to wear.

During the initial phase of the war, the officer most responsible for the fate of Union prisoners was Brig. Gen. John Henry Winder. At sixty-one, Winder had been too old for field command when he decided to join the Confederate Army after a long career with the United States Army. General Winder personally oversaw the operation of most Confederate military prisons through the majority of the Civil War. Winder was responsible for construction of Camp Lawton in Burke County, Georgia. Winder described it as the “largest prison camp in the world.” The camp was built hastily during the late summer and fall of 1864 to alleviate overcrowding at Camp Sumter. After its completion, Winder established his headquarters at Camp Lawton; when he was later promoted to Commissary-General of Prisons East of the Mississippi, Winder operated much of the Confederate military prison system from Camp Lawton.

Winder was the son of Gen. William H. Winder (1775–1824), author of the Winder Cartel of 1814 that was used as an instrument in the War of 1812. The Dix-Hill Cartel was modeled on the Winder Cartel.

On June 21, 1861, John Winder was named Provost Marshal General of Richmond, Virginia, where many of the initial prisoners were sent as a temporary holding place until exchanges could be arranged. In this position, Winder was to oversee the federal captives sent to the prisons in the city.
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As the Confederate prison system grew, Winder’s position expanded along with it. He effectively served as the de facto Commissary General for prisoners throughout the war, although his post as such was not officially created until November 21, 1864. Winder remained in this position until his death in February 1865.

In Richmond, the number of prisoners quickly overran the capacity of the adapted warehouses and other facilities in Richmond, and the two principal prisons in the city—Libby and Belle Isle—became overcrowded, resulting in severe food shortages. As the number of prisoners grew, Confederate officials began to look for another prison location farther south. Gen. Robert E. Lee suggested that an appropriate location would be in North Carolina, on the Danville Railroad, where wood for construction was inexpensive and provisions abundant, and from which prisoners could be relocated readily if exchanges were resumed. However, efforts to obtain suitable land in North Carolina failed, and in November 1863 Confederate Secretary of War James A. Seddon ordered Capt. W. Sidney Winder to proceed to identify an appropriate site in southwest Georgia. Captain Winder learned through Uriah Harrold, a purchasing agent for the Commissary Department in Americus, of a possible site at Andersonville near the Southern Railroad that had access to a water supply.

**Federal Prisons**

Several historians have authored scholarly investigations of the federal prisons of the Civil War era. For example, Lonnie Speer’s *Portals to Hell: Military Prisons of the Civil War*, and Frances Casstevens, “Out of the Mouth of Hell”: *Civil War Prisons and Escapes*, document life for those incarcerated in the individual prisons. Summaries of the experience of life in several federal prisons are included below for reference. A list of other known federal prisons follows for reference.

**Alton Military Prison.** Alton Military Prison was located in Alton, Illinois, on the Mississippi River. The prison was first built in 1833 for state use, and converted for use as a military prison on February 9, 1862. Those imprisoned included Confederate soldiers, civilians, and Federal soldiers under sentence of court martial or military commission. Over the course of the war, the prison housed 12,000 prisoners. Its capacity at any one time was 1,891.  

Alton was a three-story fortress-style building that contained 256 cells, each measuring 4 feet by 7 feet. The main building, a stone structure, was surrounded by 30-foot-high walls, and divided into five large rooms, each partitioned into two spaces. Prior to the war, the building had been condemned and abandoned for use as the Illinois State Penitentiary. Located in close proximity to the river, the building was exposed to flooding and poor drainage that contributed to disease within the prison. Prisoners were housed in the main building and several outbuildings. Malnutrition, contaminated water, overcrowding, and smallpox contributed to high death rates in the prison.

Today, the site of Alton Military Prison is a public park and playground. Most of the buildings were removed after the war. A portion of a cell block was restored in 1973 as a monument. The site of the prison was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1975. A historical marker has also been placed on the site by the state of Illinois.

**Camp Chase.** Camp Chase was located in Columbus, Ohio. It was established in 1861 as a training center for Federal troops before being converted into a Confederate prisoner of war facility. Initial prisoners were soon exchanged. Camp Chase remained in operation through the end of the war. The prison was composed of barracks surrounded by a high fence. It housed enlisted men and officers, as well as the African American servants of officers, and political prisoners. The prison had a capacity of 4,000; the highest number of prisoners known to have been held at one time was 9,423. The prison was
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named for Secretary of the Treasury and former Ohio governor Samuel P. Chase.

In August 1864, Adjutant General of Ohio B. R. Cowen described the prison:

The camp is situated on the National road, five miles west of this city [Columbus, Ohio], and consists of wooden barracks for the prisoners as well as for the garrison. The prisoners are surrounded by tight board fences twelve feet in height, surmounted by a parapet for the sentinels, from which a full view of the entire inclosure is obtained and any unnecessary movement on the part of the prisoners is observed. The prison inclosures are lighted with coal oil lamps at night to guard against any unnecessary collection of prisoners or any concerted efforts to overpower the guards. The prison buildings are similar in construction and material to the temporary military prisons in the Northern States, and in my opinion, are as safe as wooden buildings can be made.118

Nothing remains of Camp Chase today except for a cemetery that contains the remains of the Confederate soldiers who died there. The earliest casualties of the prison were interred in the City Cemetery at Columbus. In 1863, a new cemetery was established near the prison for purposes of burying prison dead. The earlier burials in City Cemetery were exhumed and reinterred in the new cemetery. By the end of the war, the cemetery held 2,260 burials. In June 1902, a memorial was placed in the cemetery to honor those buried there. The memorial consists of an granite structure surmounted by a bronze statue of a Confederate soldier guarding those buried in the cemetery. In 1906, white marble headstones were erected on each of the graves.119

**Camp Douglas.** Camp Douglas was located in Chicago, Illinois, near Lake Michigan, and on part of “Oakenwald,” the estate of politician Stephen A. Douglas. It was established in February 1862 as a facility for training and quartering Union troops from the area by the summer of 1862, however, the prison held 9,000 military prisoners, principally Confederate soldiers captured at Fort Henry and Fort Donelson.120 In January 1863, the facility was formally converted to a prisoner of war camp.

The camp extended over approximately 60 acres. It was divided into compounds of varying sizes by partitions. Each was named in accordance with its purpose, such as Garrison Square, Hospital Square, and Prison Square. The prisoners were housed in wooden barracks enclosed by a high fence.

By the end of the war, between 26,000 and 26,781 prisoners were housed in the prison. Of these, as many as 12,000 lived in the prison at any one time; the prison was designed with a capacity of 6,000. Camp Douglas was referred to as “80 acres of hell.”121 As early as summer 1862, the camp was described as in poor condition due to its unsuitability for use as a place to house thousands of individuals. The site, situated on low-lying ground, regularly flooded whenever it rained. An inspection by Edward D. Kittoe, a surgeon with the U.S. Volunteers, on the order of the U.S. Army suggested:

> The ground is low and flat, rendering drainage imperfect and difficult to effect. Its proximity to Lake Michigan, and consequent exposure to the cold, damp winds from off this large body of water, with the flat, marshy character of the soil, must of necessity create a tendency to disease of the respiratory organs, which . . . is clearly demonstrated by reference to reports of disease prevalent during the month of December.122

With the unhealthful conditions, Camp Douglas became notorious for its high mortality and
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morbidity rate. During the particularly cold winter of 1864, 1,091 prisoners died.\footnote{\textsuperscript{123}}

In addition to the flooding, one of the guards, Col. Joseph H. Tucker, noted that “the structure and form of this camp is very unsuitable for the confinement of prisoners [because] the insecurity of the fences is a constant temptation to the prisoners to attempt escape, and numerous props and irregularities on the inside afford ready means of climbing over quickly.”\footnote{\textsuperscript{124}} The prison was known for the cruel treatment administered by the guards.

Today, nothing remains of Camp Douglas. The 4,000 individuals who died while imprisoned there were initially buried in unmarked graves in Chicago’s City Cemetery. In 1867, the dead were exhumed and reinterred at Oak Woods Cemetery, located approximately 5 miles south of the prison site. A monument was later placed at the cemetery by Southern Veterans.\footnote{\textsuperscript{125}} A marker was erected to commemorate the site of Camp Douglas in 2014.\footnote{\textsuperscript{126}}

**Camp Morton.** Camp Morton was located in Indianapolis, Indiana, on the site of the Indiana State Fairgrounds. First established as a training camp for Indiana volunteers in 1861, the facility was adapted to house prisoners in 1862. The buildings at the entrance into the camp, which had been constructed in 1852 for the fairgrounds, were Victorian in character. Like Camp Douglas, the prison space became needed to house Confederate prisoners after the Union capture of Forts Donelson and Henry in 1862. Capt. James A. Ekin, Assistant Quartermaster General of the U.S. Army, was tasked with establishing a prison to accept up to 3,000 prisoners. Five wooden barracks were constructed to serve as housing. Additional facilities included several smaller buildings, adapted from fairground use, to house officers, nurses, and a prison hospital. Although the prison capacity ranged from 2,000 to 3,000, Camp Morton regularly housed as many as 5,000 prisoners.

The fairgrounds offered both advantages and disadvantages as a prison. A stream and shade trees offered important prisoner amenities. However, the large open area proved difficult to guard. Within the larger fairgrounds area, Union personnel designated a 5-acre site within which to confine the prisoners. Within the confinement site was a running stream, several maple trees, and five wells.\footnote{\textsuperscript{127}} The site was enclosed by a board fence; a platform edged the outside of the fence and was used by the guards as a walkway. There was a second low fence inside the stockade that served as the deadline, which the prisoners were forbidden to cross. Eventually, the prisoners were forced to dig a trench, 16 feet wide and 10 feet deep, to diminish the potential for escape.\footnote{\textsuperscript{128}}

As with many other Civil War prisons, conditions were unhealthful. Heating was insufficient, and many prisoners froze to death or died from disease brought on by exposure and lack of enough food. The latrines regularly overflowed.\footnote{\textsuperscript{129}}

Many prisoners attempted escape. One of the methods used was tunneling. The ditch that surrounded the prison site made tunneling more difficult; however a group of prisoners did manage to complete a tunnel and escape. The tunnel was discovered soon thereafter and closed. However,
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the prisoners continued to attempt this form of escape with varying results, mostly negative.  

Following the end of the war, Camp Morton was returned to state fairgrounds use until 1890, when a new fairground was built. The property was subsequently subdivided and developed with residences. In 1916, students and teachers from Indianapolis School No. 45 placed a marker near the site to indicate the former location of Camp Morton. In 1962, a second sign was added to the site. The two markers are now located within the Herron-Morton Place Historic Park. In 2000, the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, in cooperation with the Sons of Confederate Veterans, placed four markers to indicate the boundary of the former camp site. A dedication ceremony was held at the site on October 25, 2003. Prisoners who died while at Camp Morton were buried in the city cemetery and at Greenlawn. Some Confederate soldiers were later exhumed and returned to their families in the South for reburial. Others were moved when the Vandalia Railroad line was planned to extend through the area in 1870.

In 1906, former Confederate Col. William Elliott was placed in charge of identifying and marking the graves of Confederate dead within Northern states. As noted in Confederate Veteran magazine, “Confederate prisoners are buried in 61 cemeteries extending over the Northern states from Boston in the east to Santa Fe in the west. Col. Elliott must cover this vast territory.” At Camp Morton, this work resulted in the enclosing of a plot approximately 45 by 200 feet in size within an iron fence. In 1912, the Federal government erected a monument at the site; the monument was later moved to Garfield Park. It carries the names and regiments of the 1,616 dead Confederate soldiers and sailors, and honors those whose graves could not be identified. In 1931, the War Department exhumed the Confederate prisoners buried at Greenlawn and moved them to Lot No. 32 at the Crown Hill Cemetery. In 1993, additional markers were placed at the site to identify the names and regiments of those buried there.

During the early twentieth century, Confederate veterans honored the first commander at Camp Morton—Col. Richard Owen—by commissioning a bust to be placed in the state capital at Indianapolis. The bronze bust, which rests on a three-part limestone base, was sculpted by artist Belle Kinney Scholz and dedicated in 1913. The bust was funded through contributions from individuals as well as Confederate veterans associations in recognition of Owen’s humane treatment of Confederate prisoners during the war.

**Elmira Prison.** Located in Elmira, New York, the Elmira Prison was established as a training camp for Union soldiers in 1861 and converted for use as a prisoner of war camp in July 1864. The capacity of the prison was 5,000; at one time the prison held more than 9,500 prisoners. It was nicknamed “Hellmira.”

The prison was located in the Chemung River valley in western New York State near the Pennsylvania border. It was composed of several barracks enclosed within a high fence. A set of double doors near the center of the enclosure on the north side marked the entrance into the 40-acre area that comprised the prison. A 14-foot-high plank fence enclosed the confinement area, characterized by a flat plain along the banks of the river. A narrow walkway edged the fence exterior

that was used by the guards to maintain visual control over the prison. In addition, two large platforms were constructed outside the fence that were used by paying visitors to observe the prison. The interior space was lighted at night by large globe lamps placed at regular intervals. Prisoners were quartered in long wooden barracks. The interior of the compound was divided by a long, narrow lake that paralleled the river.

Prisoners held at Elmira suffered from the cold, poor food rations, lack of medical treatment, poor sanitary conditions associated with the lake, and severe punishments by prison officials and guards. Illnesses included diarrhea, dysentery, scurvy, and smallpox. Like Camp Morton, prisoners at Elmira attempted tunneling to escape; some were even successful.

Today, all that remains of the prison site is a memorial marker erected in 1992 within the camp site. By the end of 1865, most of the buildings had already been torn down or moved. Prisoners who died at Elmira were buried about one mile from the prison. Today, these burials fall within Woodland National Cemetery. The graves are marked by headstones due to the efforts of John W. Jones, a former slave, who kept meticulous records of each death and supervised each burial. Within the cemetery is a monument erected by the United Daughters of the Confederacy in 1937 to honor the memory of the Confederate soldiers buried there.\(^{134}\)

Additional federal prisons that operated during the Civil War were located at Fort Delaware, Fort Lafayette, Fort McHenry, Fort Warren, Gratiot Street, Johnson’s Island, Ohio State Penitentiary, Old Capitol Prison, Point Lookout, and Rock Island.

---

**Confederate Prisons**


**Camp Sumter (Andersonville Prison)**

*Establishment and construction of the prison camp.* Following a rise in prisoners housed in Richmond, Virginia, which posed problems for the Confederacy in terms of its ability to meet supply needs, and the potential for prisoners to serve as a liability should the capital city be attacked by the Union Army, Secretary of War James A. Seddon determined the need to establish a new prison further south. In late December 1863, he ordered Capt. W. Sidney Winder to consult with Georgia Governor, Joseph E. Brown, in Milledgeville, and General Howell Cobb, in Atlanta, about a prison site. The general areas identified as suitable included Americus and Fort Valley. After his first two choices at Blue Springs and Magnolia Springs were rejected by local residents, he settled on Andersonville in Sumter County, 5 miles west of the Flint River and 1,600 feet east of the Andersonville Depot.\(^{135}\) The small population of Andersonville (less than twenty persons) meant that there was little local resistance to development of the prison. The site was selected and named Camp Sumter, but the prison became commonly known as Andersonville for its proximity to the town, which was named for John W. Anderson, Superintendent of the Southwestern Railroad. The land, owned by Benjamin Dykes and Wesley W. Turner, was to be leased by the Confederate government for the
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prison and associated burial site for $50 and $30 a month from the owners, respectively. It was located in Georgia’s cotton and corn belt, a region characterized by rolling open fields, woodlots, and wooded stream corridors. The land was only marginally productive. The prison site occupied the side of a hill that included a marshy area associated with a stream. The stream corridor was edged by dense stands of oak and pine trees.

Responsibility for construction of the prison was assigned to Richard B. Winder of the Quartermaster Department, a cousin of Capt. W. Sidney Winder and nephew of Brig. Gen. John H. Winder (Capt. W. Sidney Winder’s father). Brigadier General Winder, who resigned his federal commission in April 1861 and was given a commission in the Confederate Army in June, was eventually made commissary general, responsible for oversight of all prison camps in the Confederacy east of the Mississippi River.

Construction of a prison camp at Andersonville began in January 1864, with slaves from local farms digging ditches and felling trees.

Initially designed to hold 10,000 prisoners, the prison consisted of a rectangular stockade approximately 1,010 feet long and 780 feet wide, surrounding 16 1/2 acres. The walls of the enclosure were constructed of pine trees cut to approximately 22 feet in length, hewn to a thickness of 8 to 12 inches, and set in a 5-foot-deep trench. The poles were cut flat on the sides so that prisoners could not see out between the posts. Two gates were located along the west side of the stockade, each consisting of a timber pen approximately 30 feet square, with an opening to the exterior and a second opening into the prison. Completed in the third week of March 1864, the stockade had eight sentry boxes positioned along the palisade at 40-yard intervals, to permit the guards to look into the prison (Figure 8 and Figure 9). As the number of prisoners increased, additional sentry boxes were constructed, and the spacing between them was reduced to approximately 100 feet.

In late March, a wood fence or “deadline” was constructed 19 feet on average inside the stockade wall, with guards ordered to shoot prisoners who crossed this line (Figure 10 and Figure 11).

FIGURE 9. Diagrammatic illustration of the camp and its layout, and relationship to the rail line and the town of Andersonville. (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site, image ANDE-2578)

FIGURE 10. View along the deadline, 1864. (Source: National Archives)
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The site’s small, slow-moving stream, which became known as Stockade Branch, ran through the middle of the prison enclosure; it was expected to supply water to most of the prison (Figure 12).

In July 1864, eight small earthworks equipped with artillery were constructed around the exterior of the prison for internal control and in response to fear of an assault by Sherman’s army.  

**Figure 11.** View through the deadline into the camp, 1864. (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site, image A-1-5073)

**Figure 12.** View of the camp and Stockade Branch, 1864. In the foreground is an open latrine area, where pits referred to as sinks were in use. Behind the latrine area is Stockade Branch, edged by railings, which constituted the camp’s supply of water. (Source: National Archives)

**Occupancy and management of the prison.** Although soldiers from the 55th Georgia and the 26th Alabama were initially detailed as guards, the newly authorized Reserve Corps of Georgia soon took over this responsibility. The Corps consisted mainly of elderly men, young boys, and a few wounded veterans.

The first 500 prisoners arrived on February 24, 1864, and were housed in the unfinished stockade with limited food and equipment. Following Winder’s difficulties securing lumber for construction of barracks to house the prisoners, he instead decided to request tents. However, he was informed that no tents were available to him. As the prisoners began to fill up the stockade, shelterless, they set to work building huts and lean-tos from all available material—logs, limbs, shrubs, brush, blankets, tent flies, and overcoats.  

As many as 400 new prisoners arrived every day followed. As their numbers increased, the prisoners were divided into detachments of 270 men; each detachment was subdivided into three companies, each with a Sergeant in charge. By March 20, 6,488 prisoners had been transferred to Andersonville.  

To keep up with the increase in prisoners, the daily rations of meal, peas, and beef were decreased. By late March, only cornmeal and salt were available to feed the prisoners.

Although Andersonville was designed principally for enlisted personnel, officers were also interned there. Most officers were housed in a separate smaller stockade named Castle Reed (Figure 13). White officers who had commanded black troops, however, were kept in the primary stockade with the enlisted men and not given the dignity of their rank. The facility was located approximately one-half-mile west of Camp Sumter near the railroad depot. It was composed of a pen of hewn logs, 15 feet high and 195 feet by 108 feet in plan, that enclosed several open-sided shed barracks. Castle Reed was a temporary facility. Up to sixty-four Union officers were held there until transferred to Camp Oglethorpe in Macon, Georgia, in May 1864. The stockade was subsequently used to
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contain Confederate soldiers caught committing various offenses.\textsuperscript{145}

\textbf{FIGURE 13. Sketch of Castle Reed. (Source: Library of Congress)}

In early March 1864, Capt. Henry Wirz was ordered to Andersonville to command the prison.\textsuperscript{146} Born November 25, 1823, in Zürich, Switzerland, Heinrich Hartmann Wirz immigrated to the United States in 1849. Upon his arrival in the United States, Wirz unsuccessfully pursued a career as a physician in New York City. He worked as a translator in small factories in Massachusetts and Connecticut; as a homeopathic physician in Kentucky; and as overseer of Cabin Teele, a 2,200-acre plantation in Louisiana. When the Civil War began, Wirz joined the 4th Battalion, Louisiana Infantry.\textsuperscript{147} Following the First Battle of Bull Run in July 1861, Wirz’s unit was sent to Richmond, where he caught the attention of Brigadier General Winder, who was in charge of the Richmond prison system at the time. By November 1861, Wirz was listed as a member of the city’s seven-man Prison Board.\textsuperscript{148}

In late November 1861, Wirz was transferred to the Confederate prison at Tuscaloosa, where he served as assistant to Capt. Elias Griswold. The following spring, Wirz was reassigned to serve as Provost Marshall of Manchester, a small community in Richmond, following the transfer of the prisoners from Tuscaloosa for exchange. Within a few days he was placed on the staff of Brigadier General Winder and promoted to Captain. A few months later, Wirz was in command of Belle Isle and Libby Prison in Richmond.\textsuperscript{149}

From September 1862 through spring 1863, Wirz was ordered to document the number of prisoners held throughout the South for the purpose of exchange. Upon his return to Richmond in 1863, Wirz applied for a medical furlough in order to seek treatment for an arm injury he sustained in 1862.\textsuperscript{150} Wirz returned from furlough in February 1864 and reported to General Winder, who assigned Wirz to the newly established prison at Camp Sumter in Andersonville. Col. Alexander Persons of the 55th Georgia Infantry commanded the post when Wirz arrived. Captain Wirz formally took command of the prison stockade on March 27, 1864.\textsuperscript{151}

Although the prison was located to afford access to nearby Stockade Branch for fresh water, the bakery and cookhouse, as well as the Confederate guard, were located upstream of the prison, polluting the drinking and bathing water. In addition, contagious diseases, inadequate hospital facilities, exposure, poor sanitation, short and deficient rations, and overcrowding led to illness and death among the prisoners. The prisoners constructed make-shift shelters, but lack of supplies hindered efforts to improve sanitation, and excessive heat in the summer led to more deaths.

Some prisoners took up occupations such as baking, bucket and kettle making, and laundering to fill the time and make money. They were able to receive boxes of food from friends and relatives outside the prison, and to send and receive mail.
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Approximately 300 paroled prisoners worked outside of the stockade, obtaining vegetables, chopping logs, and working as clerks, bakers, carpenters, teamsters, litter-bearers, and grave diggers.\textsuperscript{152}

In an attempt to improve living conditions, Captain Wirz tried to implement a plan to drain the swampy area where Stockade Branch conjoined Sweetwater Branch at the southern end of the prison site and create areas of clean drinking and bathing water, but this plan failed due to lack of lumber and other supplies.\textsuperscript{153}

The first prison hospital established to treat Camp Sumter prisoners was located inside the stockade. It was separated into two divisions, each further split into wards, with surgeons in charge of each. On May 22, 1864, the prison hospital was moved out of the stockade and into a wooded area on 2 acres of land southeast of the main enclosure. It was supplied with water from a creek that was not affected by waste from the camp or prison (Figure 14). This prison was later expanded to an area more than 5 acres in size.\textsuperscript{154}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure14.png}
\caption{Sketch of the prison hospital, circa 1864. (Source: Andersonville NHS A 1-28)}
\end{figure}

By May 27, 1864, the prison housed 17,000 persons, with 500 more added every day. Some arrived with money, as the Union armies had been re-clothed and paid off in spring 1864 for the coming campaigns. These prisoners were able to gamble, trade with the guards, and obtain supplies. However, food and living conditions for prisoners remained poor. Available shelter was limited to structures built by some of the prisoners of scrap wood or tent fragments, or holes or caves dug in the ground. Many prisoners had no shelter of any kind. No clothing was provided, and the daily ration for prisoners and guards consisted of 1-1/4 pounds of cornmeal and either 1 pound of beef or 1/3 pound of bacon, occasionally supplemented with beans, peas, rice, or molasses. In correspondence, prison authorities commented on the overcrowding, limited amount and poor quality of provisions, and lack of medical supplies, construction materials, and shelter. Prisoners attempted escape by various means, including running away from work details and digging tunnels under the stockade; only a few succeeded.\textsuperscript{155}

In addition to the registered dead, several were killed attempting to escape.\textsuperscript{156} Others likely died when their tunneling efforts resulted in cave-ins, or their excavated shelters collapsed. It is also thought that as many as several hundred others were removed from the prison burial ground by friends or family members after the close of the war, and re-interred in other cemeteries.\textsuperscript{157}

By April 1864, a gang of prisoners known variously as “camp-robbers,” “marauders,” “desperadoes,” and “the Raiders” began to rob and allegedly murder fellow prisoners. They operated both as individuals and in groups. Problems with the stealing of personal items and random acts of violence occurred when the prison population began to increase. By the end of June, the Raiders had begun to commit their crimes boldly, in full daylight. This criminal activity fueled fear within the camp. Since the Confederate authorities failed to set up or enforce any regulations inside the
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stockade, a prisoner group formed to address the problem during the final weeks of June.\footnote{National Park Service, “The ‘Raiders,’” pamphlet (Division of Interpretation and Education, June 2014).}

Identifying themselves as the “Regulators,” they approached Confederate authorities about dealing with the criminals. The idea of having a police force within the stockade was supported by both the Confederate authorities and the camp population. The Regulators were given permission from the Confederate authorities to enforce laws within the camp. During late June and early July, with the permission of Captain Wirz, the Regulators sought out and arrested more than seventy-five accused Raiders. These men were held outside the stockade wall in order to protect them from the other prisoners until they could stand trial. In the trial held during early July, other prisoners assumed the roles of judge and jury.\footnote{Ibid.}

Those chosen for this role were newly arrived prisoners who were ostensibly not biased since they had not been victims of the raiders.

During the trial, many of those identified by the Regulators as having committed unlawful acts were found guilty and issued punishments of varying severity based on their offenses. When some of the accused soldiers were released back into the prison on July 9, they were forced to run “the gauntlet,” a double line of prisoners holding sticks and clubs who beat them.\footnote{Ibid.}

Six men were found guilty of crimes punishable by hanging. On July 11, the Confederate authorities allowed the Regulators to gather lumber and build a gallows to be used for their execution. Captain Wirz delivered the six men to the Regulators for the execution. The six Raiders were hanged that afternoon. They were buried in the prison cemetery, isolated from the other prisoners buried there.\footnote{Ibid.}

The trial itself was not recorded in the prison history. The story, however, was described in the accounts of several prisoners held at Andersonville and released at the end of the war. The story of the raiders was also recounted in Captain Wirz’s trial in late 1865. Over the course of the nineteenth century, the stories became more dramatic and sensational as they were repeated. Efforts conducted by the National Park Service to review available primary sources, such as the accounts of the Wirz trial, reveals little about the Raiders except that they were tried and hung and now rest in separate graves at Andersonville National Cemetery. The graves of the Raiders remain in the cemetery today.\footnote{Ibid.}

On June 17, Brig. Gen. John H. Winder arrived at Andersonville. With the continuing influx of new prisoners, by that month the population had reached more than 20,000, and it was decided that the prison should be enlarged. The prison’s walls were extended 610 feet to the north, encompassing an area of roughly 10 acres, bringing the total prison area to 26 1/2 acres. Construction was completed in approximately fourteen days by a crew of Union prisoners. On July 1, the northern extension was opened to the prisoners, who subsequently tore down the original north stockade wall and used the timber for fuel and building materials.\footnote{Bearss, 28–29.}

In the new portion of the prison, the clay in the ground could be mixed with water to form brick or adobe, allowing the prisoners to build shelters.

On July 20, 1864, work began on construction of two additional stockade walls and a system of earthworks ordered by Brigadier General Winder. The stockade walls were composed of unhewn pine logs set vertically in wall trenches that were about 4 feet deep. The middle stockade posts projected approximately 12 feet above the ground surface. The posts of the outer stockade extended about 5 feet above the ground surface.\footnote{Ibid., 30.}

Earthworks built around the prison site included a Star Fort located southwest of the prison; a redoubt located northwest of the north gate; and six redans. The corner redans were inside the
middle stockade wall. The entire system of stockades and earthworks was to be encompassed by the outer stockade wall, but the outer wall was never finished.\textsuperscript{165}

The earthworks were built in reaction to the movement of Union forces, under the command of Maj. Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, into Georgia. The earthworks reinforced existing gun emplacements, which were positioned for internal control of the prisoners. They could also defend against possible attacks or rescue attempts.\textsuperscript{166}

The earthworks were designed to provide fields of fire on potential avenues of prisoner escape as well as to defend against possible attack by Union forces. The outer stockade, which was never completed, was meant to encompass the entire complex of earthworks and stockades. The posts of the outer stockade extended about 5 feet above the ground surface.\textsuperscript{167}

During July, Sherman ordered two cavalry units to ride south and cut the Macon and Western Railroad line. This advance was to include a raid by the unit commanded by Gen. George Stoneman to advance on the Macon rail yard, free the Union officers at Camp Oglethorpe, and then proceed to free the prisoners at Andersonville. Sherman, however, held a very low opinion of Stoneman’s cavalry unit, and did not hold out hope for its success. As anticipated, Stoneman’s cavalry lacked sufficient resources to adequately conduct the raid and was defeated by the Georgia militia. As a result, 500 additional prisoners were taken to Andersonville.\textsuperscript{168}

In August 1864, more than 32,000 prisoners were held in the stockade, with less than approximately 36 square feet of space per person. Wirz and the Chief Surgeon continued to write to Richmond seeking help and funding, but help was not forthcoming.\textsuperscript{169}

During the summer, lack of water contributed to further hardship. However, on August 9, 1864, a heavy rain caused the stream running through the stockade to flood, cleaning out the stream and swamp, and damaging the stockade where the stream ran into and out of the prison. The sudden appearance of a spring during the storm, at the west wall of the stockade, was a treasured memory of many Union survivors of the prison.\textsuperscript{170}

Prison authorities issued the “Rules of Andersonville Prison,” which mandated two daily roll calls and established a Chief of Police and support force to prevent stealing, in January 1865, when the population was relatively small. A framework of four barracks, each housing 270 prisoners, was completed in September 1865. That same day, orders came to evacuate the prisoners in response to Sherman’s capture of Atlanta. Two additional barracks were later constructed at the prison. Lack of proper food and medicine led to ongoing prisoner mortality.

**Hospital facilities.** Hospital facilities were first established within the stockade on February 25, 1864 on high ground north of the stockade. The care of the prisoners was assigned to Dr. Isaiah H. White, who reported for duty on March 7, 1864, as chief surgeon. White, who was from Virginia, was responsible for the health of prisoners as well as guards. Very little had been done to address medical care before his arrival.\textsuperscript{171}

In establishing the hospital, White divided the hospital into two divisions, and assigned each a surgeon. One division was further subdivided into three wards, while the other housed two wards; each was overseen by an assistant surgeon. Before the hospital was relocated, a total of 4,588 patients
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received treatment. Of these, 1,026 died from diarrhea, dysentery, and scurvy, among other problems. Overcrowding and a lack of supplies plagued the surgeons administering the hospital. All patients were housed in a total of thirty-five tents, which was the only shelter available.\textsuperscript{172}

As summer approached, the prison was visited in May 1864 by Gen. Howell Cobb, who was accompanied by Dr. E. J. Eldridge. Eldridge recommended moving the hospital outside the stockade to a new site along Sweetwater Creek that could be sited within its own wooden enclosure, 10 feet high, and large enough to accommodate 800 to 1,000 patients.\textsuperscript{173} White concurred with Eldridge’s recommendation, and the matter was put to the Inspector General’s Department on May 10, 1864. Authorization for the relocation of the hospital was granted by Capt. Walter Bowie, who also ordered the requisite number of tents be provided to shelter 1,000 patients.\textsuperscript{174} Bowie also recommended that a “shady oak grove” located approximately 100 yards southeast of the stockade serve as the site for the new hospital.

With the necessary authority granted, White oversaw relocation of the hospital outside of the stockade to a 2-acre site near Sweetwater Creek on May 22. A ditch provided water from the creek into the enclosure. There was also a well and a few nearby springs available to provide drinking water.\textsuperscript{175} In addition, there were several large trees that provided welcome shade; many of the promised tents never arrived.\textsuperscript{176}

As the number of patients continued to increase, White ordered the hospital site expanded over the course of the spring until it reached approximately 5 acres in size. Among other things, the hospital lacked an adequate supply of tents.

As with many aspects of the prison operation, supplies for the hospital were insufficient for the need. Records suggest that hospital personnel made several attempts to secure additional hospital tents from Captain Winder. In the end, neither Winder nor the Medical Director in Atlanta were able to provide the much-needed tents, although Winder is known to have attempted to purchase some tents owned by the state of Georgia. His request was refused by Gov. Joseph E. Brown, who preferred to save them for the state militia expected to mobilize in the spring of 1865.\textsuperscript{177} Winder later requested tents from the War Department, finally securing a few refuse tents from the Georgia Reserves.\textsuperscript{178} By August 6, 1864, hospital conditions had become dire, with 2,208 recorded patients.\textsuperscript{179}

In August 1864, White was promoted to Chief Surgeon of the Post, a position he assumed in October, while Surg. R. Randolph Stevenson was placed in charge of the prison hospital. Stevenson immediately began to erect several sheds to accommodate hospital patients, using lumber as it became available.\textsuperscript{180} With the transfer of many prisoners in October, the hospital became less crowded. Stephenson was replaced by Dr. H.H. Clayton in January 1865.

It was also during the spring and summer of 1864 that a separate hospital was constructed on a ridge southeast of the village of Andersonville, Georgia, for the care of Confederate soldiers. Camp Sumter Hospital was housed in two large, two-story framed structures. Camp Sumter Hospital was commanded by Asst. Surg. W.B. Harrison. As with the prison hospital, supplies for the Confederate hospital remained difficult to obtain, and conditions were difficult at best.\textsuperscript{181}

According to an investigation made by Comrade Geo. G. Russell, a total of 17,873 patients were
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registered for treatment at the prison hospital. Of these, 823 of these were eventually exchanged, while another 25 took the oath of allegiance to the Confederacy. It is believed that the mortality rate for prisoners who entered the hospital was approximately 76 percent.

**Confederate evacuation and closing of the prison.** In September, partly in response to movements of the Union Army near Atlanta, some of the healthier prisoners were moved in detachments to Camp Lawton in Millen, Georgia, or to Florence, South Carolina. By September 8, approximately 5,000 prisoners had left. The sick and dying prisoners remained, some of whom were moved into the barracks. Much of the guard, medical, and command staff had also been moved, many to support the operation of Camp Lawton. By the end of September, the stockade was nearly empty. In the space of six weeks, 24,000 prisoners had been moved from Andersonville, with 17,000 moved in a single week. Such a feat required an amazing amount of resources at a time when the Confederacy was unable to secure sufficient supplies and address other prisoner needs. As such, it illustrates the priorities of the Confederate Army and underscores its recognition of the value of the prisoners and of the serious threat they would pose if released.

Beginning in October 1864, Andersonville no longer received prisoners. Only those who could not travel remained. For a time the site essentially became a hospital prison, with approximately 8,000 persons present. Hospital buildings and patient accommodations were being constructed. Fewer prisoners meant that more rations were available and less crowding occurred. Water and soil conditions improved. However, the mortality rate remained high and circumstances evolved faster than the Confederacy could adapt.

By mid-November, only 1,500 prisoners and a few guards remained at Andersonville. As Sherman neared Savannah in mid-December, the prison population again rose as the population of Camp Lawton near Millen, Georgia, was relocated, first to Thomasville and eventually to Andersonville. At the same time, 2,000 prisoners arrived from Salisbury, North Carolina, ahead of Union troop movements. This arrival and other transfers to the prison in late December increased the number of prisoners once again, to approximately 5,000 persons.\(^{183}\)

In March, efforts to parole and exchange prisoners were reinstated as a result of an agreement between Union General Ulysses S. Grant and Confederate Colonel Robert Ould. Captain Wirz immediately initiated efforts to parole prisoners housed at Camp Sumter in exchange for Confederate prisoners. The exchange site, however, was located in Black Bridge, Mississippi, and required a long journey by boat and rail. Due to the difficulty of travel, Maj. Gen. Samuel Jones, Commander of the District of Florida, recommended that the exchange site be moved to Jacksonville. On April 4, Confederate Col. George Gibbs oversaw an initial transport of 1,100 prisoners, which was quickly followed by a second group of 1,200 on April 5. Unfortunately, the prisoners were sent back to Andersonville after Maj. Gen. Quincy A. Gillmore refused to allow the exchange.\(^{184}\) On April 19, 1865, Gibbs left Andersonville to exchange prisoners at Baldwin, Florida. Although Gibbs returned to Andersonville, he abandoned his post on May 4, at which time five prisoners remained in the hospital and seventeen in the stockade.\(^{185}\) (The last prisoner death at Andersonville was recorded on April 28, 1865.\(^{186}\))

Gen. Robert E. Lee surrendered to Lt. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant on April 9, 1865. The war nonetheless continued in some areas. On April 17,
Columbus, Georgia was finally captured by Union forces. Within three weeks, all of the prisoners at Camp Sumter were released and Captain Wirz arrested. During the fourteen months in which Andersonville Prison operated, 12,920 Union prisoners died and were buried there.

After the Civil War, the prison and burial grounds were appropriated by the United States. In 1868, Benjamin B. Dykes reclaimed a portion of the land that had been occupied by the Confederate government as part of the prison and that he had leased to the Confederate government.

**Wirz trial.** On May 7, 1865, Union Capt. Henry E. Noyes arrived at Andersonville with orders to arrest Captain Wirz. Wirz was taken to Washington, D.C., and held in the Old Capitol Prison. Wirz was later charged with conspiracy to kill or injure prisoners in violation of the laws of war. According to these laws, prisoners could not be denied access to available food, water, clothing or medical supplies; as noted earlier, these supplies were often withheld when requested by the prison by War Department officials and others, such as the governor of Georgia, to serve other purposes. Wirz was also charged with multiple counts of murder; in some cases, Wirz was accused of personally killing prisoners, although he was also accused of giving orders to kill others.

Wirz’s trial by a military commission in Washington, D.C., received national attention, particularly as the country demanded justice for the deaths of nearly 13,000 American soldiers at the camp. Many of the accusations are believed today to have been inflated. Wirz’s attorneys suggested that he had done all he could to provide for the prisoners, but was forced to operate the prison under difficult circumstances due to severe shortages of supplies and medical equipment. They presented numerous letters documenting Wirz’s efforts to secure additional supplies, and to solve various logistical problems. These letters paled in comparison, however, with the testimony of nearly 150 former prisoners, guards, Confederate officials, civilians, and medical staff who suggested that Wirz had violated the laws of war by not only withholding available food and supplies, but in issuing orders that directly resulted in the death of prisoners of war. Wirz was convicted and sentenced to hanging for conspiring to “impair and injure the health and to destroy the lives . . . of large numbers of federal prisoners . . . at Andersonville” and also for “. . . murder, in violation of the laws and customs of war.” Wirz was executed on November 10, 1865. He is buried in Mount Olivet Cemetery in Washington, D.C.

**Prisoner burials at Andersonville.** Interments of those who died in the nearby prisoner of war camp began in February 1864. At Camp Sumter, when a prisoner died, his body was moved to the “dead house” outside the stockade, transferred by wagon to the nearby graveyard, and placed in shallow burial trenches dug by paroled prisoners (Figure 15). Each body was assigned a number in the hospital register of deaths and the same number was pinned to the deceased’s clothing. After burial, the number was branded on a wood marker used to indicate each grave. The soldier’s name, company, regiment, and cause of death were also entered in the hospital register, if this information was available.

During much of the operation of Andersonville prison camp in 1864–1865, Dorence Atwater, a prisoner from the 2nd New York Cavalry, kept the hospital register. Only 16 years old when captured by the Confederates at Hagerstown, Maryland, on July 7, 1863, Atwater was first held at Belle Isle before being transferred to Andersonville. He fell
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ill in May 1864, and after recovering by mid-June 1864, was paroled as clerk for the hospital.

The process of recording and burying the dead was an arduous task that required diligent work on the part of all of the prisoners involved. When Atwater began keeping the death register on June 15, 1864, there were nearly 2,000 dead. By the time he left the following year, there were 12,631 on the list, recorded by Atwater in just over seven months as clerk. In order to ensure accuracy, the prisoners on the burial detail checked their work diligently. The men being buried in the long trenches were, after all, their comrades, and they did their best to ensure accurate burial records. During Atwater’s tenure as clerk, only 1 percent of the graves were unknown, a testament to the work of Atwater and other paroled prisoners, including the African American prisoners of war. In August 1864, Atwater began secretly copying the death register.

In addition to Atwater, dozens of prisoners were paroled to work around the prison. As Atwater later recalled, “… [prisoners] did all of the work except guard duty.” Many of these parolees, like Atwater, had previous training or skills that would make them useful to the prison’s operation.

African American soldiers, many of whom were captured during the February 20, 1864, Battle of Olustee in Florida, were among the first prisoners to arrive at Andersonville. They were frequently used as forced labor and were severely punished if they resisted. The best sources of information relating to the treatment of African American prisoners at Andersonville was provided in the testimony presented at Wirz’s trial. Frank Maddox, Private, 35th United States Colored Troops, provided especially compelling testimony.

When African American prisoners initially arrived at Andersonville, no policy had been established to guide how they would be treated. Winder’s first communiqué on the matter was “until further orders treat them as prisoners of war.” In all, there were about 100 African American prisoners held at Andersonville. As noted by Maddox, at first “(The colored prisoners) were treated in no way differently from the white soldier.” However, this did not mean the absence of punishment. Maddox described one prisoner, Isaac Hawkins of the 54th Massachusetts, receiving 250 out of 500 lashes. Like white prisoners, the African American prisoners were used on work details outside the stockade, involved in pulling stumps, cutting wood, digging ditches, and helping to enlarge the stockade. Maddox also reported black prisoners being used on burial detail beginning in September 1864. Maddox also described the location of the African Americans inside the stockade as “in a
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gang by themselves up towards the south gate.” The African American prisoners appear not to have been transferred out in September 1864 when 18,000 others were moved to other prisons.198

Among the prisoners paroled to work in the hospital was Solon Hyde, a prisoner from Ohio who had been a hospital steward with his regiment and had been detailed to conduct similar work at Andersonville. Hyde described the process of maintaining the death register:

> When a prisoner died, his name, if known, was written on a slip of paper and pinned to any article of clothing he might have on . . . and the body was then carried to the dead-house. From the dead-house the corpses were piled on a wagon . . . and were then driven to their last resting-place . . . The cemetery was nearly half a mile north of the stockade. The burying was under the immediate supervision of Alonzo Avery . . . who was a member of the Ninth Minnesota Volunteers and a prisoner. He had a squad of negro prisoners to assist in digging and filling up the trenches . . . The manner of burying was to dig long trenches, six feet wide and four feet deep, with a six-foot space between trenches. The bodies were placed side by side . . . As each one was placed in position, the paper containing his name was inscribed with the number of his grave and the date of death. At the same time a stake was numbered to correspond, and laid on the ground . . . above the body . . . These papers were handed in each evening to Mr. Atwater, who copied them in the death register, name, number and date, so that if any one should ever wish to remove their friends they could do so.199

Realizing how important this information would be after the war, Dorence Atwater secretly made a second copy of the death register and carried it with him when he left Andersonville in March 1865.200 Upon crossing into Union territory, he wrote to Secretary of War Edwin Stanton. In his letter, Atwater requested a thirty-day furlough to allow him to have the death register published, hoping that the information would be made available to families of deceased soldiers immediately. Atwater soon received a response in the form of a telegram requesting he bring the death rolls to the Secretary of War’s office. There Atwater met with Maj. Samuel Breck, who offered $300 for the rolls. Atwater was hesitant to sell the rolls, as he felt they should be published for the benefit of the families searching for missing soldiers. However, he eventually agreed to sell copies of the rolls to the government in return for $300, a clerkship in the War Department, and the return of the rolls once they had been copied.201

Before the War Department published the death register, Atwater wrote to Clara Barton, having read of her efforts to locate missing soldiers. Clara (Clarissa Harlowe) Barton (1821–1912), a former clerk at the U.S. Patent Office in Washington, D.C., had organized a relief program for soldiers of the 6th Massachusetts Regiment who arrived in the city after the Baltimore Riots in April 1861. Following the First Battle of Bull Run in July 1861, Barton advertised for donations and established an independent organization to distribute goods and medical supplies to soldiers. The following year, Surgeon General William A. Hammond granted Barton a general pass to travel with army ambulances to distribute aid and provide nursing to the sick and wounded. Barton became known as the “Angel of the Battlefield,” as her work attracted national attention. She served as superintendent of Union nurses in 1864, and at the end of the war began a letter writing campaign to search for missing soldiers through the Office of Correspondence. Barton, who was also an advocate of women’s rights, went on to serve as
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President of the American National Red Cross for twenty-two years.\textsuperscript{202}

**Other Confederate Prisons**

**Belle Isle.** Located within the James River in Richmond, Virginia, Belle Isle prison was one of two prisons within the Richmond area. The other—Libby Prison—was for officers, while Belle Isle served enlisted men. The prison was designed to hold 3,000, but the numbers of those imprisoned reached as high as 10,000 at one time. The prison was established in July 1862. The first prisoners were transferred there from other prisons, including the tobacco warehouses that had previously housed prisoners in Richmond. Other early prisoners were transferred from Libby Prison.\textsuperscript{203}

The prison comprised a 4-acre enclosure on the approximately 15-acre island. Prisoners brought to Richmond were initially held in tobacco warehouses, but these facilities soon became overcrowded. Belle Island was selected as a replacement by Confederate administrators after they realized the island might prove more suitable as a prison because its location in the middle of the James River might diminish the “temptation to escape,” “while fewer men would [need to] serve as a guard.”\textsuperscript{204}

Belle Isle continued to be used as a prison for the remainder of the war, except for a brief period in September 1862, when a prisoner exchange program led to the removal of the Union soldiers being held there at that time.\textsuperscript{205}

In the summer of 1862, Capt. Norris Montgomery was placed in charge of the Belle Island Prison. Montgomery reported to Capt. Henry Wirz, temporarily in charge of the Confederate prisons at Richmond and later in command of the prison camp at Andersonville. During the summer, battles raged in Virginia, which resulted in large numbers of prisoners streaming into Belle Isle. Captain Wirz ordered the Belle Isle prison enlarged to deal with the overcrowding.\textsuperscript{206}

The island, which had previously been developed to support a small iron works, could be reached by a small, covered railroad bridge that linked the iron works to the Richmond and Danville Railroad Depot on the Manchester side of the river. The bridge was bordered by an 8-foot-high fence. A gate at the prison end was bolted at night.

Prisoners lived in a 4-acre portion of the 15-acre island. A small earthwork and a ditch marked the boundary of the camp. The ditch served as the “deadline”—guards, positioned every 40 feet around the camp, were authorized to shoot if a prisoner crossed it. The interior of the compound was nothing more than a central road with rows of tents on either side.\textsuperscript{207} Prisoners were assigned to squads of fifty; each squad was associated with a particular row of tents. Outside the perimeter were quarters for officers and guards, a hospital, and a cook house. There was a graveyard located near the hospital.\textsuperscript{208}

Wells provided clean water. Prisoners were also allowed to bathe in the river with permission. In December 1863, a female prisoner was discovered who had been passing as a male soldier for nearly a year. Several prisoners were African American soldiers.\textsuperscript{209}

Prisoners at Belle Isle suffered due to exposure to cold weather, starvation, and smallpox and other diseases. Confederate medical director William A. Carrington inspected the camp in November 1863, writing to Gen. John H. Winder:

> The camp at Belle Isle is as well managed as possible under the circumstances but I think that here may be found most of the causes of
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the severity and frequency of the sickness. The men are too much crowded. They have not sufficient quantity of blankets nor sufficient fuel supplies. They sleep on the ground and are exposed to all the vicissitudes of temperature incident to our climate, increased by the position and the winds blowing over the water… Another class of causes is the depressing moral influence prisoners labor under, especially noticeable since they have been told there is no hope of exchange. They die from slight disease, having lost all hope.210

Following an outbreak of smallpox, Union Gen. Benjamin Butler sent enough vaccine to the island prison to inoculate the prisoners, which helped to prevent further spread of the disease. Conditions in the prison were reported in northern newspapers and were described by Walt Whitman as follows: “Can those be men? Those little livid, brown, ash streaked, monkey-looking dwarves? Are the not really mummified, dwindled corpses?”211

Near the end of 1863, Belle Isle was recognized as a drain on the food supply for Richmond. After Camp Sumter opened in spring 1864, the prisoners from Belle Isle were moved to the new prison site in Georgia. Belle Isle then became a temporary prison, where prisoners would stay briefly until transportation could be arranged to Danville Prison, where they could be housed inside; or to the prison in Salisbury, North Carolina; or to Andersonville.

After Federal troops entered Richmond in April 1865, Belle Isle was used as a temporary place of shelter for Union refugees and other persons who sought protection within Union lines. The iron works on the island expanded over the camp site, destroying every physical trace of the prison. Between 1904 and 1963, the Virginia Power Company built and operated a hydroelectric power plant on the island, but by the early 1970s, all industry on Belle Isle had come to an end. The island was later acquired by the city and now serves as a public park. The park is accessible via a pedestrian bridge suspended from the Robert E. Lee vehicular bridge.212

Cahaba Prison/Castle Morgan. Located in Cahaba, Alabama, some 60 miles west of Montgomery and 13 miles southwest of Selma, the Cahaba or Castle Morgan prison was established in 1863–1864 to hold Federal prisoners of war and civilians. Designed to accommodate 500 prisoners, its population regularly approached 1,000. The prison was composed of a barren stockade and converted, unfinished cotton warehouse buildings near the junction of the Alabama and Cahaba rivers. Cahaba had previously served as the state capital from 1819 to 1826, and was the county seat for Dallas County until a disastrous flood in 1865. Prior to the war, the town was located along an important rail line and served as a shipping point for cotton to Mobile. Confederate control of the railroad, and removal of the tracks for use elsewhere, led to a decline in the economy of the town.

The prison was located within the town on the banks of the Alabama River. It was enclosed within a 12-foot-high stockade fence of 2-inch wide planks set within the ground to a depth of 3 feet. The unfinished building contained exterior walls, but no roof or interior partition walls. Water was supplied by an artesian well and carried to the stockade by underground pipes to flow into three sunken barrels and a latrine sink. There was a single fireplace, and prisoners were permitted to build fires inside the prison enclosure. Several Federal officers were quartered in the town.

Guards walked around the stockade along an elevated walkway to observe the prisoners; two small cannons were aimed at the interior of the stockade through portholes set within the fence. An area outside the buildings was surrounded by a separate plank fence and used during the day for cooking food.

After the war, with the loss of county government, the community collapsed and the town was abandoned. By the 1930s, nearly all evidence of the
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town was gone. There are no markers indicating the Civil War prison site today.\textsuperscript{213}

**Camp Ford.** Located in Tyler, Texas, Camp Ford welcomed its first prisoners in August 1863. Like Cahaba Prison, Camp Ford was a barren stockade, initially an open area surrounded by guards. As many as 4,700 prisoners were housed in the prison at one time. It was named for notable Texan Col. John S. Ford, who had served as a Texas Ranger, state senator, newspaper editor, and commander of Confederate troops in Texas. Originally established as a training camp, the facility was converted to prison use and became the largest military prison west of the Mississippi. In November 1863, after learning of a possible escape plan, prison officials convinced local residents to lend them slave laborers, who they used to build a stockade of logs split in half and set deeply in the ground. The structure was banked with dirt on the outside, which was used by prison guards as a patrol walk. The 16-foot-high stockade fence enclosed an area approximately 6 to 8 acres in size; all vegetation within the complex was removed. A spring furnished clean water. There was no provision for shelter for the prisoners, although prisoners were allowed to go outside the stockade to cut logs to build huts and cabins. Others burrowed in the ground to create shelters, as prisoners at Andersonville and Belle Isle are known to have done. The prisoners at Camp Ford are known to have entertained themselves by playing baseball and making objects out of wood and clay. Some objects were traded with the guards for food.

Prisoners lacked clothing, shoes, blankets, other necessities, medical supplies, and a variety of food. Many died of exposure and illness. However, Camp Ford had the lowest death rates of any prison during the Civil War. In July 1865, the stockade was burned by men of the 10th Illinois. Today, the site of Camp Ford is a public park owned by Smith County, Texas, and managed by the Smith County Historical Society.\textsuperscript{214}

**Castle Thunder.** The Castle Thunder prison was located on Cary Street in Richmond, Virginia. Also known as Rebel Bastille, Gleanor’s, and Palmer’s, Castle Thunder was established in 1862 in a group of three converted tobacco warehouses. It housed Confederate deserters, spies, and political prisoners; runaway slaves; Federal deserters; criminals under court-martial; and some Federal officers. With a capacity of 1,400, the prison held as many as 3,000 prisoners. Castle Thunder was one of the most controversial Civil War prisons. It held more desperate and dangerous prisoners than any other prison in the South.

By spring of 1862, Richmond’s three prisons—Belle Isle, Libby, and Castle Godwin—were overflowing. The thirteen rooms of Castle Godwin were so overcrowded that some of the political prisoners had been moved to Libby Prison. A larger facility was needed. When Castle Thunder was ready, Castle Godwin was closed, and its 600 prisoners transferred to Castle Thunder, which opened in August 1862 in the Gleanor’s Tobacco Warehouse. The warehouse was attached to the Palmer Factory and Whitlock’s Warehouse.

The prison complex was made up of three former tobacco factories and warehouses that formed a parallelogram. Across the street was a smaller building called Castle Lightning, which held the overflow of prisoners from Castle Thunder. A high fence connected the buildings. Water was pumped into the compound from the James River. Features of the prison included a back room where balls and chains were kept, which opened onto the execution yard. A gallows stood in the yard on a side ledge. The brick wall that surrounded the yard was pock-marked from executions carried out there in full view of the prisoners who watched from the barred windows.
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Behind the buildings was an enclosed yard where prisoners could exercise and where the latrines were located. There were also cells for condemned prisoners.

The buildings associated with Castle Thunder were returned to the private sector after the war, and demolished in 1879. Today, the site is a parking lot for the employees of Philip Morris.215

Tuscaloosa. The Tuscaloosa prison was established in response to a desperate plea from Richmond to locate additional space to house captured Union soldiers. In October 1861, Acting Secretary of War, Judah P. Benjamin, wrote to the governors of Georgia and Alabama seeking prison space. Governor Andrew B. Moore of Alabama at first indicated that he could locate no building suitable for use as a prison. Benjamin replied:

I am told you have at Tuscaloosa, the former capital, not only legislative buildings but an insane asylum and a military institute—all unoccupied. We are greatly embarrassed by our prisoners, as all accommodations here are required for our sick and wounded . . . . It would be a great service if you can find a place for some if not all of our prisoners.216

It is assumed that Moore relented, as by October 28, Secretary Benjamin was making arrangements to transfer prisoners to Tuscaloosa, later dispatching Capt. Elias Griswold to the site to administer the prison. After he arrived in the city, Griswold found the facility, an abandoned paper mill, entirely unsuitable, and sought instead to rent the insane asylum.217

By early December, 500 prisoners had reached Tuscaloosa from Richmond under the command of Sergeant Wirz. With little else available, these initial transfers were housed in the U.S. Hotel, unoccupied at the time. During the next few months, Tuscaloosa became a concentration point for western prisoners.218

Wirz remained in Tuscaloosa to oversee the prison. As noted by historian Roger Pickenpaugh:

. . . opinions of him were decidedly ambivalent. A creature of duty, he did all he could to see to the prisoners' well-being while at the same time enforcing prison rules rigidly. Soon after securing the U.S. Hotel for the Richmond prisoners, he took away their meat rations because one of them had broken down a door. Later, after Capt. Griswold was the recipient of disrespectful language, Wirz placed two guards at the door and announced that only one prisoner would be allowed out at a time. He further ordered the sentries to 'kill all they can and the easiest way they can' if the captives attempted to make a charge.219

Several of those held in the prison later reported on their comrades being shot for such infractions as looking out the window. At the same time, it was Wirz who secured bedding for the prisoners, who were forced to sleep on the floor when they first arrived.

The major Confederate prisons that operated during the Civil War include the following by state:

- Alabama: Selma (Cahaba/Castle Morgan); Mobile; Montgomery; Tuscaloosa
- Georgia: Andersonville (Camp Sumter); Atlanta; Augusta; Blackshear; Millen (Camp Lawton); Marietta; Macon (Camp Oglethorpe); Savannah (Camp Davidson and Fort Pulaski)
- Louisiana: Shreveport
- North Carolina: Charlotte; Raleigh; Salisbury
- South Carolina: Charleston (Castle Pinckney); Columbia; Florence
- Texas: Tyler (Camp Ford); Hempstead (Camp Groce)
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Virginia: Danville; Lynchburg; Petersburg; Richmond (Libby, Castle Thunder, and Belle Isle)

**Historic Resources Associated with Historic Context Two**

- Norfolk South Railroad rail line
- Andersonville railroad depot
- Town of Andersonville\(^{220}\)
- Wells dug by prisoners
- Earthworks
- Burials

**Significance**

Andersonville National Historic Site preserves the location of the most notorious of all Civil War military prisons where 12,900 Americans died, more than in any other prison or battle of the Civil War.\(^{221}\) The park is listed in the National Register of Historic Places for its association with Camp Sumter, as well as Andersonville National Cemetery, established in 1865 to honor Union prisoners buried nearby. The National Register nomination for the park notes that the prison site is significant under Criterion A for its association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history, in the area of Military History.\(^{222}\) The park’s Foundation Document notes that several historic resources survive today that can be tied to the history of the Civil War prison. These are described as fundamental resources. They include Star Fort, other earthworks, wells, potential archeological resources, Stockade Branch, and Providence Spring.

---

\(^{220}\) Although the town, rail line, and railroad station fall outside of current park boundaries, they are important features of the surrounding landscape that are associated with this historic context.

\(^{221}\) National Park Service, Foundation Document Andersonville National Historic Site, Georgia (February 2014), 5.
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FIGURE 16. Andersonville National Cemetery looking across Section E, 1885. (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site)

Military Burial Practices Prior to the Civil War

For Americans and others involved in national military forces, those dying in the defense of their state or nation have typically been honored for their service on the field of battle. Methods of marking and honoring fallen soldiers varied, but included the establishment of burial grounds and the establishment of markers and other memorials. Make-shift cemeteries were established as memorials to those who had given their lives in battle. Following the Mexican-American War, American burial policy was advanced when Congress established the Mexico City Cemetery in 1850 for the interment of those who had fallen during battles in and around the city.

After the initial battles of the Civil War conflict, the U.S. Army continued its traditional practices for soldier burials, which offered two options: burial near the place of death, such as in a military post cemetery, or transport to a private cemetery selected by the soldier’s family. Army practices associated with post burial grounds generally included marking graves with a headstone fashioned of hard wood and bearing a suitable
inscription, keeping cemetery registers with a fairly uniform system of recording burials, and assigning grave numbers in plots with name lists corresponding to those inscribed on headboards. However, through the experience of the Civil War, Army burial and record-keeping practices evolved. Although there is no specific evidence that either the President or the General-in-Chief was directly responsible for issuance of orders that revolutionized Army burial practices, it emerged along with the birth of the national army; the United States felt compelled to afford a decent burial to those who gave their lives in defense of the Republic.  

By summer 1861, it was already apparent, however, that these practices would be inadequate to address the large numbers of casualties relating to the Civil War. For the Union, the establishment of procedures for creating records relating to deceased soldiers and of their places of burial was a problem faced by the War Department early in the conflict. Residents of the area around the battlefield and women’s organizations often participated in the identification and burial process. Although the Army continued to bury fallen soldiers near the battlefield, or in cemeteries associated with military hospitals, fairly early on in the conflict Congress passed legislation to establish special burial benefits for defenders of the Union.

**National Cemetery Development**

**General Orders for Federal Burials**

On September 11, 1861, the War Department issued two General Orders that made the
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patriotic service by donating plots for Army burials. Existing Army posts, which often included cemeteries, were also used as possible when space was available. In Washington, D.C., which became the base and training area of the Army of the Potomac, the Board of Governors of the Soldiers’ Home agreed to permit usage of a portion of the land originally assigned to its jurisdiction in 1851 as a cemetery to accommodate Union soldiers. The cemetery was opened on August 1, 1861.\textsuperscript{229}

**Establishment of the First National Cemeteries**

In the circumstances of the Civil War, Congress determined that the thousands of citizens who were fighting to preserve the Union deserved special burial spaces to honor their sacrifice. Thus, national cemeteries were created as the final resting places for Union soldiers who died during the Civil War.\textsuperscript{230}

On September 11, 1861, the War Department issued General Orders No. 75. With this action, the Quartermaster General of the U.S. Army was charged with addressing the burial of officers and enlisted men. The General Orders also directed that the Army keep a register of all burials, and mark graves with a wooden headboard.\textsuperscript{231}

On April 3, 1862, the War Department expanded on the responsibilities of the army through publication of General Orders No. 33, which included all zones of active hostilities in the new burial program. General Orders No. 33 indicated that commanding generals were responsible to ensure that a burial ground was laid out in a suitable location near every battlefield as soon as feasible after the battle. Finally, the General Orders also stipulated that the commanding offices direct the reinterment of their fallen soldiers.\textsuperscript{232}

In the Act of July 17, 1862, Congress provided the legal authority for President Abraham Lincoln to create a national cemetery system by authorizing him to “purchase cemetery grounds and cause them to be securely enclosed, to be used as a national cemetery for the soldiers who shall die in the service of the country.”\textsuperscript{233}

In addition to those who died during battles or of injuries received in combat, thousands of soldiers died in prison camps in both the North and the South due to exposure, overcrowding, lack of medical facilities, lack of food and shelter, and disease. These individuals were also afforded the right to be buried in the new national cemeteries.\textsuperscript{234}

The implications of the Act were not fully understood at the time of the bill’s passage, either by the government or the people of the United States. Because the sites of great battles became the logical location for many national cemeteries, the new system would be imbued with a memorial aspect that was neither foreseen nor intended in the Act of July 17, 1862.\textsuperscript{235}

As the nation learned of increasing numbers of horrific battles with high casualties during the summer and fall of 1862, the public began to raise concerns that the remains of Union soldiers were not being properly accounted or cared for. In response, the federal government worked to designate several national cemeteries; fourteen were established by the end of 1862. In some cases, the cemeteries were used not only to inter the bodies of those who had fallen on a particular battlefield, but for all Union dead from the surrounding area.\textsuperscript{236}
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The first fourteen national cemeteries completed by the end of 1862, listed alphabetically, include:

- Alexandria (Virginia)
- Annapolis (Maryland)
- Antietam (Sharpsburg, Maryland)
- Camp Butler (Springfield, Illinois)
- Cypress Hills (Brooklyn, New York)
- Danville (Kentucky)
- Fort Leavenworth (Kansas)
- Fort Scott (Kansas)
- Keokuk (Iowa)
- Loudon Park (Baltimore, Maryland)
- Mill Springs (Nancy, Kentucky)
- New Albany (Indiana)
- Philadelphia (Pennsylvania)
- Soldier’s Home (Washington, D.C.)

Establishment of each of these cemeteries reflected particular site conditions. The cemetery established at Alexandria, Virginia, was founded to address the needs associated with the vast encampment that surrounded the nation’s capital, with the City of Alexandria serving as the site of one of the principal concentration camps for Union troops sent to defend Washington at the outbreak of the war. The Soldiers’ Home cemetery was established for purposes of administration. In Kansas, two existing post cemeteries, Fort Leavenworth and Fort Scott, were also incorporated into the system. Seven additional national cemeteries were established at troop concentration points in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; New Albany, Indiana; Danville, Kentucky; Camp Butler in Springfield, Illinois; Keokuk, Iowa; Loudon Park, Maryland; and Annapolis, Maryland. Another national cemetery was opened at Cypress Hills, New York, for burial of the remains of Confederate prisoners and guards who perished in a train wreck.

National cemeteries were also established at battlefields, including Antietam near Sharpsburg, Maryland, and Mill Springs, Kentucky.

**Soldiers’ National Cemetery at Gettysburg**

In 1863, another six national cemeteries were established. These included:

- Soldiers’ National Cemetery (Gettysburg, Pennsylvania)
- Beaufort (South Carolina)
- Cave Hill (Louisville, Kentucky)
- Knoxville (Kentucky)
- Lexington (Kentucky)
- Rock Island (Illinois)

Soldiers’ National Cemetery was the site of President Abraham Lincoln’s famous Gettysburg Address presented at the dedication of the burial ground on November 19, 1863.

Land to establish the Soldiers’ National Cemetery at Gettysburg was acquired shortly after the battle, with the support of Pennsylvania Governor Andrew Curtin, and the assistance of rival local attorneys David Wills and David McConaughy. Among the first to propose a cemetery at Gettysburg was New York State Representative Dr. Theodore S. Dimon, who visited the battlefield with other Northern state agents to locate and identify the remains of their troops. At a state
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agents’ meeting in July 1863, Dr. Dimon proposed “. . . that a portion of the ground occupied by our line of battle on Cemetery Hill should be purchased for a permanent burial place for the soldiers of our army who lost their lives in this battle . . .”239 At the same time, David McConaughy, a Gettysburg lawyer and president of Gettysburg’s Evergreen Cemetery Association, a private concern, advocated the establishment of a cemetery at Gettysburg for the interment of the battle’s casualties. Following the battle, McConaughy purchased land on Cemetery Hill in order to “enlarge the area of our own cemetery . . . and to secure . . . the most interesting portion of this illustrious battlefield.”240 It was McConaughy who proposed to the governor of Pennsylvania that Union soldiers be buried in the cemetery and that “. . . a noble National Monument in memory of the battles and the dead . . .” be erected at the cemetery.241 In August 1863, the Evergreen Cemetery Association sold to the state of Pennsylvania, at cost, the land McConaughy had acquired.

Once the land was acquired, Union dead were moved from hastily dug, shallow, and inadequate burial sites on the battlefield to the new cemetery. Although McConaughy was instrumental in developing the initial concept for the cemetery and early organization of the project, it was Wills who would help to oversee the construction of the cemetery and plan its dedication ceremony.

Speakers at the November dedication included Edward Everett, an American politician, pastor, educator, diplomat, and orator from Massachusetts, and President Lincoln. The night before the dedication ceremony, the President slept in Wills’ house on the main square in Gettysburg.

Landscape architect William Saunders, who had founded the National Grange, had been engaged to design the cemetery. Saunders, who preferred the designation “landscape gardener,” was a nationally known landscape designer. He was born in Scotland into a family of professional gardeners and immigrated to America in 1848, where he quickly established himself as a gardener and writer. He published regularly in the leading journals of his day, including the Horticulturist. Through his work with the journal, Saunders met Andrew Jackson Downing, who was generally considered the leader in the field at the time.

The design that Saunders prepared for the Soldiers’ National Cemetery at Gettysburg was intended to invoke a sense of simplicity and grandeur, while providing a peaceful, contemplative environment in keeping with its solemn purpose. Saunders’s work likely influenced the design of many other national cemeteries that followed. His professional involvement in the design of a national cemetery is unusual. Saunders’s design integrated two primary features: the Soldiers’ National Monument placed at the center of the space that symbolized the Union victory and the valor of the fallen soldiers; and a semi-circular arrangement of consistent grave markers placed around the monument, indicating the egalitarian nature of American society.

Although the original plan suggested that the plots be organized in essentially random order, resistance from the states led Saunders to group the graves by state, with two sections for unknowns and one section for regular army members. Saunders proposed a strict circular geometry for grave sites, set within a landscape of curvilinear paths and carriage ways, and expanses of lawn framed by irregular groupings of trees and shrubs. Despite the fact that Saunders admired Downing’s work, he felt that Downing lacked practical knowledge of site planning and architecture. Portions of Saunders’s design for Soldiers’ National Cemetery—most notably the curvilinear elements in the center, and more
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picturesque forms to the outside—were suggestive of Downing’s notions of the picturesque. However, they also reflected trends in the design of rural cemeteries that had become popular in the 1830s with the establishment of Mount Auburn Cemetery in Cambridge, Massachusetts (1831), Laurel Hill in Philadelphia (1836), and Greenwood Cemetery in Brooklyn (1837). Downing had also championed rural cemeteries, lauding their design as a moral influence on society.

Soldiers’ National Cemetery was completed in March 1864 when the last of 3,512 Union dead were reburied; however, it did not officially become a federally administered national cemetery until May 1, 1872, when control was transferred to the War Department.

For many, the gesture of creating Soldiers’ National Cemetery on a battlefield suggests a profound interpretation. For example, cultural geographer J. B. Jackson notes:

> It is safe to say that when we visit Gettysburg it is usually the setting of the action, the environment that we explore. One is tempted to see if this monumentalization of an entire landscape is a peculiarly American trait, a particularly American way of interpreting events in terms of their environment. The evolution of the American civic monumental art is another topic; we may merely mention the tendency, strong throughout the last hundred years, to dedicate whole environments—not merely civic centers and school campuses but also parks, playgrounds, beaches, and forests.

Perhaps this most conspicuous example of the transformation of a cemetery from monument into environment is Gettysburg. The original dedication in 1863 by President Lincoln and Edward Everett was of a small burial ground for those who died in the battle. The speeches of both men are classic definitions of the cemetery as monument. We are familiar with Lincoln’s address; but Everett’s lengthy description of the ancient battle of Marathon and the monument erected to its heroes was even more in the tradition. As early as 1867, land was acquired outside of the original cemetery, and, beginning in 1878, markers were erected to show the location of units in the battle. In 1896 the area included 600 acres and 320 monuments.242

In 1865, national cemeteries were established at

- Beverly (New Jersey)
- Mound City (Illinois)
- Battleground (Washington, D.C.)
- Arlington (Virginia)

Arlington National Cemetery was established on land associated with the antebellum home of Robert E. Lee and his wife, Mary Anne Randolph Custis, granddaughter of George and Martha Washington. Mary Custis had inherited the property, known as Arlington Mansion, from her father.

Beginning in May 1861, following Virginia’s secession from the Union, the Union Army occupied the property as an encampment site. Fortifications were built across the property as part of the network established to defend Washington, D.C. against Confederate attack.

In 1863, burial space in the newly-established Soldiers and Sailors Home National Cemetery, in Washington, D.C., and nearby Alexandria National Cemetery, quickly grew scarce. As a result, Qm. Gen. Montgomery C. Meigs recommended that a portion of the grounds of the Custis property be used as a burying grounds for Union dead. The first individual buried at Arlington was Pvt. William L. Christman of the 67th Pennsylvania Infantry, Company G. on May 13, 1864. On June 15, 1864, Secretary of War, Edwin M. Stanton, ordered that Arlington Mansion and associated land totaling as much as
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200 acres be used to establish a national cemetery on the site.243

**The Reburial Program**

Soon after General Lee’s surrender in 1865, the Quartermaster Department initiated efforts to conduct a Federal Reburial Program whereby attempts would be made to locate and identify the remains of all Union soldiers for reburial in a national cemetery. Over the next four years, the Quartermaster Department oversaw efforts to search battlefields, hospitals, prisons, entrenchments, and other areas where Union soldiers might have been buried on site. All military remains that were located were moved to national cemeteries unless claimed by friends or family for private interment elsewhere. The chaotic nature of the war, the manner in which many had been hastily buried without identification, and the effects of animal activity and farming in the years following the battle events meant that many of the remains could not be identified. Death and burial records were also not always well maintained. Government-issued identification tags did not exist during the Civil War, and makeshift identification marks fashioned by the soldiers themselves often did not survive. There were also numerous naval tragedies where bodies were never recovered. Also hampering the effort to locate Union dead were the changes that had occurred in the landscape, rendering the identification of former burial sites challenging.244

**Search and recovery program.** The remains of approximately two-thirds of the Union soldiers who died during the Civil War would need to be recovered before final interment in national cemeteries could be accomplished. This suggested the creation of an extensive search and recovery program. The reburial program was initiated within two months of Lee’s April 9, 1865, capitulation at Appomattox. Capt. James M. Moore, who had already helped to establish Arlington and Battleground National Cemeteries,
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dictated movements of the armies also controlled expenditures of time and energy for the care of the dead, and grave registration units were nonexistent. Burial was performed by fatigue parties from the line. Little or no provision could be made for any systematic interment of remains during a campaign or rapid movement; Army commanders were not in a position to jeopardize the chance of victory in the midst of intense and prolonged combat by tending to burials.248

On June 23, 1865, Chaplain William Earnshaw, Superintendent of Stones River National Cemetery in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, was instructed to take charge of the work of locating and reinterring Union soldier remains within a specific radius at Stones River National Cemetery.249 After relocating the remains from three known burial places on the battlefield, Chaplain Earnshaw extended his search eastward through Murfreesboro to Union University. Examination of graves in that locality led to discovery of a large burial ground identified as “the first burying place used by our brave defenders.”250 After these efforts, Earnshaw directed his attention to the burial sites of general and unit hospitals erected during the eight-month period during which Rosecrans’ army prepared for their advance on Chattanooga in 1863. Overall, through Earnshaw’s efforts, some 3,000 remains were recovered and reintered. The search continued north and south through Murfreesboro and yielded some 600 remains.251

Similar operations were conducted by Chaplain Thomas B. Van Horne in the vicinity of Chattanooga, Tennessee.252 Captain W. A. Wainwright, Assistant Quartermaster, oversaw a similar effort between the upper Tennessee Valley, Cumberland Gap, and eastern Kentucky into Knoxville, Tennessee.

By the end of 1866, these efforts had resulted in substantial progress being made toward consolidating Union soldier burials in existing burial grounds or in new national cemeteries. During 1866 alone, the remains of 2,442 individuals were reintered in national cemeteries within the Commonwealth of Virginia; ultimately, national cemeteries within the state would receive a total of 15,000 burials. The program was pushed with equal vigor in the Military Division of Tennessee. Within the system as a whole, 87,664 remains had been reintered in forty-one national cemeteries. By June 30, 1866, the total number of interments had reached 104,528.253

At that time, the Quartermaster General reported that a total of $1,144,791 had been spent on the Reburial and National Cemetery Programs. With an estimated additional funding need of $1,609,294, the Quartermaster General indicated that $2,609,294 would be the total cost of the establishment of Civil War national cemeteries, and the collection, transfer and reinternment of soldier remains. The average cost of transfer and reinternment of each individual was calculated to be $9.75. The largest single expense for each was the wooden coffin, which averaged $4 in the Washington, D.C. area, and $3 in more rural areas.254

The cost of maintaining wooden headboards soon led Quartermaster General Meigs, in his annual report of 1866, to propose a more economical solution: “A design has been adopted for a small cast-iron monument, to be protected from rust by a coating of zinc, to have in raised letters cast in the solid, the name, rank, regiment and company of each soldier or officer. One of these will be placed at the foot of every grave and will remain when the wooden headboards decay and perish.”255 Due to the anticipated expense, General Meigs
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resisted proposals made to use to marble or granite slabs in place of his proposed iron monuments.  

As the Reburial Program proceeded in 1866 and the difficulties in identifying remains became increasingly apparent, a Joint Resolution of Congress required the Secretary of War "to take immediate measures to preserve from desecration the graves of soldiers of the United States who fell in battle or died of disease in hospitals, to secure suitable burial places in which they may be properly interred, and to have the graves enclosed so that the resting places of the honored dead may be kept sacred forever." This resolution was followed by the first National Cemetery Act of February 22, 1867.

A letter from the Office of National Cemeteries, dated January 11, 1867, discusses reburials and outlines where the bodies of Union soldiers should be taken. The letter states that Union dead south of the Augusta railroad and south and east of Lovejoy's Station would be removed to Andersonville and Savannah.

The Reburial Program ended in 1870, following the re-interment of 299,696 Union soldiers in seventy-three national cemeteries. Approximately 58 percent of the remains had been identified.

The marking of graves continued with diminishing returns each year. In 1870, with the project virtually completed according to Quartermaster General Meigs, there were seventy-four national cemeteries, with the remains of 299,696 Union soldiers laid to rest. Of the total interred by 1870, there were 173,109 positive identifications and 143,446 unknown remains.

The Role of U.S. Colored Troops

The Quartermaster General's efforts in conducting the Reburial Program were supported in particular by a regiment of the United States Army composed of African American soldiers known as the United States Colored Troops (USCT). First recruited following President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation of January 1863, by April 1865 there were 175 USCT regiments with ranks totaling 178,000 free blacks and freedmen. This constituted about one-tenth of the manpower of the entire Union Army. Prior to this time, Lincoln had opposed efforts to recruit African American soldiers, although he had accepted the Army's use of them as paid workers.

The War Department issued General Orders No. 143 on May 22, 1863, establishing the Bureau of Colored Troops to facilitate the recruitment of African American soldiers to fight for the Union Army.

Regiments, including infantry, cavalry, engineers, light artillery, and heavy artillery units, were recruited from all states of the Union for the USCT. Their service bolstered the Union war effort at a critical time. The USCT suffered 2,751 combat casualties during the war, and 68,178 losses from all causes. Disease was the cause of the most fatalities for all troops, black and white.

USCT regiments were led by white officers; rank advancement was limited for African American soldiers. The Supervisory Committee for
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Recruiting Colored Regiments in Philadelphia opened the Free Military Academy for Applicants for the Command of USCT at the end of 1863.\textsuperscript{262} Initially, African American soldiers received less pay than their white counterparts. Through lobbying efforts on the part of the soldiers and their supporters, they later gained equal pay.\textsuperscript{263} The courage displayed by African American troops during the Civil War played an important role in African Americans gaining new rights. As abolitionist Frederick Douglass wrote:

> Once let the black man get upon his person the brass letter, U.S., let him get an eagle on his button, and a musket on his shoulder and bullets in his pocket, there is no power on earth that can deny that he has earned the right to citizenship.\textsuperscript{264}

Before the USCT was formed, several volunteer regiments were raised from free black men, including freedmen in the South. Nearly all of the volunteer regiments were later converted into USCT units.

The USCT was instrumental in the success of the Reburial Program. At Stones River National Battlefield, for example, Chaplain William Earnshaw took over command of the cemetery upon Means’ departure. Under Earnshaw’s direction, members of the 111th USCT disinterred Union soldiers buried within a ninety-mile area of Murfreesboro for reinterment at Stones River National Cemetery.\textsuperscript{265} The same regiment also began construction of a limestone perimeter wall around the cemetery in 1865. It is possible that USCTs were involved with reburial at Andersonville after the war.

### The National Cemetery System Expands

In the years following the Civil War, the War Department would extensively expand the National Cemetery System and develop protocols for permanent features, burials, and maintenance and management practices. Eleven of the cemeteries were located on or near major battlefields of the Civil War that later became national military parks. As such, these national cemeteries became the nuclei for later parks that honored and commemorated the events of the war.\textsuperscript{266}

Following the close of the Civil War in 1865, the War Department began to develop existing national cemeteries while also establishing new burial grounds. National cemeteries were established that year at the following locations:

- Ball’s Bluff (Virginia)
- Florence (South Carolina)
- Mobile (Alabama)
- Raleigh (North Carolina)\textsuperscript{267}
- Salisbury (North Carolina)
- Andersonville (Georgia)
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- Stones River (Murfreesboro, Tennessee)
- Fredericksburg (Virginia)\textsuperscript{268}

In 1866, following an April 13\textsuperscript{th} Joint Resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives, several additional burial grounds were added to the system, including:
- Camp Nelson (Nicholasville, Kentucky)
- City Point (Hopewell, Virginia)
- Cold Harbor (Richmond, Virginia)
- Corinth (Mississippi)
- Crown Hill (Indiana)
- Danville (Virginia)
- Fort Harrison (Richmond, Virginia)
- Glendale (Richmond, Virginia)
- Hampton (Virginia)
- Jefferson Barracks (St. Louis, Missouri)
- Marietta (Georgia)
- Nashville (Tennessee)
- Natchez (Mississippi)
- Port Hudson (Zachary, Louisiana)
- Richmond (Virginia)
- Seven Pines (Richmond, Virginia)
- Staunton (Virginia)
- Winchester (Virginia)
- Poplar Grove (Petersburg, Virginia)
- Vicksburg (Mississippi)

Historic Context Three: The National Cemetery System

- Yorktown (Virginia)\textsuperscript{269}

In 1867, the U.S. government formalized the concept of soldiers’ and sailors’ cemeteries associated with Civil War battlefields through the formal designation of a National Cemetery System to be administered by the War Department. The substantive legislation of the National Cemetery Act of February 22, 1867, provided funds and specific guidance for the creation of national cemeteries. It also directed the Secretary of War “to have every national cemetery enclosed with a good and substantial stone or iron fence; to cause each grave to be marked with a small headstone or block; to direct the appointment of reliable veterans as cemetery superintendents, and to erect adequate quarters to house cemetery superintendents.” The Act also funded purchases of land to serve as national cemeteries and provided for salaried cemetery superintendents.

Reorganization of the Quartermaster General’s Office

After Congress passed the Act to Establish and to Protect National Cemeteries in February 1867, national cemeteries were developed under the stewardship of Quartermaster Gen. Montgomery Meigs. Although the act mandated that every national cemetery include a superintendent’s lodge, a stone or iron perimeter fence, and stone headstones, the layout of each cemetery was left to the discretion of the superintendent. Many of the cemeteries reflected the design style popular during the period, which was articulated by the Saunders design for Soldiers’ National Cemetery at Gettysburg.\textsuperscript{270}

Under the new system, quartermaster officers, acting in accordance with their responsibility for construction, repair, and maintenance at army installations, took over the management of post burial grounds. Additionally, the customary method of marking graves in frontier communities (a headstone fashioned of hard wood and bearing a suitable inscription) came into general usage. Third, surviving copies of old post cemetery
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 registers, many of which are now preserved in the National Archives, indicate the existence of a fairly uniform system of recording burials. This recording system included, in some instances, the notation of assigned grave numbers in plots and name lists corresponding to those inscribed on headboards.

**Beginning of Memorial Day Observances**

National cemeteries became a locus for remembrance even before the Civil War was over. One of the first commemorative traditions established was a day for honoring fallen soldiers, first referred to as Decoration Day and known today as Memorial Day. The tradition arose at a grass roots level from the actions of a young girl. On May 30, 1864, in the town of Boalsburg, Pennsylvania, Emma Hunter, a teenager, placed flowers on the grave of her father, a Union Army colonel who had been killed while commanding Pennsylvania’s 49th Regiment. At the cemetery, she exchanged memories with another mourner, a Mrs. Meyers, who had brought wild flowers to the grave of her nineteen-year-old son, Joe, a private also killed in the war. A year later, they again met at the cemetery, this time joined by other members of the community who also brought flowers to the cemetery. Among them, they decorated every grave in the cemetery. The new custom quickly spread, with women and men in the North and the South decorating the graves of battle dead in several states.²⁷¹

In 1868, Maj. Gen. John A. Logan, President of the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR), a Union veterans’ organization founded in Decatur, Illinois, proposed the establishment of Decoration Day to honor America’s fallen soldiers. His proposal suggested that groups around the country mark Decoration Day by decorating the graves of Union war dead with flowers on May 30, a time of year when flowers would be in bloom around the country. The GAR orchestrated the first large observance of Decoration Day at Arlington National Cemetery on May 30, 1868.²⁷² Decoration Day, or Memorial Day as it was also called, quickly grew in popularity and was soon celebrated in many parts of the country on May 30 by the end of the nineteenth century. The U.S. Army and Navy adopted regulations associated with observance at their facilities. After World War I, observances were expanded to honor all those who had died in American wars.

While many towns and groups claim to be the birthplace of Memorial Day, it was not officially established until 1966, when Congress and President Lyndon Johnson declared Waterloo, New York, the originating home of Memorial Day based on a May 5, 1866, ceremony honoring local veterans of the Civil War. In recognition of the event, local businesses closed, and residents flew flags at half-staff. In 1971, Congress passed legislation declaring Memorial Day a national holiday. It was officially to be recognized on the last Monday in May.²⁷³

In response to the growing practice, General John A. Logan, commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, issued Order No. 11 on May 5, 1868, designating May 30 as Decoration Day. Logan suggested that individuals mark the occasion by “strewing with flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades who died in defense of their country (during the late rebellion) and whose bodies lie in almost every city, village, and hamlet churchyard in the land. . . .”²⁷⁴ The term Memorial Day was first used circa 1882, but was not in common usage until after World War II. Memorial
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Day became a federal holiday in 1888. The official name Memorial Day was established through federal law in 1967.

Many national cemeteries would eventually feature rostrums for the purpose of holding memorial ceremonies such as those associated with Decoration Day.

**Burial of Veterans**

**Changes in Eligibility Requirements for Burial.** During the 1870s, the original cemetery legislation was amended to allow veterans of the Civil War to be buried in the national cemeteries. In 1870, Congress took steps to remove burial restrictions for veterans. The Army Appropriations Act of 1870 included in the general and incidental expenses of the Quartermaster’s Department an allowance “for expenses of the interment of officers killed in action or who may die when in the field, or at posts on the frontier, or at posts and other places when ordered by the Secretary of War, and of noncommissioned officers and soldiers.” A second Act approved June 1, 1872, provided that “All soldiers and sailors of the United States, who may die in destitute circumstances, shall be allowed burial in the national cemeteries of the United States.” After receiving extensive criticism suggesting that this was an attempt to transform the national cemeteries into potter’s fields, Congress hastened to amend the act on March 3, 1873, providing that:

> . . . honorably discharged soldiers, sailors or marines, who have served during the late war either in the regular or volunteer forces, dying subsequent to the passage of this Act, may be buried in any national cemetery of the United States free of cost, and their graves shall receive the same care and attention of those already buried. The production of the honorable discharge of the deceased shall be authority for

Thus, national cemeteries became burying grounds for all veterans who served during the Civil War, not merely for those who gave their lives in battle. This expanded role led to the establishment of forty-seven new national cemeteries beyond the Civil War regions of battle. In addition, veterans who died while in residence at homes established by the federal government (Asylums for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, later National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers) were buried in cemeteries developed on site that were later designated as national cemeteries.

**National Cemetery Lodges**

During the 1870s, gradual improvements were made to the cemeteries based on the provisions of the 1867 Act to Establish and to Protect National Cemeteries. Carefully designed landscape and built features were added to make the cemeteries peaceful settings for remembrance. One of the first major changes was the replacement of original wood headboards with permanent and more durable marble headstones beginning in 1877. Permanent superintendent offices and quarters, known as “lodges,” were also built. Temporary lodges had been built before 1870 but were typically simple one-story wood structures with two to three rooms. These were replaced by larger masonry lodges designed under the supervision of Quartermaster Gen. Montgomery C. Meigs.

The lodges were built of various materials—brick, frame, ashlar, and coursed stone chosen partly by what was locally available—from a prototypical design prepared by Meigs. The Meigs lodges were designed in a style reflective of late Victorian Second Empire. The plan was typically an inverted L-shape. The buildings were primarily one-and-one-half stories in height and featured a mansard roof with decorative fish-scale slate or hexagonal
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slate with patterns formed by variations in color that included the initials “U.S.” The first floor contained the office and two other rooms. Sleeping quarters were located on the upper floor. Kitchens were at first located in separate structures, but many surviving lodges have kitchen additions. By September 1871, permanent stone or brick lodges had been constructed in several national cemeteries, including Richmond, Virginia; Marietta, Georgia; Barrancas, Florida; and Salisbury, North Carolina.

At three national cemeteries—Loudon Park, Maryland; Cypress Hills, New York; and Mound City, Illinois—new lodges, also designed by General Meigs, were two-story structures of a much simpler Victorian design. The simple floor plans of the one-and-one-half-story lodge provided an office, living room, and kitchen on the first floor and three bedrooms on the upper story.

Later, at many of the national cemeteries, original Meigs-designed lodges were demolished, with a new lodge constructed on the original foundation.

Other Cemetery Improvements

Plantings. The Act of February 22, 1867, also provided for a year-by-year improvement in landscaping. In 1870, the War Department set aside funds for the purpose of adding trees to improve the appearance of the national cemeteries. Later that year, General Meigs consulted with noted landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted regarding the appearance of national cemeteries. Olmsted recommended that the overall planting design for the cemeteries remain simple, and that the detail and ornament popular in the Victorian landscape be avoided. In his assessment, Olmsted wrote:

I would recommend that it (the general design) should be studiously simple . . . . The main object should be to establish permanent dignity and tranquility. Looking forward several generations, the greater part of all that is artificial at present in the cemeteries must be expected to have either wholly disappeared or to have become inconspicuous and unimportant in the general landscape . . . . This then is what I would recommend to be aimed at: A sacred grove, sacredness and (protection) being expressed in the enclosing wall and in the perfect tranquility of the trees within.

As a result of Olmsted’s recommendations, trees, shrubs, and flower beds were added to many national cemeteries. Greenhouses were constructed at some cemeteries to supply ornamental plantings. It was also during the 1870s that masonry walls were built around most national cemeteries to replace the original wood rail fences. Plaques and monuments were also erected to complement the headstones and footstones that honored the dead.

Walls and fences. Prior to June 3, 1870, stone walls had been erected around the cemeteries at: Camp Nelson, Kentucky; Lebanon, Kentucky; Little Rock, Arkansas; Mill Springs, Kentucky; New Albany, Indiana; and San Antonio, Texas. Brick walls had been erected at Barrancas, Florida, and Mobile, Alabama; iron railings had been erected at Loudon Park, Maryland.

During Fiscal Year 1871, stone walls were constructed around the cemeteries at Alexandria, Virginia; Annapolis, Maryland; Ball’s Bluff, Virginia; Hampton, Virginia; Jefferson Barracks, Missouri; New Bern, North Carolina; Richmond, Virginia; Wilmington, North Carolina; and Winchester, Virginia. A brick wall was constructed at Cold Harbor, Virginia, and iron railings at the cemeteries at Keokuk, Iowa, and Rock Island.
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Illinois. Work on these perimeter features would continue during the 1870s at many national cemeteries.

**Headstones.** The extraordinary cost of erecting permanent grave markers could only be met by a special appropriation of Congress. Due to this potential drain on the U.S. Treasury, Quartermaster General Meigs continued to reject calls for the marking of national cemetery graves with stone slabs, despite the fact that in the Act of 1867, the Secretary of War had specified that the markers should be of white marble or granite. On March 3, 1873, Congress finally took action by appropriating $1,000,000 for the erection of headstones made of durable stone at each grave in the national military cemeteries. The stones were to be heavy enough to remain in place once set. The Secretary of War specified that the markers should be of white marble or granite, 4 inches thick, 10 inches wide, with 12 inches above ground and 24 inches below ground in areas south of the latitude of Washington and 30 inches in those to the north. The top was to be curved and the face ornamented with a recessed shield and raised lettering. The granite or marble block for unknown soldiers should be 6 inches square by 2 feet 6 inches, with 2 feet set below ground. The project was completed in 1877 at a total cost of $786,630. A second gravestone program was undertaken in 1879, with the result that by 1881, all soldiers' graves were marked, as provided by law.

Work continued to improve the national cemetery system in the 1880s and 1890s. Burial grounds that first presented an unsightly appearance of bare mounded graves, wooden headboards, picket fences and frame buildings had been transformed by structures of iron, stone and marble. With landscaping projects adapted to each locality, the national cemeteries gradually assumed an aspect of stately parks, decorated with shrubs, trees, graveled paths, driveways, and vistas of shaded turf carpeting the mounded graves. The popularity of these cemeteries with the general public prompted the construction of access roads to many cemeteries from nearby cities.

In 1892, the Quartermaster’s Department undertook documentation of the as-built conditions of every national cemetery, which were considered substantially complete by that time. The documentation did not record the location of most of the smaller features such as flowerbeds, but did show trees and larger landscape features.

**Confederate Burials**

National cemeteries were established to honor fallen soldiers of the United States military. When the system was first established, regulations were put into place that allowed only United States military could be buried in national cemeteries. Because Confederate soldiers were not technically United States military personnel, they were traditionally buried elsewhere. Confederates were also, at that time, considered to have been traitors of the nation.

Arranging Confederate burials thus became a state, local, or individual responsibility. As a result, many Confederates were buried in private family or city cemeteries. After the war, several women’s groups and veterans’ organizations began campaigns to exhume Confederate dead from their temporary battlefield graves and from small, remote plots and reinter them in central locations where they could be protected and honored. Perhaps the best example of such an effort is the Confederate cemetery in Hagerstown, Maryland, where thousands of Confederate dead were relocated from the battlefields of Antietam and South Mountain. Confederate cemeteries are located in close proximity to many Civil War battlefield and prison sites.

While national cemeteries were originally conceived as Union burial grounds, there are
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several instances of Confederate soldier burials throughout the system. At Arlington National Cemetery, for instance, there are Confederate soldiers who died in battle, were prisoners of war, or who were in Washington, D.C., area hospitals. Some are veterans who served as Confederate soldiers during the Civil War but later served the United States, allowing them to be buried there.

At Andersonville, approximately 117 Confederate guards who were assigned to the prison and died while stationed there were buried at the site. These graves were relocated to the left of the cemetery entrance, in a grove of oaks, when a brick wall excluding them was built around the national cemetery. In 1880, 115 members of the prison guard detail who had been buried at Andersonville were disinterred by the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) and reburied in an area of Oak Grove Cemetery in Americus, Georgia, designated as the Confederate Cemetery.289

One Confederate soldier is also presently buried at Andersonville; this grave is a reinterment from a private cemetery that occurred on March 24, 1995. In addition the remains of one Revolutionary War soldier were also removed from a private cemetery and reinterred at Andersonville on November 18, 1993.

In 1956, although U.S. Congress stipulated that the interments of Confederate soldiers should be treated in the same way as those of United States soldiers, the practice of burying Confederate remains in places other than national cemeteries generally continues.290
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289. Oak Grove Cemetery records cited by Alan Anderson, archivist, Sumter Historic Trust, Inc. Confederate records were not as well documented or preserved as Union records, suggesting that the number of Confederate graves is approximate.
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Evolving National Cemetery Administration and Management

Of the 149 burial grounds that comprise the National Cemetery System, 133 are administered by the National Cemetery Administration, a branch of the Department of Veterans Affairs, while two—Arlington and Soldiers’ and Airmen’s Home—are administered by the Department of the Army. Fourteen are administered by the Department of the Interior, specifically the National Park Service, including the following:

- Andersonville (Georgia)
- Andrew Johnson (Greeneville, Tennessee)
- Antietam (Sharpsburg, Maryland)
- Chalmette (Louisiana)
- Custer (Crow Agency, Montana)
- Fort Donelson (Dover, Tennessee)
- Fredericksburg (Virginia)
- Gettysburg (Pennsylvania)
- Poplar Grove (Petersburg, Virginia)
- Shiloh (Tennessee)
- Stones River (Murfreesboro, Tennessee)
- Vicksburg (Mississippi)
- Yorktown (Virginia)

Of these, the first eleven were transferred to the Department of the Interior in 1933 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Executive Order No. 6166.
Two of the cemeteries administered by the National Park Service remain active: Andersonville and Andrew Johnson.291

Following the initial legislation establishing national cemeteries as a way to honor the service of U.S. military personnel, the National Cemetery Administration has evolved in response to several changes in the program. Beginning in 1873 all honorably discharged veterans were eligible for burial in national cemeteries. During the late nineteenth century, cemeteries associated with military posts on the western frontier, such as Fort McPherson, Nebraska, were added to the system. During the 1930s, new national cemeteries were established to serve veterans associated with major metropolitan areas, such as New York, Baltimore, Minneapolis, San Diego, San Francisco, and San Antonio. It was also during this period that several of the cemeteries that were closely associated with Civil War battlefields, such as Gettysburg, were transferred to National Park Service administration due to their value in interpreting the historical significance of the battles.

Transfer of eighty-two national cemeteries from the Department of the Army to the Veterans Administration occurred following passage of Public Law 93-43 on June 18, 1973. On November 11, 1988, Public Law 100-476 established the National Cemetery Administration, responsible for the interment of deceased service members and veterans. The National Cemetery Administration was to oversee the national cemeteries transferred to the Veterans Administration in 1973, as well as all other cemeteries under the jurisdiction of the Veterans’ Administration at the time. In 1999 and 2003, Congress passed two additional laws that directed the establishment of twelve new national cemeteries. The most recent addition to the system was Tallahassee National Cemetery, opened in October 2015.292

**Administration of National Cemeteries by the National Cemetery Administration and National Park Service**

The national cemeteries administered by the National Cemetery Administration are managed in accordance with the guidelines conveyed in the *National Shrine Commitment: Operational Standards and Measures*, Version 4.0, prepared by the Department of Veterans Affairs in October 2009.

The national cemeteries administered by the National Park Service are managed in accordance with *Director’s Order No. 61: National Cemetery Operations* (July 2010) and *Reference Manual 61: National Cemetery Operations* (November 2011). These documents make reference to the regulations and standards established for the National Cemetery System by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Although the cemeteries administered by the National Park Service are excluded from National Cemetery Administration oversight, the National Park Service works to meet its policies and shares in its mission to honor the dead and keep their burial places sacred forever, as embodied in a Congressional Joint Resolution of April 3, 1866.

Included in these documents is the requirement that all National Park Service national cemeteries have either an approved Cultural Landscape Report or National Register documentation that adequately addresses the cultural landscape, identifies contributing landscape characteristics and features, and establishes criteria for analyzing the historic significance and integrity of the

---

291. An “active” cemetery, as defined in *Director’s Order No. 61*, is one in which casket or cremation gravesites are available for first interments. New interments are sometimes made even in closed cemeteries, due to previous reservations or the interment of family members of a previously interred individual.
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landscape. Director’s Order No. 61 also provides general direction on visitor use; interment eligibility, limitations, facilities, and services; disinterment; headstones, markers, and commemorative markers; and ceremonies and special events.

Management and treatment of Andersonville National Cemetery, as a component of the National Park System, is also guided by the mission of the National Park Service “...to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.” The application of this mission to cultural landscapes is articulated in the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and the Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes. As a cultural resource, management of Andersonville National Cemetery is defined in federal regulations by 36 CFR Part 2: Resource Protection, Public Use and Recreation, section 2.1: Preservation of Natural, Cultural, and Archeological Resources. The application of these regulations to cultural landscapes is considered within National Park Service Management Policies 2006, Director’s Order No. 28: Cultural Resource Management, and NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guideline.

In addition to its management as a cultural resource, Andersonville National Cemetery is also subject to National Park Service regulations and policies relating to national cemeteries including 36 CFR Part 12: National Cemetery Regulations. Specifically, these regulations note:

All national cemeteries administered by the National Park Service will be managed as historically significant resources, and as integral parts of larger historical parks. Burials in national cemeteries will be permitted, pursuant to applicable regulations, until available space has been filled...

The enlargement of a national cemetery for additional burials constitutes a modern intrusion, compromising the historical character of both the cemetery and historical park, and will not be permitted.

The National Park Service regulations are modeled after the regulations published by the National Cemetery Administration, 38 CFR Part 38: National Cemeteries of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Policies established by the agency to guide national cemetery management are found in several Department of Veterans Affairs publications:

- Headstones and Markers Manual (July 2014)

The Headstone and Markers Manual details the eligibility requirements for receiving headstones, and the styles of markers available. The specifications included in the manual that are relevant to the treatment plan include the types of headstones furnished, the disposition of removed headstones, and the policies for headstone replacement. Replacement of historic headstones is also addressed in National Cemetery Administration Notice 2004-06, which includes information about the importance of preservation.


294. National Park Service Organic Act, 16 U.S.C. 1, 3, 9a, 460 1-6a(e), 462(k) (1916).


of the cultural landscape, within the context of correcting inaccurate information on nineteenth-century markers.

The 2010 revision of *Director’s Order No. 61* and other National Park Service management policies regarding national cemeteries in part reflects changes made by the National Cemetery Administration to its guidelines on management of cemetery landscapes in response to the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefit Act of 1999 (Title VI, Subtitle B, Section 613). The Act stipulates an evaluation of the repairs needed at national cemeteries to meet care and appearance standards. Based on this study, the National Cemetery Administration established the National Shrine Commitment, which articulates an overall vision for national cemeteries as national shrines:

> A national shrine is a place of honor and memory that declares to the visitor or family member who views it that, within its majestic setting, each and every veteran may find a sense of serenity, historic sacrifice and nobility of purpose. Each visitor should depart feeling that the grounds, the gravesites and the environs of the national cemetery are a beautiful and awe-inspiring tribute to those who gave much to preserve our Nation’s freedom and way of life. 297

The current version of *National Shrine Commitment: Operational Standards and Measures* is the most current in a long line of published national cemetery standards beginning with War Department administration in 1911, which themselves expanded on standards established during the founding of the National Cemetery System during the Civil War. The *National Shrine Commitment* assumes a high level of care and maintenance for all cemeteries within the system. The current standards provide detailed direction on the treatment of headstones, buildings, and grounds. They outline the requirements for maintenance, including the percentage of lawn that must be weed free and the percentage of headstones that must not show evidence of debris or objectionable accumulations.

While these standards and measures, and the *National Shrine Commitment*, pertain specifically to the National Cemetery Administration, standards designed to impart honor, memory, majesty, serenity, and beauty perpetuate qualities identified as desirable during the nineteenth century, when many national cemeteries—including Andersonville—were established. The National Park Service, while following the guidance offered by the National Cemetery Administration, Veterans Administration in management of the cemetery, also treats these properties as historic resources, affording an additional layer of consideration in protecting their original intended character. As such, evaluating the layers of history and determining how best to protect, maintain, and interpret associated resources require careful consideration. National Park Service management of national cemeteries recognizes the many concerns and considerations involved in maintaining the cemetery as a place of honor, while also stewarding historic resources, and allowing for ongoing use and interpretation for park visitors.

**Andersonville National Cemetery**

Andersonville National Cemetery was established on July 26, 1865, at the burial ground associated with the Confederate Camp Sumter military prison. During the short time that Camp Sumter operated, 12,920 of those imprisoned perished and were buried in a series of trench-like graves on a hillside northwest of the prison stockade.

The national cemetery was initially established to honor Union soldiers who perished at Camp Sumter; the role of the cemetery has since
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expanded to include burial ground for deceased veterans of all American wars. Today, it is one of only two active national cemeteries administered by the National Park Service.

The cemetery extends over 27.15 acres within Andersonville National Historic Site, a unit of the National Park System. The cemetery is accessed from a two-way road leading from the prison site; there is also a restricted-access funeral entrance along Georgia State Route 49. The burial ground is arranged into quadrants formed by a cross-axial road system marked at the center by a flagpole. The four quadrants of the cemetery together contain eighteen burial sections, identified by lettered section markers, as well as open space for future burials.

The cemetery landscape displays a formal geometry marked by the rectangular perimeter brick wall, cross-axial roads that terminate in visual focal points such as the flagpole and a rostrum, and carefully arranged rows of headstones. In addition to more than 20,000 marble headstones, Andersonville National Cemetery also features several large commemorative monuments.

Just outside the perimeter wall to the west is a cluster of historic buildings used to administer the cemetery. These include the original Cemetery Lodge, built in 1872 to serve as an office and residence for the Cemetery Superintendent, but now serves as park offices. To the west of the Administration Building is the Cultural Resources Building, originally built as a chapel in 1908. It serves as the Cemetery Administration Office and archives facility. To the north of the lodge building is a modest brick well house that formerly served the water supply needs of the cemetery complex. To the north of the Cultural Resources Building is a maintenance shop building.

---
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James M. Moore of the U. S. Army and a crew of thirty-four men including two clerks, one foreman, twelve carpenters, twelve letterers, and seven laborers to Andersonville in the summer of 1865. Captain Moore was ordered by General Meigs "to identify, as far as possible, the graves of Union soldiers buried there, placing over them suitable memorials, and also establishing a cemetery with suitable protection to guard the graves from desecration."  

Arriving at Andersonville on July 25, 1865, Moore and his party found the prison sites and buildings essentially undisturbed and looked after by W. A. Griffin of Fort Valley, Georgia, who had enlisted the help of twenty African Americans to recover bodies that had been exposed by weather or animals. Griffin was named temporary superintendent of the cemetery on June 1, 1865, by General Wilson and given limited resources to enclose a 50-acre square plot using salvaged lumber. Griffin erected one-third of the fence and constructed a brick kiln to manufacture bricks for a drainage system to conduct water away from the graves.  

Atwater, Griffin, and Moore, together with Moore and Griffin’s work crews, compared the numbers on the wood markers at the graves with the names on the register. The graves were confirmed to be successive trenches containing 100 to 150 bodies with grave markers of little posts and boards denoting each interment. Moore’s crew then lettered, painted, and positioned a wood tablet with name, company, regiment, and date of death, as well as the number that had been inscribed on the associated wood marker. Through this process, 12,920 graves were marked using Atwater’s records and record books seized by General Wilson at Andersonville. Of these interments, 460 unidentified graves remained, marked as "unknown Union soldier."  

By August, work enclosing the grounds and identifying and marking the graves was largely complete. The team had enclosed the grounds, identified and marked the graves, and erected signage at the gates and along the pathways. Trees were planted along the cemetery roads, and a wood gate was built at the west entrance to the cemetery. A flagpole was also erected near the center of the cemetery. In August 1865, Clara Barton raised the first U. S. flag to fly over the cemetery.  

Despite his important contribution to the identification of those buried at Andersonville, Dorence Atwater was met with difficulties in trying to have the death register published. At the suggestion of Clara Barton, he had brought his original copy of the rolls to Andersonville, where Col. Samuel Breck requested that Atwater’s rolls be returned to the War Department, as the copy made from the original was unsatisfactory. Colonel Breck indicated the additional condition that if the rolls were not returned, Atwater would need to give back the $300 fee provided by the War Department. Atwater, who considered the rolls legally his property, entrusted them to Clara Barton for publishing. Colonel Breck had Atwater arrested, and when the rolls were not found in his possession, Atwater was charged with larceny and conduct prejudicial to good military discipline, and was court-martialed. He was given a dishonorable discharge, fined $300, and sentenced to eighteen months of hard labor.  

Atwater was granted amnesty by President Andrew Johnson after two months’ service at Auburn Prison in New York. The rolls were finally published in the New York Tribune in February 1866. In 1868, President Johnson appointed Atwater U. S. Counsel to the Seychelles, and in 1871, President Grant transferred him to Tahiti, where he won the admiration of the natives and married a Tahitian princess. However, although the importance of his work on the burial register was recognized, Atwater was not awarded an honorable discharge by Congress until 1898; Clara Barton was instrumental in obtaining this  
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recognition for him. Atwater died in 1910 in San Francisco and was buried in Tahiti.  

Establishment of the National Cemetery

Under the direction of Superintendent Griffin and Captain Moore, most of the structures built by the Confederates were preserved. Following her return to Washington from Andersonville, Clara Barton argued that the site should be designated a national cemetery and become United States property, including a square mile area to encompass the cemetery grounds and embrace “all points of general and historic interest.”

Superintendent Griffin seized all property and structures associated with the Confederate quartermaster and commissary departments, which included two houses, a mill, stable, school, storehouse, grocery store, and blacksmith shop.

On November 25, 1865, by General Order No. 70, General Meigs established Andersonville as a national cemetery, a permanent place of honor for those who died in military service to our country. General Order No. 70 was to be retroactively effective as of July 26, 1865, the first day that work began at Andersonville to securely enclose the cemetery. By 1868, additional interments from nearby battlefields increased the total buried to 13,669.

The Cemetery and Prison Site after the Civil War

Records left by visitors to the cemetery and the prison site after the end of the war document the appearance of the area in the latter decades of the nineteenth century. In May 1867, Mary A. Shearman visited Andersonville and the Freedman’s School, which had been established in two wood buildings, one of which had formerly served as the Confederate hospital. Andersonville Freedman’s School opened in 1866 under the auspices of the Congregational Society of Barrington, Rhode Island; by March 1867, two teachers taught ninety-one students there. Miss Shearman visited the stockade and sentry boxes, the sheds, and remains of the deadline, as well as shelters built by prisoners. She also visited an African American family living in one of the log guardhouses, as well as the cemetery, noting the headboards erected by the U. S. Army Quartermaster Expedition led by Capt. James M. Moore.

On March 24, 1868, a correspondent for the Boston Spectator & Weekly Advertiser visited Andersonville and the cemetery. The cemetery at that time was described as a 40-foot-wide avenue extending northward from the termination of the road leading to the depot, with signs at the entrance denoting “Andersonville National Cemetery” and a stanza from “The Bivouac of the Dead.” Ten rows of graves to the right and left of the entrance avenue were marked with headboards. North of these sections was a cross avenue extending east and west; in the northeast quadrant were more soldiers who had died at Andersonville, while in the northwest quadrant were those who had died elsewhere and been reinterred. At the intersection of the entrance and the cross avenues were four more boards on which were painted stanzas from the aforementioned poem. The correspondent also visited the prison, and noted that it was unguarded and that timber was being removed by local residents for fuel. Further, erosion was taking its toll and underbrush was growing up along the creek. He also noted
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that plans were being made to mark the corners of the main stockade with granite posts.\textsuperscript{315}

On April 26, 1869, Confederate Memorial Societies from Fort Valley, Marshallville, and Americus, Georgia, visited Andersonville to inspect the condition of Confederate graves in the cemetery. They expressed gratitude to Captain Henry Williams, the Superintendent, upon finding the Confederate graves “in splendid order, bearing marks of good attention.”\textsuperscript{316} They believed he was giving the Confederate graves the same care that he was according to the Federal graves.

The federal inspector, 1st Lt. Richard P. Strong, however, did not similarly find conditions at Andersonville to his liking during a visit to the cemetery in 1869. He noted in a letter on May 22, 1869 to Brig. Gen. T. J. Haines, Acting Chief Quartermaster Department South, that no Register of Burials or plan of the cemetery was on file in the Superintendent’s office, that 250 grave headboards were rotted, and that the fences were in poor condition. Because Lt. Strong believed the number of individuals available to maintain the cemetery was insufficient to keep it in good condition, he recommended doubling the number to four workers should the cemetery remain of a similar size. He also recommended, however, that the grounds be diminished to the extent that three laborers could be employed to maintain it. Strong also suggested that the Superintendent was “making improper use of the government animals in his charge” by allowing government mules to be used by local farmers and others in traveling to Americus.\textsuperscript{317} It is possible that Quartermaster General Meigs was in possession of this information when he requested on May 25, 1869, that General Haines replace Superintendent Williams with “a good man.”\textsuperscript{318}

Lt. Strong found a storehouse and two houses on the property. One of the houses was the Cemetery Lodge, which was considered to be in “good condition.” Later, 1st Lt. E. G. Gibbs recommended that the Superintendent’s House, a temporary wooden building erected during the Civil War, either be repaired to make it comfortable or that a house be built near the cemetery entrance for the Superintendent in order to protect the cemetery. The existing lodge could be used to accommodate visitors.\textsuperscript{319}

**Further Development of Andersonville National Cemetery, 1870s**

Although the cemetery was well established by 1870, the land occupied by the cemetery was still legally owned by Wesley Turner and Benjamin Dykes, from whom the government eventually purchased 120 acres for $3,300 in 1875.\textsuperscript{320} While the government purchased the property on which the cemetery had been established, they renounced claim to the prison site property.

By 1871, construction of a new Cemetery Lodge was underway (Figure 17). At 47 feet long and 15 feet wide, it was made of pine with a shingle roof. There were three rooms in the basement, which was fashioned out of brick and cement. Above there were three rooms and a hall, and porches were constructed in the front and rear. The caretaker’s lodge and adjacent outbuildings were completed in 1872 using a standard design developed under the supervision of General Meigs for national cemetery lodges.
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\textsuperscript{316} Ricks, 6; from *Daily Columbus Enquirer*, April 27, 1869.
\textsuperscript{317} Ibid., from May 22, 1869, letter from 1st Lt. Richard P. Strong to Brig. Gen. T. J. Haines, Acting Chief Quartermaster, Department South.
\textsuperscript{318} Ibid.; from May 25, 1869, letter from M. C. Meigs, Quartermaster General, Washington to Brig. Gen. T. J. Haines, Atlanta.)
\textsuperscript{320} Bearss, 153.
During an evaluation conducted in 1871, an inspector noted a “new and substantial plank fence with cedar posts 4-1/2 feet high.” He complained of rotten and fallen headboards but noted that 600 new stakes had been set up in the summer. As part of the development of the national cemetery system in the 1870s, replacement of temporary wood markers with permanent marble markers of a standard design began at Andersonville National Cemetery in 1877. Replacement of the temporary markers with marble headstones bearing the Union Shield began in 1882. Lastly, the government also built masonry enclosing walls at national cemeteries; the brick wall at Andersonville was constructed in 1878-1879 following specifications developed by the Army.

In 1873, Albert Wheeler and his wife visited Andersonville. They visited the site with Superintendent Sullivan, who lived in a cottage nearby, and described the carriage gateway with wickets at either side, and a substantial white fence behind which were the grave markers and graves. They described the broad entrance avenue, cross avenue, and diamond-shaped lot where the roads crossed, on which stood a flagpole. To the left at the entrance was a grove of oak shading the graves of 117 Confederate dead. The headboards of the Union graves were described as 2-1/2 feet tall, painted white with black lettering. Since Miss Shearman’s visit in 1867, the cemetery had been planted in Bermuda grass. The avenues were lined with double rows of live oak (Quercus virginiana), with copse of other trees at various locations.

In 1876, inspector James Gall, Jr., a civil engineer, found the general condition of the cemetery to be good, but reported that the site was too large for the needs of the nation. He said only about one quarter of it was taken up by graves.

The 1878 Inspector, Colonel H. Davis, inquired whether private animals were being allowed to graze on the federal grounds. Superintendent Eugene Sullivan replied that only public animals were allowed on public lands, and that no cattle could come into the enclosed cemetery area.

In 1880, 115 members of the prison guard detail who died at Andersonville were disinterred by the United Daughters of the Confederacy and buried in an area of Oak Grove Cemetery in Americus, Georgia, designated as the Confederate Cemetery.

In 1883, Jerus Bryant arrived at Andersonville to take charge as cemetery superintendent. Inspector James Gall, who visited the site that year, felt that
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Andersonville had been developed into “one of the finest of the national cemeteries.”

In May 1888 W. H. Owen reported to the Quartermaster General that the area of the Andersonville reservation was 120 acres, 25 of which were enclosed by a brick wall and nine by other means. Generally he found the cemetery in good condition but considered the privy too small and recommended that twenty-five dollars be spent to enlarge it.

On January 25, 1889, several former Union soldiers, many of them African-Americans, met in Atlanta to form a Georgia division of the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR). On Memorial Day 1889, members of GAR Post #5 decorated the graves of their fallen comrades at Andersonville. The event marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of the prison. Attendance at the event totaled 7,000. The commander of Post #5, E. S. Jones, related to the Quartermaster General that it had rained hard while the visitors were at the cemetery. He noted that the Superintendent’s home was the only shelter available and was not adequate to accommodate those gathered at the cemetery. He recommended the government build a shelter for cemetery visitors that included a rostrum for the use of the GAR and other groups.

Because the War Department was administering Andersonville National Cemetery and had a trained superintendent in charge, the Woman’s Relief Corps presidents at their 25th and 26th National Conventions suggested that the Federal Government might do a better job of overseeing the prison property. Thus on February 9, 1909, Senator James B. Foraker of Ohio introduced a bill into the Senate to combine the two properties and call them the Andersonville Prison Park. In May 1909 the Senate passed Bill #56971 and sent it to the House where Congressmen General Isaac R. Sherwood, Ohio, and Major Thomas W. Bradley of New York introduced it. Both Houses gave the bill unanimous approval on January 17, 1910, and on March 2, 1910, President William Howard Taft signed it into law.

**The National Cemetery under U.S. Army Administration, 1910–1970**

Between 1870 and 1939, there were only 50 additional burials in Andersonville Cemetery. One reason was that few Union veterans wished to be buried so far away from their homes and families. Furthermore, Confederate veterans were not given the right to be buried in national cemeteries until after 1900, and even then most of them did not choose to be buried with their former enemies.

In 1908, the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic built a chapel at Andersonville (Figure 18). The chapel was located just west of the perimeter brick wall surrounding the National Cemetery.

![Figure 18. Chapel built at Andersonville by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, 1908. (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site files, container 1, box 3, D-2)](image)

In the 1910s, several additional monuments were erected by individual states in the cemetery—New York (1914); Illinois (1912), designed by William Carlys Zimmermann and Charles
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Mulligan; and Minnesota (1916), designed by John K. Daniels.

In 1932, Georgia State Route 49 was built on a new alignment just west of the cemetery, partially following the route of the Old Dixie Highway. A new entrance to the cemetery was established from the highway.

In a 1932 inspection, Colonel C. A. Bach considered the cemetery and prison park in “very good condition.” He estimated that there had been a total of 50,000 visitors that year. By 1934, this number had fallen to 27,659, likely due to the Depression.

In 1932, the Cemetery Lodge was remodeled. The upper floor was entirely redone, including the exterior and the roof. All of the rooms were wired for electricity. A kitchen was added to the rear, and a complete steam heating system, with radiators in every room, was installed. Additional modifications were made in 1936.

As part of the Legislative Appropriation Act of 1933 Congress requested that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt “eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort” in the federal government. On June 10, 1933, Roosevelt signed an Executive Order that transferred battlefields, parks, monuments and cemeteries, including those still taking burials, from the War Department to the Department of the Interior for administration by the National Park Service. In addition, the executive order transferred control over District of Columbia parks and public buildings to the park service and also transferred national monuments under the administration of the U.S. Forest Service to the National Park Service.

After lobbying by Horace Albright, director of the National Park Service, a revised order was signed by Roosevelt postponing transfer of active cemeteries, including Arlington National Cemetery. Control of eleven cemeteries was transferred to the National Park Service in 1933. Control of three additional cemeteries was subsequently transferred to the National Park Service: Custer in 1940, Andrew Johnson in 1942, and Andersonville in 1970. Albright would later state that he regretted not asking for the transfer of the prison site and cemetery at Andersonville to the National Park Service from the War Department.

Andersonville was one of the sites targeted by some legislators for transfer in the 1930s. Congressman Stephen Pace of the Third District in Georgia was one of those who lobbied for this action. However, United States entry into World War II sidetrack his efforts. It was not until publication of the Ex-POW Bulletin in 1956, which called for the establishment of a POW national shrine and museum at Andersonville that the idea was once again taken up in the public realm.

**Civilian Conservation Corps.** During the 1930s, two Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) camps were located at Andersonville. On June 18, 1934, Col. Duncan Major, Jr., submitted a request to Robert Fechner, Director of Emergency Conservation Work, for a work project at

---

331. Inspection Report by Col. C. A. Bach, April 21, 1932.
333. “Lodge showing 1936 addition”; diagrams and narrative in file named “Sexton’s House files,” including a 1984 elevation noting a 1936 kitchen addition with a concrete foundation, and referencing the remodeling in spring 1932, Park Files, Andersonville National Historic Site.
336. Albright.
337. Ricks, 32; and *Ex-POW Bulletin*, June 1956.
Andersonville National Prison Park, and by early August the project was approved. On September 28, 1934, a twelve-member contingent of Company 1411 set up a temporary camp under the direction of Lt. Plato's Rhyne. The temporary tent camp was located on the north slope of the prison site. It consisted of four, fifty-man tents as barracks, an officer's tent, and a mess tent. Four days later, additional personnel arrived and began construction of a permanent camp west of Georgia State Route 49, across from the entrance to the national cemetery. By December 1934, four pine barracks were completed, each housing fifty men. Additional buildings consisted of a kitchen/mess hall, officer's quarters, recreation hall, education building, and latrine. North of the buildings was a field used for ballgames and drills. The commander of the permanent camp was John M. Tatum.\textsuperscript{339}

Company 1411 ceased operations at Andersonville Prison Park on December 31, 1935. During its fourteen months at the site, Company 1411 changed the face of Andersonville with roads, bridges, landscaping, and erosion control. The work at Andersonville, however, did not end. On January 1, 1936, Company 4455, stationed at Fort Benning, Georgia, assumed responsibility for the camp at Andersonville. Fifty men were detailed to the camp to do beautification work at Andersonville National Cemetery. Company 4455 worked at the cemetery for one year, departing the premises on January 1, 1937.\textsuperscript{340}

In 1936, the CCC remodeled the 1908 chapel (currently the Cultural Resources Building). The work included the removal of the parapet and replacement of the low-slope roof with a gable roof. Red brick veneer was added over the concrete block exterior. A new porch was also added to the south gable end of the building. Inside, part of the building was partitioned to establish an office for the Cemetery Superintendent, while a restroom was added that could be accessed from both the inside and the outside of the building.\textsuperscript{341} The entrance gates to the cemetery were reconstructed at this time.\textsuperscript{342}

\textbf{Rostrum.} In 1941, the cemetery was expanded eastward by the Army with a new rostrum and angled perimeter walls (Figure 19). As part of this work, more than 400 linear feet of the nineteenth century brick wall was removed, including an original gate at the centerline of the cemetery. A new 20-inch-thick random ashlar stone masonry wall was built on a concrete footing, including piers, metal fencing, and new metal gates at either end of the new section of wall. The new walls extended east approximately 40 feet and then continued on a diagonal to the rostrum. The 20-foot by 50-foot rostrum itself had a concrete foundation and stone masonry walls.\textsuperscript{343}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{339} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{340} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{341} A plaque in museum collection storage, which apparently hung on the front of the building at one time, reads: "Erected 1908 / by the Ladies of the Grand Army / Remodeled 1936." Correspondence with park.
\item \textsuperscript{342} Marsh, "Andersonville's New Deal: Civilian Conservation Corps." See also "Inspection of Andersonville National Cemetery and Prison Park," March 1938; drawings titled, "Reconstruction of Chapel Building" November 1935. Park Files, Andersonville National Historic Site.
\item \textsuperscript{343} National Park Service, "Andersonville National Cemetery, Rostrum & Enclosing Wall," Construction Division, Office of the Quartermaster General, May 15, 1940. NPS drawing #437-80073.
\end{itemize}
Plantings. A 1948 plan of the cemetery (Figure 20), which was later revised, indicates the tree and shrub species gracing the grounds at the time. They included both deciduous and evergreen species, which were generally planted within the burial sections in such a way as to present a pastoral character. Some of the plantings were arranged in rows that followed the interior of the perimeter wall and the circulation corridors located between sections. A larger grove was also located within section D. Species indicated as present on the 1948 map are as follows.  

Trees:  
- Catalpa (*Catalpa bignonioides*)  
- Deodar cedar (*Cedrus deodara*)  
- Hickory (*Cary sp.*)  
- American holly (*Ilex opaca*)  
- Eastern red cedar (*Juniperus virginiana*)  
- Southern magnolia (*Magnolia grandiflora*)  
- Ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*)  
- Olive tea (*Osmantus fragrans*)  
- Pecan (*Carya illinoisensis*)  
- Red oak (*Quercus rubra*)  
- Sourwood (*Oxydendrum orboreum*)  
- Virginia pine (*Pinus virginiana*)  
- White oak (*Quercus alba*)

Shrubs:  
- Glossy abelia (*Abelia x grandiflora*)-shrubs and hedge  
- Compact arborvitae (*Thuja occidentalis*)  
- Cactus (species not identified)  
- Crapemyrtle (*Lagerstroemia indica*)

---

344. The plants indicated below constitute contemporary nomenclature. Some incomplete information on the map has been updated where possible.
- Yulan magnolia (*Magnolia denudata*)
- Cunninghamia (*Cunninghamia lanceolata*)
- Dogwood (*Cornus florida*)
- English laurel (*Laurus nobilis*)
- Euonymus (*Euonymus sp.*)
- Firethorn (*Pyracantha coccinea*)
- Flowering quince (*Cydonia japonica*)
- Forsythia (*Forsythia x intermedia*)
- Pfitzer juniper (*Juniperus pfitzerryana*)
- Pomegranate (*Punica granatum*)
- Rose (*Rosa sp.*)
- Bridal wreath spirea (*Spiraea prunifolia*)
- Sweet shrub (*Calycanthus floridus*)
- Yucca (*Yucca filamentosa*)

**1950s–1960s Alterations.** Additional work was performed at the cemetery in 1960–1961, including reconstruction of the cemetery gate and the construction of two new outbuildings, a maintenance building north of the administration building outside the cemetery wall and a well house north of the caretaker’s lodge within the walls. The well house, completed in 1961, replaced an earlier well house at the same location. At about this time, the nineteenth century outbuildings north of the caretaker’s lodge within the cemetery walls were demolished. Also, a new parking area was established outside the western entrance to the cemetery.

A planting plan dated 1957 indicates that additional species had been added to the cemetery and around the buildings (Figure 21).
Andersonville National Historic Site, 1970 to Present

(See also Historic Context Four: Civil War Commemoration and Interpretation.)

Establishing the National Historic Site. The release and subsequent popularity of MacKinlay Kantor’s bestselling novel Andersonville in 1955 led to a sharp increase in visitors to Andersonville.345

In October 1959, the Advisory Board of National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments recommended that Andersonville be added to the National Park System. The recommendation did not begin to advance until 1963, when the Army declared 40 acres, including the prison site, as surplus land. At this time, the Middle Flint Planning and Development Commission, which represented eight counties in the region, began to call for the transfer of the property to the National Park Service. Future President, then State Senator, Jimmy Carter was a member of the commission.346

In 1965, Jimmy Carter, as chairman of the West Central Georgia Area Planning and Development Commission, requested that the University of Georgia prepare a preliminary developmental study of the Andersonville site. The report was prepared by Robert J. Hill, a Landscape Architect with the Institute of Community and Area Development, and William B. Keeling, a Professor of Economics in the College of Business Administration. The study looked at the advantages and disadvantages of placing the site

345. Ricks, 33.

346. Ibid., 34.
under the control of different local, state, and federal agencies, including the National Park Service. The study concluded that the main advantage of placing the park under NPS control would be the relief it would provide local communities with regard to financing and administering the park. The main disadvantage listed was the lack of local control over the development and use of the park. The study further suggested approaching the National Park Service with a formal request to make the park a national historic site. 347

In 1965, the U.S. Army requested that the National Park Service study the feasibility of the Andersonville site becoming part of the National Park System.

In March 1966, Georgia Senator Richard Russell invited Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall to his office to discuss the Andersonville site. Also present were Senator Herman Talmadge, Congressman Bo Calloway, and State Senator Jimmy Carter. The group requested Udall’s support for designating Andersonville as a national historic site. Udall expressed support for the project, and in May 1966, a National Park Service planning team prepared a report that called for establishing a national historic site at Andersonville. 348 In November 1967, the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments recommended that Andersonville be established as a national historic site under the control of the National Park Service. 349

After a series of congressional hearings, and a failed legislation in 1968, Andersonville National Historic Site was established under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior by federal legislation on October 16, 1970, when President Richard Nixon signed Public Law 91-465. The legislation incorporated the two areas previously administered by the United States Army—Andersonville Prison Park and Andersonville National Cemetery—which would thereafter be administered by the National Park Service.

The stated purpose of the enabling legislation was:

... to provide an understanding of the overall prisoner of war story of the Civil War, to interpret the role of prisoner of war camps in history, to commemorate the sacrifice of Americans who lost their lives in such camps, and to preserve the monuments located therein ... 350

The enabling legislation also authorized the Secretary of the Interior to designate:

... not more than five hundred acres in Macon and Sumter Counties, Georgia, for establishment as the Andersonville National Historic Site [and to acquire this acreage by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, transfer from a Federal agency, or exchange lands and interests therein for the purposes of this Act. 351

The site was administratively listed in the National Register upon its establishment in 1970. In 1976, National Register documentation was prepared for Andersonville National Historic Site as a historic district. The documentation of the site was accepted by the Keeper of the National Register on November 24, 1978.

**NPS administration of the site.** From 1971 until 1998, the park museum and visitor center were located in the former 1908 chapel, which contained a museum about Andersonville’s Civil War history. 352 In 1987, a storage building was

---


348. Ricks, 36.

349. Ibid., 38.


351. Ibid.

352. “Andersonville National Historic Site History,” typed manuscript in park files, no author or date; and correspondence with park.
converted into a one-room museum to tell the story of prisoners of war from wars other than the Civil War. In 1996 it was converted into housing for former prisoners of war and renamed the POW Guest House (now called the Volunteer Guest House).\textsuperscript{353}

During the 1970s and 1980s, several monuments were constructed while site work was conducted within the national historic site. The Georgia Monument was erected in 1976, designed by sculptor William J. Thompson. The Odd Fellows (Unknown Soldier Monument) was built in 1984, and the Stalag XVII-B Monument in 1989.

In 1976, a connecting road was constructed between the cemetery and prison park parcels. Circa 1970s, cannon were placed on wood platforms around the prison site.

Circa 1983, three new maintenance buildings were added to the site, east of the cemetery rostrum.

The National Park Service has conducted a series of archaeological investigations at the park since the 1970s, including investigations of areas considered for opening to new burials; locations of planned construction or universal access improvements; and other research purposes.

The National Park Service has also conducted several planning studies for the park, including the “Andersonville National Historic Site: Historic Resource Study and Historical Base Map” (Bearss report) (1970); Interpretive Prospectus (1974); General Management Plan/Development Concept Plan/Environmental Assessment (1988); Collection Condition Survey (2001); Archives Assessment Survey (2001); Museum Emergency Operation Plan (2003); Collection Management Plan (2005); Museum Security and Fire Protection Survey (2006); Long-Range Interpretive Plan (2010); Cultural Landscape Inventories for Andersonville Memorial Landscape and Andersonville National Cemetery (2010); Conservation Condition Survey (2012); Interment Plan (2012); Scope of Collection Statement (2013); Cultural Landscape Report (2015); and the Cemetery Operations Plan.

In addition to ongoing stewardship of the prison camp site, cultural landscape, buildings and monuments, and active national cemetery, the National Park Service has continued to implement improvements and to maintain and preserve the national historic site. A new entrance road for the park was constructed in 1997. In 1999, work was completed on converting the former Cemetery Chapel for use as the curatorial storage/museum collection area and cemetery office. Also in 1999, 7,000 square feet of the nineteenth-century brick wall were repointed around the national cemetery; this was one of many repointing programs for the brick wall undertaken by park staff or contractors over the history of the cemetery. In 2004, the Memorial Section in the cemetery was enlarged to extend along the stone wall on either side.

In 2002, the authorized boundary of the park was expanded from 500 to 520 acres in order to accommodate proposed parcel acquisition\textsuperscript{354} The Friends of Andersonville acquired and donated the additional acreage northeast of the park to create a safer and more appropriate entrance dedicated solely to park traffic.\textsuperscript{355} In 2009, a metal boundary fence was erected along Georgia State Route 49, at a portion of the park’s eastern and northern boundary. Ornamental plantings at the rostrum were removed in November 2009 and replaced in 2010. A large magnolia was removed

\textsuperscript{353.} Correspondence with park; see also 1996 Superintendent’s Annual Report.

\textsuperscript{354.} Public Law 107-357, “An Act to amend the act entitled ‘An Act to authorize the Andersonville National historic Site in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes’, to provide for the addition of certain donated lands to the Andersonville National Historic Site” (116 Stat. 3014, December 17, 2002).

\textsuperscript{355.} National Park Service, \textit{Andersonville National Historic Site: Long-Range Interpretive Plan} (Andersonville National Historic Site, Harpers Ferry Center Interpretive Planning, and ECOS Environmental Design, Inc., February 2010), 2.
from the cemetery grounds in 2014 due to its poor condition.

Today, Andersonville National Cemetery contains more than 20,000 interments and remains an active burial site. Administered by the National Park Service, Andersonville National Cemetery uses the same eligibility criteria as cemeteries administered by the National Cemetery Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Committal services are held in the rostrum. Park personnel provide opening and closing of graves, assist funeral directors and family members with arrangements for interment, and maintain the cemetery grounds. Perpetual care of the gravesites is provided, and cemetery regulations address burial procedures, use of the site, and grave decoration policy.

### Historic Resources Associated with Historic Context Three

- Andersonville National Cemetery Landscape
- Perimeter wall
- Headstones
- Section markers
- Andersonville National Cemetery Lodge (Administration Building/Park Headquarters)
- Road system
- Rostrum
- Cultural Resources Building (former chapel)
- New Jersey Monument

---

356. One difference between NPS-administered cemeteries and other national cemeteries regarding services to veterans/family members is that the NPS does not pay for burial vaults. This has been a controversial issue at times, and in at least one year, funds were allocated to pay for vaults. Most years, and presently, families must buy the vaults for burial in NPS-administered national cemeteries, while the Veterans Department of Veterans Affairs pays for vaults in all other national cemeteries.

### Significance

Civil War-era national cemeteries were created originally to afford a decent resting place for those who fell in defense of the Union. These cemeteries began the ongoing effort to honor and memorialize eternally the fighting forces that have and continue to defend our nation. Today, the entire national cemetery system symbolizes, in its gracious landscapes and marble headstones, both the violence of the struggle and the healing aftermath. The Civil War-era national cemeteries are nationally significant under Criterion A, both for their symbolic and physical representation of that war, and for representing the origins of the National Cemetery System.

Civil War-era national cemeteries are also nationally significant under Criterion C for embodying an important and recognized...
Historic Context Three: The National Cemetery System

landscape design and for establishing certain landscape features that have been retained for over 100 years. While it was mandated that every national cemetery have a lodge, a stone or iron fence, and headstones, the actual layout of the cemetery, for the most part, was left to the discretion of the cemetery superintendent who was named during the construction of these features. These superintendents responded to the style and design thinking of that era.

Many Civil War-era national cemeteries contain a cemetery lodge built according to a design by Quartermaster Gen. Montgomery C. Meigs, who was quite significant during that period in government and had great influence over other military architecture. His design represented the style of the period, yet was able to be used for construction of superintendents' lodges in all parts of the country for many years. There is little or no distinction in the components of the lodges, but the overall design is significant by its architect, its time, its use, and its flexibility in adapting to numerous variations in local building materials.

The serene national cemeteries offer perpetual testimony of the concern of a grateful nation that the lives and services of members of the Armed Forces, who served their nation well, will be appropriately commemorated. The flag of the United States flies proudly as a symbol that this nation forever will remember.357

357. Sammartino, F-3.
Historic Context Four: Civil War Commemoration and Interpretation (1861–2017)

FIGURE 22. Andersonville Prison Park, undated photo (post-1915). (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site, image 2618)

Introduction

Andersonville National Historic Site is a commemorative landscape. Commemorative landscapes are places that are set aside and marked by a culture to recall, celebrate, or memorialize significant people, places, or events in its history. Commemorative landscapes feature design elements intended to honor and recognize; the act of designating a place to observe a unique historic personality, place, or event makes it commemorative.

Commemorative landscapes are often developed around such culturally significant markers as a centennial, an important holiday, a significant spiritual experience, or an extraordinary event. In the aftermath of the Civil War, for example, focused efforts to save, mark, and memorialize landscapes associated with individual battles became a central focus for many patriotic organizations and government entities. Burial grounds and cemeteries are among the earliest and most iconic forms of public commemorative landscapes. Other commemorative landscape examples include battlefields, presidential sites,
and memorials. Together these special places form an important physical expression of a culture’s shared heritage.

At Andersonville, the park as a whole constitutes a commemorative landscape that contains three discrete commemorative resources: the national cemetery, preserved prison park (Figure 22), and National Prisoner of War Museum. Each of these contains monuments and memorials, plaques, structures, and plantings that have been placed by groups, organizations, and government entities in an effort to memorialize and commemorate the Civil War-era events associated with Camp Sumter and with American prisoners of war. The history of commemoration at Andersonville, which extends to the Civil War itself, can be tied to a broader national context of commemoration within several thematic areas that include monumentation, cemetery and park development, and interpretation. The commemorative features associated with Andersonville National Historic Site are considered below within the relevant context.

**Pre-Civil War Military Commemoration**

Erecting public monuments to celebrate events, ideas, or heroes associated with military events began on a broad scale late in the eighteenth century when nationalism and political ideology started to supplant a role that religion had customarily fulfilled in civic culture. In Europe, a culture of historical art and architecture flourished during the nineteenth century to bolster patriotic sentiments based on historic traditions. In England, for example, from the 1830s to the end of the nineteenth century, the Gothic revival vied with the Classical revival for a national idiom in which to commemorate Britain’s long history and bolster patriotic sentiments in an age in which national identity faced changing social and cultural forces.\(^{358}\)

One of the earliest examples of commemorative gestures in North America resulting from battle includes the placement of a cross on the Fort Oswego battlefield in New York by the priests accompanying General Marquis de Montcalm’s forces in 1756. The cross included the inscription, “this is the banner of victory.” Also placed on the battlefield was a wooden column inscribed with the arms of France and “Bring Lilies with full hands.” Two years later, a cross was erected in France, on July 9, 1758, following the Battle of Carillon, also known as the 1758 Battle of Ticonderoga, to honor the decisive French victory over the British along the shores of Lake Champlain. Here, Montcalm erected a large wooden cross with an inscription which read “Christian Victory was not achieved by Montcalm’s prudent tactics, by these felled trees [an abatis protected the French troops] or by the bravery of the French troops but by the hand of your victorious God, whom you see on this cross.” A replica of the Fort Carillon cross stands at Fort Ticonderoga today, on the approximate site of Montcalm’s first cross. The construction of these commemorative features likely constitutes the earliest European battlefield memorials in North America. In both cases, the French celebrated the divine guidance of Providence in the memorials, not the activities of man.

Preservation and commemoration of battlefields has been an evolving American tradition that began in 1781 with the authorization of its first commemorative monument—the Monument to the Alliance and Victory—at Yorktown in 1781. Despite Congressional authorization for its development, the monument would not be completed for another 100 years. In America in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, commemoration of the American Revolution began as a controversial issue. Some held that ceremonies commemorating the Revolution were important to the young nation while others thought that monuments and ceremonies should be avoided for their association with the monarchy of Europe. Thus, many of the earliest monuments

---

placed to commemorate American military events were funded and designed by private groups and individuals. Due to conflicts among political parties and the reluctance of the federal government to use public monies to build national memorials, the task of commemoration fell to private individuals or associations. As such, many early American Revolution commemorative efforts tended to be haphazard attempts executed on the local level; however, they did receive a certain legitimacy by federal charter and by permission granting the use of federal land.

The first publicly erected monument was placed on Lexington Green in Lexington, Massachusetts, in 1799. The Revolutionary Monument honored eight Minutemen and the 1775 Battles of Lexington and Concord. It was not until after the War of 1812, however, that the American Revolution began to occupy an important place in American memory as an important period in the nation’s young history. By the mid-nineteenth century, reverence of the principles and accomplishments of the founding of the nation prompted memorialization and commemoration of Revolutionary War battles and events. Early monuments commemorated the individual soldiers as well as the generals who led them; placement of these monuments ranged from central civic spaces to the battlefield, and even the specific location where the enemy had been vanquished.

In 1817, the first private commemorative monument was erected to honor patriots who fell during the 1777 Battle of Paoli in Pennsylvania. Private efforts to purchase battlefield land and Revolutionary War sites began in 1820 when William Ferris Pell purchased 546 acres containing the ruined site of Fort Ticonderoga. In 1825, private investors and the Bunker Hill Monument Association acquired 18 acres of battlefield at Breed’s Hill. For the site, Solomon Willard designed an obelisk, a form derived from an ancient Egyptian tradition used to honor war heroes and the dead. The obelisk, along with the victory column, would soon become the most popular forms for military commemorative features in America. Other early commemorative monuments that took the obelisk form include the Chalmette Monument, near New Orleans (1855), Fort Griswold in Groton, Connecticut (1826–1830), and the Battle Monument at Concord, Massachusetts (1836). One of the advantages of the form was that it offered four flat sides for inscription. The importance of the form was further emphasized in Mills’s design for the Washington Monument, work on which began in 1845 but was not completed until 1884.  

Although the most important reason for the erection of monuments on military sites was to commemorate the efforts of those who had died in battle, local pride sometimes fueled a competitive spirit and American cities vied for recognition of their patriotic and heroic deeds. Baltimore was the first city to commemorate both national and local heroes through memorial structures; in 1815, prominent local citizens laid the cornerstone for the Washington Monument. Baltimore’s Washington Monument, like Washington’s, was designed by Robert Mills. The monument was similar in form to the Colonne Vendôme in Paris, a column built between 1806 and 1810 based on Trajan’s Column erected in Rome in 107–113 CE. In Baltimore, work on the Battle Monument was later initiated in 1829.

In 1836, the state of Indiana recognized wartime events by protecting a military engagement site through the acquisition of 16 acres of the Tippecanoe Battlefield. In 1850, the Hasbrouck House, General Washington’s headquarters at Newburgh, New York, became the first historic house museum in the United States. The site of the 1814 Battle of Mackinac Island became the first battlefield protected within a national park in 1875, with the establishment of Mackinac National Park in Michigan.

It was also during the nineteenth century that the formation of groups and organizations to recognize and honor notable historic events became popular. The formation of the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association to preserve Washington’s home at Mount Vernon in 1853 was instrumental in crystallizing the American tradition of preserving and protecting sites of historic and patriotic importance. The work of the association to save George Washington’s home on the Potomac River from destruction served as a model for many groups, including the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association founded in 1864, the Hollywood Memorial Association formed circa 1870, the Valley Forge Centennial Association established in 1877, and the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities established in 1889.

Commemoration of the Revolutionary War in monuments would become part of the national hagiography surrounding American patriotism. Mid-nineteenth century public commemoration of the Revolutionary War also developed as part of a larger movement focusing on creating a historical narrative intended to promote patriotic faith and a sense of national identity. Political parties also began to use military sites and commemorative markers as a backdrop for public events to champion their cause or election platform. For example, in the 1830s, the Democratic and Whig parties began to hold competing ceremonies, using the occasion to link their cause to the memory of the American Revolution.360 Local and regional celebrations of military events took the form of public holidays that encompassed the dedication of monuments, parades, flag raisings, battle reenactments, athletic events, political speeches, concerts, and marking of graves.

Despite widespread local efforts by prominent citizens and amateur organizations to preserve the memory of the Revolutionary War in tangible forms, and to instill in citizens a greater sense of patriotism, when it came to the national character of battlefield preservation it was frequently necessary to seek federal funding and control both due to financial considerations and the difficulties associated with maintaining private organizations over extended periods of time.

The event that resulted in a dramatic change in national pride and interest in historic events and people was the one-hundredth anniversary of American independence, which occurred in 1876 and was marked by the Centennial Exposition held in Philadelphia’s Fairmount Park. The event resonated nationally and contributed to the proliferation of patriotic organizations that focused on Revolutionary War-era sites and heroes. Those initiated during the late nineteenth century included the Sons of the Revolution, founded in 1889, and the Daughters of the American Revolution and Colonial Dames of America, formed in 1890. These groups garnered both public and private support to purchase and maintain historic structures and sites, place monuments to commemorate military achievements, and mark graves of the heroic dead. Like the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association before them, many of the preservation-related organizations conducting activities during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century were led by women.

As discussed in the section that follows, these events would eventually lead to the establishment of the first five national military parks, each of which was associated with the Civil War rather than the Revolutionary War. The Revolutionary War continues to resonate with Americans and to serve as the object of commemoration.

As noted by the American Battlefield Protection Program’s Report to Congress on the Historic Preservation of Revolutionary War and War of 1812 Sites in the United States,

The years following World War I saw an increase in public enthusiasm for establishing additional national military parks. Congress

considered 14 bills to establish national military parks with proposed appropriations approximating $6 million and another 14 bills asking for markers on battlefields or studies of others. In June 1925, the Army War College provided Congress with a memorandum outlining “a comprehensive system for classifying battles according to their importance, and proposed preservation action corresponding to the relative importance of each category.” The memorandum addressed 31 Revolutionary War battlefields and 11 War of 1812 battlefields.

The Army War College recommended that two—Saratoga, New York, and Yorktown, Virginia—be commemorated as national military parks. It recommended that the rest be declared national monuments, which would require limited land protection and varying types and degrees of interpretation and commemoration. With numerous and piecemeal proposals before it, Congress passed legislation in February 1926 directing the War Department to conduct a general study of battlefields in the United States to determine what action Congress should take to preserve or commemorate the sites. This was the first federal effort to conduct a national survey of historic sites.361

In contrast with Civil War commemorative efforts, very few veterans were involved with Revolutionary War commemoration due to the time that had elapsed before many of the efforts were undertaken, and a lack of coordination among the efforts.

**Civil War Military Site Commemoration: Organizations, Monuments, Reservations**

**Military Site Commemoration and Monumentation**

The intensity of the combat, and the close personal nature of both the camaraderie and loss suffered by the troops during the Civil War, resulted in the combatants themselves constructing the war’s first memorials.362 The 8th Georgia Infantry erected the first of these memorials—the Bartow Monument—a marble obelisk designed to honor their brigade commander who was mortally wounded during the Battle of Manassas in July 1861. Although the Bartow Monument was later removed from the area in 1862, when the Confederate army evacuated the area, its marble base remains today, marking the location of the first Civil War monument. Less formal memorials, such as the cairn of field stones and river cobbles etched with the names of visitors and veterans piled on the site of General Lyon’s death after the August 10, 1861, Battle of Wilson’s Creek, were also established on many battlefields. The oldest surviving Civil War monument was also erected while the war still raged. After the Battle of Stones River, Tennessee, in December 1862 and January 1863, Union soldiers erected the Hazen Brigade Monument during the summer and fall of 1863 in honor of those brigade members killed in the battle and buried in the field. One year after the surrender of Vicksburg by the Confederate Army in July 1863, victorious Union troops erected a monument on the spot where Union General Grant and Confederate General Pemberton agreed on the terms of the surrender. Unlike the Bartow and Hazen monuments, the Surrender Monument

---


memorialized a particular event rather than commemorating the dead.\textsuperscript{363}

**National Cemeteries**

*(See also Historic Context Three: The National Cemetery System.)*

On July 17, 1862, President Abraham Lincoln signed an Act that provided for the establishment of burial grounds designed to honor U.S. soldiers who died in service to their country. This legislation, enacted during the Civil War, was intended to address the growing need for honorific burial of the thousands of soldiers who were dying on the battlefield.

Early grassroots initiatives propelled the most significant memorial effort to occur while the Civil War was still being fought: the development of Soldiers’ National Cemetery at Gettysburg. The cemetery was dedicated in November 1863, four months following the Battle of Gettysburg, and was intended as the ultimate memorial to the valor and triumph of the Union army.\textsuperscript{364}

In 1867, the U.S. government formalized the concept of soldiers’ and sailors’ cemeteries associated with Civil War battlefields through the designation of a national cemetery to be administered by the War Department. Thereafter,

Under this authority, in the years following the Civil War, the War Department developed the system of national cemeteries in the continental United States, which now includes some eighty-five units. Of these, eleven were on or near the major battlefields of the Civil War that eventually became the nuclei for the later establishments of national military parks or battlefield sites, as was the case with Gettysburg.\textsuperscript{365}

Only Union soldiers were honored through burial in the national cemetery system, however. Soldiers’ National Cemetery at Gettysburg was just one of many national cemeteries that were eventually established on or near Civil War battlefields; three other cemeteries were established during the war—Chattanooga, Antietam, and Shiloh. The inclusion of commemorative monuments was permitted in these cemeteries. The Soldiers National Monument was a signature feature of the cemetery at Gettysburg, and the incorporation law for the Antietam National Cemetery Association included instructions to the trustees to include “a monument or monuments” in addition to “suitable marks to designate the graves.”\textsuperscript{366}

Over time, national cemeteries would evolve to include a set of features intended to mark, honor, and commemorate the service of American soldiers, such as a perimeter wall, carved stone grave markers, monuments and memorial features, and rostrums for use during commemorative occasions such as Decoration Day, the precursor to Memorial Day. Although grave markers generally followed standard designs, the architectural style of monuments, memorials, and rostrums varied to a great degree. These features were generally carefully designed by state monument commissions or other organizations. Rostrum styles, for example, varied from small, classical Greek temples to pulpits, lecterns, and bandstand structures designed as focal points. Materials used in the construction of rostrums and monument included marble, granite, iron, bronze, steel, and wood.\textsuperscript{367}

\textsuperscript{363} Ibid., 87–92.
\textsuperscript{364} Edward Linenthal, *Sacred Ground: Americans and their Battlefields* (Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, 1991), 90.
\textsuperscript{367} Sammartino, E-10.
The First Five National Military Parks

(See also Historic Context Five: Civil War Military Site Preservation.)

Following the efforts to establish the Soldiers’ National Cemetery at Gettysburg as a place to appropriately memorialize—with “simple grandeur and propriety”—the soldiers buried there, interest remained in preserving and marking key locations associated with the Battle of Gettysburg on the battlefield itself.\(^{368}\) On April 30, 1864, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania chartered the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association (GBMA), which was charged with commemorating “the great deeds of valor... and the signal events which render these battlegrounds illustrious.” Founded while the Civil War was still in progress, the GBMA was one of the earliest historic preservation organizations in the country.\(^{369}\) Despite its formation, the majority of commemoration that occurred at Gettysburg and at other Civil War battlefields over the next twenty years was focused on the establishment and development of the national cemeteries.

Marking the sites of important military events continued to grow in popularity during the nineteenth century, culminating in the establishment of five national military parks by the U.S. government during the 1890s. These parks, which were to be administered by the War Department, were built on the work of the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association, a private veterans group that had developed a particular approach for marking the lines of battle at Gettysburg for posterity and to support military training and education. The battlefields chosen for preservation by the federal government were not selected at random, but “constituted, almost from the beginning, a national battlefield park system. As the Army War College pointed out later, these national parks were designed by Congress, both to preserve the major battlefields for historical and professional study and also to serve as lasting memorials to the great armies of the war on both sides.”\(^{370}\)

The idea of the national military park can be understood to have developed in two distinct periods. The first period ranges from 1863, with the establishment of Soldiers’ National Cemetery at Gettysburg, and ends with in the late 1870s and early 1880s with early attempts to preserve and mark the battlefield sites at Gettysburg and Antietam.

The second period begins in 1890 with the establishment of Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park and continues through establishment of Vicksburg National Military Park in 1899. This second period of development can be characterized as an effort to use battlefield commemoration as an act of reconciliation between North and South, fusing the memory of all who fought into a national narrative of bravery, military excellence, and heroism. Unlike Gettysburg, which in 1888 still only had state monuments along Union lines, the new national military park at Chickamauga and Chattanooga was intended to bear witness to the activities and bravery of both the North and South. The Act establishing Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park authorized the War Department to enter into agreements with private owners of battlefield lands that would allow them to occupy and cultivate the land with a regard, however, to preserving the existing buildings and roads, and the existing outlines of field and forest. The specific purpose of battlefield preservation would be to mark the lines of battle of all troops. This legislation was followed with the establishment of Shiloh National Military Park in 1894, Gettysburg National Military Park in 1895, and Vicksburg National Military Park in 1899.

\(^{368}\) “Report of the Select Committee Relative to the Soldiers’ National Cemetery together with the Accompanying Documents, as Reported to the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, March 31, 1864,” 37.


\(^{370}\) Ibid., 16.
Although marked as early as 1890, Antietam did not become a national military park until later.

**Private Groups and Veterans Associations**

*(See also Historic Context Five: Civil War Military Site Preservation.)*

Private citizens and veterans were the first to recognize the significance of America’s Civil War sites, and their early efforts to preserve and commemorate those places set the precedent for establishing and developing the national military parks. Among the earliest organizations formed to address the future of a Civil War battlefield was the GBMA, incorporated in April 1864 by non-veterans but taken over in 1880 by a state organization of Pennsylvania veterans. The GBMA was motivated by the idea that the preservation of the landscape in which an historic event occurred was crucial to conveying the significance of that event to future generations.³⁷¹ In characterizing its plans for the battlefield, the GBMA said the result would:

> Be the shrine of loyalty and patriotism, whither in all times will come the sons of America, and the pilgrims of all lands, to view with wonder and veneration the sacred scenes of heroic struggles, in which were involved the life of the nation and the perpetuation of liberty.³⁷²

The GBMA’s enabling act also explicitly stated the organization’s objective:

> To hold and preserve, the battle-grounds of Gettysburg, . . . as they were at the time of said battle, and by such perpetuation, and such memorial structures as a generous and patriotic people may aid to erect, to commemorate the heroic deeds, the struggles, and the triumphs of their brave defenders.³⁷³

Following the lead of the GBMA, other Union veterans soon began to form associations. The Society of the Army of the Tennessee and the Military Order of the Loyal Legion were both formed in 1865; the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR) was organized in 1866; the Society of the Army of the Cumberland was established in 1868; and the Society of the Army of the Potomac was formed in 1869. Many individual combat units, including divisions, brigades, regiments, and companies, also formed veterans’ organizations.

These groups held annual reunions, erected battlefield monuments, and lobbied state legislatures to appropriate funds for the erection of state monuments on numerous fields.³⁷⁴ When organized around a common goal, the veterans were able to wield considerable influence. The GAR posts in Pennsylvania would acquire sufficient shares in the GBMA in 1880 to effectively take over the organization. Under the tutelage of the veterans, the GMB continued a philosophy of preserving the battlefield, but also began a vigorous campaign to mark the field of battle with substantial monuments to the victorious Union forces.³⁷⁵

In the South, Confederate veterans groups were also formed, but generally the trend began later than in the North. The Southern Historical Society (SHS) was organized in New Orleans in 1869. The Association of the Army of Northern Virginia (AANVA) and the Association of the Army of Tennessee were both formed in 1877; the United Confederate Veterans (UCV) was established in 1889, and the UDC was organized in 1894. Like their Northern counterparts, these organizations promoted commemorative activities and raised funds for monuments.³⁷⁶

Rather than protest the efforts of the federal government to establish reservations on

³⁷¹ Abroe, 82.
³⁷² Amy Kinsel, “From these Honored Dead: Gettysburg in American Culture, 1863–1938” (Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 1992), 159.
³⁷³ Ibid., 160.
³⁷⁵ Kinsel, 175–176.
³⁷⁶ Hanson and Blythe, 29.
battlefields and mark the lines, the UCV, at its annual reunion in 1899, resolved that:

Whereas the Government of the United States has undertaken and is pushing forward the work of permanently marking the lines and positions of the troops of both contending armies on several great battlefields of the Civil War, among them Gettysburg, Chickamauga, Shiloh, Vicksburg, . . . That we as Confederate veterans, sympathize with and commend this patriotic purpose of the government, and will lend our influence and aid towards its full realization . . . we trust the people of the Southern States will take early and effective steps to erect upon these battlefields suitable monuments in honor of our glorious heroes in gray who fought and died for what they believed to be right.377

As the twentieth anniversary of the war approached, Union and Confederate veterans’ organizations began to work in concert in their ongoing efforts to preserve the battlefields. In 1888, for example, the Society of the Army of the Cumberland formed the committee of the Chickamauga Memorial Association and proposed a Joint Memorial Battlefield Association consisting of members from all states, both North and South, whose troops had participated in the battle. The Association’s efforts were instrumental in the successful effort to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Chickamauga.378

Through the 1880s, the GBMA continued to locate and place monuments at the positions held by state regiments. When the War Department took over administration of Gettysburg in 1895, it continued the work of the Association; by 1905 the War Department had constructed more than 20 miles of avenues marked with monuments and landscaped with fencing and plantings to lead visitors throughout a didactic landscape that illustrated both the events of battle and the brave actions of the soldiers. Authorization of four other national military parks—Antietam and Chickamauga/Chattanooga in 1890, Shiloh in 1894, and Vicksburg in 1899—occurred over the course of the final decade of the nineteenth century. For each, the War Department followed a similar approach to park establishment and design, placing monuments and tablets at critical battlefield locations. The marked lines were connected by roads that facilitated touring for educational purposes.

The military parks protected battlefield land from development, in some cases restored historic landscape features, provided opportunities for military training and historical research, and allowed for reunions of veterans. The placement of markers was undertaken painstakingly with the assistance of hundreds of veterans who returned to the battlefields to relocate troop positions, engagement areas, high water points, etc. For this reason, the national military parks are irreplaceable indications of actual events. The federal government generally adopted an approach:

. . . of preserving the battlefields as nearly as possible in their condition at the time of the battle. This policy was implemented in part by continuing the historic farmhouses and fields in use for agricultural purposes, thus adding life to the scene, at the same time reducing the costs of maintenance. The far-sighted practice of purchase and lease-back with preservation conditions was adopted as a tool of land management. Congress recognized that specialized knowledge was required to ascertain, mark, and preserve the main lines of battle and the cultural features of the terrain.379

Although these efforts to preserve and commemorate Civil War battlefields were extremely popular, they were ultimately very expensive, and the government was forced to seek ways to prioritize land acquisition and share acquisition and management costs. After the establishment of Vicksburg National Military

Park, few additional battlefields were preserved until after Congress had a chance to fund a study that would help prioritize acquisitions in 1926.

**The National Union of Andersonville Survivors**

After several attempts to organize societies of soldiers who had been confined in Southern prisons during the Civil War failed, on April 9, 1874, the National Union of Andersonville Survivors was formed in Worcester, Massachusetts, with Warren Lee Goss of Norwich, Connecticut named president. The organization changed names several times, including the National Union of Survivors of Andersonville, and other Southern Military Prisons, before becoming the Union Ex-Prisoners of War Association in 1887. The goal of the group was “to strengthen the ties of fraternal fellowship and sympathy, formed by companionship in arms during the Civil War among the survivors of Rebel military prisons; to perpetuate the name and fame of those who have fallen in the prison pens of the South, and in the line of duty; to bind together in the most friendly ties the survivors of the above prisons by joint action of its members in any direction which will secure justice to the living and honor to the dead, and to assist such of our fellow-prisoners as need help and protection, and to extend needful aid to the widow and orphans of those who have fallen.” Membership in the organization peaked in the 1890s. Records suggest that the organization remained in operation at least until the 1910s.

**Efforts Conducted by the Grand Army of the Republic, including at Andersonville, 1891–1896**

*(See also Historic Context Five: Civil War Military Site Preservation.)*

As noted above, the GAR was founded in 1866 as a veterans’ organization. Benjamin F. Stephenson was its official founder. On April 6, 1866, Stephenson identified the guidelines for membership, which indicated that it would be open only to honorably discharged veterans of the Union Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Revenue Cutter Service who had served between April 12, 1861, and April 9, 1865. The organization was to be composed of community-level posts that would be given a number and tied to a particular Department representing a state or region. Posts could also be given names by the members, including the use of names of deceased individuals as a means for honoring service. The Departments reported to a national oversight committee with an elected Commander-in-Chief. Posts operated in accordance with meeting and induction rituals that were similar to Masonic systems. These were eventually handed down to the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, another organization founded to commemorate the Civil War.

As part of their mission, the GAR commemorated the Civil War by founding soldiers’ homes, providing relief to veterans in need, and lobbying for pension legislation. The GAR was instrumental in codifying the practice of setting aside May 30 as a day of remembrance for fallen soldiers.

The GAR became a powerful political entity, helping to elect Ulysses S. Grant to the presidency. In fact, five postwar presidents were members of the GAR. The GAR was also instrumental in organizing the veterans’ reunions that took place on many Civil War battlefields during the 1880s, helping reconcile and reunify the nation. These veterans’ reunions were one of the important factors leading to the establishment of the first five national military parks during the 1890s.

One of the important legacies of the GAR is the observance of Memorial Day, which originated as Decoration Day. In 1868, Gen. John A. Logan, Commander-in-Chief of the GAR, suggested that members of the organization take the opportunity of decorating the graves of fallen soldiers on May
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30. He was inspired by the work of his wife, who had helped decorate Confederate graves in Virginia with other Southern women. 382

During the late nineteenth century, several auxiliary organizations were established to support the GAR. These included the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War (founded in 1881, and representative of the original GAR), Auxiliary to the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War (founded in 1883), Woman’s Relief Corps (founded in 1883), Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War (organized in 1885), and Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic (chartered as the Loyal Ladies League, and nationalized as the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic in 1886). 383

The GAR served several important roles at Andersonville. On January 25, 1889, ex-Union soldiers living in Georgia, many of whom were African American, met in Atlanta to form a Georgia Department of the Grand Army of the Republic. On Memorial Day 1889, members of the newly formed Post #5 of the GAR from Macon, Georgia, decorated the graves of their fallen comrades at Andersonville. As many as 7,000 were in attendance for the proceedings on this, the twenty-fifth anniversary year of the establishment of the prison. 384

In 1891, the GAR, Department of Georgia, acquired the prison site through a fund raising effort amongst its membership and subscriptions. 385 On January 28, 1891, George W. Kennedy sold a 73-1/2 acre parcel with a 100 foot right-of-way leading toward the railroad to the GAR of Georgia for $1,500. 386 The parcel contained the stockade site except for the northwest corner and some of the surrounding earthworks. During its first year overseeing the site, the GAR made improvements to the property including clearing undergrowth while leaving large trees standing, and planting a hedge around the property that later died, as well as other hedges around the remaining eighteen wells. They also graded a belt roadway around the outer limit of the property, built two bridges, flushed the creek and made improvements to control washing, and graded a central avenue and a roadway leading from the avenue to Providence Spring. 387

Later, near the turn of the century, several states which had had soldiers at Andersonville prison appointed commissions and began to plan monuments. Land for these memorials was deeded to states as they needed it. The monumentation efforts were enthusiastically supported by the GAR, and later the Woman’s Relief Corps, and the interest of states in erecting monuments at the site quickly grew. Soon fifteen states had erected monuments at Andersonville, with the Woman’s Relief Corps adding five more. To dedicate Michigan’s monument, two train car loads of visitors traveled to the site. Governor Aaron T. Bliss, his staff, his council and members of the Legislature were among the attendees; Mrs. Bliss unveiled the monument. 388

**Efforts Conducted by National Woman’s Relief Corps, Including at Andersonville, 1897–1910**

Several years after the founding of the GAR posts, women’s auxiliaries began to be formed in association with many of the posts. These
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auxiliaries would be chartered as a Woman’s Relief Corps with a mission of forming a community of the mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters of Civil War veterans and supporting the work of veterans, and their organizations. The statement of purpose for the patriotic organization was:

To perpetuate the memory of the Grand Army of the Republic, as we the National Woman’s Relief Corps are their auxiliary and were organized at their request in 1883, and of men who saved the Union in 1861 to 1865; to assist in every practicable way in the preservation and making available for research of documents and records pertaining to the Grand Army of the Republic and its members; to cooperate in doing honor to all those who have patriotically served our country in any war; to teach patriotism and the duties of citizenship, the true history of our country, and the love and honor of our flag; to oppose every tendency or movement that would weaken loyalty to, or make for the destruction or impairment of, our constitutional Union; and to inculcate and broadly sustain the American principles of representative government, of equal rights, and of impartial justice for all.389

By 1896, the GAR realized that its funding was insufficient to adequately develop the prison park, and the officers offered the site to the National Woman’s Relief Corps as an unencumbered gift. At the fourteenth annual convention of the Relief Corps, a resolution was passed accepting the property. The Woman’s Relief Corps arranged to purchase the remaining 14-1/2 acres of the original site from the owners in 1897. During the year following acquisition of the property, the Relief Corps had the property enclosed with a wire fence and gate, erected a caretaker’s residence and stable, cleared the bushes along the creek, and planted the stockade enclosure area with grass. In 1898, an 115-foot-tall flagpole was erected, and a memorial arch was built on the west boundary of the park inscribed with “Andersonville Prison Park/In Memory of the Unknown Dead at Andersonville.”390 William Wilson, a veteran, was appointed Superintendent, and a house for the superintendent and visitors was constructed.391

The gates established at the cemetery were originally located at Boston Common, as noted in the following 1898 newspaper article detailing the activities of the National Woman’s Relief Corps:

The old west gates of Boston Common, which were erected immediately after the war at a cost of $10,000, and recently presented to the W.R.C. by the City of Boston for the purpose, will be put in place this Spring at the main western approach to the prison grounds.

The committee is anxious to make improvements as fast as the means can be secured. Among others of importance, they contemplate the erection of a fine pavilion over “Providence Spring,” and a magnificent bronze monument, to be erected by appropriations from Congress and various State Legislatures.392

In 1901, the National Woman’s Relief Corps arranged to have a granite pavilion and pool erected at Providence Spring, while survivors of the prison donated a fountain. The Corps voted to deed to any state, free of cost except for legal fees, the land on which to place monuments to its soldiers who had died at Andersonville.

Integral to the work of the Woman’s Relief Corps was the leadership of Mrs. Lizabeth Ann Turner, elected National President of the organization in 1895. After spending much of the Civil War aiding
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sick and wounded soldiers in the Boston, Massachusetts, area, Mrs. Turner turned her attention to veterans’ relief organizations. During her tenure as president, Mrs. Turner supported the organization’s efforts at Andersonville in several ways. She died in 1907 at Andersonville while preparing for the annual Memorial Day proceedings. On June 27, 1908, the Woman’s Relief Corps dedicated a memorial to her at Andersonville.  

A chapel was constructed in 1908 through the efforts of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic. The one-story building had a rock-faced concrete masonry exterior with decorative sills and string courses and an arched entryway. Sarah Winans served as Mrs. Turner’s successor as chairman of the Woman’s Relief Corps Committee on Andersonville. In 1909, she reported that the drainage system at Providence Spring had failed yet again, and recommended that a pool be added within the pavilion to limit the need for making constant repairs. Mrs. Winans also noted the addition of a monument to Confederate Commandant Henry Wirz in Andersonville. “Someday,” she predicted, “a thunderbolt like unto the one that opened up ‘Providence Spring’... will lower the statue with the name ‘Wirz’ chiseled upon it.” The stone obelisk, in the central square of the town, was erected in 1908 by the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

After Andersonville National Cemetery was established and the graves marked, veterans worked to commemorate the sites of events associated with the war with monuments and markers. Several states erected monuments in the national cemetery, while others established monuments in the area of the stockade. Monuments erected in the cemetery honored Union soldiers from the following states:

- New Jersey (1899)
- Maine (1904)
- Pennsylvania (1905)
- Iowa (1906)
- Connecticut (1907)
- Indiana (1908)

Monuments were erected in the prison park by the following states:

- Massachusetts (1901)
- Ohio (1901)
- Rhode Island (1903)
- Michigan (1904)
- Wisconsin (1907)

In addition, the National Woman’s Relief Corps erected the Elizabeth Turner Monument in the prison park in 1908.

**Battlefield and Historic Site Commemoration and Administration by the U.S. War Department and U.S. Army, 1910–1970**

*(See also Historic Context Five: Civil War Military Site Preservation.)*

The prison site was donated by the National Woman’s Relief Corps to the United States Government in 1910, to be administered by the War Department, later the Department of the Army. On May 30, 1911, the Woman’s Relief Corps presented the federal government with a sundial monument designed to commemorate its oversight of the property. Belle C. Harris, National President of the Woman’s Relief Corps, presented
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394. The chapel is often mistakenly referred to as the Woman’s Relief Corps Chapel since the group was the official auxiliary to the GAR.

the sundial to Capt. J. W. Bryant, the new Superintendent of the Army Post.\textsuperscript{396}

In the 1910s, several additional monuments were erected by individual states. These included monuments in the cemetery—Illinois (1912), designed by William Carby’s Zimmerman and Charles Mulligan; New York (1914); and Minnesota (1916) designed by John K. Daniels—and one additional monument in the prison park—Tennessee (1915). From the 1910s to the 1930s, the National Woman’s Relief Corps erected several additional monuments on the prison site, one of which honored Clara Barton (1915). Other monuments erected by this organization on the prison site during this period included the Sundial Monument (1911), the National Woman’s Relief Corps Monument (1929), and the National Woman’s Relief Corps Monument to Eight States (1934).

In 1918, Confederate veteran John Gratz visited Andersonville. He visited the national cemetery and observed that the earthworks of the prison were visible, though wooded, that the stockade palisades had been replaced by a row of pecan \textit{Carya illinoiensis} trees, and that the wells remained, surrounded by wire fencing and vegetation. He visited Providence Spring and its stone pavilion, and noted the collapsed bridge at Stockade Branch. The Star Fort area of the prison park had not been maintained, and the trails and hillsides were overgrown. Markers had disappeared, and painted signs on posts indicated the locations of the various prison sites and Confederate gun positions.\textsuperscript{397}

In 1922, Superintendent William M. Coates began the process of permanently marking the stockade line with concrete posts. By 1927, 116 concrete markers had been installed. Other lettered concrete pillars were added to Star Fort to mark gun sites, magazines, Major Henry Wirz’s office, and the sally port.\textsuperscript{398}

In 1928, a new brick stable was erected. This building was used to exhibit prisoner of war history from 1987 until 1996.\textsuperscript{399}

On December 13, 1928, John M. Morin, Chairman of Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, introduced bill HR 15330 that authorizing the Federal Government to accept bronze commemorative tablets from the Woman’s Relief Corps that would be placed at Andersonville. The tablets contained Lincoln’s Gettysburg address and General John A. Logan’s Memorial Day Order Number 11. The plaques were dedicated in a May 30, 1929, Memorial Day ceremony, with Minnie T. Horsemann, National Woman’s Relief Corps President, presenting them to Col. Henry Wagner of the U. S. Army. That same year, after a wooden flagpole that had been erected by the Woman’s Relief Corps blew down in a storm, the organization replaced it with a 70 foot metal pole.\textsuperscript{400}

In 1932, Georgia State Highway 49 was built on a new alignment just west of the cemetery and prison park, partially following the route of the Old Dixie Highway.

The 1934 Woman’s Relief Corps convention also took note of the well-kept grounds at the park. They felt the bridges needed replacing but were pleased that money had already been set aside by the government to build concrete bridges.\textsuperscript{401}

Flo Jamison Miller, Chairman of the Andersonville Committee, reported to the organization that eight states with only a few men buried at the prison park had not put up monuments. She noted that the committee had begun the process of erecting one for each of them at a cost of $500.00.\textsuperscript{402} On
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February 2, 1936, in a ceremony “in bitter cold . . . unpleasant weather,” Mary Love, National President of the Woman’s Relief Corps, presented the monuments to Lt. Charles Mathews of the Officer Reserve Corps, on duty with the CCC camp and representing the United States. 403

The dedication of these monuments in 1936 marked the end of efforts of patriotic groups to honor by monument those who died in the Andersonville prison. During this memorialization period there were surprisingly few burials in Andersonville Cemetery—only fifty between 1870 and 1939. One reason was that few Union veterans wished to be buried so far away from their homes and families. Additionally, Confederate veterans were not given the right to be buried in national cemeteries until after 1900, and even then most of them did not choose to be buried with their former enemies. 404

**The contribution of New Deal-era programs.** Andersonville was one of the beneficiaries of President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s national work programs to help the unemployed. Between 1933 and 1942, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) would support research, conservation, restoration, reconstruction, and interpretation projects at many national and state parks as well as other historic properties such as Andersonville, at the time administered by the U.S. Army. The first park to receive the assistance of CCC labor was Morristown National Historical Park, beginning in 1933. Although its efforts are sometimes criticized for a lack of accuracy or for being harmful to historic park resources, the CCC generally produced exemplary work and set precedents for future archeological and historical investigations. 405

In 1933:

> When the Emergency Conservation Work (ECW) began, NPS officials thought primarily of using the enrollees on park development and nature conservation projects. However, in the summer of 1933 the War Department transferred 11 national military parks, 11 national cemeteries, 10 national battlefields, 10 national monuments, three memorials, and two national parks to the Park Service, and this increased the magnitude of work to be accomplished. 406

At first, park officials were concerned about the capabilities of the ECW laborers to conduct the very specialized and sensitive archeological and historical investigations that would be needed to address the needs of the park. In a letter to CCC Director Fechner, General Douglas MacArthur indicated:

> It must be borne in mind that the development of these parks has for its purpose the restoration of the battle fields and preserving historic locations, monuments and sites of battle. Consequently, such work as is done must be performed with this in view, in order that the trench system and other historic points may not be destroyed but retained in their present condition or restored to the condition they were in at the time of the battle. In other words, the Emergency Conservation Work to be performed must be in accordance with the plan of restoration already determined by the Commissions and approved by the Secretary of War. 407

Government agencies slowly grew in the role of administering the use of the CCC laborers at historic properties. They began by hiring supervisors with backgrounds in history and archeology to oversee the research and archeological work, and the development of interpretive materials. Over time, the CCC
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enrollees were trained in historical work prior to assuming their first assignments.

In 1934, the CCC program expanded from the first work conducted at Morristown to several other parks, including Colonial National Monument, Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, Grand Canyon National Park, Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park, Petersburg National Battlefield, Shiloh National Military Park, and Vicksburg National Military Park. The CCC provided labor to conduct restoration at many of these military parks, including the rebuilding of rifle-pits, earthworks, soldiers’ huts, and gun emplacements. The NPS enacted a policy that restoration work would be limited to only those structures necessary to illustrate the significance of the park.

Beginning in 1941, the CCC camps began to lose men and funding as the United States entered World War II. After 1942, it became increasingly difficult for the parks to adapt to the loss of CCC labor and New Deal funding, and many struggled to adequately preserve and protect the cultural resources under their care.408

The Civilian Conservation Corps at Andersonville

(See also Historic Context Three: The National Cemetery System.)

During the 1930s, two CCC camps were located at Andersonville.409 The camps resulted from a request submitted on June 18, 1934, by Col. Duncan Major, Jr., of the War Department to Robert Fechner, director of ECW. His request entailed a work project at Andersonville National Prison Park to address site improvements. After the project received approval in early August, members of Company 1411 set up a temporary camp under the direction of Lt. Platos Rhyne on September 28, 1934. The temporary tent camp, located on the north slope of the prison site, consisted of four, fifty-man tents, an officer’s tent, and a mess tent.

A permanent camp was later built west of Georgia State Route 49, across from the national cemetery entrance. By December 1934, it contained four pine barracks, each housing fifty men. Additional buildings consisted of a kitchen/mess hall, officer’s quarters, recreation hall, education building, latrine, and pumping facility.410 There was also a field used for ballgames and drills.

Company 1411 operated for a total of fourteen months, and was closed on December 31, 1935. During their time at Andersonville, Company 1411 built roads, bridges, stormwater management and erosion control structures, cleared brush, and planted trees.

Following closure of the Company 1411 camp, work continued beginning on January 1, 1936, with members of Company 4455 assuming responsibility for work at Andersonville. Company 4455 was originally stationed at Fort Benning, Georgia. Fifty men were detailed to the camp at Andersonville to continue improvements at Andersonville National Cemetery. They continued in this role for one year, departing on January 1, 1937.

During this time, the CCC workers constructed a stone gateway at the Pecan Lane entrance to the park (Figure 23), stone and concrete features marking the prison stockade location and the site where the Raiders were hanged, and the Prison Site Road for visitors to circumnavigate the prison site. The road featured two concrete bridges over Stockade Branch (Figure 24).

---

408. Paige, Civilian Conservation Corps.
pools to control the outflow from the spring (Figure 25 and Figure 26). A gravel trail and service drive was established around Star Fort. The CCC also remodeled and expanded the 1872 caretaker’s lodge in the cemetery in 1936.411 The entrance gates to the cemetery were also reconstructed at this time, and the 1908 chapel was remodeled.412

![Figure 25. View toward Providence springhouse following CCC improvements, circa 1936. (Source: Alan Marsh, “Andersonville’s New Deal: Civilian Conservation Corps,” September 2011)](image)

The CCC also did landscaping work and constructed retaining and freestanding walls, paved drainage channels, and culverts, as well as a retaining “well” near the Providence Springhouse (Figure 25).

Work at the Providence Springhouse included a new brick floor inside the springhouse, construction of a parking lot, a concrete walkway with a bridge, and a series of small brick-edged pools.

411. A plaque in the museum collection storage, which apparently hung on the front of the building at one time, reads: “Erected 1908 / by the Ladies of the Grand Army / Remodeled 1936.” Correspondence with Andersonville National Historic Site staff.

**Rostrum**

In 1941, the cemetery was expanded eastward by the U.S. Army with a new rostrum and angled perimeter walls (Figure 27 through Figure 29). As part of this work, more than 400 linear feet of the nineteenth century brick wall was removed, including an original gate at the centerline of the cemetery. A new 20-inch-thick random ashlar stone masonry wall was built on a concrete footing, including piers, metal fencing, and new metal gates at either end of the new section of wall. The new walls extended east approximately 40 feet and then continued on a diagonal to the rostrum. The 20-foot by 50-foot rostrum had a concrete foundation and stone masonry walls. The rostrum would provide a podium for speeches conducted as part of public gatherings and events such as Memorial Day observances. As such it would become an important component of the commemorative landscape of the Andersonville National Cemetery.

![Figure 27. Drawing of the rostrum and wall, 1940. (Source: NPS Drawing No. 437-80073, sheet 1)](image)

---

FIGURE 28. Drawing of the rostrum, 1940. (Source: NPS Drawing No. 437-80073, sheet 2)

FIGURE 29. Drawing of the rostrum, 1940. (Source: NPS Drawing No. 437-80073, sheet 3)
1950s–1960s Alterations

In 1958, the Woman’s Relief Corps caretaker’s residence at the prison park was demolished. Additional work was performed at the cemetery in 1960–1961, including reconstruction of the cemetery gate and the construction of two new outbuildings, a maintenance building north of the administration building outside the cemetery wall and a well house north of the caretaker’s lodge within the walls. The well house, completed in 1961, replaced an earlier well house at the same location. At about this time, the nineteenth century outbuildings north of the caretaker’s lodge within the cemetery walls were demolished. Also, a new parking area was established outside the western entrance to the cemetery.

Military Site Commemoration and Interpretation Efforts Conducted by the National Park Service

Andersonville National Historic Site was established under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior by federal legislation in October 1970, incorporating the two areas previously administered by the United States Army: Andersonville Prison Park and Andersonville National Cemetery, which would thereafter be administered by the National Park Service.

The stated purpose of the enabling legislation was:

... to provide an understanding of the overall prisoner of war story of the Civil War, to interpret the role of prisoner of war camps in history, to commemorate the sacrifice of Americans who lost their lives in such camps, and to preserve the monuments located therein....

The enabling legislation also authorized the Secretary of the Interior to designate:

... not more than five hundred acres in Macon and Sumter Counties, Georgia, for establishment as the Andersonville National Historic Site [and to acquire this acreage] by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, transfer from a Federal agency, or exchange lands and interests therein for the purposes of this Act.414

The site was administratively listed in the National Register upon its establishment in 1970. In 1976, National Register documentation was prepared for Andersonville National Historic Site as a historic district. The documentation of the site was accepted by the Keeper of the National Register on November 24, 1978.

From 1971 until 1998, the park museum was located in the former 1908 chapel and focused on Andersonville’s Civil War history.415 In 1987, the west storage building was converted into a one-room museum to tell the story of prisoners of war from wars other than the Civil War. In 1996 it was converted into housing for former prisoners of war and renamed the POW Guest House (now called the Volunteer Guest House).416

During the 1970s and 1980s, several monuments were constructed while site work was conducted within the national historic site. The Georgia Monument was erected in 1976, designed by sculptor William J. Thompson. The Odd Fellows and Rebekahs Monument (Monument to the Unknown) was built in 1984, and the Stalag XVII-B Monument in 1989.

In 1976, a connecting road was constructed between the cemetery and prison park parcels. Circa 1970s, cannon were placed on wood platforms around the prison site.

In 1981, all but four of the hand-dug wells on the prison site were filled for safety, stabilization, and protection, and most of the well fencing was


415. “Andersonville National Historic Site History,” typed manuscript, no author, no date, Andersonville National Historic Site park files.

416. Correspondence with Andersonville National Historic Site staff; see also Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1996.
removed. Concrete markers were placed to indicate the former well locations, and the metal fencing was salvaged and re-fabricated to create a metal gate at the Pecan Lane gateway to the prison site. (Two other wells have been filled since that time; only two open well remnants remain.) In 1983, woody growth was cleared from the stream valley and earthworks at the prison site. Also circa 1983, three new maintenance buildings were added to the site, east of the cemetery rostrum.

In 1987, the northeast portion of the stockade was reconstructed for interpretive purposes, followed by reconstruction of the north gate in 1991. Interpretive replica shelters, tents, rail fence, and stocks adjacent to the northeast stockade wall were also put in place at this time. Interpretive programs were conducted inside the prison at the North Gate and deadline following 1991. In 1994, the stockade was again rebuilt as a result of erosion and other safety concerns. The southeast corner was reconstructed soon after the north gate, but due to deterioration and termite damage, it was later removed.

The National Park Service has conducted a series of archeological investigations at the park since the 1970s, including investigations of the inner, middle, and outer stockade, gates, deadline, and hospital locations; areas considered for opening to new burials; locations of planned construction or universal access improvements; and other research purposes. Previous archeological studies and archeological resources identified are discussed in the Existing Conditions chapter for each area of the national historic site. In addition, refer to the Bibliography for further information on archeological reports issued on the investigations listed above.

The National Park Service has also conducted several planning studies for the park, including a Master Plan during the 1960s; an interpretive prospectus in 1974; a General Management Plan/Development Concept Plan/Environmental Assessment in 1988; a Long-Range Interpretive Plan in 2010; Cultural Landscape Inventories for Andersonville Memorial Landscape and Andersonville National Cemetery, also in 2010; and a Cultural Landscape Report in 2014.

In addition to ongoing stewardship of the prison camp site, cultural landscape, buildings and monuments, and active national cemetery, the National Park Service has continued to implement improvements and to maintain and preserve the national historic site. A new entrance road for the park was constructed in 1997. In 1999, work was completed on converting the former Cemetery Chapel for use as the curatorial storage/museum collection area and cemetery office. Also in 1999, 7,000 square feet of the nineteenth-century brick wall were repointed around the national cemetery. In 2004, the Memorial Section in the cemetery was enlarged to extend along the stone wall on either side.

In 2002, the authorized boundary of the park was expanded from 500 to 520 acres in order to accommodate proposed parcel acquisition. The Friends of Andersonville acquired and donated the additional acreage northeast of the park to create a safer and more appropriate entrance dedicated solely to park traffic. In 2009, a metal boundary fence was erected along Georgia State

418. Alan Marsh, personal communication.
Route 49, at a portion of the park’s eastern and northern boundary.

Ornamental plantings at the rostrum were removed in November 2009 and replaced in 2010.

Today Andersonville National Cemetery contains more than 20,000 interments and remains an active burial site. Administered by the National Park Service, Andersonville National Cemetery uses the same eligibility criteria as cemeteries administered by the National Cemetery Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Committal services are held in the rostrum. Park personnel provide opening and closing of graves, assist funeral directors and family members with arrangements for interment, and maintain the cemetery grounds. Perpetual care of the gravesites is provided, and cemetery regulations address burial procedures, use of the site, and grave decoration policy. A large magnolia was removed in 2014 due to its poor condition. Also, in 2014 a temporary flagpole was erected at the Star Fort for the one-hundred fiftieth anniversary of Civil War events at the park.

Evolution of Commemorative Monumentation and Expansion of the Prisoner of War Story beyond Andersonville to a National Level

The National Park Service has also supported and significantly expanded the role of the site in interpreting prisoner of war camps in history and commemorating the sacrifice of Americans who lost their lives in such camps. This has occurred through the development of a National Prisoner of War Museum, and a Commemorative Memorial Plaque Walkway.

National Prisoner of War Museum. As noted in a summary prepared by then Superintendent of Andersonville National Historic Site, Fred Boyles, the idea to establish a “museum to commemorate the sacrifices of all POWs in American history has its roots many years ago.” He noted that, as the Army indicated its interest in ending its oversight of the cemetery and the prison park, and local citizens began to suggest the property be designated a unit of the National Park System, other groups, such as the United Daughters of the Confederacy, raised concerns about the negative stories that might be told about the South, rather than a balanced picture of prison camps in both the North and the South. Possibly in response to these concerns, but also to encompass the POW experience of all Americans in history, the story at Andersonville was broadened. George Hartzog, then Director of the National Park Service, has credited President Lyndon B. Johnson with the idea, and the museum grew out of the suggestion.

As noted previously, it was Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter’s commissioning of a monument for the national cemetery that was dedicated to all POWs that helped to shape the park narrative. Unveiled in 1976, the monument was unique as until that time no monuments had been placed in the park by southern states, and also for its recognition of all POWs, not just those of Andersonville.422

During the early 1980s, the park reached out to the American Ex-Prisoners of War (AXPW), recognizing that it had not been attending to its mission to commemorate all POWs. Through meetings and discussions, AXPW agreed that Andersonville would serve as the National Memorial to all POWs, and that a museum should be built on site to tell the larger story.423

In 1984, AXPW signed an agreement with the National Park Service to help raise funds in the amount of $2.5 million to build the museum. The agreement established the Andersonville Fund. The National Park Service followed up by articulating the goal of having the museum in the park in its General Management Plan. In the meantime, in November 1987, the park opened a prisoner of war exhibit in the 1928 brick storage house north of the prison site (today’s Volunteer


423. Ibid.
Guest House) to interpret the prisoner of war experience from wars other than the Civil War.\textsuperscript{424}

In 1990, with a large appropriation from Congress, museum planning and design began in earnest. A team of National Park Service architects and engineers was appointed from the Denver Service Center to initiate the design, while exhibit design was added later. Goals for the effort included building something that would convey to visitors a total understanding of the story of all POWs, and to work collaboratively with the AXPW in the design process. While many AXPW members served on committees in this capacity over the years, Bill and Nancy Fornes were recognized by Superintendent Boyles for participating throughout the entire process.

Boyles has also noted that the AXPW committee members were instrumental in developing the courtyard concept as a place where visitors could contemplate the POW story and reflect in an appropriate environment. AXPW also took full responsibility for commissioning the artwork and sculpture for the courtyard. The efforts conducted by the National Park Service and the AXPW were further supported by the Friends of the Park, established in 1988, who helped raise necessary funds and support for the project throughout the state of Georgia.\textsuperscript{425} When fundraising proved insufficient to meet the construction costs anticipated, Congressman Pete Peterson of Florida, a former POW, introduced a bill for the U.S. Mint to produce a commemorative coin with proceeds to fund the project. The Prisoner of War Memorial Silver Dollar, which carries an image of a bald eagle in flight on the obverse side and an image of the National Prisoner of War Museum on the reverse, was made available for purchase in August 1994 and was an immediate success; Congress authorized the National Park Service to proceed with construction of the museum in late 1994.

The Andersonville Trust was established under the auspices of the Friends of Andersonville in 1996 to support the continuing interpretation of the American prisoner of war story and the important role of this historic site in the telling of this story.

Construction of the National Prisoner of War Museum, a 10,000 square foot building, began in the summer of 1996. On April 9, 1998, the fifty-sixth anniversary of the fall of the Bataan peninsula during World War II, thousands of former prisoners of war and their families, along with national and local supporters of the park, gathered to dedicate the National Prisoner of War Museum (Figure 30).\textsuperscript{426}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Entrance, National Prisoner of War Museum, 2010. (Source: All photos by authors, unless otherwise noted)}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Commemorative plaques.} Following the opening of the National Prisoner of War Museum in 1998, recognizing the interest in groups and organizations to locate commemorative plaques in association with the museum, the Superintendent of Andersonville National Historic Site sent a memorandum to the Regional Director of the National Park Service requesting consideration of

\textsuperscript{424} “Andersonville National Historic Site History,” and Boyles, “The Evolution of the National Prisoner of War Museum Andersonville National Historic Site.”

\textsuperscript{425} Boyles, “The Evolution of the National Prisoner of War Museum Andersonville National Historic Site.”

\textsuperscript{426} April 9, the anniversary of the fall of the Bataan peninsula during World War II, was selected as the opening day for the museum. This date was first proclaimed National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day by President Reagan in 1987.
the establishment of a “Commemorative Memorial Plaque Walkway.” The memorandum indicated:

In compliance with 36 CFR 2.62; Memorialization and 9.17 “Commemorative Works and Plaques,” NPS Management Policies, we are submitting for review and approval a proposal to establish a new “Commemorative Memorial Plaque Walkway.” This new commemorative walkway will be located in the grass area above the sidewalk in the lower parking deck of the new National Prisoner of War Museum.

It has been a year since the National Park Service dedicated and opened to the public the National Prisoner of War Museum. This project continues to be an outstanding example of collaboration and what can be accomplished with park partners and supporters. The completion of this project would have not been possible if not for the fulfillment of our Memorandum of Agreement and fundraising obligations of the American Ex-Prisoners of War (AXPW) and “The Friends of Andersonville.” As part of the building, a commemorative courtyard was included in the original design, that not only included three brick relief wall sculptures and a bronze statue, but also space for six commemorative plaques. All six spaces, that were assigned on a “first come first served basis,” were reserved and plaques were on site prior to the opening of the museum. Several were dedicated on the same day as the grand opening of the museum. Prior to and since the opening of the museum the historic site has received an overwhelming amount of requests from POW and/or military organizations (that have a POW affiliation) for the placement of additional commemorative plaques in the courtyard or in the museum. We have regrettably denied these requests due to not having an appropriate and NPS approved designated site for additional commemorative plaques. It was also part of the agreement with AXPW that no commemorative plaques and/or walls would be allowed in the interior of the museum. The historic site’s proposal is to designate the grass area above the walkway in the lower parking lot of the POW Museum as a

“Commemorative Memorial Plaque Walkway (see attached drawing). This whole area, including the museum is located to the north of the old prison site and the historic zone. These plaques would be the same size . . . as those in the courtyard and would be mounted on a slanted . . . granite slab . . . . At three feet apart the site will be able to accommodate a total of forty commemorative plaques. Submissions will be carefully reviewed to not only insure compliance with size and composition of materials but also for historical content (as appropriate), accuracy, and design elements prior to final approval. The historic site has completed and met all its responsibilities under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and 36 CFR Part 800 (see attached documentation).”427

The memorandum outlined the framework for the design of plaques to be considered for inclusion, including the design, review, and approval process, and articulated the value of establishing such a commemorative feature as providing “the historic site with another excellent avenue by which to accomplish its diverse congressional mandates of interpreting the story of all Prisoners of War throughout our nation’s history. It will also defuse complaints that a particular aspect of the prisoner of war story is not being told in the museum.”428 Finally, the memorandum tied the proposal to meeting the park’s mission as the only park to serve as a memorial to all Americans ever held as prisoners of war, with a purpose, as articulated in the Congressional enabling legislation, “to provide an understanding of the overall prisoner of war story of the Civil War, to interpret the role of the prisoner of war camps in history, to commemorate the sacrifices of Americans who lost their lives in such camps, and to preserve the monuments located therein.”429

The proposal was quickly approved, and the first plaques dedicated in 2000. Several additional plaques were added in 2001 through 2003, and

428. Ibid.
429. “An Act to authorize the establishment of the Andersonville National Historic Site in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes” (84 Stat. 989).
again in 2009. The most recent addition was made in 2013.


With several plaques already in place at the park, the guiding document allowed for thoughtful additions to a system that had already been established with the construction of the museum. The guidelines document indicated the following:

The National Park Service defines the term commemorative as any statue, monument, sculpture, memorial, or other structures or landscape features, designed to perpetuate in a permanent manner the memory of a person, group, event, or other significant element of history. For this purpose, Congress has authorized the placing of commemorative works at certain battlefields and other parks. The placement of commemorative plaques at Andersonville National Historic Site is for the purpose of enhancing overall visitor understanding of the prisoner of war story in American history. Approved commemorative plaques will adhere to the interpretive mandates set forth in the enabling legislation “… to provide an understanding of the overall prisoner of war story of the Civil War, to interpret the role of prisoner of war camps in history, and to commemorate the sacrifice of Americans who lost their lives in such camps…”

The document indicated that approval for new plaques by the Director of the National Park Service or as delegated to the Park Superintendent by official memorandum is required for the placement of all commemorative plaques at Andersonville National Historic Site (36 CFR 2.62). The document also indicated the process for filing an application (including a written request and drawing) for consideration of new plaques, and the need for approval prior to any plaque fabrication. The document further articulates guidelines for inscriptions and materials (bronze plaque and granite base). It also indicates that the cost of the plaque, base, transportation and delivery, as well as installation, is to be borne by the sponsoring organization. Following installation and receipt of a deed of gift and transfer of ownership, the National Park Service accepts responsibility for maintenance or damage to the plaque. The Friends of Andersonville, the document notes, is in a position to receive donations to the offset the cost of perpetual care of the plaque.

The document also outlines the guidelines for design and size of plaques, indicating that future plaques are to be in keeping with the existing plaques approved and installed in the commemorative courtyard of the National Prisoner of War Museum, and with the historic integrity of the park. Further, the document also outlines siting placement guidelines, including the requirement that the plaques be carefully sited to avoid disturbance of natural and cultural resources and values, and located along the commemorative plaque walkway. The National Park Service assigns plaque locations. The area can accommodate a total of forty plaques, and spaces will be available on a first-come, first-served basis until all spaces are filled.⁴³⁰

**Ex-POW Memorial Grove.** Contemporary with the building and construction of the new entrance road was the planting of the Ex-POW Memorial Grove at the new entrance to the Park. The park determined to amend the existing farmland to resemble the area just to the north of the cemetery. Trees were obtained from the Historic Tree

---

program, which was a part of American Forests, and were purchased by members of AXPOW at a cost of approximately 40 dollars each. The park selected trees that were appropriate for the area; most had a military heritage, such as the George Washington Mt. Vernon Tulip Poplar. The property was obtained in two parcels; fifty trees were planted by Eagle Scouts in the first parcel, and 100 trees by park maintenance staff in the second. A list of trees and donors was kept at the visitor center so that visitors could identify the type of tree planted for each person, although specific trees were not designated for individual people.  

**Civil War Museums**

The National Prisoner of War Museum is one of several museums located around the country that focus attention on a particular aspect of the Civil War at a national level of investigation and interpretation. Other examples of nationally focused Civil War-themed museums include

- American Civil War Museum, including Historic Tredegar, Richmond, Virginia; White House and Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia; Museum of the Confederacy-Appomattox, Appomattox, Virginia
- Confederate Memorial Hall Museum, New Orleans, Louisiana
- National Civil War Museum, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
- National Civil War Naval Museum, Columbus, Georgia
- National Museum of Civil War Medicine, Frederick, Maryland
- National Museum of the Civil War Soldier, Pamplin Historical Park, Dinwiddie, Virginia
- Women of the Civil War Museum, Bardstown, Kentucky

**Historic Resources Associated with Historic Context Four**

The historic resources associated with this context include:

- Prison Site Road
- Stockade Branch bridges
- Drainage channels and erosion control systems
- Providence Spring landscape
- Providence Spring pavilion
- Monument landscape
- Massachusetts Monument
- Ohio Monument
- Rhode Island Monument
- Michigan Monument
- Wisconsin Monument
- Lizabeth A. Turner Monument
- Sundial Monument
- Clara Barton Monument
- Tennessee Monument
- Lincoln-Logan Monument
- Monument to Eight States
- New Jersey Monument
- Maine Monument
- Pennsylvania Monument

---

431. E-mail correspondence between Fred Boyles, former Andersonville National Historic Site Superintendent, and Alan Marsh, former Chief of Resource Management, August 2014. See also AXPOW Bulletins for additional information.
- Connecticut Monument
- Iowa Monument
- Indiana Monument
- Illinois Monument
- New York Monument
- Minnesota Monument
- Wrought iron fences around well sites
- Pecan Lane landscape
- Pecan Lane walls
- Stockade wall corner markers
- Stockade and deadline markers
- Post marking the raider hanging site
- East and west storage buildings (Carriage House and Guest House)

**Significance**

Andersonville National Historic Site is nationally significant under Criterion A for its association with several historic trends in commemoration that have helped to convey to the visiting public the valor, bravery, and sacrifice of Civil War soldiers.

When viewed in terms of resource protection, the design characteristics of designated historic sites including battlefields and other military sites are associated more with planning, preservation, and interpretive strategies than with formal approaches to the design of public parks and cemeteries. The way in which new interventions, in the form of roads, visitor accommodations, interpretation, and commemorative features were sited and articulated speak about the values and intentions of those establishing, developing, and managing the earliest form of preserved and interpreted public resources.

Historic military sites have evolved into places visited by all facets of the public. They are now, along with scenic and natural wonder parks and other types of historic sites, important destinations in the American landscape of travel, tourism, leisure, and recreation. They also represent one of the nation’s most potent symbolic landscape types. As didactic landscapes, they have served as physical expressions of the nation’s collective memory and postwar reconciliation. The national military parks are among the first American landscapes that clearly reveal the contested nature of history and public memory. Andersonville conveys aspects of these early efforts to mark, commemorate, and honor the contributions of American military personnel. While they continue to protect the hallowed ground of burial places and mark the locations of events associated with significant military events, they are also parks that provide interpretive programs to visitors, and commemorative sites that mark, honor, and revere the contributions of many groups and individuals. Nonetheless, there are many visitors who remain unaware of the commemorative component of the military park histories. The history of military site park development and commemoration is a significant aspect of American history well represented at Andersonville.
Historic Context Five: Civil War Military Site Preservation (1861–2017)

**FIGURE 31.** View of the improvements completed at Star Fort to protect the earthwork from erosion, and provide access for visitors. The improvements were built by the CCC at Andersonville, circa 1935. (Source: Alan Marsh, “Andersonville’s New Deal: Civilian Conservation Corps,” September 2011)

**Introduction**

The preservation of Andersonville Prison and Andersonville National Cemetery can be seen within a broader context of the protection of historic properties in America in order to preserve heritage values and the stories of national heroes. Military valor was one of the key values that became the focus of historic property preservation, and thus military sites were one of
the most protected historic site types for much of
the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The
protection of the Andersonville Prison and
establishment of Andersonville National Cemetery
are both associated with this long tradition of
preserving sites of military importance in the
United States. Military site preservation is often
integritaly tied to commemoration of military
events and the valorous acts of individuals on the
field of battle. Thus, the information conveyed in
this section of the Historic Resource Study (HRS)
is closely tied to Historic Context Three: The
National Cemetery System, and Historic Context
Four: Civil War Commemoration and
Interpretation.

Military Site Preservation
Prior to the Civil War

The first commemorative monument honoring a
military site authorized by the U.S. Congress was a
marble column to be erected at Yorktown. The
column was to commemorate the surrender of
General Cornwallis to General Washington
following a siege on the British position in 1781.
Although the monument was not constructed for
another 100 years, it remains the first authorized
battle-related monument in the United States. This
early monument, however, was intended to mark
an important site but was not linked to any specific
battlefield preservation effort.

The first efforts to preserve a military site involved
the purchase of Washington’s Headquarters in
Newburgh, New York, by the state in 1850. The
state opened the house later that year to the
public, at which time it became the first publicly
acquired and operated historic site in the United
States. Preservation of George Washington’s home
on the Potomac River, Mount Vernon, followed
soon thereafter in 1853, although the effort was
spearheaded by a private group—the Mount
Vernon Ladies’ Association, rather than a public
entity. These initial efforts signaled a fundamental
shift in American views on history and nationalism
that grew as the young country began to mature.
By the mid nineteenth century, history began to
become entwined with national identity. The
second generation after the American Revolution
developed an interest in preservation. A
movement with early roots in the 1850s would
become a popular trend following the Centennial
Celebration held in Philadelphia in 1876. Along
with the growth of popular interest in national
identity came the idea of preserving tangible
historic sites that could be tied to important
people or events in the nation’s recent past. The
cause would be taken up by state and local
governments, as well as the federal government,
along with private patriotic organizations. In
addition to Colonial America, the Revolutionary
War, War of 1812, and Civil War became the focus
of preservation and commemoration efforts
during the mid to late nineteenth century. Of
these, the Civil War would become the greatest
focus of military site preservation, due in part to
the fact that the conflict had served as a major
break in nation building, and had resulted in a
division that required mending and a nation in
need of reunification.

Early Civil War Era Military
Site Preservation, 1863–1890

Even before the Civil War had ended, groups
began to form to effect preservation of hallowed
ground. The efforts of veterans and others
resulted in support for the national cemetery
system as it emerged during the Civil War in
response to the growing number of Union
casualties, as well as early preservation of
battlefield land at Gettysburg. These efforts
culminated in the establishment of the first five
national military parks during the decade of the
1890s at Antietam, Chickamauga and Chattanooga,
Gettysburg, Shiloh, and Vicksburg. Following the
success of these efforts, the U.S. Congress was
flooded with bills seeking the establishment of
other national military parks, requests that were
categorically tabled due to financial considerations
until an overall plan could be developed for
prioritizing future acquisitions.

The fruition of the national military park idea
occurred in two distinct phases. The first began
with early efforts conducted at Gettysburg and
culminated in the establishment of the first
national military park at Chickamauga and
Chattanooga in 1890. Over this period, the vision and justification for battlefield preservation were developed and articulated by veterans’ groups and others. Private citizens and veterans were the first to recognize the significance of America’s Civil War battlefields, and their early efforts to preserve and commemorate those places set the precedent for establishing and developing the military parks. It was also over the course of this time period that the preservation and commemoration efforts grew from Union or Confederate-led to unified efforts intended to support national reconciliation and reunification. During the early phase, initial efforts to preserve and mark the battlefields at Gettysburg and Antietam by 1888 still included only state monuments along Union lines. With the establishment of a national military park at Chickamauga and Chattanooga the focus was on bearing witness to the bravery of the armies of both the North and South as reflected in an 1890 House Military Affairs Committee report indicating that Chickamauga and Chattanooga battlefield preservation was a national concern. As discussed below, however, battlefield preservation of the late nineteenth century bears little relationship to the practice today, in that the emphasis was on the significance of preserving the history of military strategy and battle tactics for military training and research. As noted in records relating to the establishment of Chickamauga and Chattanooga, the preservation for national study of the lines of decisive battles, especially when the tactical movements were unusual both in numbers and military ability, and when the fields embraced great natural difficulties, may properly be regarded as a matter of national importance.”

As noted above, national identity was one of the key issues surrounding military site preservation. In 1876, Americans celebrated the Centennial of the American Revolution with an exposition in Philadelphia. The centennial captured and inspired public interest in America’s colonial past. As part of the popular trend, Americans developed a renewed fascination with colonial- and revolutionary-era history, particularly battlefields of the Revolution such as Valley Forge, Bunker Hill, and Concord/Lexington. Some Americans believed that commemorating battles and celebrating the valor and patriotism of those who fought in them would strengthen American national identity by emphasizing unity. The Civil War remained a divisive issue, however. In an effort to promote unity, the United States Soldiers Monument that would be erected at Antietam National Cemetery was exhibited at the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia.

The Role of Veterans Associations and Private Groups in Preserving Battlefields

(See also Historic Context Four: Civil War Commemoration and Interpretation.)

As early as 1864, citizens began to call for the preservation of battlefields, sites “...of loyalty and patriotism, whither in all times will come the sons of America, and the pilgrims of all lands, to view with wonder and veneration the sacred scenes of heroic struggles, in which were involved the life of the nation and the perpetuation of liberty.”

The first organization formed to promote battlefield preservation was the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association (GBMA), established by prominent local citizen David McConaughy. GBMA was incorporated in April 1864. The group planned to promote preservation of the Gettysburg battlefield landscape to ensure that its meaning would be conveyed to future generations. The group envisioned that battle veterans would be instrumental in effecting historically-accurate preservation of the battleground and memorialization of key battlefield sites, events, and individuals.
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The approach adopted by the GBMA was to mark the lines of battle, and establish road corridors along which visitors could learn about the battle from the markers. Also located along the road corridors would be commemorative structures and works of art erected to honor those who had fought in the battle. They were assisted in the endeavor when the Pennsylvania legislature acquired battlefield land for preservation. This same approach was later adopted by the federal government in the 1890s when the first five national military parks were established.

However, although the GBMA had noted its intent to involve the veterans in the effort, the organization was essentially administered by non-veterans. In 1880, GAR posts in Pennsylvania acquired a majority interest in GBMA to ensure leadership by veterans.

Under their leadership, GBMA worked to preserve and mark the battlefield, while also initiating a vigorous campaign to mark the field of battle with substantial monuments to the victorious Union forces.\(^{438}\)

On the land secured by the state legislature, the organization constructed eight avenues and erected one hundred monuments at locations where state regiments had camped during the 1880s.

In 1887, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania again offered to appropriate state funds for land acquisition. GBMA targeted key battlefield locations on Little Round Top, Culps Hill, and East Cemetery Hill for inclusion in the area to be preserved.

GBMA inspired several other Union veterans’ groups to preserve Civil War battlefields elsewhere around the county. These included the Society of the Army of the Tennessee and the Military Order of the Loyal Legion both formed in 1865; the GAR organized in 1866; the Society of the Army of the Cumberland established in 1868; and the Society of the Army of the Potomac formed in 1869. Veterans organized reunions, erected battlefield monuments, and lobbied state legislatures to appropriate funds for the erection of state monuments on key battlefields.\(^{439}\) With many veterans going on to political careers, and jobs on Capitol Hill, the veterans were able to wield considerable influence.

Confederate veterans’ groups also formed during the 1860s, 1870s, and 1880s. The Southern Historical Society (SHS) organized in New Orleans in 1869, while the Association of the Army of Northern Virginia (AANVA) and the Association of the Army of Tennessee (AAT) both formed in 1877. The United Confederate Veterans (UCV) was established in 1889. Like their Northern counterparts, these organizations promoted commemorative activities and raised funds for monuments.\(^{440}\) During their annual reunion held in 1899, the UCV resolved to place markers on Civil War battlefields where efforts to date had primarily reflected the input of Union veterans.\(^{441}\)

The late nineteenth century was an important time for historic preservation. In addition to battlefield preservation initiated by Civil War veterans, other groups formed to preserve aspects of local and regional heritage. The Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities was the first statewide preservation agency formed in the United States in 1888. In articulating its mission, the organization suggested it “…gathered together the scattered remnants of the old order but redefined the past in the light of present necessity.”\(^{442}\) In Pennsylvania, the Valley Forge Centennial and Memorial Association formed in 1876 to protect and preserve the land associated with the Revolutionary War-era encampment and the Valley Forge story. Such groups focused on garnering public and private support to purchase
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and maintain historic structures and sites, erect monuments, and mark graves of the heroic dead.

**Reunification**

One of the key goals of national military park establishment was to promote reconciliation between the North and the South. By the 1880s, veterans from both sides had begun to embrace a culture of national reunion. Union and Confederate veterans’ organizations eventually acted in concert in their ongoing efforts to preserve the battlefields. In 1888, for example, the Society of the Army of the Cumberland formed the committee of the Chickamauga Memorial Association and proposed a Joint Memorial Battlefield Association consisting of members from all states, both North and South, whose troops had participated in the battle. The Association’s efforts were instrumental in the successful effort to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Chickamauga.443

With the passage of time, the bitterness between the former Civil War combatants began to lessen. During the 1880s, contact between former Union soldiers and their Confederate counterparts steadily increased. Influential Union veterans’ organizations such as the GAR, the Society of the Army of the Tennessee, and the Society of the Army of the Cumberland, formed in the 1860s, were joined by newer groups such as the Union Veteran Legion and the Union Veterans’ Union. Together they lobbied state governments to erect state monuments at the sites of several Civil War battles. The 1880s also witnessed reunions of Confederate veterans and the rise of statewide veterans’ groups in Virginia, Tennessee, and Georgia that led to the formation of the regional UCV in 1889. As veterans began to focus on common wartime experience, more formal combined Blue and Gray reunions and joint ceremonies took place. The first occurred at Gettysburg in 1882. This was followed by reunions at Fredericksburg, Antietam, and Kennesaw Mountain. As the 1880s progressed, the veterans began to lobby the federal government to take responsibility for protecting battlefield sites and marking unit positions. One of the most vocal and influential was the Society of the Army of the Cumberland, which lobbied for a national military park at the Chickamauga and Chattanooga battlefields. Member concern for preserving these two battlefields had begun with an inspection of the site of the battle during an 1881 reunion held at Chattanooga. At that time, they “...discovered significant changes in the appearance of the battlefield, including the disappearance or alteration of roads, farms, and landscape features.”444

Reunification sentiments also became popular as a way to avoid addressing the emancipatory legacy of the Civil War. In a world where racial and ethnic pluralism had begun to challenge the social order and technological advances created tensions between labor and capital, a sentimental nostalgic yearning for a simpler past played out in the fraternalism of soldier reunions. Commemoration focused on the heroism of the individual soldier, and his valor, military skill, and endurance.

These reunions began in 1881 with the Society of the Army of the Cumberland holding a reunion at Chattanooga. The first of these was followed in 1888 with a twenty-fifth anniversary reunion of the battle at Gettysburg where attendees reenacted Pickett’s Charge and dedicated 133 regimental monuments.445 Politicians followed these events closely, and began to speak at monument and battlefield dedications in order to ally themselves with these patriotic events. With politicians speaking on themes of reconciliation and reunion that encouraged their constituents to set aside

---

443. Paige and Greene, 16–18.
444. Hanson and Blythe, 30.
sectional differences, these ideas began to infuse the work of Congress.446

As veterans aged, the reunions became places where memories of former strife blurred with recollections of the shared horrors of war; acknowledgement of common actions as lessons for the people became a goal for the nation. As such, the need for reconciliation and the activities of the veterans were instrumental in helping justify the establishment of national military parks. Maj. Wells Sponable clearly articulated these beliefs in his speech at the unveiling of the 34th Regiment [New York] Monument at Antietam, in 1902:

There are no better teachers for those who come after us than the silent monuments on the battlefields, marking the places where men died for a principle they believed right, whether it wore the blue or the gray uniform. The monuments… will teach those who come after us lessons that can be learned in no other way.447

This sentiment was similarly expressed in the Southern parks, such as the statement made at Vicksburg by the Wisconsin-Vicksburg Monument Commission:

It [Vicksburg] is a park in which the North and South alike may take a just pride. It has done, is doing, and will continue to do, more than any of us can understand toward strengthening the bonds that bind us together as a nation. Whoever visits that unique park studying carefully the hundreds of inscriptions on both avenues, finding no trace of bitterness, no sign of hatred, but instead, most impressive tokens of a noble and generous spirit of brotherhood, must be inspired with higher ideals of citizenship and find his very being imbued with a stronger and more enduring love for the country that has cost us so much of blood and treasure. He must see a great and glorious future for the nation… now united as never before.448

In the 1890s, as Americans sought tangible symbols of unity, they turned to the battlefields where that union had been challenged, but not defeated. Over time, the practice of holding reunions spread to many of the Civil War battlefields, serving to draw attention to the need to preserve the fields of battle and as a symbolic act of healing of sectional divisions. The visits to the battlefields conducted by veterans also served to spark the interest of the general public. Gettysburg was the battlefield that most fully captured the American imagination as a pivotal event in the history and culture of the United States. It gradually became a quintessential destination for genteel touring. Appleton’s 1867 traveler’s guide described the town as “surrounded by hills, from which extensive views of the village and adjacent country are obtained. . . The guide suggested that travelers ‘allow a day to tour the battlefield and two days for visiting the springs and other objects of attraction in and around the village.”449 As noted in 1890 by Maj. Gen. Abner Doubleday, “Gettysburg is now the Waterloo of our country, and deserves a visit from every tourist; not only on account of its historical associations, but as one of the art centers of America.”450 Ironically, Waterloo was not nearly as well-marked by this time as Gettysburg.

Another aspect of reunions that attracted attention were dedication ceremonies for battlefield monuments. Dedication ceremonies brought publicity and hundreds of visitors to a significant historic site, where visitors could experience patriotism and pleasure, and enjoy a reassuring sense of social order and political unity.451

450. As cited in Unrau, 63.
Establishment of the First Five National Military Parks, 1890–1899

(See also Historic Context Four: Civil War Commemoration and Interpretation.)

In 1895, the War Department assumed administrative responsibility for the preserved battlefield land at Gettysburg. The system established by the GBMA was later adopted by the War Department when they took over administration of Gettysburg in 1895. In fact, the work conducted by the War Department at Antietam (authorized 1890), Chickamauga and Chattanooga (authorized 1890), Shiloh (authorized 1894), and Vicksburg (authorized 1899), followed a similar approach, placing monuments at critical battlefield event locations and designating either existing or newly established roadways as tour routes throughout the battlefield landscape. Between 1890 and 1899, the U.S. government began to acquire land associated with five Civil War battlefields—Chickamauga and Chattanooga, Antietam, Gettysburg, Shiloh, and Vicksburg—where they sought to establish new national parks, and to appropriately mark the events of important Civil War battles. In most cases, these efforts entailed setting aside large tracts of land for inclusion in the parks. The idea of a nation setting aside battlefield land and preserving it for historical purposes was novel. This large-scale land acquisition program was in part justified by the War Department’s interest in using the sites for teaching military tactics and strategy. Vicksburg, for example, was established:

To preserve the campaign, siege, and defense of Vicksburg, and to preserve the history of the battles and operations of the siege and defense on the ground where they were fought and carried on.

It was during this period that the government shifted its memorialization emphasis from cemetery development to the protection, preservation, and marking of Civil War battlefields. Pressure by the veterans, the work of the GBMA and Pennsylvania at Gettysburg and other private preservation efforts conducted at Antietam, and interest on the part of the public had contributed to federal involvement in battlefield preservation. By this time, many Civil War veterans had become prominent state and national politicians, and begun lobbying Congress for the preservation of Civil War battlefields. In 1890, the U.S. House of Representatives Military Affairs Committee acknowledged the need for such preservation at Chickamauga, emphasizing the significance of lessons to be derived from military activities:

A field as renowned as this for the stubbornness and brilliancy of its fighting, not only in our own war, but when compared with all modern wars, has an importance to the nation as an object lesson of what is possible in American fighting, and the national value of the preservation of such lines for historical and professional study must be apparent to all reflecting minds.

At Antietam and Chickamauga, established in 1890, several of the specific policies and approaches for developing national military parks were first put forward. The land would be administered by the War Department, particularly as sites that were to focus on military training and study. The enabling legislation for Chickamauga and Chattanooga set a precedent, stating that the park was created for the purpose of “...preserving and suitably marking for historical and professional study the fields of some of the most remarkable maneuvers and most brilliant fighting in the war...”
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In 1890, the Hon. Charles G. Grosvenor eloquently described the vision for the battlefield at Chickamauga and Chattanooga:

We do not propose a beautiful park, with beautiful lanes and flowering and ornamental walks and gate-ways... but we do propose... to preserve in as near the condition of the battle-field was on the close of the 20th of September 1863 as it is possible to do so... we will not change into beautiful drives and thoroughfares the roads... and we would preserve the battlefield itself, with its wooded hilltops, its fair bestudded plains, and all its particulars and general appearance as near as when left as it is possible to do... We would leave all this intact and we would put monuments to mark the place where the troops of Thomas, and the other troops... charged... and drove Bragg and his gallant troops away off to the south... So in plain and concise words, we want to preserve the woods of Chick; we want to preserve the fringes of trees, bushes, and shrubs that nature has planted along the banks of the river of blood. We want to preserve the entire tract.\footnote{456}

However, at the same time a slightly different policy was adopted at Antietam, known as the Antietam Plan, which called for acquisition of road corridors rather than the entire battlefield, due to the expectation that the rural landscape would remain undeveloped. As such, the government would not need to expend funds securing the land. The bill establishing Antietam, however, was clear in the need to equally mark the positions of Northern as well as Southern armies in the conflict:

The Bill under consideration proposesto preserve and properly mark with plain, enduring tablets the field of Antietam... To a clear understanding of the field... it is absolutely necessary that the lines of both sides to the persistent struggle should be marked; [and] The purpose is to have each State, which had troops engaged on the field, provide the monuments for marking the position of troops after the general plan heretofore pursued at Gettysburg... and proposed by the Chick

\footnote{457}{Snell and Brown, 72.}

\footnote{458}{Paige and Greene, 127.}

National and State Battlefield Commissions

In addition to the veterans’ organization, various state and national battlefield commissions and boards were, over the years, to have significant influence on the development of the landscapes at the battlefield parks, by choosing sites for monuments, holding design competitions, and in some cases, judging designs. In these activities, however, they were guided by the enabling legislation written by Congress for each park.

Although the enabling legislation for each park differed in particulars, in general, each was to have appointed a three-man national commission to oversee preserving and marking the lines of battle, building roads and fences, and acquiring land. Each national park commission established specific regulations for their battlefield park in order to coordinate the work of the state commissions working at each site on monumentation. For example, in 1893, the Chickamauga National Commissioners authored regulations governing the raising of monuments, specifying that the proposed dimensions, designs, inscriptions, and material for all monuments, tablets, or other markers must be submitted to the commissioners who would forward all designs to the Secretary of War for approval.\footnote{458}

The three-man commission at each battlefield included at least one veteran, appointed by, and reporting directly to, the Secretary of War. Commissioners were appointed not for their design credentials, but for their involvement in the Civil War and/or their historical knowledge of specific battlegrounds. In this way, authenticity and historical accuracy were ensured in executing the charge given to them to preserve and mark. The national commissions were charged first with preserving and marking the field of the battle for
the “correct understanding of the battle.” Both Union and Confederate armies were represented on these boards; for example, the first national commission for Gettysburg included one Confederate and two Union veterans.

At the state level, early commissions were formed to assist each park’s national commission with efforts to locate and identify the dead soldiers of each state on the fields of battle. Some state commissioners were also appointed to assist in the development of the battlefield cemeteries. State commissioners served a very different role from the veterans’ organization in the development of the battlefields. In addition to marking troop positions on the battlefields, the state commissions were responsible for erecting monuments that honored the contribution of their troops, and for securing funds to pay for the design, construction, and installation of the monuments. Not all of the battle troops were from specific states. Regular Army units also participated in the battles and the federal government assumed responsibility for marking their positions.

Marking troop positions was the most important duty of the state commissions. Although monument design was important, more critical was the identification of associated troop positions to be marked. Many of the battlefields had a surveyor who worked with veterans’ organizations, state commissions, as well as with individual soldiers and officers to mark troop positions and movements. It was these positions and movements that would determine road alignments and monument locations. The state commissions carefully and thoroughly researched troop positions and chose monument sites based on the most accurate information they could gather. After troop locations had been marked, state commissions directed memorial and monument design.

During the 1890s, the park commissioners also adopted an approach to managing and maintaining the battlefields so as to preserve the landscape as it appeared at the time of the battle. Battlefield landscape restoration often combined the need to weave an accurate depiction of historic landscape character with the placement of monuments. Congress recognized that specialized knowledge was required to ascertain, mark, and preserve the main lines of battle and the cultural features of the terrain. For this, they retained veterans of the battles themselves.

At Gettysburg, the Commission followed a policy of preserving and restoring features of the battlefield as they existed at the time of the battle. To accomplish this, stone walls and fences were repaired and restored, forests were renewed where they had been cut away since the battle, leases were made to farmers to live in the old farm houses and cultivate the old fields, and great care was taken to avoid changing the natural grades of the ground when constructing avenues.

Congress likewise established a general policy “of preserving the battlefields as nearly as possible in their condition at the time of the battle.” This policy was implemented in part by retaining historic farmhouses and fields for agricultural purposes, helping to add life to the scene, while at the same time reducing the costs of maintenance. They used a practice of purchase and lease-back with preservation conditions as a tool of land management. Common landscape restoration efforts included the planting or removal of trees; the construction or realignment of historic roadways; the restoration of topographical features, including earthworks; restoration of fence or property lines; and the restoration or removal of buildings and structures.
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Similar to land acquisition efforts, these restoration efforts were based on existing knowledge of historic appearance including drawings, maps, photographs, and veterans’ accounts.\textsuperscript{464}

As the national military parks were established over the course of the decade, similar language described the duties of the commissioners in the enabling legislation and set forth a design context for each. At Shiloh, for instance, the intentions are equally clear in the description of the duties of the park commission printed in the Statutes at Large in 1895:

> It shall be the duty of the commission… under the direction of the Secretary of War, to open or repair such roads as may be necessary to the purposes of the park, and to ascertain and mark with historical tablets or otherwise, as the Secretary of the War may determine, all lines of battle of the troops engaged… and other historical points of interest pertaining to the battle.\textsuperscript{465}

**Role of the veterans.** Input from veterans continued to be significant. Their technical and historical knowledge of the battlefield events was instrumental in focusing the direction in which preservation of the battlefields grew as they actively participated in the marking of the fields. Veterans who visited the parks also made sure that state and regimental monuments were located precisely at places where significant actions or events had occurred. In several instances, monuments were moved or shifted in order to accommodate the way the veterans recalled the events of the battle.\textsuperscript{466} Early on at Chickamauga, for example, the veterans were invited to comment on regimental monument and tablet locations, while at Shiloh the Iowa Commission contacted all of the survivors of the 15th Iowa Infantry Regiment in 1895 so that they could comment on the placement of the position tablets marking the regiment’s location on April 6, 1862.\textsuperscript{467} The importance of the veterans’ recollections for accuracy in the siting of roads and monuments was clearly recognized and appreciated by the park commissioners.

In addition to engaging veterans in battlefield delineation, the national military parks were marked with the aid of a federal government publication, the multi-volume *War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (OR). This tome provided park commissions with a wealth of intimate detail about the individual battlefields. The original purpose of the OR was to compile the official military documents from both sides of the conflict, so the series contained a wealth of official reports, letters, telegrams, strength returns, casualty lists, maps, and plates. The military and civilian editors of the series noted that “nothing is printed in these volumes except daily authenticated contemporaneous records of the war.”\textsuperscript{468} Because the park development goal was to afford the opportunity to tell or teach the stories of the battle events in great detail, the OR became the bible for the battlefield commissions as questions about monument placement surfaced. At each of the first national military parks, locations of monuments, roads, and other landscape features could not have been determined without the publication of the OR.

**Role of the War Department.** In addition to the park commissions, there was also to be oversight at various levels of the federal
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government including Congress and the War Department. In fact, all five parks were to be administered by the War Department. By 1895, the private associations that had acquired battlefield land at Gettysburg for preservation purposes relinquished them to the War Department. However, they retained their original three-man commissions, which were to report to the War Department.

The War Department in particular was also instrumental in ensuring that park establishment remained on track. One of the other methods employed to determine conditions at the time of the battles and the events that occurred during the war was a special study commissioned by Congress in 1896. The study was to identify the locations of the lines of battles based on surveys, and to map troop movements. Because of the expense inherent in acquiring and maintaining battlefield lands, the U.S. government began to establish management agreements with some of the states where Civil War battlefields were preserved. They devised a system whereby the War Department was responsible for the purchase or acquisition of battlefield lands, the delineation of major lines of battle, and management and maintenance of the land, while the states were responsible for marking the activities of their troops.

Although its principal purpose was to further military education and training, the War Department also recognized that non-military personnel would be interested in the parks and visit them. Thus, the War Department hoped that “visitors thereto might enjoy the facilities afforded for studying the scenes of action and whatever natural beauties might exist, as well as to pay homage to the brave men who fought at these places. The superintendents and other employees shall therefore exert themselves on all occasions to place all the facilities at their command at the disposal of visitors for observation and study of everything connected with the parks and should be prepared to explain fully all details concerning the movement of troops, monuments, and other factors of the activities.”

Goals and Uses for National Military Parks

The new national military parks were intended to be didactic, evocative landscapes. Principally they were intended to serve as memorials to the military forces of the Civil War, forming tangible links with the event for future generations; they were also intended to preserve the field of battle for historical and professional study, including teaching history to military historians as well as to the general public, and tactics to military personnel.

Of critical importance, particularly due to the fact that the new parks were to be managed by the War Department, was the role of the battlefields in military study, as noted in a House report on Chickamauga:

The preservation for national study of the lines of decisive battles, especially when the actual movements were unusual both in numbers and military ability, and when the fields embraced great natural difficulties, may properly be regarded as a matter of national importance … The proposition for establishing the park is in all its aspects a purely military project. The park, when completed, will be the most comprehensive and extended military object lesson in the world…. The grounds will be a park only in the sense of being restored to their condition at the time of the battle. No work will be done for purely decorative purposes. The old lines are to be restored…. Inscriptions must be purely historical, and must relate only to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga campaigns.

One of the ways that the national military parks established by Congress in the 1890s were intended to educate military personnel in practical aspects of warfare was through staff rides. These


hands-on teaching sessions were instituted at the battlefields as a way to train officers in tactical warfare. Members of Congress viewed such education as extremely important. As noted by Rep. John P. Tracy of Missouri, the educational value of the staff rides was critical:

A month’s campaigning for practical study on such a field of maneuvers by the corps of West Point cadets, where the lines of battles and the movements in the engagement of nearly every organization of each side have been ascertained and…marked with historical tablets…would be worth an entire course in textbooks on the strategy of a campaign and battle tactics.

His statements were later echoed by Brig. Gen. M.M. Macomb, commandant of the Army War College at the outbreak of World War I, who believed that soldiers could only learn certain important lessons “…most clearly only by seeing the field itself.”

However, the military use of the battlefields went far beyond site observations and staff rides. In 1896, Congress authorized the use of the national military parks for other types of military maneuvers and instructional camps to be used by the U.S. Army and National Guard. These types of uses also influenced the design of the parks. In 1889, Col. John B. Bachelder, a member of the GBMA Board and battlefield historian, urged that the Confederate lines be marked as well as the Union lines, suggesting that it would be “…impossible for the tourist or student of history to acquire a correct understanding of the positions or movement of troops unless both are marked; and to determine the Confederate lines would increase the value of the Union Monuments.” In a second letter, Bachelder noted “…as only the positions of one side are marked, it really possesses no tactical value whatever. … With both sides

marked, Gettysburg would be the most wonderful object-map in the world.”

**Commemoration.** Like civilian tourists, military personnel viewed the park from the same roads and observation towers and read the same historical markers, all of which were meant to preserve and commemorate the battlefield as national shrines. As such, these parks were first and foremost repositories of a national memory, commemorated through monuments. Enabling legislation for each Civil War national military park provided both for preservation of the battlefield and for its commemoration through monuments and markers. Although these practices appear to be in conflict with one another—preservation coupled with changes to the landscape by the addition of markers and monuments, as well as roads to provide access to these features—they contributed to the richness of the landscapes that evolved at the battlefields and were essential elements in the construction of a cultural memory at the national military parks. Each park’s national commission placed historical tablets on the field that explained to visitors important aspects of the battle. Reading the text, the visitors could survey the field and in the mind’s eye imagine the events of the battle. Markers encouraged visitors to move along the lines of battle and made them aware of the significance of the ground on which they stood. Observation towers were constructed at the battlefields to provide elevated vantage points for additional understanding of the battles.

Supplementing these texts and vistas were the monuments erected by private and state associations. In these memorials, the original combatants are re-called to the field to take their places along the lines of battle. Realistic and lifesized or heroic figures rendered in bronze and granite help to suggest the battles themselves. Visitors could vicariously experience the valor,
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dignity, and sacrifice of the soldiers of both armies.\textsuperscript{476} The battlefields were active places where visitors were expected to experience the landscape and in this way participate in constructing and confirming a national narrative and cultural memory.\textsuperscript{477}

**Interpretation.** Related to visitor accommodation was the understanding that the monuments erected to memorialize a unit or individual’s participation in a battle or encampment could also be used to educate the viewer. Markers and tablets were erected as interpretive devices to orient and educate visitors to the site, in addition to their role in marking positions in the field. Like monuments, markers were erected by historical or veterans’ groups, park commissions, and federal and state governments. In the nineteenth century, historical tablets were often made of iron with lettering cast as part of the plate. The placement of ordnance was another popular way to mark strategic positions, particularly at sites such as Gettysburg and Chickamauga. These markers were usually accessible by a series of roadways or trails.\textsuperscript{478} Another popular interpretive device of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was the observation tower. These towers allowed the visitor to view large expanses of the battlefield or encampment from high above. At Gettysburg, the War Department erected five steel towers throughout the park. Five towers were also built at Chickamauga, Antietam, and Vicksburg. Sited at the top of the towers were placards that provided information such as site names and distances to key features of the battlefield.\textsuperscript{479}

Over time, the role of interpretation in military parks grew. The War Department issued regulations calling for the provision of guides in all national military parks “to assist visitors in visualizing the positions and movements of troops… thus enabling them to appreciate fully and quickly the magnitude of the struggles which took place on the battlefield.”\textsuperscript{480}

**Tourism.** As noted earlier, residents of the area in which national military parks and other sites of importance such as national cemeteries were established quickly recognized the potential to benefit financially from tourism. In addition to the land itself, monuments were a major attraction. The role of the monuments at the battlefields as inducements for citizens to visit the sites was noted by J. Howard Vert in his 1880 publication, *A Complete Handbook of the Monuments and Indications and Guide to the Positions on the Gettysburg Battlefield*. In the book, Vert notes that “the more the field is decorated with these works of art, the more powerful becomes the impulse of the traveler and patriot to visit or revisit the field of glory.”\textsuperscript{481} Monuments quickly became tourist attractions, and souvenir books featuring the monuments were produced for sale to allow visitors to take home with them the memory of the battle. As attractions and commemorative objects, the monuments were very much a part of the touring experience. Guidebooks, handbooks, postcards, paintings, and photographs became part of a visual culture in the late nineteenth century that also sustained public interest in such places as the national military parks.\textsuperscript{482}

The number of tourists visiting the battlefields was significant. Gettysburg, for example, recorded more than a million visitors per year by 1910.\textsuperscript{483} These ever growing numbers of visitors began to influence the design and management of the parks. At Shiloh, the Commission expressed concerns about “any system of partial fencing—for
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protection against roving animals... on account of the obstruction which it would cause to public travel, and the moving of visitors."\(^{484}\) In a letter to Col. Cornelius Cadle, Chair of the Shiloh Battlefield Commission, George B. Davis, President of the Antietam National Military Site Board, cautioned against "the temptation to build roads on battlefields," a temptation that he suggested "needs to be somewhat restrained, for you soon discover that they are most misleading to visitors, and are calculated to introduce not a little confusion when they did not exist during the battle."\(^{485}\)

During the late nineteenth century, most travelers arrived at battlefields via rail lines. After 1890, railroads became special patrons of the battlefields, primarily by providing special trains or reduced fares for veterans and their families attending reunions.\(^ {486}\)

Veterans were not the only ones who rode trains to the battlefields. Between 1885 and 1900, American rail passenger traffic increased 70 percent. To some extent, that increase reflects the willfulness of the middle class to travel. They believed that travel, particularly travel to didactic landscapes such as the Civil War battlefields, could serve as a means of moral improvement, as suggested in an 1893 article stating, "The historic pilgrimage [to Gettysburg] will stir the imagination of the average American, vivify for him a too monotonous existence, quicken his interest in an heroic past, and give him an appreciation of the fruitful present."\(^ {487}\) American tourists, intent on moral edification, were willing to endure considerable discomfort for the experience. Maj. George B. Davis described travel to Shiloh thus:

> The place, though it is not in any sense accessible, is visited by a considerable number of persons each year. Some come by way of Corinth [22 miles away by a hard-packed earth road 'almost impassable in wet weather' to a railroad connection] but the greatest part are brought in parties by the river steamers from St. Louis, Evansville, Cairo, and Paducah.\(^ {488}\)

Some of the efforts to attract and profit from tourism were detrimental to the battlefield scene. The growing crowds at Gettysburg, for example, prompted the Gettysburg & Harrisburg Railroad to construct a spur rail line through the battlefield to a park at Little Round Top where visitors could patronize refreshment stands, a dancing pavilion, and a shooting gallery.\(^ {489}\) Although these amenities were eventually dismantled and the park closed, similar commercial intrusions into military sites protected as parks continued. In 1956, landscape architect Arthur Shurtleff viewed the scene at the historic Revolutionary War-era Concord and Lexington, and decried the "vending stands, booths, small roadside restaurants, resting rooms and filling station" that had mushroomed along the historic Battle Road. Shurtleff warned that these "... rapid changes in the roadside appearance are now beginning to engulf and blot out many of the most important ancient landmarks."\(^ {490}\)

During the early twentieth century, battlefield visitors began to travel to the battlefields by automobile. The introduction of the automobile to the battlefield park landscapes precipitated profound changes at all levels of design. In the Annual Report of 1905, the Gettysburg Park Commission noted that "A large number of persons have visited the field. The avenues seem to be a special inducement to large and numerous automobile parties, who persistently disregard the

\(^{484}\) Oct. 4, 1895, letter from the Shiloh Commission to the Secretary of War.

\(^{485}\) May 10, 1895, letter from George B. Davis, President of the Antietam National Military Site Board, to Col. Cornelius Cadle, Chair of the Shiloh Battlefield Commission.


\(^{487}\) Weeks, 47.

\(^{488}\) March 18, 1895, letter from Davis to the Secretary of War.

\(^{489}\) Weeks, 47.

\(^{490}\) Letter from Shurtleff to Boston National Historic Sites Commission, 1, June 5, 1956, File LS 1959-1960, Box 4, RG 79, Minute Man National Historical Park, Subject Files, National Archives, Waltham, Massachusetts.
rules and regulations governing the park.” By 1918, the Gettysburg Commission noted that:

...the mode of travel to Gettysburg and over the battlefield, as well as elsewhere over the country, has been entirely changed by the growing popularity and affordability of the automobile. Before the advent of the automobile, visitors were taken through the park in carriages... The automobile has completely taken up this work that it has materially checked the running of the excursions. We see the automobile here by the hundreds sometimes thousands and from distant cities and States.  

As the parks grew in popularity, the numbers of visitors became increasingly difficult to accommodate. In 1899, at Gettysburg, “about 9,000 vehicles, carrying 36,000 tourists, passed over Hancock Avenue in a single month.” Maintenance of the road systems at the parks became an ongoing concern at all of the parks and often precipitated design change. At Chickamauga and Chattanooga, Engineer E.E. Betts noted on October 10, 1900: “The good results from paving in gutters are so apparent that... there is no other branch of our park work of more importance or where the good results are sooner manifested.”  

As Betts noted, road maintenance soon became the focus of park officials.

Recreation. Historian Fred Sears has commented on the cultural reasons behind the rise of nineteenth century historic sites as tourist attractions, noting that they “absorbed some of the functions of sacred space, they integrated those functions into a new form that yoked the sacred and profane, the spiritual and the commercial, the mythic and the trivial, the natural and the artificial, the profound and the superficial, the elite and the popular in a sometimes uneasy combination.”  

One of the elements of visitation that emerged during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, particularly with increasing automobile
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of the Stones River National Cemetery in 1864–1865, which involved the placement of monuments, plaques, and the reinterment of fallen Union soldiers. During the late nineteenth century, several subsequent private efforts were conducted to commemorate the battle. Although these did not result in the establishment of lasting memorials, they helped raise awareness of the importance of the battle. Commemorative activities began to grow following Reconstruction in the South. As the region began to recover in the post-war years, rudimentary tourism began to grow at Stones River, as at other battlefields, along with the practice of veterans’ reunions where former soldiers could recall “the exciting and tragic scenes of their youth. But they were not alone; a younger generation of Americans, simply enthralled with the history of these places, visited as well.”

In the 1890s, veterans of the Battle of Stones River and citizens of nearby Murfreesboro, Tennessee, began to call for additional memorials to mark the hallowed ground of the battlefield, including acquisition of land that could be incorporated into a national military park similar to those that were in the process of being established at Antietam, Chickamauga and Chattanooga, Gettysburg, Shiloh, and Vicksburg. Veterans groups began to gather at the cemetery for memorial services during and after Reconstruction, and were fervent in their attempts to have the battlefield declared a national military park in the 1890s. Interest in establishing a national military park at Stones River took on more urgency following the dedication of Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park in September 1895.

On April 28, 1896, the Stones River Battlefield and Park Association was chartered by a group of Confederate and Union veterans. The association secured options for the purchase of battlefield land in January 1897. By June, the organization had acquired options on as many as 3,400 acres. The association also erected several wooden signs to mark and interpret specific locations on the battlefield and used similar signage to direct visitors to places of interest.

Despite these efforts, financial considerations contributed to a lack of ability on the part of the federal government to add Stones River to the list of national military parks established in the 1890s. Without the assistance of the federal government, the Stones River Battlefield and Park Association found that it was not able to raise the money needed to exercise their options on the battlefield land, and the project was abandoned. Stones River Battlefield was finally added to the list of national military parks in 1927 after Congress authorized a nationwide survey and prioritization plan in 1926.

One of the practical considerations of establishing national military parks was the potential to bring business to the local area. The political and business leaders of Murfreesboro were sure to have taken notice of the large numbers of travelers passing through the area on their way to the Chickamauga dedication. In fact, the efforts to create a national military park at Stones River began in earnest immediately after the Chickamauga dedication when local citizens as well as veterans began to call for the establishment of a national military park at Stones River.

Although their intentions were driven primarily by local pride and patriotism, it appears likely that “the movement to protect and develop the great battlefields of the war found willing partners in communities hoping to attract tourists.”

Although the battlefield did not become a national military park in the 1890s, additional commemoration occurred on the battlefield due to the actions of the Nashville, Chattanooga, and St.
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Louis Railway, and the access it afforded to the Stones River National Cemetery and Hazen Brigade Monument. Because the railroad company had become a popular means for visitors, including veterans, to reach the battlefield, and, hoping to expand its ridership, the railway company actively promoted its rail connection to the battlefield as a means of generating new business. By the 1890s, the railroad was regularly publishing impressive traveler’s guides to the southern battlefields located along the line. One of these booklets titled *Southern Battlefields* included a discussion of the Stones River battlefield with an illustration of the Hazen Brigade Monument. In fact, the rail line promoted itself as the Battle-Field Route to Atlanta.\(^{500}\) Nashville, Chattanooga, and St. Louis Railway president John W. Thomas, a Confederate railway agent who had lived in Murfreesboro for many years, was likely personally responsible for the promotion of Stones River as well as other battlefields. A *Confederate Veteran* article pointed out, “All along the line, through Tennessee, Alabama, and Georgia, markers and monuments were set under the direction of Major Thomas.”\(^{501}\)

The railroad company erected large markers that could be seen from the train by passengers, and directions for visiting other points of interest. In many cases these were more permanent cast-iron markers that replaced the wooden markers erected earlier by the Stones River Battlefield and Park Association. The connection between battlefields and rail lines reflected the importance of controlling these transportation systems during the Civil War.

After World War I, Congress began to revisit the idea of creating battlefield parks. To facilitate decision making, Congress passed the Act for the Study and Investigation of Battlefields in 1926. The Act authorized a national survey of Civil War battlefields to help prioritize land acquisition.

Acting upon the recommendations of the study, which classified Stones River as a Class IIA battlefield worthy of some kind of monument or marker, Congress authorized the establishment of Stones River National Military Park on March 3, 1927.\(^{502}\)

The first action conducted by the War Department in creating the new park was the appointment of a three-member commission to research troop movements and other battle events, and to inspect and mark the Stones River battlefield following the model of the first five national military parks established in the 1890s. Access to the battlefield would occur along existing road corridors as much as possible. Along the roads as well as other key locations, the Commission recommended the installation of thirty-five cast-iron tablets and ten pointers, and that tablets being used at other national military parks might be used as a model.

The rail line paralleled the parcels of the new park and would continue to convey visitors to the park via a depot outside the wall of the cemetery. Important sites would continue to be marked by signs located along the rail line. By this time, however, private automobile use was beginning to rival the railroad in popularity.

**Twentieth-Century Changes in Military Site Preservation Practices, 1900–1933**

By 1900, the idea of preserving and commemorating Civil War battlefields had become extremely popular. With the introduction into Congress of more than 34 bills related to historic preservation between 1901 and 1904, government officials began to consider ways to allow for the marking or chronicling of many sites. However, the “large number of projects gave the committee much concern, first of all because of
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the potential cost.” In 1902, the government formally adopted the approach used at Antietam, dubbed the Antietam Plan, whereby small parcels along roadways and other parcels critical to delineating the lines of battle were purchased, parking areas and some roads were constructed for access, and historical monuments and markers were erected, but large areas of battlefields would not be acquired. Views of the privately-owned, rural agricultural landscape that surrounded the majority of the battlefield sites would supplement these small holdings. This approach was based on the assumption that the adjacent parcels would remain open and agricultural, as they had been in the 1860s. Funding was not forthcoming to support the establishment of any additional national military parks after Vicksburg in 1899 until after Congress authorized a nationwide study to prioritize additional acquisitions in 1926.

In 1913, Gettysburg hosted the fiftieth anniversary reunion of the Blue and Gray. Here, United Confederate Veterans met with the Grand Army of the Republic for the dedication of the Peace Monument. The reunion drew over 50,000 veterans and again a reenactment of Pickett’s Charge was a featured event.

As Americans entered a new war in 1917, reassurances of political unity were welcome. At the dedication of the monument to the 104th New York Volunteer Regiment at Antietam, Almeth W. Hoff noted:

This monument and services such as these help us to preserve and perpetuate for all time the ideals of the founders and preservers of this united country… As beneficiaries of the hardships you bore and the sacrifices they and you made… we as citizens of a common country, united under one flag, join in this service to-day which means that we do not forget… As these monuments about us tell their story, imperfectly it must be… may we of later generations dedicate ourselves to the proposition that we shall teach posterity a due sense of the cost of our country’s dear-bought freedom and unity.

Even as the United States entered World War I, the national military parks had started to become less integral to the training of military personnel, and, as the country went through new, trying periods of war, economic depression, and social unrest, they became less important as a means of promoting national unity or sectional reconciliation. With the advent of the automobile, parks became more accessible, and increased numbers of tourists from a new generation experienced a landscape that was both didactic and more oriented to automobile traffic.

With time, as well, the number of veterans who had participated in the Civil War diminished, and with it, their input on how the events of the battles had been positioned on the ground. In the 1920s, when Stones River National Military Park was being established, the commission member at both Shiloh and Chickamauga and Chattanooga noted that, due to the passage of time and the death of so many veterans whose first-hand knowledge was crucial, it would be impossible to accurately mark the battlefield.

The early twentieth century also marked a change in the area of preservation, particularly after Congress passed the first historic preservation legislation in 1906. The Antiquities Act authorized the President of the United States to proclaim certain sites (in addition to southwestern American Indian sites and battlefields) of historical and cultural significance. The act spawned a series of efforts that since have become models for the economic benefits that preservation can yield.

With the passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906 to preserve historic landmarks and historic structures on lands owned or controlled by the government of the United States, a change occurred in the understanding that broad legislative action was vital to effective preservation.308

In 1912, Congress enacted the Sundry Civil Bill, which provided for the gradual transfer of the authority of individual battlefield park commissions to the Secretary of War as the existing commissioners vacated their positions.

Nationally, interest in battlefield preservation continued, and twenty-eight new preservation bills were introduced in Congress in 1926. President Calvin Coolidge requested that the War Department undertake a thorough study of America’s battlefields that same year. Battlefield acquisition by the government slowed while the study was performed, although fourteen new sites were established between 1926 and 1933.

By the 1930s, visitation had increased and affected the parks to such a degree that policy decisions reflected the need to accommodate a growing public.

The War Department, recognizing the shift in use of the national military parks from historical research and military training to popular visitor attraction, continued to adapt the way the parks were managed. In 1929, a Board of War Department officers, charged with marking in

... if the casual observer can be helped to see more effectively, by placing some additional devices in the park, that device should be installed. By casual observer is meant the 95 percent of tourists who drive through the park without stopping, acquiring such knowledge as they can by hasty glances at monument and markers.509

The manual prepared by the War Department in 1931 regarding management of historic military sites noted:

Use for assembly: The facilities of the parks and monuments are available for the purpose of assembly of military or patriotic organizations. . . . The parks and monuments will be available for purposes of assembly of purely civic activities, such as festivals, picnics and similar assemblies only when authorized by superintendents. Visitors are expected to be orderly so as not to interfere with the full enjoyment of the parks by other people.510

During this same period, preservation efforts nationwide were to be profoundly affected by what was happening in Williamsburg, Virginia. William A. R. Goodwin, minister of Williamsburg’s Bruton Parish Church, saw the potential in recreating an historic landscape that would not only save the fabric of the town, but also infuse it with financial and economic stability. Such was the strength of his argument that he convinced business tycoon John D. Rockefeller to contribute the funds for establishing what has become the first living history museum, essentially a reconstructed and preserved historic landscape. Early efforts focused on preservation of the structures and isolated fragments of land, but this soon evolved into a holistic approach that combined preservation and reconstruction of colonial gardens as well as more urban elements such as sidewalks and steps, and spatial relationships relating to the original town plan.

508. Lee, 44.
509. Annual report to the Secretary of War, 1905, Gettysburg.
510. U.S. War Department, National Military Park Regulations.
The last great soldier reunion was held at Gettysburg in 1933 on the seventy-fifth anniversary of the battle. In all, approximately 1,845 veterans were in attendance. The featured event was the dedication of the Eternal Light Peace Memorial by President Roosevelt. By then, Americans were again engaged in a common struggle, this time with a catastrophic economic depression and the resultant social sufferings. In the midst of this battle against poverty and despair, and social and political uncertainty, Americans were called to unity by another President visiting the scene that had represented America’s greatest challenge.511

**Historic Preservation and Park Development, circa 1933–1968**

In 1933, the administration of national military parks was transferred from the War Department to the National Park Service through a reorganization of executive agencies by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The national military park and some national cemeteries were thereafter to be administered by the National Park Service, with a modified mission to make historic military landscapes accessible to the broader public. The National Park Service had been established in 1916 with a mission to conserve scenery, natural and historic objects, and wildlife, as well as to provide for the enjoyment of these resources by leaving them unimpaired for future generations. Under the agency’s administration, the national military parks and other historic military sites became part of a larger system of federally-protected sites that would need to be considered holistically. By transferring historic military sites to the National Park Service, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt acknowledged their national public significance, and supported the articulation of a narrative that reached beyond the local and specific and placed commemoration into a wider concept of national identity.

At the same time, the national concept and approach to historic preservation had begun to shift from one of marking to that of protecting larger landscapes, as had been done with the national military parks in the 1890s. One of the military sites where this was particularly evident was at Appomattox Court House in Virginia. With the National Park Service working to “go rather heavily into the historical park field” under the Directorship of Horace Albright in the 1930s, Appomattox Court House joined the first historical parks at George Washington Birthplace National Monument, Colonial National Historical Park, and Morristown National Historical Park in the early 1930s.512 The transfer of War Department properties within this context led the agency to address the need for codifying appropriate approaches for managing historic sites.

At Appomattox, a debate quickly ensued over whether to establish an object-type monument or restore an entire landscape as the commemorative gesture. The debate occurred at a time where national notions of preservation as the bucolic and reverential protection of historic resources were being supplanted by a mandate for accuracy and preservation, and scene restoration based on diligent research. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, preservation of historic sites had often entailed the creation of a landscape that romanticized the past. Physical evidence considered to be incompatible with a particular historic scene was typically removed. Conjectural features were added to recall key buildings and other elements missing from the historic scene when historical documentation was not available. This approach was first called into question due to the work conducted at Williamsburg to reestablish the Colonial capital in the 1920s and 1930s. The documentation techniques used to reconstruct buildings were ground-breaking, and led to the
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formation of the Historic American Buildings Survey. Archeological investigations conducted at the site were also used to guide reconstruction work. At Colonial Williamsburg, the work soon evolved into a comprehensive treatment of the entire community, including gardens, sidewalks, steps, and spatial relationships that contributed to the recreation of an authentic town. At Appomattox, this approach resonated, and eventually was used to guide the restoration of the town and the landscape features that had been part of the nineteenth-century rural village, such as fences, roads, and field and woodland patterns. After a failed reconstruction at George Washington Birthplace National Monument, the National Park Service was more careful at Appomattox to understand the character and configuration of the historic site at the time of its recognized significance.\[513\]

In *Preservation Comes of Age*, Charles Hosmer notes:

> The shift from a public monument to reconstruction at Appomattox shows that the Park Service gradually moved into the field of interdisciplinary research at one site. The debates over the future of the McLean House permitted the historians and architects to discuss the value of historical reconstruction.\[514\]

Once the decision to restore the village had been made, the National Park Service applied stringent principles to the reconstruction including the use of accurate historical research and documentation. The methodology extended to the entire village, producing a holistic effect, carried out by an interdisciplinary group of architects, historians, and archeologists to produce the most accurate landscape possible.

Charles Hosmer also noted:

> There was one fascinating interlude at Appomattox that illustrated the progress made in the field of historical research with the hiring of a professional staff. On January 20, 1937, P.C. Hubbard of Lynchburg, Va., wrote to director Cammerer, offering to sell the 1893 plans of the McLean House made at the moment of demolition. Charles W. Porter III of the Richmond regional office looked at the old drawings and concluded that, if they proved to be genuine, these documents were indispensable to a successful reconstruction. He also noted that their authenticity must be established beyond question.... The National Archives and the FBI tested the paper [that the drawings were on] in several ways and reported that the plans were indeed as old as the owners claimed they were. It was an extraordinarily thorough piece of detective work on the part of the historians....

Although the idea of using historical areas as links in an educational chain persisted into the later 1930s, historians Ronald Lee and Charles W. Porter had started a new debate. Correspondence within the National Park Service regarding reconstruction at Appomattox makes clear the discussion on the appropriateness of any reconstruction. On September 5, 1939, Branch Spalding, Coordinating Superintendent for Appomattox, submitted a powerful report showing how the village could be used to interpret the social history of rural Virginia. He saw a fully-restored Appomattox as ‘an arresting challenge to the Park Service’ because it presented “such a great opportunity to depict a way of life that had disappeared many years before.\[515\]

**New Deal Era Historic Preservation: the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps**

Following a stock market collapse that began on October 24, 1929, America’s economy began a long decline. By the time President Franklin


\[515\] Ibid., 623–624.
Delano Roosevelt was inaugurated in March 1933, more than 25 percent of the American workforce was unemployed. Immediately upon his inauguration, Roosevelt began to implement a suite of programs designed to offer work to the unemployed and potentially stabilize the economy. Together, these would become known as his New Deal.

Based in part on his experience as New York governor, where he had helped to put thousands of unemployed young men to work on public works projects, Roosevelt campaigned for the 1932 Presidential election with a pledge to put the unemployed back to work while addressing infrastructure issues of national concern. Roosevelt’s first New Deal program was the Emergency Conservation Work (ECW) Act. Within days of his inauguration, the President convened an emergency session of the 73rd Congress to address the needs of the nation. Two weeks later, on March 21, 1933, Roosevelt presented the ECW program to Congress, noting:

I propose to create a civilian conservation corps to be used in simple work, not interfering with normal employment, and confining itself to forestry, the prevention of soil erosion, flood control and similar projects. I call your attention to the fact that this type of work is of definite, practical value, not only through the prevention of great present financial loss, but also as a means of creating future national wealth. . . .
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His proposal suggested the government form a peacetime army from unemployed youth that could undertake projects around the country to repair damage done to soil and water resources by poor farming, logging, and mineral extraction.

By 1933, an estimated 12 to 15 million people were out of work; many of the unemployed were young men. Farms were being abandoned, businesses going bankrupt, and more than 2,000 banks had shut their doors. At the same time, environmental problems resulting from the loss of 700 million acres of virgin forests and 6 billion tons of topsoil were being felt by many around the country. President Roosevelt promised that, if granted the emergency powers he requested, 250,000 men would be established in work camps by the end of July 1933. Senate Bill S. 598, introduced on March 27, 1933, quickly passed both houses of Congress, and was on the President’s desk to be signed by March 31, 1933. The resulting Executive Order 6101, dated April 5, 1933, authorized the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) program. The effort would be overseen by an Advisory Council with representation by the Secretaries of War, Labor, Agriculture and Interior. The Department of Labor was responsible for the selection and enrollment of volunteers using state and local relief offices as the basis for qualifying individuals. Reserve officers from the U.S. Army were in charge of the camps. The Departments of Agriculture and Interior were primarily responsible for planning and organizing the work to be performed; they were encouraged to devise projects in every state of the union.

Plans for the program began to take shape immediately, facilitated by the organizational prowess of the military. One of the concerns expressed was that the bulk of the unemployed youth were from the East, while much of the work that needed to be carried out was in the West. The Army was the only department capable of handling the logistics needed to organize and mobilize this workforce across great distances, and so became responsible for developing the plans needed to meet the challenge of managing this enormous mission. The Army utilized the nation’s transportation systems of rail lines and roads to move thousands of enrollees from induction centers to work camps. Engaged in the program were regular and reserve officers, and regulars of the Coast Guard, Marine Corps, and Navy.

By April 7, 1933, the first enrollees had been inducted. Enrollees were dispatched to remote

sites in forests, deserts, seashores, and canyons to carry out projects involving the conservation of natural resources and to create havens for public enjoyment. The program was organized along military lines. The CCC camps were constructed as close as possible to the areas of proposed projects. Each camp was designed to house approximately 200 enrollees as a company. The earliest camps were composed of Army tents, but, as funding was appropriated by Congress to continue the program, these were replaced with wooden barracks. The enrollees built their own camps. Camps typically included officer/technical staff quarters, a medical dispensary, mess hall, recreation hall, educational building, lavatory and showers, technical/administrative offices, tool room/blacksmith shop, parade or assembly ground, and motor pool garages.

The work conducted by each camp was dependent on a plan prepared by a department or agency. Many enrollees were devoted to soil conservation or forestry projects in particular. As such their camps included an associated designation, such as SC for Soil Conservation or F for Forestry. The men built fire towers, telephone lines, picnic tables, overlooks, trails, and campgrounds with wells, fireplaces, and privies. They piled up boulders and brush piles in erosion ditches to stop the force of water. Whatever timber improvement projects the rangers could devise, the CCC enrollees did it. In some national forests with nurseries, they planted hundreds of thousands of seedling trees. The CCC also built many, many miles of roads. The CCC were highly involved in national, state, and other parks, building trails and roads, addressing soil erosion and storm water management needs, and constructing recreational amenities.

The CCC was highly successful. Over the course of the nine-year program that lasted from 1933 to 1942, more than three million young men participated in this massive conservation effort. The CCC quickly became the most popular of Roosevelt’s New Deal programs. The program was also attractive to America’s unemployed.

Those qualifying for the program were U.S. citizens who were unemployed and on relief, unmarried, and between 18 and 28 years of age. Enrollees were volunteers who agreed to serve for a minimum six-month period. They would be given the option to extend their service period to as many as four periods, or up to two years, if they remained unable to find employment outside the CCC. They needed to pass a physical exam, or undergo a period of conditioning that allowed them to pass, to prepare them for the demands of physical labor. Enrollees worked 40 hours a week, lived in work camps, and received a base pay of $30 per month, $25 of which they were required to send home to their families. They were encouraged to spend the rest in nearby towns, to bolster local economies. In addition to their pay, they received all of their food, clothing and medical care from the program.

Over time, the program was expanded to include opportunities for African Americans, veterans, American Indians, and skilled laborers. These were known as locally experienced men; their inclusion in the program helped local communities near the camps by providing opportunities for their own unemployed.

By July 1940, with war in Europe and Asia, an increasing number of CCC projects became focused on resources for national defense, developing infrastructure for military training facilities, and forest protection. Fewer eligible young men were available after conscription commenced in 1940.

By late summer 1941, the CCC was in decline. A diminished number of applicants, problems with desertion, and the availability of jobs that siphoned off enrollees at the end of their six-month commitments reduced the program to fewer than 200,000 men in about 900 camps. With the bombing of Pearl Harbor, it soon became clear

that federal projects not directly associated with the war effort should be phased out. The CCC came under review in 1941 by Congress. A joint committee overseeing the evaluation recommended the CCC be abolished by July 1, 1942. Although it was never formally abolished, Congress severely cut funding for the program in June 1942 by a narrow vote of 158 to 151. With its funding cut, the CCC was forced to formally conclude operations at the end of the federal fiscal year on June 30, 1942. Liquidation of the CCC was ordered by Congress by the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act (56 Stat. 569) on July 2, 1942. The camps were closed and incomplete work projects were resolved to the degree possible. Enrollees were also relocated to their homes or armed force bases. CCC property was transferred to the War and Navy Departments and other agencies, while final accounting records were prepared. Although liquidation appropriations continued until April 1948, the program was substantially closed by June 30, 1943. Several CCC camps were reactivated between 1941 and 1947 as Civilian Public Service camps where conscientious objectors performed work of national importance as an alternative to military service. Other camps were used to hold Japanese American internees or German prisoners of war.

Preservation at Andersonville, 1865–2017

Andersonville National Cemetery

*(See also Historic Context Three: The National Cemetery System.*

Protection of the burial ground associated with Andersonville Prison was the first preservation effort conducted at the site. The cemetery was first visited in response to the Special Orders issued by the Quartermaster General's Office on June 30, 1865, that instructed Capt. James M. Moore to travel to Andersonville in order to mark the graves of Union soldiers for identification and to enclose or protect the cemetery. Moore arrived at Andersonville on July 26, at which point he began the work of identifying the graves, painting and lettering headboards, laying out walks, and enclosing the grounds in order to establish the site as a national cemetery. In these efforts, Moore was assisted by one company detailed from the Fourth U. S. Colored Troops based in Macon, Georgia. The work required adjustment of the soil levels on the burial trenches where it had been washed away. Because the Confederates had buried the bodies so closely together, the small woodentables, provided by the Government, which measured ten inches in width, were placed in close proximity to one another. Moore identified the individual bodies using the information contained on the numbered stakes cross-referenced with the Andersonville Hospital Record. Overall, Moore recorded the graves of 12,461 named soldiers and 451 unknown. A copy of the record was provided to the cemetery superintendent so visitors could locate the graves of identified soldiers. Andersonville National Cemetery also became the final resting place of numerous prisoners of war who had been buried at Macon, Columbus, Thomasville, and Albany, and casualties that had been buried on other regional battlefields.

Additional tasks associated with establishing the cemetery included acquiring title to the 25-acre parcel that comprised the burial ground, creating roads and walks, planting trees, shrubs, and flowers, laying drain tile, placing sod, and building a perimeter brick wall. A residence was built for the Superintendent, along with outbuildings, arbors, and a flagstaff. Over time, the cemetery came to be the focus of Memorial Day observances and ceremonies conducted by the GAR posts of the Department.

Important information was provided in the accounts of Captain Moore's initial visit during the summer of 1865 to support future interpretation of the prison site. He noted that there was only one house in the vicinity of the Andersonville railroad depot. The rest of the buildings were hospital structures, officers' quarters, and commissary and quartermaster buildings used by the Confederates. He noted the character of the stockade, which remained almost entirely intact, and its dimensions:
The noted prison pen is fifteen hundred and forty feet long and seven hundred and fifty feet wide, containing twenty-seven acres. The dead-line is seventeen feet from the stockade and the sentry boxes are thirty yards apart. The inside stockade is eighteen feet high, the outer one twelve feet, and the distance between the two is one hundred and twenty feet. . . .

The ground is filled with holes where they had burrowed, in their efforts to shield themselves from the weather, and many a poor fellow, in endeavoring to protect himself in this manner, was smothered to death by the earth falling upon him.\textsuperscript{518}

Interestingly, the Superintendent appointed for the national cemetery was instructed to “allow no buildings or structures, of whatever nature, to be destroyed, particularly the stockade surrounding the prison pen.” Despite his orders, over time all of the buildings as well as the stockade would disappear, likely carried off for use as fuel and for keepsakes by relic hunters.

Union Cavalry Gen. James H. Wilson, who was headquartered in Macon, Georgia, and responsible for the arrest of General Wirz in May 1865, was responsible for ordering the burial grounds at Andersonville surveyed, planned, and enclosed. Wilson, respectful of the events that had transpired at the site, took steps to maintain the area as a historic monument, in the words of Clara Barton, “. . . undisturbed, so long as the elements will spare the structures.”\textsuperscript{519}

The government finally secured free title to the grounds of Andersonville National Cemetery in 1875. However, their acquisition did not include the prison site, and no efforts were made to secure that land by the government. After the Civil War, the prison site remained in private ownership and was used for farming. When asked, the owner of the property indicated that he farmed the South slope of the branch, planting corn in 1879 and cotton in 1880. By 1881, the majority of the stockade had either rotted or been removed, and the enclosure north of the branch was grown up in trees and underbrush.\textsuperscript{520}

In 1883, Cemetery Superintendent James Bryant noted that the prison site land was rented to a black farmer, George W. Kennedy, by the heirs of the Turners, who had owned the land after the war. Bryant also noted that Kennedy was known to carve canes from the remaining wood of the stockade for sale as souvenirs.\textsuperscript{521} The national cemetery continued to attract visitors. Many were also interested in seeing the prison site while in the area. To accommodate visitors, the Army considered building a shelter and rostrum for protection against rain and strong sun.\textsuperscript{522} Visitors at the time also included the GAR and other veterans’ groups.

**The Role of the GAR**

*(See also Historic Context Four: Civil War Commemoration and Interpretation.)*

During the 1880s, as noted, veterans began to visit battlefields, national cemeteries, and other military sites in droves, conducting reunions and memorial observations wherever conflict had occurred. By the early 1890s, the idea of protecting the sites of hallowed ground for military research and study, and for commemoration had become a ground swell, and bills were in front of Congress to preserve and protect the Chickamauga and Antietam battlefields. At Andersonville, visitors that included thousands of prison survivors and their friends began to lament the private ownership and condition of the prison site, and to express keen regret that steps had not been taken.

\textsuperscript{518} Averill, 7.

\textsuperscript{519} Clara Barton, “Report of an Expedition to Andersonville, Georgia, July, 1865, for the Purpose of Identifying the graves and enclosing the grounds of a cemetery created there during the occupation of that place as a prison for Union soldiers in rebel hands” in \textit{A List of the Union Soldiers Buried at Andersonville}, (New York: John F. Tribune Association, 1866), v.
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\textsuperscript{521} Bryant’s Deposition, October 13, 1905, claim of Turner Heirs, Cong. Jurisdiction, Case 11496, NARG 125.

\textsuperscript{522} June 28, 1889, letter from E.S. Jones to Quartermaster General.
to acquire the grounds and preserve them as a memorial to those who had suffered there.\textsuperscript{523}

The organization that would soon take up the cause was the GAR (Figure 32). Influenced by popular demand, Commander E. S. Jones of GAR Post No. 5, based in Macon, introduced a resolution on January 24, 1890, asking the Department of Georgia to assist the Post in preserving the prison site. A committee was appointed to devise means for the purchase, preservation, and improvement of the Andersonville Prison property. At a Department meeting held in Savannah in May, the committee was authorized to purchase the prison property, for which they had already secured an option from the owner.\textsuperscript{524}

![FIGURE 32. Members of the GAR, 1883. (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site, image D-3-139)](image)

The land acquired by the Department of Georgia as part of this initial effort consisted of approximately 72-1/3 acres, and a 100-foot-wide right-of-way that connected the land with the railroad station as an access corridor. The land encompassed the entire stockade except for a small part of the northwest corner, as well as the earthworks around its perimeter (Figure 33). Along with their purchase of the land for $1,500, the GAR spent another $1,500 on improvements over the next six years, consisting of clearing undergrowth, planting a hedge around the property, planting a hedge around eighteen of the well sites, clearing and grading a belt roadway around the entire outer limit of the purchase, and building two substantial bridges across the creek. The GAR also removed debris from the stream corridor and conducted some erosion control measures consisting of driving piling at the eastern end of Branch Creek to contain the soil and prevent washing away of earth after heavy rains. In addition, they created a drive from the right-of-way across the grounds to the eastern boundary, and another drive leading from the central road to Providence Spring.\textsuperscript{525} It took the Department four years to pay off the debt incurred by acquiring and improving the property. Concerned with the cost of its upkeep, the Post asked the national GAR to take it over for them. Because of their dwindling numbers, the national group was unable to accept the proposal.\textsuperscript{526}

![FIGURE 33. Image illustrating character of the prison site at the time the GAR acquired the property, circa 1899. (Source: Averill, Andersonville Prison Park, 11)](image)

**The Role of the Woman’s Relief Corps**

*(See also Historic Context Four: Civil War Commemoration and Interpretation.)*

Following their attempt to involve the national GAR, the Post sought assistance from the Woman’s Relief Corps. While the proposition to take charge of the Andersonville Prison property was strongly advocated by several leading women of the order after investigating the property, they
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were careful to consider the idea from several angles before agreeing to the proposal.

At the Twenty-ninth National Convention of the Woman’s Relief Corps, held in St. Paul, Minnesota, in August 1896, a committee from the Georgia Department presented the idea to those convened. The committee of women selected to investigate and report on the proposal also spoke in support of the idea. Following the presentations, the membership unanimously adopted the following: “Resolved, that we accept, as a sacred trust, the Andersonville Prison property, on the conditions proposed by the Department of Georgia, GAR.”527 Their conditions included the following:

1) that the property be passed to them clear of all encumbrances; 2) that they would preserve the grounds as ‘a fitting and lasting memorial to the memory of the heroes who suffered there;’ and 3) that the grounds be improved over the years as they developed the means to do so.528

Support for the effort was immediate; by the end of the convention, contributions were made by several of the ladies present to a fund for site preservation totaling $1,865.50. Following their convention, a committee of ladies visited the National Encampment of the GAR and conveyed their decision. The announcement was received with enthusiastic applause, after which the GAR passed the following resolution: “Resolved, that we heartily commend the patriotic and generous action of the Woman’s Relief Corps, in providing for the permanent preservation of the site of the Andersonville prison.”529

The Woman’s Relief Corps also soon created a “Board of Managers of the Andersonville Prison Property,” which include Chairman Lizabeth A. Turner, Annie Wittenmyer, Emma R. Wallace, Margaret R. Wickens, and Charlotte J. Cummings. The board drew up a deed for the property, and began to solicit additional donations of funds. The property was transferred on November 18, 1896. The following year, the GAR, at their national convention, held in September 1897 in Buffalo, New York, created an advisory board to assist the Woman’s Relief Corps and ensure that the site was properly managed. The board was composed of Chairman James P. Averill, Thomas Frame, who was Superintendent of Andersonville National Cemetery, and W. W. DeHaven. The board was chosen to help carry out some of the improvement plans for the site. With approximately $3,000 in hand, the Woman’s Relief Corps remained concerned about economy, and urged that only those projects that were deemed to be the most pressing and necessary should be undertaken.

The first priority established by the board and advisory board was acquisition of 14-1/2 acres in the northwestern corner of the prison site that had not been secured earlier by the GAR due to owner reluctance. The cost of this land was estimated at $350. By this time, the owner was willing to sell, and the land was added to the holdings, which now totaled 82-2/10 acres, on August 16, 1897. The site was described as “covered with scrub oaks, briars, wild vines and sand” at the time of its purchase, and the Woman’s Relief Corps immediately set out to beautify it.530

By 1898, aspects of the remainder of the property described at the time include the fact that the earthworks were in very good condition although overgrown with trees, that the entire property had been enclosed by a Page wire fence, at a cost of approximately $600, and that the stockade area had been planted with Bermuda grass at a cost of $117. The Woman’s Relief Corps also built a nine-room residence to the north of the stockade to house a caretaker, and some visitor accommodations, as well as a stable. Furnishings for the residence were donated by members of the Woman’s Relief Corps from Massachusetts and the Department of Illinois. These improvements totaled $2,000. The Woman’s Relief Corps soon located GAR member William Wilson, of Post No. 1 in Atlanta, to serve as site caretaker.531
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The Woman’s Relief Corps also marked the prison site by erecting a 150-foot flagstaff on Memorial Day, 1898, in front of the superintendent’s residence (Figure 34). The flagstaff was a contribution of the Colony Woman’s Relief Corps No. 2 and the Fitzgerald GAR post. The flag was a gift from the Prisoners of War Association of Connecticut.

An arch bearing the inscription, “Andersonville Prison Park,” was erected “In Memory of the Unknown Dead at Andersonville,” at the main entrance on the western edge of the grounds where it met the drive leading to the railway station (Figure 35). The arch was donated by the Woman’s Relief Corps No. 9, Department of Kansas, and No. 172, Department of Massachusetts.

**FIGURE 35.** Gate erected by the Woman’s Relief Corps at Andersonville, circa 1900. (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site, image D-4-142)

Additional improvements were implemented as funds became available. In fall 1899, for example, the Woman’s Relief Corps board planted twenty-four pecan trees on the property as a way to generate funds. The pecans were to be harvested and sold. They also sold souvenirs of wood which were said to be pieces of the old stockade. Other plans were made to drain the bottom lands along the creek and clear it of vines, briars, and brush, as well as to terrace, grade, and culvert areas undergoing erosion.

In 1898, Lizabeth A. Turner persuaded the National Association of Ex-Prisoners of War during their convention in Cincinnati to assist in a project to build a stone pavilion (Figure 36) over Providence Spring, the site of a water source that had emerged within the prison complex following a storm and continued to support the needs of the prisoners until the prison was closed. The new pavilion was to replace a temporary wooden building. The pavilion was soon completed, and dedicated on Memorial Day, 1901. James Atwell, Commander of the National Association of Union Ex-Prisoners of War, unveiled a tablet marking the importance of the spring and fountain designed to contain its waters. General James P. Averill, Chairman of the Advisory Board of Managers in Atlanta, noted in his speech that “future
generations will sip from it and draw patriotic inspiration.”

Other commemorative goals included the erection of monuments to honor aspects of the prison site’s history (Figure 37). The site proposed for the location of new monuments was the elevated plateau near the north line of the stockade, which was considered to command an impressive view over much of the prison site.

**FIGURE 36.** View of Providence Springhouse and its setting as it nears completion, circa 1899. (Source: Averill, 17)

**FIGURE 37.** Dedication of the New York Monument, erected during Woman’s Relief Corps administration of the prison site, 1906. (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site, image D-4-143)

By the early twentieth century, the Woman’s Relief Corps noted the following regarding their work to date:

> Although satisfactory progress has, thus far, been made, much yet remains to be accomplished in order to carry out the plans of the Board of Managers and to satisfy their laudable ambition to transform this sacred spot into a fitting memorial. It is the desire to render it as beautiful and attractive as possible, where generations yet unborn may come to pay homage to one of the noblest bands of heroes in the world’s history and receive patriotic inspiration. Nature has done and is doing its best to aid the efforts that are being made, as though to express her warm sympathy and full approbation. She has covered, with a mantle of bright green, all of the somber features of the past. Her fertile soil responds lavishly and lovingly to the efforts to beautify the grounds. The creek, which then ran darkly through the stockade, now sparkles and dances, clear and pure, in the sunlight, never ceasing, inviting us to banish all unpleasant memories of the past and accept the joy of the present—the joy and peace which the suffering at Andersonville did so much to bequeath to us.

At the time, the site included the caretaker’s house, Providence Spring and pavilion, the site for a proposed monument, the boundary fence, an outline of the stockade that enclosed the prisoners and another indicating the extent of the outer stockade, the dead line, Confederate forts and batteries including Star Fort and associated powder magazines, the site of the gallows where the raiders were hung, the site of Captain Wirz’s headquarters, a gate at the road leading to the cemetery, the well sites dug by prisoners, the site of the dead house, an entrenched camp for guards, the road leading to the railroad station, Stockade Branch, sites of the north and south gates, and a flagstaff (Figure 38).

In 1904 at the Woman’s Relief Corps National Convention, Lizabeth A. Turner recommended that $1,000 be budgeted each year by the organization to ensure proper care of the
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Andersonville prison property. After a positive vote on the proposal, she said, “it is comforting to know that my child will be taken care of, for I regard the Andersonville prison property as my child.”\footnote{534} By August 1906, additional improvements had been made at the property, including establishment of a pump and windmill to increase the supply of water for the lodge, barnyard, and a rose garden, as was available from the existing 80-foot-deep well.\footnote{535}

Within two years, the Woman’s Relief Corps began suggesting that the War Department assume responsibility for the care of the property due to their efforts at nearby Andersonville National Cemetery, and the presence of a trained superintendent in charge. On February 9, 1909, Senator James B. Foraker of Ohio introduced a bill into the Senate to combine the two properties as Andersonville Prison Park. In May, the Senate passed Bill S6971 and sent it to the House, where it was introduced by Congressmen Gen. Isaac R. Sherwood of Ohio and Maj. Thomas W. Bradley of New York. Both Houses gave the bill unanimous approval on January 17, 1910. On March 2, 1910, President William Howard Taft signed the bill into law.

\textbf{FIGURE 38.} A map of the Prison Park, circa 1899. (Source: Averill, Andersonville Prison Park, 26–27)

\footnote{534}{\textit{Journal}, 22nd National Convention of Woman’s Relief Corps, August 1904.}

\footnote{535}{\textit{Journal}, 24th National Convention of Woman’s Relief Corps, August 1906.}
War Department Administration of Andersonville Prison Park

In 1910, the Woman’s Relief Corps committee spent some time working to put everything at the site in good order before the government assumed responsibility of the property. As noted by committee member, Sarah Winans:

As this sacred place is about to pass into other hands, and I think of laying down the work so near to my heart . . . I must confess a feeling of loneliness comes over me and I shall long to journey to that ‘Mecca’ once more and see it made more beautiful as the years go by.”

The organization vowed to remain involved at the site, particularly through donations to support care of the rose garden. The War Department vowed that “no marks now existing will be removed, and that an effort will be made to carry out in every detail the ideas of the Women’s [sic] Relief Corps in preserving this memorial . . .”

The property was officially transferred on September 20, 1910, during the 44th National Convention of the GAR and the 28th National Convention of the Woman’s Relief Corps, held simultaneously in Atlantic City, New Jersey. Kate E. Jones, Chairman of the Transfer Committee, handed the deeds and other papers to Lewis Wall, Chief Clerk of the Office of Judge Advocate General and George B. Davis of the War Department.

One of the concerns raised by Attorney Hopkins was the issue of clear title. He noted at the convention, “I do not know that I have ever come across a more tangled title than the one which your organization undertook to convey to the United States.” He went on to indicate that the Woman’s Relief Corps appeared to actually have “no title whatever . . . except by occupation and adverse possession.”

To ensure that there were no problems with the title in the future, particularly due to the fact that several states had been deeded small plots of land on which to place monuments, the Federal Government instituted friendly condemnation proceedings. These were completed by June 27, 1911, under U. S. Judge Emory Speer.

Although the War Department had reassured the Woman’s Relief Corps that they would maintain the property (Figure 39), at the national convention held in September 1913, Sarah Winans reported that the prison ground now had a “rundown appearance” and that the Woman’s Relief Corps flag had been taken down.

Concerned that Superintendent Bryant was “not in sympathy with the preservation and perpetuation of Andersonville Prison Park,” she suggested that the Woman’s Relief Corps request the War Department provide additional assurance that landmarks would not be disturbed and that Bryant “be transferred to more congenial surroundings.”

FIGURE 39. Character of the property during Department of the Army administration, date unknown. (Source: Andersonville National Historic Site, image D-5-146)

Evidence that Superintendent J. W. Bryant was not supportive of the policies instituted by the Woman’s Relief Corps began to grow in 1914. When E. G. Mitchell, C.E., made the first survey of the prison property after the federal government
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acquired it in March 1914, he noted that the Superintendent and the prison park caretaker were not cooperating with each other. The survey took note of the wooden markers that had been placed around the site with statements of former prisoners to help visitors interpret the site.

By the time the Woman’s Relief Corps held their national convention in September 1916, Superintendent Bryant had been replaced, and the organization had obtained War Department permission to raise their flag again over the prison area. The War Department also authorized the organization to refurbish the caretaker’s house and maintain it as they wished.540

During the 1917 convention, the membership learned more about the problems caused by Superintendent Bryant. Isabel Worrell Ball, Chairman of the Committee, described how he had continually opposed the ideas of the Woman’s Relief Corps, and had tried to have the caretaker’s house removed. Bryant had also had the interpretive signs removed since he did not favor the government keeping the prison area as part of the park. He ordered a painting of Andersonville be taken down in the Woman’s Relief Corps house and that all books written about Andersonville be placed out of sight. Bryant was also heard to comment that “Andersonville ought to be plowed up and planted in corn.” Effecting Bryant’s removal had been Col. John McElroy, editor of the National Tribune and a former Andersonville inmate, who, along with Isabell Ball, brought these issues to the attention of Maj. Gen. John Lincoln Clem. In 1896, Clem served as Commander of the Georgia Department of the GAR.

The Woman’s Relief Corps soon began the work of repairing the caretaker’s cottage, which was described as “shabby,” with the woodwork needing refinishing and many chairs and the glass on many pictures in need of repair or replacement.541 At the next convention, Mrs. Ball reported the house had been refurbished to the point where it was suitable for the 200 to 300 survivors who visited the prison site every year.

**CCC Activities at Andersonville, 1934–1936**

On June 18, 1934, Col. Duncan K. Major, Jr. of the War Department, who served as Representative on the Emergency Conservation Work Advisory Council, asked Robert Fechner, Director of Emergency Conservation Work, to establish a CCC in the region to address needs at Andersonville. This was to be the first CCC camp requested by the War Department for a military reservation or park. As justification, Major noted the need to clear woodlands, replant trees, drain wet areas, build access roads, and repair Star Fort as well as the lodge, museum, and entrance monuments. These repairs were required to meet the expectations of the 60,000 visitors who came to Andersonville each year.542

By June 29, Fechner had given his tentative approval for the request. By July 12, an article had been published in the Americus Times Recorder informing the CCC would begin making improvements to the park, noting them as “hard surface roads, bridges in Prison Park, restoration of Star Fort, erosion control and swamp clearing as well as construction of a small museum.” The camp, officially recorded as Company 1411, Army Camp A-3, 4th Corps Area, District H, was established on August 8, 1934, with the first enrollees arriving on September 28. Under the command of Lt. Plato S. Rhyne, twelve men set up a temporary tent camp on the north slope of the prison site. In October, work began on a more permanent camp west of the roadway that ran between the prison site and cemetery and the town of Andersonville. The wooden camp buildings were bolted together so that they could be more easily assembled. By December four barracks, capable of housing fifty men each, had been erected. A large stove in the center of each barracks provided heat. There was also a
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kitchen/mess hall, officers’ quarters, recreation hall/education building, and latrine arranged in a circle. A field used for drills and sports completed the camp.

Following the request for funds, the Quartermaster General indicated in September that the efforts of the local camp would be limited “strictly to work in the nature of flood control, prevention of soil erosion by the construction of necessary trails throughout the reservation to properly maintain the improvements made, including the housing of supplies and materials needed to [complete] this maintenance work.” This change to a focus principally on maintenance led to the abandonment of the proposed museum building in favor of a storage building.

By late January 1935, the CCC camp had 207 enrollees and staff: 164 were involved in park and forest work, 14 were skilled supervisors, 25 were involved in running the camp, and two were forest and park supervisors. The enrollees planted 38 acres of open field in trees and completed 32 acres of forest improvement projects. The 3.4 miles of road in use in the park at that time were graded, drained, and hard surfaced. The workers also constructed a new entrance gate and rock walls to provide separate access to the prison site, removing the Woman’s Relief Corps gate in April 1935. They added a new tile floor and roof to the Providence Springhouse; improved the access trail to the building by constructing a new bridge and hard surfacing the trail; and corrected water flow problems. They also corrected erosion problems associated with Stockade Branch and Star Fort, and built new pedestrian walks to provide access to the earthwork interior for visitors. (Refer to Figure 31; also see Figure 40, Figure 41, and Figure 42.)
Director Fechner visited the camp in November 1935 to dedicate the roads and bridges. He was so impressed with the camp that he wrote to Col. W. H. Noble, Quartermaster at Fort McPherson, Georgia on December 2, 1935:

> I want to congratulate you and all others who had a part in this important work. So far as my record shows, I do not know of another Civilian Conservation Corps camp or project that has made a better showing for the time and the money than has been made by Company 1411….

Camp A-3 operated from September 28, 1934, to December 31, 1935. A second side camp of 50 men, referred to as Camp A-4, was later detailed to work at Andersonville from January 1, 1936, to January 1, 1937.

**National Park Service Interest**

The War Department continued to manage the combined prison site and national cemetery through World War II, and during the postwar era. Few records have been located that pertain to U.S. Army administration of the property. Several declassified files available in the National Archives from the period 1947 to 1950 suggest that the Army conducted regular inspections of the property to determine its condition and need for repair and improvement. The cemetery is generally considered to be less well maintained than the prison park in these documents. In 1949, the Army indicated that the entrance posts at the paved highway for visitors approaching the prison park required the addition of plaques to indicate the name of the property. Records from 1949 and 1950 identified the need for a utility building, and funding was sought for its construction. In 1950, it was recognized that the well water used to supply the site, secured from three different wells, required chemical analysis and testing, and potentially the addition of filters to improve its quality for the safety of those using it.

By the middle of the 1950s, interest in the property as a significant historic site began to grow. With the publication in 1955 of MacKinlay Kantor’s best-selling novel, *Andersonville*, national attention was focused on the site, and visitation increased dramatically. Superintendent C. W. Schaller suggested in his reports that the number of visitors increased to such a degree that he and his nine-man crew could not handle the work load. They had no visitor guide booklets to hand out, or personal guides to take people around. Visitors had only available signs to read for guidance. An undated pamphlet prepared by the Department of the Army that conveys the history of the property and contains a map of the prison park may have been produced following this increase in visitation and interest in order to meet the needs of visitors.

The Georgia Chamber of Commerce took note of the site calling it “one of the South’s most underrated tourist attractions.” An article was published in the *Atlanta Journal* in 1957 describing the tourism opportunities, with another in the *Journal and Constitution Magazine*. Soon thereafter, members of the Woman’s Relief Corps were informed that their furnishings in the caretaker’s house would have to be removed so that the building could be repaired in time for Civil War Centennial events. They were told that if they refused to remove the furnishings, the building would be dismantled. Although they complied with the request, the building was nonetheless demolished in 1959.

With interest in the park as well as historic preservation growing, the Advisory Board of National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and
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Monuments recommended placing Andersonville in the National Park System in October 1959, “...should administrative considerations make it appear desirable.”

The idea remained conceptual until four years later when the Andersonville Steering Committee learned that the Department of the Army had declared a 40-acre portion of the property that included much of the prison stockade site surplus to its needs. Alarmed that the prison park property might be sold to private interests and desiring that the site be developed to attract tourists to their eight counties, the Middle Flint Planning and Development Commission, which represented eight Georgia counties, began to lobby for transferring the entire historic property to the National Park Service.

One of the people who spoke in Washington on behalf of the Commission was a farmer from Sumter County named Jimmy Carter. Carter later became Chairman of the West Central Georgia Area Planning and Development Commission and requested that a preliminary developmental study be prepared by the University of Georgia. The report suggested emphasizing the final year of the war in interpretation, allowing the prison story to be placed in context and balanced with other information from 1864-1865. The study also recommended construction of other tourist attractions nearby to support the needs of visitors traveling to Andersonville. They noted, however, that no commercial establishments should be allowed to occupy the entrance road due to the commemorative nature of the national cemetery. The study also weighed the advantages and disadvantages of having the National Park Service administer the property. The study suggested the benefits outweighed the concerns and that transfer of the site to the agency should be the first priority of the commission. Finally, the study estimated the cost of repairing the developed features of Andersonville as $750,000, with $200,000 needed to reconstruct Star Fort and the stockade; $250,000 needed to build a museum and displays; $150,000 for road building; $50,000 to acquire additional lands; $50,000 to build lakes and landscape the park; and $50,000 to develop a camp site and picnic area, and a modest commissary on Highway 49, directly across from the park entrance. With this plan implemented, they estimated the park would draw between 125,000 and 175,000 visitors, bringing significant economic benefit to the region.

Efforts to Transfer the Property to the National Park Service, 1965–1970

On November 1, 1965, several months after publication of the University of Georgia study, the Department of the Army requested the National Park Service consider assuming responsibility of Andersonville as a national park. In March 1966, Georgia Senator Richard Russell invited Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, to visit Georgia. Attending a meeting conducted in his office were Georgia’s Junior Senator Herman Talmadge, Third District Congressman Howard “Bo” Calloway, and State Senator Jimmy Carter. The attendees requested that Udall consider establishing Andersonville as a national historic site. In his appeal, Carter noted that the Georgians in the room believed the events that transpired at Andersonville were of national significance, and memory of them should be preserved as part of the nation’s history. Udall responded “I like the idea. History contains many things that are pleasant and unpleasant. That is the story of life.”

In May 1966, a National Park Service planning team prepared a report on management alternatives for the property and suggested it be considered for national historic site designation.

550. Statement of Mr. L.H. McKenzie, Chairman of the Middle Flint Planning and Development Commission, Andersonville National Historic Site files.
On June 7, 1967, Alfred B. Fitt, Special Assistant (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, admitted in a letter to Raymond L. Freeman, Acting Assistant Director, National Park Service:

We [the Army] have been unable in the past with the funds provided for cemeterial expenses to develop and encourage greater visitor-use and interpretation of the area. I believe that our future capability will be similarly restricted. The National Park Service has both the staff and experience to develop the Prison Park into a worthwhile venture so that funds spent on the installation will serve a beneficial purpose. I shall appreciate your reconsidering the alternatives developed in the Planning Study Report with a view to supporting transfer of the Prison Park to the National Park Service.554

In November 1967, the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, during its annual meeting, endorsed the idea that Andersonville be administered by the National Park Service. In December, National Park Service Planners began to prepare a master plan to use in getting the necessary legislation passed.555 Within a year, Jack Brinkley, Congressman from the Third District, Georgia, had introduced a bill into Congress to make Andersonville a national historic site, with a plan to tell the prisoner of war story for all American wars, not just the Civil War. This initial effort, however, failed to pass.556

A second bill was prepared and on June 2, 1970, the House of Representatives Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings to discuss H.R. 140. George Hartzog, Director of the National Park Service, in a prepared statement, observed that Andersonville had “the greatest amount of remaining archeological and historical data for the presentation of the prison story during the Confederacy.” In response to the question of why more land was needed for the park, Hartzog answered that future land purchase was necessary “to control the environment and the type of development that takes place adjacent to the historic site.” Further, he believed that interpretation to northern visitors of the pattern of how the prisoners lived would be “a very difficult interpretation.” Hartzog disclosed that one part of the interpretive plan for the park was to reconstruct the outline of the prison site rather than the complete prison site. When asked why the National Park Service should not charge a fee to Andersonville visitors, Hartzog replied that the agency did not charge admission to national cemeteries or visitor centers, and that charging admission would be difficult at Andersonville because the park had two entrances off a heavily travelled state highway. In answer to a query as to why the Service could not close one entrance, Hartzog said that the prison park and cemetery were not connected within the park by a road and they could not be because of the location of the graves.557

The vision to include Andersonville in the national park system was finally realized when President Richard Nixon signed Public Law 91-465 on October 16, 1970, authorizing the establishment of Andersonville National Historic Site. In this bill Congress stated that Andersonville’s mission was “to provide an understanding of the overall prisoner of war story of the Civil War, to interpret the role of prisoner of war camps in history, to commemorate the sacrifices of Americans who lost their lives in such camps, and to preserve the monuments located therein.”558 The bill indicated that after the National Park Service acquired lands up to a limit of 500 acres, it would be allocated $1.6 million to spend in developing the park.

On July 1, 1971, in a ceremony lasting fewer than five minutes, the authority over Andersonville cemetery and prison park was transferred from the Department of the Army to the National Park Service. Nicklas G. Hamaty of Atlanta, representing the Department of the Army, handed
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keys to the gates of the cemetery and prison park to John Jensen, the new National Park Service Superintendent of Andersonville.559

**National Park Service Administration, 1971–2017**

Even as designation of Andersonville Prison Park and National Cemetery as a national historic site signaled a new era in the preservation of these related historic sites, there arose areas of conflict and concern. One of the immediate issues of concern was adequate management and maintenance of the property, as the only staff assigned to the property were National Park Service Superintendent, John Jensen, and five maintenance personnel who remained from the Department of the Army administration. There was little in the way of equipment to work with, as the Army had taken most everything with them. Aside from maintenance concerns, the Superintendent was initially faced with addressing the land ownership goals for the park. In addition to the 202 acres transferred to the Department of the Interior by the Department of the Army, Jensen set about acquiring the land necessary to meet the goals of the 1965 master plan. Jensen would purchase 272 acres at a cost of $214,885. Because some of the related properties were residential, several houses had to be demolished, and new homes had to be built elsewhere for the displaced persons.560

The other area of concern arose from the response of Georgia residents, concerned that promotion of Andersonville as a national park unit would damage the reputation of Southerners when visitors learned of the conditions at the prison during the Civil War. The national organizations of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Sons of the Confederacy worked to intercede in the process of establishing Andersonville as a national historic site by writing letters to the Congressmen and working with the press to prevent the “cruelly unfair reflections on the Confederacy . . . [which] most of the published histories of Andersonville have done.”561 The United Daughters of the Confederacy also demanded “equal treatment in the allocation of federal funds, the right to place monuments and markers giving the Southern position leading up to the war and to include in any historical speeches or recordings . . . the South’s side of the historical background of the war.”562 The Superintendent spent much of his first year addressing the concerns of Georgia Congressmen, vowing that the site would “tell the Andersonville story without reviving old antagonisms,” and promising to “welcome the touring history buff and provide an oasis of serenity for urban citizens.”563

Despite the outcry, development of the park moved forward. Congressman Jack Brinkley indicated that Southern states would be allowed to place monuments at Andersonville, and that Georgia had already been encouraged to build its own monument there. In a letter to National United Daughters of the Confederacy President, Mrs. G. A. Moore, Jr., Brinkley wrote that he was interested in “preserving and protecting our Southern heritage at every opportunity,” and hoped that the South might find a way to honor “our native sons who died in northern prisoner of war camps.”564

Another politician who was involved in the discussion was Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter. Carter in particular was interested in the effort of state government to place a Georgia monument at Andersonville. He thought it should memorialize the Georgians who had died in northern prisoner of war camps during the Civil War, as well as Georgia prisoners of war since that time.565 To support the effort, Carter made $10,000 available from a discretionary emergency account for the

---

monument. He also appointed a committee of local residents to work on the project.566

Opposition to the park slowly quieted down. After the controversy appeared over, a second ceremony was held on May 28, 1972, to mark the transfer of the park from the Department of the Army to the National Park Service. Nicholas Hamaty, Assistant Chief, National Cemetery Supervising Office, passed keys to Sam Weems, Assistant to the Director of the Southeast Region, National Park Service.567

By 1972, the park boasted eleven permanent employees, and had initiated a full-time interpretive program. The park also had the beginnings of a library and a collection of items relating to the Civil War. The park also began to prepare a research file on Andersonville prisoners of war and the guards who had been stationed at the prison. One of the preservation efforts conducted within the park was the removal of trees to reveal the historic earthworks.568 The Georgia Monument was commissioned in 1973.

To increase tourism, the Superintendent worked with the Middle Flint Planning Commission to create the Andersonville Auto Loop Tour, a 75-mile planned route from 1-75 at Perry to Andersonville, and returning to the interstate via Cordele.569 At the site, visitors could purchase a 20-page brochure written by Raymond F. Baker of the National Park Service from research conducted by agency Historian Edwin C. Bearss.

In the town, residents formed the Andersonville Guild, concerned with work to “preserve, restore, beautify and promote Andersonville as a Georgia community during the era of the Civil War.” Peggy Sheppard, a long-time resident and a culinary columnist in Georgia Magazine, published a book entitled Andersonville, Georgia, USA.570

Lee, an artist with the Middle Flint Area Planning and Development Commission, painted a “mural size representation of what the town should look like, right down to store fronts and paint colors.”571

With these efforts, visitation increased dramatically. To meet the needs of the visitors, the park’s interpretive programs were expanded. The park staff erected a gazebo with interpretive panels and an audio station within the prison park site. Archeological investigations were conducted to support the knowledge base for interpretation. The study was led by Dr. Lewis Larson of West Georgia College under the guidance of the National Park Service’s Southeast Archeological Center. The study was also deemed important as a mitigation strategy to ensure that nothing was inadvertently built over the original stockade, should the National Park Service decide to build an interpretive replica.572 The investigations revealed the location of both the inner and outer stockades, and the northeast and northwest corners and the north gate of the stockade. Later, a wayside exhibit was installed near the entrance to the prison site, which was accompanied by an orientation map and brochures that outlined a self-guided tour of the entire park.573

In July 1974, Superintendent Jensen was transferred and replaced by John Flister in October.574 When the gasoline crisis began to curtail visitation, Superintendent Flister initiated programs to encourage local residents to be more involved with the park, such as senior citizen tours, and worked closely with the Andersonville Trail, the Andersonville Guild, and the Middle Flint Planning and Development Commission to promote tourism.575 The annual Memorial Day
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services were also reinstituted in 1974 after a lapse of many years.

On July 4, 1975, Superintendent Flister began a program of offering Torchlight Tours of the park that included theatrical presentations by the 5th Georgia Civil War Reenactment Group, and tours and demonstrations by park personnel dressed as Confederate soldiers. To help the staff with the tours and other special events, Flister began the V.I.P. or Volunteers in the Park program and implemented the existing program at Andersonville National Historic Site. On October 15, 1975, the park opened a nature trail and center in the prison site. The nature center was based in the old carriage house, and included animals such as goats, rabbits, quail, and squirrels, exhibited in their natural habitats. The animals were intended to provide local school children with something interesting to look forward to during their visit, while also teaching them about the environment and history.

As the Bicentennial approached, the park worked to repair and restore resources that were in deteriorated condition. Several Civil War-era headstones found in the woods nearby were returned to the cemetery. The staff also checked the accuracy of each individual headstone against the index card file and the Dorence Atwater list of prisoners interred in Andersonville. To publicize these efforts, Park personnel were featured in six television programs telecast from the nearby cities of Macon, Columbus and Albany.

During the Bicentennial Year, the Georgia monument was unveiled on Memorial Day. Sculpted by Georgia artist William Thompson, the monument consisted of three figures standing on a granite base engraved with the names of Georgia prisoners of war in all the wars. The Mengel Foundry of Detroit, Michigan, cast Thompson’s clay model in bronze. Thompson, speaking at the unveiling, interpreted the three figures as representing humanity, suffering, and death. He noted that the figures are “not looking at one another but are looking for God ... and are searching for Him to come to help them.”

It was also during 1976 that a Youth Conservation Corps unit, called Camp Sweetwater, and one of only four in Georgia, was established at Andersonville. Twenty-six young men and women from the surrounding counties helped to clean up the site and stabilize the earthworks.

Later that year, the park experimented with redirecting visitors during their visit by closing the prison park gate so that visitors arrived at one location where they could be greeted by staff and counted.

In 1977, local resident Jimmy Carter was inaugurated as President of the United States. This brought many people into the area to visit nearby Plains, his hometown. Resident Peggy Sheppard believed Carter’s election changed many local people’s attitudes about the park at Andersonville:

> For many years, the people wanted nothing to do with Andersonville, because it made them angry and a little ashamed. Now the people here no longer pretend there was no such thing as Andersonville prison. You can see the scars healing in a place like this. We’re all looking at our history a little more squarely now.

Additionally, the Houston Home Journal of Perry, Georgia, applauded Andersonville for “rescuing its name from undeserved prejudice dating from the 1860s and making it a symbol of Southern hospitality and goodwill.”

In October 1977, the Andersonville Society was formed with a mission to publish the names of all prisoners, guards, and civilians associated with the prison.

---

577. Ibid., August 22, 1975; November 6, 1975.
In response to the increase in visitation to Andersonville, park staff began a program to protect the earthworks from erosion and traffic. They closed the roadway around Star Fort temporarily to protect the fort and to avoid traffic congestion. When this change was found to be acceptable, the road was closed permanently.  

In the spring of 1978, Ellen Ehrenhard of the National Park Service's Southeast Archeological Center completed a cultural resource inventory of the prison. Excavation was completed in order to protect underground remains of the prison and of prehistoric artifacts during future development.

During a festival referred to as the Andersonville Historic Town Fair held in 1978, Secretary of State Ben Fortson dedicated Easterlin Square. In his speech, Fortson commended the people of Andersonville and the Andersonville Guild for their restoration of the town. Three stores and ten houses still standing from Civil War times had been rehabilitated. Mayor Easterlin noted that in 1864–1865 Union prisoners were unloaded at the town and for the next 100 years the town had “. . . tried to live down memory of the prison. Then they came to realize you can’t do that; you learn to live with it. People here don’t bear that guilt anymore, [and] they’re banking on that history to revitalize the town.”

New interpretive programs initiated in 1978 sought to teach good planning for and management of the environment. The prison was made an example of how people suffered because of lack of resources that resulted from poor planning and management. One of the goals of the staff during 1979 was good management of resources in the park.

One of the attractions of the park during the late 1970s was the collection of war records maintained by the park and available for use by visitors in the visitor center. One employee, Sarah Robinson, estimated that 90 percent of the visitors looked through the war records, many looking for information about ancestors.

In 1980, to preserve the soil and to beautify the entire park, 72,000 square feet of centipede grass sod was placed over prepared soil. Many maintenance hours were spent preparing the soil as well as ensuring that the new grass survived the summer drought. One result of the drought may have been the cessation of the flow of Providence Spring in November, 1980. Park officials felt that this treasured monument had to be saved. Thus the reservoirs of the spring had to be cleared of sand and root systems. This required the cleaning out and replacement of some of the pipes from the spring to the fountain. After this work, the spring began to flow again at its normal level.

On October 8, 1980, Superintendent John Flister retired. He was followed by Superintendent John Tucker, who took over the position on November 17. Tucker found the park “in excellent condition.” Among the projects that Tucker pursued during his early tenure was a survey and marking of the park boundaries in the summer of 1981, the first time this had been done since the agency had assumed responsibility for the site. He proposed clearing the trees that were growing along Stockade Branch. He also identified several research needs: archeological investigations at the prison and prehistoric site areas, and on property that was under consideration for designation as surplus, excavation of the wells that had been filled in, and historic resource studies from 1827–1864 and from 1865–1970.

While the staff agreed that the trees growing along Stockade Branch obstructed the view of the prison grounds and curtailed the ability of visitors to understand the size and shape of the prison, they remained reluctant to cut them down because many were very old and large. The Superintendent nevertheless determined that they should be removed in three stages. The second phase
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involved removal of trees from the earthworks and the hospital site.

The property under consideration as surplus was located across the highway from the cemetery entrance. The army had previously determined the land surplus. Park staff opposed a similar agency declaration due to the fact that the remains of a CCC camp, the original entrance to the cemetery, and the Old Dixie Highway were located on the tract. Following investigation of the property by the Southeast Archeological Center in 1983, it was decided that the park would retain the parcel for these historic associations.

In 1981 the road connecting the cemetery and the prison area was graded and paved with the chip and seal process. Fourteen new wayside exhibits were installed that featured Riddle photographs from the Civil War period to enhance visitor understanding of the prison site. Because of erosion of land around the wells in the prison area, all but three of the remaining wells were filled in with white sand and covered over with plastic so that if excavation is needed in the future it will be easy to carry out. The cookhouse well was also filled.

To house museum items, a room was set aside in the maintenance building for curatorial storage. A hydrothermograph was installed to ensure that the environment was kept at the right level to preserve the archived material. In 1983, central heating and air conditioning was installed in the maintenance building, and the curatorial room was moved to the former well-house building.

In order to protect the park’s setting, the park signed an agreement with the Mulite Corporation of America to reclaim Tract 02-114, which they had strip-mined in the early 1970s. In conformance with the agreement, the company added topsoil and planted pine trees. It was also during 1982 that a greater emphasis was placed on the mission Congress had included in the enabling legislation suggesting that the park tell the story of prisoners of war throughout history, rather than just the Civil War era. Interpretation was expanded to meet this mission. Finally, during 1982, Star Fort was made accessible to wheel chairs by replacing the foot bridge with a ramp.

In 1983, the brick perimeter wall around the cemetery was painted by the park’s mason. The maintenance crew implemented a new turf management plan that called for centipede grass in the cemetery and common Bermuda grass in the prison site. The crew estimated that the centipede would reduce fertilizer and chemical use by 60 percent and reduce weeds. The crew also attempted to control kudzu for the first time. A new 84-foot-long equipment shed was added to the maintenance area. The rostrum was wired so that speeches could be heard more easily, while all electric lines around the buildings were placed underground to enhance the scene.

Bob Byrd of the Veterans Administration inspected the cemetery in 1983 and found 600 headstones associated with the Civil War and Spanish American War era defective. He recommended that the National Park Service develop more effective cemetery management policies. In response, a Southeast Region Committee was formed to look into management policies. The committee initially called for historian Ed Bearss and others to formulate a definite national policy. Superintendent Tucker helped to organize the first Conference on National Cemeteries in June 1984 in Washington, D.C. The participants, who included representatives of the fourteen national cemeteries administered by the National Park Service, determined that specific guidelines for the operation and maintenance of the cemeteries would be necessary. The new guidelines were to conform to the Act of 1973 that conveyed several cemeteries to the care of the National Park Service. The committee that produced the guidelines informed NPS 61 in January 1986 and were placed in the Code of Federal Regulations in May 1986 included Superintendent Tucker.

Because park buildings were now filled with materials interpreting the Civil War era, the Superintendent determined in 1987 that the POW story for other wars could not adequately be dealt with in the existing facilities. A temporary POW
exhibit was placed in the brick storage house at the prison site for the edification of the public. At the same time, park staff met with the Southeastern and Southwestern Directors and the National Historian of the American Ex-Prisoners of War, Inc. to address the need to better commemorate the sacrifices of all American POWs. They agreed to use one of the rooms in the visitor center to house an ex-Prisoner of War museum. Because public funding was not available to carry out their plans, the group decided to seek private funding. Thus, five community representatives formed The Friends of the Park, which planned to set up a foundation to accept private donations toward the development of a museum or exhibit. 588

In 1984, the town of Andersonville won a Phoenix Award for its restoration work from the Society of American Travel Writers. Herb Rau, one of the judges and an official of the Travel Writers Association, enumerated the accomplishments of the Andersonville Guild in its ten-year history to give the town an appearance reflecting the 1864–1865 period: all the storage buildings were restored and two modern structures, including the mobile home that housed the mayor’s office, were removed; a railroad depot built in the late 1800s was moved into town to serve as a welcome center, museum, and city hall; and a historic log church was also moved into the town and restored. 589

During the thirty-seventh annual convention of American Ex-POWs held in Seattle, Washington in 1984, the leadership urged the Secretary of Interior to fund a visitor’s center at Andersonville with a museum for POW items, a separate research room, and a theater for showing movies about POWs. 590 Associate Director of the National Park Service, David G. Wright, replied that funding was scarce and that new buildings could not be a high priority at that time. 591 A collection box placed in the park’s visitor center raised $2,300 for the effort.

The Andersonville staff prepared a survey of the industrial community around the park in 1983. They noted that Mulite Corporation of America (MULCOA) was located just south of the site and American Cyanamid about 2 miles north. Both companies were noted as strip-mining bauxite and kaolin, and cleaning, drying, and grading the minerals for shipment. Before the companies installed air cleaners, the chemical used in their operations had affected the growth of nearby vegetation. The pollution was reduced substantially, and the Superintendent praised the management of both companies for their cooperative nature. The Superintendent also noted that MULCOA owned 13.89 acres within the authorized park boundary and that the National Park Service hoped the industry would donate it when they had extracted the minerals and restored the land. A third company, Buckeye Cellulose, 5 miles to the north, was less of a visual intrusion on the park. A division of Proctor and Gamble, Buckeye produced cellulose out of pine pulpwood. When the wind blew toward the park, there was sometimes a problem with unpleasant odors in the park. Another way that this industry affected the site was in bringing increased truck traffic to Georgia Highway 49. 592

By 1985, the need for the new prisoner of war interpretive venue had become a larger concern. National Historian, Helen Smith, in a letter to Secretary of Interior, Donald Hodel, called a new visitor center at the park a “must.” She pointed to the inadequacy of the present building, saying, “There is no way the Park Service can display all the memorabilia that Ex-Prisoners of War have donated at the museum.” She also raised the point that a new visitor center would allow for a better separation between visitors and funerals, a vital
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need. The Ex-POW Association publicized Andersonville’s need for POWs to donate their records and memorabilia. In May, many of them attended a Prisoner of War forum at Georgia Southwestern College where Helen Smith and POWs from World War II and Korea served on a panel to discuss their experiences. In August, Mrs. Smith and her husband, Gordon, worked alongside the staff at Andersonville to set up an exhibit to show the POW memorabilia in the Carriage House. The site received accreditation for the museum from the American Association of Museums in 1986.

Later that year, park maintenance personnel enclosed the front porch of the lodge/administration building to establish a waiting room for family members of persons to be buried in the cemetery. Funeral home owners from around the state donated the funds.

In October, National Park Service Director Mott and Regional Director Baker visited the site. They discussed with the Superintendent the idea of rebuilding part of the inner stockade to help the public better understand the park. They suggested reconstructing three corners, the deadline, and a sentry location. The features were to be constructed with pressure treated wood set in concrete to help them last longer.

With ever increasing visitation, in 1985 the parking area at Providence Spring and Star Fort were enlarged and all of the park roads repaved.

In the spring of 1986, all the pipes around the springhouse were replaced. Erosion has been a concern within the areas of the prison where the slopes are steep, and visitors congregate. The northeastern portion of the stockade is one area where erosion has resulted in a reworking of interpretive features, such as the stockade wall. A site visit by National Park Service regional archeologist Guy Prentis in 2012 indicated ongoing problems with erosion on the eastern side of the reconstructed North Gate, near the Southeast Redan, and elsewhere.

An amendment to the 1981 General Management Plan, prepared in 1987, proposed that “three corners and a portion of the west wall and the gate of the inner prison stockade be reconstructed to enhance the park’s interpretive program and promote and better understanding by visitors of the prison and prison conditions.” Following a Finding of No Significant Impact, the project was revised slightly to begin at the northwest corner rather than the southwest corner due to previous disturbance in that area by archeological investigations. Reconstruction of the northeast corner was completed in February 1988, and evaluated prior to continuation of the project with reconstruction of the southeast corner. Based on review of a visitor questionnaire regarding the effect of the northwest corner reconstruction, the park decided to move forward with reconstruction of the southeast prison corner wall and the north gate. The work continued into the early 1990s, and was completed by 1992.

The southeast corner reconstruction has since been removed. Information was not available for this study to confirm when or why it was dismantled.
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Historic Resources Associated with Historic Context Five

- East and west storage buildings (Guest House and Carriage House)
- Providence Spring pavilion
- Prison Site Road
- Stockade Branch bridges
- Erosion control measures, Stockade Branch and Star Fort
- Drainage channels and erosion control systems

Significance

Andersonville National Historic Site is nationally significant under Criterion A for its association with several historic trends in military site preservation that have helped to protect, mark, and make accessible to the public the valor, bravery, and sacrifice of Civil War soldiers.

The park is associated with a broad national context of military site preservation efforts initiated by private groups and veterans beginning in the 1860s. These efforts culminated in the establishment of the first five national military parks in the 1890s at Antietam, Chickamauga/Chattanooga, Gettysburg, Shiloh, and Vicksburg.

Andersonville National Cemetery was established by the federal government in 1865, and was thus afforded protection and commemoration consistent with other cemeteries that comprised the National Cemetery System once free title to the land was secured in 1875.

The Prison Park site, however, returned to private agricultural use after the war. It was not until 1890, after veterans groups had formed and begun to organize reunions at military sites, that the GAR identified the need to protect and preserve the Prison Site. The GAR was soon successful in securing the land associated with the stockade, and set to work improving its condition, and providing access to the property. With their numbers dwindling, the GAR engaged the Woman’s Relief Corps to assist with the preservation of the Prison Park site. It was through the untiring efforts of this private organization that the Prison Park survived. The financial burden of maintaining the park, however, led the Woman’s Relief Corps to transfer administration of the property to the War Department and U.S. Army in 1910, with their ongoing involvement in site preservation.

Improvements to the condition of Prison Park features were affected by the CCC during the 1930s. These efforts resulted in preservation of eroding earthworks and stream corridors, and the installation of stormwater management structures to help diminish further deterioration of the landscape. These efforts, and those of the National Park Service beginning in 1970 have resulted in the protection of the site of the historic prison, with gestures such as roads and markers affording access to the site and the means for understanding missing physical fabric.

These efforts are consistent with a national context for military site preservation associated with units of the National Park System as well as other historic military sites administered by state and local governments and private organizations around the country.

Historic military sites constitute important destinations in the American landscape of travel, tourism, leisure, and recreation. They also represent one of the nation’s most potent symbolic landscape types. As didactic landscapes, they have served as physical expressions of the nation’s collective memory and postwar reconciliation. The national military parks are among the first American landscapes that clearly reveal the contested nature of history and public memory. Andersonville conveys aspects of these early efforts to protect and preserve, as well as mark, commemorate, and honor the contributions of American military personnel. While they continue to protect hallowed ground and mark the locations of events associated with significant military events, they are also parks that provide interpretive programs to visitors, and commemorative sites that mark, honor, and revere...
the contributions of many groups and individuals. The history of military site protection and preservation is a significant aspect of American history well represented at Andersonville. It speaks not only to the dedication of our federal government to recognize important moments in our past, but also of private local and regional groups. Grassroots efforts have often led the way in the preservation of significant historic sites; Andersonville is a prime example of this trend in our nation’s history.
Identification and Assessment of Historic Resources

**FIGURE 43.** Andersonville National Cemetery, view of markers and monuments, with the rostrum in the background.

**Introduction**

This chapter provides more detailed information about the character, configuration, and history of each of the historic cultural resources located within Andersonville National Historic Site that have been assessed as part of this Historic Resource Study (HRS).

The resources are organized in accordance with the contexts with which they are most closely associated. The resource descriptions are illustrated with maps and photographs wherever possible.

**Historic Resources Associated with Historic Context One**

Although there are no features related to this context that survive within the park, several historic buildings, structures, and landscape elements are present in close proximity to the park that relate to early settlement of the region. These
elements were integrally tied to the development of Camp Sumter during the Civil War. They include the Norfolk Southern Railroad rail line, the Andersonville rail depot, the Town of Andersonville, and the Georgia State Route 49 road corridor.

**Norfolk Southern Railroad Rail Line**

Although located outside of park boundaries, the present-day Norfolk Southern Railroad line (originally the Southwestern Railroad line) passes through Andersonville along the same route that was established during the nineteenth century, and used to transport prisoners to Camp Sumter during the Civil War. Between the opening of the prison in February 1864 and the end of the war, the rail line served as a critical transportation link for all Confederate military activities associated with the prison. A train wreck on the line near Fort Valley, Georgia, resulted in Union prisoner of war casualties. The line also served to convey War Department representatives as well as Clara Barton to the area to inspect the prison site and support its transition to a national cemetery. It later was instrumental in bringing veterans and other visitors to the area to tour the prison park. The present-day railroad depot is not the same building, and is not in the same location as the one used during the Civil War.

The Norfolk Southern Railroad line, located near the western edge of Andersonville National Historic Site, contributes to the significance of the park as part of its setting under both the settlement and prison period contexts.

**Andersonville Railroad Depot**

The availability of the rail line and railroad depot at Andersonville was a critical factor in Confederate selection of this location to establish a prisoner of war camp in 1863. Although a railroad depot edges the rail line today outside the western boundary of the park, is it not the same building that was present during the Civil War (Figure 44). The present-day depot is also not in the same location as the earlier building, although it lies proximate to the original depot’s original site. Other changes that have occurred that affect the integrity of the resource include the planting of vegetation by the National Park Service to screen views of kaolin and bauxite mine plants located near the park. This screening also serves to limit historic views of the railroad depot and the Wirz monument in the town of Andersonville from the prison park landscape. Although the railroad depot does not contribute to the significance of the Andersonville National Historic Site landscape, the building plays an important role in interpreting the establishment and operation of Camp Sumter.
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**FIGURE 44.** The Norfolk Southern Railroad rail line and Andersonville railroad depot, located near the park’s western boundary.

**Town of Andersonville**

The town of Andersonville was first established under the name Anderson Station in 1835. It was named for John Anderson, a director of the Southwestern Railroad, which was extended from Oglethorpe to Americus that year. The railroad company established a small depot at this location, which contributed to the town’s settlement. The name of the town was changed to Andersonville in 1855 after a post office was established there in November, in order to avoid confusion with the post office in Anderson, South Carolina. In the fall of 1863, when the area was selected for use as a prison by Brig. Gen. John Winder (who was in charge of Confederate prison operations), the village was home to approximately twenty individuals. During the period of prison operations, approximately twenty buildings were built or added to the town in support of prison administration. The connection between the village, its railroad depot, and the prison was
critical since every prisoner brought to Camp Sumter arrived at Andersonville by rail, and was then marched east to the gates of the prison camp stockade. When the prison was constructed, trees were cleared to facilitate a visual connection between the prison site and the railroad depot.

Today, there are several nineteenth century structures located within the town of Andersonville. A centerpiece of the commercial square is a monument to Capt. Heinrich Hartmann Wirz, who served as commander of Camp Sumter for most of its fourteen-month period of operations (Figure 45). Wirz was convicted of murder and conspiracy by a military tribunal and hanged in Washington, D.C., in November 1865. The United Daughters of the Confederacy, determined to honor and vindicate Wirz, decided to erect a monument in his honor. After much controversy over where the monument should be located, the town of Andersonville was selected as the site. The monument was erected in 1908 and dedicated on May 12, 1909. The monument consists of a limestone obelisk set on a granite and rusticated limestone base. Inscriptions on the granite base of the monument read as follows:

**North side:**

When time shall have softened passion and prejudice, when reason shall have stripped the mask from misrepresentations, then justice, holding evenly her scales, will require much of past censures and praise to change places.

Jefferson Davis, Dec. 1888

**South side:**

Discharging his duty with such humanity as the harsh circumstances of the times, and the policy of the foe permitted, Capt. Wirz became at last the victim of a misdirected popular clamor. He was arrested in the time of peace, while under the protection of parole, tried by a military commission of a service to which he did not belong, and condemned to ignominious death on charges of excessive cruelty to Federal prisoners. He indignantly spurned a pardon proffered on condition that he would incriminate President Davis and thus exonerate himself from charges of which both were innocent.

**East side:**

In memory of Captain Henry Wirz, C.S.A. born Zurich, Switzerland, 1822, sentenced to death and executed at Washington D.C. November 10, 1865. To rescue his name from the stigma attached to it by embittered prejudice this shaft is erected by the Georgia division, United Daughters of the Confederacy.

**West side:**

It is hard on our men held in southern prisons not to exchange them, but it is humanity to those left in the ranks to fight our battles. At this particular time to release all rebel prisoners would insure Sherman’s defeat and would compromise our safety here.

Ulysses S. Grant, Aug. 18, 1864

**FIGURE 45.** The town of Andersonville, including the Wirz Monument.

The town of Andersonville contributes to the significance of the park as part of its setting under both the settlement and prison period contexts. It remains an important resource for interpreting the events associated with the Civil War and postwar commemoration.
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Georgia State Route 49 Corridor

Georgia State Route 49 is a public two-lane arterial road that connects Andersonville to the nearby towns of Americus and Oglethorpe, Georgia. All of the access roads that lead into park roads arise from this highway. Georgia State Route 49 forms the northern boundary of the national historic site. It edges the national cemetery to the west, and cuts through a portion of the park as it continues southward (Figure 46). Georgia State Route 49 was constructed circa 1932. Part of the road corridor follows the route of the earlier Oglethorpe-Americus Road, which became part of the Dixie Highway. The Oglethorpe-Americus Road was relocated in the 1910s to lie east of the rail line. This newer location was used in part for the route of Georgia State Route 49, although traces of the earlier road remain in evidence within the park and elsewhere in the vicinity of the town of Andersonville. The original cemetery entrance road was also affected by these changes to the highway system, and was abandoned after construction of Georgia State Route 49. A new road was also built to connect visitors to the prison park. The new road was sited across from the route leading to the village of Andersonville. Referred to as Pecan Lane, this road was constructed by the CCC. Georgia State Route 49, which is located outside of the park’s boundary, contributes to the significance of the park as part of its setting.

**FIGURE 46.** View across the Georgia State Route 49 corridor from inside the park.

Historic Resources Associated with Historic Context Two

The park was established in part to protect surviving evidence of Camp Sumter. Several resources located outside current park boundaries also relate to Historic Context Two, including the Norfolk Southern Railroad rail line, Andersonville railroad depot, and the Town of Andersonville. In addition, several features located within the park can be tied to prison operations. These surviving prison-related features include wells dug by prisoners, earthworks established to protect against prisoner escape and potential Union attack, and the burial locations of Union and Confederate military personnel.

Although not addressed as part of this study, there are also likely archeological resources within the park that relate to this context. (See also Cultural Landscapes, Ethnographic Resources, Archeology, and Museum Collections chapter.) Park historic resources that relate to Historic Context Two are discussed below.

Wells Dug by Prisoners

The period of use as a prison, from late 1863 to May 1865, is represented by the remains of earthworks and the sites of prisoner-excavated wells (Figure 47).

Due to the poor quality of the water associated with Stockade Branch during the period of prison occupation, prisoners dug wells within the ground of the stockade to secure an additional source of fresh water. It is believed that between 50 and 200 wells were dug by prisoners to secure water for drinking and other purposes. These were located both north and south of Stockade Branch. Several of the known well locations are indicated with small concrete markers. Although most of the well sites have been filled over the years for visitor safety, others survive but are enclosed within iron fences.
emplacements around the perimeter of the site in 1864 that were used to emplace artillery as a means to prevent prisoners from escaping, and Union forces from overtaking the prison.

Civil War-era field fortifications were typically earthen structures composed of a parapet wall and a ditch system. The wall protected artillery and soldiers from incoming fire, while the ditch served as an obstacle to attackers. Earthworks interiors were engineered to accommodate artillery with gun platforms, traverses to protect against enfilading fire, and a level bench where soldiers could stand along the interior of the parapet. The parapet and ditch system was arranged into one of several geometric forms according to terrain and anticipated avenues of enemy attack. The four forms used most often during the Civil War were the redan, redoubt, star fort, and lunette. A redan is a V-shaped salient angle that faces the direction of an anticipated attack. A redoubt is a square or polygonal, fully enclosed form. A star fort is also fully enclosed but features five or more redan-like extensions to face different potential avenues of approach or attack. A lunette is linear feature composed of two faces that form a projecting angle, and two flanks.

At Andersonville, the Confederates built an earthwork system along the perimeter of the prison site that was composed of six redans and lunettes, a detached redoubt to the west that was supported by a rifle pit, and Star Fort located at the southwest corner (Figure 48).

**Earthworks**

(HS-110 through HS-118, LCS 006106 through 006114)

Confederate military personnel stationed at Andersonville prison devised a system of earthen
The earthworks survive today, and can be accessed and viewed from the tour road. A wooden ramp has been added to provide access to the interior of Star Fort from the road. The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) are believed to have repaired eroded and damaged sections of Star Fort’s earthen walls during the 1930s.

The earthworks are currently maintained under a mix of grasses and other low-growing vegetation; there are also trees growing on some of the earthworks. The earthworks exhibit some problems with erosion, particularly where there are trees growing on the parapet. Although the earthwork structures have eroded over time and trees have grown up over some of the parapet and ditch features, and access and interpretive features have been added to Star Fort, the earthworks survive with sufficient integrity to convey their historic associations and contribute to the significance of the park.

**Burials**

Nearly 13,000 Union soldiers lost their lives while incarcerated at Andersonville prison during the final year and a half of the Civil War. Confederate prison personnel buried the Union dead in trenches on the high ground to the northwest of the prison site in orderly rows, and maintained a record of those buried on site. The area used to bury prisoners who had died while incarcerated later formed the basis for Andersonville National Cemetery. As such, the Civil War era burials represent a historic connection between the Civil War period and the contemporary landscape. Today, most of the Civil War era burials within the cemetery remain in the original locations established by the Confederate personnel. The markers that were used by Confederate personnel to locate individual graves do not survive today. They were replaced with marble headstones consistent with federal guidelines relating to national cemetery protocols during the 1870s (Figure 49). This followed efforts beginning in 1865 to identify and honor the individuals buried at Andersonville, and, as noted by Brig. Gen. Montgomery C. Meigs, Quartermaster General of the Army, to place “over them suitable memorials, and also [establish] a cemetery with suitable protection to guard the graves from desecration.”

As such, many of the burials currently marked within Andersonville National Cemetery survive with integrity and convey their historic associations with the Civil War period, and contribute to the significance of the park.

**FIGURE 49.** These tightly spaced grave markers are related to the trench burials during the prison era.

**Historic Resources Associated with Historic Context Three**

The federal government established Andersonville National Cemetery in 1865. In addition to marking burials relating Camp Sumter, Andersonville National Cemetery includes additional features established between 1865 and 1941 to commemorate and honor U.S. military personnel involved in the Civil War as well as more recent conflicts, to facilitate access and events, and to administer the property. Historic resources associated with Historic Context Three include the Andersonville National Cemetery landscape, the perimeter wall, headstones, section markers, Andersonville National Cemetery Lodge, road system, rostrum, commemorative markers, and the Cultural Resources building (former chapel).

Although not been addressed as part of this study, there are also likely archeological resources within the park that relate to this context. (See also Cultural Landscapes, Ethnographic Resources, Archeology, and Museum Collections chapter.)
Andersonville National Cemetery Landscape
(HS-100, LCS 006097)

Andersonville National Cemetery is part of a system of burial grounds established by the federal government during the Civil War. Although each cemetery in the system has a unique character reflecting regional materials and environmental conditions, most feature examples of elements that were regularized by the U.S. government, including perimeter walls, orderly rows of standardized headstones, and geometric arrangements of paths, roads, burial sections, and plantings (Figure 50; also refer to Figure 49).

![Figure 50. View across the perimeter wall toward the orderly rows of headstones and commemorative markers that characterize Andersonville National Cemetery.](image)

Civil War-era national cemeteries administered by the Veterans Administration have been evaluated for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as part of a Multiple Property Documentation Form. Those managed by the National Park Service are typically consistent with Veterans Administration properties and similarly meet eligibility requirements for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. To a great degree, national cemeteries that have not lost integrity are significant under Criteria A and C. Their primary significance stems from their strong association with the Civil War, although they often also possess architectural and landscape significance relating to their layout and design that reflect a unique site interpretation of a set of principles and component features delineated for the system as a whole as implemented between circa 1872 and 1941. Additionally, many contain the fine architectural examples of a prototype design for the lodge structures intended to house the cemetery manager. The prototype building style and floor plan was designed by Brig. Gen. Montgomery C. Meigs, Quartermaster General of the Army from 1861–1882. The prototype is often interpreted at individual cemeteries through the use of local building materials. In addition, many national cemeteries were established on or near battlefields or prison sites.

At Andersonville, there are several character-defining elements of the national cemetery landscape that are consistent with the larger national cemetery system, yet uniquely articulated. These include patterns of spatial organization composed of the overall rectangular shape of the enclosure formed by the perimeter brick wall, the cross-axial cemetery road system, the central island set within a diamond-shaped turnaround at the road intersection, the resulting quadrants that contain the rows of grave markers grouped into sections, and the embracing form of the rostrum. The cemetery landscape, which retains its original perimeter brick wall, rows of marble cemetery markers, monuments, intersecting access drives, and tree plantings, survives with integrity and contributes to the significance of the park.

Park historic resources that relate to Historic Context Three are discussed below.

There are three monuments located within Andersonville National Cemetery erected after the period of significance—the Georgia Monument, Stalag XVII-B Monument, and the Odd Fellows and Rebekahs Monument. These monuments are managed as cultural resources by the park due to their commemorative and artistic value. They are also discussed below.

Finally, additional resources associated with this context also exist that postdate the period of significance—a well house and maintenance shop. These non-contributing resources are also discussed below.
Although not addressed as part of this study, there are also likely archeological resources within the park that relate to this context. (See also Cultural Landscapes, Ethnographic Resources, Archeology, and Museum Collections chapter.)

**Perimeter Wall**

(HS-108, LCS 006105)

The brick wall surrounding the cemetery encloses an area 27.15 acres in size. It measures 4-1/2 feet in height and is 1-foot-wide. The wall also features square capstones approximately every 10 feet atop the wall (Figure 51).

![FIGURE 51. The brick perimeter wall.](image)

Built in 1878–1879, the current wall replaced an earlier perimeter wall built by the U.S. Army from salvaged lumber during the early stages of cemetery development. Although essentially rectangular in form, the wall also includes exterior protrusions that enclose the terminal loops of Cemetery Road (N-S).

Along the east wall, the brick is interrupted by the granite wall of the rostrum, a later addition that also protrudes outward from the main block of the burial ground. Other interruptions in the wall include gaps along the west and south walls to accommodate vehicular entrances. There is also a narrower pedestrian entrance that relates to the sidewalk associated with the Park Offices building, and a gated pedestrian entrance in the east side of the enclosing wall of the southern terminal loop. At the base of the eastern wall there are several vaulted openings that allow for storm water to drain out of the cemetery through the wall.

Since its initial construction, the wall has been altered several times. The west entrance into the cemetery and associated gates were altered in 1931–1932 to reflect changes made in the access road system when use of a former road extending from the Old Dixie Highway to the main gateway was discontinued. The gates were altered again in 1960 through widening to permit passage of funeral vehicles. The perimeter wall was also expanded to incorporate the rostrum into the cemetery design in 1941. Finally, the wall has also been periodically repaired and locally rebuilt to correct damage due to vehicular impact or tree fall, and other deterioration. In spite of these relatively minor changes, the cemetery wall possesses sufficient integrity to convey its historic associations with this context and contributes to the significance of the park.

**Headstones**

Many of the headstones located within Andersonville National Cemetery are carved white marble (Figure 52). The rhythmic arrangement of the headstones, placed in parallel rows and tightly spaced, and set within a larger field of green turf, is a character-defining feature of Andersonville National Cemetery. Marble headstones were first installed in 1877 and were used to replace the wooden tablets initially used to mark each grave in 1865. The wooden tablets, which themselves replaced the prison era wooden stakes etched with the death register number given to the deceased and pinned to their clothing before burial, were approximately 2-1/2 feet tall. Each tablet was marked with information denoting the soldier’s name, company, regiment, date of death, and the original number associated with the burial. The tablets, however, were subject to deterioration, and many have been replaced with a more durable material, resulting in a variety of headstone styles and sizes present today. Twenty-seven original marble headstones are believed to survive from the late 1870s. The National Park Service actively protects the integrity of historic headstones; historic grave markers are not replaced unless damaged beyond repair or cannot be restored.
Marble headstones that survive from the period of significance with integrity contribute to the significance of the park.

**Section Markers**

(HS-119, LCS 090197)

Small marble markers identify the 17 burial sections (Figure 53). These were added in 1951. As such, they thus postdate the period of significance and do not contribute to the significance of the park.

**Andersonville National Cemetery Lodge (Administration Building/Park Headquarters)**

(HS-106, LCS 006103)

The Andersonville National Cemetery Lodge is located near the western, or funerary, entrance into the cemetery. The two-story structure faces the entry drive and measures approximately 36 feet by 32 feet with a 16 foot by 17 foot addition (Figure 54). At the first floor, the building is brick masonry with two-over-two wood double-hung windows. The second floor is wood-framed construction with wood and stucco cladding intended to resemble half-timbering. The second floor has six-over-six wood double-hung windows, and the building has a hip roof covered with asphalt shingles. A short flight of concrete steps leads from the front walk to an uncovered entry patio, which can also be reached by the accessible ramp on the east side of the structure.

The building, which currently houses park offices, was constructed in 1872, and modified in 1932 and 1936, followed by later renovations in the 1970s. The columns and porch roof were added in the 1980s.

The lodge was originally constructed to serve as the residence and office for the cemetery superintendent. As originally constructed, the L-shaped residence had a second floor under a slate-covered mansard roof, brick masonry first floor walls, and wood two-over-two double-hung windows. Both the interior and exterior were extensively altered in 1932, and an addition was constructed in 1936. The entire second story was removed and rebuilt, a room addition constructed, and the bathroom relocated.

In the 1970s, the exterior brick and woodwork was sprayed with a rubber-based coating, which further reduced its historic integrity.
From 1960 to 1976, the building was used exclusively as a residence. Since the late 1970s, it has been used for park offices.

With most of the changes to the building occurring in 1936, which falls within the period of significance, Andersonville National Cemetery Lodge possesses sufficient integrity to convey its historic associations and contributes to the significance of the park.

**Cultural Resources Building (Former Chapel)**

( HS-101, LCS 00609)

The Cultural Resources Building faces the entrance drive near the west gate. The one-story, gable-roofed brick building, which measures approximately 31 feet by 61 feet in plan, currently houses the park’s museum collections storage and curator’s office, Cultural Resources offices, and Cemetery Administration office (Figure 55).

![Cultural Resources Building](image)

**FIGURE 55.** Cultural Resources Building.

The building present today constitutes an extensive modification of a cemetery chapel built in 1908 by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic.

As originally constructed, the Cultural Resources Building featured rock-faced concrete masonry exterior walls with decorative sills and stringcourses, a flat roof, an arched entrance at the south wall, and wood four-over-four double-hung windows.

The interior and exterior were extensively altered from their original design in 1936. As part of the effort, the original roof and parapet wall were replaced by a new gable roof, and a red brick masonry veneer was installed over the concrete block. At the south gable end, a new porch was added, with brick piers supporting a wood-framed, flat roof with entablature and a rooftop balustrade. The windows were replaced by paired inswing casement units protected by screens. The interior was altered by partitioning off a section to provide an office for the Cemetery Superintendent. Other changes included the creation of visitor restrooms accessible from the interior and exterior.

The 1930s windows were later replaced with one-over-one double-hung units.

From the late 1970s to 1998, the building housed the visitor contact station and a small museum. These functions were relocated to the National Prisoner of War Museum after it was completed.

Because the changes made to the building in the 1930s occurred during the period of significance, the Cultural Resources Building possesses sufficient integrity to convey its historic associations, and contributes to the significance of the park.

**Road System**

The primary cemetery circulation feature is a cross-axial system of perpendicular asphalt-paved roads, edged by low aggregate concrete curbing, which are oriented north-south—Cemetery Road (N-S)—and east-west—Cemetery Road (E-W). These roads arise from the two cemetery entrances. Public access to the cemetery is afforded at the southern terminal loop of the Cemetery Road (N-S), which arises from Prison Site Road (Figure 56). A second, restricted-access funerary entrance is located at the west end of Cemetery Road (E-W), where it intersects Georgia State Route 49. The two roads intersect at a circular roundabout that has mown grass inside. The center of the mown turf roundabout features a flagpole. Cemetery Road (E-W) terminates in a large circular loop in front of the rostrum. A one-way, asphalt-paved service drive, added later, arises from the south edge of this loop, extends
behind the rostrum through gated openings in the perimeter wall, and circles back to rejoin the northern terminus loop of Cemetery Road (N-S).

The roads divide the cemetery into four quadrants of burial sections. Within the quadrants created by the axial cemetery roads, the burial ground is organized into seventeen sections, each identified with a letter of the alphabet that include A through Q, except for the letter O, which is excluded.

The current geometric road configuration was designed and installed in the 1870s. It was intended to link the west entrance with a former entrance road and the south entrance with the prison camp. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, formal rows of trees were planted along the margins of the road, while brick-paved drainage ditches were added to address problems with storm water management. Many of the trees have been lost, while the ditches are no longer present. It is likely that the roads were improved by the CCC as part of the cemetery’s eastern extension and the construction of the rostrum in 1941.

The cemetery roads survive today with diminished integrity due to the loss of the rows of trees and the paved ditches. The cemetery roads are character-defining features of the cemetery landscape and contribute to the significance of the park.

**Rostrum**

( HS-106, LCS 006103)

The granite rostrum forms the terminus of Cemetery Road (E-W). There is a direct axial view from the rostrum to the central flagpole. The central portion of the structure measures approximately 48 feet by 20 feet (Figure 57). The hip roof is standing seam metal. Granite walls extend from both sides of the rostrum’s rear wall, embracing lawn panels at its base, and adjoining the cemetery’s perimeter brick wall. The rostrum’s masonry walls are primarily constructed of rusticated granite. Arched openings on the north, east, and south sides have honed-finish granite trim and keystones. Centered in the east wall is a speaker’s platform used for ceremonies. Four Doric-order columns support a stone entablature in the west wall. Painted iron railings guard openings at the east and west walls; stairs ascend from grade to the openings at the north and south ends. Granite terraces edged by planting beds are located at the base of the structure along the west wall and both the north and south ends. The granite wall has several openings: two gated vehicular openings where the wall crosses the one-way service drive marked by wide granite piers; and two smaller pedestrian openings where the twinned concrete sidewalks lead to the planted terraces.

A universally-accessible motorized lift and concrete ramp are located to the rear of the building, connected with a small parking area. The guardrail adjacent to the motorized lift has been
replaced with an operable gate. Two pre-fabricated plastic storage units are tucked behind the wall where it meets the rostrum.

The rostrum was completed in 1941 to provide a permanent place for public ceremonies in the cemetery. The rostrum possesses a high degree of integrity as it is generally unaltered from its original design except for the addition of the universally accessible motorized lift and concrete ramp at the rear (east wall) of the structure. The rostrum contributes to the significance of the park.

**Commemorative Markers**

**New Jersey Monument.** (HS-006, LCS 006082). The New Jersey Monument was completed in 1899. This 24-foot-tall monument is composed of a shaft on a pedestal mounted on a triple base that supports a granite sculpture depicting a soldier at rest, 6 feet 6 inches in height (Figure 58). It is located between sections J and K of the national cemetery. The monument has not been altered since its completion and retains a high degree of integrity. The New Jersey Monument contributes to the significance of the park.

![Figure 58. New Jersey Monument.](image)

**Maine Monument.** (HS-003, LCS 006079). The Maine Monument, erected in 1904, is located in section I. It measures 36 feet 6 inches in height. A statue of a soldier stands atop the monument that is 8 feet 9 inches high. The soldier is holding a rifle, barrel down, and with a bowed head. The soldier is carved from solid granite. The bottom step of the foundation measures 9 feet square (Figure 59). The monument has not been altered since its completion and retains a high degree of integrity. The Maine Monument contributes to the significance of the park.

![Figure 59. Maine Monument.](image)

**Pennsylvania Monument.** (HS-002, LCS 006078). The Pennsylvania Monument is located in the western portion of section I, west of the Maine Monument, in the national cemetery. The monument is composed of marble, granite, and bronze. The foundation measures 20 square feet, while the entire monument stands 35 feet in height. The monument, erected in 1905, is composed of rusticated stone that forms a domed enclosure, open on two sides, which supports an
8-foot-high sculpted bronze soldier figure (Figure 60). The monument honors the 1,849 soldiers from Pennsylvania who died at Andersonville. The monument has not been altered since its completion and retains a high degree of integrity. The Pennsylvania Monument contributes to the significance of the park.

**FIGURE 60.** Pennsylvania Monument.

**Connecticut Monument.** (HS-007, LCS 006083). The Connecticut Monument, completed in 1907, is located at the northwest corner of section Q of the national cemetery. It consists of an 8-foot-high bronze statue of a Union prisoner of war who is standing on an 8-foot-high granite pedestal. Flanking the pedestal is a low granite wall, 24 feet 8 inches in length, which curls out from the pedestal around a granite floor (Figure 61). The monument has not been altered since its completion and retains a high degree of integrity. The Connecticut Monument contributes to the significance of the park.

**FIGURE 61.** Connecticut Monument.

**Iowa Monument.** (HS-008, LCS 006084). The Iowa Monument, located at the center of section K of the national cemetery, is composed of marble and was erected in 1906. It measures 10 feet in width and 21 feet in height. It features a shaft of red polished marble. The shaft supports a white marble sculpture of a woman kneeling and weeping over Iowa’s dead soldiers (Figure 62). The monument has not been altered since its completion and retains a high degree of integrity. The Iowa Monument contributes to the significance of the park.

**FIGURE 62.** Iowa Monument.
Indiana Monument. (HS-004, LCS 006080). Located in the southeast portion of section I of the national cemetery, the Indiana Monument measures 15 feet 7 inches long, 13 feet 5 inches wide, and 18 feet high (Figure 63). Completed in 1908, the monument is set atop a three-stepped granite base. It is composed of polished brown marble and features four columns surrounding a central shaft. The monument has not been altered since its completion and retains a high degree of integrity. The Indiana Monument contributes to the significance of the park.

![Indiana Monument](image)

**FIGURE 63. Indiana Monument.**

Illinois Monument. (HS-009, LCS 006085). The Illinois Monument, located between sections E and F of the national cemetery, features a sculpture of Columbia standing with an outstretched hand and front by Youth and Maiden, young male and female figures. A bronze eagle sculpture sits on each side of the figural sculpture group. Each wing of the pedestal includes carved text quoting the closing lines of Lincoln’s first Inaugural Address and the Gettysburg Address. A figural sculpture of a veteran rests at the outer end of each granite pedestal wing. Four steps lead up to the monument, with polished granite orbs set on the low cheek wall at each side of the stair. The pedestal stands 8 feet high on top of a platform that measures 20 feet by 24 feet in plan. The monument, completed in 1912, reaches a height of 18 feet (Figure 64). The Columbia statue stands 8 feet in height, while the veterans stand 7 feet in height. The monument has not been altered since its completion and retains a high degree of integrity. The Illinois Monument contributes to the significance of the park.

![Illinois Monument](image)

**FIGURE 64. Illinois Monument.**

New York Monument. (HS-005, LCS 006081). Located in section D of the national cemetery, the 1914 New York Monument is composed of eight horizontal courses of granite blocks. On the front or easterly side of the monument in high relief is modeled a female figure 7 feet 3 inches high with a wreath in her right extended hand. On the reverse or westerly side are pictures in relief of two prisoners inside the stockade. Above them is an angel with an olive branch in her right hand. The base measures 17 feet long and 9 feet 6 inches wide and stands 21 feet above the foundation (Figure 65). The New York State Coat of Arms is affixed to the front and back of the monument. The monument has not been altered since its completion and retains a high degree of integrity. The New York Monument contributes to the significance of the park.
Other Cultural Resources

**Georgia Monument.** (HS-021, LCS 021025). The Georgia monument was sculpted by University of Georgia artist William J. Thompson, and installed in the cemetery in 1976. It is located at the center of the circular grass island in the southern terminal loop of the cemetery drive. The monument features three bronze figures mounted on an 8 feet by 8 feet square base of polished granite (Figure 67). The figures represent humanity, suffering, and death. The monument post-dates the period of significance and is not considered to contribute to the significance of the park. It is, however, managed as a cultural resource by the park.

**Minnesota Monument.** (HS-001, LCS 006077). The Minnesota Monument, erected in 1916, is located in section R of the national cemetery. The granite sculpture measures 8 feet long, 8 feet wide, and 16 feet high. It consists of the bronze figure of a Union soldier in a great coat with his hand over his heart and his cap in his hand (Figure 66). The monument has not been altered since its completion and retains a high degree of integrity. The Minnesota Monument contributes to the significance of the park.

**Odd Fellows and Rebekahs Monument (Monument to the Unknown).** (HS-022, LCS 090278). The Odd Fellows and Rebekahs Monument, also known as the Monument to the Unknown, erected in 1984, is a rectangular marble slab dedicated to the memory of the unknown persons interred in the national cemetery. It measures approximately 4 feet by 8 feet, and is engraved with a dedication (Figure 68). The Odd Fellows and Rebekahs Monument is located at the center of the circular grass island in the northern terminal loop of the cemetery drive. The monument post-dates the period of significance and is not considered to contribute to the significance of the park. It is, however, managed as a cultural resource by the park.
Stalag XVII-B Monument. (HS-023, LCS 090277). The Stalag XVII Monument was erected in honor of the Stalag XVII-B American prisoners and all the American prisoners held in German prison camps in the European theater of operations. Erected in 1989, the monument is located in the eastern portion of section J of the national cemetery, directly opposite the Indiana Monument across Cemetery Road (E-W). The monument is fashioned from granite and has a 3-foot-high base with a center rectangular section that projects to 8 feet in height. The monument is framed at the base by closely trimmed shrub plantings (Figure 69). The monument post-dates the period of significance and is not considered to contribute to the significance of the park. It is, however, managed as a cultural resource by the park.

Non-contributing Resources

Well house. (HS-104, Shadow LCS 000006). Located behind the lodge building is a small brick and wood frame structure originally built as a well house. The brick section was constructed in 1961. An addition was added at an undetermined later date. The addition is a wood-framed structure clad with wood siding and is painted red. The well house is a one-story, gable-roof structure that measures 20 by 14 feet in plan (Figure 70). The well house originally housed the water purification system for the nearby buildings. Once the park was connected to the public water supply, this building became obsolete. It is now used for storage and office space. This building post-dates the period of significance and does not contribute to the significance of the park.

Maintenance shop. (HS-105, Shadow LCS 092403). Located behind the Cultural Resources Building is the maintenance shop, a one-story, L-shaped structure that measures approximately 79 feet by 26 feet, with the base of the ell measuring 26 feet by 18 feet in plan (Figure 71). The building, constructed in 1960, has a brick masonry exterior, gable roof covered with asphalt shingles, hanging gutters and downspouts, and six-over-six wood double-hung windows. The building has three overhead doors at the east wall of the main wing, personnel doors and two windows at each gable end, and eight windows at the west wall. The smaller southeast wing has a shallower roof slope, a brick chimney at the south wall, and three doors at the north wall. In addition to the maintenance shop, the building houses a small office. The driveway leading north from Cemetery Road terminates in a paved service court nestled into the ell of the building that provides access to the employee parking area. A short length of concrete sidewalk, including a set of concrete steps set with
a metal handrail, connects the rear entry of the Cultural Resources Building to the maintenance shop. A row of shrubs is located along the west exterior wall. This building post-dates the period of significance and does not contribute to the significance of the park.

![Maintenance shop](image)

**FIGURE 71.** Maintenance shop.

### Historic Resources Associated with Historic Context Four

The prison site features several monuments, markers, structures, and landscape features designed to commemorate and interpret the history of Andersonville Prison that constitute historic resources. These features include the prison site road and associated Stockade Branch bridges, the Providence Spring landscape and pavilion, the monument landscape and monuments, wrought iron fences around well sites, the Pecan Lane landscape and associated rubble stone walls, the stockade wall corner markers, stockade wall and deadline markers, stone gate markers, post marking the raiders hanging site, east and west storage buildings (Carriage House and Guest House), CCC camp site, and the National Prisoner of War Museum. Several monuments located within the national cemetery property, discussed earlier, also relate to this context. They include the New Jersey, Maine, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Iowa, Indiana, Illinois, New York, and Minnesota monuments.

Park historic resources that relate to Historic Context Four are discussed below.

Additional resources associated with this context also exist that postdate the period of significance or have lost integrity. These non-contributing resources, including stone gate markers; prison stockade, north gate, and sentry box exhibits; the CCC camp site; National Prisoner of War Museum; Prisoner of War Commemorative Courtyard; and memorial plaques in the courtyard and parking area are also discussed below.

Although not addressed as part of this study, there are also likely archaeological resources within the park that relate to this context. (See also Cultural Landscapes, Ethnographic Resources, Archeology, and Museum Collections chapter.)

### Prison Site Road

The prison site is encircled by a road first developed by the GAR and later updated and extended by the CCC. The road provides access to the various interpretive and commemorative features of the prison site and affords visitors the opportunity to experience and learn about the history of the site. Prison Site Road is an asphalt-paved, one-way route edged in places by stone-lined drainage channels (Figure 72). Storm water is conveyed beneath the road through culverts with stone headwalls.

![View north along Prison Site Road](image)

**FIGURE 72.** View north along Prison Site Road.

Visitors begin their tour at the northwest corner of the prison site and move counter-clockwise through the landscape. Two bridges constructed in the 1930s by the CCC convey the road across Stockade Branch west and east of the prison site. There are five small parking lots located along the road to afford access to key features, including
Providence Spring, Star Fort, and the cluster of monuments located in the northwest corner of the prison site. Prison Site Road and the parking area associated with Providence Spring built by the CCC are historic. These features survive with sufficient integrity to the period of significance and contribute to the significance of the park.

**Stockade Branch Bridges**

Two bridges convey the tour road across Stockade Branch east and west of the prison site. These bridges were constructed on site from reinforced and poured concrete, which is painted white. Unpainted concrete wing walls extend into the creek banks to either end of each bridge. The bridges also support bronze plaques that read: “Erected by Co. 1411 CCC, Georgia Army No. 5, Robert Fechner, Dir., 1935” (Figure 73). Striped warning signs are located on the north side of the west bridge and the south side of the east bridge, facing the direction of traffic and alerting drivers to a slight dip in the roadway. These bridges are historic features that contribute to the significance of the park.

![Figure 73. Bronze plaque and railing associated with one of the concrete bridges built by the CCC to cross Stockade Branch as part of Prison Site Road.](image)

**Providence Spring Landscape**

The Providence Spring pavilion was constructed in 1901 by the National Woman’s Relief Corps to memorialize the prison site. The pavilion serves as the centerpiece of a larger commemorative landscape that includes water channels and pools, trees, a walk, footbridge, retaining walls, and parking. Most of the features that support access to the Providence Spring pavilion were built by the CCC in 1934 and 1935.

Visitors arrive at the small parking area via Prison Site Road. The parking area, tucked into the side of a hill, is edged by a low rubble stone retaining wall, capped in places by concrete. The wall breaks around the walk leading to the Providence Spring pavilion. The walk crosses a drainageway via a small concrete footbridge framed with metal railings. A flight of concrete steps leads from the walk to a basin, channel, and brick pools associated with the spring outflow located downslope from the pavilion. A culvert edged by a brick headwall conveys water from Providence Spring pavilion.

The water arising from the spring is directed into two underground brick cisterns or reservoirs located a few yards north of the Providence Spring pavilion. Water collected in the cisterns then flows via pipes into a basin inside the pavilion. From the basin, the water flows through a culvert and pipe system that directs it to cascade into a basin located outside the building to the south. The water is then channeled through a series of brick-lined rills and small round pools to a reflecting pool, after which it flows into Stockade Branch (Figure 74). Three large birch trees edge the small round brick pools. The roots of the trees have almost completely engulfed the bricks forming the edge of the rill. The walk, bridge, pools, rill, and parking area were developed by the CCC. Although the spring source has migrated over time, requiring replumbing of the system, the Providence spring landscape retains a high degree of integrity as enhanced by the CCC and contributes to the significance of the park.
flanked by rectangular openings, which leads to an open entry porch. The north and south sides each have three rectangular openings. The well is located along the back wall of the entry porch. It is marked by an ornamental stone fountain flanked by commemorative stone plaques (Error! Reference source not found.). The wood-framed roof structure is exposed at the interior ceiling. The interior floor is ceramic tile. Both the floor and the roof were replaced by the CCC in 1934–1935. The pavilion retains a high degree of integrity as enhanced by the CCC and contributes to the significance of the park.

**Providence Spring Pavilion**

(HS-107, LCS 006104)

The Providence Spring pavilion marks the location of a spring, which emerged after a flood that occurred along Stockade Branch in 1864. The spring provided much needed fresh water for the prisoners and became known as Providence Spring based on the theory that it appeared through divine intervention. The pavilion and an associated fountain were constructed over top of the spring in 1901 by the National Woman’s Relief Corps as part of its commemoration of the prison site (Figure 75).

**Monument Landscape**

The northern end of the prison site features a stand of large deciduous shade trees that encircle a cluster of commemorative monuments and a small parking lot set atop a level plateau (Figure 77). The grove features pecan, oak, dogwood, and Southern magnolia trees. Many of the monuments were erected during the period of significance. These structures, which include the Massachusetts, Ohio, Rhode Island, Michigan, Wisconsin, Lizabeth A. Turner, Sundial, Clara Barton, Tennessee, Lincoln-Logan, and Eight States monuments, are described individually below. As a site, the monument landscape retains a high degree of integrity and contributes to the significance of the park.
Massachusetts Monument
(HS-012, LCS 006088)

The Massachusetts Monument, sculpted from granite and erected in 1901, is composed of a three-step base that supports a rock-faced granite masonry horseshoe shaped form with a large round granite orb on top. Inscription panels are featured in the top of the base on both the front and back. The base measures 11 feet by 8 feet, and the monument is 14 feet high (Figure 78). The Massachusetts Monument retains integrity and contributes to the significance of the park.

Ohio Monument
(HS-015, LCS 006091)

The Ohio Monument is a granite obelisk mounted on a triple-stepped granite base. The monument is 12 feet 4 inches square at the base and has a total height of 48 feet 6 inches (Figure 79). The Ohio Monument, erected in 1901, retains integrity and contributes to the significance of the park.

Rhode Island Monument
(HS-011, LCS 006087)

The Rhode Island Monument is constructed of granite. It features a double-stepped base that supports the Rhode Island state seal in bronze on the upper front. The monument measures 8 feet square at the base and is 12 feet in height (Figure 80). The Rhode Island Monument, erected in 1903, retains integrity and contributes to the significance of the park.
Michigan Monument

(HS-016, LCS 006092)

The Michigan Monument is a rectangular, smooth-faced block of granite that features a female figure in carved relief that represents the state of Michigan. The base is 14 feet by 9 feet 8 inches, and the overall height of the monument is 9 feet 6 inches (Figure 81). The original bronze wreath associated with the monument, which was missing, was replaced in the 1990s. The Michigan Monument, erected in 1904, otherwise retains integrity and contributes to the significance of the park.

![The Michigan Monument](image1.png)

**FIGURE 81.** The Michigan Monument.

Lizabeth A. Turner Monument

(HS-020, LCS 006096)

The Lizabeth A. Turner Monument was constructed of granite and mounted on a single block base that measures 5 feet 2 inches by 3 feet 5 inches. The granite monument is 8 feet in height. It is ornamented with a United States flag draped over the top with the Woman’s Relief Corps emblem beneath (Figure 83). The Lizabeth A. Turner Monument, erected in 1907, retains integrity and contributes to the significance of the park.

![The Lizabeth A. Turner Monument](image2.png)

**FIGURE 83.** The Lizabeth A. Turner Monument.

Wisconsin Monument

(HS-010, LCS 006086)

The Wisconsin Monument is constructed of granite blocks forming a base that is 3 feet tall base and 25 feet long. A tapered pedestal supporting a large bronze eagle rises to a height of 25 feet (Figure 82). The structure rests on a slab base and has stairs leading to the front where there is a stone bench. The Wisconsin Monument, erected in 1906, retains integrity and contributes to the significance of the property.

![The Wisconsin Monument](image3.png)

**FIGURE 82.** The Wisconsin Monument.

Sundial Monument

(HS-018, LCS 006094)

The Sundial Monument has a one-step granite base with a six-sided granite pedestal that measures 6 feet by 5 feet. The monument is 4 feet
10 inches tall. It features a bronze American flag used as a hand on the sundial (Figure 84). The Sundial Monument, erected in 1911, retains integrity and contributes to the significance of the park.

**Tennessee Monument**  
(HS-013, LCS 006089)

The Tennessee Monument was constructed of a one-piece granite base with rough-hewn front and sides and a small granite orb on top. The monument base measures 5 feet 7 inches by 4 feet 3 inches, while the overall height of the monument is 8 feet (Figure 86). The Tennessee Monument, erected in 1915, retains integrity and contributes to the significance of the park.

**Clara Barton Monument**  
(HS-019, LCS 006095)

The Clara Barton Monument is a single stone stab of pink granite with a primarily rusticated finish and a polished recessed cross on the front face. A bronze plaque is mounted below the polished cross. The monument measures 3 feet 5 inches in width by 1 foot 4 inches in depth, and is 6 feet 6 inches tall (Figure 85). The Clara Barton Monument, erected in 1915, retains integrity and contributes to the significance of the park.

**Lincoln-Logan Monument**  
(HS-017, LCS 006093)

The Lincoln-Logan Monument consists of a granite slab with a polished front and two bronze plaques attached; the left plaque bears Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address, while the right displays the Memorial Day Order by John Logan. The monument measures 6 feet in width, 12 inches in depth, and is 4 feet tall (Figure 87). The Lincoln-Logan Monument, erected in 1929, retains integrity and contributes to the significance of the park.
filled were marked with concrete monuments in 1981. Two wells are presently surrounded by wrought iron fencing set into concrete curbs (Figure 89); historic photographs suggest that there were at least four on the property at one time. Hedges were planted around some of the wells during the early twentieth century, while decorative woven wire fences were added in 1916 to replace wooden fences erected after the war to prevent cattle from falling into the depressions. Although the date of origin of the current fencing is not currently known, they were most likely installed by either the GAR or the National Woman’s Relief Corps before 1941. These fences survive from the period of significance and contribute to the significance of the park. The concrete monuments that mark the former locations of other wells are later additions that do not contribute to the significance of the park.

**Monument to Eight States**

(HS-014, LCS 006090)

The Monument to Eight States is constructed of a rough granite slab, 4 feet 5 inches wide, 2 feet deep, and 5 feet high, with a rough-hewn finish (Figure 88). The Monument to Eight States, erected in 1934, retains integrity and contributes to the significance of the park.

**Wrought Iron Fences Around Well Sites**

During the use of the site as a prison, overcrowding and a lack of potable water led prisoners to dig into the hillside in search of water sources. Several prisoner-dug wells survived at the time the prison park was developed. Over time, some collapsed while others became hazardous. All but two of the well sites have been filled in to protect visitors from injury; those that have been

**Pecan Lane Landscape**

Pecan Lane connects Prison Site Road and Georgia State Route 49. It also serves as the present-day exit for visitors to the prison site. Pecan Lane was constructed by the CCC in 1935. During the mid-twentieth century, Pecan Lane served as the park entrance as well. However, the entrance was relocated to the north due to safety concerns resulting from several traffic accidents near the intersection of Pecan Lane and Georgia State Route 49.

The road extends from the western edge of the prison site, curving through mown lawn and Civil
War earthworks before passing through a gate in a stone wall. Beyond the gate, the road is edged by an allée of large pecan trees. The allée was planted by the CCC in the 1930s in conjunction with the construction of the entrance road. Today, the trees form a vaulted space over the road corridor (Figure 90). Because of Pecan Lane’s original orientation as the park entrance, the gates at either end of the lane are oriented toward the highway.

Other features associated with the Pecan Lane landscape include a pair of concrete culvert headwalls connected by corrugated metal piping that carries storm water below Pecan Lane, metal pickets set along the interior gateway, and two smaller metal picket gates located in the openings in the north and south walls at Pecan Lane. An undated photograph shows the main gates topped with barbed wire, which is not present today. The smaller gates associated with the interior concrete gateway are fashioned from tubular metal and appear to be a contemporary addition. The metal gates located at the end of Pecan Lane near its intersection with Georgia State Route 49 were installed during the 1990s. They were fashioned from wrought iron fencing that formerly enclosed one of the well sites. The gate additions diminish the integrity of Pecan Lane, as does the change from a two-way corridor to a one-way corridor and the change of the visitor arrival sequence at the park. While Pecan Lane is no longer used by visitors to enter the park, it is still used as an exit drive and provides a vista into the town of Andersonville that is framed by the pecan trees that line the road, depicting the historical relationship between the village of Andersonville and the train depot with the prison site. Pecan Lane possesses sufficient integrity to convey its historic associations and contributes to the significance of the park.

![Figure 90. The Pecan Lane landscape.](image)

**Pecan Lane Walls**

Two parallel freestanding rubble retaining walls, constructed by the CCC, parallel Pecan Lane. The walls end at piers at either end (Figure 91). The walls and piers are constructed of the same gold-colored native stone as retaining wall features located within the prison park. The piers are comprised of mortared rubble with pyramidal tops. Each features an inset carved marble plaque on its west face. The northern piers read “Andersonville,” while the southern piers read “Prison Park.” The rubble walls extend outward from the piers before turning at a right angle toward the prison site. A mortared layer of smaller stones caps each wall. At regular intervals, the wall is punctuated with slightly wider stone piers, each of which has a pyramidal top. A small metal picket gate is set into each wall. The base of each wall is punctuated by drain openings approximately the same width as the wall stones. A larger drain opening supported by a metal lintel is located on the east side of the north wall. A wide concrete gutter passed through the opening in the wall. The interior piers are constructed of formed concrete painted white. These piers support a wrought iron security gate and bronze plaques that read “Andersonville Prison Park.” The Pecan Lane walls possess sufficient integrity to convey their historic associations and contribute to the significance of the park.
East and West Storage Buildings (Carriage House and Guest House) (HS-102, HS-103)

Two brick buildings located at the northern end of the prison site are referred to as the east and west storage buildings (Carriage House and Guest House) that serve utilitarian purposes. The east storage building is used for storage and as a restroom. It is known to park staff as the carriage house. The west storage building, which was furnished by the American Ex-Prisoners of War Department of Georgia, is used as a guest house and for park volunteer lodging. An unpaved driveway provides access to the rear of the buildings from Cemetery Road.

The east storage building, constructed in 1936 as a combination storage building and restroom, measures approximately 21 feet by 42 feet in plan. It is a single-story, rectangular, red-brick masonry structure with a gable roof covered with asphalt shingles (Figure 92). The asphalt shingles are a replacement for the original diamond-pattern cement asbestos shingle roof. Foundation plantings are located along its south and east exterior walls. The building has six-light wood hopper windows. Doors at the east wall and the east end of the north wall lead to restrooms, and two pairs of wood two-panel doors on the south wall lead to the storage areas. Wood privacy fences located on the east and north sides of the building screen the restroom entrances from the prison site and the concrete walk from the museum. The East Storage building retains sufficient integrity to convey its historic associations and contributes to the significance of the park.

The west storage building, constructed in 1928, measures approximately 20 feet by 37 feet in plan. It is a one-and-one-half-story, rectangular, red-brick masonry structure with a gable roof covered with asphalt shingles. It is known to park staff as the guest house. The asphalt shingles are a replacement for the original diamond-pattern cement asbestos shingle roof. The building has a gabled entrance porch at the center of the south exterior wall, and six-over-six wood double-hung windows (Figure 93). A narrow wood stair is located on the west facade of the structure to provide access to the upper level. Several ornamental shrubs edge the foundation at the south exterior wall. The wood-framed staircase at the west gable end and the front entrance porch are later additions. Otherwise, the exterior materials and forms are generally intact from initial construction. The west storage building retains sufficient integrity to convey its historic associations and contributes to the significance of the park.
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**FIGURE 93.** West storage building (Guest House).

**Stockade Wall Corner Markers**

One of the interpretive features associated with the prison park site is a series of tall stone monuments that mark three of the four corners of the stockade. A marble sign is inset into the side of each monument that reads “Stockade” (Figure 94). Originally installed in the 1930s by the CCC, the monuments are composed of mortared gold-colored rubble stone with a pyramidal top. The corner markers survive with integrity from the period of significance and contribute to the significance of the park.

**FIGURE 94.** Stockade wall corner markers.

**Stockade and Deadline Markers**

Another interpretive feature of the prison site is the system of slim, white-painted carsonite posts that outline features of the stockade, including the outer wall and deadline. A concrete form of these markers was installed by the CCC circa 1934 to indicate the former location of the stockade wall, and the deadline located 10 feet to the inside. The markers are arranged into two parallel rows. The National Park Service has replaced the original concrete posts with carsonite replicas. In some cases, a metal sign has been affixed to one face of the post that identifies it as part of either the stockade or deadline (Figure 95). The stockade and deadline markers survive from the period of significance, with diminished integrity of materials due to the replacement of concrete with carsonite, and design where signs have been added, and contribute to the significance of the park.

**FIGURE 95.** One of the deadline markers, affixed with an identity sign.

**Post Marking the Raider Hanging Site**

One of the interpretive features located within the prison site is a white-washed concrete post located to mark the site of the raider hanging (Figure 96). As the population within Andersonville Prison grew, the number of incidents involving stealing and random acts of violence also grew. The perpetrators of these crimes were referred to as “camp-robbers,” “marauders,” “desperadoes,” and
eventually “raiders.” The Confederate prison administration authorized the prisoners to establish a group known as the “Regulators” to identify those accused of committing crimes. The 75 men arrested based on the work of the Regulators were brought to trial. Six were found guilty of crimes punishable by hanging. The site of the hanging is marked by the post described above. The concrete post, like the deadline marking features, appears to have been installed by the CCC in the 1930s. Although its condition is deteriorated, the post possesses sufficient integrity to convey its historic associations and contributes to the significance of the park.

**FIGURE 96.** Post marking the raider hanging site.

**Non-contributing Resources**

**Stone gate markers.** Another interpretive feature of the prison site includes two large stone gate markers installed circa 1960. These paired markers were constructed of rubble stone to match the corner markers. They were inset with carved marble signs. They are rectangular in plan, and mark the two sides of the historic north and south prison entrance locations (Figure 97). The north gate markers were removed circa 1991 when the wooden north gate exhibit was constructed. Today, only the south gate markers survive. The gate markers postdate the period of significance and do not contribute to the significance of the park.

**FIGURE 97.** Stone gate markers.

**Prison stockade, north gate, and sentry box exhibits.** The National Park Service has provided several interpretive features within the prison site to suggest historic conditions during the Civil War. These include partial reconstructions of the prison stockade within the northeastern corner of the prison site, and the north gate and an associated sentry box, or guard tower, on the higher ground northwest of Providence Spring. The structures serve the purpose of interpreting the scale of the log stockade wall (Figure 98), the log north entrance gate, and sentry features (Figure 99). The North Gate is fashioned from pressure-treated logs amended by park staff to appear hand-hewn. The pressure-treated timbers used in the northeast corner are not amended as they represent the expansion of the stockade in 1864, which did not feature hand-hewn timbers. These interpretive features postdate the period of significance and do not contribute to the significance of the park.

**FIGURE 98.** Prison stockade exhibit.
The camp access road forks once within the woodland. One branch leads south to the camp site, while the other travels west to its terminus at Oglethorpe Street. There are several structures associated with the former CCC camp, which operated between 1934 and 1935, which survive on site. These include rubble piers and a freestanding wall that mark the entrance into the former CCC camp and a concrete foundation that was associated with a well or a pump. Later additions include a wood gate arm mounted to a metal post adjacent to the southern section of the rubble wall, a small open-sided wood storage platform covered by a pitched roof near the edge of the campground that was constructed by a Boy Scout group for firewood storage, a concrete culvert along the highway, and picnic tables and campfire rings used by the Boy Scouts. Due to the loss of several built features associated with the camp, it no longer retains integrity as a historic property. However, further study may suggest that it possesses importance as an archeological site.

**National Prisoner of War Museum.** The National Prisoner of War Museum, situated on a ridge north of the prison site, opened in 1998. The building and its exhibits were developed through a joint venture of the National Park Service and former prison of war organizations, primarily the American Ex-Prisoners of War organization, as a “tribute to all former prisoners of war from all services in all wars.” The facility serves as the park’s visitor center and contains Interpretation and Resource Management Division offices.

The building was designed with details that reference POW camp architecture, including its four, single-story, brick masonry volumes connected by three towers lit by clerestory windows (Figure 101). The building has gable and pyramidal roof areas covered with slate shingles. Windows and doors are aluminum framed. The entry sequence, which leads from the parking lot, down a walkway, through a gate, and into the building, is meant to convey a sense of confinement and of entering a prison. After passing through the building, visitors pass through the door opposite the entrance to enter the outdoor Prisoner of War Commemorative
Courtyard. The building has not been altered since its construction.

FIGURE 101. Entrance to the National Prisoner of War Museum.

The museum postdates the period of significance and thus is not a contributing historic resource. However it does possess a unique architectural style and retains national importance as the National Prisoner of War Museum. The museum could be evaluated for its significance in these areas in the future.

Prisoner of War Commemorative Courtyard. The POW Commemorative Courtyard is bounded by low brick walls on either side, and the taller brick and terra cotta relief sculpture, “The Price of Freedom Fully Paid” (Figure 102).

FIGURE 102. The Prisoner of War Commemorative Courtyard.

The Price of Freedom Fully Paid sculpture is located on the south side of the Prisoner of War Museum. It includes a water feature. The work, created in 1998 by Donna L. Dobberfuhl of San Antonio, Texas, includes a sculptured brick wall displaying bas relief images of prisoners of war, a freestanding bronze sculpture of a prisoner of war, a pool, and a curving rivulet of running water that leads through the south terrace of the museum along the front of the wall. Water also travels up through the interior of the statue and exits in the hand, dripping into the pool below. The Prisoner of War Commemorative Courtyard postdates the period of significance and thus is not a contributing historic resource.

Memorial plaques in the courtyard and parking area. A number of plaques have been placed in the commemorative courtyard and along the memorial walkway within the museum parking area (Figure 103).

The plaques in the commemorative courtyard are inset into the brick walls that surround the space. The plaques are typically approximately 2 feet by 3 feet in size and constructed of cast metal. The following plaques are located in the commemorative courtyard:

- American Ex-Prisoners of War (April 9, 1998)
- 27th Bombardment Group United States Army Air Corps (October 12, 1993)
- United States Army officers and enlisted men as Prisoners of War in OFLAG64 and 64Z (April 9, 1998)
- Vermonters who perished at Andersonville (April 9, 1998)
- U.S. Air Force and Navy who lost their lives while Prisoners of War at Hiroshima, Japan (August 5, 1989); moved to current location April 9, 1998)
- Battling Bastards of Bataan (April 9, 1998)
**FIGURE 103.** Memorial plaques in the parking area.

The plaques located along the memorial walk are cast metal mounted on granite slabs. The slabs are set in the ground along the sidewalk in a vegetated island within the museum parking area. The following plaques are present at the commemorative walkway adjacent to the parking area:

- 106th Infantry Division (May 25, 2003)
- USS Pueblo Ager-2 (April 25, 2001)
- American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor (May 30, 2000)
- Armored Division Association Mystery Division (May 30, 2000).
- The Tiger Survivors (May 27, 2001)
- Saluting Vietnam Prisoners of War (May 10, 2001)

Additional plaques are present on the interior of the building.

The memorial plaques in the courtyard and memorial walkway postdate the period of significance and thus are not contributing historic resources.

**Historic Resources Associated with Historic Context Five**

There are a few landscape elements that survive within the park that relate to military site preservation. These include the east and west storage buildings (Carriage House and Guest House), Providence Spring pavilion, Prison Site Road, Stockade Branch bridges, erosion control measures associated with Stockade Branch and Star Fort, the CCC camp site, and other drainage channels and erosion control systems. All of these resources are described in association with Historic Context Four above, with the exception of the drainage channels, discussed below.

**Drainage Channels and Erosion Control Systems**

Drainage channels were constructed by the CCC circa 1934–1935 as part of the grading associated with the Prison Site Road and associated parking areas. The drainage channels that edge the road are composed of grass-lined swales as well as gutters that are paved with mortar rubble and poured aggregate concrete with brick or rubble edges (Figure 104). The CCC also placed rip-rap along the banks of Stockade Branch as an erosion control measure. These features survive with sufficient integrity to the period of significance and contribute to the significance of the park.

**FIGURE 104.** One of the drainage structures installed along Prison Site Road by the CCC.
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FIGURE 105. Providence Springhouse, June 2014.

The primary purpose of this chapter is to provide a broad understanding of the cultural resource types associated with Andersonville National Historic Site not specifically addressed in the previous historic context chapters of this Historic Resource Study (HRS). These resource types include cultural landscapes, ethnographic resources, archeological resources, and museum collections. Relevant information relating to each is conveyed below.

Cultural Landscapes

As defined by the World Heritage Committee, cultural landscapes are cultural properties that represent the combined works of nature and of man. The National Park Service defines cultural
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landscapes as geographic areas (including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein) associated with a historic event, activity, or person, or that exhibit other cultural or aesthetic values. There are four categories of cultural landscapes: historic sites, historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, and ethnographic landscapes.\(^{604}\)

Andersonville National Historic Site is composed of several cultural landscapes that can be characterized as historic sites and historic designed landscapes.

The National Park Service records the resources and cultural and aesthetic values attributed to cultural landscapes through the Cultural Landscapes Inventory (CLI) initiative, an internet-based inventory of National Park Service-owned or managed properties determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. CLI property records include a site development history, significance evaluation, integrity assessment, identification of features contributing to significance, and condition assessment. The CLI partially satisfies the inventory and assessment requirements for cultural resources under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act. More detailed information about cultural landscapes is developed through preparation of a Cultural Landscape Report (CLR), a thoroughly researched report that builds on the information gathered in the CLI. The CLR provides more extensive historical and existing conditions documentation, significance evaluation, and integrity assessment, with the goal of supporting a feasible long-term treatment and preservation plan or strategy for the management of the cultural landscape.

In 2010, through the work of Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc., and John Milner Associates, the National Park Service completed CLIs for two historic landscapes associated with Andersonville National Historic Site: Andersonville National Cemetery and Andersonville Memorial Landscape. A CLR was prepared for the park by the same team of consultants for the National Historic Site as a whole in 2014.

Based on preparation of this HRS, which has drawn from the previously developed CLI and CLR documents, coupled with an additional site visit and resource assessment, Andersonville National Historic Site is a single cultural landscape—the site of the Civil War-era Andersonville Prison—for which little survives aboveground today. Within the overarching Andersonville Prison landscape, there are two primary historic designed landscapes that commemorate and memorialize the Civil War prison site—Andersonville National Cemetery and Andersonville Prison site. Each reflects its own heritage of historic events and associations, although they are integrally linked. The park as a whole, and these component parts, survive from a historic period of significance with sufficient integrity to convey their historic associations. As such the park is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. A third designed cultural landscape—the National Prisoner of War Museum—while not historic, is also an important site of commemoration.

Andersonville National Historic Site was listed in the National Register upon its establishment in 1970. Its significance was later documented in a National Register nomination prepared by staff of Andersonville National Historic Site in February 1976. The nomination was accepted by the Keeper of the National Register on November 24, 1978, and certified by the National Park Service on November 27, 1978. The National Register-listed property includes the Andersonville National Historic Site as it was configured in 1976. At the time the nomination was prepared, the park encompassed 466.22 acres, including the earlier Prison Park as well as the Andersonville National

Cemetery. The authorized boundary of the site as established in 1970 included “not more than 500 acres.” Since 1976, the park has expanded to include 515.61 acres.

The National Register nomination for Andersonville National Historic Site does not specifically reference the National Register evaluation criteria in its statement of significance. The areas of significance for the park indicated for the property include Military and Social/Humanitarian. The period of significance is broadly defined in the nomination as “1800–1899” and “1900–” (per the nomination form used at the time), suggesting the entirety of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Based on research, analysis, and consideration of all materials available for preparation of this Historic Resource Study, the cultural landscape of Andersonville National Historic Site appears nationally significant under Criteria A, C, and D, as a historic district that protects and preserves the site of Camp Sumter (Andersonville Prison), as well as Andersonville National Cemetery, and memorializes American prisoners of war.

Andersonville National Cemetery also appears nationally significant as a designed historic landscape created to honor those who served in the United States Armed Forces. Efforts conducted by the War Department and the CCC to preserve and restore the site of the prison camp, the cemetery, and the surrounding landscape are likely significant within a national context of conservation and commemoration. For these associations, Andersonville National Historic Site is significant in the areas of Archeology (Historic–Non-Aboriginal), Commemoration, Conservation, Landscape Architecture, Military, Politics/Government, and Social History during the period 1863–1941.

In addition, the property meets the listing requirements of National Register Criteria Consideration D as, “a cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events,” and Criteria Consideration F as, “a property that is primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own exceptional significance.”

In the context of the period of significance described above, several of the resources discussed in the 1976 National Register nomination should be reconsidered in terms of their contributing/non-contributing status. For example, the storage buildings constructed in 1928 and 1936, designated as noncontributing resources in the nomination, are considered contributing based on the period of significance established by this study.

Consideration should be paid to updating the park’s National Register nomination to reflect the assessments and evaluation of significance information afforded in this HRS, and articulated in the Cultural Landscape Report to ensure appropriate resource protection and preservation. An updated nomination should include a boundary increase to encompass all 515.61 acres in current park ownership, as well as the addition of several areas of significance—Archeology (Historic–Non-Aboriginal), Commemoration, Conservation, Landscape Architecture, and Politics/Government—and revisions to the list of contributing and non-contributing resources.

In addition to updating the National Register nomination, planning for the documentation, evaluation, preservation, and treatment of the

---

605. The nomination incorrectly calculates the area as 495 acres.

606. An Act to authorize the establishment of the Andersonville National Historic Site in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes (84 Stat. 989, October 16, 1970).

607. Acreage information provided by the National Park Service, Southeast Region. Land Resources Division, December 2014.

park’s cultural landscapes should remain a priority for park staff.

Also important to consider is the designation of important features not currently eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places due to age, for management as cultural resources to protect their inherent value. This would apply to several monuments located within Andersonville National Cemetery that are not fifty years of age. They include:

- Georgia Monument (1976), HS-021
- Odd Fellows and Rebekahs Monument (Monument to the Unknown) (1984), HS-022
- Stalag XVII-B Monument (1989), HS-023

Other buildings constructed after the 1976 National Register nomination include:

- Three maintenance buildings located east of the rostrum (circa 1983)
- National Prisoner of War Museum (1998)
- Two maintenance buildings east of the museum (shed, circa 1998, and cart barn, circa 2000)

The National Prisoner of War Museum, also less than fifty years of age, should be considered for management as a cultural resource due to its architectural and symbolic importance.

In addition to updating the National Register nomination for the park, planning for the documentation, evaluation, preservation, and treatment of the park’s cultural landscapes should remain a priority for park staff.

Ethnographic Resources

One of the important aspects of the park’s cultural landscapes that is not currently documented is their relationship to ethnographic resources.

Further study is needed to connect surviving resources with cultural lifeways. It is recommended that the park collect this information by conducting personal interviews with those knowledgeable about the cultural landscapes from this perspective.

The National Park Service is often the steward of resources that are considered important by indigenous people and cultural groups who have cultural, spiritual, and subsistence connections to park resources. These ethnographic resources include both the cultural and the natural features in a park that are assigned significance in the cultural system of a people traditionally associated with parklands before their designation as a national park. Ethnographic resources can include extant cultural features, such as structures, archeological sites, wildlife and other natural features, sacred or ceremonial locations or landscapes, and the material culture preserved in park museum collections, as well as intangible features, such as cultural values and traditions.609

There are several legislative mandates that require the National Park Service to work with traditionally associated peoples in an effort to include their perspectives in the planning, management, and interpretation of ethnographic resources. These are rooted in the Organic Act of 1916, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The National Park Service developed a specific ethnography program in 1981 to distinguish an applied cultural anthropology program that focused on working with living populations related to archeological sites or studies. Recognition of the program first appeared in 1985 in Director’s Order No. 28, Cultural Resource Management. As part of new policy directives, parks were required to include ethnography in general management plans in order to understand how contemporary communities are traditionally associated with a park’s lands and resources. More specific policies for ethnography were instituted in the 1988 National Park Service Management Policies (as

most currently updated in 2006). Beyond the guidelines outlined in National Park Service policy documents, legislation such as the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (AIRFA) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA), require research, consultation, and action to protect the interests of indigenous people. Ethnography was first included as an individual cultural resource category in 2001. These policies require consultation with people that have traditional associations with parklands.

Andersonville National Historic Site has not completed an Ethnographic Overview and Assessment, nor is one planned as of this writing. A Special History Study researching the African American experience from the Civil War through the present day is underway, and includes an oral interview component.

**Archeology**

Archeological resources on federal lands, both sites and collections, are protected by law. Several federal acts have defined the responsibility of the federal government in protecting archeological resources. The protection of archeological resources on federal property began when President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Antiquities Act of 1906 into law. The law set-up penalties for the unauthorized collection or excavation of historic or prehistoric ruins or monuments situated on federal land. The Act also empowered the president to set aside as national monuments any historic landmarks, historic or prehistoric structures, or other objects of historic or scientific interest on lands controlled by the federal government. The federal agencies assigned to oversee these national monuments were required to offer proper care and management of the resources. This included care of the objects collected from sites in a museum so the public can view them. Finally, the law also regulated and established a permit system for legitimate study of archeological resources; only those people qualified under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards are permitted to conduct archeological investigations, while the projects themselves have to meet specific criteria. Permitted activities are identified as those providing for the benefit of the public through study and interpretation. The department overseeing the land, such as the Department of the Interior, is allowed to issue permits. These requirements also protect archeological resources from looting.

In 1935, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed the Historic Sites Act that declared the preservation of historic sites, buildings, and objects a national policy. The Act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to obtain information, survey, conduct research, maintain, and preserve sites with archeological significance. It also established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 established the National Register of Historic Places, which enabled archeological sites to be listed. It also provided additional federal protections for archeological materials, including Section 106, which required that all federal agencies afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation the opportunity to comment on any undertaking that might affect a property listed on, or eligible for, the National Register.

In 1974, the federal government passed the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act, which made federal agencies responsible for mitigating the damage caused by their actions to important archeological sites. The Act focused attention on significant resources, but did not require that they be of national significance. The Act was intended to limit the potential for destruction of archeological sites throughout the country by actions funded or otherwise supported by federal agencies.

The 1979 Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) was enacted to protect archeological resources and sites on federal lands and Native American lands as an irreplaceable part of America's heritage. The Act also required the preservation of objects and associated records in a suitable repository once recovered from a site, and
established penalties and fines for breaking the law. The main purposes of ARPA are as follows:

1) Regulation of legitimate archeological investigation on public lands through a permitting process [Sec. 470cc];

2) Enforcement of penalties against those who illegally excavate, remove, damage, alter, or deface archeological resources [Sec. 470gg];

3) Requiring federal land managers to plan and schedule archaeological surveys of the lands under their control [Sec. 470mm];

4) Requiring federal land managers keep archeological site information confidential [Sec. 470hh];

5) Requiring federal land managers establish programs to increase public awareness of the significance of archeological resources and the need to protect them [Sec. 470iii(c)].

Finally, the Native American Graves Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA) specified special treatment for Native American human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony, and stipulated that illegal trafficking in human remains and cultural items may result in criminal penalties. Also issued in 1990 was Federal Code of Regulations 36 CFR 79, which provided government-wide regulations for the curation and care of federal archeological collections required by the National Historic Preservation Act and the Archeological Resources Protection Act.

In its Foundation Document, completed in 2014, the park identified the need to conduct a comprehensive archeological resources inventory to meet standards established in the NPS Systemwide Archeological Inventory Program. The comprehensive inventory program will meet standards defined by Director’s Order No. 28 and The Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation to provide baseline data for identification, evaluation, and management of archeological resources. This inventory would help with updating the park’s interpretive wayside exhibit plan and the long-range interpretive plan.

The specific archeological investigations identified in the Foundation Document as needed to address outstanding research questions include consideration of the CCC camp site to pinpoint the locations of resources, continued research, and the development of research questions. Other suggested avenues of further study included excavation of the prison site to confirm the configuration of the stockade wall and the location of the south gate. These investigations were also noted for the potential to yield information that might prove useful in updating the park’s interpretive wayside exhibit and long-range interpretive plans.

To date, the park has been the subject of numerous archeological studies and investigations. These include:


---


• Ehrenhard, Ellen B. Archeological Investigations of Park Resources (Hospital Site), Features Exposed that Might Represent Wall Trench Enclosing Hospital, SEAC-00317. 1979.


• _______. Archeological Resource Inventory, Prehistoric and Historic Sites, Tallahassee, Florida: National Park Service, Southeast Archeological Center, 1985. (Cultural resource inventory completed April 9, 1978 by SEAC; areas of proposed development outlined in EA for Development Concept Plan (1977) inspected and archeologically tested)


• Hicks, Clifton. Archeological Survey of Third Regiment Georgia Reserves (Confederate) guard camp and Secondary Hospital Location at Andersonville National Historic Site (ANDE-SEAC-2687). Tallahassee, Florida: National Park Service, Southeast Archeological Center, 2014.


• Larson, Lewis H., Jr., Professor of Anthropology, West Georgia College, and Morgan R. Crook, Jr., West Georgia College. Investigation of Inner, Middle and Outer Stockade (ANDE-SEAC-00366) (work conducted in October 1973 and October 1974). Tallahassee, Florida: National Park Service, Southeast Archeological Center, 1975.


• Paglione, Teresa L. *Archeological Significance of the CCC Camp.* Tallahassee, Florida: National Park Service, Southeast Archeological Center, 1985. (Draft supplement to the 1984 archeological survey and report.)


• ______. *Archeological Site Condition Assessment at Andersonville National Historic Site, (ANDE-SEAC-02561).* Tallahassee, Florida: National Park Service, Southeast Archeological Center, 2012.


**Museum Collections**

Although museum objects are sometimes perceived as entities separate from other park resources, they possess a critical link to the park’s
physical history. National Park Service museum collections inform and enhance every aspect of park work, from resource management and interpretation, to research and public accountability. Natural and cultural objects and their associated records provide baseline data, serving as scientific and historical documentation of the park’s resources and purpose. Museum objects are acquired, preserved, exhibited, and researched to foster understanding and increase knowledge. They are primary sources of cultural and scientific information, and must be preserved in perpetuity while also being made available for research needs both within the National Park Service and to others.

The National Park Service is mandated to acquire and preserve museum collections as directed in the Antiquities Act of 1906, the Historic Sites Act of 1935, and the Management of Museum Properties Act of 1935. Other legal mandates and authorities include the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and the Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979. A park’s museum collection may include both natural and cultural collections. In addition, archeological collections, except inalienable and communal property (as defined by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 [25 USC 3001-13]), recovered from within park boundaries through systematic collection are federal property and must be retained in the park’s museum collection in accordance with 43 CFR 7.13 and National Park Service Management Policies (2001).

Curation and associated costs must also be covered in collecting permits as described in the 2001 Management Policies, Director’s Order No. 24 (Museum Collection Management), and NPS-77 (Natural Resource Management Guideline). Specifically, project budgets must include funding for the basic management of collections that are project-generated. Collections management includes cataloging; labeling; conservation examination and treatment (including specimen preparation); initial storage of objects and specimens; and organization and storage of project documentation, including appraisal, arrangement, description, finding aid production, and appropriate archival housing.

One of the foundational documents prepared by the National Park Service to guide museum collections policy is the Scope of Collections Statement (SOCS). A SOCS is a stand-alone document that states the significance of the museum collection and sets limits on it based on the park’s purpose and interpretive objectives as enunciated in legislation, other mandates, and park-specific planning documents. Preparation of a SOCS is required by NPS Management Policies (2001, Chapter 5), Director’s Order No. 24 (Museum Collection Management) and Director’s Order No. 28 (Cultural Resource Management). A Collection Management Plan for Andersonville National Historic Site was developed by the National Park Service in 2005.

At Andersonville National Historic Site, the museum collections encompass the National Prisoner of War Museum and associated commemorative courtyard, museum collections/artifacts, and archival collections. The artifacts and other collections contained in the National Prisoner of War Museum provide an outstanding opportunity for education and research to further the understanding of the history of Andersonville and the larger history of prisoners of war throughout American history. The museum courtyard provides a poignant reminder of the sacrifices of prisoners of war throughout U.S. history and a moving portrayal of resolve in the face of despair.

In the 2014 Foundation Document, the park identified the need to prepare a museum collections feasibility study in order to determine the feasibility of joint museum collection storage with Jimmy Carter National Historic Site and make recommendations for long-term storage of Andersonville museum collections. The Foundation Document also identified the need for a museum exhibit plan that would help select museum objects to replace objects currently on display and provide interpretive text for selected objects.
It also suggested an archives assessment survey be conducted to determine the condition of archival material in the museum collection and identify conservation treatment priorities. This assessment is anticipated to inform the Museum Exhibit Plan and the comprehensive Integrated Pest Management Plan.

The Foundation Document identified the need for a collection condition survey to assess the condition of museum collection objects and identify conservation treatment priorities to help inform the museum exhibit plan and museum collections feasibility study.

Finally, it recognizes the need to assess the effectiveness of collection storage facilities for protection against environmental effects, including those from climate change, and to evaluate the effects of environment, such as increased humidity, on collections. This assessment would inform the museum collections feasibility study.

**Archival and Library Collections**

In accordance with National Park Service *Management Policies* (December 2006), rare books, books that are not rare, and other library materials retained for their physical properties, associative value, or for purposes of exhibition in museum exhibits or historic furnished rooms are to be managed as part of the park's museum collection.

Traditional library materials are not managed as part of the park’s museum collection. Policies and procedures covering library materials are also outlined in Chapter 5 of the 2000 *Management Policies*, and Director’s Order No. 28 (*Cultural Resource Guideline*).

In the 2014 Foundation Document, the park identified the need to prepare an archives assessment survey in order to determine the condition of archival material in the library and identify conservation treatment priorities.
Management Recommendations

Preparation of this Historic Resource Study for Andersonville National Historic Site has resulted in the identification of several recommendations for the future management of historic cultural resources, including potential research efforts and interpretive programming. These recommendations consider issues surrounding the identification, evaluation, and management of cultural resources. Implementation of the recommendations may require the park to seek funding that is beyond its annual operating budget.

The park’s significant cultural resources include historic buildings, structures, and cultural landscapes, as well as archeological sites, artifacts, and archival collections. This HRS focuses primarily on historic resources, although there may be prehistoric features associated with the property. Historic period resources are tied to several historic contexts, including evidence of early European-American settlement, the Civil War era Confederate military prison of Camp Sumter, commemorative markers, monuments, and memorials, a national cemetery, evidence of
Civilian Conservation Corps activities, and a more contemporary museum. Because these cultural features possess national significance due to their connection to the tragic history of Andersonville Prison, the HRS recommends that the maintenance and preservation of National Register-eligible properties, some of which have not yet been listed, should be the park’s top cultural resource management priority.

**Cultural Resources**

Protection of historic cultural resources within park boundaries is a critical National Park Service management consideration. Park management is well aware of this responsibility and has adopted a proactive stance toward resource conservation. Because of the fragility of historic resources, it is recommended that the park continue to maintain this level of awareness and stewardship. Limited staff and budgets add to the challenges associated with maintaining cultural resources within the park landscape.

The park’s historic cultural resources, including evidence of the prison and later commemoration, the cemetery, and the landscape preservation activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps, offer significant value in understanding and interpreting the unique history of the park. Deterioration or loss of surviving historic cultural resources reduces research potential and the ability of park managers and others to understand and interpret features within context.

Park management practices currently protect, to the extent possible, surviving cultural resources and limit the potential for visitors to negatively impact fragile features by restricting certain activities and limiting access to sensitive areas. Additional efforts may be needed in this area to further guard against deterioration of fragile resources such as military earthworks.

There are several threats posed by conditions outside the park that also have the potential to affect cultural resources. These include the bauxite mining near the park boundary, future development or construction visible within the park viewsheds, and additional roadway improvements. These actions could affect historic park properties directly, or contribute noise, light, air, and water pollution that would be detrimental to the visitor experience and hazardous to the environment. The park should monitor potential development along the boundary to protect against incompatible land uses and viewshed infringement, and work with the neighboring mineral extraction sites to diminish or limit the impact on the park. The park should also maintain communication with the Georgia Department of Transportation to protect against inadvertent resource damage due to future road projects.

**Cultural Resources Documentation**

Better documentation is currently needed for the buildings and structures within the park. Recent projects to prepare cultural landcape inventories and a cultural landscape report have resulted in successful documentation of the overall park landscape. As noted in the park’s 2014 Foundation Document, historic structures reports are also needed for the buildings and structures to secure adequate documentation for these resources. Similarly, an updated archeological overview and assessment is needed to document known and potential archeological resources associated with the park.

Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires park managers, in consultation with their state historic preservation officers, to locate, inventory, and nominate to the National Register of Historic Places all properties that appear to be eligible for listing. Although the park is already listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the existing nomination was prepared in the 1970s and is outdated. It is recommended herein that the nomination be updated. The documentary research and field investigation required to prepare nominations would contribute additional important knowledge to the park’s inventory of cultural resources, and support the park’s efforts to manage and protect these resources.
If not already completed, it is also recommended that the park complete an inventory of all existing historic cultural resources within Andersonville National Historic Site to meet the objectives of National Park Service planning policy and Section 106 and Section 110 compliance, as well as historic resource protection, monitoring, and interpretation needs. The inventory should be used to create in-depth files for all cultural resources. The information collected should include the age, condition, alterations, and recommended treatment for each structure. It should include photographs, Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates, and locational mapping. The region’s List of Classified Structures (LCS) already captures much of this information; however, additional information needs to be collected, particularly for resources that are difficult to access and have not been well-documented to date, as well as non-historic features. Compilation of accurate information about structural and cosmetic changes to the park’s more recent buildings will assist future cultural resource management decisions should these structures be determined significant in the future. The LCS should also be evaluated to determine if all historic resources are included on the list, and where missing should be added.

The park should also ensure that all cultural resources already identified and evaluated as eligible are listed in the appropriate National Park System inventories, including the Cultural Landscapes Inventory (CLI), Cultural Sites Inventory, LCS, National Catalog of Museum Objects, and National Register of Historic Places.

**Baseline Cultural Resources Reports**

National Park Service policy suggests that each park develop several baseline reports that provide information for a variety of purposes ranging from planning to interpretation. This Historic Resource Study is one of the required baseline reports, designed to provide a general overview of park cultural resources and serve as a framework for further identification, evaluation, and nomination of cultural resources to the National Register of Historic Places. The primary baseline documents for the park currently in place, as noted in the 2014 Foundation Document, include the following (listed here in chronological order):

- Archeological investigations of the North Gate at Andersonville National Historic Site (1989)
- Biodegradation of marble headstones (1998)
- Collection condition survey (2001)
- Archives assessment survey (2001)
- Cultural landscape inventory (2010)
- Long-range interpretive plan (2010)
- Interment plan (2012)
- Collection management plan (2012)
- Conservation condition survey (2012) (objects on exhibit in National Prisoner of War Museum)
- American Alliance of Museums reaccreditation report (2013)
- Scope of Collections Statement (2013, draft)
- Cultural landscape report (2014)
- Historic Resource Study (this study, which was in progress at the time the Foundation Document was prepared)
- Cemetery operations plan (in process)
- Twentieth century army cemetery plans (plot and vegetation maps)
- GIS baseline maps
- Agreements with POW organizations (various)

Additional archeological studies have also been completed for the park. These are discussed in the chapter of this HRS entitled Cultural Landscapes, Ethnographic Resources, Archeology, and Museum Collections.
Management Recommendations

As identified in the Foundation Document, the planning studies and management plans that have not been initiated, and which are still needed for the park, include the following (with level of priority indicated):

- Visitant use management plan (high)
- Universal accessibility plan (high)
- Structural fire plan (high)
- Museum collections feasibility study (high)
- Monument maintenance and preservation plan (high)
- Museum exhibit plan (medium)
- Historic structure reports (medium)
- Update interpretive wayside exhibit plan (medium)
- Sign plan (medium)
- Comprehensive integrated pest management plan (low)
- Update long-range interpretive plan (low)
- Vegetation management plan (low)
- Visitor survey project (high)
- Comprehensive archeological inventory (high)
- Assess environmental effects on park cultural and natural resources and prescribe appropriate preservation and mitigation measures (medium)
- Conduct analysis of National Prisoner of War Museum and recommend preservation and maintenance techniques (medium)
- Archives assessment survey (low)
- Collection condition survey (low)
- Administrative history (low)
- Identify POW camps where lack of documentation exists and acquire oral histories and additional information to document those camps (low)
- Archeological investigations of Civilian Conservation Corps camps (low)
- Assess effectiveness of collection storage facilities for protection against environmental effects, including those from climate change (low)

- Conduct archeological excavation of prison site (low)

Mapping

Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping of all cultural resources within the park has been completed. This locational information is essential for development of accurate maintenance and management strategies for cultural resources.

The recent development of Light Detection and Ranging (LIDAR) mapping technology offers a new tool for documenting and assessing cultural resource sites. LIDAR technology affords an enhanced approach for historians, archeologists, and social geographers involved in determining the physical history of the region. LIDAR survey of the park should be considered.

List of Classified Structures

The National Park Service’s List of Classified Structures (LCS) is a record of all historic structures located within the National Park System. The LCS defines a structure as a constructed work that serves some form of human activity and that is generally immovable. Because the LCS is a listing of structures considered to be “historic,” a structure must meet one of the following criteria before it is entered in the LCS:

- All historic and prehistoric structures within parks of the National Park System that individually meet the listing criteria of the National Register of Historic Places.

- All structures that are contributing elements of sites or districts that meet the listing criteria of the National Register, and structures that are managed as cultural resources because of law, policy, or decisions reached through the planning process. These structures might also include certain structures that have been moved or reconstructed, commemorative structures, and structures that have achieved significance within the last fifty years.
In order for a historic structure within a park to be listed in the LCS, it should first be determined eligible for listing in the National Register. Even if a resource has not been identified as a contributing resource of an existing historic district, Determinations of Eligibility (DOEs) can be made for individual features in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) that are sufficient to meet the LCS listing criteria. Once concurrence is received from the SHPO in the form of a signed and dated letter, the structure(s) can be entered in the LCS, while National Register documentation can be submitted at a later date. Before the structure can be “certified,” the Park Superintendent must agree to the recommended management category and provide a letter to that effect to the Regional LCS Coordinator.

It appears that several resources that have been identified as historic in preparing the CLR documentation and this HRS project are not yet included in the LCS. All structures identified in this study as potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places should be evaluated through preparation of a DOE prior to inclusion in the LCS.

**Determinations of Eligibility**

As noted previously, Andersonville National Historic Site is currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Due to the age of the nomination, several resources that were not identified in 1976 as contributing may need to be revisited in terms of their eligibility for listing. Determinations of eligibility are also an important first step in listing resources on the LCS. The two storage buildings constructed in 1928 and 1936 should be considered in this endeavor, along with specific examples of work conducted by the Civilian Conservation Corps, such as the Providence Spring area improvements, the erosion control and storm water management systems, Pecan Lane and the associated trees and wall/gate features, and potentially other aspects of the park road system.

**National Register of Historic Places**

As noted previously, the National Register nomination for the park is outdated and should be updated to reflect current scholarship and resource evaluations.

**Management of Historic Structures**

Several of the historic structures within the park are fragile or susceptible to deterioration resulting from environmental factors, poor maintenance practices, visitor access, or vandalism. The park’s Foundation Document makes reference to the need for historic structures reports for buildings and other structures, and for monument and marker conservation maintenance plans. Also at risk are the earthen gun emplacements constructed during the prison period. These fragile earthen mounds are one of the only aboveground resources that survive from the prison period and should be a focus of proper preservation. An earthworks management plan should be prepared similar to the historic structures reports and conservation maintenance plans identified above.

**Interpretation**

Opportunities exist to broaden the park’s interpretation of the prison site, the national cemetery, and the history of prisoners of war. As the park is already doing, employing the cultural landscape in interpretive programming will serve to engage visitors further. Use of creative techniques in interpreting missing features, such as the north gate and the camp area, should also continue to be considered.

Based on review of the park’s Foundation Document, several recommendations relating to interpretation are already under consideration. These include:

- Update long-range interpretive plan to define future visitor services and programming.
Management Recommendations

- Expand interpretation and educational materials and exhibits to provide broader public understanding of the timeless nature of the POW story.

- Collect more oral histories.

- Partner with other organizations recording oral histories.

- Partner with other museums that interpret the POW experience, such as the National Infantry Museum. Partner with survivors and POW families and descendants to further the educational and commemorative mission of the national historic site.

- Expand interpretive materials, social media, and online video to engage and educate a larger audience on the mission of the site.

- Improve the staff ride training experience for military personnel.

- Continue to engage with POW organizations.

- Review new and pertinent sales items, audio tours, and educational products.

- The park also recognizes the need to continually review, evaluate, and update the exhibits within the museum for accuracy, relevancy, and engagement.

- The HRS project are warranted in order that the National Park Service maintain a comprehensive record of the physical history of the landscape.

There are likely other areas of historical interest that would benefit from further research. Former Cultural Resource Manager Alan Marsh, for example, visited the National Archives in Washington, D.C., while working at the park to collect information relating to the Civilian Conservation Corps and other periods of the property’s history. Research leads resulting from that effort, coupled with discussions with Mr. Marsh regarding additional research that he may have considered of value, should be noted and considered for a future project, either at the regional or park level.

Finally, there are several individuals still living that were instrumental in park establishment and development. President Jimmy Carter, for example, was involved in efforts to establish the park while serving as a Georgia State Senator, and served as governor at the time the park was established. An oral history could be proposed to record President Carter’s recollection of the political process and efforts entailed in establishing the park.

An interview with former Superintendent Fred Boyles should also be considered. Mr. Boyles may suggest additional names of people to be interviewed.

Finally, Alan Marsh is one of the most knowledgeable individuals regarding the history of the park. An interview should also be conducted with Mr. Marsh with the goal of documenting and archiving the park’s physical history.

The National Park Service should make every effort to continue processing and cataloging archival material, providing appropriate storage facilities, properly curating, conserving as needed, and protecting this valuable collection while making it accessible to future researchers.

---

Archive and Manuscript Collection

The park has an archive and manuscript collection that includes graphic and photographic documents.

One of the periods of history not well represented in the park’s archives is the U.S. Army administration era. Initial efforts to locate records relating to operations, maintenance, and physical development of the property prior to 1970 conducted on behalf of this project were unsuccessful in uncovering Army records. Additional research efforts, beyond the scope of
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