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FOREWORD

We are pleased to make available this administrative history as part of our ongoing effort to provide comprehensive documentation of National Park Service units in the Southeast Region. Many individuals and institutions contributed to the successful completion of this project. We would especially like to thank Horseshoe Bend National Military Park Superintendent Barbara Tagger and the park staff for their support and contributions to this work. Thanks also to Dr. Keith S. Hébert and Dr. Kathryn H. Braund, Principal Investigators at Auburn University, for their dedication to the successful completion of this report. We hope this study will be a useful tool for park management and for others interested in the history and significance of Horseshoe Bend National Military Park.

Julie H. Ernststein, Ph.D., RPA
Acting Chief, Cultural Resources, Partnerships, and Science Division
Southeast Regional Office
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The National Park Service (NPS) established Horseshoe Bend National Military Park (HOBE) in 1959 to commemorate General Andrew Jackson’s victory over Red Stick Creek Indian warriors at the March 27, 1814, Battle of Horseshoe Bend, the final battle of the Creek War (1813–1814). The fighting began as a civil war among Creek Indians before escalating as American forces invaded Creek Indian territory. The battle resulted in the deaths of more than 800 Red Stick Creek Indians and led to the signing of the Treaty of Fort Jackson that transferred millions of acres of Creek Indian land to the federal government. American Indians owned the land that comprised the battle site until 1837 when white settlers purchased it from the federal government. Between 1837 and the creation of HOBE, the battlefield site was divided into individual lots and used to raise crops and livestock. During the late 1890s, Alabama historian Thomas M. Owen launched the first efforts to preserve the historic battlefield. In 1914, Congress approved the installation of a granite monument on the battlefield but denied requests to establish a park.

Following World War II, a local judge named Jack Coley collaborated with the Alabama Power Company to lobby Congress to create a national park. Initially, NPS officials did not want HOBE because they did not believe that the battle held any national significance. With Alabama Congressman Albert Rains’ help, HOBE received congressional approval in 1956 and joined the national park system in 1959 as the result of an executive order by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. This establishment occurred during a period of servicewide improvements and expansion known as Mission 66—a program that emphasized visitor services and facilities. Under Superintendent Clarence Johnson’s leadership, HOBE built a visitor center, tour road, interpretive shelters, and museum exhibits that effectively transformed the land of Horseshoe Bend into an operating national park unit. On March 27, 1964, the park officially opened with a ceremony to mark the battle’s 150th anniversary.

During the park’s development, advocates celebrated the battle as a pivotal moment in the expansion of white civilization into the American South. After 1964, HOBE staff incorporated new interpretations of American Indian culture to balance the park’s celebratory narratives. New living history programs that featured American Indian interpreters were added to the park’s traditional military weapons demonstrations, but few consultations happened between HOBE and the Muscogee (Creek) Nation in Oklahoma until the late 1990s. On March 27, 2014, a crowd of more than 300 Muscogee (Creek) Nation American Indians attended the 200th anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. The event reflected the improving relationship between HOBE and its American Indian partners and marked 50 years of successful NPS stewardship of this historic site.

As the park improved its American Indian interpretation, HOBE also placed new emphasis on natural resource management. As a military park, HOBE’s primary mission is to preserve and interpret its cultural resources. During the 1970s, HOBE launched several environmental education and natural resource management initiatives, but those programs faded by the end of that decade because of budget cuts and the absence of natural resource personnel.
HOBE’s history provides a lens through which historians can better understand how changes within the National Park Service affected small parks systemwide. Thus, HOBE’s administrative history reveals much about how the National Park Service has evolved over the past 50 years.
INTRODUCTION

Horseshoe Bend National Military Park (HOBE) was the site of the decisive battle of the Creek War, 1813–1814. Horseshoe Bend virtually ended Creek Indian armed resistance to the combined American forces under General Andrew Jackson’s command. Months later, Creek leaders ceded more than 22 million acres of land during the Treaty of Fort Jackson. The battle and the war permanently altered Creek Indian society. Horseshoe Bend is the sole National Park Service unit associated with the Creek War and the historic Creek Indians—two subjects about which most Americans know little. Park promoters had advocated for the establishment of a national park at Horseshoe Bend since the early 20th century. These promoters saw the battlefield as a site to commemorate the victorious American army that won the Creek War. They dreamed of erecting large monuments that honored General Andrew Jackson, Major Lemuel Montgomery, and the nameless frontier militiamen who served under their command. Promoters mostly ignored the fact that Jackson’s army also included a sizeable party of Creek and Cherokee Indians. They also ignored the fact that Jackson’s invasion force had interceded in what had begun as a civil war among Creek Indians. Jackson’s invasion transformed what had been an internal fight over who would control the Creek National Council into an armed land grab conducted by white men who excused their actions as a necessary response to protect the southern frontier (Braund 2012).

The creation of Horseshoe Bend National Military Park was a struggle as park promoters initially failed to convince the National Park Service that the Battle of Horseshoe Bend was nationally significant. During the 1950s, funding for the National Park Service declined during the Truman and Eisenhower administrations. To reduce the National Park Service’s expenses, Congress began to reevaluate the status of several park units whose national significance lacked adequate documentation. Since 1950, Congress had purged ten park units from the National Park Service. Several, such as Verendrye National Monument in North Dakota, were delisted because subsequent historical research discovered serious flaws in their original park nomination materials. The purging of NPS units made Congress suspicious of new park unit applications and forced applicants to provide more documentation than may have been previously required during the nomination process. Despite the additional scrutiny, HOBE managed to convince Congress that the Battle of Horseshoe Bend was nationally significant because of its supposed influence on American and British negotiations during the Treaty of Ghent that ended the War of 1812. Park advocates devoted little time to delving into Creek Indian history and culture.1

Under National Park Service administration, the development of Horseshoe Bend National Military Park outpaced the available scholarship on the Creek War. Consequently, exhibits created in time for the park’s 1964 opening lacked sufficient understanding of Creek Indian history because scholarship on that subject was equally lacking. In addition, the National Park

Service discovered during the park’s developmental phase that few artifacts created by Creek Indians had survived the Creek War. Park service personnel combed through collections held in archives, museums, and private hands nationwide to no avail. Portraying Creek Indian history through its material culture would be problematic, if not impossible, and hampered the park’s interpretation. Eventually, by the mid-1970s, increased academic interest in Creek Indian history and the rise of ethnohistory had combined to produce new perspectives on the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Unfortunately, incorporating this new research into the park’s programs was difficult because of an inability to secure funds to produce new exhibits and expand park staff so that this information could be incorporated into existing programs. Horseshoe Bend National Military Park gradually shifted its interpretation away from celebrating General Andrew Jackson’s victory over the Creek Indians, but problems in interpretation remained even with a new set of exhibits installed in the mid-1990s. Despite these challenges, Horseshoe Bend National Military Park staff managed to protect, preserve, and interpret the park’s historic, natural, and archeological resources while gradually finding creative ways to enhance park programs and expand park staffing.

Since the park’s official dedication in 1964, most of the facilities and overall footprint on the land have remained constant. Visitors who came to the park in 1964 and returned in 2014 would have noticed few changes in the park’s layout, facilities, and staffing. Observant visitors, however, would notice significant changes in park programs and a greater presence of American Indian perspectives. Park programs now make a concerted effort to present American Indian views. American Indian interpreters, reenactors, craftspeople, and visitors have all increased over the past decade. Consultations with the Muskogee Creek Nation and other tribal governments affiliated with the Battle of Horseshoe Bend have also increased during this period and have played a central role in reshaping park interpretation and programming. Recently, the National Park Service funded historical and archeological studies to learn more about Creek Indian society. In most cases, the results of these studies have been incorporated into the park’s existing interpretation by a park staff that is dedicated to presenting multiple perspectives. No single moment better represents the changes that have occurred at Horseshoe Bend since 1965 than the 2014 bicentennial commemoration. That ceremony epitomized the progress that the National Park Service has made at Horseshoe Bend reaching out to surviving American Indian tribal governments and presenting the public with a balanced account of the site’s history. Today, the park regularly consults with federally recognized tribal governments to ensure that the park provides accurate and culturally sensitive accounts of American Indian history. Increased tribal consultations have also led to increased American Indian participation in public program planning as well as discussions about natural resource management (Iverson 1998; Keller et al. 1998).

**Horseshoe Bend National Military Park**

Horseshoe Bend National Military Park is a 2,040-acre park located in rural Tallapoosa County, Alabama. The park’s name derives from the horseshoe-shaped bend in the Tallapoosa River that on March 27, 1814, was the site of a major battle fought between approximately 3,300 American forces under the command of General Andrew Jackson of Tennessee and their allied American Indian warriors and about 1,000 “Red Stick” Creek Indians who defended the fortified town of Tohopeka. Jackson’s victorious army killed more than 800 Creek Indian warriors during the
battle making it the single greatest loss of American Indian lives in American history. The Battle of Horseshoe Bend marked the end of Creek military resistance to white settlement and placed the tribe on a path toward its eventual removal to Oklahoma.

After a series of failed attempts to create a national park in the early 20th century, a group of dedicated park promoters successfully convinced the U.S. Congress to authorize the establishment of Horseshoe Bend National Military Park in 1956. Three years later, President Dwight Eisenhower signed a proclamation that officially created the park as a unit owned and managed by the National Park Service. Horseshoe Bend National Military Park was the first National Park Service unit to be formed in Alabama.

HOBE’s appearance has remained fairly constant since its creation. In the 1960s, using funds received from the Mission 66 program, the National Park Service built a visitor center, tour road, park employee housing, boat ramp, picnic area, and interpretive shelters at the park. Since that initial wave of construction, the only significant additions to the park’s facilities have been a maintenance building (1976), a park employee house (1990), new interpretive shelters (2004), and a restroom building (2004).

Whereas many of the battlefield parks managed by the National Park Service, especially those associated with the American Civil War, have large numbers of commemorative monuments that have been added to the landscape, HOBE has only a small handful located on Gun Hill, the location of Jackson’s headquarters and artillery units. In 1917, the U.S. Congress paid for the erection of a large rectangular granite congressional monument. The monument was dedicated in honor of “General Andrew Jackson and his brave men [who] broke the power of the Creek Indians.” Unfortunately, the monument misidentifies the date of the battle as March 29, 1814—the battle actually happened on March 27, 1814. During the 1914 centennial program, the National Society United States Daughters of 1812 placed a granite marker at the base of Gun Hill in recognition of the Jackson Trace—the route that Jackson’s army traveled during the Creek War. In 1972, the Tohopeka Chapter of Daughters of the American Revolution placed a small granite headstone to mark the location of the final burial place of Major Lemuel Montgomery, the first American casualty during the battle.

The bulk of HOBE’s 2,040-acre property consists of second-generation forests. The land surrounding the park’s boundary is mostly forested, and the entire area is sparsely populated. National Park Service staff are unsure of how the battlefield might have appeared in March 1814. Between 1814 and 1959, portions of the battlefield were used sporadically as agricultural fields. Farming activities, most notably the construction of several terraces, likely altered the battlefield and resulted in the loss of numerous artifacts left behind by the battle’s participants. Since the park’s opening in 1965, the National Park Service decided to clear several areas of the battlefield of invasive vegetation species to create vistas for visitors. In 2006, HOBE performed the park’s first prescribed burns to eliminate the high fuel load that had accumulated in many of the park’s heavily forested areas.

The Tallapoosa River is one of the park’s most recognizable natural resources. The 265-mile river forms in Paulding County, Georgia, and winds through parts of west Georgia and east Alabama before joining the Coosa River at Wetumpka to form the Alabama River. Approximately 3 miles of the river flows through HOBE’s boundary. The river has experienced
significant changes since 1814. During the early 20th century, the Alabama Power Company built four hydroelectric dams on the Tallapoosa River. Martin Dam, built in 1926 at Cherokee Bluff, impounded 44,000 acres of water forming Lake Martin, one of the nation’s largest lakes. Dam construction has altered the river’s aquatic species and changed the pace of its flow. Sediment soils loosened upriver by water exiting hydroelectric generators often deposits downstream resulting in a raising of the river bottom. In 1814, the Tallapoosa River likely had a deeper bottom and swifter currents compared to its extant state.1

Park visitors can only access the park using Alabama Highway 49. The nearest cities of Dadeville and Alexander City are located more than a dozen miles away. U.S. Highway 280 passes through Tallapoosa County approximately 12 miles from the park entrance. Before the construction of federal interstates 59 and 65 in the mid-1970s, U.S. Highway 280 had been one of the main corridors used by Midwestern tourists traveling to Florida’s Gulf Coast beaches.

Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site, located approximately 60 miles away in Macon County, Alabama, is the closest National Park Service unit. Since HOBE’s creation, the National Park Service has established five other units in the state, including Russell Cave National Monument, Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site, Little River Canyon National Preserve, Tuskegee Airmen National Historic Site, and the Selma to Montgomery National Historic Trail. HOBE is the only National Park Service unit whose history is associated with the Creek Civil War. In addition, the park is the only National Park Service unit that focuses solely on historic Creek Indian history. HOBE is among several National Park Service units associated with the War of 1812 and was included in the 2012 bicentennial commemorations of that often-forgotten American conflict.

HOBE administration and staffing has remained consistent since 1964. The park has been managed by a superintendent except for a brief period during the late 1990s and early 2000s when it was placed under the management of the Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site. During that period, HOBE’s staff included a Historian, Chief Interpretive Ranger, Chief of Maintenance, Maintenance Technician, Law Enforcement Ranger, Administrative Officer, Administrative Technician, and Park Guide. As of 2018, however, the park no longer has a Park Historian or Law Enforcement Ranger. Between 1965 and 2014, the number of full-time employees ranged from six to ten. Park personnel has been supplemented by seasonal hires, volunteers, and student workers. In 2010, community partners established the Friends of Horseshoe Bend, a 501(c)(3) partner organization that assists with park planning, programs, and advocacy.

In addition to regularly scheduled historic weapons demonstrations and living history reenactments, HOBE hosts three annual programs. In late March each year, the park commemorates the anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. The event is usually held on a Saturday and at times has been a two-day program. This event has been held each year since the park’s 1965 opening. In August each year, the park marks the anniversary of its creation as a

National Park Service unit by holding a series of living history demonstrations. Over the past decade or so, this event has been referred to as the Muster on the Tallapoosa. Recently, the park hosted an annual symposium in collaboration with the Auburn University Caroline Marshall Draughon Center for the Arts and Humanities. The one-day event is a forum for scholars to present the latest research on the Battle of Horseshoe Bend and Creek Indian society to the public. Other annual programs have come and gone during the park’s history such as a popular winter holiday open house event.

While HOBE has faced many challenges during its 50-plus year history in the national park system, the park has largely avoided any significant threats to its protected cultural and natural resources. On the one hand, the park’s history has been one of great continuity over time. HOBE is a small park with a small staff that has always found creative ways to remain an active presence in the local community, while providing some of the best examples of cultural and natural resource management and education programs in Alabama. HOBE has consistently served as an important resource for local law enforcement, fire fighters, forestry managers, and educators. The park has played a major role in reconnecting Alabama and the nation with Creek Indian descendants who have grown to see this site as a place for mourning, healing, and educating the public about their culture. The park has preserved a site that despite its painful past has become a pilgrimage site for many Creek Indians seeking to honor their society’s past. On the other hand, the growing presence of American Indians at HOBE represents some of the biggest changes in the park’s history. During the park’s creation, local advocates generally portrayed Creek Indians as an uncivilized and unproductive society that needed to be removed so that a superior white civilization could benefit from their lands. Early park interpretive programs often echoed those same descriptions of American Indians and failed to reach out to the Muscogee (Creek) Nation in Oklahoma to discover possible alternative interpretations. Gradually, the park’s interpretive programs abandoned many of the racial overtones that early descriptions expressed. Beyond its treatment of American Indians, however, HOBE reflects many of the changes that have occurred across the National Park Service during the last half century. Changes in HOBE’s environmental education, living history, fire management, public interpretation, public outreach, and American Indian relations have coincided with larger movement in the National Park Service. Thus, any detailed examination of HOBE’s history promises to reveal much about how the National Park Service has evolved over the past 50 years.
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CHAPTER ONE
HORSESHOE BEND IN THE 19TH CENTURY

Introduction

The Battle of Horseshoe Bend was a transformative event in the history of the Creek Indians that directly influenced subsequent events that accelerated the white settlement of Alabama and hastened the removal of its native peoples. An internal conflict among Creek Indians provided state and territorial governments in Georgia, Tennessee, and Mississippi that were motivated by the prospect of seizing native lands with an opportunity to launch military invasions into Creek lands. The battle also influenced General Andrew Jackson’s rise to national prominence. Jackson’s victory increased the confidence that the United States government had in his military prowess and set the stage for later events at the Battle of New Orleans. Jackson’s growing popularity eclipsed the events at Horseshoe Bend. For the Creek Indians, the battle was a horrific episode best left in the past. For many Americans, Horseshoe Bend appeared to have been largely forgotten as a minor battle fought during the larger War of 1812. Within a few years after the battle, the battlefield had been transformed into part of a large farm. Beyond a few efforts to commemorate the achievements of the Tennessee militiamen who fought at Horseshoe Bend, no initiative was launched during the remainder of the 19th century to remember the battle. While accounts of the battle appeared in early Alabama history books, the state made no effort to either preserve the battlefield or organize a celebration to honor its memory. As the century ended, a small group of Alabama historical enthusiasts had begun organizing support for establishing a battlefield park.

The Creek War of 1813–1814

The Battle of Horseshoe Bend (March 27, 1814) was the final battle of the Creek War of 1813–1814. The Creek War began as a civil war, largely centered among the Upper Creeks, whose towns were located on the Coosa, Tallapoosa, and upper reaches of the Alabama rivers. The conflict pitted a faction of the Creeks who became known as Red Sticks against those Creeks who supported the National Council, a relatively new body that had developed from the traditional regional meetings of headmen from the Creek towns. Under the auspices of Federal Indian Agent Benjamin Hawkins, the National Council’s authority and powers had been expanded. The war broke out against the backdrop of the American-British War of 1812. Americans, fearful that southeastern Indians would support the British, quickly joined the war against the Red Sticks, turning the civil war into a military campaign designed to destroy Creek power. To prove their loyalty to the United States, contingents of Choctaw and Cherokee warriors joined the American war against the Creeks. Thus, the Creek civil war was quickly transformed into a multidimensional war that resulted in the total defeat of the Creek people at the hand of American armies and their American Indian allies.
The complex causes of the war can be traced to the declining economic situation among southeastern Indian groups, the resentments caused by increasing accommodation of American demands by the Creek National Council, the increasing pressure from expanding white settlement along Creek borders (particularly along the newly constructed Federal Road), and a reactionary religious movement.

By 1812, the Creek National Council agreed to use annuity payments from the U.S. Government for sales of hunting lands to retire the debts of major Creek debtors—an action that antagonized many Creeks. By 1813, the hunting and trading economy of the 18th century was largely on the decline, and growing numbers of Creeks were adopting herding and agriculture geared toward the emerging market economy. As a result, there was an increasing disparity in wealth and access to imported foreign goods, which were growing ever more expensive. Lacking an industrial base, Creeks were completely dependent on imported goods, including cloth, tools, and weaponry. The United States provided limited amounts of goods through trading stores, or "factories," but the Creeks got the majority of their supplies from the Florida-based Panton, Leslie and Company and its successor, John Forbes and Company.

In addition, Creek resentment was growing over expanding settlements of Americans along the Creek-Georgia border and in the Cumberland Valley. By the spring of 1812, Creek representatives had met with Shawnee leaders on the Ohio River regarding the possibility of obtaining arms from the British. Shawnee-Creek diplomacy and concern over white encroachment dated to the mid-18th century, and at the time, the Shawnee were undergoing a revitalization movement and purposely urging those from other tribes to resist white encroachment. A small number of Creek warriors took action against the unwelcome settlers and killed two families near the Duck River, in what is now Tennessee, as well as two men along the Federal Road. Federal Indian agent Benjamin Hawkins called for the immediate execution of the guilty and threatened the Creeks with federal intervention if the murderers were not executed. The National Council complied and ordered the execution of eight Creeks.

In January 1813, a small party of Creeks in communication with the Shawnee murdered another group of whites, and Hawkins again pressed the Creek National Council to act quickly and punish the offenders. The council sent out warriors led by William McIntosh (Tustunnuggee Hutke) of Coweta to execute the dissidents, who were largely from the Upper Creek Towns. Traditionally, such matters had been handled by clans rather than the council’s new police force known as the “Law Menders.” Thus, in spite of their intention to preserve peace with the United States, this action by the council split the Creek Nation. The dissidents, attempting to subsist in a broken economy in which only a few prospered and resenting the increasing border encroachments and traffic along the contested Federal Road, acted against the council. These Creek dissidents blamed the expanding conflict on the relatively new exercises of power by the National Council. The executions came at a time of intense religious prophecy among many American Indian groups that urged a spiritual awakening and a return to pre-contact traditions combined with a denunciation of foreign influences and the use of armed force if necessary to regain American Indian land. Creek prophets, influenced by the Shawnee brothers Tenskwatawa (known as The Prophet) and Tecumseh, gained adherents, especially among Creek traditionalists who resented the infringement of traditional clan authority that the Creek National Council had assumed in ordering the execution of leading warriors.
As dissident Creek warriors rose against their National Council and threatened the traditional seats of power in Tuckabatchee and Coweta, Hawkins ruled out any hope of reconciliation when he called on the Creeks to renounce them and their "prophets." Hawkins made it clear that those who did not fight the dissidents were America's enemies, given the widely held belief that a September 1811 visit by Tecumseh had aimed to form a pan-Indian confederation to fight white expansion. The Shawnee call for unity and armed resistance to American expansion was accompanied by "new war songs and dances" as well as prophetic messages. The call also was for rejection of the American system, armed resistance to American expansion, and revitalization of Creek culture found receptive ears.

The dissidents' objective was Tuckabatchee, home to one of the leading chiefs on the National Council. There, the town residents had already begun erecting defensive works, as had those in Cusseta and Coweta. In addition to assaulting Tuckabatchee, dissidents attacked accommodationist headmen and, in the Upper Towns, began a slaughter of domestic cattle around Tuckabatchee, most of which belonged to men who had gained power by adopting aspects of European culture. Some historians have asserted that the dissidents believed that domesticated animals perverted the natural order that dictated that animals were meant to live wild in the woods. Since most of the cattle in the Upper Creek Nation were not killed at this time, it is more logical to assume this was a military and political move designed to starve the inhabitants of Tuckabatchee while also destroying their property.

To prepare for action against the National Council, the dissidents traveled to Pensacola to seek ammunition and assistance from the Spanish government. On their return home, they were attacked by Mississippi militia and Tensaw area settlers who wanted to prevent Spanish ammunition from reaching the main body of disaffected warriors. The attack on July 27, 1813, near Burnt Corn Creek (in present-day Escambia County near Brewton), changed and escalated the nature of the war. In retaliation for the attack at Burnt Corn, the dissidents turned their fury on the fortified settlement of Samuel Mims. These dissidents were soon called "Red Sticks" because they had raised the "red stick of war," a favored weapon and symbolic Creek war declaration. The brutal attack on Fort Mims on August 30, 1813, by nearly 700 Red Sticks was a complete victory and left 250 of the defenders and civilian inhabitants dead, with perhaps 100 others taken captive by the Red Sticks. Sporadic attacks were likewise launched against American settlers along the Chattahoochee River, and support for the Red Sticks expanded rapidly among the Upper Towns.

Following the attack on Fort Mims and the ensuing escalation, the divided Creek towns faced an invasion of their country by military forces from Mississippi, Georgia, and Tennessee. The sprawling and open layout of Creek towns, however, made them difficult to defend or fortify. As a result, Red Stick leadership fortified their towns. Moreover, the embattled towns sought strength in numbers, relocating scattered residents to remote and more defensible locations, one for each of the three major Creek tribal divisions. The Alabama towns collected at the Econochaca (Holy Ground), Tallapoosas congregated near Autossee, and the Red Stick Abeikas (primarily Okfuskees) took refuge behind a formidable barrier they erected at Tohopeka (Horseshoe Bend). In addition to erecting fortifications, Creek prophets performed incantations to erect spiritual barriers as well. These hastily constructed positions became the focus of American attacks.
The attack on Fort Mims and its civilian inhabitants, many of whom were of Creek descent, outraged Americans and immediately changed the course of the war. Red Sticks followed up their attack on Fort Mims with smaller attacks against nearby Fort Sinquefield. American retaliation for the attack on Fort Mims was loosely but ineffectively coordinated by a series of American military commanders, notably General Thomas Flourney, the commander of the Seventh Military District, as well as the governors of Georgia, Tennessee, and the Mississippi Territory. The Americans’ hastily devised plan called for a three-pronged invasion of Creek country in which the three armies were to rendezvous along the Tallapoosa River. By October 1813, the invasion was underway, largely without regard for training new recruits and volunteers or the establishment of clear communication channels and supply chains.

Governor William Blount of Tennessee called for 3,500 volunteers from across the state to be mustered in two armies led by rival commanders John Cocke and Andrew Jackson, whose West Tennessee militia of 1,000 men was supported by 1,300 cavalry commanded by John Coffee. Jackson’s force was also supplemented by a sizeable contingent of Cherokee warriors. Their objective was to attack the Red Sticks among the Abeika towns. By November 3, Jackson secured the first American victory in the war when Coffee’s cavalry routed Creeks at the town of Tullusahatchee, killing 200 Red Stick warriors as well as many women and children. A few days later, a large Red Stick force laid siege to the Creek town of Talladega. Jackson attempted to encircle the town, but most of the approximately 1,000 attackers managed to escape, although with heavy losses of perhaps one-third of their warriors. Meanwhile, Hillabee residents sent word to Jackson that they did not intend to support the Red Stick faction. Without Jackson’s knowledge, General Cocke sent a contingent of his army to attack the town, killing roughly 70 warriors and capturing nearly 300. Those who escaped joined the Red Sticks. Supply problems, short enlistments, poor communications, and quarrels between Jackson and Cocke plagued the Tennessee forces, and by year’s end, Jackson was left with approximately 150 men at Fort Strother on the Coosa River.

The Georgia militia, under Gen. John Floyd, had been in the field first, with limited action against Red Sticks along the Chattahoochee River near the allied Creek town of Coweta in August and September. The nearly 1,000 Georgians set out for the Tallapoosa towns at roughly the same time that the Tennesseans moved toward the Abeika heartland in October, building a string of fortified supply depots as they proceeded. A contingent of 400 Creek warriors under William McIntosh assisted Floyd’s army. Floyd’s main objective was the Red Stick stronghold at Autossee. His men attacked and burned the town on November 29, 1813, but could not surround it. Most of the inhabitants escaped, but the defenders lost an estimated 200 warriors to only 11 American dead and just over 50 wounded, including General Floyd. The wounded Floyd retreated to Fort Mitchell, a supply post he had established earlier on the Chattahoochee River.

General Ferdinand Claiborne, whose troops included Mississippi Territory militia, poorly trained and equipped volunteers who had joined after the Mims massacre, and Choctaw warriors, commanded the third arm of the American invasion force. In the early fall of 1813, after several minor skirmishes along the Alabama River, including Samuel Dale’s famous "canoe fight," Claiborne’s troops made for their main objective, the Holy Ground, a settlement located on the bluffs above the Alabama River, approximately 30 miles west of present-day
Montgomery, which they attacked on December 23, 1813. Most of the Red Sticks escaped, however. After pillaging the town for corn, Claiborne’s troops burned the town and retreated south and disbanded.

By January 1814, both Jackson and Floyd had managed to raise recruits and organize supplies for additional campaigns. Action in the New Year began when Floyd headed west from Fort Mitchell to extend his supply line. After building Fort Hull, a small post 40 miles west of Fort Mitchell, he proceeded to Calabee Creek. There, his camp was surprised in the early dawn by a large force of Red Sticks that attacked with war clubs and tomahawks but could not overpower Floyd’s artillery. Timpoochee Barnard, leading the allied Yuchi Creeks, was instrumental in saving a company of Georgians who had been nearly overwhelmed by Red Sticks. The Red Sticks lost 50 men, while the Georgians and their Creek allies lost 22 men, with 150 wounded. After the battle, Floyd’s army retreated to Georgia.

Thus, by the middle of January, only one American army remained active—that of Andrew Jackson; the army of 60-day enlistees had expanded to nearly 1,000 men. Seeking to defeat the Red Sticks before his army dissolved again, Jackson moved south from Fort Strother. By the end of the month, he had engaged the enemy at Emuckfau Creek and Enitachopco Creek with little success. The arrival of the 600-man, 39th U.S. Infantry Regiment allowed Jackson to embark on an ambitious campaign against the single largest remaining Red Stick settlement—Tohopeka at the Horseshoe Bend of the Tallapoosa River. There, on March 27, aided by Cherokee and Creek allies, Jackson’s army routed the Red Sticks, killing nearly all of the estimated 800 warriors who had gathered behind an impressive barricade. From Horseshoe Bend, Jackson proceeded along the Tallapoosa River, burning towns and improvements in his path, until he reached the junction of the Coosa and Tallapoosa rivers where he built Fort Jackson, the site of the earlier French post, Fort Toulouse. In addition to dispatching scouting parties who attacked any Creeks they encountered, Americans also burned virtually every town in the Upper Creek Nation, nearly 60 in all.

The death rate during the various Creek war battles was high, with estimates ranging from 1,500 to 3,000. Whatever the number, the Red Sticks themselves represented their numerous losses to agent Benjamin Hawkins as “like the fall of leaves.” The death toll among noncombatants continued to climb after hostilities ceased, primarily from starvation and exposure. Uncounted numbers of refugees headed for Florida and resettled among the Seminoles.

After the defeat at Horseshoe Bend, Red Sticks began surrendering in large numbers. Many of their leaders preferred to surrender and take their chances with Andrew Jackson rather than face death at the hands of their own people, who blamed them for their destitution. Others led their people into canebrakes and swamps to hide.

It was under these circumstances that Jackson called Creek leaders to Fort Jackson to hear the terms for peace. Representatives of the National Council—as the lawful representatives of the Creek Nation representing a variety of towns including Coweta, Tuckabatchee, Hillabee, Coosa, and Tuskegee—signed the treaty on August 9, 1814. The cession of land demanded by the United States as payment for the cost of the war encompassed more than 21 million acres west of the Coosa River (the hunting territory of the Abeika) as well as a swath of land to the south of the Tallapoosa River and north of the border with Florida that reached from the Tombigbee
River to the St. Marys River—in effect, taking a good deal of Tallapoosa and Lower Creek land, including some Alabama town sites. The treaty also purported to erect a buffer between the Creek towns and potential Spanish supplies at Pensacola. Even though many Creeks objected to the treaty, they had little choice but to agree to Jackson’s terms.1

Creek Indian Land Cessions: 1814–1832

The defeat of Creek Indian forces at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend (March 27, 1814) combined with the ensuing Treaty of Fort Jackson (August 9, 1814) made available more than 21 million acres of Creek Indian land to thousands of white settlers who poured into the region seeking land. This wave of immigration became known as “Alabama Fever.” In 1810, about 10,000 white men and women lived in Alabama. Ten years later, Alabama’s population had swelled to more than 127,000. By 1830, more than 300,000 people lived in Alabama—most of whom occupied lands once held by Creek Indians. Alabama’s population grew at such a rapid pace that it gained statehood in 1819, only five years after the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Creek Indian land cessions made possible the white settlement of the Deep South.2

Many of these early immigrants settled on the considerable territory lost by the Creeks under the terms of the treaty. The land along the western bank of the Coosa River as well as the bottomlands along the Alabama and lower Tallapoosa Rivers were highly desirable for cotton (Abernethy 1965). Rising demands for cotton fueled “Alabama Fever.” A vibrant international cotton trade developed during the early decades of the 19th century as European textile manufacturers developed new production methods and American capitalists began incorporating these technological advances into their production centers. Cotton fetched a high price both domestically and internationally. To reap the massive financial rewards from this booming commodity trade, farmers invested in new lands and black slaves. Large numbers of white settlers sold or abandoned their lands in Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Georgia to claim new lands in Alabama.3

While Creek Indians surrendered more than 21 million acres of land following the Treaty of Fort Jackson, Creek Indians retained control of millions of acres in what is now east-central Alabama and west Georgia, including the site of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Tensions

between Creek Indians and white settlers remained high following the Creek War. Pressure to abandon their homeland and move west came from the states as well as the federal government. Many settlers entering the region in search of quick profit from cotton illegally squatted on Creek lands, building a house and planting crops without any legal title to the land (Libby 2008; Dattel 2009; Keith 2015).

Southern states, eager to take over Creek land within the borders they had established, began to enact a series of “extension laws” that extended state jurisdiction over American Indian land and, at the same time, deprived Indians of basic rights. Southerners also put pressure on the federal government to extinguish American Indian title to lands within the borders claimed by the states.

Frustrated by the Creek National Council’s refusal to cede additional land, the federal government resorted to using bribes and personal favors to agitate divisions among the Creek. Federal agents targeted a Lower Creek headman, William McIntosh, who had previously accepted bribes from federal officials in exchange for his cooperation in opening negotiations with Creek leaders. McIntosh, a veteran of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, was an affluent planter who owned large tracts of land along the Chattahoochee River in west (Carroll County) and west-central Georgia (Butts County). After commanding a unit of Lower Creek warriors that served in Jackson’s army during the Creek War, McIntosh used his connections with federal officials and kinship with several prominent Georgia leaders to profit from the exchange of goods and materials between the government and Creek towns. In 1821, McIntosh played a critical role in negotiating the Treaty of Indian Springs—an agreement by which a small group of Creek men sold 4.3 million acres of land in Georgia in exchange for cash and debt remittances. McIntosh received at least $40,000 in cash and more than 1,000 acres in land in exchange for his enthusiastic efforts to convince Creek leaders to sign the agreement. When state and federal parties failed to fulfill promises of future cash payments and canceling of debts, Creek leaders became increasingly reluctant to enter into any further land cession negotiations. To prevent Creek leaders from acting independent of the National Council, a law was enacted prohibiting any chief or leader from selling land. Violators of this law would be put to death.4

Federal and state efforts to persuade Creek leaders to cede additional lands intensified during the early 1820s. In December 1824, a delegation of federal officials appointed by President James Madison tried unsuccessfully to negotiate a land cession with the Creek National Council. Creek leaders clung to past federal treaties that guaranteed their right to remain on their ancestral lands. In 1825, federal agents offered McIntosh a series of personal bribes that included land and money in exchange for gathering a delegation of Lower Creek leaders to cede more than 3 million acres of land, including all land claimed by the state of Georgia and considerable territory in what is now Alabama. The ensuing Treaty of Indian Springs resulted in a national scandal as members of the Creek National Council declared the treaty illegal since none of the signatories represented their body. Several months later, a large group of Creek leaders

warriors led by Menawa executed McIntosh at his home on the Chattahoochee River in west Georgia.\(^5\)

In 1826, the federal government, after holding a meeting in Washington, D.C., with a large contingent of the Creek National Council, nullified the Treaty of Indian Springs and replaced it with the Treaty of Washington. The new treaty allowed the Creeks to retain approximately 5 million acres of land along the Coosa and Tallapoosa rivers in Alabama in exchange for selling millions of acres of land in Georgia. Following the treaty, the first groups of Creek Indians, comprised mostly of McIntosh supporters and members of other Lower Creek towns, began their emigration to Oklahoma territory. About 1,600 additional Creeks would voluntarily leave Alabama in the years following the Treaty of Washington (Haveman 2016).

The Treaty of Washington marked a victory for Creek leaders because it reaffirmed the sovereign powers of their national council in negotiating land cessions. The Creek National Council had successfully challenged the federal government and gained some sympathy nationally for continued resistance. However, the treaty upset Alabama leaders who believed that the Treaty of Indian Springs had legitimately ceded all remaining Creek lands east of the Chattahoochee River, which included some land claimed by Alabama. Politicians who sought to appeal to the masses of poor white voters that comprised the nation’s broadening electorate found ways to capture the anger many felt toward American Indians and mobilize those hostile sympathies into one of the most popular political movements in American history (Thornton 2014; Watson 2006).

As part of the anger generated by the nullification of the Treaty of Indian Springs, the Alabama legislature began issue states’ rights assertions and continued the practice of extending state law into territory in Alabama that the Creeks had regained by the nullification of the Indian Springs treaty. New laws also prohibited Creek Indians from hunting, fishing, or trapping in the state thus limiting them to farming. Alabama also funded new roads across Creek territory leading to further influxes of white settlers who often illegally squatted upon American Indian lands. The state legislature passed laws that protected squatter claims to property making it difficult for Creeks to remove their unwelcomed neighbors. Moreover, these laws prohibited American Indian testimony in some legal cases and banned the operation of the National Council, making it illegal for an American Indian assembly to make laws in their own territory (Green 1982).

Following the Treaty of Washington, Alabama leaders urged the Creek National Council to sell its remaining lands in the state. Statewide a slate of Democratic politicians rose to power largely thanks to their strong condemnations of Creek sovereignty. During the election of 1828, Alabama voters overwhelmingly cast their support behind Andrew Jackson who pledged to assist Georgia and Alabama with the removal of its remaining American Indian population. In Washington, Alabama’s congressional delegation joined Georgia’s to form a steadfast coalition that helped pass the controversial 1830 Indian Removal Act. The act gave the president the power to exchange lands west of the Mississippi River for Indian claims in the east. Two years later, Alabama passed another law that extended state law over practically all Creek lands undermining the national council’s authority and placing remaining Indians under the

\(^5\) Griffith, McIntosh, Frank, “William McIntosh,” Encyclopedia of Alabama, 
“protection” of state courts. Certain that Creek Indian removal was a foregone conclusion, thousands of additional white settlers entered east Alabama hoping to stake a claim on Indian lands. (Rogers et al. 1994)

In 1832, President Jackson hosted a delegation of Creek leaders in Washington, D.C., to discuss the sale of their remaining lands in Alabama. Under Opothle Yoholo’s leadership, Creek negotiators worked tirelessly to ensure that their people received as much financial compensation and other considerations as possible. According to the terms laid out in the Treaty of Washington (1832), Creeks surrendered their sovereign land claims in exchange for allotment of legal title to individual tribal members. Chiefs would be given 640-acre land parcels and other heads-of-households would receive 320-acre lots. Technically, Creeks could either sell their land to whites and relocate to Oklahoma or remain on their land permanently as the legal titleholder. The Creek Nation also received $100,000 in cash plus an additional $210,000 in annuity payments to be dispensed over a 15-year period. These funds were to be used to help the Creeks establish new communities in Oklahoma.6

Horseshoe Bend Battlefield: 1832–1900

Horseshoe Bend National Military Park is located in Tallapoosa County, Alabama. The Alabama legislature formed Tallapoosa County in 1832 following the Treaty of Washington. Okfuskee, a Creek town site, served as the county’s first seat from 1832 to 1838. In 1838, the county seat was permanently relocated to Dadeville.7 Of interest is the fact that the site was the reserve belonging to Menawa. His allotment (T21 R23E section 4) of 640.92 acres was officially closed on April 6, 1840, when Joseph Bryan, Irvine Lawson, Charles McLemore, and Peter Dudley purchased it and assigned their interest in the SW quarter of the section to the "Court House County Commissioners."8

To proceed with the individual allotment of lands, a census of Creek Indians was undertaken in 1832, known widely known as the Parsons and Abbott census. It is the only census of Creek Indians made prior to removal, with individual heads of families listed and enumerating numbers of males, females, and slaves per household. Benjamin Parsons conducted the census of the Upper Towns and found a total population of 13,697 Indians and 445 slaves. The census listed 78 Upper and Lower Creek towns with a total population of 21,772 inhabitants.9

Concurrently, federal surveyors were sent into the field to survey the treaty cession. Conducted by William Weakley, the survey of the area encompassed by Horseshoe Bend National Military
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9. Census of Creek Indians Taken by Parsons and Abbott, 1832. Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives and Records Administration. Available as microfilm (T275) and online at (http://www.usgwarchives.net/special/native_american/).
Park began on September 12, 1832, as Parsons and Abbott were finishing their work. Like all public lands in the United States, the Creek country was surveyed using the township and range system that created 6-square mile townships further divided into tracts of one square mile known as sections that were further divided into quarter sections and smaller parcels. Land offices were created in nearby cities, such as Montgomery, Alabama, that would handle the disposal of property. Military veterans usually received a right to free land. Individuals with legally registered claims could sell their claim before a patent was issued. Land speculators, often representing wealthy men such as Andrew Jackson or corporate investors, such as the Bank of Columbus (Georgia), acquired legal title to large tracts of the most arable lands in Alabama.10

The majority of land encompassed by Horseshoe Bend National Military Park falls into Township 23 N Range 23E. The battle site primarily lies in sections 22 and 15, while the site of Newyaucau stretches from section 14 into section 13. Weakley's field notes provide details on the tree cover, primarily black and post oak, hickory, chestnut, and pine, and noted the topography as "rolling" and "hilly."11

The original survey plat in the Alabama Secretary of State's Land files as well as the General Land Office (GLO) copy notes "Horse Shoe Bend Battle Ground" on the map. The Alabama copy of the plat map also shows five Creek allotments that had either been claimed or assigned as an individual allotment under the Treaty of Washington by the time the plat was approved in early 1834 (figure 1.1). These include Long Jim and Molly (each the recipient of a half section in section 13), Ken-no-ho-ee (southern half of section 15), Aw-loo-dul-le-ga (northern half of section 16), and Fi-e-char (northern half of section 25).12

The Parsons and Abbott census provides additional details about the five Creek heads of household assigned property in Township 23. It is logical to assume that these individuals were from Newyaucau. The town name is rendered "Ko he mut ki garts kar" in the census index, which is perhaps a garbled phonetic spelling of the more widely recognized name of the town. Their five households were small, containing just 15 individuals. The largest household, with three males and three females, belonged to Long Jim. As is apparent by the name, the sole female head of household was Molly. None of the families included slaves.13

13. The disposition of their land and their personal histories are unknown and require additional research. Census of Creek Indians Taken by Parsons and Abbott, 1832, 95-97, Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, RG 75, NARA, T275. The transcription of the town name is problematic as the first letter on the actual census page appears closer to "n" than "k." The nearly illegible spelling is rendered "Nohohunt, the Gartsnar Town" in a version of the census published in Correspondence on the subject of the emigration of Indians, between the 30th November, 1831, and 27th December, 1833, with abstracts of expenditures by disbursing agents, in the removal and subsistence of Indians, &c. &c. Furnished in answer to a Resolution of the Senate, of 27th December, 1833, by the Commissary General of Subsistence, Vol. IV, p. 323. Senate Document 512, 23d Cong., 1st sess.
Creek leaders entered into the Treaty of Washington hoping that the agreement would ease hostilities between land hungry, white settlers and Indian families. Moreover, the federal government pledged to protect individual Creek land claims under terms of the treaty. Conditions in Alabama, however, only worsened following the treaty’s ratification. Many white settlers refused to acknowledge the legal land titles Creeks held. Squatters continued to pressure Creeks to abandon their lands or sell their acreage at a price far below market value. Meanwhile, land speculators took advantage of Creek households swindling them of their legal titles in exchange for empty promises and nonexistent future payments (Ellisor 2010).

Amidst continuing hostilities, additional Creek parties voluntarily migrated west willing to risk the unknown situation in Oklahoma rather than continue living amid mounting hostilities in Alabama. Other Creeks, however, remained determined to resist white encroachment. Sporadic violence erupted across parts of east Alabama as white settlers and Creek landowners clashed. In the spring of 1836, Creek warriors from several towns launched attacks upon white plantations. The attacks gave President Andrew Jackson the justification needed to forcibly remove the remaining Creek Indians from Alabama. Between 1836 and 1838, the federal government led several groups of Creek Indians out of Alabama to their new homes in Oklahoma. Ultimately, more than 23,000 Creeks were relocated. By the end of the 1830s, only a handful of Creek families remained in Alabama. Most of them left as well in the 1840s and 1850s (Haveman 2016).

Not all American Indian land (individual allotments or reserves) was sold prior to emigration, however. For example, Kaney and Kalunda of "Kohomutskigartskar" whose reserves were in sections 16 and 9 of Township 23 Range 23 E appear on a list of Creek reserves recently sold dating April 1841.14

Land sales to Americans in Section 22 of the Horseshoe Bend Township commenced in April 1, 1837, as Creeks were moving west. At that sale, Mathew Brinson purchased four
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parcels for a total of just over 140 acres, including the "toe" of the Tallapoosa River bend. A few
days later, Francis Powers purchased 32 acres on the opposite side of the river. The biggest
purchase of land came in November of that year, when John Goldthwaite purchased four
parcels totaling just over 246 acres, essentially gaining title to the land on the far side of Bean’s
Island down the river to the area where Cherokees had forded the bend during the Battle of
Horseshoe Bend. At the same sale, Phillip Ware purchased two parcels totaling 80 acres. The
final parcel south of the bend was purchased in 1848 when James Collum bought 40 acres.\textsuperscript{15}

Little physical evidence of the battle remained beyond reports of scattered human remains. The
log barricade that had played a central role in the battle was mostly destroyed by fire after the
battle. Whatever was left of the barricade was almost destroyed by subsequent farmers. When
federal surveyors traversed the property in 1832, their maps, while noting that the bend had
once been a battlefield, made no mention of the barricade.\textsuperscript{16} By 1907, there was nothing left but
"a little ridge of earth, curving toward the center and grown up with trees, and extending a great
part of the way across the neck of the land."\textsuperscript{17} Despite the fact that many knew that a major
battle had been fought on the site, no one attempted to transform any part of the land into a
commemorative site.

Alabamians were interested in preserving the legacy of Major Lemuel Montgomery, the first
American soldier to die at the battle. After the battle, Privates John Lovelady and Samuel
Gearing buried Montgomery about 50 yards from Red Stick barricade at the base of Gun Hill.
The men went to great lengths to hide the burial site from potential Red Stick looters by burning
a brush heap over the site and hauling away excess dirt. Two years later in 1816, the Mississippi
Territorial legislature created Montgomery County—named in honor of Major Lemuel
Montgomery. In June 1839, an Alabama militia company comprised of soldiers from Coosa,
Chambers, and Randolph counties located Montgomery’s remains at the battlefield site and
reinterred them in the town of Dudleyville, about 6 miles southeast of Horseshoe Bend. The
soldiers located Montgomery’s remains with the help of a veteran of the battle as well as an
African American man who as a boy had served as a drummer in Jackson’s army. The militia
company reinterred Montgomery at a spot located just west of Dudleyville in the front yard of
Pat Wise’s house on Main Street. No one marked Montgomery’s new burial with a headstone
and its location remained in doubt for decades.\textsuperscript{18}

At the time that Alabama militia removed Montgomery’s remains from the Horseshoe Bend
battlefield, no one appeared to be farming the historic site. More study is needed to determine
the way white landowners developed the land they acquired. The most desired lands from the
Creek cession were along the Alabama and lower Tallapoosa rivers, as well as the
Chattahoochee, namely in Macon, Russell, and Barbour counties, and southern Chambers and

\textsuperscript{15} Land Patent records are available on-line at \url{http://www.glorecords.blm.gov/default.aspx}. Judging by the dates of
patents for land north of these sections, additional land held by the National Park Service north of the battlefield was
not sold to private individuals until the 1840s and then in parcels of roughly 40 acres each.
\textsuperscript{16} Federal Survey Map, Horseshoe Bend Papers, Box 4, Alabama Department of Archives and History.
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Memorial of the Horseshoe Bend Battle Commission}, S. Report 756, 60th Congress, 2d Sess., 9.
\textsuperscript{18} Peter A. Brannon, “Lemuel Purnell Montgomery,” \textit{Arrow Points} 8: 5 (1924); Brannon, “Lemuel Purnell
Montgomery,” \textit{Arrow Points} 8:6 (1924). In 1972, the NPS reinterred Montgomery’s remains at HOBE.
Tallapoosa counties. Though the lands in the area around Horseshoe Bend were not as desirable, parts of Tallapoosa County were farms and plantations of impressive size.

Alabama’s antebellum plantation economy collapsed in the aftermath of the American Civil War as the emancipation of the state’s enslaved black laborers forced changes in agricultural production. The large plantations were largely broken up into smaller farms in the decades following emancipation. Slavery was replaced by a new set of exploitive practices, tenant farming and sharecropping, which placed Alabama on an economic path that lead directly to prolonged periods of stagnation and generational poverty that continued until World War II. In the area around the park, small holdings devoted to subsistence farming, cattle, and timber developed. According to the 1870 manuscript census for Tallapoosa County, the majority of households located near the historic battlefield were either owned by small farmers or rented out by larger landholders who resided elsewhere in the area.

The Winslett family, for example, lived on land that would eventually become part of the National Military Park. In 1870, the Winsletts were representative examples of the local population. They, like most of their immediate neighbors, were white. Approximately 76 percent of Tallapoosa County’s local population was white. Most African American residents lived in the western portion of the county where antebellum plantations and large farms had been broken up into smaller tenant and sharecropper farms worked by black families. Like most of their neighbors, the Winsletts grew modest amounts of corn and garden crops, the bulk of which was consumed by their livestock. Some grew small amounts of cotton. Household men earned additional income by working on neighboring farms. Women also sold their labor and produced an array of household goods that could be sold in the neighboring market towns. Most residents near Horseshoe Bend were relatively poor and owned less than $100 in personal property. While the percentage of white landowning families in the county had declined since the end of the Civil War, about 80 percent of those who lived near the battlefield owned their modest farms.19

Between 1870 and 1900, Tallapoosa County experienced significant demographic and economic changes. The number of tenant and sharecropper households nearly doubled as many white farmers lost their land because of crop failures and mounting debts. Many abandoned their farms in search of better economic opportunities elsewhere such as those afforded by area textile mills, coal mines, and steel plants. As the number of white landowning farmers declined, the number of black tenant and sharecropper households increased. Black households began to appear more frequently in the area surrounding Horseshoe Bend. Generally, the total wealth of the farmers in the area declined sharply as fewer and fewer owned land and many owned few personal possessions. As the number of tenant and sharecropper households grew, the amount of cotton grown in the area expanded. However, the lands that surrounded Horseshoe Bend were less suitable for cotton production compared to other parts of the county. Farmers near the bend struggled to attain the annual yields needed to profit from their hard labor.

Consequently, like many southern farmers during this period, most local growers found themselves in a cycle of perpetual debt and declining economic status.20

**Historians and Public Memory, 1814–1900**

After 1814, Andrew Jackson’s legacy and the Battle of Horseshoe Bend were inseparable. However, Jackson’s victory over the Red Sticks in Alabama was overshadowed by his later victory over the British at the Battle of New Orleans. Consequently, as Jackson’s fame skyrocketed after the War of 1812, the Battle of Horseshoe Bend and the Creek War was often depicted by his admirers as an event of secondary importance. Efforts to commemorate the Tennessee Militia’s role in the Creek War, which were popular across Tennessee in the decades that followed Horseshoe Bend, did not spark any movements to reclaim the battlefield. As monuments to Jackson sprang up in other parts of the South, especially in New Orleans, Horseshoe Bend remained empty. Even following the removal of Creek Indians from the area surrounding Horseshoe Bend in the 1830s, no organized effort emerged to reclaim the site for commemorative purposes.21

The Battle of Horseshoe Bend, however, echoed throughout a number of historical and literary works published in the decades that followed. Such works played a major role in shaping future commemorative efforts at the site. Twentieth century commemoration organizers consulted these 19th-century histories when building their case for the battlefield’s national significance. Thomas M. Owen, for example, provided Congress with entire sections of Albert James Pickett’s two volume *History of Alabama, and Incidentally of Georgia and Mississippi, from the Earliest Period* (1851).22

Pickett, who grew up around American Indians, turned his attention to the history of his state in later life. In addition to embarking on a massive evidence-gathering campaign, which included acquisition of numerous documents, he personally interviewed and corresponded with Creek War survivors and anyone with a knowledge of the Creek War or other aspects of early Alabama history. Based on his research—and his oral history interviews—he sought to place Alabama’s American Indians into a grand narrative of Alabama history. His history reflects his place and time, with an emphasis on the romance of the frontier and values that reflected pride in his own culture. While his use of such terms as "heathen" and "savages" are viewed as racist today and his account is superficial in parts because of the nature of his interest and evidence and not without outright error, it remains a valuable study and was widely cited (and frequently plagiarized) by every historian who followed over the next century.23

The next Alabama historians of note to focus on the war were Henry S. Halbert and Timothy H. Ball, whose *The Creek War of 1813 and 1814* appeared in 1895. Although primarily focused on

---

the southern part of the war, the authors sought to examine the Indian side of the story in ways previous historians had not and presented an unusually balanced account of the war from that period (Halbert et al. 1969).

Both Pickett’s History and Halbert and Ball’s Creek War served to sear battles and combatants of the war into the hearts and minds of early Alabamians who celebrated the heroes of the conflict. These heroes included Jeremiah Austill of the Canoe Fight fame; Davy Crockett; and Major Lemuel Montgomery, the first American casualty at Horseshoe Bend, as well as such heroic Creek figures as William Weatherford and Menawa. Generations of Alabamians grew up learning stories of the Creek War read from these early histories.

National histories and biographies of Andrew Jackson tended to lack objective analysis of the battle and often served as propaganda pieces written to glorify Jackson or ideas associated with Old Hickory to serve a political cause. Jackson made numerous enemies throughout this career. His opponents used history as a tool to attack a reputation built upon military exploits. In the weeks and months that followed the battle, national newspapers printed the first accounts of Horseshoe Bend. Written at a time when Americans needed a national hero and military victories because of the country’s poor showing during the War of 1812, these reports lauded Jackson’s military genius and heroic leadership while casting the defeated Red Sticks as a brave and formidable foe. Jackson gained national celebrity status that eventually launched his political career.

A small chorus of critics questioned Jackson’s motives and sought to slow the general’s meteoric rise. Some accused Jackson of personally profiting from the Creek War by using his influence to acquire large tracts of land in Alabama. The accusation challenged the prevailing narrative that Jackson and his men were selfless patriots that placed the interests of their nation above their individual desires.

As Jackson’s political career placed him on a path toward the highest elected office in the land, opponents hoped to use his actions at Horseshoe Bend to slow his presidential momentum. Chapman Johnson, an Anti-Jackson leader, told a convention of Jackson opponents that more would join their cause “when they review the history of his Indian campaigns, and especially when they read the stories of the cold blooded massacre at the Horseshoe.” A few months later, an anonymous pamphlet circulated Washington, D.C., entitled A Review of the Battle of the Horseshoe and of the Facts Relating to the Killing of Sixteen Indians on the Morning after the Battle. The unidentified author blasted Jackson for staining the honorable American flag with his murderous actions. “This productive victory which gave present and future security to the frontier was tarnished by a most bloody, unnecessary, and wanton” murder of sixteen “unresisting” warriors, under Jackson’s orders, the day after the battle. Similar attacks accused Jackson of executing Red Stick warrior prisoners and murdering defenseless women and children. Even a New Orleans newspaper described the Battle of Horseshoe Bend as an “indelible stain upon the character of our country.” Many of these slanderous stories used select

---

24. “Great Victory over the Indians!” New York Evening Post, April 19, 1814; “General Andrew Jackson,” The Providence Patriot, June 18, 1814.
passages from Jackson’s account of the battle to paint a troubling picture of a bloodthirsty immoral maniac.27

Jackson’s defenders rallied around their embattled hero. For the first time, Creek War veterans articulated what they believed to be the significance of their wartime heroics. Efforts to defend Jackson’s reputation promoted an existing narrative of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Defenders of Jackson—and his peace treaty that stripped the Creeks of millions of acres—reminded Americans that Creek Indians had spilled “innocent” blood that threatened the security of pioneer settlers. Sam Houston declared that any attack upon Jackson’s handling of Horseshoe Bend was an assault upon the reputation of the heroic men who followed him into battle and the state they so ably defended. Pro-Jackson forces clung to the notion that the bloodshed at Horseshoe Bend had been carried out so that white civilization could rid the frontier of a savage race that impeded expansion and threatened innocent settlers (Wilentz 2005; Remini 2001; Curtis 1997).

Jackson too joined in his defense. Through the writings of John Eaton, a Creek War veteran and Jackson campaign manager who penned a popular biography in defense of Old Hickory, Jackson reassured Americans that patriotism and duty drove his actions during the Creek War. Eaton’s biography depicted Jackson as the quintessential self-made man of his generation whose example inspired countless others to aspire toward greatness. Whereas Jackson’s critics accused him of murdering captured Creek War warriors following the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, Eaton claimed that the general had offered the “misguided savages” an opportunity to surrender without further bloodshed only to be met with “further resistance.” The “savage” Red Sticks, according to Eaton, allowed their spiritual beliefs to work themselves into such an uncivilized state that they carelessly cast their lives away when any civilized soldier would have surrendered. Readers loved Eaton’s biography. The book became one of the antebellum period’s best-selling books.28

Jackson’s supporters inaugurated a new age of American politics that gave Old Hickory huge victories in the presidential elections of 1828 and 1832. By reputation and through his actions, Jackson’s image became inextricably bound with the imagery Americans conjured when dreaming of the western frontier. Celebrated widely as an American Indian fighter, Jackson’s rough and tumble image glorified the violence witnessed during the Creek War as a justifiable and merciful act that protected innocent white settlers by conquering a race of uncivilized savages. The passage of the Indian Removal Act of 1830 and the atrocities committed during the removal of the southeastern American Indians demonstrate the extent these shared memories shaped American public policy. Jackson became the representative symbol of the American West—an inspiration for those who not only supported the notion that God had ordained America’s westward expansion but also saw Jackson as Manifest Destiny’s providential agent (Woodworth 2011; Reynolds 2009; Stephenson 1996; Horsman 1981).

---

What began as a defense of Jackson’s record morphed into a national collective memory of the southeastern frontier. These memories evolved as each retelling either further exaggerated or outright fabricated the events of the Creek War. Jackson’s legacy grew so large that its shadow obstructed the public’s view of Horseshoe Bend. In the decades that followed the Creek War, more than fifty places and more than one dozen monuments were dedicated in his honor. Jackson’s legacy became an all-encompassing movement through which all things associated with Old Hickory were memorialized in the body of a single man. The commemorative celebrations that honored Jackson contributed to the commemorative silence at Horseshoe Bend.

Compared to other events associated with the Creek War, Horseshoe Bend also found itself in Fort Mims’ commemorative shadow. Perhaps no single commemorative artifact shaped public perceptions of the violence associated with the Creek War more than Alonzo Chappel’s painting, the “Massacre at Fort Mims.” Produced in 1858, the painting depicts the 1813 Red Stick assault upon Fort Mims that resulted in the deaths of 250 people and the capture of around 100 others. In the painting, tomahawk wielding Red Sticks violently murder the white soldiers and civilians who had sought refuge at Fort Mims. Especially telling are the ivory-skinned white women, beautifully coifed and attired in formal gowns, about to be scalped and murdered by very dark Indians. The racial and gendered violence was designed to produce an emotional response in the viewer. The tragic scene obscured the fact that many of Fort Mims victims were not Americans, but Creeks of mixed ancestry. An engraving of Chappel’s painting appeared in numerous national publications leading public audiences to see Fort Mims, and by extension the Creek War, as an example of the victimization of settlers by hostile "uncivilized" American Indians. These sympathies helped Americans justify southeastern Indian removal while placing any blame for the Creek War’s causes firmly at the feet of American Indians (Waselkov 2006).

Similar paintings of Horseshoe Bend did not appear alongside Chappel’s “Massacre at Fort Mims” because imagined scenes of the battle did not convey the period’s white victimization narrative. Drawings of scenes from Horseshoe Bend tended to focus less on the masses of white “pioneer” soldiers who conquered the “hostile” Red Sticks and more on the heroic patriotism of Major Lemuel Montgomery, who lost his life leading the charge at the barricade, and Sam Houston, who was determined to continue fighting even after being seriously wounded. Horseshoe Bend failed to attract the gaze of antebellum artists during a period when writers and artists interested in the Creek War focused more attention on American Indian atrocities than white military victories. The absence of nationally recognizable works of art depicting the battle likely minimized public interest in Horseshoe Bend that might have otherwise inspired early efforts to preserve or mark the historic site.

Conclusion

The Battle of Horseshoe Bend had an enormous impact of the lives of Creek Indians and in the development of the state of Alabama. The battle resulted in the deaths of more than 800 Red Stick warriors and ended Creek Indian resistance to General Andrew Jackson’s invading army. While the Treaty of Fort Jackson ceded millions of acres of American Indians land to the federal government, lands located east of the Tallapoosa and Coosa Rivers, including the battlefield, remained in American Indian hands until the late 1830s. After the removal of Creek Indians
from Alabama, the battlefield was purchased from the federal government by white settlers and divided into small farms. The battlefield was used as a farm until the National Park Service acquired the property in 1959. Between 1814 and 1898, however, no efforts were made to preserve the battle or commemorate either the 25th or the 50th anniversaries of the battle at the site. Although the battle’s results had paved the way for Alabama’s admission to the union, the Battle of Horseshoe Bend was largely forgotten during the 19th century.

The legacy of General Andrew Jackson overshadowed the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Interest in Andrew Jackson and the conquering of the western frontier remained popular until the American Civil War. The largest conflict ever fought on American soil fascinated contemporaries and subsequent generations of Americans. Large numbers of monuments and illustrations of various wartime scenes appeared both during the war and for decades afterward. The creation of national cemeteries at several Civil War sites, such as Gettysburg, Chattanooga, Vicksburg, and Andersonville, generated enormous public support and immediately inspired some to pursue establishing permanent parks to commemorate these sites. The attention generated by the Civil War pushed Andrew Jackson and the Creek War into the nation's commemorative shadows where both remained until the late 19th century when a new generation of Americans rediscovered the significance of the frontier in the nation's history.
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CHAPTER TWO
THE BATTLE TO CREATE HORSESHOE BEND
NATIONAL MILITARY PARK, 1898–1959

Introduction

During the late 19th century, the Battle of Horseshoe Bend nearly vanished from national memory. The physical and emotional devastation resulting from the American Civil War cast a long shadow across the nation that tempered most nostalgic longings to celebrate the nation’s past. By the 1880s, however, some Americans began to seek out and promote patriotic examples from the national past that generally celebrated the achievements of Anglo-Americans in an age of rising foreign immigration, political radicalism, and suffragist campaigns. History was seen as an instructive tool to be wielded in an extensive campaign to preserve and glorify past virtues in a contemporary society fraught with intensifying racial and social divisions. Such sympathies motivated groups of white, upper-middle-class, native-born women to raise funds to restore historic sites across the country. In 1889, a group of elite Nashville women formed the Ladies’ Hermitage Association to preserve President Andrew Jackson’s home, The Hermitage. These women had been inspired by earlier efforts to preserve George Washington’s Mount Vernon estate and Paul Revere’s Boston home (Kammen 1991). Meanwhile, genealogical organizations such as the influential Daughters of the American Revolution, Sons of the American Revolution, and the Colonial Dames Society sprang up nationwide. In 1892, the National Society United States Daughters of 1812 formed in Washington, D.C., and began organizing efforts to commemorate the War of 1812.

As heritage associations formed nationwide, historians founded the American Historical Association in part to professionalize the study of the past. Simultaneously, a number of distinctively southern historical organizations rose seeking to advance regional perspectives on the national past (Blight 2001; Blair 2004). In Alabama, the creation of the Alabama Department of Archives and History (ADAH), the first state funded archives in the nation, and the Alabama Anthropological Society generated enormous interest in documenting and preserving the “Yellowhammer” state’s past.1 Together, these groups were responsible for initiating a broad range of public history activities nationwide ranging from the creation of museums and historic preservation societies to funding public lectures and establishing state and federal parks. Initially, commemorative interests rarely extended beyond celebrating either the American Revolution or the Civil War. However, as the number of foreign immigrants increased, a renewed interest in the American frontier and the lives of those who conquered it emerged. In Alabama, those pursuits inspired a movement to develop a national park to commemorate the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.

---

1. Alabama is often referred to as the Yellowhammer state. The Yellowhammer is the common name for the state bird, the Yellow Shafted Flicker. During the American Civil War, and during many other recent American conflicts, Alabama military units often incorporated Yellowhammer into their unit names.
Battlefield Commemoration in the United States

The first initiatives to establish a park at the Horseshoe Bend battlefield developed during the late 1890s. At that time, American battlefield commemorations had begun evolving from earlier efforts led by private organizations toward state and federal government funded memorials. Local private sponsors erected the first monuments on American battlefields. In 1845, following a 20-year fundraising campaign, a private association erected a monument at the site of the Battle of Bunker Hill in Massachusetts. Eleven years later, members of the Washington Light Infantry placed a monument at the site of the Battle of Cowpens in South Carolina. During the 1850s, New Orleans residents formed the Jackson Monument Association to raise funds to build a monument at the site of the Battle of New Orleans. The association successfully purchased a portion of the historic battlefield from a private owner and lobbied the state legislature to appropriate funds to erect an obelisk at the battlefield and place an equestrian statue of Andrew Jackson in the Place d’Armes in the city’s French Quarter.

The Civil War and Reconstruction, however, prevented the association from acquiring enough funds to complete their planned memorial. For almost 50 years, the Battle of New Orleans monument sat unfinished and neglected. Meanwhile, in the 1870s and 1880s as part of the American Revolution’s centennial commemorations, the U.S. Congress for the first time appropriated federal funds for the construction of monuments at Revolutionary War battlefields. Congress allotted funds for monuments at Yorktown, Bennington, Saratoga, Newburgh, Cowpens, and Monmouth (Blythe 2012; Greene 1985; Huber 1983).

During the 1890s, several factors converged that resulted in the creation of the nation’s first battlefield parks. The popular American Revolution Centennial celebrations had inspired many organizations nationwide to continue to find new ways to commemorate the nation’s past. In addition, aging Civil War veterans, many of whom held prominent state and national political offices, began lobbying the U.S. Congress for funds to commemorate and preserve battlefield sites. Organizations such as the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Confederate Veterans led the charge to establish military parks in advance of the war’s 50th anniversary. During the 1890s, Congress established four large battlefield parks: Chickamauga and Chattanooga, Shiloh, Gettysburg, and Vicksburg. Combined, these parks ushered in an era known as the “Golden Age of Battlefield Preservation.” Organizers preserved enough of each battlefield to highlight major troop movements and actions that could be viewed by visitors from carriage tour roads that traversed each site. From the start, battlefield parks would be popular tourist destinations. Mass tourism in America expanded during the last decades of the 19th century as the nation’s cities and middle class expanded. Despite the carnage that had occurred on the nation’s historic battlefields, most tourists saw battlefields as a type of garden or natural resource to be enjoyed for its contrast to the nation’s growing industrial and urban centers. The arrival of millions of eastern European immigrants during the 1890s also spurred interest in preserving America’s past. Critics of immigration accused immigrants of eroding the nation’s culture and saw the new arrivals as threats to the country’s security. By celebrating national heroes and monumental events, many white upper-middle-class Americans believed
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1. Congress also created the Antietam National Battlefield Site in 1890. This site was much smaller than the larger battlefield parks that were created during that decade.
that history could preserve the nation’s culture. Events of the 1890s set off a new wave of national interest in battlefield preservation.²

**Thomas M. Owen and Samuel Sinclair Broadus**

The movement to establish Horseshoe Bend National Military Park began during the final years of the 19th century. In 1898, Thomas M. Owen, a struggling Montgomery lawyer who married into the influential Bankhead family, received an appointment from Governor Joseph F. Johnson to revise the dormant Alabama Historical Society (figure 2.1). One of Owen’s first tasks was to prepare a report on the state of historical records in Alabama. In this report, Owen recommended that Alabama form a new state agency to maintain the records of state agencies and collect private materials deemed significant to Alabama history. Upon reading Owen’s report, Governor William Samford encouraged him to prepare legislation to establish a state archives. Owen drafted a bill that passed both houses of the Alabama legislature and was signed into law by Samford on February 27, 1901. The Alabama Department of Archives and History was the first state archives in the nation.³


repository of such historical documents could be established in Montgomery. Legislators also approved the construction of a state Confederate monument to be erected on capitol grounds—a bill enacted one day after the creation of the archives. Excited by the opportunity to commemorate the Confederacy and champion the “Lost Cause,” state leaders saw the archives as a vital part of preserving the state’s Confederate heritage and reinforcing long-standing notions of white supremacy. As the archives first director, Owen devoted much of his time to gathering materials pertaining to the Civil War.4

From his one-room archives located in a former cloak room in the state capitol building in Montgomery, Owen, the archives’ sole employee, worked with partners statewide to compile an extensive inventory of historical records, buildings, and sites, such as Horseshoe Bend. The archives assumed responsibility for acquiring and preserving a “collection of materials,” wrote Owen, “bearing upon the history of the State from the earliest times.”5 He intended the state archives to also become Alabama’s de facto history museum. He hoped that any artifacts recovered from future archeological excavations in Alabama would be stored at ADAH. Owen wrote numerous letters to private collectors who possessed Alabama-related artifacts and actively sought out materials gathered from a number of amateur excavations of American

Indian mounds in Alabama. By 1909, many individuals had donated items to the Alabama archives beginning one of the nation’s largest American Indian collections. Owen’s initiatives sparked a wider movement of historical-related activities in Alabama as a number of local historical societies and heritage associations formed in response to the director’s calls for local records.6

Owen also considered ADAH to be the state’s foremost authority on archaeology. In 1899, Clarence B. Moore, working for the Philadelphia Museum of Natural History, undertook extensive excavations at several locations in Alabama, most notably Moundville. His finds were taken out of state for study and display. Moore’s work excited Owen but he worried additional excavations would result in the loss of irreplaceable artifacts. Owen wanted to create an organization that could help keep these items in Alabama. The director advocated for Alabama’s legal right to retain artifacts excavated in the state.7

In 1909, Owen and seven other Montgomery residents formed the Alabama Anthropological Society. The organization’s founders consisted of a variety of educated professionals ranging from a retired college professor, Henry S. Halbert, to a florist, J.H. Paterson. During their first meeting, Owen laid out plans to conduct archeological research through “mound exploration, the location and identification of town and village sites, [and] the building up of a collection of materials for study.”8 While the society devoted much of its time to studying mounds, they also toured Creek Indian villages and Creek War sites.9

The creation of the Alabama Archives and the zeal that Thomas and Marie Owen displayed laid the foundation for subsequent historical initiatives. In 1907, Decatur, Alabama, banker and investor Samuel Sinclair Broadus began pressuring state leaders to do something to commemorate Horseshoe Bend. Broadus bemoaned the fact that during the 1890s, the so-called “Golden Age of Battlefield Preservation,” southern tax dollars had been used to erect numerous monuments and establish several battlefield parks honoring the heroism of Union soldiers. Although the federal government had made a concerted effort to balance commemorations of Union and Confederate partisans when establishing battlefield parks, Broadus nonetheless believed that planners had undervalued the Confederate experience. Horseshoe Bend, he contended, offered the north and south a chance to celebrate a shared victorious past in
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commemorating General Andrew Jackson’s defeat of Red Stick warriors and opening of the Deep South to white settlement.10

Broadus’ rhetoric mirrored the sentiments of a larger national reconciliation movement that had gained momentum during the 1880s. After years of sectional discord, reconciliationists encouraged northern and southern partisans to set aside their differences and unite under their shared national heritage. The Civil War was to be preserved as a noble struggle between white men who fought to preserve their visions of the Union. Battlefields served as stages upon which these men performed heroic deeds. Reconciliation, however, ignored the role that slavery had played in the war and downplayed the heated sectional tensions and racial violence that followed during Reconstruction. Adherents conveniently forgot that hundreds of thousands of black men had fought in the Union Army. Reconciliation purposely omitted black memories of the conflict. By the dawn of the “Golden Age of Battlefield Preservation,” white Americans had carved out a distinctive memory of the Civil War that allowed both sides, Union and Confederate, to celebrate ideals of white supremacy that reunited their postwar national interests. Ultimately, during the 1890s, reconciliation sympathies nationally led to the creation of Jim Crow laws that discriminated against African Americans and a number of anti-immigration laws that sought to preserve the power that white male, native-born held in

American society. For Broadus and others, victories over American Indian warriors at places such as Horseshoe Bend explicitly bolstered shared notions of white supremacy (Blight 2002; Brundage 1993; Foster 1988).

**Horseshoe Bend Battle Anniversary Commission**

Broadus used his political influence to lobby state and national politicians to do something to recognize Horseshoe Bend’s enduring significance. The wealthy banker held positions on various advisory boards and commissions statewide that allowed him to pressure leaders from several directions. On August 6, 1907, the Alabama legislature established the Horseshoe Bend Battle Anniversary Commission and appropriated $2,500.00 to cover their expenses (table 2.1). Legislators asked the commission to conduct extensive research to document the history of the battle so that an “appropriate celebration” could be held to mark the event’s centennial anniversary.11

Thomas Owen handled the principal work of the committee. Between 1907 and 1909, he gathered primary and secondary sources pertaining to the battle. Owen also corresponded with a number of state officials and individuals statewide to gather additional support for the planned anniversary event. Owen gained some support from the Tohopeka Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution and encouraged people across the state to form new War of 1812 genealogical societies. Meanwhile, Owen also played an instrumental role in the establishment of the Alabama Anthropological Society (AAS) in 1909 (figure 2.4). Owen was assisted by society co-founder Peter Brannon, the state archives’ first employee and future director. The AAS provided an organizational framework to support activities that Owen and Brannon had organized privately for years. One of the society’s first official field visits took place at Horseshoe Bend and coincided with the anniversary commission’s planning meetings.12

During the first decade of the 20th century, Alabama and other former Confederate states allocated public funds to erect stone monuments on various Civil War battlefields. From the start, Owen’s plans for Horseshoe Bend’s centennial program centered around the unveiling of a large stone monument that would permanently mark the site and recognize Jackson’s pivotal role in the battle. Inspired by the federal acquisition of several Civil War battlefields and the recent passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906, Owen hoped to use his father-in-law’s influence to convince Congress to acquire and establish a military park at the site. Creating a federal park, however, exceeded the anniversary commission’s original charge. Owen convinced the state legislature to expand the commission’s original mission and to reconstitute the anniversary commission as the Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission.13

---

Table 2.1. Appointed Members of the Horseshoe Bend Battle Anniversary Commission, 1907.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horseshoe Bend Battle Anniversary Commission (1907)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor Braxton Comer, Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Thomas M. Owen, Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Blount Brewer, Tuskegee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Lafayette Bulger, Dadeville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John William Overton, Wedowee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix L. Smith, Rockford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James William Strother, Dadeville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 2.4. THE ALABAMA ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY ORGANIZED NUMEROUS VISITS TO KNOWN AMERICAN INDIAN SITES ACROSS ALABAMA. IN THIS 1918 PHOTOGRAPH, MEMBERS, INCLUDING THOMAS M. OWEN (STANDING IN CENTER HOLDING PAPERS), VISIT THE SITE OF FORT MITCHELL. [ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES AND HISTORY]
Memorial of the Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission

The movement to establish a federal military park at Horseshoe Bend gained momentum when J. Thomas Heflin, Alabama’s 5th Congressional District representative, agreed to introduce the necessary legislation during the 60th Congress. Heflin, an attorney from neighboring Chambers County, believed that Horseshoe Bend deserved to be included among the nation’s growing list of federally owned historic battlefields.14 Hefflin’s House Resolution No. 26395 asked Congress to authorize $5,000.00 in federal aid that would be used to match an additional $5,000.00 provided by Alabama so that 100 acres of the battlefield could be turned into a public reservation. State and federal funds would also be used to erect a series of monuments on the site marking various critical points in the battle, the Creek Indian log barricade, and the graves of soldiers interred on the battlefield. Individual monuments or statues honoring General Andrew Jackson and Major Lemuel Montgomery were also proposed. Additional funds would also be used to acquire artifacts associated with the battle and to conduct future excavations on the property to gather materials that could be put in a public display for the benefit of park visitors. In March 1909, the entire Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission traveled to Washington, D.C., to personally lobby Congress.

On March 3, 1909, Senator John H. Bankhead (figure 2.5), flanked by battlefield park commission members, stood before Congress and urged its members to create “a lasting memorial to the brave Americans who fought in those trying days when hostile Indian aggression threatened our frontier civilization.” The establishment of a Horseshoe Bend military park, according to Bankhead, would commemorate a “neglected” and somewhat “forgotten . . . . battle as one of the most decisive battles in the long history of heroic battles of the country. . . . The establishment of the Horseshoe Bend Battle Park would not only be a long-deferred recognition and commemoration of one of the great historic events in the life of our people, but it would be another public expression of the patriotic and educatory value of the lessons of the past.” Throughout his speech, Bankhead reminded his colleagues that it was their “patriotic” duty to ensure that historic sites such as Horseshoe Bend “become the property of the Government” or be “suitably commemorated in a permanent and lasting way.”15

Despite Bankhead’s patriotic appeals, Congress rejected Heflin’s resolution. Congressional representatives raised several objections. First, under the guidelines for establishing federal parks included in the Antiquities Act of 1906, only the President of the United States had the power to create a new park. Congress urged Heflin to seek out presidential approval. The act also required that any land deemed worthy of designation, as a federal park had to be owned by the federal government. The Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission’s plans for creating the park failed to lay out a clear plan to acquire the 100 acres of battlefield land. Although the Alabama legislature supported the commission’s work and lobbied Congress on their behalf, the state had failed to set aside funds to acquire land that could be conveyed to the federal

government once the park was created. Moreover, commission members failed to include a clear description of the proposed park’s boundary or a list of current property owners.\footnote{National Park Service, “Antiquities Act of 1906,” \url{https://www.nps.gov/subjects/legal/american-antiquities-act-of-1906.htm} (Accessed 5 June 2018).}

Congress also questioned Horseshoe Bend’s national significance. Commission members presented a clear case for why the site was significant to Alabama’s history. Broadus, for example, told Congress that March 27, 1814, marked “Alabama’s birth” that made “possible the Alabama, the Georgia, and the Mississippi of to-day.”\footnote{Senate Documents, Volume 22 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1909) [Congressional edition, Volume 5409 by United States Congress] December 7, 1908–March 4, 1909, 756. Memorial of Horseshoe Bend Battle Commission.} The commission’s appeal to Congress also underplayed the direct connection between the battle’s outcome and Andrew Jackson’s rising national popularity. To be sure, Jackson’s name appeared throughout the commission’s report, but nowhere in their argument did they tether Jackson’s meteoric rise in American politics with his victory at Horseshoe Bend. Without Jackson at the forefront, Congress likely struggled to understand how a battle fought on the western frontier against Creek Indians either connected to the larger War of 1812 or influenced broader developments in American history. At that time, even commission members conceded the fact that Jackson’s national fame largely
stemmed from his astounding victory against the British at New Orleans months after
Horseshoe Bend. Commission members maintained contact with organizers in New Orleans
who were developing similar plans to commemorate that city’s battlefield.\(^{18}\)

Despite Congress’s rejection, Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission members remained
committed to their work. Heflin reintroduced his resolution to establish a federal park again in
1911, 1913, and 1914. The congressman grew frustrated by the lack of interest the proposal
received. Ultimately, Heflin and the commission failed to prove “that this battle of Horseshoe
Bend was something more than an Indian Battle . . . that it was . . . of great historical significance
in the building of our great country.”\(^{19}\)

**Benjamin Russell, Alabama Power, and Hydroelectric Dams**

As Congress deliberated Horseshoe Bend’s significance, the rising demand for hydroelectric
power in the region surrounding the battlefield threatened the site’s preservation. During the
first decade of the 20th century, textile manufacturers began opening new production facilities
across the South, particularly at locations with abundant water resources capable of generating
cheap electrical power. Although northern capitalists financed many of these plants, a
significant number of southern entrepreneurs sought to gain a foothold in this expanding
industry. In Alexander City, twelve miles west of Horseshoe Bend, entrepreneur Benjamin
Russell founded Russell Manufacturing Company.\(^{20}\) Using only steam-powered engines, the
company’s employees used six knitting machines and ten sewing machines to produce daily 150
pairs of women’s and children’s undergarments (Baklanoff et al. 2008).

Anticipating rising demand for manufactured garments, Russell needed to locate a long-term
electrical power source capable of supplying his expanding factory and Alexander City. Russell
and his partner, Industries Light and Power Company, selected a site at Buzzard Roost shoals on
the Tallapoosa River to erect a hydroelectric dam. The shoals were located just a few miles
downstream of the Horseshoe Bend battlefield. Russell began buying property around the
historic site in anticipation of flooding the area once his dam was completed. Around the same
time that Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission members were lobbying Congress to
establish a federal military park, Russell completed work on a cofferdam—an earthen structure
that diverts water from dam construction sites (Atkins 2006).

Benjamin Russell’s plans ran afoul with the Alabama Power Company’s efforts to build a larger
hydroelectric dam further south at Cherokee Bluff. When completed, the proposed Cherokee
Bluff dam would have flooded Russell’s dam site. Founded in 1906 in Gadsden, Alabama, the
Alabama Power Company was finalizing plans to build the state’s first hydroelectric dam on the
Coosa River. The company’s owner James Mitchell, a Massachusetts engineer with British and
Canadian financial investors, hoped to build his first dam at Cherokee Bluff on the Tallapoosa
River. Mitchell scrapped those plans, however, when surveyors discovered that a Central of

\(^{18}\) Ibid.
\(^{19}\) [Horseshoe Bend Park Association]. *Ceremonies Attending the Sesquicentennial of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend and
Dedication of the Park Visitor Center, Friday, March 27, 1864 at 2:00 P.M.* (n.p.: c. 1964), 1, 53.
\(^{20}\) Herbert J. Lewis, “Russell Corporation,” *Encyclopedia of Alabama,*
Georgia Railway bridge over the Tallapoosa River would need to be replaced before that line could transport the heavy materials required for construction. As the company moved ahead with its dam on the Coosa River, Mitchell encouraged Russell to abandon his planned Buzzard Roost project. After some initial resistance, Russell agreed to halt the project. In exchange for his cooperation, Russell eventually sold to the Alabama Power Company large tracts of land that he owned along the Tallapoosa River including property at Cherokee Bluff and near the Horseshoe Bend battlefield. Alabama Power also acquired several local utilities companies that Russell either had founded or in which he had invested. Russell and Alabama Power Company officials, including the company’s legal counsel and future president Thomas W. Martin, developed a mutually beneficial relationship that would later serve well the interests of Horseshoe Bend.21

Faced with the possible destruction of the battlefield and unable to secure congressional approval to establish a federal military park, Thomas Owen and other Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission members refocused their efforts on achieving their organization’s original goal: planning a commemorative program to mark the battle’s centennial. On July 3, 1909, the commission sponsored an Independence Day picnic at Horseshoe Bend that was attended by Congressman J. Thomas Heflin, Alabama Governor Braxton Comer, and Alabama Agriculture and Industries Commissioner J.A. Wilkinson. Owen hoped that the event would start an annual Independence Day tradition at the battlefield. His vision was somewhat dashed as many of the various officials that he invited to the picnic had trouble navigating the area’s treacherous dirt roads and poorly constructed bridges. If the battlefield were to be made into a military park, significant improvements would have to be made to the roads connecting the site to the neighboring cities of Dadeville and Alexander City. The annual Independence Day picnic failed to take off but nonetheless the event helped commission members prepare for the larger centennial celebration five years later.22

22. Thomas M. Owens Papers, Box 1, Folder 26, Alabama Department of Archives and History; Tallapoosa Courier, 8 July 1909; Ghioto, “Centennial Celebration,” 78.
Congressional Monument

Owen’s laborious efforts to raise awareness of the commission activities slowly gained momentum. In 1911, Nora E. Miller, resident of Dadeville, offered to sell the 5.1 acres of Horseshoe Bend battlefield land that she owned to the park commission in exchange for $1.00.23 Her acreage included the Gun Hill site upon which Jackson commanded his forces and his artillery bombarded the Creek Indian log barricade below. As a member of the Daughters of the American Revolution and the newly formed Birmingham, Alabama, chapter of the U.S. Society of the Daughters of 1812, Miller was a vocal advocate for the need for commemorative societies to preserve the nation’s vanishing past. Miller also served as the Daughters of 1812’s first state chapter historian. Her sale stipulated that if the commission failed to erect a permanent monument to Andrew Jackson’s victorious army within four years that the property would revert to her possession.24

Owen immediately turned to Heflin and Alabama Senator Oscar Underwood for assistance. During the 63rd Congress, Heflin authored House Resolution No. 9671 requesting $25,000 in federal funding to erect a permanent monument at Horseshoe Bend. The resolution was placed in the hands of the Committee of the Library who convened a hearing on the matter on December 17, 1913. Nora E. Miller, Broadus, Governor Emmett O’Neal, Heflin, and Underwood all submitted statements or appeared before the committee in support of the measure.25

During the hearings, Underwood described the Battle of Horseshoe Bend as “an event that opened up the entire southeastern portion of the country to white civilization.” By placing additional emphasis upon the heroics of General Andrew Jackson, perhaps the commission had learned several lessons from previous failed attempts to gain congressional support. Underwood claimed that the monument would “memorialize . . . the memory of one of America’s greatest generals, greatest statesmen, and greatest men. When we think of Jackson the soldier we think of the Battle of New Orleans, but . . . Jackson was made in the Creek War” where his “courage in holding the small band of patriotic soldiers together in the wilderness without supplies, without provisions, and without relief, to blaze the way for the great civilization of this land of ours.”26

According to Underwood, Andrew Jackson “the great soldier” was “born” at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. The popular writings of historian Frederick Jackson Turner found a voice in Underwood who like many white, native-born Americans living on the eve of World War I saw

24. Deed, Mrs. Nora E. Miller to Horseshoe Bend Battle Anniversary Commission, January 18, 1911. Copy on file at HOBE and Horseshoe Bend Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History; Deed, Nora E. Miller to Horseshoe Bend Battle Anniversary Commission, January 18, 1911, Book 21, Page 373, Probate Court Records Room, Tallapoosa County, Alabama.
25. Monument at Horseshoe, Alabama, Hearings before the Committee of the Library, 63rd Congress, 2d Session, H.R. 9671, 13.
America as exceptional and its continued geographic expansion as necessary to its future prosperity. Underwood, known for his powerful rhetoric usually directed in opposition to women’s suffrage, alcohol, and labor unions, received a series of enthusiastic standing ovations during his remarks. The Washington Post remarked that Underwood’s speech has “removed practically all opposition to the measure.” Illinois Congressman Robert Mann, a Committee of the Library member, applauded Alabama’s efforts. According to Mann, “every state contributed great men, great deeds, and great events to the history of our country. Alabama may well be proud of her history.”

On April 2, 1914, in response to Underwood’s powerful speech, Congress authorized $5,000 to fund the erection of a permanent monument at Horseshoe Bend. Unfortunately, the funding arrived too late to unveil the monument as part of the site’s pending centennial celebrations. The funded amount was also significantly less than the $25,000 requested and thus commission members had to lower their expectations regarding the monument’s scale. Nonetheless, the successful effort to fund the monument invigorated commission members and generated additional public interest as planners finalized upcoming centennial commemorations.

**Tallapoosa County Centennial Commemoration**

The Horseshoe Bend Battle Anniversary Commission decided to observe the battle’s centennial during two separate events. The first event was held on the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, Friday, March 27, 1914, at the Dadeville courthouse (figure 2.6). Despite the date falling on the Christian observance of Good Friday, the large crowds that gathered on the courthouse lawn filled the air with a patriotic spirit that transformed the joyous celebration of General Andrew Jackson’s defeat of “hostile” Creek Indians into a festive event reaffirming American nationalism (figure 2.7). The savory smell of smoked pork filled the air as a series of area ministers prayed that modern day Americans could gain inspiration from the white soldiers and settlers who “civilized” Alabama. For several hours, crowds lingered singing “Our Country” and “Sing Me a Song of the South.” Following additional rounds of public prayer and orations from local politicians and anniversary commission members, Tallapoosa County officials unveiled a tablet installed on the courthouse exterior commemorating the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.

The tablet reveals much about how early 20th century Alabamians interpreted the battle’s meaning. The final paragraph reads, “This battle broke the power of the fierce Muscogee, brought peace to the southern frontier, and made possible the speedy opening up of a large part of the state of Alabama to civilization.” Certainly, the battle devastated Creek society and put an end to any organized massive armed resistance against further white encroachments. Peaceful

---

29. Alexander City Outlook, 29 March 1914.
coexistence, however, remained in the illusory as land-hungry white settlers and the surviving Creeks struggled for control of their remaining land. Ignored was the devastation and suffering of the Creek people because of the war’s destruction. To be sure, Creek losses at Horseshoe Bend played a central role in the opening of Alabama west of the Coosa River to additional white settlers, but that process of white encroachment on Indian lands began long before Jackson arrived on the Tallapoosa River. None of the public commemorations, memorials, or public programs produced by anniversary commission officials considered Creek Indian perspectives or questioned white motives. Creeks would go on to endure many more injustices over the following decades, including their disenfranchisement. The few American Indians identified during these programs, such as Menawa, gained mention only to reemphasize the “savage” people that Jackson’s “heroic” army had defeated.30

Nearly four months after Tallapoosa County celebrated the Battle of Horseshoe Bend’s centennial, the official anniversary commission exercises were held on July 4, 1914, at the historic battlefield. Organizers sought to connect Horseshoe Bend’s significance to the well-established traditions that surrounded Independence Day commemorations. Event advertisements appeared in many state newspapers. Hoping for a strong turnout, commission members persuaded the Central of Georgia Railway to discount passenger fares to and from Dadeville. The event drew between an estimated 8,000 and 10,000 visitors.31

Perhaps as many as 2,000 visitors camped on the battlefield. Getting such a large number of visitors to the rural battlefield site presented organizers with several logistical problems, most notably transporting and feeding guests. Commission member J.B. Rylance of Dadeville headed the transportation committee. In newspaper articles published weeks before the event, Rylance urged out-of-town automobile drivers to avoid using the road that connected the battlefield to Dadeville because the anticipated traffic into the site would exceed the poorly built road’s limitations. Advertisements appeared in local newspapers throughout the month of June offering “good pay” for individuals who used their horse-drawn wagons, slurries, or automobiles to ferry visitors back and forth between Dadeville and the battlefield.32

32. Alexander City Outlook, 13 June 1914; Alexander City Outlook, 20 June 1914; Alexander City Outlook, 27 June 1914.
Horseshoe Bend July Fourth Centennial Celebration

Figure 2.6. Photograph of July 14, 1914, Horseshoe Bend Centennial Celebration. [Alabama Department of Archives and History]

Figure 2.7. Photograph of Horseshoe Bend Centennial Commemoration Picnic. [Alabama Department of Archives and History]
Some visitors went to great lengths to attend the ceremonies. In 1978, HOBE Park Ranger R. Wayne Hay interviewed Nora Blankenship Gunn of Equality, Alabama, who attended the July 4, 1914 commemoration. After hearing about the event, Gunn’s father promised to take his entire family if they “worked real hard.” As the day of the event approached, her father wanted to change their plans but his children, who had performed additional chores, begged him to go. On July 3, the family left their farm before dawn traveling in two wagons bound for Horseshoe Bend. After a forty-plus-mile journey, the family arrived at the battlefield around dawn where they set up camp among numerous other campers. According to Gunn, most people came by “wagon or buggy” while “there were a few cars the well-to-do came in.”

The visitors far exceeded the city’s limited hotel space. Commissioners urged private homeowners to rent rooms to accommodate as many out-of-town guests as possible. On the eve of the event, Montgomery Advertiser reporter Paul Stevenson described Dadeville as “aglow” as “all offices, stores, and residences are bedecked in flags and bunting. . . . the place is imbued with true holiday spirit.” Lines of cars waited at the Dadeville train depot eager to ferry passengers to their overnight accommodations.

At the battlefield, organizers provided guests with food and water and latrines. Nora E. Miller recruited many volunteers from Dadeville to assist. An Alexander City newspaper editor reported that “Cold drink stands were numerous; in fact, more than I ever saw before.” Volunteers representing a broad array of Alabama organizations also lent a hand to manage the large crowds and sprawling campgrounds. Prior to the event, Miller, who still owned much of the property surrounding the 1.5-acre Gun Hill site that she donated to the state, paid laborers to clear dozens of acres of fields to create space for the campgrounds and ceremonies.

The centennial program featured more than one dozen speakers representing churches, heritage associations, and government agencies during morning and afternoon sessions (table 2.2). Governor Emmet O’Neal’s opening address set the day’s reflective tone. “We boast that we live in a more civilized age,” declared O’Neal. “It is not, however, an age which breeds the stern, intrepid, and adventurous race of men, who penetrated the wilderness and with muskets in their hands, hewed down these forests, and laid deep and permanent, the foundations of great imperial commonwealths.” O’Neal portrayed a battle fought between an “invincible” army of “adventurous pioneers” facing menacing dangers and “untutored” yet courageous “savages . . . . fighting for their homes and the graves of their dead.” The governor hoped that if a foreign invader ever threatened Alabama that its people would respond with as much courage as the Creek Indian defenders at Horseshoe Bend.

---

33. Nora Blankenship Gunn to R. Wayne Hay, HOBE, 30 May 1978, HOBE.
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Table 2.2. Organizations Represented at Horseshoe Bend Centennial Event, July 4, 1814.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations Represented at Horseshoe Bend Centennial Event, July 4, 1814</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ladies Hermitage Association, Nashville, Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughters of the American Revolution, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Daughters of 1812, New York, New York, National Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Daughters of 1812, Birmingham, Alabama Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughters of the American Revolution, King’s Mountain Messenger Chapter, Fayetteville, Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Order of Red Men, Atlanta, Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Daughters of 1812, Sims Kelly Chapter, Birmingham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O’Neal’s speech was followed by several shorter addresses by representatives of various heritage associations. Margaret Wilson, a member of the Ladies Hermitage Association in Nashville, Tennessee, shared her group’s efforts to preserve Andrew Jackson’s home and legacy. The Hermitage had almost vanished during the late 1880s when Tennessee legislators proposed to use the house as a Confederate Veterans Home. Through the efforts of a dedicated group of women, the Tennessee legislature gave the home to the Ladies Hermitage Association who organized a massive fundraising campaign to restore the house and grounds and repurchase furnishings once owned by the Jackson family. The association even managed to convince President Theodore Roosevelt to provide federal funds to help their cause. Wilson’s speech urged Alabama legislators to fund the creation of a state park because Jackson’s legacy was permanently connected to his actions at Horseshoe Bend. She also reminded the crowd “We are here because 100 years ago General Jackson and his Tennessee troops were here, ridding this beautiful southland of savages so that a higher type of manhood might inhabit it.” Wilson’s remarks reflected the nativist sympathies shared by many World War I-era Americans. With rising numbers of eastern European and other non-Protestant and non-Christian immigrants arriving in America, many heritage groups looked to the nation’s past when “noble” and “brave” leaders such as Andrew Jackson ridded the southeast of an “uncivilized race of red men.”

In a similar vein, longtime Horseshoe Bend advocate Broadus’s address called for state and federal leaders to provide funds for a “proper” and “permanent” monument to memorialize

37. “100th Anniversary,” *Alexander City Outlook*, 10 July 1914. Margaret Wilson was identified as Mrs. M.F. Wilson in the official program.
Jackson’s army. Broadus implied that Congress’s failure to allocate the full $25,000 requested by the anniversary commission meant that the group had to accept a less satisfying monument.38

Following a noon dinner break, Maud McLure Kelley, a Birmingham lawyer and Alabama president of the United States Daughters of 1812, presented the anniversary commission with a small granite milestone erected at the foot of Gun Hill to mark the terminus of the trace Jackson’s men created from Tennessee to Horseshoe Bend (figure 2.8). When the small granite milestone was unveiled, members of the Alabama National Guard fired a salute in honor of “Old Hickory’s” accomplishments. The milestone and an accompanying bronze plaque were the first permanent commemorative objects placed on the historic battlefield.39

![United States Daughters of 1812 Milestone and Bronze Plaque]

**Figure 2.8. United States Daughters of 1812 Milestone and Bronze Plaque Dedicated During the July 4, 1914, Horseshoe Bend Battle Centennial. [National Park Service]**

Efforts to preserve Horseshoe Bend inspired others in the area to acquire land associated with the history of the Creek War. During the centennial observance, M.F. Parker of Cullman, Alabama, presented the Commission with a deed to the land on which he believed the Battle of Emuckfau (January 22, 1814) had taken place. Parker hoped that his gesture might persuade others to donate private lands associated with the Creek War. Today, the Emuckfau site has not been definitively identified.40

By the time Congressman J. Thomas Heflin took the stage, the afternoon temperature had nearly exhausted the audience. Heflin recommitted that he would pursue additional federal support to preserve the site. He also reminded the audience of the $5,000 monument that the anniversary commission had recently purchased thanks to congressional support (figure 2.9). “We owe it to

39. Ibid.
the memory of those brave men,” spoke Heflin, “to perpetuate their deeds of valor and to keep aloft in the minds and hearts of the living their heroic service to their country.” Heflin told the audience “Here once stood a vast and unbroken forest made hideous by the war whoop, the scalping knife, and the tomahawk of the red man. It is now the scene of the white man’s industry and enterprise.” If visitors listened carefully, Heflin proclaimed, “where the terror striking war whoop was once heard we hear the music of the woodman’s axe and the song of the saw mill. Where he brandished his death-dealing tomahawk, the white man wields his scythe in the fields of waving grain. And where his wigwams stood and horrid war councils met we now have school houses and churches that adorn and bless this country.” Horseshoe Bend, according to Heflin, transformed Alabama from “savage” to “civilized.” Echoing Governor O’Neal’s opening remarks, Heflin asked visitors to think about how the Battle of Horseshoe Bend might help them better serve their state and nation.41

As the official program ended, visitors were encouraged to tour the grounds alongside anniversary commission members and local citizens capable of identifying key battle locations. Some visitors reported that they could still see indentations in the soil where the Creek barricade had once stood. Others told reporters that they discovered arrowheads and other items believed to have been used during the battle. A guide showed visitors a set of trenches and barricades supposedly used during the battle. As visitors struggled to imagine how the battle unfolded back in 1814, two local companies of Alabama State Militia fought a “sham battle” intended to bring the battle to life. The mock battle might have been the first of its kind organized in Alabama. While reenactments of military battles had been organized around the world for centuries, in the United States, reenactments did not gain widespread popularity until the programs commemorating the Civil War’s centennial between 1961 and 1965.

The Horseshoe Bend centennial organizers were likely highly influenced by a reenactment of Pickett’s Charge held during the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg in July 1913. Many elderly Alabama Confederate veterans participated in that reenactment. Tom Owen, the primary Horseshoe Bend event planner, was also highly involved in Alabama Confederate memorial associations and fully aware of what had happened at the Gettysburg anniversary event. The Horseshoe Bend reenactment made no effort to outfit the soldiers in period style clothing—they all wore their standard militia uniforms. Beyond forming two lines and shooting blanks toward one another, the militia made no effort to replay how the actual battle transpired. The militia were assigned to Horseshoe Bend to help control the expected crowds and provide water and temporary relief from the sweltering July heat. The sight of young men shooting harmlessly at one another did more to amuse the crowd than educate them about the battle. One spectator recalled “as the soldiers came over the hill shooting blanks, farmers started running, and horses and mules tore loose and scattered all over the place.” As daylight began to fade, the “sham battle” ended as the large crowd headed for home.42

41. Montgomery Advertiser, 5 July 1914.
By all accounts, the Horseshoe Bend centennial event was a resounding success. People had come from near and far to observe the day’s festivities. Visitors remained on their best behavior with only one reported arrest made during the celebration. Anniversary commission secretary Thomas Owen declared: “The citizens of Dadeville and Tallapoosa County showed themselves the best of hosts . . . . Transportation, housing, clearing of grounds, subsistence, and other things were looked after with the thoroughness of a trained business man. . . . The program was carried through without a single break.”43 The Montgomery Advertiser pronounced, “No celebration in Alabama has ever surpassed the one held here in brilliancy of oratory or in real enthusiasm. When asked about her memories 64 years after the celebration, Nora Blankenship Gunn replied that it was “a trip I’ll never forget.”44

Although visitors gained an unforgettable experience, the centennial commemoration purposely excluded Creek Indian perspectives as part of their ceremony. No portion of the program offered visitors any accounts of early 19th-century Creek Indian culture. Organizers made no effort to invite Creek Indians to participate in the program. Explanations for the causes of the Creek War centered on the white man’s duty to bring civilization into a wild frontier teeming with red-skinned savages. Event organizers cast Jackson’s victory as a divine act unleashed by a heavenly creator bent on securing America’s manifest destiny to dominate the continent. The only lessons found at Horseshoe Bend were those white southerners had already put into action. Whereas Thomas Owen referred to the Creek Indians as “the last obstacle to the progress and development of Alabama.” He and other white supremacists, such as, Heflin, Underwood, Broadus, Wilson, and O’Neal equally believed that African Americans were the greatest obstacle blocking progress across the 20th-century South. Most of the men who actively supported Horseshoe Bend’s early commemorations were also responsible for enacting discriminatory Jim Crow laws in Alabama and drafting the infamous 1901 Alabama Constitution that effectively disenfranchised African Americans and placed state power in the hands of affluent executives
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and large landholders who dominated state politics from the state capitol in Montgomery. These men used Horseshoe Bend, specifically, and history, generally, as tools employed to build traditional narratives that excused the region’s racial inequalities and xenophobic prejudices as nothing more than the divine means by which white men overcame the burdens minorities placed upon society.  

**Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Association**

Following Horseshoe Bend’s centennial commemorations, the initiative to create a national park faded. In 1916, Congress approved the creation of the National Park Service. The park service’s development led to an immediate expansion of the number of parks managed by the Department of the Interior. Alabama leaders tried to get Congress to include Horseshoe Bend in this initial expansion but failed because they never organized a cohesive plan for how they were going to acquire the property and struggled to make a case for the battle’s national significance. The unexpected death of Thomas M. Owen in 1920 left the movement without a central leader.

As support for a Horseshoe Bend Battlefield Park faded locally, nationally the United States entered into a new period of military park expansion known as the second wave of battlefield preservation. Following World War I, interest in preserving and commemorating American battlefields increased during a national wave of patriotism. Petitions and movements for the creation of new military national parks overwhelmed Congress. Congress needed a system to manage the park creation process. In 1926, the U.S. War Department and Army War College devised a classification scheme that organized historic battlefields into three distinct categories with corresponding subcategories. This system was created following an order issued by President Calvin Coolidge who worried that without some standard for measuring the historic qualities and physical size of a battlefield that the park service would exceed its abilities to adequately manage these properties. The classification system assisted the War Department and National Park Service with identifying, preserving, and commemorating American battlefields. The department determined that Class I battlefields warranted being preserved as national military parks. Class II battlefields were to be recognized as national monuments. Class II included two subcategories. Class IIa battlefields would receive a series of markers to designate various battle lines and perhaps, but not always, a commemorative monument. Meanwhile, Class IIb battlefields would be identified by a monument, tablet, or marker. The War Department relied on this classification system until 1933 when President Franklin D. Roosevelt ordered that department to transfer its historic properties to the National Park Service. At that time, NPS adopted the War Department’s classification system.

---
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In the 1930s, Horseshoe Bend was identified by the War Department as a Class IIb battlefield. This classification recommended that the site be preserved by setting aside one acre of land and erecting a monument on the battlefield. The existing classification system did not recommend acquiring the entire battlefield nor did it advise the service to take possession of additional lands surrounding the historic site to serve as a protective buffer from future development. 48

In practice, the classification system lacked uniformity. If a battlefield under NPS consideration had the support of powerful politicians, a historic site might receive a higher classification than it technically deserved. In the mid-1950s, Congress abandoned the classification system thus encouraging future potential NPS site applicants to muster as much political clout behind each nomination as possible. Without the classification system, Congress held extended hearings that allowed park supporters to directly lobby a congressional committee for a site’s inclusion in the national park system. Hearings evolved into public displays of power and influence as applicants paraded scores of leading businessmen and elected officials before the committee. Unfortunately, this process often ignored NPS recommendations for whether the proposed site deserved to be incorporated into the park service.49

As Congress evaluated how it would manage preserving historic battlefields, Horseshoe Bend encountered the greatest single threat to its future preservation. During the 1920s, the rising demand for electricity combined with the need for flood control along the Tallapoosa River again threatened the Horseshoe Bend battlefield. Beginning in 1916, the Alabama Power Company began purchasing thousands of acres of real estate along the Tallapoosa River in anticipation of constructing multiple hydroelectric generating dams. Alabama Power Company President Thomas W. Martin sought to expand electrical power into rural areas of Alabama years before the Rural Electrification Administration and the Tennessee Valley Authority made similar efforts during the Great Depression. Martin planned to use hydroelectric dams as the principal power source to provide the energy needed by the state’s rural customers. One of the proposed dam sites was located a few miles downstream from Horseshoe Bend at Stow’s Ferry. Alabama Power received a preliminary permit from the Federal Power Commission to proceed with plans to build the dam. Alabama Power Company was undecided whether it would build its dam at Stowe’s Ferry or Cherokee Bluff, located approximately 20 miles downstream from Horseshoe Bend.50

Thomas W. Martin had developed a lifelong interest in history. As a child growing up in Montgomery, Martin visited Horseshoe Bend with his parents. His family moved in the same social circles as the Bankhead family. That relationship likely brought Martin into contact with Thomas and Marie Bankhead Owen. In 1913, Martin convinced Alabama Power Company founder James Mitchell to abandon plans to build a dam at Buzzard’s Roost that would have flooded Horseshoe Bend. One year later, Martin attended the Horseshoe Bend Centennial

program and began to make frequent contact with those who advocated establishing a national park. Martin lobbied Alabama officials to create a state park at Horseshoe Bend. He even offered to donate the land for such a park if necessary.51

In 1923, as plans for erecting Freeman’s Dam at Stowe’s Ferry materialized, Martin and Alabama Power Company chief engineer Oscar G. Thurlow toured Horseshoe Bend battlefield. Thurlow presented Martin with recent surveys that showed that if Freeman Dam was built, all but a small portion of the battlefield would be flooded. Faced with the possible loss of what Martin already considered to be one of Alabama’s most significant historic sites, he returned to Birmingham where he recommended to his company’s board of directors that it avoid Horseshoe Bend by erecting its new hydroelectric generating dam at Cherokee Bluff. The board agreed and allowed the company to set aside their extensive property at Horseshoe Bend so that Martin and others could persuade state or national agencies to authorize a park at the site. Martin’s leadership ensured that the battlefield would remain farmland until further plans for the creation of a park could be developed. Not only did Martin’s action save Horseshoe Bend, many in Alabama refer to his advocacy as one of the first actions that sparked a broader movement to preserve historical resources statewide.52

During the 1940s, the Dadeville Kiwanis Club unsuccessfully lobbied state and national officials to designate Horseshoe Bend as a national park. Club president and county farm agent, Charles P. Storrs, organized numerous field trips to Horseshoe Bend to raise public awareness of the battlefield’s history. Working closely with ADAH Director Marie Bankhead Owen and archivist Peter Brannon, Storrs held meetings with state legislators to urge them to consider the formation of a state park. Storrs formed an ad-hoc committee to develop park plans. Their dreams of forming a national park, however, were dashed when their contacts in Washington, D.C., “doubt[ed] seriously” if the National Park Service would consider their proposals.53

Undeterred, Storrs reached out to Marie Bankhead Owen, director of ADAH and Thomas M. Owen’s widow, for support. After her husband’s death, Owen dedicated herself to completing numerous projects that her beloved husband had begun. She sought to build a permanent legacy that would honor his contributions to Alabama. Getting a national park at Horseshoe Bend had been one of the deceased Owen’s top priorities. Mrs. Owen had influential family connections in Washington, D.C. Her father, John H. Bankhead, Sr., had been a powerful senator and her brothers John H. Bankhead, Jr. and William B. Bankhead both served in the House of Representatives. In 1935, William B. Bankhead was elected Speaker of the House after years of serving as one of President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s floor leaders in charge of pushing New Deal legislation through Congress. In 1940, Marie began writing her brother frequently asking him to use his “influence” to lobby the National Park Service, Historic Sites Division Supervisor Ronald F. Lee on behalf of Horseshoe Bend. “I will be glad,” wrote the Speaker, “to take this subject up with Mr. Lee of the National Park Service” and “urge him to establish this park.”

---
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Simultaneously, Marie reported to Lee that “it is greatly desired by everyone in the state that this spot shall be made into a historical park. . . . very anxious to have all possible aid in the matter of making the area a . . . historical park.”

During the early 1950s, efforts to create a national park at Horseshoe Bend gained new momentum thanks to the leadership of Clinton Jackson “Jack” Coley of Tallapoosa County, Alabama. Coley was born in Alexander City in 1902. As a child, Coley became fascinated with Tallapoosa County history, especially its connection to the Creek Indians and the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. He enthusiastically attended the Horseshoe Bend centennial commemorations. After graduating from the University of Alabama, Coley took a position at the First National Bank of Alexander City. In 1945, Coley became director of the bank. The following year, Coley successfully ran for Judge of Probate of Tallapoosa County, a position he held for 14 years. As probate court judge, Coley was also responsible for managing county government (figure 2.10). From the start, Coley tirelessly advocated for the creation of the national park at Horseshoe Bend. He contacted numerous public officials across Alabama trying to spark renewed interest in the project.

Coley and Owen convinced the Alabama Historical Association to erect a roadside historical marker along Alabama Highway 49 between the battlefield and Dadeville to attract added attention to the battlefield and possibly influence the National Park Service’s evaluation of the site (figure 2.11). Coley sent numerous letters and drafts of signage text to Ronald F. Lee of the National Park Service informing him of progress made toward erecting a marker. Local officials also believed that a roadside marker would attract tourists passing through the region in route to Florida. In 1955, Alabama began construction on State Highway 49, which passes through HOBE, and a new concrete bridge to replace the aging Miller Covered Bridge over the Tallapoosa River near the historic battlefield. The new highway replaced the existing unpaved road and significantly improved travel conditions between Horseshoe Bend and Dadeville.

Coley planned an elaborate marker dedication ceremony to spark new interest in developing a national park. He penned hundreds of personalized letters inviting politicians and business leaders statewide to attend the function. With the help of ADAH archivist Peter Brannon, Coley convinced WAFM-TV Channel 13 in Birmingham to broadcast the unveiling. Station directors pledged to broadcast the recorded event later. Coley envisioned copies of the ceremony being distributed to Alabama schools. WRFS 105.1 FM in Alexander City agreed to broadcast the ceremony live. Coley also hired the Birmingham-based Sparrow Advertising Agency to help market Horseshoe Bend. Letters exchanged between Coley and Sparrow discussed strategies for attracting additional public interest in the battle. Marketers advised Coley to highlight “savage Indian war cries. . . . [and the] clash of sword against tomahawk” as background audio for the
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upcoming radio and television broadcasts. The agency also recommended that Coley should emphasize that the battle “broke the power of the hostile Creek Nation . . . [and] opened over half of Alabama to white civilization” despite British aid to the Indians. Marketers cast Horseshoe Bend as part of a larger nationalist narrative pitting individualistic hardy pioneers against savages unduly influenced by foreign powers.57
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**FIGURE 2.10. JUDGE CLINTON JACKSON COLEY, FAR RIGHT, PARTICIPATES IN THE 1970 GROUNDBREAKING CEREMONY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW EAST WING AT THE ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES AND HISTORY IN MONTGOMERY. [ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES AND HISTORY]**

One week prior to the marker dedication, the Alabama Historical Association convened in Dadeville. That year’s program contained several panels dedicated to Horseshoe Bend and the Creek War and included a guided tour of the battleground. Many association members remember the Dadeville meeting as one of the best planned in that organization’s history. Coley’s keynote address extolled the virtues of Alabama pioneers whose “sterling qualities” helped them defeat savage Red Sticks so that “civilization” could be brought to the region. Coley received numerous letters following his speech complimenting his remarks and advising him to publish his address in state newspapers.58

Sparrow Marketing Agency played a central role in developing the Horseshoe Bend roadside marker dedication ceremony. The week of the event, the agency distributed a press release across Alabama media outlets that sanitized the battle’s meaning. The release referred to the white settlement that happened in Alabama following the battle as an “indirect result” of the conflict that nonetheless “moved civilization into the Gulf South.” According to the author,
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General Andrew Jackson “held the view that progress in the development of the country should not be retarded by [Creek Indian] tenure of the land.” The agency’s marketing campaign connected Horseshoe Bend to the nation’s “manifest destiny”—a belief that a divine creator had set aside the continent for the benefit of white civilization.

Sparrow Marketing Agency’s efforts attracted a sizeable crowd for the marker dedication (figure 2.12). Officials from the governor’s office, state highway office, and the state archives attended the ceremony. Several business leaders from Birmingham also attended. They hoped that any further development and recognition of Horseshoe Bend would attract tourists to central Alabama. Hotel, restaurant, and gas station owners attended the event and advised Coley on how best to draw additional support among “Magic City” entrepreneurs.

The marker dedication renewed interest among Alabamians in developing a national park at Horseshoe Bend. Coley, with the help of Alabama Congressman Albert Rains, pushed to introduce legislation to establish Horseshoe Bend Battle Park. On June 6, 1955, in anticipation of Congress approving Rains’ legislation, Alabama Governor John Patterson incorporated the Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Association (HBBPA) “to promote the creation and establishment of a national military park.” Patterson appointed Thomas D. Russell, a prominent business leader and owner of Russell Manufacturing in Alexander City, president, and Rucker Agee, a
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prominent investment banker from Birmingham, vice president. Tallapoosa County Judge Jack Coley agreed to serve as association secretary. He remained the park’s most active supporter and unofficial leader. The association’s membership also included wealthy businessmen, journalists, and politicians as well as several members of “women’s patriotic societies.”

The association planned to generate widespread public support to influence Congress and the National Park Service. Agee immediately recommended that the association rehire Sparrow Advertising Agency to promote the park. In Agee’s opinion, the association required the services of a marketing firm to coordinate communications with Congress and the National Park Service. Previously, Horseshoe Bend advocates were sending letters to congressional representatives that sometimes contained contradictory information or unclear plans for developing the site. These private letters fostered confusion among several Alabama congressional representatives who were uncertain about park promoter plans. The Sparrow Agency recommended that Coley and Agee handle all association communications.

Under Sparrow’s guidance, Agee reached out to entertainment magnate Walt Disney. At that time, Disney produced the “Walt Disney’s Disneyland” show that aired nationwide on Monday evenings. Disney’s broadcasts were divided into series that corresponded with the names of sections of his Disneyland theme park: Frontierland, Adventureland, Fantasyland, and Tomorrowland. The Frontierland series focused on notable figures from American history, especially those associated with the “taming of the western frontier.” The episode that centered on Davey Crockett was one of the highest rated shows in ABC history and led millions of American children to idolize the “King of the Wild Frontier.” In 1955, Horseshoe Bend supporters incorrectly believed that Crockett had fought in the battle. They hoped that Disney would produce an entire episode depicting the Battle of Horseshoe Bend and its “spectacular characters” that “determined that the southeast would henceforth be a white man’s country.” Agee’s letter to Disney illustrated how park promoters chose to interpret the battle in 1955.

62. Ibid.
63. Rucker Agee to Clinton Jackson Coley, 15 June 1955, LPR 38 1:3, HOBE Papers, ADAH.
“Pioneers,” wrote Agee, “took over the frontier from the Indians. . . . There is no greater story in American history then that of Horseshoe Bend. . . . [It was the] destiny of our nation. Here is another Birth of a Nation story.” Agee’s reference to the controversial yet popular 1915 D. W. Griffith silent motion picture underscored the role that celebrating past achievements of the white race played in the park’s early development. Disney never produced a television episode about Horseshoe Bend.  

In addition to trying to raise public awareness of Horseshoe Bend’s history, the association also recruited Alabama educators to emphasize the battle in their classrooms. Coley agreed to publish several hundred copies of W.H. Brantley’s “Battle of Horseshoe Bend” booklet to distribute to Baldwin Jr. High School (Montgomery County) students. Several thousand additional copies were printed and kept in Coley’s office ready to be mailed out to teachers who requested additional information about the battle. He sent every member of the Alabama Historical Association a complimentary copy in 1955. Meanwhile, Agee urged Brantley to revise the booklet “to devote greater attention . . . to Sam Houston and Sequoyah” because their stories were more familiar to most Americans.

Coley spent the next few years touring Alabama speaking to dozens of Rotary Club and other civic organizations promoting the park. At one point, Coley held executive positions in more than one dozen organizations. He even used his elected office as a county probate court judge to appeal to members of the Alabama State Bar Association to endorse the park. Whenever possible, Coley traveled to Birmingham to meet with business executives urging them to see the project as important to the region’s economic development.

Coley also led numerous guided tours of the battlefield. Perhaps no one knew the land better than Coley at that time. Coley gave Alabama Governor “Big” Jim Folsom an extended personal tour of the site in September 1955. Folsom referred to the land as “eternal hills” and “hallowed ground” that should be “properly set aside. . . . as a suitable shrine.” Coley provided tours for at least four Alabama governors, three congressional representatives, and countless state legislators between 1951 and 1965.

Coley realized that his efforts alone would not be able to convince the National Park Service to create HOBE. The association needed someone whose influence might sway politicians and attract additional support to their cause. Rucker Agee, the association’s vice president, urged Coley to consider asking Alabama Power Company President Thomas W. Martin to assume a leading role. Martin, wrote Agee, “from time to time over the years . . . [has expressed] regret that the position of Jackson in Alabama history has never been properly recognized, even by our own people. We should give him a title that authorizes him to speak with authority.” Martin had already promised to donate Alabama Power Company land to the National Park Service if the Department of the Interior granted the site national park status. He had kept himself apprised of developments in Montgomery and Washington as various park proposals made their way
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through state and federal legislative bodies. After meeting with Coley and Agee, Martin agreed to serve as the association’s chairman. His involvement would prove to be instrumental to Horseshoe Bend’s development.68

The association also worked to acquire the battlefield site and surrounding acreage so that if a park received congressional approval it could be donated to the National Park Service. In 1911, Nora E. Miller had conveyed 5.1 acres (Gun Hill) to the Horseshoe Bend Battle Anniversary Commission. Coley questioned whether Miller’s donation had been properly processed. According to Coley, no deed existed in the Tallaposa County probate court records showing a legal transfer of land from Miller to the original commission. In addition, in 1923 the Alabama legislature disbanded the centennial commission. State officials examined whether Miller’s donation remained valid given that the commission who accepted the donation and whose name was on the deed of gift no longer existed. Even Alabama officials could not report with certainty who owned that 5.1-acre tract. Moreover, if Alabama owned the property, which existing state agency was responsible for managing the site. Attorneys agreed to investigate the matter further, free of charge.69

During the 1920s, Alabama Power Company had purchased most of the Horseshoe Bend battlefield site. The company had agreed to donate the land to the federal government if the National Park Service agreed to create a park. Other portions of the battlefield as well as hundreds of additional acres that would serve as a buffer between the proposed park and surrounding private property holders remained in private hands. Before the National Park Service would consider approving the park plan, the association had to acquire more than 1,000 acres of land. Without these acquisitions, the proposed park stood little chance of succeeding. The association needed support from the state of Alabama. During the summer of 1955, the Alabama legislature passed House Joint Resolution No. 42 pledging to provide future funds for the establishment of a Horseshoe Bend National Park. Alabama pledged to allocate funds to purchase private lands surrounding the battlefield if the National Park Service agreed to establish a park. According to Alabama Congressman Albert Rains, the resolution affirmed to the National Park Service Alabama’s commitment to the project. Legislators estimated that buying the necessary property would require nearly $500,000 in public funds.70

During the summer of 1955, the proposed park at Horseshoe Bend attracted the attention of members of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. At their annual meeting in Nashville, Trust member Douglas A. Fuller reported that “that site of the Battle of the Horseshoe, which has been sorely neglected through the years” needed federal support. The Trust passed a resolution in support of the National Park Service establishing a park at Horseshoe Bend. The resolution also encouraged Alabama to acquire and then subsequently convey park property to the federal government.71

In 1955, Alabama Congressman Albert Rains, with support from Alabama Senators John Sparkman and Lister Hill, introduced legislation urging Congress to approve the creation of
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Horseshoe Bend National Park (figure 2.13). Before House Resolution No. 288 could be introduced on the House floor, it had to be approved by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee who consulted with the Department of the Interior on all matters concerning NPS designations. Navigating the proposal through the legislative and executive branches of government required association members, most of whom were Democratic Party members, to reach out to Alabama’s minority Republican Party leaders who might be able to influence President Dwight D. Eisenhower.72

![Figure 2.13. Alabama Congressman Albert M. Rains played an instrumental role in securing congressional approval for Horseshoe Bend National Military Park.](image)

NPS Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, a unit charged with acquiring new parks, did not support Rains’ bill, noting that park promoters had failed to clearly describe how they were going to acquire the necessary land that would need to be donated to the federal government. Planners, according to the National Park Service, also continued to lack a persuasive argument making the case for Horseshoe Bend’s national significance. Like previous proposals that had failed to meet NPS approval decades earlier, the 1955 proposal continued to emphasize the Battle of Horseshoe Bend’s role in securing the American frontier from “hostile Indians” for the benefit of white settlers. Furthermore, it was “the view of the [Advisory] Board that the federal government’s participation in the commemoration of this site was adequately accomplished by the erection there in 1918 of the memorial monument.” The Board argued that the state of Alabama had agreed to manage the monument and therefore was best suited to preserve the battlefield.73 The association had also failed to adequately lobby Department of the Interior officials prior to the bill’s introduction.
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Claude Vardaman, a prominent Alabama Republican Party leader with connections to the Department of the Interior, told Coley that “had there been some contact made with the Interior Department before they took a negative stand, it would have been far easier” to push this proposal through the congressional committees. During the summer of 1955, the National Park Service did not want to create HOBE.74

The National Park Service was not alone in doubting the Battle of Horseshoe Bend’s national significance. Princeton University historian Walter Phelps Hall told a Georgia newspaper that he “had never heard of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.” Other historians proclaimed that only Alabamians placed such importance on the battle. Such comments sparked a lively debate as a group of southern born scholars rushed to defend Horseshoe Bend’s reputation. John Temple Graves, a Princeton graduate and Georgia native, suggested that the scholarly opposition to the creation of HOBE provided further evidence of the North’s efforts to exclude southern achievements from American history.75

Despite their initial setback, Horseshoe Bend advocates benefited from larger movements taking shape within the National Park Service. Following World War II, millions of Americans took to the road traveling by automobile to tourist destinations and historic and natural parks nationwide. During the 1950s, visitation at national parks climbed from 6.8 million visitors annually to more than 80 million by 1960. In 1955, perhaps as many as one third of all Americans visited at least one national park. That year, Conrad Wirth, NPS Director, reported to Congress that America’s national parks were “in danger of being loved to death.” Increased visitation had taxed the park service’s human resources and eroded its facilities. In addition, the parks needed to develop new interpretive methods and staff training to better fulfill the needs of these visitors. To ameliorate the situation, the National Park Service convinced Congress to promise a ten-year increase in park appropriations for a massive building program in advance of the agency’s 1966 50th Anniversary. The Mission 66 program, however, was much more than a construction initiative. The program also set aside funds for the creation of new parks. These funds became available just as Horseshoe Bend promoters redoubled their lobbying efforts.76

Following the National Park Service’s rejection of their initial legislation, Horseshoe Bend association members urged Alabama Senator John Sparkman to apply pressure on both Department of Interior officials and members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Sparkman personally visited Department of the Interior headquarters and met with Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton. Sparkman failed to convince Seaton to reverse the park service’s previous recommendation to reject HOBE. Undeterred, Sparkman approached the chair of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Democratic Congressman Clair Engle of California, to lobby for a hearing to debate the park’s potential national significance. Sparkman argued that the park service lacked the necessary information to determine the park’s eligibility. He asked Engle to schedule a hearing where park advocates and scholars could provide testimony and respond to questions posed by congressional members or park service representatives. Engle’s willingness to schedule hearings breathed new life into the movement to
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form HOBE. This time the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs would hold the hearings.\textsuperscript{77}

Jack Coley had several months to prepare for the association’s testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He made every effort to ensure that Alabama had a large delegation of influential supporters at the hearing. Senators Sparkman and Hill agreed to attend the event as well as Congressman Albert Rains. Members of the Alabama governor’s staff would also attend the session in addition to representatives from the state conservation department. Major business leaders, and association board members, such as Thomas W. Martin, retired President of Alabama Power Company, and Benjamin Russell, President of Russell Manufacturing, also planned to attend. Coley also paid University of Virginia history professor Thomas Perkins Abernethy to make a case for Horseshoe Bend’s national significance to the committee. Abernethy, a student of famed historian Frederick Jackson Turner, was a leading scholar of the American early republic period as well as a noted historian of early Alabama history. At Coley’s urging, park supporters across the southeast sent a steady stream of letters of support to congressional committee members and NPS officials.\textsuperscript{78}

Months prior to the subcommittee hearing, Subcommittee Chair Gracie Pfost (D-Idaho) asked the National Park Service to reconsider its original position on H.R. 288. On March 30, 1956, the park service advisory board reconsidered the resolution and determined “that in view of the reactivation of the national historic site survey under the Mission 66 program . . . it recommends a coordinated study including the Battle of Horse Shoe Bend to determine the relative historical importance of all sites under this theme.” They also recommended “that H.R. 288 be held in abeyance pending the completion of the study . . . (because) it would be premature and impracticable for this department to reconsider the matter again until the historical study to which the Advisory Board refers has been completed and proper evaluation of the results has been made.” The park service acknowledged that Congress had the right to approve designating Horseshoe Bend a national park without their approval. If Congress determined that the park should be created, the National Park Service would do its best to oversee its development.\textsuperscript{79}

\textbf{House Subcommittee on Public Lands Hearing}

The subcommittee convened its hearing on June 18, 1956, in room 1324 in the New House Office Building in Washington, D.C. The meeting began with a reminder that the National Park Service had previously rejected H.R. 288. Perhaps because of the park service’s previous complaints that park promoters had neglected American Indian contributions to Horseshoe Bend’s significance, the association invited Oklahoma Congressman Ed Edmondson to report support for the effort among the Creek Indian descendants in his district. “The national park,” spoke Edmondson, “would . . . bring into proper and justly deserved prominence a great Indian people, the Creeks, whose bravery and valor on the field of this battle won worldwide acclaim. Many Oklahomans of Creek origin have spoken to me of this bill, and have urged its passage.” Edmondson’s remarks made no mention of the Creek tribal government. In fact, none of the
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witnesses who testified before the subcommittee were either Creek Indians or representatives of any Creek tribal governments. Throughout the remainder of the hearing, Creek Indians were cast as “a warlike nation” that threatened the peace and security of the southern frontier. One of the association’s principal witnesses, University of Virginia Professor of History Thomas P. Abernethy, described the Creek as “the most warlike of the southern Indians and had always resisted the westward advance of the white man.” Other speakers described the Creeks as untrustworthy “red men” whose supposed alliance with the British was an act of treason committed against the American government. Throughout the hearing, no one, including committee members or NPS representatives, questioned how park advocates chose to depict Creek Indians.80

Alabama Congressman Albert Rains was the first park advocate to testify before the subcommittee. California Congressman Clair Engle began his introduction of Rains by extolling the virtues of southern politicians. The South, Engle declared, “train their men in the tradition of statesmanship probably more than any other area in the country. They understand and appreciate and try to live up to the historical traditions of our country. . . . It is the truth to say that the southerners run the House of Representatives.” Engle’s praise came at a time when white southern Democrats in Congress had organized into a powerful caucus to resist federal laws intended to end racial segregation nationwide. When Rains and other Alabama congressmen were not advocating on behalf of Horseshoe Bend, they were battling the effects of the 1953 Brown vs. Board Supreme Court decision and seeking to enact new laws limiting voter registration and empowering private business owners to maintain racial segregation. Although most of the correspondence between park association leaders and Alabama politicians focused on Horseshoe Bend, a handful of letters shed light on the larger social and political battles that occupied the bulk of these men’s time. Jack Coley, for example, expressed concerns that new laws might limit his court’s ability to restrict African Americans from serving as jurors. He urged Rains to do all that he could to block civil rights legislation. For Rains, history gained new meaning during these times because, in addition to outdated notions of white supremacy, southern leaders justified racial segregation by linking it to regional traditions and heritage.81

Rains presented the subcommittee with several letters from various individuals and organizations who supported the park’s creation including the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce, Alabama Department of Conservation, Alabama Historical Association, National Society of the Order of the Mexican War, Alabama Society of Daughters of the American Revolution, U.S. Daughters of 1812, American Legion, ADAH, and Alabama Attorney General. He also provided the subcommittee with copies of Thomas W. Martin and W.H. Brantley’s histories of Horseshoe Bend. The congressman described the park movement as “a matter that is dear to the hearts of many people, not only in Alabama, but throughout the Nation.”82

As the hearing proceeded, subcommittee members were impressed to learn that Alabama Power Company planned to donate 300 acres where most of the fighting happened. Subcommittee
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member Walter Rogers (D-Texas) complained that many new park proposals include requests for the federal government to purchase large tracts of land without much assistance from state and local partners. These proponents, Rogers carped, “come to the federal government wanting everything handed to them on a silver platter.” Alabama Power Company’s willingness to donate hundreds of acres to the National Park Service played a central role in gaining the subcommittee’s approval.83

Martin, however, saw himself as more than a philanthropist. As someone who had spent decades studying the battle, Martin also saw himself as the park’s unofficial historian. Prior to the subcommittee hearing, Martin had grown a bit frustrated by the National Park Service’s refusal to recognize Horseshoe Bend’s national significance. He and other park promoters had relied heavily upon Colonel Arthur St. Clair Colyar’s *Life and Times of Andrew Jackson* as the basis for their argument for national significance. Colyar argued that Andrew Jackson’s decisive victory at Horseshoe Bend directly influenced American and British negotiations at Ghent, Belgium. Colyar insisted that British-Creek relations caused the Creek War. British officials, according to Colyar, provided Creek warriors with military supplies and urged them to attack white settlements in Alabama while British forces captured New Orleans, Pensacola, and Mobile. Colyar insisted that the continued threat of Creek warriors in Alabama strengthened British demands during treaty negotiations. Based on his reading of Colyar, Martin reported that British negotiators “were demanding Wisconsin, Minnesota, Indiana, Illinois, and certain areas in the Northeast.” British demands totaled more than “233 million acres of land” and demanded “the right to use the Mississippi River forever from its mouth.”84 According to Colyar, news of the Creek defeat at Horseshoe Bend (and Jackson’s other victories in Pensacola and Mobile) reached British negotiators at Ghent two days before the treaty was signed on December 24, 1814. When the British learned of the Creek defeat, they dropped their land demands and signed a treaty that was far less favorable to the British than they had intended to sign just a few days earlier. HBBPA members argued that the American victory at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend prevented the loss of millions of acres of national territory.85

While park advocates believed Colyar to be the authority on the connection between Horseshoe Bend and the Treaty of Ghent, the National Park Service, as well as members of Congress, asked the association to provide adequate primary source evidence to support Colyar’s claims. Unfortunately, Colyar’s book lacked internal citations that might have pointed to the sources he consulted. Aware that the lack of proof could potentially derail the park’s proposal, Martin hired Vera Ledger, a historical researcher living in London, England, to comb through the British archives to locate evidence linking Horseshoe Bend to the Ghent negotiations. Ledger sifted through thousands of documents found in the British Public Record Office, the War Office, the Foreign Office, and the British Museum of London. Ledger discovered a handful of relevant documents.
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In late September 1814, President James Madison delivered an address to Congress that celebrated Jackson’s victories against the Creek Indians. “On our southern border victory has continued to follow the American standard,” Madison declared. “The bold and skillful operations of major general Jackson have subdued the principal tribes of hostile savages.” Madison proclaimed that Jackson’s victorious campaign had successfully curtailed British plans to further conspire with American Indians against American settlers. A letter written on October 24, 1814, by Senator Henry Clay of Kentucky, a member of the American peace commission in Ghent, to Secretary of State James Monroe urged the secretary to consider pushing for peace if Jackson’s army thwarted the recent British military actions in the “southern parts of the United States.” Ledger also discovered another document that both American and English negotiators at Ghent received days before the treaty was signed that depicted the scope of Jackson’s victories and declared that further British invasions on the Gulf Coast held little promise of success. Ledger’s research provided the Horseshoe Bend association with the evidence that the National Park Service and Congress wanted. Martin and others skillfully incorporated Ledger’s findings in the materials they presented to the subcommittee. Martin’s willingness to use personal funds to hire an overseas researcher and Ledger’s research impressed subcommittee members who applauded their combined efforts.

Impressed as subcommittee members were with the association’s research and enthusiasm, several representatives expressed concern about the future cost of building and maintaining the park and the association’s inability to estimate those future expenses. Some members worried that while Martin and the Alabama Power Company had agreed to donate hundreds of acres for the park that he might change his mind and try to negotiate the sale of this land once Congress had approved the park. Subcommittee members vaguely referred to other recent NPS additions where advocates used congressional approval to demand above market value prices for park lands held in private hands. Martin’s inability to estimate the market value of Alabama Power Company’s land holdings at Horseshoe Bend frustrated several committee members. Likewise, Martin could not understand why the subcommittee wanted this information since he had already pledged to donate the land, but representatives knew that the land was controlled by the Alabama Power Company’s Board of Directors who in the event of Martin’s death may or may not honor his promise. Martin had already retired from his position as company president. Although he retained the position of chairman of the company’s board, his influence over the company’s future decisions hinged upon his ability to continue to exert influence over its board of directors. The federal government questioned whether other Alabama Power Company officials were as equally committed to Martin’s vision. A 1955 resolution unanimously approved by the Alabama Power Company that was presented to Congress likely added to the subcommittee’s doubts. While the document clearly confirms Alabama Power Company’s desire to cooperate with Horseshoe Bend park advocates to donate some of the vast estate they controlled in the area, the resolution also stipulated that any final decision ultimately required

Chapter Two

board approval. The board agreed in principle that such a donation would be made in the future as long as it was deemed “desirable from the Company’s viewpoint for such purpose.”

Congress worried that future company leaders might see the creation of a national park as an opportunity to profit from federal expenditures. In 1956, an acre of farm land in Tallapoosa County, Alabama, sold for around $100. Alabama Power Company’s donated lands would have been worth approximately $50,000. Some congressmen wished that Alabama Power Company had already donated those lands through a deed of gift to either the park association or Alabama prior to seeking congressional approval. Alabama Power Company, however, wanted to keep their options open in case neither the National Park Service nor the Alabama Department of Conservation decided to acquire the land to open a permanent park. Martin told the committee that while Alabama Power did not plan to build a new dam that might impact Horseshoe Bend, the company did intend to build several new dams in the region and that the Stowe’s Ferry site remained a viable location for a future hydroelectric dam. Alabama Power Company’s actions were interpreted differently by various NPS officials and elected politicians. While Congress worried that the company might use this situation to turn a handsome profit, park service leaders described their efforts as “remarkable” and “unprecedented” given that few American companies could “hardly match” the company’s “interest of preservation of the Horseshoe Bend area.”

Weeks prior to Horseshoe Bend’s subcommittee hearing, that same committee had recommended that the National Park Service create Pea Ridge National Military Park in Arkansas, site of a battle fought during the American Civil War. Pea Ridge marked a major turning point in how the National Park Service acquired battlefield sites. Previously, the NPS classification system recommended that military units, such as Pea Ridge and Horseshoe Bend, be preserved by setting aside one acre of land and erecting a monument. The existing classification system did not recommend acquiring the entire battlefield nor did it advise the service to take possession of additional lands surrounding the historic site to serve as a protective buffer from future development. Pea Ridge advocates argued that the entire battlefield should be preserved and that an area surrounding the park would need to be protected so that the site would maintain its sense of place in spite of whatever future developments might occur. During the Pea Ridge subcommittee hearings, Congress, in consultation with the National Park Service, requested that a minimum donation of 1,200 acres would be required to create the park. The subcommittee agreed to approve the park designation with the caveat that Pea Ridge supporters would need to acquire and donate to the Department of the Interior at least 1,200 acres before the National Park Service began its management of the site. With the strong support of local advocates and state leaders, Pea Ridge promoters convinced Arkansas to acquire and donate 5,000 acres to the Department of the Interior. Despite what some saw as an excessive expansion of the historic site’s boundaries, the National Park Service accepted the donation and opened the park in time for the battle’s centennial commemoration. Pea Ridge set a new precedent that House subcommittee members used to

urge future military park applicants to include larger tracts of land in their proposals. Committee members worried that Alabama Power Company’s initial 300-acre donation would not be enough to protect the resource. Martin tried to alleviate such fears by promising that Alabama Power Company, who owned thousands of acres in the area, would be willing to increase its donation as needed. Doubts shared among some committee members as to whether Alabama Power Company would donate at least 1,000 acres to the federal government for the park led the committee to make the creation of HOBE contingent on additional land donations that exceeded the association’s initial 300-acre proposal. If such a donation could not be made, subcommittee members intimated that the extant congressional memorial that had been erected at the battlefield would suffice as an appropriate memorial thus making the establishment of any park less than 1,000 acres unnecessary. Congress told Horseshoe Bend supporters that efforts would need to be made to acquire property on both sides of the Tallapoosa River regardless of whether the property was owned by Alabama Power Company or private citizens.89

Subcommittee members also expressed concerns over the park’s future expenses. Since the National Park Service had denied earlier requests to support the creation of HOBE, the park association had not developed a prospective plan for developing the park. Despite several invitations from Coley, NPS representatives had not toured the site and thus were unaware of its condition. Association members did not know how much it would cost to properly staff the park or what facilities the park would require. Some congressmen wanted the association to pledge state or local funds to cover some of the costs to improve the land, an arrangement that park supporters knew would be impossible.90

Lacking in details about potential costs and park needs, HBBPA members shared with the subcommittee their hopes for how the park would be managed. Coley believed that the National Park Service should reconstruct the Creek Indian log barrier that played such a central role in the battle. Visitors, he claimed, would have a difficult time imagining the battle without the wall. Organizers also urged the park service to remove trees located inside of the bend on the Tallapoosa River and reconstruct the village of Tohopeka. Coley also hoped that the National Park Service would open a museum at the park that could showcase some of the artifacts that locals had recovered from the site. Many of these items, Coley reported, were already in the association’s possession and being temporarily stored at ADAH until a museum could be built. When asked if the National Park Service should pay for these improvements, Congressman Rains replied, “I do not mind making my statement clear that I think the National Park Service . . . ought to buy it and pay for it. If you prove it of national significance—and I am quite sure all the other famous national military parks in my area, Chickamauga Battlefield, and many more that I can name, did not have the generous approach of the people in the local areas that these people
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have—so I am certain anything done to bring back the battle itself . . . should be borne by the federal government.”

Ultimately, the house subcommittee recommended that Congress should pass H.R. 288 with the condition that Rains introduce a clean bill to Congress and that the park association secure the land necessary to both interpret and protect the battlefield prior to the site being officially turned over to the National Park Service. Although most of the testimonials presented during the hearing either focused on establishing Horseshoe Bend’s national significance or defining the proposed park’s potential boundaries, concerns that Alabama was one of five states in the nation that lacked an NPS unit strongly influenced the subcommittee’s recommendations. Subcommittee members who represented southern states argued that adding a site that symbolized the defeat of “savage” American Indians in the face of an expanding civilization would serve as an important national lesson of the country’s past sacrifices and territorial expansion. They believed that the park service and by extension the nation needed more sites that recognized the heritage and traditions of the American South.

H.R. No. 11766

Following the June hearing, Congressman Rains quickly reintroduced the Horseshoe Bend legislation to Congress as a clean bill, H.R. No. 11766. Rains successfully lobbied Department of the Interior officials and House Interior and Insular Affairs committee members to require only 500 acres (instead of 1,000 acres that the subcommittee originally proposed) to be donated to the federal government prior to the park’s establishment. On July 25, 1956, H.R. No. 11766 passed both houses of Congress with unanimous support. When President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed the bill on August 3, 1956, Alabama had gained its first national park. The bill stated “That when not less than five hundred acres of the non-federal lands hereinafter described . . . and known as Horseshoe Bend Battle Ground on the Tallapoosa River, in the State of Alabama, shall have been acquired and transferred free and clear of all encumbrances to the United States without expense to the federal government, such areas shall be, and are hereby, dedicated and set apart as a unit of the National Park Service . . . under the name of the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park.” The act also limited the size of the park to only include land in “Sections 13, 14, 15, 22, and 23, Township 23 north, Range 23 east, Saint Stephens Meridian, and not more than 20 acres of adjacent lands.” The proposal boundary “includes the course of the Tallapoosa River from the site of the Indian village of Newyaucau on the east to the limit of the legislative authorization on the west which is near the mouth of Emuckfaw Creek.”

92. Ibid., 53.
H.R. No. 11766 authorized the Department of the Interior to conduct a resource survey of the Horseshoe Bend battlefield so that the park’s boundaries could be determined and park planning could begin. Congratulations began pouring into Coley’s office. “I am a fine believer,” wrote Martha Twing, “that credit should be given where it is justly due—so to you—my hat is off for being so instrumental in getting our state a national park. Without your enthusiasm and continued efforts, I am certain this never would have become a reality.” Charles Adams, an Alabama state legislator who later played a central role in securing state funds to purchase additional land needed to create the park, echoed Twing’s feelings. “I think that you, more than any other one person, are responsible for the results that have been achieved with the passage of federal legislation establishing a National Military Park in our country.” Coley, however, knew that the association still had a lot of work to do before the dream of HOBE was realized. With “dogged determination,” Coley resumed his work.94

Defining Park Boundaries and Land Acquisition

First, Coley had to determine what legal process would need to take place so that Nora Miller’s original 5.1-acre donation to Alabama for the creation of a battle memorial could be conveyed to the federal government. After consulting with the Alabama attorney general and the Department of Conservation, Coley learned that Alabama could legally convey the land to the federal government free of charge but was willing to do so only if the conveyance included a clause that allowed Alabama to recover the land if for any reason the National Park Service failed to use it for its intended purpose within five years of the agreement. Conservation department officials noted, “this department for some time has considered developing the property as a part of our State Park System. Funds have not been available for such work.” But now, after nearly half a century had passed since Nora E. Miller donated the land, her goal of a federal park at the battle site seemed at hand.95

Shortly after the bill’s passage, NPS officials Elbert Cox, Region One Office Director and James W. Holland, Regional Historian, flew to Birmingham where they met with Horseshoe Bend Association members at Alabama Power Company headquarters. Cox had been one of the first historians hired by the National Park Service in 1931. He had played a major role in the development of Colonial National Historic Park. Cox had served as Region One Director since 1951. At that time, the National Park Service was organized into six regional administrative divisions each managed by a director. Alabama fell under the jurisdiction of Region One, which was headquartered in Richmond, Virginia. Cox laid out a plan for moving the park forward that included scheduling a series of site visits by Holland and other park service personnel charged with surveying proposed park boundaries, identifying extant cultural resources, and documenting extant structures and buildings placed on site after the 1814 battle. Alabama Power Company attorneys also worked with Cox to identify any potential problems that might occur when the company legally donated the land to the federal government. Coley provided Cox and

95. Drinkard to Clinton Jackson Coley, 5 June 1956, HOBE Papers, LPR 38 1:4, ADAH.
Holland with a guided tour of the battlefield and Dadeville. After a brief two-day visit, park service representatives returned to Richmond, Virginia.97

In September, James W. Holland returned to Alabama with a team of NPS experts that included Arthur F. Perkins, Regional NPS Planning Chief and Landscape Architect, and Dr. Dawson A. Phelps, Superintendent of Natchez Trace Parkway. Tasked with surveying the battlefield so that the prospective park’s boundaries could be established, the men spent nearly a week working side by side with Coley walking the property. After a thorough comparison of historic maps of the battle with the existing terrain, Perkins concluded that the park would need to include land located across the Tallapoosa River to the south and east as well as additional property located west of Alabama Highway 49. The additional lands included portions where events associated with the battle happened as well as hundreds of additional acres intended to buffer the historic battlefield from future development. Originally, park promoters planned to donate 300 acres to the National Park Service. Now the park would consist of 2,040 acres. Perkins’s recommendations meant that Coley would need to ask the Alabama Power Company to donate an additional 200 acres of land and purchase land from several private property owners. Months later, Perkins published *Boundary Investigation Report for Horseshoe Bend National Military Park (Proposed)* to assist the park service and association with defining which lands would need to be acquired.98 With the National Park Service’s help, Coley determined that he would need to purchase 1,313 acres of land currently owned by nine private landholders (table 2.3).

In addition to impacting nine property owners, the creation of HOBE also resulted in the eviction of a handful of black and white tenant farm families who rented lands from the Alabama Power Company. Coley sent letters to all property holders notifying them that Alabama would like to purchase their lands at a per acre value to be determined by a team of appraisers hired by the Alabama Power Company. A majority of the owners consented to the sale and worked with Coley to set a fair price and prepare the necessary title transfers. Others, however, rejected Coley’s offer and expressed an interest in either remaining on the land permanently or holding out until Alabama paid an amount for the land that they believed was fair. Negotiating purchases from these holdouts caused Coley numerous problems and temporarily jeopardized HOBE’s creation.99

---

97. Elbert Cox to Jack Coley, 16 August 1956, HOBE Papers, LPR 38 2:3, ADAH. Elbert Cox served as Region One Director from 1951 to 1966. At that time, the Region One office was located in Richmond, Virginia. In 1962, the Region One Office was renamed the Southeast Region Office. In 1972, the Southeast Region office was relocated from Richmond to Atlanta, Georgia.
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Table 2.3. Private Property Owners Impacted by Creation of Horseshoe Bend National Military Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landholder</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.D. Cotney (Estate)</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.A. Cotney (Estate)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. Eason</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.W. Winslett</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Morgan</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe McKelvey</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida Walker</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Harrelson</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Fuller</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,313 acres</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The HBBPA lacked the necessary funds to purchase those private lands. Previously, the Alabama legislature had promised to support the association’s efforts. Initially, this support was intended to serve as a symbolic show of unity intended to convince federal officials that all Alabamians supported the park movement. The original declaration of support lacked any funding allocations beyond small amounts set aside to cover association activities such as meetings and travel. Fortunately, Coley had spent years cultivating strong relationships with various agencies and politicians in Montgomery. Foremost, Alabama Governor “Big Jim” Folsom supported the Horseshoe Bend movement. He provided Congress with a letter of support indicating that if necessary he would work with the National Park Service and park association leaders to secure state funding to assist with the park’s development. At that time, Folsom’s popularity in Alabama was high and his influence on the state legislature, a body renowned for its internal divisions, remained strong.

Coley’s elected position as Probate Judge and chief executive for Tallapoosa County restricted the time that he could spend in Montgomery lobbying elected officials. Coley relied heavily on ADAH Director Peter Brannon to use his extensive connections to lobby in his stead. As the head of a state agency that reported directly to the governor’s office, Brannon had a direct pipeline to all of the governor-appointed state agency executives. Always seeking additional funds to promote the archives, Brannon knew firsthand which members of the state legislature would be most receptive to supporting allocating state funds for the park. Brannon worried that “bumbled efforts” to start a state park at Fort Toulouse/Fort Jackson in Wetumpka, Alabama, might impact Horseshoe Bend’s funding request. Apparently, disagreements between state officials, property owners, and park advocates stalled Fort Toulouse’s momentum and frustrated some legislators who questioned the landowners’ motivations. Brannon and Coley,
however, found two legislators willing to not only sponsor the Horseshoe Bend appropriations bill but willing to personally lobby on its behalf. Charles Adams, a Democrat who represented Tallapoosa County in the Alabama House of Representatives, and Broughton Lamberth, a Democratic State Senator from Alexander City, visited with dozens of members of the Alabama legislature urging them to support their bill. Congressman Albert Rains likewise used his influence to sway support.100

On August 2, 1957, the Alabama legislature unanimously passed a $150,000 appropriations bill to purchase the necessary lands to establish HOBE. The bill also gave the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources the power to acquire lands to hold for future use as a national park site. Governor Jim Folsom signed the bill on August 26, 1957. At that time, this ranked high among the largest appropriations bills ever passed by the legislature. Department of Conservation and Natural Resources Director W.H. Drinkard, who strongly supported the bill, warned legislators that without these funds Horseshoe Bend might fail to attain national park status and that additional funds would be needed soon to improve state parks that had deteriorated because of a sharp rise in visitation. The $150,000 allocation exceeded the funding required to purchase the 1,313 acres needed to complete the park. Legislators provided extra funds in case it became necessary to purchase lands from Alabama Power or if the park service unexpectedly expanded the park’s boundaries.101

The availability of state funds motivated other groups across Alabama to vie with Horseshoe Bend for recognition. A small group of supporters approached Coley with a proposal to expand HOBE’s boundaries to include Fort Mitchell, a military installation associated with the Creek War located on the Chattahoochee River. Simultaneously, another group in Tallapoosa County urged Coley to use these new state funds to purchase the Battle of Emuckfau site so that it too could be included as part of the park. Another group solicited Coley in support of the inclusion of Fort Jackson. Coley politely rejected each request but privately worried that one or more of these groups might influence how the state legislature allocated the appropriated $150,000.102

Armed with the necessary state funds, Coley began negotiating with the nine owners whose property fell within HOBE’s boundary. Several issues complicated Coley’s efforts. Foremost, many owners believed that Coley had offered them less than fair market value for their property. Market value estimates were created by a team of appraisers hired by the Alabama Power Company. Owners claimed that an acre of land in Tallapoosa County was worth approximately $110.00. The landowners estimated value closely matched typical land sales in the area. Coley, however, sometimes offered owners as little as $33.00 an acre, a figure well below the appraised value. Owners often countered Coley’s offer and eventually increased his offer to a value they deemed acceptable but this process upset most of the landholders and cast a dark shadow over

101. Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Annual Report (Montgomery: Government Printing Office, 1957), 12; Act No. 347, Acts of Alabama, Reg. Sess. 1957, Vol. 1, 457. Despite receiving invitations to the governor’s signing ceremony, Alabama’s congressional delegation did not attended the event because they felt they had to remain in Washington, D.C. to cast votes against the Powell Amendment—a proposal that promoted public school racial integration. Senator John Sparkman sent Coley a letter of apology for missing the ceremony but reassured him “that I am doing everything that I can to see that this so-called civil rights legislation is defeated.”
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the park’s creation. Rumors spread in nearby towns that the federal government might seize properties if owners did not consent to Coley’s offers. Questions about the value of timber further complicated Coley’s acquisition plans. When Coley first made an offer to Hoyt Winslett, owner of 260 acres located on the west bank of the Tallapoosa River, the bid did not include any additional funds to cover the value of the property’s timber. Winslett rejected Coley’s offer citing that if the association did not compensate him for the full value of his timber he would harvest the trees before any potential sale. Winslett asked Coley to pay for the timber or risk losing the land’s wooded appearance. A.D. Cotney, owner of 218 acres that adjoined the historic battlefield, told Coley that it would be unfair if Alabama purchased the property without compensating him for the estimated values of its gravel pit. Cotney also wanted an additional $2,061 for his timber.103

After months of negotiation, Coley managed to arrange purchase agreements with all of the landowners except for Braxton B. Cotney, Hoyt Winslett, Curtis N. Harrelson, and William S. Fuller. The remaining holdouts concerned NPS Region One Director Elbert Cox who had been led to believe by Coley and others that local landholders unanimously supported the park’s development. Cox told Coley that during the recent creation of a handful of parks elsewhere that it had been necessary for local government to condemn the property of reluctant landowners so that it could be seized and donated to the federal government. During the late 1950s, the National Park Service changed land acquisition policies for new parks. Previously, a park could be created before all of the property located in its proposed boundary was transferred to federal ownership. Also, earlier parks had allowed privately held land parcels to be maintained even in situations where that parcel was surrounded by federal park land. In 1959, the National Park Service adopted a new policy that required new parks to acquire all of the land within its proposed boundary before the establishment of a new park unit. HOBE’s development occurred in the middle of this policy transition. The requirement that all park land be transferred to federal ownership prior to the establishment of the park placed tremendous pressure on local officials who worried that any delay might curtail HOBE’s creation.104

At that time, Alabama law did not empower local officials, such as county commissioners and probate court judges like Coley, to legally condemn land to force a sale to a government agency. Coley needed the Alabama legislature to pass a new bill before he could proceed with a condemnation hearing. As the 1957 legislative session drew to a close, both chambers passed Act No. 347, which charged local and state governments with the ability to condemn personal property when a change of ownership served broader public interests. Immediately following the bill’s passage, the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources sent a letter to Coley empowering him to condemn the properties of those who refused to sell land that fell within HOBE’s proposed boundary. Coley dreaded the thought of forcing someone to sale their land against their will. Before moving forward with condemnation hearings, Coley reached out to the property owners urging them to change their minds. Braxton B. Cotney agreed to sell his family’s lands to avoid the condemnation proceedings. After receiving a letter from Coley

threatening to condemn the property if a sale agreement could not be reached, Hoyt Winslett responded, “This property was purchased by my Daddy . . . . I was born there. . . . There has never been any thought of selling this property out of my family. . . . So you must realize that we relinquish ownership of this property very much against our will. . . . The yardstick for values should reflect the over-all Alabama valuation. There should be no desire on anyone’s part to place values on the lowest level possible.” Winslett found Coley’s offer of $14,522.25 for the 260 acres of land and its timber insulting. The owner estimated that the entire property (including timber and gravel deposits) was worth $32,909.98. Winslett and Coley’s communications were civil. Both men expressed a mutual respect for one another. Coley, however, disagreed with Winslett’s valuation and proceeded with condemnation hearings.105

In August of 1958, Coley carried out the condemnation hearings that eventually forced the three remaining landholders to sell their property at amounts set by Alabama Power Company appraisers. Winslett, for example, only received $14,522.25 for his land, less than half of what he believed the land was worth. By September, Coley informed NPS Regional Director Elbert Cox that the State of Alabama had procured all the property that fell within HOBE’s boundary. Several weeks later, according to local accounts, one of the men whose property had been condemned struck Coley in the jaw on the steps of the Tallapoosa County courthouse.106

**Miller Covered Bridge**

HBBPA’s original plans for the park did not include Miller Covered Bridge (figure 2.14). The 1908 covered bridge spanned the Tallapoosa River 100 yards downstream from Bean’s Island. Local interest in the bridge remained high yet park planners did not see the structure as part of the park because it was built after the 1814 battle and was not located on the original 400-acre tract of land that Alabama Power Company intended to donate to the Department of the Interior. In 1955, Alabama built a new concrete bridge to replace the covered bridge, which by that point could no longer support vehicular traffic. By 1959, the bridge’s condition had deteriorated further because of neglect and damage suffered during a strong windstorm.107

When Coley asked the Alabama Highway Department to repair the wooden structure, their division engineer, W.P. Dejornette, inspected the bridge and determined that “its condition was such that a major repair job will be required. . . . skilled and experienced workers” would be needed to start the project. At that time, the highway department told Coley that they lacked the funds to repair the covered bridge given that they were building so many new concrete bridges elsewhere. Unable to secure local or state funding to repair the covered bridge, Coley contacted NPS Director Conrad Wirth for assistance. Coley reported that there was a “great danger of the bridge collapsing” unless emergency funds arrived. Wirth consulted Elbert Cox and James W. Holland who informed Coley that the bridge was not a priority because it was not a contributing resource associated with the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Coley turned to Congressman Rains for

---
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help. Rains visited Wirth in person to present a case for why the park service should preserve this Tallapoosa County landmark. Wirth admitted that even if the bridge contributed to future plans that the park service lacked the funds needed to adequately restore the damaged structure. The bridge collapsed in July of 1963.108

![Figure 2.14. Miller Covered Bridge During the Construction of a New Concrete Bridge, c. 1955. (Alabama Department of Archives and History)](image)

**Horseshoe Bend National Cemetery Proposal**

Genealogical and heritage societies played important roles in supporting HOBE’s development. The HBBPA asked and received support from several societies including the Daughters of the American Revolution, Sons of the American Revolution, and the National Society United States Daughters of 1812. In 1914, the U.S. Daughters of 1812 donated and installed the first monument at the park to mark the Jackson Trace. These groups often expressed strong opinions concerning how the HBBPA and the National Park Service should interpret the park’s history. The Daughters of the American Revolution, for example, urged Jack Coley to hire a Birmingham sculptor to cast a large bronze statue of General Andrew Jackson that could be installed atop Gun Hill. They called upon Coley to ask the National Park Service to include a member of their organization as part of the park’s planning team. Coley politely told the women that the National Park Service would determine how best to interpret the park’s history. For years after the park’s creation, many Alabamians and park advocates continued to reach out to Coley whenever they had a recommendation for the park. Coley

served as an invaluable intermediary for HOBE staff often deflecting public requests or defusing potential conflicts.\textsuperscript{109}

Alabamians struggled to understand the parameters that governed HOBE’s creation. They did not understand that the park’s development was governed by its legislative mandate. HOBE was not a blank canvas to be used for any purpose deemed important by its supporters. The U.S. Daughters of the War of 1812 organized a group of heritage organizations to lobby the National Park Service to establish a national cemetery at HOBE. These organizations incorrectly believed that the remains of federal soldiers who died at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend were buried in unmarked graves around Gun Hill. Now that the National Park Service owned the site, the Daughters of the War of 1812 thought that a section of the battlefield might be set aside for use as a national cemetery. At that time, Mobile National Cemetery was the sole national cemetery in Alabama. Advocates argued that Alabama needed a national cemetery closer to major cities such as Birmingham and Montgomery. NPS Associate Director E.T. Scoyen informed the society that the National Park Service did “not believe that land should be set aside in the newly erected Horseshoe Bend National Military Park for cemetery purposes . . . . [HOBE] was to be set apart . . . solely for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States in order to preserve the site of Andrew Jackson’s victory on March 27, 1814, over the Creek Confederacy, which opened the way for settlement in Alabama and other parts of the old Southwest.”\textsuperscript{110}

Presidential Proclamation

The HBBPA’s successful acquisition of all 2,040 acres of land within the proposed national park boundaries allowed HOBE to become an official NPS unit. Nearly three years had passed since Congress approved H.R. 11766. Before the official designation could be conferred, the park association needed to work with the State of Alabama to transfer all of the Horseshoe Bend park lands to the Department of the Interior. Once Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Department of the Interior, accepted the donation, President Dwight D. Eisenhower would sign a proclamation officially declaring the creation of HOBE. At that point, the National Park Service would become the sole owner and manager of the property and park planning would commence.\textsuperscript{111}

After years of legal research and uncertainty, the Alabama legislature determined that Nora E. Miller’s 5.1-acre donation in 1911 could only be transferred to the United States as a land patent since the state would not receive any funds during the exchange. In 1957, the state legislature passed a bill declaring that Miller’s land could be given to the United States as a patent if and when the National Park Service assumed its management. Two years later, on January 22, 1959, the legislature officially conveyed that patent to the United States government free of charge and without future considerations. Next, the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources needed to convey the 1,474.24 acres that Coley had acquired from private property holders. On February 9, 1959, Governor John Patterson and Conservation Director Claude D. Kelley legally conveyed the state’s property to the United States of America. Eleven days later,
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on February 20, 1959, Alabama Power Company President Walter Bouldin officially donated 560.66 acres to the Department of the Interior “for inclusion in the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park.” The company’s board of directors also approved the donation that same day. These conveyances satisfied all the stipulations that Congress had placed in H.R. 11766 requiring that at least 500 acres of land be donated to the federal government before the National Park Service could accept HOBE into its system.112

On April 24, 1959, Department of the Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton held a ceremony in Washington, D.C., to formally accept the State of Alabama and Alabama Power Company’s donations. Seaton honored “business leader” Thomas W. Martin whose “patriotic vision” enabled the federal government to “preserve the battlefield in its natural state for future generations.” After the ceremony, dozens of park association members joined Congressman Rains and senators Sparkman and Hill for a luncheon hosted by the Speaker of the House in honor of the HBBPA’s accomplishments. Always looking to maximize every opportunity to advocate for funds that supported the park, Coley used this luncheon, as well as his brief stay in Washington, to lobby officials to devote funds to preserve Miller Covered Bridge.113

On August 11, 1959, the HBBPA members attained their goal when President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed an executive proclamation officially establishing the park as an NPS unit. Horseshoe Bend was Alabama’s first national park. After nearly four decades of efforts to create the park, Horseshoe Bend advocates gained the recognition that they felt had been long overdue. During the signing ceremony, association members proudly gathered alongside Eisenhower to celebrate their monumental achievement.114

Conclusion

Between 1907 and 1959, a coalition of Alabamians led at first by Thomas and Marie Bankhead Owen and later by Jack Coley and Thomas W. Martin applied relentless pressure on the U.S. Department of the Interior to establish HOBE. Horseshoe Bend’s creation marked a major turning point in Alabama history. Not only did Alabama gain its first national park, but the movement directly also influenced numerous other preservation actions statewide. The Alabama Power Company, for example, remained very active promoters of the state’s cultural resources. Since 1959, the company has donated thousands of acres of land to create various parks and forests in addition to the millions of dollars the company has given to organizations such as the Alabama Historical Commission, ADAH, and Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. Thomas W. Martin’s legacy as a hard-nosed businessman with a philanthropic sense of responsibility to his customers continues to influence the company’s leaders.
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Creating HOBE was an arduous task that took decades of lobbying by Alabamians to finally gain recognition from the National Park Service. Initially, the National Park Service doubted whether the Battle of Horseshoe Bend held any national significance and rejected various park proposals. HOBE’s creation gained momentum during the early 1950s when Alabama Congressman Albert Rains and Senator John Sparkman used their influence within the Democratic Party to push legislation to establish the park through various Department of the Interior congressional subcommittees. At that time, park promoters viewed Horseshoe Bend as significant because of its association with General Andrew Jackson and westward expansion. Advocates persuaded Congress that Horseshoe Bend was a pivotal moment in the expansion of “white civilization” across a land that had been previously occupied by “uncivilized savages.”

After Congress authorized the establishment of HOBE in 1956, local promoters had to acquire hundreds of acres of privately owned land before the National Park Service would accept the park. Led by Coley, park advocates pushed new legislation through the Alabama General Assembly that allowed the state government to condemn properties and force the removal of landowners who resisted. After months of tense negotiations, Coley forcefully evicted three landowners to gain the last acres needed for HOBE’s establishment. As the National Park Service assumed the park’s management, it continued to work with local and state leaders to find creative solutions to preserve the park’s history during times of inadequate funding. The HBBPA’s work did not end when President Eisenhower authorized HOBE. Association members, especially Coley, continued to collaborate with the National Park Service. Together they forged a partnership between enthusiastic local advocates and professional park service staff that played an instrumental role in the park’s early history.
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CHAPTER THREE
DEVELOPMENT OF HORSESHOE BEND
NATIONAL MILITARY PARK, 1959–1964

Introduction

In the fall of 1959, the National Park Service assumed ownership and management of Horseshoe Bend National Military Park. In its first year, more than 55,000 visitors came to the park despite the absence of any permanent facilities or active interpretation. Between 1959 and the spring of 1964, NPS staff and park supporters worked to build park facilities and interpretive exhibits in time for a planned sesquicentennial commemoration ceremony to be held on March 27, 1964. HOBE’s developed as part of the NPS Mission 66 program, a period of expansion within the National Park Service between 1956 and 1966 in anticipation of the agency’s 50th anniversary. In addition to managing a massive construction program, the National Park Service had also started to reevaluate its interpretive methods to improve visitor experience. Under the leadership of HOBE Superintendent Clarence Johnson, the park began to take shape.

During this period, the National Park Service made its first attempts to develop an interpretive plan for HOBE. While these efforts promised to deliver a degree of professional expertise to balance the boosterism of its most vocal supporters, this did not happen. HOBE developed at a time when the National Park Service was undergoing significant changes in how it organized park facilities and exhibits. HOBE was among a group of parks that first experienced the effects of those changes. By the time of the park’s opening ceremony, public interpretation of the site remained clouded by a celebratory narrative that failed to produce a balanced account of the battle capable of placing Horseshoe Bend in the broader context of early 19th-century American history. On March 27, 1964, HOBE marked the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend by hosting a large ceremony that doubled as the park’s official grand opening. On the one hand, the ceremony demonstrated just how far the park had come during its short stint under NPS control. The completion of the park visitor center and tour road had improved visitor access to the park and provided a blank canvas for subsequent interpretive programs. On the other hand, the ceremony illustrated the need for additional research on Creek Indian culture and the Creek War’s origins that might divorce the park from the incorrect interpretations that had been produced during its formation. Between 1959 and 1964, the National Park Service had done little to dismiss earlier assertions that the Battle of Horseshoe Bend represented a clash of civilizations fought on the American frontier between a superior white society and an inferior American Indian civilization.

Mission 66

HOBE joined the National Park Service during a period of tremendous growth in that agency’s history. Previously, during the 1920s, Congress had provided generous funding for the park service to build new facilities and roads, especially in the large western units. During the 1930s, New Deal programs ushered in a period of substantial growth as many new units were brought under NPS management. As the nation waged a global war in multiple theaters, NPS funding, as
well as other domestic programs, fell sharply as funds were dedicated to supporting the war effort. After World War II, federal domestic spending remained stagnant until the mid-1950s as the nation struggled with mounting debts incurred during the New Deal and World War II. For nearly a decade, the park service could not acquire necessary funding to adequately maintain its units. Meanwhile, as usage of automobiles expanded after World War II, larger numbers of visitors included national parks as part of their summer vacation. As visitation increased, the National Park Service experienced a sharp rise in personnel and maintenance costs at a time when new funding was in short supply. In addition, numerous communities across the nation began lobbying Congress to designate their local natural and historic sites as national parks. Without a major infusion of funding, the National Park Service could neither expand nor maintain its operations. Consequently, as the park service approached its 50th anniversary in 1966, most parks had endured a decade long period of stagnation.1

NPS Director Conrad Wirth realized that his agency required an unprecedented national strategy to improve its existing parks as it simultaneously expanded its number of units to meet popular demand. First, Wirth needed a plan to secure additional congressional funding. Previously, each NPS regional office submitted budget increases to Congress annually to complete a variety of short-term projects. Regional offices managed all park construction projects. A lack of coordination among regional offices meant that these offices competed for funding. In 1954, to improve coordination of all construction systemwide, Wirth established an Eastern and Western office of Construction and Design in Philadelphia and San Francisco. These offices were staffed by architects, landscape architects, engineers, and construction managers who reported directly to supervisors housed at NPS headquarters in Washington, D.C. To secure funding increases required to revitalize the park system, Wirth presented Congress with a ten-year plan to modernize, enlarge, and even reinvent the National Park Service in time for its fiftieth anniversary in 1966. Congress pledged more than $700 million toward the initiative. By the time HOBE joined the national park system, the agency’s total annual budget had more than doubled compared to pre-Mission 66 levels.2

HOBE supporters voiced concerns about the park’s place within the Mission 66 program. Most saw the program as critical to the park’s development. The National Park Service plans to invest millions of dollars in developing new parks overlapped with HOBE’s approval. Alabama Congressman George Huddleston, Jr. worried that since the Mission 66 initiative began before HOBE was officially accepted into the service that the park might not receive adequate funding for all of its construction projects. NPS Acting Director E.T. Scoyen reassured Huddleston that HOBE was part of the Mission 66 program and that funding would be available to the park to hire a superintendent and staff at the start of the 1960 fiscal year appropriations. Scoyen told Huddleston that the park would need to prepare a master plan before development could begin.

Master plans take time to develop, as Scoyen pointed out, but fortunately HOBE’s boundary had been determined and substantial historical research seemed to be available to assist park planners. Scoyen indirectly urged Huddleston to use his political office to support NPS funding increases scheduled to be included in the 1960 federal budget.¹

Unlike Huddleston, Congressman Albert Rains opposed HOBE’s inclusion in the Mission 66 program. Rains wanted the National Park Service to submit a separate funding request to Congress to support HOBE’s development. The longtime park advocate believed that he could get enough votes in the House of Representatives to pass any spending bill related to HOBE. Rains worried that if HOBE’s funding depended on Congress’s continued support for the Mission 66 program the park might have to wait for funds as the National Park Service directed funding toward other parks deemed a higher priority than HOBE. NPS leaders tried to alleviate Rains’ concerns by promising that HOBE would not be forgotten. Nonetheless, the years that immediately followed HOBE’s creation were difficult for park supporters because they were overly anxious to see the National Park Service start construction and make immediate improvements to the park. The National Park Service required time to develop a proper plan of action and gather human and financial resources needed to move forward. Those tensions created some anxiety that at times strained relations between the National Park Service and their local partners.²

In response to local concerns about the Mission 66 program, William G. Carnes, Chief of Mission 66 Staff, agreed to come to Birmingham and meet with HBBPA members. After arriving in Birmingham on October 4, 1959, Carnes received a guided tour of the Horseshoe Bend battlefield and surrounding lands from Alabama Power Company Land Department Manager Ollie D. Smith. The two were joined by Judge Jack Coley who likely discussed with Carnes some of the reservations Rains and others had about Mission 66. Carnes then spoke to the Birmingham Kiwanis Club where he described in detail Mission 66 program goals and laid out the tasks that needed to be completed before HOBE’s dedication. Carnes urged park supporters to remain patient and reassured them that HOBE staff would need their continued support and input. Carnes’s visit alleviated many of the misconceptions park supporters held about the Mission 66 initiative and ended any opposition to HOBE’s inclusion in that program.³

Most of the construction projects initiated at HOBE between 1959 and 1966 were funded by the Mission 66 program (table 3.1). This was a period of rapid expansion and new construction throughout the National Park Service fueled by growing public demand for parks following World War II. Planners designed the Mission 66 program to improve NPS facilities and
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² Albert Rains to Jack Coley, 1 June 1959, HOBE Papers, LPR38 1:7, ADAH; Albert Rains to Jack Coley, 10 July 1959, HOBE Papers, LPR38, 1:7.
interpretation nationwide. The program also provided funds for the creation of new park units. Mission 66 funds paid for the park’s visitor center, park housing, landscaping, road construction and demolition, interpretive shelters, picnic facilities, boat ramp, and maintenance facilities. Mission 66 funds also supported the cost of developing the park’s visitor center museum and tour road wayside exhibits. HOBE received $757,794 from the Mission 66 program (table 3.2).

Table 3.1. This table contains a list of HOBE construction and interpretive projects funded by Mission 66 between 1963 and 1970.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOBE Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Housing Units 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing, Park Entrance Signage, and Gate</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>1963-1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Center</td>
<td>$84,823</td>
<td>1963-1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td>1959-1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour Road Construction</td>
<td>$237,726</td>
<td>1964-1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramp</td>
<td>$4,043.76</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Center Exhibits</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1961-1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayside Exhibits</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1964-1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Botanical Trail</td>
<td>$20,971.61</td>
<td>1966-1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Housing Unit 3</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Ibid.
Table 3.2. Between 1959 and 1970, HOBE received $757,794 from the Mission 66 program to support new construction and interpretation.\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Funding Allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959-1963</td>
<td>$331,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>$226,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1969</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>$102,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>$757,794</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clarence Johnson, HOBE’s First Superintendent

Horseshoe Bend needed an experienced leader to guide the park during its formative years. Shortly after President Eisenhower signed the proclamation creating HOBE, NPS Director Conrad Wirth selected Clarence Johnson to be the park’s first superintendent. Johnson was a twenty-four-year NPS veteran. Johnson, a Wheeler, Mississippi, native, received a B.S. in Education from the State Teacher’s College in Livingston, Alabama (now University of West Alabama) and a M.A. in Education from the George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville, Tennessee. His first NPS post was at Chalmette National Historical Park in New Orleans where he worked as a historian. In 1944, he was appointed custodian of Chalmette National Historical Park. Custodians managed the daily operations of small parks and monuments and reported to a superintendent who oversaw their work. At Chalmette, Johnson led numerous tours of the historic battlefield and conducted extensive research on the War of 1812. After five years at Chalmette, Johnson took a position as historian at San Juan National Historic Site in Puerto Rico. Johnson had earned a reputation for developing interpretive programs. At San Juan, Johnson collaborated with other park historians to develop that park’s first public programs and interpretive plan. After a brief stint in Puerto Rico, Johnson became a historian at Petersburg National Military Park in Virginia. Prior to his arrival at HOBE, Johnson was the chief historian at Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Missouri. Johnson’s extensive knowledge of the War of 1812 and American military history made him an ideal choice as HOBE superintendent. Moreover, Johnson was a native of Mississippi who had family in Alabama and was eager to continue his career closer to home. Wirth told Jack Coley that Johnson would

6. Ibid.
ably guide HOBE through its developmental phase. Johnson arrived at HOBE on September 10, 1959. Since there were no office facilities at the park, Johnson conducted all park business from his quarters at the Dadeville Hotel.7

Following the successful transfer of HOBE land to the National Park Service, Thomas W. Martin met with Superintendent Johnson to discuss the park’s plans. During that meeting, Johnson suggested that the park might benefit from an additional donation of Alabama Power Company land to further buffer it from neighboring property holders. Martin, believing that Johnson had agreed to accept another land donation, immediately contacted NPS Region One Acting Director R. M. Lisle with an offer to donate an additional 100 plus acres of Alabama Power Company lands that adjoined the park boundary. The eighty-year old Martin wanted to make this final donation because he planned to step down from his position as chairman of the Alabama Power Company Board of Directors. Unfortunately, regional office officials believed that they could not legally accept Martin’s donation without congressional approval. Johnson was embarrassed by the incident and worried that the National Park Service’s rejection of Martin’s donation might hurt the philanthropist’s feelings. Martin withdrew the offer only to later receive news from NPS Associate Director E.T. Scoyen that the land could be included in a revised park boundary without congressional approval. The incident demonstrated a growing strain between the National Park Service and park promoters after the park’s creation as additional layers of NPS administration led to difficulty in communications and confusion among the public over who was authorized to make policy decisions.8

**Park Development, 1959-1964**

Launching a new park unit was a monumental task, even for a NPS veteran like Johnson. From the start, planners agreed that the park’s official opening ceremony would take place on March 24, 1964, the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Johnson had less than five years to complete his work. Johnson and his NPS collaborators believed that they could clear the park of any existing non-historic buildings, clear excessive vegetation that blocked many of the park’s vistas, build a road system, visitor center, and interpretive shelters, and create a permanent museum exhibit before the planned opening. In addition, Johnson had to develop a cohesive interpretive plan for the park based on what he considered insufficient historical research.9

Meanwhile, as Johnson developed the park’s facilities, visitors were provided access to the battlefield. During Johnson’s first year at HOBE, more than 4,000 visitors came to the park despite the lack of facilities or interpretive programs. With his office located several miles from the park, Johnson constantly traveled back and forth to inspect the park and ensure that visitors
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were not looting the grounds. Previously, local relic hunters had frequently explored the battlefield in search of artifacts. Johnson had to create enough of a physical presence at the park to dissuade relic hunters. Unfortunately, guarding the park robbed Johnson of valuable time needed to focus on HOBE’s development. When Jack Coley visited Johnson several months after his arrival, he noted that Johnson appeared quite exhausted because of the long hours that he kept both at the park and in his Dadeville hotel office.

Johnson assumed this challenge with a minimum number of staff. Initially, Johnson was the sole NPS staff member assigned to the park. Within a few months of his arrival, Park Ranger Franklyn Hamby joined HOBE’s staff. A few months later, Rogers Young became HOBE’s first park historian. Like other new park units, Johnson relied heavily on support received from exhibit developers at the newly established Harpers Ferry Center and historians and archeologists employed by the Region One office in Richmond, Virginia. The park’s construction projects were managed by the Eastern Office of Design and Construction (EODC) in Philadelphia. Johnson corresponded frequently with a wide range of NPS professionals and contractors. Between 1959 and 1964, dozens of NPS professionals and contractors visited HOBE. Each visit usually required either Johnson or Hamby to provide a brief tour or supervise their movements about the park. In addition, numerous Alabama officials and park supporters routinely visited the park to introduce themselves to Johnson and to offer suggestions for the park’s development. Many came to Horseshoe Bend hoping to acquire a National Park Service contract to build some of the park’s planned facilities.

Johnson faced several challenges that made overseeing the park’s development difficult. Foremost, as subsequent HOBE staff would confirm, the park’s enabling legislation was vague and failed to provide Johnson with a clear mandate to guide his initial steps. H.R. No. 11766 stated that the National Park Service would “administer, protect, and develop the park. . . . [and] shall construct and maintain therein such roads, trails, markers, buildings, and other improvements . . . for the care and accommodation of visitors.” Neither H.R. No. 11766 nor Eisenhower’s proclamation clearly identified a central interpretive theme or statement of significance that Johnson could have used to base the park’s development planning. For example, Eisenhower’s proclamation stated, “this significant historic event on the Indian border opened the way for settlement in Alabama and other parts of the old Southwest.” While the Battle of Horseshoe Bend certainly contributed to these developments, Johnson and others struggled to develop strategies to illustrate the battle’s larger meaning using its greatest asset, the historic battleground. The National Park Service and park promoters had connected the battle to larger events happening elsewhere as part of the War of 1812 but knew far less about the battle’s role within the Creek War. Johnson and James Holland, NPS Region One Historian, recognized that unanswered questions about Creek War causes and a general lack of understanding of Creek society impaired interpretation. Was HOBE to be a monument to the military exploits of General Andrew Jackson? Would park visitors learn anything about the lives of?
of Creek Indians who had fought and died at the site beyond the stereotypical characterizations of uncivilized, yet brave savages found throughout the congressional hearings?\textsuperscript{12}

Clearly, stories of American soldiers assaulting a formidable log barricade built and defended by Creek Indians excited a visitor’s imagination, but major questions remained about the barricade’s shape, location, and origins. During the congressional hearings, park advocates hypothesized that Creek Indians had received help in building this advanced structure from their British allies. Additional historical research and archeological surveys would need to be funded before a more definitive description could be made. Johnson also worried that visitors would not be able to visualize the barrier unless it could be reconstructed. Park promoters had long dreamt of rebuilding the log barricade. When NPS officials began meeting with HBBPA members in the months leading up to the park’s official creation, rebuilding the barricade was a popular conversation. The National Park Service supported the idea but cautioned that without additional research it would be difficult to recreate a structure that scholars knew so little about.

Immediately following HOBE’s creation NPS Region One Historian James W. Holland reached out to several scholars of the American Early Republic period to help evaluate the many claims of national significance that had been made by park promoters during congressional hearings. The National Park Service had always doubted the validity of the research findings presented by Thomas W. Martin and other HBBPA members. While the National Park Service now believed that the battlefield was worthy of being a national park, questions remained about how the Battle of Horseshoe Bend related to broader events in American history. Did the battle influence American and British negotiations at Ghent? Did the battle influence white settlement or did the expansion of settlers into American Indian territory precipitate the conflict? How exactly did the battle contribute to the rise of Andrew Jackson? These questions and more remained unanswered and needed credible explanation before the National Park Service could plan its interpretation.\textsuperscript{13}

Holland proposed hiring Dr. W. Richard Walsh, Georgetown University Professor of History, to prepare a contracted research study to determine what, if any, influence the Battle of Horseshoe Bend had on the Treaty of Ghent. Unfortunately, funds set aside for completing HOBE research studies were encumbered for another purpose. Without a new study, Holland approached several scholars who were considered experts on the history of the War of 1812 and American diplomatic history. Dr. Samuel F. Bemis, who Holland referred to as the “dean of American diplomatic historians,” challenged Thomas W. Martin’s assertions about the battle’s impact at Ghent. “I doubt very much,” wrote Bemis, “whether Horseshoe Bend had anything to do with Ghent. I never saw it mentioned in the diplomatic correspondence, as I remember.” Bemis then offered Holland a different lens through which to view Horseshoe Bend’s significance. “A better pitch is to relate it to the War Department then in charge of Indian treaties and show how the Treaty of Fort Jackson opened up the rich black bottom cotton lands and had such a later economic and political influence on United States history and the sectional

\textsuperscript{12} U.S. Congress, House, \textit{An Act to provide for the establishment of the Horse Shoe Bend National Military Park, in the State of Alabama}, HR 11766, 84\textsuperscript{th} Cong., 1\textsuperscript{st} sess., July 25, 1956.
\textsuperscript{13} “Battle of Horseshoe Bend Research,” Archeological and Historical Research, Relating to National Park Service Areas, Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, 1959, RG 79 Records of the National Park Service, H2215, Box1422. NARA-College Park.
Holland recommended HOBES Superintendent Johnson dismiss many of the statements of significance made by HBBPA members to Congress and to continue to seek funds to commission new historical reports that could improve the accuracy of any proposed park interpretation.  

Johnson urged the National Park Service to conduct an archeological investigation of the battlefield to determine more precise locations for the barricade and Tohopeka and Newyaucau villages. He worried that local estimates for these locations were primarily speculative and in need of verification. In 1960, the National Park Service hired Florida State University archaeologist Charles H. Fairbanks to organize a summer field school at HOBES to identify the location, form, and extent of the barricade, discover the location and extent of the encampment in the bend commonly called the Tohopeka village, and verify the precise location of the Newyaucau village on the east bank of the Tallapoosa River. The National Park Service paid Fairbanks $4,250. Fairbanks and a small team of students spent several weeks at HOBES during the summer of 1960. His team dug six trenches by hand totaling 1,030 feet in length at a depth of five feet that ran north to south along an area within proximity to Gun Hill. Fairbanks also used a ditching machine to create an additional 1,210 feet long trench in that same area. After a brief study of the area, Fairbanks concluded that “there now remains no possibility of locating the Indian fortifications, or of locating any scrap of Indian land surface.” Fairbanks hypothesized that erosion resulting from extensive agricultural activity had lowered the battlefield surface by several feet thus washing away any barricade remains.  

Local park supporters had hoped that Fairbanks’ investigations would locate the barricade and help the park service better understand its size and shape so that a reconstructed version could be erected on the battlefield. Horseshoe Bend Battlefield Park Association members wanted the National Park Service to reconstruct the Creek Indian barricade. The National Park Service held discussions regarding the structure during their initial interpretive planning. While a reconstruction of the barricade would have significantly enhanced visitor experience, several problems prevented its construction. First, historical accounts and battlefield maps provide contradictory descriptions of the barricade’s size and shape. Some accounts depicted the barricade as a long straight wall that extended across the narrowest point in the bend. Other accounts described a wall with protruding sections that allowed Creek defenders a superior line of sight. Accounts of the wall’s height and thickness also varied. Second, HBBPA members and NPS staff did not know the barricade’s exact position on the battlefield. Jackson’s army burned the barricade following the battle. Between 1814 and 1959, the battlefield was sporadically farmed. During the early 20th century, members of the Alabama Anthropological Society visited the battlefield and did not document any physical remains of the barricade. Those who attended the 1914 centennial commemoration were shown “a little ridge of earth, curving toward the center and grown up with trees, and extending a great part of the way across the neck on the bend” that many believed to have been the location of the barricade. No photographs of these soil depressions exist. During the 1930s, Tallapoosa County farm
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extension service agents supervised the construction of several agricultural terraces on the battlefield. Most people assumed that the structure extended across the narrowest part of the bend and was located approximately 100 yards south of Jackson’s position on Gun Hill.16

Johnson urged park supporters to abandon hopes of rebuilding the barricade. NPS best practices for conserving historic sites strongly discouraged parks from rebuilding lost buildings and structures. The superintendent told Jack Coley that at best the park might be able to rebuild a small portion of the barricade at a different location in the park, removed from the main battle lines and closer to the visitor’s center. Locals, however, continued to press HOBE leaders to rebuild the barricade for decades.17

Although locals would never get their rebuilt barricade, the absence of this critical component of the battle’s story further complicated Johnson’s efforts to convey the Battle of Horseshoe Bend’s events and meaning to a public audience. Johnson needed help creating an interpretive plan that would coordinate the new park’s program development. In 1961, NPS Branch of Museums Interpretive Planner Albert Manucy and Exhibits Specialist Edward J. Bierly prepared HOBE’s first interpretive plan. Manucy had previously served as the chief historian at Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in St. Augustine, Florida, and, like Clarence Johnson, had developed a reputation as an expert in early American warfare. Bierly had been tasked within developing exhibits for several Mission 66 visitor centers, including the Petrified Forest National Park in Arizona. Unlike Johnson and Manucy, Bierly had some experience developing exhibits and programs that highlighted American Indian culture. However, his previous work had focused on western Plains Indians rather than Southeastern Indians.18

Manucy and Bierly’s work played a major role in the park’s development because it guided the creation of visitor center and tour road exhibits and the park’s subsequent 1964 Master Plan. The 1961 plan recommended that the park focus on the story of General Andrew Jackson’s campaign against “hostile” Red Stick Indians that culminated at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Manucy reminded future interpreters that the story of Horseshoe Bend was not a “pretty story.” The amount of blood shed on the historic battlefield had sanctified the ground as a permanent memorial to all who fought and died there. Proposed interpretive themes highlighted topics such as military tactics, weaponry, daily life of soldiers, Creek Indian prophecy, Creek Indian assaults on white settlements, and American land acquisition. The visitor would experience the history of Horseshoe Bend through a series of museum exhibits and a loop tour road that would identify major points in the battle. The report also advised HOBE to build a museum collection filled with historic weapons and munitions, Creek Indian artifacts, white settler household items and farm implements, and reproduction uniforms and military equipment. He also urged

the park to develop an interactive electric battle map that would use a series of white and red colored lights to illustrate troop movements during the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. The map would use several audio tracks to narrate the battle’s events and to immerse visitors in the sounds of this conflict. Electric battle maps were popular interpretive tools in many NPS battlefield units during the 1960s and 1970s. For example, Chalmette National Historical Park, the site of the Battle of New Orleans, developed a similar electric map. Manucy, citing a lack of available historical studies, did not recommend that HOBE’s interpretation devote much attention to Creek Indian culture, internal divisions among Creek Indian society, or white settler provocations that might have escalated the Creek War. Nor did he seem to comprehend that the conflict began as an internal civil war among the Creek Indians. The plan recommended that HOBE pursue funding to commission additional historic studies on Creek Indian weapons, culture, and the log barricade. In 1961, based on Manucy and Bierly’s recommendation, Johnson requested $22,100 to fund museum exhibits and audio-visual installations as part of the project construction program proposal for the HOBE visitor center. Visitor center construction, however, remained the park’s top priority. As construction progressed, funding set aside for exhibit development dwindled as the visitor center exceeded its initial allocation and monies were reallocated.19

The interpretive plan also included the construction of a park tour loop road that would allow visitors to tour the battlefield from their automobiles. Tour roads were common features among NPS Mission 66 parks. The Mission 66 Program evolved during a period when automobile travel in America had significantly expanded. Park planners nationwide tried to incorporate the automobile into new parks because visitors wanted the comfort of cruising through a park in their automobile. The road would have several wayside exhibits and parking areas. HOBE hoped to complete the road by March 1964 but these plans failed because of shrinking budget allocations and unexpected costs elsewhere in the park’s development.20

Before Clarence Johnson’s plans for HOBE’s interpretive programs and facilities could be launched, he had to first clear the park of the many structures and buildings that had been left behind by previous owners. Many of these resources were historic and represented the property’s long-time usage as a farm. NPS practice called for the removal of all resources not associated with the Battle of Horseshoe Bend or Creek Indian culture. More than a dozen surplus buildings and structures left behind by the previous landholders remained on the property. In 1957, Arthur Perkins, NPS Region One Chief of Planning, inventoried the surplus buildings and structures that would need to be removed during park planning.21 Johnson asked Jack Coley to manage the sale and removal of these surplus properties—houses, barns, fencing, privies, coops, pens, and cribs. On August 11, 1959, Coley placed an advertisement in the Alexander City Outlook and Dadeville Record inviting locals to visit HOBE if they were interested in purchasing surplus property. Sales would be made to the highest bidder. Area farmers rushed to the park eager to find a bargain. Paul Nickerson, a farmer in nearby Jackson’s Gap, bought two corn cribs and a tractor shed for $71.00 the same day that the advertisements
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appeared. Joseph Crawford of Dadeville paid $350 for a house located on the “Old Miller Estate.” The Tallapoosa County Board of Education purchased and moved the “old Morgan estate” to Dadeville where it was used as the superintendent’s office. He and other buyers agreed to move the properties they purchased within a few weeks after purchase. All funds raised from these sales went to the National Park Service. By the close of 1959, Coley had disposed of all major surplus property, except for a 60-year old pole barn. Johnson knew that it would take a few years to build new maintenance facilities, so they decided to keep a turn-of-the-twentieth-century pole barn, once owned by Nora E. Miller, to use as a maintenance facility. The building remains in use today.22

During the spring of 1960, HOBE’s final inhabitants, an African American tenant farm family, left. According to Coley, the unnamed family lived in a rented house a mile from the park but worked a tract of farmland located in the park’s boundary. By the early 1960s, the number of tenant farms and family owned farms in Tallapoosa County had experienced a steady decline for nearly two decades as the rise of automobile transportation and state highways provided avenues for locals to find employment in the region’s growing textile mill and manufacturing industries.23

As HOBE cleared non-historic buildings and structures from the park, Horseshoe Bend Battlefield Park Association members requested Johnson reconstruct the Tohopeka village that would have been located inside the bend along the Tallapoosa River. Johnson told association leaders that a reconstruction of the village site would not be possible because of NPS standard practices that strongly discouraged parks from reconstructing lost resources. However, Johnson needed to determine if the large stands of pine trees in that section of the park were healthy or posed potential threats to visitors or various construction projects ongoing in the area. As Johnson inspected the area to evaluate if clearing the section was feasible he discovered that many of the trees were infected with Cronartium and Little Leaf disease. Many standing trees had already died and had become infested by pine beetles that threatened to damage neighboring healthy trees. Elsewhere in the park, Johnson observed numerous damaged trees that would need to be removed before any roads, trails, or wayside exhibits could be installed. Johnson recommended that the National Park Service remove the damaged trees, especially those found in the bend, and set aside at least $500 annually to manage the forest’s pests. HOBE postponed clearing trees until the visitor center had been completed.24

23. Disposition of Pre-Park Structures, 1960, HOBE; The Heritage of Tallapoosa County, Alabama (Tallapoosa County, Alabama: 2000). A close reading of this book’s family histories reveals that most residents had abandoned farming by the 1960s and had found employment in either neighboring Alexander City or in the various construction and service industry jobs created by the growth of nearby Lake Martin.
Mission 66 Visitor Center

HOBE’s visitor center represented the purpose-built design ideals found throughout Mission 66 architecture. During the Mission 66 program, NPS visitor centers evolved into centralized multipurpose facilities located at carefully chosen locations in parks that would attract the largest amount of visitor foot traffic. Previously, many NPS parks lacked visitor centers and often had administrative headquarters that were neither centrally located in parks nor designed to be easily accessible to visitors. In fact, the use of the term visitor center first emerged during the Mission 66 program. Mission 66 era visitor centers would be designed to serve a broad spectrum of visitor needs ranging from park information to restrooms. Visitor centers became a greater focal point in parks for the presentation of interpretive programs including museum exhibits, slideshows, ranger talks, and published materials. Although some pre-Mission 66 NPS facilities had space for both administrative and interpretive activities, Mission 66 visitor centers always housed as many of a park unit’s activities as possible in a centralized space, often under a single roof. Centralization encouraged the park to be efficient in its administration and reinforced new ideas that all of a park’s operations should center on improving the visitor experience.25

At 2,040 acres, HOBE was a small park. NPS officials doubted whether HOBE would attract significant numbers of visitors because of its rural location and lack of additional tourist attractions in the area. Therefore, the National Park Service believed that HOBE did not require a large visitor center. Instead, the National Park Service attempted to design a visitor center capable of serving as the park’s central administrative complex complete with museum exhibits, restrooms, office and meeting space, an information desk, and maintenance facilities. Planners also hoped to place any park housing close to the visitor center to reduce the amount of time staff spent traveling to and from work to maximize efficiency. In addition, architects wanted the visitor center to be close to maintenance facilities and park housing so that all could share utilities. HOBE drew its water from a well dug by the National Park Service and disposed of its waste using a septic tank and waste field. Convenience and efficiency were major factors in all Mission 66 construction projects. Mission 66 designers believed that architecture could serve multiple purposes that not only pleased the aesthetic needs of visitors but also created an environment where park staff could complete their work effectively and efficiently.26

HOBE Superintendent Clarence Johnson and NPS Region One Director Elbert Cox disagreed over where the visitor center should be built. Johnson and Rogers W. Young, HOBE historian, preferred a location atop Cotton Patch Hill where the topography presented visitors with a panoramic view of the battlefield (figure 3.1). From atop Cotton Patch Hill visitors would be able to look down toward Gun Hill and the Creek Indian barricade line and gain a quick overview of the battle’s principal fighting. A parking lot would be built on the northwest slope of Cotton Patch Hill behind the proposed visitor center. Johnson wanted the HOBE visitor center to include a second-floor outdoor observation deck similar in design to the new visitor center.

center at Yorktown Battlefield in Colonial National Historical Park in Virginia. Johnson had seen similar observation decks at Fort Donelson National Battlefield in Tennessee and Cumberland Gap National Historical Park in Kentucky. The deck, Johnson proposed, could serve as an excellent spot for park rangers to provide a quick overview of the battle before visitors explored the park’s walking and driving trails. Johnson had recently visited Yorktown while attending a Region One Office training workshop. “I was so impressed with the Visitor Center at Yorktown,” Johnson reported, “that I returned later to see it more leisurely.” Johnson’s choice of Cotton Patch Hill reflected the opinions of many Mission 66 park planners who encouraged new units to erect visitor centers on sites that provided the best overviews of the managed resources.27
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**Figure 3.1. In 1960, Superintendent Clarence Johnson Urged the National Park Service to Build the Hobe Visitor Center atop Cotton Patch Hill. The Visitor Center would eventually be located on Miller Hill, closer to the park entrance in an area behind where Andrew Jackson’s reserves would have been stationed during the battle. [National Park Service]**

Johnson believed that his proposed visitor center location would maximize the park visitor experience. His plan, however, only included a visitor center and did not intend to place the maintenance facility on Cotton Patch Hill. The trend among Mission 66 parks, however, was to combine facilities as much as possible to lower construction costs and increase efficiency. When

the NPS Eastern Office of Design and Construction (EODC) in Philadelphia reviewed Johnson’s plan they recommended the park build a “combined Visitor Center-Maintenance Unit.” Regional Director Elbert Cox believed that it would be unfeasible to place any combined facility atop Cotton Patch Hill. The hill, he observed, was far too small to accommodate such a facility. After consulting with EODC architects, N. Reese Smith, Regional Chief of Operations, told Johnson “it was decided that the Visitor Center and Maintenance Unit could be located close to the highway with a parking area and overlook on Cotton Patch Hill to serve interpretive purposes. We were not sympathetic to a combined Visitor Center-Maintenance Unit located on Cotton Patch Hill.” Cox reminded Johnson that wherever the visitor center was located that it would require space for additional future expansions. Park promoters had long urged the National Park Service to include in the visitor center a library dedicated in honor of Thomas W. Martin where primary and secondary source materials related to the battle could be publicly accessible. HBBPA members believed they could raise enough local funds to pay for the library. Cox and EODC recommended that the HOBE visitor center be situated closer to Highway 49 where visitors would encounter it immediately upon entering the park.28

The National Park Service hired Columbus, Georgia, based architectural firm Biggers and Neal to design the HOBE visitor center. James W. Biggers was a Georgia Tech graduate who designed numerous buildings in Georgia and Florida during the 1950s and 1960s. In 1964, he won a prestigious fellowship from the American Institute of Architects. Biggers and Edward W. Neal worked together for several years and built more than one dozen public buildings including libraries, post offices, and administrative offices. Biggers eventually opened his own firm in Columbus shortly after designing the HOBE visitor center.29

The HOBE visitor center design blended modern architectural style with natural wood and stone surfaces. Architects used exposed natural building materials such as slate, natural wood, and quarry tile throughout the HOBE visitor center to decrease the transition between exterior and interior spaces. Large sections of glass pane windows flushed the visitor center lobby with abundant natural light. As is common among modern-style buildings, the visitor center main entrance designs included a wide courtyard with plantings and trees and crushed stone surfaces. The long and low one-story building with a low-pitched roof line was designed to blend into the park’s sloping hills. The visitor center’s modern design and interior layout was reminiscent of the most popular housing type of the period, the Ranch house. The building’s natural materials reflected earlier forms of NPS architecture that had continued to influence Mission 66 designs.30

The building’s interior reflected the ideals of the Mission 66 program by using design to maximize efficiency. The 4,350 square foot building had three primary public areas: a lobby with an information desk, two restrooms, and a gallery designed to display 16 exhibits. The building had three offices. The park superintendent and park historian had separate office spaces while

the rest of the staff shared a common administrative office. The common administrative office was originally intended to be used as an assembly room. Plans called for the installation of a screen, projector, and speakers so that visitors could watch an audio-visual program that would introduce them to the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. The AV assembly room, however, pushed construction costs beyond the planned budget forcing NPS administration to replace it with a less expensive central office space.31 A large storage area was located off the administrative office and two additional storage spaces connected the main building to an attached maintenance building. The maintenance building had four large garage doors and was located at a slightly lower elevation than the main building. The visitor center-maintenance building design was laid out so that HOBE staff could communicate with one another quickly. Since HOBE would likely have a small staff, the visitor center was also designed so staff could always be ready to greet visitors at the information desk in the lobby while continuing their work at their desks.32

In 1962, the National Park Service approved $90,900 to fund HOBE visitor center construction. An additional $2,822 was allocated to dig two wells that would provide the visitor center and other HOBE buildings with water. Contractors completed visitor center construction in 1963 (figures 3.2 and 3.3).33

![Figure 3.2. The Horseshoe Bend National Military Park Visitor Center was originally designed to contain both Park Headquarters and Utility Facilities. (National Park Service)](image)
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Tour Road Construction

The development of HOBE’s visitor center coincided with planning for the park’s tour road. Beginning in 1959, the NPS EODC began planning a loop road at HOBE to provide visitors with vehicular access to the battlefield. Superintendent Johnson envisioned the road serving as a self-guided tour for visitors, a critical part of HOBE interpretation since its limited staff would be unable to provide regularly scheduled guided tours. Initially, HOBE staff planned to complete the road in time for the March 27, 1964, sesquicentennial and visitor center dedication ceremony. Internal disagreements over the road’s design and a lack of funding delayed the start of construction until the summer of 1964, after the park’s opening ceremony.34

Johnston, Region One staff, and EODC engineers debated details about the road’s layout, tour stops, interpretive kiosks, parking, and more. Designers created at least four different versions of the road’s layout. The first proposal called for an additional road to be built along the suspected log barricade location. Johnson believed that visitors could understand the log barricade better if the tour road traced its location. NPS regional office staff rejected Johnson’s proposal because the road might interfere with plans to reconstruct the barricade. The regional office recommended that the park mark the barricade’s suspected location with a row of hedge plantings.35

The second proposed route planned to provide visitors with two options to tour the Tohopeka Village area in the bend. Johnson hoped that future funds would be available to reconstruct portions of the Tohopeka Village. The additional road would have passed through the village area and provided visitors with a closer view of the reconstructed buildings. The EODC decided to abandon this plan because it would have significantly increased the tour road cost and negatively impacted the park’s most valuable cultural resource, the battlefield. EODC and Region One planners sought to balance the need to provide visitors the level of battlefield access they wanted as part of their experience with the park’s primary mission to preserve and protect its historic resources. The EODC encouraged Johnson to develop new tour road routes that further minimized its footprint on the battlefield (figures 3.4 and 3.5).36

Johnson’s third proposal called for a single, one-way loop road spur that connected to the main two-way street visitors would use to enter the park and access the visitor center and the Cotton Patch Hill interpretive area. Compared to the second plan, the third proposal reduced to total road surface area and had a decreased impact on the Tohopeka Village area. The EODS again asked Johnson to develop a road plan that would further minimize the park’s total road surface.37

---
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In 1962, Johnson and the EODC developed the fourth and final tour road plan. At 3.1 miles in length, the final version was more than one mile shorter than previous versions. The two-lane park entrance road led visitors past the visitor center, Cotton Patch Hill, Gun Hill, and the log barricade before turning into a one-way loop extending onto the horseshoe bend and Tohopeka Village area. On June 11, 1964, HOBE opened the road project to outside bidders. Columbus, Georgia, construction firm C.B. Hewitt Company received the $166,146 road contract. Work began in August and continued until December when heavy rains and freezing temperatures forced a prolonged work stoppage. The road crew excavated a massive four-foot-deep trench the entire length of the project that was eventually filled with crushed stone and sand and paved in asphalt. They also had to dig a cut through the west side of Gun Hill to provide enough room for the two-lane roadbed. The company made quick progress in part because of the park’s flat terrain. Construction resumed in early May 1965 and was completed by the end of that month. During construction, the National Park Service awarded C.B. Hewitt Company an additional $25,000 in funds to build the culverts, bridges, turnouts, and parking areas the tour road required. The entire project cost $237,726.01. The road remains one of the central tools used by HOBE to provide public access to the park’s resources. 38

Road construction reopened questions about the Creek Indian barricade location. The 3.1-mile tour loop road bisected the historic barricade location at two points. Contractors had to cut a

four-foot-deep trench for the road grade. The only professional observations made during road construction were written by park service historian Glenn Hinsdale, a professional historian without any archeological training or experience. Hinsdale had joined the HOBE staff in 1961 and was tasked with gathering information about the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Despite his lack of training, his report nonetheless presented some interesting findings that possibly invalidated Fairbanks previous archeological surveys. “Across the width of this cut,” observed Hinsdale, “is a linear deposition of discolored gravel rich earth which extends an unknown distance into undisturbed ground on either side of the road. . . . Grading for the road penetrated this discolored material vertically about two feet at the deepest point.” Hinsdale hypothesized that the discolored soil had been created from excessive heat that left behind a “finely divided carbon” layer. Hinsdale also questioned Fairbanks’ theory on soil erosion had destroyed any remaining barricade remnants. The park historian discovered an “extensive deposition of both the native clays and topsoil” in the area that had added at least two feet of soil above the discolored soil.

Hinsdale’s observation led to additional questions about the Fairbanks’ survey. Hinsdale told his Region One Director that Fairbanks’ conclusion “was based on evidence that is extremely weak.” Hinsdale claimed that Fairbanks’ trenches were laid out too close to Andrew Jackson’s lines prior to their assault on the barricade. Two of the areas Fairbanks excavated, Hinsdale claimed, were located in an area known to have been occupied by Jackson’s army. The third trench, according to Hinsdale, bisected a known Great Depression-era agricultural terrace whose construction would have likely destroyed any barricade remnants in that immediate area. Hinsdale believed that Fairbanks should have dug his trenches further south. Jack Coley told Hinsdale that there were several elderly residents who remembered seeing the remains of the barricade during the last decades of the 19th century. Hinsdale contacted these unnamed individuals and took them out to the battlefield where they helped him locate several places where they had recalled seeing barricade remains. Meanwhile, Hinsdale continued to closely observe the road construction in the hopes of revealing more information about the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.

The tour road was just one of several construction projects Johnson managed prior to the park’s 1964 opening ceremony. Park housing was another priority. The Mission 66 program had identified improving staff housing as a major objective. A survey conducted in the mid-1950s across NPS units discovered that many staff lived in park unit housing that they considered to be substandard. Many parks reported a need for more housing. The Mission 66 program planned to build more than 1,000 new staff houses. Parks that could demonstrate the greatest need for new houses would receive funding first. New parks, such as HOBE, had to document why they needed staff housing. HOBE was located about 14 miles from the nearest town. The area surrounding the park remained rural and lacked any suitable existing rental housing for park employees. On-site housing would need to be provided for the superintendent and other staff. The National Park Service debated where the housing should be erected. Some wanted the
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housing to be located across Highway 49 from the visitor center where the new construction would have little visual impact on the historic battlefield. Others, in accordance with Mission 66 construction practices, urged planners to locate the housing within easy walking distance to the visitor center to maximize staff efficiency and provide some afterhours security for the park visitor center and other resources. Ultimately, the housing was built close to the visitor center.

In 1961, Johnson proposed that the National Park Service build two 1,352 square feet single detached houses at the site at a total cost of $40,000. The park paid an additional $17,000 to supply the houses with water, power, and sewage connections. Additional trees were planted around the houses as part of the overall park landscape plan to provide shade for the houses and to screen the new construction from the park visitor center. The houses were designed by NPS Region One architect Edward W. Aschmann and followed a similar layout to other park employee housing found throughout the park service. The houses were completed on April 18, 1963. Superintendent Clarence Johnson and Park Ranger Franklyn Hamby were the houses’ first occupants. Hamby sometimes shared his house with other park employees, especially seasonal employees. Prior to that date, Johnson and other park staff had been renting rooms at a Dadeville hotel for more than three years. HOBE staff immediately recognized that the park needed more housing for its expanding staff. By the time of the park opening, HOBE’s staff was expected to increase to seven full-time employees. With local housing options in short supply, Johnson urged NPS planners to consider building three additional houses. Johnson’s recommendations made it into the park’s 1965 Master Plan. However, HOBE would not add additional housing for several decades.42

In addition to park housing, Johnson wanted to erect fencing along the park entrance to create a visual barrier marking HOBE’s primary entrance along Highway 49. Johnson paid $16,000 to erect a 3,500-feet long stretch of three-rail fencing. The project also included a metal entrance gate that could be locked at night to prevent cars from entering the park after hours and an “entrance feature sign” to mark the park entrance.43

As the March 27, 1964, sesquicentennial ceremony approached, Johnson focused his attention on completing visitor center landscaping and parking projects. When the visitor center was completed in 1963, the park had lacked enough funds to finish the proposed landscaping and parking projects. When it rained, the area surrounding the visitor center became muddy. Johnson complained that staff and visitors tracked lots of mud into the new visitor center. The area surrounding the visitor center also experienced some soil erosion because of rain runoff. Without a parking lot, visitors often parked anywhere they pleased sometimes pulling their vehicles directly in front of the visitor center main entrance. When the ground was wet, some cars got stuck in the mud. The visitor center also served as a maintenance facility and garage. Workers had trouble getting equipment in and out of the garage because of the poor soil
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conditions. After several delays, the needed landscaping, parking lot, and concrete sidewalks were completed a few months prior to the sesquicentennial event.44

**Master Plan**

As the March 27, 1964, park dedication approached, Johnson and HOBE turned their attention toward planning. In 1964, HOBE reevaluated Manucy’s interpretive prospectus during the creation of the park’s first master plan. Master Plans were formal statements of a park unit’s core mission that provided guidance for all planning and management decisions. The National Park Service began preparing master plans in the 1930s. Plans set goals for future park planning such as the development of resource and visitor use studies. These plans are comprehensive and include detailed discussions of cultural and natural resource management and interpretation. Plans identify potential park problems, such as a lack of adequate facilities or personnel, and identify strategies to maximize existing resources. Superintendents rely on Master Plans to determine park strengths, weaknesses, and priorities. Each year, park superintendents set goals for the coming year that are largely based on prior objectives identified in the master plan. Annual park superintendent reports usually include sections that detail any progress a park has made toward achieving its goals. HOBE, NPS Region One, and NPS Washington, D.C., staff collaborated for several years to create the master plan. The plan received NPS approval one month after the park’s sesquicentennial program, but discussion of the document began several years earlier.45

Johnson began the process but shortly before the park’s dedication ceremony he fell ill and was forced to step aside and pass leadership on to a new superintendent, E.J. Pratt. Trained as a historian, Pratt, a twenty-two year park service veteran, had previously worked at Fort Donelson National Military Park in Tennessee before his promotion to superintendent of that unit. After spending 11 years as Fort Donelson superintendent, in 1961, Pratt became the superintendent of Fort Sumter National Monument in South Carolina. When Johnson fell ill, NPS Region One Director Elbert Cox needed to find an immediate replacement with prior administrative experience and training as a military historian to oversee HOBE’s dedication ceremony and park planning. Pratt was an ideal choice because his expertise in early American warfare mirrored Johnson’s strengths and he had already managed two park units during his fourteen years as a superintendent. Initially, Cox intended for Pratt’s appointment as acting superintendent to be temporary until Johnson’s health improved. By February 1964, Johnson’s physical presence at the park had been substantially reduced. He did not attend the park dedication and in November 1964 he resigned his position and Pratt was appointed HOBE superintendent.46

---

Pratt never saw HOBE as a permanent post and preferred working in Civil War park units. Yet, he stepped in and carried on Johnson’s work skillfully and without complaint. Pratt largely continued what Johnson had already begun. Jack Coley commented that Pratt saw himself as the park’s caretaker and was eager to carry on the work that had begun prior to his arrival. Johnson and Pratt by-and-large shared a single vision for the park. Pratt continued to consult with Johnson even after the latter had stepped aside. The lack of an official position at HOBE never prevented Johnson from expressing his opinions and continuing to shape the park’s future even when his declining health threatened his own.47

The new Master Plan challenged many of the recommendations included in Manucy’s interpretive prospectus and reflected several differences of opinion that had emerged during those early years as HOBE staff and NPS officials collaborated to create an agenda that would move the park forward. Questions such as: who was HOBE’s audience? how would the park balance its need for visitor facilities with preserving its cultural and natural resources? what message did the park want visitors to take way from HOBE’s interpretation of the battle? which aspects of Creek Indian culture would the interpretation include? None of those questions had simple answers. Opinions varied.48

Granville B. Liles, Assistant Regional Director of Operations, participated in the planning process and advised HOBE to place greater emphasis on presenting Creek Indian culture. Liles observed that HOBE staff were “interested in showing the human story rather than just show military movements.” The battle provided interpreters with ample opportunities to satisfy visitors who came to the park “looking for a dramatic and stimulating presentation.” Liles warned that Manucy’s proposed electric map would “duplicate museum exhibits” citing that NPS “thinking on the separation of the functions of interpretive media has changed greatly in the last few years.” Rather than rely on an electric map as the central focal point of the proposed visitor center exhibits, Liles recommended that “a better approach might be to use original art, artifacts, and live scenes of the battlefield to interpret more fully the Creek War as a clash of two cultures in a struggle that meant disaster for one and new empire for the other.” Liles challenged HOBE staff to create audiovisual programs that added “another dimension to your overall interpretive program.” He advocated for the addition of an assembly room to the visitor center where audiovisual programs could better orient visitors to the battlefield. Without the use of audiovisual programs, Liles feared that visitors would struggle to understand the battle.49

47. Elbert Cox to Jack Coley, February 1964, HOBE Paper, ADAH. Coley was informed of Johnson’s declining health in the months leading up to March 27, 1964. E.J. Pratt joined HOBE as an acting superintendent around February 1964 and was promoted to park superintendent shortly after the park dedication ceremony.
The Master Plan identified four main groups of HOBE visitors that should be taken into consideration when developing interpretive programs:

1. Weekend Trippers;
2. School Groups;
3. Elderly Couples from North Central States who “wintered” in Florida;
4. Families from the Northeast who Vacationed in Florida.

Weekend trippers included local residents who might visit the park on a routine basis but would seldom enter the visitor center or seek out interaction with HOBE staff. Weekend trippers were more likely to be interested in Horseshoe Bend’s natural setting and recreational opportunities than its cultural resources and interpretive programs. HOBE expected to draw a steady number of school groups annually. Specific programs and demonstrations would need to be developed for school aged children. The Master Plan recognized that HOBE’s lack of an assembly space to host large groups of more than twenty guests would hamper school program development. Nonetheless, HOBE staff were encouraged to contact local school administrators and invite classes to organize field trips to the park.\(^{50}\)

In the 1960s, prior to the construction of federal interstates in Alabama, federal and state highways were the main transportation routes used by motorists. U.S. Highway 280, known as the “Heart of Dixie Highway,” was located twelve miles from the park entrance. Each year hundreds of thousands of travelers from American midwestern and northeastern states passed through Tallapoosa County, Alabama, on their way to and from Florida. The park would require roadside signage and printed materials to be stocked in state visitor centers to direct travelers to the park. The Master Plan urged HOBE staff to develop relationships with Alabama government agencies to help promote the park to out-of-state visitors. Compared to weekend trippers, out-of-state tourists were more likely to spend longer periods of time at the park and seek out guided tours and other HOBE staff-led programs. “Scheduling and availability of group tours,” as stated in the Master Plan, “will be critical to helping visitors understand the battle.” If the park attracted increasing numbers of tourists, HOBE would require additional staff to provide the kinds of entertaining and informative guided programs that these groups expected.\(^{51}\)

The Master Plan advised HOBE to broaden its interpretation to shed more light on Creek Indian society. “For interpretive purposes,” wrote Superintendent E.J. Pratt, “the emphasis should be on transitions in the Creek Culture resulting from the impact of foreign cultures during historic time.” Previously, the park and its supporters had interpreted white settlement in Alabama threatened by increasingly hostile actions undertaken by a violent sect of Creek Indians. White settlement on Creek Indian lands was viewed by many as a positive force that brought peace and prosperity to an “uncivilized” and “virgin” land. The Master Plan, however, urged HOBE to commission studies that would reconsider the impact that Creek Indian encounters with white settlers had on the development of the American southeast. The plan recommended that more attention be provided to comparing Creek Indian and white settler motivations before and during the Creek War. According to the plan, questions such as why did
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state governments in Tennessee, Mississippi, and Georgia see the Creek War as a threat to their security and why did white soldiers fight needed to be examined in future park exhibits.52

Several problems prevented the Master Plan from having an immediate impact on HOBE interpretation. First, as the plan was being developed by a committee of NPS staff, all of the park visitor center and wayside exhibits were already in production. The exhibits installed at HOBE in 1964 and 1965 largely conformed with Manucy’s 1961 interpretive prospectus. Thus, HOBE’s first interpretive exhibits devoted most of their attention to various military history topics that overshadowed the role that transformations and disagreements within Creek Indian society played in the conflict. The lack of available Creek Indian research also compromised the plan’s potential impact. Beyond the need for new studies that examined Creek Indian and European contact, the master plan also advised the National Park Service to commission resource studies that documented “pre-Creek occupation” of the battlefield, the log breastwork site, and Newyaucau and Tohopeka villages. These studies would require significant funding allocations and take years to develop into reports that could be incorporated into HOBE interpretation. As the Master Plan developed, the need to open the HOBE visitor center and tour road exhibits in time for the 150th commemoration of the battle took priority over waiting to discover new information that might dramatically alter the NPS understanding of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.53

The Master Plan also failed to instruct HOBE and the National Park Service to build a relationship with the various American Indian tribes associated with the battle. While the plan recommended that HOBE continue its relationship the Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Association, Alabama Department of Archives and History, and other Alabama state and local government agencies, the plan never considered the potential value that consultation with American Indian tribes might contribute to the park’s interpretation. Rather than collaborate with Creek Indian tribes to better understand various aspects of their society, the plans recommended that HOBE hire consultants to prepare studies on the subject.54

HOBE’s poor relationship with American Indians reflected broader problems within the National Park Service. Since the creation of the nation’s first national park in 1877, the relationship between those who manage federal parks and American Indians either living on those lands or having been previously dispossessed of those lands by force or treaty had been tenuous at best. Both the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and National Park Service (created in 1916) are administered by the Department of the Interior. According to historians Robert Keller and Michael Turek, for much of its history, the Department of the Interior, like many executive branch agencies of the federal government, has been “supervised by complex but weak federal bureaucracies.” As the designated administrator of most federal lands and natural resources, the Department of the Interior’s mission regularly adversely impacted American Indian land claims and ignored the effect their decisions had on Indian cultural resources and religious beliefs. Because the Department of the Interior saw national parks as either unused or worthless lands, they, like the early 19th-century governments who invaded Creek lands under General Andrew Jackson, believed that American Indians had underdeveloped their resources and lacked any
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claim to lands that they had failed to improve. The creation of new national park units, especially during the 1930s and after World War II, produced numerous situations where new parks laid claim to lands previously set aside as part of American Indian reservations. In many cases, existing reservations were either surrounded by a new national park unit or lost territory as new parks were carved out entirely within Indian lands. Disputes between American Indian tribes and the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service centered on boundary lines, land claims, water rights, hunting and wildlife management, access to sacred sites, and more.  

One century earlier, the U.S. Congress passed the Dawes Act, which forcefully divided American Indian reservations into individual land allotments whose native claimants could only claim if they renounced tribal membership and accepted American citizenship. Indian lands not claimed by American Indian individuals would be sold by the federal government to promote its development. The Dawes Act substantially undermined American Indian tribal governments but initially did not impact the Muscogee (Creek) Nation in Oklahoma. In 1898, Congress passed a second act, the Curtis Act, that abolished the Creek, Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Seminole Indian tribal governments and outlawed the communal ownership of tribal lands. The Curtis Act was designed to eradicate tribal governments in Oklahoma as that territory prepared for admission as a state. In the decades that followed, Oklahoma tribes lost over ninety million acres in land and saw their governments virtually abolished. By the early twentieth century, Creek Indians in Oklahoma had their land allotted and land title extinguished. Those actions destroyed their reservations. Meanwhile, the federal government used heavy handed tactics to force American Indians off lands used to create major parks such as Mesa Verde and Glacier. In both instances, the federal government negotiated a series of dubious treaties that passed through Congress despite American Indian opposition. Federal agencies tended to treat American Indians as unwelcomed squatters who tainted otherwise pristine American landscapes deemed worthy of preservation.

In 1916, the creation of the National Park Service failed to change federal government and American Indian relations. Although NPS leaders generally eschewed the strong arm tactics used previously by the Department of the Interior to acquire park land, they showed little concern for American Indian rights or claims. Early NPS leaders saw the rapid expansion of their agency and the addition of new park units as necessary for their continued federal support.

During the Great Depression, President Franklin D. Roosevelt pushed the Indian Reorganization Act through Congress. Under the leadership of John Collier, Indian Bureau Commissioner, and Harold L. Ickes, Department of the Interior Secretary, the federal government abandoned its previous policy of forcing American Indians to assimilate to white culture. The failures of the American government to prevent the Great Depression had led some officials to question whether white society was superior to American Indian culture. Collier and Ickes, for example, testified before Congress that American Indian culture was
superior to American culture and thus deserved to be preserved. The Act, along with subsequent legislation, began a long process of restoring the autonomy of American Indian tribal governments and rebuilding reservations. In Oklahoma, Creek Indians received more than 10,000 acres of unallotted land that had been previously taken from them following the Curtis Act. Meanwhile, the federal government continued to recognize the private landholdings held by many Indians who had become American citizens. The Muscogee (Creek) Nation evolved into a patchwork quilt that combined large tracts of private and communal lands under tribal government authority.  

The reestablishment of Creek Indian tribal government, however, failed to change NPS relations with most tribes. For example, John Ise’s influential 1961 report Our National Park Policy only mentioned American Indians a few times in passing and ignored any discussion of what rights Indians had to shaping NPS policies that impacted their cultural heritage and seized lands. In most cases, prior to 1994, American Indian governments were not consulted by NPS units. Consequently, relations between HOBE and American Indian tribes were limited for decades after the park’s creation. Even when park planners felt that HOBE interpretation needed more Creek Indian perspectives in its exhibits and programs, no recommendation to seek out American Indian consultations followed. 

Museum Exhibit Development

As a park unit created during the Mission 66 program, HOBE entered the national park system during a period when the demand to create new museums and exhibits was high and procedures governing their creation were evolving. The first museum to operate in a national park unit opened in 1904 at Yosemite National Park, twelve years before the National Park Service was established. During the 1920s, NPS park museums were developed on an individual basis by park rangers without any agency-wide guidance or supervision. Museum development at historical parks was slow in part because the National Park Service did not hire its first professional historian until 1931. During the 1930s, the first historic museums in the park service were designed to reproduce historic settings through the display of antique furnishings and rare books. The aesthetic appeal of those displays often outweighed their historical accuracy. The National Park Service tended to put on display objects that were either rare or visually appealing even if they lacked any connection to a park’s history. During the Great Depression, members of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) built new museum buildings in several national parks. NPS museums showed signs of change during the development of Colonial National Historical Park’s Yorktown Battlefield museum. At Yorktown, the National Park Service moved away from cabinets of curiosities displays that had become standard in American museums. Cabinets of curiosities usually consisted of an eclectic array of artifacts placed in large glass cases that lacked any interpretive narrative. The displays showed rare and unusual historical artifacts but
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made little effort to convey any larger meaning to a visitor. At Yorktown, NPS historians, including Elbert Cox, created a series of exhibit displays that told a narrative story about what happened there during the American Revolution. While the exhibit contained an ample number of artifacts from the park’s large museum collection, designers selectively limited the number of total artifacts on display to ensure that the objects did not overwhelm the narrative. In 1935, the National Park Service established the Museum Division of the Branch of Research and Education to oversee the museum development. At that time, museums were placed under the NPS natural history branch. During the 1940s and 1950s, museum funding across the system was slow and usually required direct congressional support. Congress typically saw museums as an ancillary part of the NPS mission. However, during the late 1940s, museum development in the National Park Service underwent substantial changes as a new professional museum discipline emerged.

In 1947, the Region One Office appointed its first museum planning coordinator, Paul Hudson, who played a central role in the development and installation of Manassas National Battlefield Park’s 1949 exhibits. The Manassas exhibits set the standard for subsequent military park museums. According to historian Ralph L. Lewis, “The [Manassas] exhibits exemplified the characteristics of park museums for the next several years. They retained their function as the primary medium introducing visitors to the park’s significance. To underline this purpose, a panel at the entrance to the exhibit stated the prime meaning of Manassas as a historic site. The exhibits proceeded to develop this concept of significance by presenting facts and ideas in a logical sequence that visitors could follow as their time and interest dictated.”60 The Manassas exhibits also transformed historic artifacts into evocative symbols that appealed to a visitor’s emotions. Blending objects with stirring personal accounts and historic photographs combined to build a powerful case for why the battle was significant on both a personal and national level. Large dioramas were built to recreate critical moments in the battle. Dioramas had been used in previous NPS military parks, but after Manassas, their use became widespread. The Manassas exhibit was also the first to employ an electric map that used multi-colored lights to illustrate troop movements across the battlefield. When HOBE began planning its museum exhibits in 1959, the Manassas exhibits had inspired dozens of new exhibits and remained the ideal example of a battlefield park museum.61

HOBE, however, was not a Civil War park that had the benefit of an enormous amount of scholarship prior to the start of its exhibit planning. The National Park Service lacked any experts who had studied either the Creek War or the Creek Indian culture. Most of the experts in American Indian history in the National Park Service were archeologists who were more familiar with earlier periods or different geographical regions. During congressional hearings, the NPS admitted that it lacked any expertise on the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, generally, and Creek Indians in Alabama, specifically. Beyond the National Park Service, a handful of scholars had written histories of southeastern American Indian tribes but most of those studies relied exclusively on non-American Indian source material to depict Creek Indian culture. At this time, the National Park Service did not produce historical context reports on specialized topics
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such as the War of 1812 that might have assisted HOBE staff to learn more about the many facets of the park’s history. While Superintendent Johnson was a War of 1812 expert, he struggled to identify period weapons and flags and, like others, knew little about the battle’s soldiers both American and American Indian. The need for additional park-specific research hampered HOBE’s early development.62

From the start, HOBE staff knew that the park lacked any museum collections that could be used to develop visitor center exhibits. Many aspects of the park’s developing Master Plan were predicated upon the acquisition of collections that were still in the process of being identified and acquired. The lack of artifacts associated with the Battle of Horseshoe Bend made exhibit planning difficult and created doubts over whether the park should have a museum. Most Mission 66 visitor centers had museums or extensive exhibits. Mission 66 new construction necessitated the creation of numerous new exhibits. The demand for new exhibits taxed the limited resources of the NPS Branch of Museum Development (BMD). BMD leaders urged Mission 66 park planners to consider limiting the addition of museums in new parks to those parks that possessed significant museum collections that needed conservation. The lack of any extensive museum collections jeopardized the HOBE museum’s development. Ultimately, the BMD approved HOBE’s museum development plans contingent upon the acquisition of artifacts. The National Park Service had to cast a broad net to gather other materials from private collectors and public museums to display since locals and farmers had systematically removed artifacts uncovered at the site through the years. The National Park Service sought out artifacts that could provide a record of Creek Indian culture and occupation of the area as well as items connected to the battle. Once items were located, the NPS Branch of Museum Development evaluated each artifact to determine whether it was authentic. Only artifacts approved by the NPS Branch of Museum Development could be installed in NPS exhibits. The BMO also assisted parks with locating period-appropriate reproductions of artifacts. The bulk of HOBE’s exhibits would consist of BMD-approved reproductions.63

Dr. Charles Fairbanks’ 1960 archeological excavations recovered some artifacts, including pottery sherds, the cock of a flintlock musket, glass beads, porcelain china, musket balls, iron nails, stone projectiles, pipe stems, and animal bones. Most of the items were recovered at the Newyaucau site. Fairbanks failed to recover evidence of American Indian housing or remnants of the log barricade. He also gathered a small number of items left behind by the American army. After recording data for each item at his lab at Florida State University, Fairbanks returned the artifacts to HOBE.64

The National Park Service hoped that Fairbanks could help them locate additional Creek Indian artifacts held in other museums that could be donated to HOBE. Joseph F. Winkler, Staff Curator, Branch of Museums, National Park Service, provided Fairbanks with a list of desired “specimens” that would benefit HOBE. The list included various types of war clubs (atássa), tomahawk, bow and arrow, notched type war club, scalping knife, and tortoise shell rattle.
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Winkler also hoped that Fairbanks could provide the National Park Service a list of materials that would have been used to fashion the “Red Stick Warrior’s war regalia.” The museum planned to include mannequins depicting clothing worn by Red Stick Warriors and American soldiers.\(^{65}\)

Superintendent Johnson and Jack Coley asked ADAH Director Peter Brannon to donate duplicative items in his archives’ massive American Indian collection to HOBE. Many of these items had been collected at Horseshoe Bend decades earlier by members of the Alabama Anthropological Society. Brannon, a lifelong HOBE advocate, agreed to donate several items and to use his statewide connections to contact collectors who might also be willing to give portions of their collections to HOBE. When the National Park Service received a collection of beads and projectiles from Brannon, they determined that none of the items represented Creek Indian society and would be inappropriate to display. The National Park Service warned Superintendent Johnson that Brannon seemed unaware that most of his extensive American Indian collection predated Creek society by centuries.\(^{66}\)

Red Stick war clubs were the most desired items for the museum. No war club used at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend has been discovered. In 1959, the National Park Service, HOBE, and their scholarly consultants were uncertain if Creek war clubs had been recovered elsewhere. They were confident that somewhere a museum collection existed that contained duplicate war clubs that might be donated for display at HOBE. NPS officials initially found it hard to believe that Region One Archeologist John W. Griffin was unaware of any existing war clubs. In the early 1960s, the Region One archeologist was stationed at Castillo San Marcos National Monument in St. Augustine, Florida. HOBE planners were disappointed and surprised when Griffin combed through the region’s archeological collection only to discover that it did not possess a war club.\(^{67}\)

The National Park Service hoped that Charles Fairbanks might uncover some war club remains during his excavations. He failed to do so. HOBE then reached out to ADAH to see if they had any war clubs in their collection. Brannon told them that he doubted seriously if war clubs had ever existed. He argued that war clubs were stone axes and hammers that had been grooved to fit a wooden handle. ADAH owned a number of grooved stone objects that fit Brannon’s description. He offered to supply HOBE with some examples and recommended that the park recreate the wooden handles. The NPS Branch of Museums rejected Brannon’s theory. They told HOBE that they would rely on Fairbanks’ descriptions of Creek war clubs in planning to reproduce these items. Fairbanks reported to the National Park Service that Creek war clubs resembled the stock of a rifle. Although National Park Service reproduced a war club based on Fairbanks’ description, the agency continued to search for a historic war club for decades following HOBE’s opening.\(^{68}\)

---
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In addition to exhibits on Creek Indian warfare and weaponry, the National Park Service also sought to interpret Creek Indian culture and daily life. HOBE acquired stone farm tools that American Indians would have used from Ocmulgee National Monument. HOBE also received a collection of dried October Beans, Butter Beans, and Leather Britches from a North Carolina botanist. Artists were hired to create sketches depicting scenes from Creek villages and agricultural fields.69

Other exhibits analyzed the role that Creek Indian beliefs and ceremonial practices played in the Creek War. The National Park Service tried in vain to locate a set of Creek Indian leg rattles that would have been used in various tribal ceremonies. After failing to locate any within existing park service collections, HOBE managed to find a set held by collector G.D. Pope. Pope had loaned the rattles to the Museum of the American Indian in New York where they had been on display for several years. Pope had wished that he could one day trade the rattles for other American Indian artifacts that he considered more valuable. Meanwhile, Pope agreed to loan the rattles to the National Park Service temporarily so that reproductions could be made to be displayed at HOBE. The Museum of the American Indian mailed the rattles to the NPS Museum Branch in Washington, D.C., where the reproductions were made and forwarded to HOBE.70

During their search for Creek Indian artifacts, the National Park Service contacted dozens of museums and private collectors. According to available records, however, the National Park Service did not contact Creek Indian representatives in Oklahoma or in Alabama during the exhibit’s development. Curators treated Creek Indian culture as something that had died because of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. The failure to seek the assistance of contemporary Creek Indians limited the curators’ ability to locate potential artifacts and to understand the proper context of the native items they chose to display. The absence of Creek Indian voices or contemporary objects in the exhibit, however, failed to concern the National Park Service.71

HOBE’s Master Plan identified the decisive American military victory over hostile Red Stick Creek Indians as the central theme of HOBE interpretation. To convey that story to visitor, curators needed to acquire an extensive collection of War of 1812-era American weapons and accouterments. Firearms were a top priority. Unfortunately, perhaps the most famous firearm associated with the battle, the pistol that Colonel Lemuel Montgomery was carrying when he was killed during the initial American assault on the log barricade, had already been donated to the Smithsonian Institution and put on display at the Museum of American History in Washington, D.C. The Smithsonian declined loaning the pistol to HOBE. The Tennessee State Museum in Nashville held a large collection of Andrew Jackson and Tennessee militia artifacts. The museum had actively collected Creek War artifacts for decades. These existing collections made it difficult for the National Park Service to acquire Creek War artifacts.72
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The National Park Service wanted to display several muskets and rifles used by the American coalition army at Horseshoe Bend. Curators arranged to purchase several historic weapons from noted New York City collector Robert Abels. Previously, Abels had sold several antique firearms to the National Park Service. HOBE exhibit curators asked Abels to provide an 1808 National Armory musket, a Third Model Brown Bess musket, and an officer’s sword. They also asked Abels to provide a Kentucky Long Rifle for the exhibit.73

In the late 1950s, W. H. Brantley, a local historian who had penned a history of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, presented Jack Coley with a rifle that he believed had been used in the battle by High-head Jim, a prominent Red Stick leader. Coley eagerly accepted Brantley’s gift in anticipation of displaying the musket at the HOBE visitor center. In 1961, HOBE Superintendent Johnson sent the rifle to the NPS Branch of Museums in Washington, D.C., to be authenticated. Initially, curators intended to display the weapon as part of HOBE visitor center exhibit number seven—a display that would also include reproduction Creek Indian war clubs and other weapons. Two years later, the National Park Service regretfully informed Coley that the rifle could not have belonged to High-head Jim. Whereas Brantley believed the rifle had been manufactured in the United States in the years immediately prior to the War of 1812, NPS experts determined that it was a German produced smoothbore percussion rifle that had undergone a series of modifications sometime after its 1834 date of manufacture. The High-head Jim rifle was just one example of several supposed Creek War artifacts that were donated to HOBE to be displayed in their museum that originated from a later period. Park supporters were eager to accept potential museum artifacts on behalf of the National Park Service. Rarely did these items possess a clear chain of custody or documented provenance. The NPS Branch of Museums warned Johnson to carefully evaluate local donations to HOBE’s growing museum collection because so many park supporters had collected items that had been falsely attached to persons who fought at Horseshoe Bend. The National Park Service cautioned Johnson that large numbers of American Civil War rifles could be found among Alabama collectors who sometimes misidentified these weapons as modified versions of earlier War of 1812 pieces.74

The centerpiece of HOBE’s museum collection was a custom-made .42 caliber flintlock firearm known as The Whale’s rifle. “The Whale” was a Cherokee soldier, part of the group of Indian allies who served under General John Coffee’s command in the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. After Jackson began his artillery barrage on the Creek log barricade, “The Whale” and two other Cherokees swam across the Tallapoosa River and captured Red Stick canoes. He used the canoes to ferry soldiers across the river. The soldiers were able to enter Tohopeka virtually uncontested and set fire to the village thus drawing Red Stick defenders away from the barricade as Jackson launched a series of frontal assaults. Whale’s actions turned the tide of the battle in Jackson’s favor.75
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Two years after the battle, President James Madison ordered that The Whale be awarded a presentation-grade rifle and medal in recognition of his central role in securing the American victory at Horseshoe Bend. The decorative patch box of the Whale’s rifle carries the inscription: “Presented by J. Madison, President of the U.S., to Whale, the Reward of Signal Valor andHeroism at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, March 1814.” However, The Whale never received the rifle. The first one was lost and a replacement had to be produced. In 1956, this rifle resurfaced and was given to the Alabama Department of Archives and History by Sadie Mitchell Elmore and Dr. Fern Wood Mitchell with instruction to be displayed at HOBE when a museum opened at the site. HOBE received The Whale’s rifle in 1963. ADAH provided HOBE with a custom display case for the rifle. From the start, curators planned to include the rifle as one of the gallery’s 16 exhibits.76

At the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, General Andrew Jackson’s army deployed two cannons atop Gun Hill—a three-pounder and a six-pounder. The cannon had limited effect on the Creek log barricade. The location of the exact cannon used at the battle was unknown. HOBE wanted to acquire at least two cannons to help visitors understand the role that artillery played in the battle. Artillery experts at the National Park Service could neither identify the exact date of construction for these cannons nor the precise style of carriage used to transport the guns during Jackson’s campaign. Experts believed that Jackson’s army had used cannon and carriages that had been produced during the middle of the eighteenth century. A study had been conducted by NPS historians to identify the appropriate artillery used during the Battle of New Orleans. HOBE staff consulted with NPS staff at Chalmette National Historical Park (now Jean Lafitte National Historical Park) to acquire sketches for each cannon. NPS Region One office historians canvased the region’s parks in search of surplus cannon that could be relocated at HOBE. Appropriate surplus cannons were located at Manassas National Battlefield Park and at Castillo de San Marcos National Monument. Unfortunately, because of a lack of funding, HOBE was unable to secure any cannon until December 1965—18 months after the park’s official dedication ceremony.77

The NPS Branch of Museums also tried to acquire the colors of the 39th U.S. Infantry Regiment. After contacting the director of the West Point Museum, the National Park Service learned that it would need to reproduce the flag since the museum did not have a historic flag for this regiment. Two 39th Infantry flags survived the Creek War. The blue national standards for the 39th Infantry is displayed at the U.S. National Infantry Museum in Columbus, Georgia. The second regimental flag is held by a private collector in Tennessee. West Point Museum staff sent HOBE color photographs of the flag so that the National Park Service could create a reproduction. HOBE also wanted to display a reproduction of an American flag that would have been flown during the War of 1812. When HOBE received a reproduction American flag from Branch of Museums experts, they initially thought that a mistake had been made. Falsely believing that the number of stars on the American flag at any given time represented the number of states in the union, HOBE thought that the flag should have eighteen stars rather
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than fifteen. Branch of Museums Chief Ralph H. Lewis told HOBE that between 1795 and 1818 the American flag had 15 stars and 15 stripes even though the nation had grown to include 18 states.78

Exhibit plans called for the reproduction of numerous historic images found in collections nationwide. The National Park Service and HOBE did not have a repository of War of 1812 visual materials and had to rely heavily on assistance from archivists to gather the images needed to fabricate the exhibit. Harriet Owsley, Tennessee State Library and Archives director and editor of the Andrew Jackson papers, provided HOBE with substantial support, sharing her extensive knowledge of illustrations and maps related to Andrew Jackson and the Creek War. She provided HOBE with photographic copies of various portraits of prominent Tennesseans who fought at Horseshoe Bend including Jackson, Lemuel Montgomery, and Sam Houston. Owsley used her extensive knowledge of the Tennessee State Library and Archives military collections to identify and copy several important historical documents that shed light on the battle. Owsley also placed the National Park Service in contact with Tennessee Historical Society Director Robert T. Quarles who provided a negative photograph of Jackson’s 1814 map of the Horseshoe Bend Battlefield. Owsley’s eagerness to share information formed the core of HOBE’s early park research files and benefitted the park’s 1964 exhibits.79

Throughout the exhibit planning process, Superintendent Clarence Johnson urged the National Park Service to incorporate some interactive elements into the exhibits. Primarily, Johnson advocated for the creation of an electric map that would allow visitors to push buttons to highlight various major moments in the battle as well as listen to brief audio recordings depicting these events. In the early 1940s, the National Park Service developed its first electric maps for Vicksburg National Military Park and Tumacacori National Monument. One decade later, the National Park Service developed the first push button interactive maps like the one installed at HOBE. Tourists also enjoyed electric maps found at a number of Civil War museums such as those in Chattanooga and at Stone Mountain Park near Atlanta, Georgia.

Johnson pushed for the electric map because he knew that the park budget was not going to be able to cover either the cost of producing an orientation film or developing a theater that could introduce visitors to the park using an entertaining audiovisual program. Without the film or theater, Johnson hoped that locating an interactive electric map in the exhibition area would encourage visitors to explore the battle’s history. The map, however, would be expensive to produce and involved the creation of several highly specialized parts that would be difficult for HOBE staff to service, repair, or replace. Region One Director Elbert Cox opposed Johnson’s electric map proposal citing that “we are not sold on the effectiveness of complex electric maps that involve push buttons and written text.” Cox and others worried that HOBE’s rural setting and great distance from the Region One office in Richmond, Virginia, would make it difficult to provide the routine technical support needed to maintain the electric map. Cox believed that the map would break down frequently and remain inoperable for months at a time. The regional director also expressed concerns that installing an electric map in the main exhibit area
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would “create a bottleneck that might impede visitor movement throughout the exhibit.” Map audio would also distract other visitors who were exploring the gallery. Johnson’s support for the map never wavered. He developed plans to place the map in an alcove that would not impede visitor traffic. He also had designers add several handheld telephone receivers to the map that visitors could use to listen to the audio programs without disturbing other patrons. Johnson’s adamant support for the electric map ensured its continued inclusion in HOBE’s exhibit plan.80

In addition to an electric map, HOBE and the NPS Branch of Museum staff recommended the creation of one or two dioramas that would depict significant moments related to the battle’s history and be included among other visitor center exhibits. Two proposals were debated among NPS staff. One recommended that the diorama should depict the scene of General Andrew Jackson accepting the Creek Indian surrender at Fort Jackson. Supporters of this proposal argued that this scene would help visitors better understand the Battle of Horseshoe Bend’s immediate consequences. The second proposal recommended that the diorama depict the scene of American soldiers assaulting the Creek Indian log barricade. Johnson supported this plan because HOBE lacked funding needed to recreate the log barricade. Without a three-dimensional model of the barricade, Johnson worried that visitors would not be able to grasp the structure’s form and the role that it had played in the battle. The barricade diorama would depict a gruesome scene of Creek Indian resistance to the successful American assault. The proposed scene would not focus on the battle’s major leaders, as most of the visitor center exhibits did, but rather attempt to portray the intense struggle that ensued as soldiers and warriors clashed along the Tallapoosa River. The National Park Service agreed to reproduce the scene at the Creek Indian log barricade.81

Despite the great enthusiasm shown toward creating the diorama by HOBE and Branch of Museum staff, Region One Director Elbert Cox tried to dissuade curators from including any dioramas in the exhibit. Cox told Johnson “We are cool to dioramas . . . because of their high cost and few subjects lend themselves to this treatment.” The NPS Eastern Museum Laboratory in Washington, D.C., was responsible for fabricating dioramas for individual park units. The lab had a specialized team of historians and modelers who devoted their full attention to developing dioramas. In the early 1960s, the lab created more than a dozen dioramas that depicted various American Revolution and Civil War battle scenes that were installed at parks in Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia. Diorama fabrication was expensive and time consuming. Some dioramas cost several thousand dollars and required more than a year to prepare. Extensive research had to be conducted to ensure that every detail portrayed in the diorama matched the available historical record. Cox likely believed that HOBE lacked enough information to adequately recreate the log barricade. Archeological and historical investigations had failed to produce a definitive account of the barricade. HOBE had requested future funds to continue studying the barricade. Perhaps, Cox believed that the National Park Service should wait to produce a diorama of the barricade until a definitive description of the resource could be produced. Despite Cox’s initial opposition, Johnson remained steadfast in his support for the
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diorama. He successfully convinced Cox that the diorama would be a central part of HOBE interpretation. According to Johnson, the visitor experience at HOBE would be greatly enhanced by the inclusion of the proposed diorama.82

**Sesquicentennial and Visitor Center Dedication Ceremony**

Since HOBE’s creation in 1959, much of the park’s efforts had been focused on the planned March 27, 1964, dedication and battle sesquicentennial program. While the park had been open to visitors since 1959, HOBE staff considered the program to be the park’s official opening and wanted to make a great impression upon the public. Between 1959 and 1964, numerous decisions were made that prioritized the needs for the upcoming program over items that could be postponed until after the ceremony. For example, in late 1963, Clarence Johnson delayed clearing vegetation in many public areas of the park because the work could not be completed before the program and he did not want visitors to see any unfinished or ongoing projects during the ceremony. Johnson wanted the park to be free of construction or work crews for the period immediately before and after the program. Likewise, funds for the development of interpretive shelters and wayside and visitor center exhibits were routinely delayed or reallocated because the construction of the visitor center was Johnson’s foremost priority. During visitor center construction, there were a number of costs that added to the project’s original estimates. Each of those new costs led to the postponement of other projects across the park.83

NPS exhibit curators and HOBE staff hoped to complete the park’s exhibits in time for the March 27, 1964, sesquicentennial and park dedication event. Johnson and Coley spent years developing that event’s program. Funding problems, however, forced Johnson to scale back public expectations for the dedication event. Originally, Johnson wanted to have all park infrastructure completed before the ceremony: visitor center, tour road, interpretive shelters, wayside exhibits, and visitor center exhibits. By 1961, Johnson had to concede that the park loop road and wayside exhibits would not be completed before March 27, 1964. By January 1964, Johnson knew that several of the visitor center exhibits, including the electric battle map and log barricade diorama, would not be installed in time for the ceremony. The NPS Region One had several ongoing construction projects at new or existing park units that forced leaders to reallocate funds elsewhere that might have been intended for HOBE. Parks located in heavy tourism areas such as Virginia and Florida that could expect high visitation tended to receive top funding priority over less attended parks such as HOBE. HOBE also lacked substantial local partners willing to supplement NPS funds to help the park realize its initial plans. The State of Alabama had already provided $250,000 to assist with the acquisition of park land and other pre-park administrative needs. When the land was donated to the federal government, the agreement stipulated that Alabama would not be required to provide additional financial assistance to aid with the park’s development.84

---
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Despite Clarence Johnson’s efforts to liaison with state and local governments to mobilize financial support for HOBE’s development, those funds never materialized. Once the National Park Service assumed control of HOBE, local sponsors believed that it was the federal government’s responsibility to develop the park. HOBE’s development came at a time when Alabama’s relationship with the federal government and the Kennedy and Johnson administrations was especially strained because of the latter’s perceived support for the Civil Rights Movement. The early 1960s were a turbulent time in Alabama history filled with numerous conflicts over the future of racial segregation and questions concerning state supremacy. In May 1961, as HOBE staff debated whether dioramas should be used in the park’s museum, a group of Alabama Ku Klux Klan members, with the assistance of the state and local law enforcement, bombed a bus filled with protestors outside of Anniston. In the weeks that followed, further white on black violence spread in Birmingham and Montgomery as state leaders labeled civil rights protestors as communist radicals. This bloodshed occurred during Governor John Patterson’s administration who just a few years earlier had signed the state legislation needed to provide state funds to acquire HOBE lands. In June 1963, as HOBE planners continued efforts to secure additional funds for their proposed projects, Alabama Governor George Wallace made his infamous stand in the schoolhouse door to protest the racial integration of the University of Alabama.85

Alabama Congressman Albert Rains remained a vocal HOBE advocate in Washington and emerged as a prominent leader in the early efforts that would lead to the passage of the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act. Rains, a staunch supporter of racial segregation, devoted most of his time in Washington to lobbying national elected leaders to help Alabama resist changes resulting from the Civil Rights Movement. Letters exchanged between Rains and Jack Coley during the early 1960s are filled with references to their shared opposition to the Civil Rights Movement.86

For unknown reasons, park supporters such as Coley refrained from requesting additional donations be made to support the park from either the Alabama Power Company or Russell Manufacturing. Both companies continued to support several local initiatives during this period but neither company offered the National Park Service any funds to assist with park planning. After the National Park Service assumed ownership of Horseshoe Bend in 1959, local supporters believed that it was the federal government’s responsibility to provide financial support for park operations. Locals failed to see a role that they could play in helping HOBE staff raise state and local funds to make up for the inadequate support the park received from the federal government. Park supporters were far more interested in locating potential artifacts that could be displayed at the park museum or building new nearby county parks that also interpreted events of the Creek War than organizing HOBE fundraising campaigns. Although relations between HOBE staff and local park advocates remained friendly, this relationship
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failed to produce a long-term working partnership that could advocate on behalf of the park. After 1959, the National Park Service became less interested in what local advocates envisioned at HOBE. The National Park Service failed to consult or seek advice from local partners concerning park interpretation, exhibits, facilities, and staffing. As HOBE fell under the control of park service professionals who had advanced training and extensive experience in dealing with these matters, the role that local partners played in the park’s development and operations decreased.87

On Good Friday, March 27, 1964, HOBE commemorated the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend by organizing an elaborate ceremony that also marked the opening of the park’s visitor center (figure 3.6). The well-attended event had been carefully organized by Superintendent Johnson and Jack Coley. The Alexander City Chamber of Commerce created a special Horseshoe Bend committee to promote the event. Elected officials from across Alabama were invited to attend. The program platform included Johnson, Elbert Cox, Congressman Albert Rains, Thomas W. Martin, Governor George C. Wallace, and Thomas D. Russell.
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Representatives of the Eastern Band of the Cherokee Indians and Poarch Creek Band of Creek Indians also attended the ceremony. Unfortunately, Johnson was unable to attend the ceremony because of illness. In the weeks leading up to the visitor center dedication, Johnson had fallen ill and had turned over many of his superintendent duties to Acting Superintendent E.J. Pratt. Governor Wallace also missed the ceremony. At that time, Wallace was seeking the Democratic Party’s nomination to be President of the United States. Following a campaign event in Wisconsin, heavy snowstorms had grounded Wallace’s scheduled return flight to Alabama. Wallace sent staff member Luther Little to attend the event and offer the crowd his apologies for missing this historic occasion.88

The sesquicentennial ceremony provides a lens through which historians can analyze how the National Park Service and park supporters interpreted the Battle of Horseshoe Bend’s meaning in 1964. Many of these public expressions mirrored HOBE interpretation found in the newly opened visitor center museum. One of several themes found throughout early park interpretation was the idea that the Battle of Horseshoe Bend had initiated a new era of civilization in Alabama. The program’s opening prayer, delivered by Dr. Denson N. Franklin, pastor of First Methodist Church of Birmingham, declared that the Battle of Horseshoe Bend had “pushed back the tides of superstition and brought to this area of our nation a new freedom and a new opportunity for development. On this spot blood was shed to save men from darkness of savagery, and their minds were opened to the light of democracy. . . . Keep us ever conscious of the price which has been paid for our liberty.” Thomas W. Martin proclaimed that the Battle of Horseshoe Bend “helped the nation at a vital and important time to re-establish its sense of identity and purpose to become earth’s great place in earth’s great time.”89

Another interpretive theme found throughout both the 150th anniversary program and HOBE exhibits was the notion that the past heroic actions of those who fought at Horseshoe Bend could inspire modern Americans to work to improve the nation’s future. NPS Southeast Region Director Elbert Cox told the exclusively white audience that Americans needed national parks because “he wants . . . to know the history of his country, to appreciate the gifts of statesmanship, heroism, and sacrifice that together form the image of America today. . . . [NPS] believes a man ought to be inspired by the acts of his father and his grandfather so that he can chart his tomorrows in wisdom drawn from the past. What better way for Americans to learn of their past than to visit the places where history was made as here at Horseshoe Bend?” Cox concluded his remarks by declaring that Horseshoe Bend held “special meaning for those who cherish the American heritage of liberty and freedom.”90

Many speakers reflected on Horseshoe Bend’s role in the rise of “immortal” General Andrew Jackson to the national scene, a theme also found throughout HOBE interpretation. Cox saw Horseshoe Bend as a key link in a chain of events that extended from Tennessee’s response to the Fort Mims Massacre to the American victory over British forces at New Orleans. “The great
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Jackson success story,” Cox declared, helped transform the independence gained during the American Revolution into an “American Nation.” Thomas W. Martin also extolled Jackson’s virtues. Martin quoted former Alabama Governor Braxton Bragg Comer who decades earlier had said that Jackson “was the embodiment of the true spirit of the nation in which he lived. . . . He put himself at the head of the great movement of the age in which he lived.” Martin described Jackson as a man “born to command and destined to rise” who through “the interposition of Providence” became a “worthy instrument of heaven’s merciful designs.” It was Jackson, Martin reiterated, who determined “that this country would be American and not Indian nor British.”

Several speakers highlighted another one of HOBE’s interpretive themes—the Creek War served as an incubator that nurtured the rise of a new generation of American frontier leaders. Men such as Sam Houston and Davey Crockett (who did not fight at Horseshoe Bend) epitomized a frontier spirit that had spread among thousands of white settlers who came to Alabama before, during, and after the Creek War. Missing from the celebration of the frontier character that had conquered the American Indian and expanded the nation’s borders was a sincere effort to question the motivations of these settlers or any suggestion of how these settlers were connected to broader themes of westward expansion in American history. The land hungry white settler who saw Creek Indians as a moveable obstacle in their pursuit of opportunity was noticeably absent from the public discourse. The role that slavery and the expansion of the cotton South had played in pushing an army largely comprised of poor white Tennessee volunteers deep into Creek Indian country was also left unexplored. Analysis of how the expansion of freedom and opportunity for white settlers came at the expense of American Indians and black slaves was also omitted from all interpretation. Both the National Park Service and HOBE supporters cast men such as Jackson, Houston, and Crockett as defenders of American freedom and opportunity rather than as invaders seeking to use the Creek Civil War to claim millions of acres of land.

A small contingent of American Indians observed the ceremony among an otherwise all white audience. Jack Coley told visitors that no ceremony marking the battle’s anniversary would be complete without “Red Stick” representatives taking part in the commemorations. However, the American Indians present that day were descendants of Creek Indians who had served in Jackson’s army. At that point in the ceremony, Coley asked Chief Calvin McGhee, Poarch Band of Creek Indians, to stand to be recognized by the crowd. McGhee attended the event in the hopes of furthering his efforts to gain federal recognition for his tribe. Richard Crow, a member of the Eastern Band of the Cherokee Indians and a descendant of a Cherokee warrior who served under Jackson at Horseshoe Bend, was invited to give some brief remarks. He offered Thomas W. Martin a historic ceremonial peace pipe—that he claimed originated from the War of 1812—as a symbol of his people’s appreciation for what Martin and others had done to create HOBE. While Coley and others likely believed that McGhee and Crow represented the “Red Stick” perspective of what happened at Horseshoe Bend, both men’s ancestors had fought alongside Jackson during the battle. No record exists of any effort on the part of National Park Service or park advocates to invite representatives from the Muscogee (Creek) Nation in
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Oklahoma to join the ceremony. The event continued a long tradition of failing to provide opportunities for Creek people to voice their perspective. Without those voices, interpretation at HOBE remained unbalanced and overwhelmingly celebratory of the perceived advances of white civilization.93

Red Stick voices were not the only perspectives missing from both the ceremony and HOBE exhibits. Despite evidence to the contrary, park supporters continued to tout the Battle of Horseshoe Bend’s supposed influence on the Treaty of Ghent. NPS historians and academic consultants had debunked such notions shortly after the park’s creation in 1959. Yet both amateur historians such as Coley and Martin and NPS curators continued to suggest a possible connection to link the battle more closely to the War of 1812’s legacy. Although the War of 1812 held a far smaller place in American memory compared to other national military conflicts, the war cast a larger shadow than the relatively unknown Creek War. HOBE’s future place within national memory and in the expanding National Park Service relied somewhat on its connection to Andrew Jackson and promoting the idea that the American defeat of the British in the War of 1812 had reaffirmed the gains a prior generation of American patriots had won during the American Revolution. With the 150th anniversary ceremony and visitor center dedication complete a new generation of HOBE staff sought out strategies to improve the existing interpretation.

Conclusion

For longtime park advocates such as Jack Coley and Thomas Martin, HOBE’s dedication ceremony was a climactic moment that validated their extensive efforts to create a national park unit in Alabama. The park’s official opening came as a relief to HOBE staff who had worked tirelessly for five years to prepare for this moment. Creating HOBE was a herculean task that required park leaders to become expert construction project supervisors and facilities managers. Superintendent Clarence Johnson was the central figure in HOBE’s development. His prior experience in San Juan and Jefferson National had provided him with prior construction management experience. In San Juan, Johnson had built that unit’s interpretive programs from the ground up. In 1959, Johnson arrived at HOBE well prepared to build a new park unit from scratch. Unfortunately, declining health forced Johnson to step aside in the months prior to the park’s dedication. Nonetheless, his fingerprints can be found all over HOBE’s early years.

Between 1959 and 1964, HOBE successfully built the bulk of the infrastructure that continues to serve the park today. As part of the successful Mission 66 initiative, HOBE benefitted from the expertise of a broad array of NPS professionals who made every effort to ensure that this new park benefitted from experiences gleaned from older units. Staffed exclusively by cultural resource trained professionals, the park’s historians largely ignored HOBE’s natural history and struggled at times to manage those resources. Placed under the care of NPS staff, HOBE’s public advocates slowly retreated into the background as they transitioned from park leaders to advisers. From the start, park officials recognized that they were dealing with a history and
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culture that they did not fully understand. Efforts to learn more about the Battle of Horseshoe Bend and Creek Indian culture began in earnest but failed to materialize in time to influence initial interpretive programs. HOBE staff anticipated the discovery of new information that might move the park away from its Andrew Jackson centered narrative—a change that might place the park into a broader context of early American and American Indian history. Once the park dedication ceremony ended, HOBE staff resumed their efforts to complete various construction projects and improve existing interpretive programs for the benefit of future generations of Americans.
Chapter 4:
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This page intentionally blank.
CHAPTER FOUR
PARK ADMINISTRATION, 1964–1970

Introduction

Horseshoe Bend National Military Park entered the National Park Service during a period of tremendous change within that agency’s history. After the successful park dedication ceremony, Horseshoe Bend National Military Park staff worked diligently to complete many of the projects that had been postponed. Between April 1964 and March 1970, the park completed its visitor center exhibits, interpretive shelters, wayside exhibits, recreation areas, and began to address several pressing natural resource concerns. Most of the funds used to develop HOBE came from the Mission 66 program. The Mission 66 program forced the National Park Service to reorganize to meet the needs of its parks during this period of rapid expansion and improvement. Across the board, NPS personnel became more specialized in their training. This new expertise led many within the agency to question past practices. Because of the park’s association with the Mission 66 program, HOBE, like many parks created during this period, became a place where the National Park Service could experiment with new ideas. Most notably, HOBE’s visitor center exhibits and tour road wayside programs reflected changing practices across the National Park Service that had been introduced because of the Mission 66 initiative. The new park continued efforts to establish strong ties to the local community, especially in the area’s public schools. Staffing dropped slightly following the park dedication ceremony to five full-time employees and four seasonal park aids and volunteers. Park visitation remained consistent between 1964 and 1970. About 24,000 visitors came to the park each year. After working under tight deadlines for years ahead of the park dedication, life at HOBE assumed a new pace that allowed more time to think deeply about how they could improve the park’s resource management and education programs. During the late 1960s, the park avoided any major problems that might have disrupted its daily operations. Park funding remained stable, visitation steady, and local support for the park appeared to be growing beyond the original park advocates. In 1964, HOBE finalized its visitor center exhibits, installed wayside exhibits, and completed several interpretive shelters along the tour road. This period established a normal routine and stability at the park that carried over for decades.

Park Staffing and Programs

In the months that followed the March 27, 1964, visitor center dedication ceremony, Superintendent Clarence Johnson retired from the National Park Service citing mounting health problems. Since February 1964, Johnson had spent little time at the park. At that time, E.J. Pratt, a veteran park service historian, had served as the park’s acting superintendent. On November 29, 1964, E.J. Pratt became HOBE’s second park superintendent. Pratt’s park service career began in 1942 at Fort Donelson National Military Park in Tennessee. Trained as a historian, Pratt enjoyed studying the history of the American Civil War and was a frequent invited speaker at various historical societies and heritage associations. In 1950, Pratt was promoted to superintendent at Fort Donelson where he remained until 1961 when he was transferred to Fort Sumter National Monument in South Carolina. Pratt became superintendent
at Fort Sumter weeks before the park commemorated the centennial anniversary of the start of the Civil War. Huge crowds attended those programs. After the centennial program passed, Pratt supervised the display of several new Civil War era battle flags at the park’s museum. When HOBE Superintendent Clarence Johnson fell ill in February 1964, Southeast Region Director Elbert Cox asked Pratt to accept an acting superintendent post at Horseshoe Bend to ensure that plans for the park’s dedication ceremony went as planned. Cox accepted the move and was appointed HOBE superintendent eight months later. He would remain at HOBE until November of 1967.

Between 1964 and 1970, HOBE’s staff typically consisted of five full-time employees: Superintendent, Chief Historian, Park Ranger, Administrative Assistant, and Maintenance Foreman. During the busier summer months, HOBE usually hired at least four part-time staffers: three maintenance staff that included an experienced tractor operator and one temporary employee to help operate the visitor center. All of the park’s NPS trained employees came from a cultural resources background. Most had previously worked at NPS Civil War units or had prior military history expertise. The park also lacked any law enforcement trained rangers or additional full-time maintenance staff. Park staff, especially the superintendent, had to regularly help the full-time maintenance foreman complete tasks that required additional hands. The park also hired numerous community day laborers to assist with various maintenance chores. The park developed a small pool of temporary help that could be called upon for brief periods of employment. With only two park housing units, many staff had to live in neighboring towns, especially those with families with children. Housing options near the park were nonexistent. The only houses for rent or sale in the area tended to be in either Dadeville or Alexander City. Some employees complained about the commute to and from town and the park. During winter months, when the nightfall coincided with the park’s standard closing time, the rural roads from the park were dark, isolated, and often infested with deer. Driving to and from the park might take thirty or more minutes. A few of the park historians, such as Glenn Hinsdale, earned extra money by teaching college-level history courses at Southern Union State Junior College in Opelika. Since they taught at night, many of those park ranger instructors chose to live in Opelika, forty-five minutes south of HOBE.

On March 26, 1965, HOBE held its second battle anniversary program. The previous year had hosted the largest crowd in park history and included the official park dedication ceremony. The 1966 event was significantly smaller and less attended but established an annual program that continues today. The 1966 program showed some signs of HOBE’s efforts to incorporate more American Indian voices into their park’s public programs. Although the park did not extend any invitation or communicate with the Muscogee (Creek) Nation in Oklahoma, they did locate several men and women in the region who identified themselves as Creek Indians to

1. In 1962, the National Park Service renamed the Region One Office. The new Southeast Region Office would remain in Richmond, Virginia, until January 9, 1972.
perform various living history demonstrations. The living history program consisted of samples of Creek Indian ceremonial dances, basketry, and village life. A conversation between HOBE Chief Historian Glenn Hinsdale, dressed as a U.S. soldier, and a Creek man, dressed as a Red Stick warrior, was the highlight of that year’s event. While a handful of longtime park supporters attended the event, such as Jack Coley, the program did not include any state elected officials. Coley’s speech took the opportunity to mourn the passing of Thomas W. Martin, who had died in Birmingham on December 8, 1964. Coley reminded the small crowd that without Martin’s leadership and use of Alabama Power Company resources, HOBE would not have been created. Generally, the entire program had a solemn tone that not only recognized Martin’s death but paused to reflect on the enormous loss of life that took place on this site on March 27, 1814. Unlike the previous year’s event, the program made an effort to cast a better light upon the memory of those Red Stick warriors who died defending their homes and families.4

Between 1964 and 1970, HOBE offered a consistent menu of public programs. The most common program was an antique weapons demonstration led by the park’s chief historian. Living history programs were uncommon in national parks prior to the 1960s. Weapons demonstrations first appeared in the park service at Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park and Antietam National Battlefield Site in 1961. By 1968, many military-themed parks recreated campsites and surgeon’s quarters as part of their new living history programs. Although these programs were popular among visitors, some NPS staff and observers worried that these uniformed demonstrations failed to convey the solemn history associated with battlefield parks. The National Park Service did not develop systemwide guidelines for living history programs until 1980’s Interpretation Guidelines. Many living history programs developed during the 1960s and 1970s were filled with historical inaccuracies, period inappropriate materials and commentary, and culturally insensitive presentations.5

HOBE was among the first NPS units to dress interpreters in period uniforms during weapons demonstrations. Park supporters had donated a replica Model 1795 .69 calibre U.S. smoothbore musket—the same model used by many of the Tennessee militia who fought at Horseshoe Bend. After providing the crowd with a brief explanation of a soldier’s life in the Creek War, the chief historian would load and fire a blank round to demonstrate the weapon’s loud recoil. This popular program was held twice on Saturdays and once on Sundays and whenever the park received large tour or student groups. Park historian Glenn Hinsdale recommended that HOBE find a full-time interpreter who could provide a similar demonstration from the Creek Indian perspective, especially during the busier summer months. Hinsdale apparently contacted members of the Poarch Band of Creek Indians in Alabama for recommendations. Although Creek Indians participated in HOBE’s annual battle anniversary programs throughout the 1960s, the park failed to locate funding to hire a full-time summer seasonal Creek Indian interpreter.6

4. “Horseshoe Bend Ceremony,” The Dadeville Record, 27 March 1965, ADAH; Clinton Jackson Coley, Recollections (Birmingham: Author Published, 1989), 60.
HOBE also hosted an annual open house event in December. During that event, the park extended its normal operating hours allowing local visitors to come to HOBE in the early evening after they had left work. HOBE staff baked cookies and served hot cider and made an effort to be part of the local community. The event was very successful, even if it was not always well attended. News of the program was posted in the local newspapers in the weeks leading up to the event. HOBE staff also participated in local Christmas and July 4th parades.7

In the Fall of 1964, Superintendent Pratt launched a series of school programs that sent HOBE staff out to local students to discuss various historical topics such as Creek Indian culture and Andrew Jackson. Despite its small staff, HOBE averaged about one school program per week between 1964 and 1970. Meanwhile, the park’s official opening launched annual school field trips to the park. Many schools in Tallapoosa, Clay, Randolph, Chambers, and Lee counties made annual trips to HOBE. School trips typically involved a brief program and tour of the park. After spending the morning at HOBE, most schools visited nearby Lake Martin or Martin Dam in the afternoon. Many subsequent HOBE employees who were raised in the area remember going to multiple field trips to Horseshoe Bend as children.8

HOBE’s programs also served numerous state historical and civic organizations. In 1966, the Alabama Historical Association, the state’s largest historical organization, held its 8th annual ramble event at Horseshoe Bend. The event drew a large crowd of historical association members. The park routinely hosted a number of organizations such as the Daughters of the American Revolution, Sons of the Confederate Veterans, Alabama Anthropological Society, and numerous state teachers associations. HOBE staff became regular speakers for all of the organizations. During a single month, park historian Glenn Hinsdale delivered speeches in Huntsville, Mobile, Montgomery, and Atlanta. Groups usually requested that HOBE staff deliver talks on Creek Indian history and culture.9

**Visitor Center Exhibits**

One of Pratt’s first tasks was to finalize the visitor center exhibits. Some of the exhibits had been installed in time for the park dedication program. Others were still in development or awaiting final approval to begin fabrication. In April 1964, the NPS Museum Branch in Washington, D.C., finalized HOBE’s museum exhibits. All of the exhibits were installed by November 1964.

The 1964 visitor center museum gallery contained seventeen exhibits and represented a clear break between the story of Horseshoe Bend as told by the National Park Service and the tale that had been presented by the park’s public advocates.
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1964 HOBE Exhibits

1. Flag of the 1795-1818 Period
2. 1808 Musket and War Club
3. The Southwest of 1812
4. The Creek Indians
5. Land Hungry Newcomers
6. Farmers or Warriors?
7. National Defense Problems in 1814
8. War Flames
9. The Road to the Horseshoe
10. Electric Map
11. The Battle Diorama
12. U.S. 59th Infantry Colors
13. Old Hickory Describes the Battle
14. To the Victor . . .
15. At the Horseshoe
16. The Men and the Arms
17. Within a Day’s Drive

The battle’s connection to the Treaty of Ghent, for example, that had played such a critical part in gaining congressional approval for HOBE was absent from the exhibit label copy. Also, whereas park advocates described the battle as a fight between the civilizing forces of Christianity and a “brave” yet “savage” society of hostile American Indians, the National Park Service avoided casting the battle in such dichotomous “good versus evil” terms. Unfortunately, unlike the story told by park promoters, the National Park Service did not interpret the Battle of Horseshoe Bend as a central event in the development of the state of Alabama. From this perspective, Alabama history, according to men such as Jack Coley and Thomas W. Martin, began at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.¹

The 1964 visitor center museum exhibits reflected the limited understanding that the National Park Service had of the Creek War and the agency’s predilection to build exhibits at battlefield parks that promoted military history narratives at the expense of providing the critical social and cultural context needed to comprehend the war’s causes, execution, and results. The museum’s first exhibit, “Flag of the 1795-1818 Period,” established the tone and perspective for all that followed. Immediately, visitors read that under this replica flag the United States experienced significant westward expansion as Tennessee, Ohio, Louisiana, Indiana, and Mississippi all entered the Union during this period. The exhibit casts the story of Horseshoe Bend as essentially a tale of America’s successful territorial expansion while omitting any mention of the numerous American Indian tribes that were displaced as a result of this “progress.” The label copy foreshadows later exhibits that portrayed the Creek Indians as removable obstacles to American expansion rather than complex agents who played central roles in this expansionist history.²

Creek Indians made their first appearance in the museum’s second exhibit, “1808 Musket and War Club.” The exhibit case contained an 1808 flintlock musket and a replica Creek Indian war club painted red. Rather than display a replica British manufactured musket that Red Stick warriors widely used at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, the National Park Service chose the war club as a representative American Indian weapon used on the battlefield. While war clubs were certainly used in the battle, the exhibit’s label copy fails to mention that Red Stick warriors too had firearms and thus inadvertently portrayed the American Indians as technologically inferior.

¹. Ibid.
². Ibid.
Without providing additional context about Creek Indian customs, the exhibit also led visitors to assume they belonged to a society that was prone to violent conflict.3

“The Southwest of 1812” attempted to provide some context to the causes of the Creek War. The very use of the term “Southwest” as opposed to “Creek Country” revealed the viewpoint espoused. The exhibit displayed an artist rendering of the sparsely settled Spanish town of Pensacola as well as several maps locating other European-American settlements in the American Southeast. Like many historical accounts of westward expansion written before the advent of the scholarly “new western history” school in the 1980s, the exhibit’s label copy suggested that Creek Indians, whose population “never exceeded about 50,000 persons at any one time,” underutilized the arable lands of the American Southeast. The National Park Service depicted white settlement and American Indian land cessions as part of a modernization campaign waged by the American government to transform the poorly managed lands that were in the hands of American Indians into profitable farms and plantations owned by white settlers. The HOBE exhibits, like most scholars of the American West at that time, remained in the long shadow of historian Frederick Jackson Turner’s “Frontier Thesis.” Decades earlier, Turner argued that America’s westward migration had brought out a more perfect form of democracy by providing abundant opportunities for the expansion of personal liberty. Turner, like many historians prior to the 1970s, ignored the fact that the West had been occupied by American Indians for millennia prior to American expansion. If democracy improved for Americans as the nation moved westward, it did so at the expense of American Indian autonomy and security. According to Turner, American Indians had failed to develop the West and thus presented only minor obstacles to the superior American civilization that swept them aside. From this perspective, Americans could avoid having to confront the realities of western expansion that at times bordered on genocide and routinely involved acts of violence and stories of atrocity. If westward expansion had made America a more perfect Union, then the conquering of its native inhabitants had been justified regardless of the means used to achieve this victory. The exhibit perpetuated the myth that Creek Indians did not use the bulk of the territory they claimed and that this lack of productivity excused their subsequent military conquest and removal at the hands of white settlers. The “Land Hungry New Comers” exhibit in the museum further reinforced the misconception that the American Southeast was filled with “virgin land” ready for the white man’s plow.4

“Farmers or Warriors” attempted to contrast the motivations of “friendly” and “hostile” Creek Indians. Here visitors learned that by the eve of the Creek Civil War Creek Indian society had been significantly altered by more than a century of trade and political negotiation with various European and American entities. Scots-Irish traders had settled in Creek country and married Creek women and created large “mixed blood” families whose children were of two worlds: Indian and European. The same trade with Europeans that had introduced metal goods, mass produced textiles, and firearms to Creek society also brought alcohol, foreign debt, and increased numbers of white settlers. Perhaps unintentionally, “Farmers or Warriors” created a false dichotomy that depicted Creek Indians who eventually served alongside General Andrew
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Jackson as more likely to be “farmers” and “traders” and those who eventually became known as Red Sticks as “hostile” and “militant” warriors. Clearly, the exhibit blamed Red Sticks whose “militant behavior,” “prophets,” and “violence” instigated conflict with their white American neighbors. The exhibit titled “War Flames” placed additional blame on the Red Sticks by falsely claiming that “the Creek civil war soon spread to war with the United States.” The HOBE visitor center museum blamed Red Sticks for provoking American forces into taking action.5

The “War Flames” exhibit placed the blame for the American intervention in the Creek Civil War squarely on the shoulders of the Red Sticks who attacked Fort Mims. NPS designers used Alonzo Chappel’s 1858 engraving, “Massacre at Fort Mimms [sic],” as the exhibit’s principal image. Chappel’s engraving, produced more than four decades after the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, promoted the Jacksonian version of what happened at Fort Mims. The engraving depicts generic dark-skinned tomahawk wielding American Indians murdering white skinned soldiers, women, and children. The looming dark skinned “savages” also appear to have sexually assaulted their female victims. Chappel’s engraving reflected how Americans in 1813 and for decades afterwards imagined the gruesome massacre. Chappel, who did not witness the battle firsthand, failed to capture the true racial composition of the fort’s inhabitants. Most of the individuals who sought refuge at Fort Mims were of a mixed race and ethnicity that included American Indian, African, and European bloodlines. These mixed race, bicultural individuals contradicted the Jacksonian version of westward expansion that believed that the subjugation and removal of American Indians allowed white settlers to introduce civilization to a previously uncivilized land. Those fictional images excused the American military invasion of Creek territory and the attempted extermination of the Creek people that followed. The exhibit’s omission of the American ambush of Creek Indians at Burnt Corn Creek, that had occurred several months prior to Fort Mims, further misled visitors to believe that the American Indians had instigated the bloodshed. As scholars Mary-Ellen Cummings and Caroline Gebhard observed following a 1995 visit to the HOBE visitor center museum, the “[War Flames] panel display gave no hint of the complex causes that might have motivated the Red Sticks to turn against their kindred. Implicitly, the exhibit supported Jackson’s views: Fort Mims was proof of Indian perfidy against whites and had to be avenged.”6

The “War Flames” exhibit also included a list and corresponding map of 14 Creek Indian and American military engagements between October 1813 (Fort Mims) and August 1814 (Treaty of Fort Jackson). As Cummings and Gebhard commented, “In 11 of the 14 subsequent attacks listed in small print, the United States was the aggressor. What the list and the map . . . did not convey was the systematic campaign of terror conducted in Creek (Muskogee) territory: three militias, from Tennessee, Georgia, and Mississippi, vastly superior in weaponry, took part, attacking, burning crops and towns, and destroying as much of Muskogee and its people as they possibly could.”7

During the three decades that the 1964 visitor center museum exhibits were displayed, HOBE staff made countless efforts to renovate the existing displays. Despite their repeated efforts,

5. Ibid.
funding for a new exhibit did not materialize until the early 1990s. During the intervening period, HOBE staff worked hard to do the best they could to supplement the existing exhibits with additional park programs that would provide visitors with a more complete, and balanced history of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.8

Shortly after the exhibits were installed, HOBE Park Historian Glenn Hinsdale produced the park’s first interpretive guide. Hinsdale intended the document to serve as a training manual for new staff when preparing to deliver guided tours. The document appeared to be circulated only among HOBE staff. No external review of the document by the Regional Office was conducted. Beyond offering an outline for tours and identifying existing secondary source materials, Hinsdale also commented on what he perceived as some of the park’s interpretive weaknesses. Foremost, Hinsdale questioned whether visitors would be able to grasp the site’s significance without attending park ranger-led programs because the existing exhibits were confusing, incomplete, and assumed that visitors had more prior knowledge about the subject than was realistic. Because of demands placed on staff, Hinsdale lamented that HOBE would likely never be able to provide enough ranger-led programs to meet visitor needs. At that time, the park lacked introductory audiovisual programs (i.e., slide shows, films) and relied entirely on park staff and the exhibits to convey the park’s story and significance. During HOBE’s first decade of operation, only about 30 percent of all park guests saw the visitor center exhibits during their visit. HOBE Park Historian Glenn Hinsdale warned future HOBE staff that most of the “public comes to the Park with only the faintest notions about what our “message” is.” Few high school history courses devoted much attention to the War of 1812, Hinsdale observed. Even fewer, he added, knew anything about the Creek War. Most HOBE visitors, Hinsdale predicted, would spend about twenty minutes in the museum and ignore most of the label copy. The typical visitor would browse the exhibits’ images and artifacts. “The exhibit titles, the diorama, the artifacts, and the electric map,” Hinsdale forecasted, “provide most of the impressionistic acquaintance with the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.” Hinsdale also warned future staff that when the exhibits were being developed “the interpretive load at Horseshoe Bend [had] developed at a much faster pace than has the formal historical research plan.” As new research became available, Hinsdale predicted that many of the park’s original exhibits would contain an increasing number of inaccuracies that would require explanation and revision.9

**Recreational Facilities and Programs**

Recreation was a major part of HOBE’s annual visitation. Hinsdale’s report also noted that many HOBE visitors were disinterested in the park’s history and came to the park to enjoy its visually appealing landscapes and Tallapoosa River access. During the 1960s, the number of recreational facilities and public parks in Tallapoosa County expanded as Lake Martin developed and the Alabama state park system expanded. Increased boat ownership accompanied the rise of automobiles in this region. Numerous locals owned small jon boats that could be towed on a
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small trailer by a small car or truck. Before the park’s creation, locals had used a small sandy landing located near the Highway 49 bridge to launch personal watercraft.

The Tallapoosa River has a 4,675-square mile watershed that extends from Carroll County, Georgia, located 90 miles northeast of HOBE, to Wetumpka, Alabama, where it joins the Coosa River to form the Alabama River. The river contains three types of black bass: largemouth bass, redbreast bass, and Alabama spotted bass, as well as a variety of catfish, bream, darter, studdish, and shiner fish. HOBE is in a thirty-five-mile section of the river known as the Middle Tallapoosa River, which is located below the R.L. Harris Dam and Reservoir in neighboring Clay County. This section of the river is one of the best areas in the region for fishing due to the large numbers of bass and catfish. HOBE’s location on the Tallapoosa River made it an ideal site for recreational activities such as fishing and boating. Approximately, thirteen miles downriver, the Martin Dam impounds the 39,180-acre Lake Martin. At the time of its construction in 1926, Lake Martin was the largest manmade lake in the world. The development of the first state park on Lake Martin coincided with HOBE’s opening. Wind Creek State Park opened in the late 1960s and provided area residents and visitors with greater lake access. The park has hosted more than 100,000 visitors per year since its opening. Lake Martin is among the top fishing destinations in the American southeast, but many sportspeople and leisurely water travelers prefer the quieter flowing waters of the Middle Tallapoosa River to the lake. Demand for recreational activities in Tallapoosa County was on the rise and locals expected HOBE to provide public access to the Tallapoosa River. Superintendents Johnson and Pratt both commented that boaters accounted for a large percentage of the park’s visitation between 1959 and 1964. Many asked HOBE staff when a new boat ramp would be installed. The demand for public river access at HOBE was high.10

From the start of HOBE planning, the National Park Service intended to build a boat ramp adjacent to the Highway 49 bridge downstream from Bean’s Island. During master plan discussions some NPS officials lobbied for the creation of a second boat ramp to be located upstream from the first ramp near the Newyaucau Village site. Plans for the second boat ramp, however, were abandoned because HOBE staff expressed concerns that it would be difficult to monitor.11 HOBE bid out the project during the summer of 1964. Ford Construction Company of Selma, Alabama, won the bid and began construction on October 26, 1964. The boat ramp opened on November 24, 1964. The cost of construction totaled $4,043.76. Thousands of park visitors use the boat ramp annually making it one of HOBE’s most frequented attractions.12

Boat traffic on the Tallapoosa River was light but presented some problems for HOBE staff. The river was difficult to monitor and provided boaters with access to areas of the park that were far removed from the park’s primary visitor areas. Superintendent Pratt was concerned that looters

11. Franklyn Hambly to Regional Director, 17 April 1964, RG 79, D2615 Box49, NARA-College Park.
might use boats to access protected archeological sites such as the Newyaucau village. Pratt and other HOBE staff also worried that boats might be used to transport materials in and out of park land. Illegal whiskey stills, for example, had been found in the region. HOBE staff believed that moonshiners might attempt to operate stills in isolated areas of the park that were not monitored on a regular basis. In the 1960s, HOBE lacked a Law Enforcement Ranger and relied heavily on local game wardens and sheriff’s deputies to help monitor the park. Local law enforcement, for example, were often consulted whenever rangers found anything suspicious in the park such as spent ammunition shells, cigarette butts, empty alcohol bottles, or deer carcasses that had been shot by hunters solely for the harvest of their antlers. Local deputies would spread the word throughout the local community that HOBE was aware of illegal activities in the park in the hopes of scaring off the culprits. Communications between HOBE and local law enforcement agencies was a critical part of their public relations.13

HOBE’s popularity as a recreational space in Tallapoosa County presented numerous challenges to park staff. Most of the park’s property was heavily wooded and isolated. Prior to the park’s development, small roads ran across the property connecting many small farms to main roads. Other roads had been installed to provide logging trucks with access during timber harvesting. The National Park Service restricted public access to these roads and did not identify them on park visitor maps. Park planners maintained these routes because they provided the sole access to many parts of the property. The roads, however, were difficult to monitor and easily accessible. Superintendent Pratt commented that the time required to inspect these roads strained his personnel’s ability to complete other important tasks. HOBE staff frequently encountered signs of human activity along the prohibited roads. Sometimes, hikers would mistakenly believe that these trail-like dirt roads were part of the park’s public trails. HOBE staff believed that teenagers and hunters were the most common trespassers. Teenagers commonly entered the park illegally, held parties or gatherings in the woods, and left behind smoldering fire pits and empty alcohol containers.14

Recreational hunting posed the greatest threat to HOBE. The park allowed a number of recreational activities such as boating, fishing, and hiking, but strictly prohibited hunting. Prior to the park’s creation, deer hunters frequented the property, especially land bordering the Tallapoosa River. East Alabama had a large white tail deer population. For many residents, deer hunting had evolved from a necessary food harvesting activity into a recreational sport. Recreational hunting in America generally expanded following World War II as the growing middle class enjoyed more leisure time and hunted to reconnect with nature. Area hunters were accustomed to hunting on public lands and many large landholders such as Alabama Power Company and timber companies usually tolerated recreational hunting on their property. HOBE had to change the local recreational hunting culture. HOBE coordinated a public relations campaign with area game wardens to inform the public that hunting was prohibited at the park. Wardens also posted fliers in Dadeville and Alexander City businesses. HOBE staff delivered talks about NPS policies to various organizations such as the Rotary Club and

Chapter Four

Camber of Commerce. Pratt posted signs at regular intervals along the park boundary notifying hunters that hunting and firearms were prohibited. Some hunters ignored these notices and believed that HOBE’s small staff was incapable of monitoring the park, especially during the early morning and late evening hours. HOBE staff sometimes encountered hunters during their inspections. When this occurred, rangers confiscated a hunter’s gun and asked them to leave the park. Rangers would then report the incident to the local game warden who would take possession of the confiscated weapon and wait to issue a fine when the hunter came to claim their rifle. Despite their efforts, HOBE personnel, especially those who lived in park housing, routinely reported hearing shots fired at night in the park.15

While the National Park Service discouraged hunting at HOBE, the Mission 66 program encouraged parks to develop convenient picnic areas.16 Many visitors saw HOBE as a recreational park, a perfect spot to enjoy a peaceful picnic surrounded by a picturesque landscape. During the park’s development, visitors and community leaders requested that the park build a small outdoor facility capable of hosting family reunions and church picnics. Superintendent Pratt reported that park visitation would increase if the park had such a facility. In many places in America, during those hot summer months, families organize reunions to reconnect with their kin. HOBE received requests to hold such events but lacked the facilities to do so. The park’s Master Plan recommended “a facility with adequate services for 25 tables and room for future expansion . . . located well insulated from prime historical areas” of the park. HOBE leaders wished to build this facility. Without a designated picnic area, visitors might picnic on the battlefield. Initially, HOBE asked visitors to eat on the ground beneath a stand of trees behind the visitor center. Visitors did not always understand that picnicking on the battlefield violated NPS policy. Systemwide, the National Park Service allowed picnicking in designated areas removed from a unit’s principal cultural and natural resources. The Horseshoe Bend battlefield tempted many visitors because by the 1960s the site resembled a peaceful undulating pasture rising from Tallapoosa River. Park historian Hinsdale argued that the park might reconsider how it managed the battlefield landscape because its current tranquil state failed to convey the bloodshed that took place there on March 27, 1814. In 1966, Superintendent E.J. Pratt received approval to build a small picnic area across from the visitor center. While the new area proved adequate for most visitors, the facility was too small for community groups to use as a meeting place. HOBE planners had also hoped that a larger shelter might be built to host park-sponsored public programs. Those plans never materialized.17

Despite the lack of a large meeting space, HOBE staff found other ways to host large groups. For many years, local Boy Scouts of America troops held an annual camping trip at HOBE. Park staff placed the campers in the woods behind the staff housing. Sometimes these camping trips would have as many as 250 scouts. During the Boy Scouts campouts, park staff provided numerous programs and guided tours that focused on the park’s cultural and natural history.

15. Ibid.
17. Horseshoe Bend National Military Park Master Plan, 1965, HOBE. Demand for the picnic area was so high that HOBE added more tables in 1970, more than doubling the number of available tables. According to available visitor use reports, tens of thousands of visitors have used the picnic area annually for decades. In the mid-1980s, HOBE received additional funds to place an interpretive marker and an announcement board in the picnic area.
Preparing materials for the Boy Scouts gave HOBE’s staff, who typically lacked any natural resource education training, an opportunity to focus more attention on the park’s trees, plants, river, and animal species. The Boy Scouts also performed a variety of service projects in the park. During one trip, the Boy Scouts scoured the woods in search of trash that had been left behind by illegal parties. Scouts also identified potential trail routes and extant plant species. The park became a popular option for area scouts seeking projects to qualify as an Eagle Scout. During the 1970s, the park also hosted many Girl Scouts of America groups. The inclusion of Girls Scout programming at the park coincided with the arrival of the unit’s first female rangers.\(^{18}\)

**Tour Road Vistas, Shelters, Wayside Exhibits, and Trails**

When the National Park Service assumed management of HOBE in 1959, much of the park, especially along the Tallapoosa River, was covered in dense vegetation. In some places, the thick overgrowth blocked views of the battlefield and prevented access to some areas. In September 1965, HOBE paid contractors to clear more than 34 acres of vistas along the river across from Bean’s Island, at Gun Hill and the Tohopeka Village site and Newyaucau Village overlook (figures 4.1-4.6). This project was necessary before HOBE could implement its interpretive plans to develop a tour road with wayside exhibits and interpretive shelters. HOBE sometimes used Boy Scout troops or volunteers to maintain those cleared vistas.\(^{19}\)
Figure 4.2. Site of the Creek Indian Village of Tohopeka after removal of excess vegetation. [National Park Service]

Figure 4.3. Gun Hill area prior to the clearing of excess vegetation. [National Park Service]
FIGURE 4.4. GUN HILL AREA AFTER REMOVAL OF EXCESS VEGETATION.
[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]

FIGURE 4.5. HOBE CLEARED VEGETATION FROM THE FOUR AREAS MARKED ON THIS PHOTOGRAPH. THIS PHOTOGRAPH WAS TAKEN AFTER THE PROJECT HAD BEEN COMPLETED.
[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]
In the winter of 1965, as HOBE completed tour road construction and cleared select vistas, new Superintendent E.J. Pratt moved forward with plans to erect three interpretive shelters at Cotton Patch Hill, Gun Hill, and the Tohopeka Village Overlook. Each shelter had a large flat circular wooden roof supported by four, eight-foot-tall, metal poles (figure 4.7). Each large roof measured 28 feet in diameter and was designed to provide visitors with shade regardless of the sun’s position. Visitors, however, often complained that they could not read the metallic surface interpretive signs installed in each shelter because of solar glare. The shelters were completed in June 1966. Within a few years, the wooden roofs began to rot and leak and required maintenance. In 1994, HOBE installed a metal layer over each roof to protect it from further decay (figure 4.8). The preventative measures cost $24,500.20

FIGURE 4.7. In 1966, four circular shaped interpretive shelters were constructed at HOBE. This photograph was taken of the shelter located on Cotton Patch Hill.

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]

FIGURE 4.8. In 1994, new metal covers were installed to protect each shelter’s wooden roof.

[NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]
The completion of the loop tour road in 1965 allowed the National Park Service to interpret adequately for the first time the historic scene of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. The road included six interpretive stops:

1. **Stop 1 (Cotton Patch Hill):** Interpretive shelter with audio station and wayside exhibits orienting visitor to the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Parking lot.

2. **Stop 2 (Bean’s Island Overlook):** Wayside exhibit A identifies and interprets the island’s role in the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Wayside exhibit B describes the Tallapoosa River and interprets the river’s role in the battle. Vehicle pull-off.

3. **Stop 3 (Gun Hill):** Interpretive shelter with audio station, five wayside markers, congressional monument, U.S. National Society of the Daughters of 1812 Jackson Trace marker, 3-pounder cannon, 6-pounder cannon, and long wooden stakes marking suspected log barricade location. Parking lot.

4. **Stop 4 (Cherokee Crossing Overlook):** Two wayside exhibits summarizing the role that Jackson’s American Indian allies and General John Coffee’s forces played in the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Vehicle pull-off.

5. **Stop 5 (Tohopeka Village Overlook):** Interpretive shelter with audio station and two wayside exhibits orienting visitors to the historic location and scope of the Tohopeka. Parking lot.

6. **Stop 6 (Newyaucau Village Overlook):** Wayside exhibit A identifies the location and scope of the Creek Indian village and agricultural fields. Wayside exhibit B explains the role that Red Stick prophets played in the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Parking lot.

Tour roads were commonplace across NPS units. The National Park Service considered tour roads as a leisurely option for most visitors to see as much of a park as possible from the comfort of their automobile. Despite the numerous benefits of building a tour road, the addition of miles of paved asphalt roads often challenged the National Park Service to balance visitor needs with conserving natural and historic resources. Unable to provide all visitors with staff-led, guided tours and programs, tour roads were usually accompanied by interpretive shelters and wayside exhibits that interpreted the resource using text, visuals, and sometimes audio. Wayside exhibits had a great advantage over visitor center exhibits, especially in military themed parks, because they usually were located on sites significant to the resource’s history. Wayside label copy often included statements such as “from this spot” or “in front of you lies” to stimulate a visitor’s mind to imagine this place over time and to stand in the same locations as did the site’s principal historical actors. At HOBE, the tour road always had a higher number of annual visitors than the visitor center or other park resources.21

---

During the planning for the HOBE tour road, the National Park Service and HOBE Superintendent Clarence Johnson tried to develop a route that minimized the damage that the road might have on the historic battlefield. However, the National Park Service approved the final route and began construction without conducting a single archeological survey in areas that would be impacted by the road’s construction. The tour road crosses the suspected Creek Indian log barricade site south of Gun Hill, thus likely disturbing the archeological remains of the barricade. HOBE Park Historian Glenn Hinsdale paid close attention to the road construction as it proceeded through areas he believed might reveal the location of the log barricade. Hinsdale observed soil discolorations and circular soil profiles that he interpreted to be evidence of the barricade’s location. Hinsdale, however, lacked any archeological training and made no effort at the time of construction to consult with trained professionals to assist with his documentation. Furthermore, Hinsdale ignored the potential impact that the road project might have had on other sections of the historic battlefield.22

Thanks to increased funding made possible by the Mission 66 program, the National Park Service began experimenting with new technologies and materials designed to enhance the tour road experience. HOBE Superintendent Clarence Johnson pushed for the use of visitor-activated audiovisual devices to be installed in the tour road interpretive shelters. Johnson predicted that park funds would prevent HOBE staff from leading as many guided tours and interpretive talks as visitors might demand. Visitor-activated audio stations, Johnson believed, would allow park rangers to record brief, site-specific, interpretive messages that would cover some of the same themes that visitors who received guided tours might experience. When HOBE installed audio stations in its tour road interpretive shelters in 1965, around 100 NPS units already used similar programs. HOBE, however, was among the first to use multiple audio stations in outdoor shelters that included abbreviated park ranger talks and dramatic readings of primary source accounts. As much as HOBE visitors enjoyed the audio stations, however, park staff disliked the machines because they frequently malfunctioned. Audio station batteries also required frequent replacement. Getting parts or locating skilled technicians often required months of delays or longer when the park lacked funds to make the repairs.23

The Mission 66 program encouraged NPS units to adopt more efficient strategies and materials to manage park programs. Maintaining outdoor interpretive signage could be expensive. Constant exposure to the elements and heavy visitor use faded text and images displayed on outdoor signs. During the early 1960s, many NPS units began installing cast aluminum signs with superimposed or screen printed full color text and images. The sterile looking cast aluminum signs could also be customized with colorful background images that mimicked softer surfaces. For example, HOBE sign designers placed a beige-colored buckskin background on all of the park’s cast aluminum signs to produce a "frontier" appearance. Although the cast aluminum signs withstood the constant exposure to the elements better than other NPS signs, in full sunlight the brushed metal surface heated to temperatures capable of burning visitors. When exposed to full sunlight, the sign’s reflective surface also created a bright glare that hindered the

ability of visitors to read it. HOBE anticipated these problems and planned to negate them by erecting large circular shelters over some of the markers. The shelters, however, failed to adequately shade the metal surface. According to HOBE Park Historian Paul Ghioto, visitors often complained about the glare.24

The 1965 tour road interpretation, like the exhibits found in the visitor center, focused primarily on the military history of the battlefield: troop movements, weapons and munitions, and acts of heroism. The tour road’s historical narrative was told almost entirely from the perspective of General Andrew Jackson and his army. Perhaps to a greater degree than the visitor center exhibits, the tour road interpretation acknowledged the vital contributions that Jackson’s allied American Indians, Creek and Cherokee, played in securing victory. The tour road exhibits also placed greater emphasis on the bloodshed that resulted from the battle. A wayside exhibit located at the Tallapoosa River Overlook tour stop titled “Coffee’s Mounted Men” noted that “From vantage points overlooking the river, their accurate Kentucky rifles later picked off the fleeing Red Sticks as they floundered into the water.” The use of the word “floundered” did more than other exhibits in the park to set the desperate scene of defeated Red Sticks warriors, in addition to women and children, being shot down by Coffee’s cavalry as they “floundered” across a river “turned red with the blood of Red Sticks.” HOBE staff were generally more pleased with the tour road exhibits compared to the visitor center museum.25

In addition to the interpretive programs offered along the park’s tour road, HOBE planners also wanted to develop a series of ethnobotanical trails that interpreted cultural and national resources in tandem. During the mid-1960s, the National Park Service had sent several natural resource experts to the park to evaluate its potential resources. They recommended that the park develop a series of trails that mirrored the planned park tour road so that whether visitors toured the battlefield via car or by foot they would receive the same information. The natural resource planners also recommended that plans take into consideration the park’s potential as a recreational space for Tallapoosa County residents.26

Many observers commented on the park’s scenic appearance. The park, located near the southern end of the Piedmont Plateau, was situated among low rolling hills and pine forests. Yet initial surveys of HOBE flora revealed that many exotic species, such as Ailanthus, Mimosa, Chinaberry, Japanese Honeysuckle, Kudzu, and Sandburs, were found throughout the park. Large stands of pine beetle infested pines and other diseased trees were identified. Some sections of the park were filled with overgrown vegetation that would require extensive clearing before any trails could be developed. E.J. Pratt recommended that a study to determine the area’s flora and fauna between 1750 and 1840 should be funded before HOBE began altering the extant landscape. This study remains incomplete as of 2016.27

25. Ibid.
In 1966, HOBE secured funds to build an ethno-botanical trail that had been designed nearly six years earlier (figure 4.9). Construction had been delayed by a number of factors including concerns that the proposed trail route was too close to the river and thus would be susceptible to flood damage. The 2.4-mile trail loop began at Cotton Patch Hill and guided hikers along the west bank of the Tallapoosa River through the Tohopeka Village site. Trail construction was completed in 1967 at a cost of $20,971.61.28

**FIGURE 4.9. THIS 1972 PARK MAP SHOWS THE ETHNOBOTANICAL TRAIL ROUTE (MARKED WITH A DOTTED LINE). [NATIONAL PARK SERVICE]**

**Conclusion**

As the decade ended, HOBE’s leadership changed. E.J. Pratt, who had served as the park superintendent since November 29, 1964, transferred to Fort Donelson National Military Park. His move to Donelson was a homecoming. He had previously served as the Fort Donelson superintendent between 1950 and 1961 and had always considered himself to be a Civil War historian. Pratt remained as the Fort Donelson superintendent until his retirement from the park service in 1980. Pratt’s three-year tenure at HOBE set the standard for the typical length of service that future superintendents held at the park. Few superintendents stayed at HOBE for more than three years. HOBE was often the first superintendent post for many of the park’s leaders. Many went on to supervise larger parks elsewhere after learning the ropes at HOBE.

28. Ibid.
Pratt’s replacement, Albert J. Benjamin, was also a military historian. Previously, he had worked at Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Site in Baltimore, Maryland. Benjamin arrived in March 1968 in time for that year’s battle anniversary program.29

Between 1964 and 1970, HOBE fulfilled many of the plans that had been laid out prior to the park’s official opening. Museum exhibits, wayside exhibits, and an ethno-botanical trail combined to serve as the foundation of the park’s public interpretation. Park rangers developed new programs that tried to draw more attention to Creek Indian history and culture, while staying true to the park’s connection to President Andrew Jackson and the War of 1812. Park staff made vital contacts with local Creek Indians who participated in park programs and offered a different perspective on the war’s causes and outcomes than what had been presented by the park’s founders. Meanwhile, HOBE made efforts to satisfy local demands for additional recreational opportunities and labored to reach out to those communities to bring quality programs to area schools and civic organizations. Whereas early park leaders had largely ignored HOBE’s natural resources, later staff members began to piece together information and programs that would expand greatly during the following decade. As the 1960s ended, the park had few pressing problems and appeared poised for significant changes.
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PARK ADMINISTRATION, 1970-1980

Introduction

The 1970s brought substantial changes to HOBE. A series of environmental laws enacted by Congress had a profound impact on NPS natural resource management and interpretation. As parks improved their natural resource programs systemwide, HOBE’s first natural resource trained employees arrived and introduced a wave of environmental education materials and resources that brought new audiences to the park and expanded its outreach partnerships. As the park’s environmental programs emerged, HOBE’s cultural resource interpreters developed a broader selection of living history programs that employed Creek Indians to portray various aspects of Creek culture. Meanwhile, HOBE continued to make new connections within the local community as well as across the state and nation. Partnerships with local universities and secondary schools, and federal agencies such as the U.S. Forest Service, produced a broad range of activities that made HOBE’s presence felt across a broad geographic area. New park programs and activities placed enormous demands on HOBE’s personnel. To meet those increasing demands, HOBE used a broad array of full-time, part-time, contract, and seasonal employees. As park rangers spent more time delivering programs and participating in outreach activities outside of the park, part-time and seasonal workers played greater roles in delivering park programs and interacting with visitors. By the late 1970s, HOBE’s facilities were beginning to age. The Mission 66 visitor center needed renovations to meet park employee and visitor needs. Maintenance facilities proved inadequate and requests for new buildings and equipment became major priorities. As the 1970s ended, many of the environmental education programs ceased and staff launched a renewed initiative to document, interpret, and promote HOBE’s cultural resources.

Staffing

Throughout the 1970s, HOBE’s staff evolved to meet changing NPS priorities, such as the new emphasis on natural resources. However, the park’s full-time employees remained predominately white and male (table 5.1). HOBE would not have a female or African American ranger until the 1980s. Whereas the passage of the General Authorities Act of 1976 had led many park units to use law enforcement agents to protect persons and property within the park, HOBE did not receive its first Law Enforcement Ranger until the following decade. HOBE’s park rangers continued to serve as both interpreters and law enforcement officers. Like most national parks, HOBE took full advantage of the development of a new systemwide position, the park technician. Created under Hartzog’s administration, the park technician was a lower-grade position intended to attract local applicants who would be more likely to remain at a park for a longer period. These positions were especially useful in parks such as HOBE that saw a frequent turnover in full-time ranger staff, as most rangers stayed at the park for only two or three years. Those employed as technicians struggled to find advancement opportunities at the
many lacked the academic credentials and professional training park rangers held, yet many did some of the same jobs as park rangers.\footnote{National Park Service rangers and technicians formed the Association for National Park Rangers (ANPR) in 1977 to promote the professionalization of their work. The association criticized the further development of the park technician position because they believed it lacked any opportunities for promotions within the park service. They also pointed out that technicians lacked the academic and professional training held by rangers but were often expected to perform the same work. The association worried that the increased use of park technicians might damage the quality of the park service’s programs. Sirna and Conrad, \textit{Stones Rivers Administrative History}, 96; National Park Service, \textit{Career Outlines: National Park Service} (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1979), 9; Rick Smith and Jim Brady, “History,” Association of National Park Rangers, \url{http://aonpr29.wildapricot.org/History} (Accessed 5 May 2018); “ANPR Position Paper: Park Technician and Park Ranger,” \textit{Association for National Park Rangers Newsletter} 1:2 (1979): 1-2.}

During the 1970s, HOBE had four superintendents: Albert J. Benjamin (1968-1970), Thomas D. Mulhern, Jr. (1970-1972), James F. Kretschmann (1973-1979), and Walter T. Bruce (1979-1982). Kretschmann’s six-and-a-half-year stint at HOBE was the longest superintendency in the park’s history. These men had much in common. All four were park service historians who had previously served in military park units located in the southeastern United States. Under their management, HOBE’s annual budget increased sharply throughout the decade from $105,500 in 1972 to $219,000 in 1980. HOBE’s full-time staff numbers did not change during the 1970s. In 1972, the park employed seven full-time employees. Eight years later, the numbers remained the same. The number and usage of part-time and seasonal employees evolved during that same period as these employees increasingly did the work expected of full-time park rangers—law enforcement, interpretive programs, and safety coordination.

### HOBE Full-Time Staff, 1972 and 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1972</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas D. Mulhern, Superintendent</td>
<td>Phillip R. Brueck, Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Hobbes, Chief Ranger</td>
<td>Paul Ghioto, Chief Ranger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Trout, Park Historian</td>
<td>Mark E. Spier, Park Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Sims, Administrative Technician</td>
<td>Margaret Vickers, Park Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billie Templeton, Maintenance Foreman</td>
<td>Faye Johnson, Administrative Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Graddock, Maintenance Technician</td>
<td>Brandon Graddock, Maintenance Foreman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennie V. Moran, Maintenance Mechanic</td>
<td>Bill Thornell, Maintenance Mechanic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most HOBE staff stayed at the park for two or three years before being transferred to other parks. During Thomas Mulhern’s administration, he had the assistance of Chief Ranger Roy Hobbs, Historian Edward Trout, Administrative Technician Evelyn Sims, and Maintenance Foreman Billie Templeton. Sims retired in 1972 and was replaced by Mabel Clark who had previously worked for the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in Auburn, Alabama. Templeton was a native of the region who began working at the park shortly after its creation in the early 1960s.
His official position changed over time before he was finally appointed maintenance foreman. In 1972, Trout transferred to Fort Pulaski National Monument and was replaced by Roy F. Beasley, Jr., a historian who had previously worked at Fort Union National Monument. Jerry Hobbs was reassigned for several months to the Southeast Regional Office to coordinate the region’s environment education. Park Ranger Paul Lagerstorm of Everglades National Park worked at HOBE during Hobbs’ absence. Hobbs had been the first natural resource trained ranger assigned to HOBE. Lagerstorm was also a natural resource specialist. HOBE also hired its first full-time Creek Indian employee in 1972, Paul Harper, who had been working with the park as a part-time seasonal employee for several years. Mulhern was able to convert his seasonal position into a full-time park aid position. That same year, Superintendent Mulhern accepted a new position in the Western Regional Office, and James F. Kretschmann became the fifth superintendent in HOBE’s history.¹

Kretschmann’s six-and-a-half-year administration was the longest in the park’s history. He came to HOBE from Carl Sandburg National Historic Site in North Carolina. In 1973, shortly after Kretschmann’s arrival, Jerry Hobbs took a new position in the Western Region Office and was replaced by Ronald G. Warfield who, like his predecessor, had extensive natural resource training. Prior to his stint at HOBE, Warfield had earned a degree in Forest Recreation from Colorado State University before taking his first NPS position at Yellowstone National Park. He later served brief stints on the Blue Ridge Parkway and Cape Hatteras National Seashore. As Warfield arrived, Maintenance Foreman Billie Templeton retired after a 35-year career in the federal government, thirteen of which were spent at Horseshoe Bend. Kretschmann promoted Maintenance Technician Brandon Graddock to maintenance foreman and filled his technician position with Coleman Motley, a tractor operator who had previously worked at the park as a seasonal laborer. Kretschmann also converted Paul Harper’s park aide position into a career conditional subject to furlough position. This placed Harper on a path to becoming a full-time park ranger.²

Kretschmann continued to expand HOBE’s maintenance staff. Previous superintendents had relied on two full-time maintenance staff to manage the park. Their work was supplemented by a variety of seasonal staff and local day laborers who would be paid to do specific tasks such as clearing ditches or mending fences. In 1974, Kretschmann was able to promote part-time tractor operator Curtis Morgan to a full-time maintenance technician position. Historian Billy Stout replaced Roy Beasley after his departure. That same year, the Southeast Regional Office appointed Kretschmann as the NPS state coordinator for Alabama. HOBE’s superintendent position was raised to a GS-12 to compensate for these additional responsibilities. This pay increase elevated the HOBE superintendent position to the top end of the scale for those employed at small parks and made the position more attractive to prospective applicants.³

---

HOBE Administrative History

HOBE continued its commitment to developing natural resource programs when Park Ranger Frank Wilson arrived in 1975 following Ronald Warfield’s transfer to Cape Hatteras. Wilson had worked as a natural resource education specialist at Everglades National Park. The following year HOBE hired its first park technicians, Daniel Young and Ronald Sprinkle. The men were sent to the Southeast Regional Office to receive law enforcement and fire prevention training. While they performed some interpretive duties during peak times, the park primarily used the technician position to supplement its understaffed maintenance department. When Young resigned in 1977, the park replaced him with Robert Wayne Hay, a seasonal employee from Cape Hatteras National Seashore who was recommended for the position by former HOBE ranger Ronald Warfield who now worked at Hatteras. The park technician position changed frequently but proved useful because it allowed the superintendent to fill temporary vacancies created when full-time staff retired, transferred, or left for extended periods on assignment with technicians that had some prior experience with the park’s administration. For example, in 1978, Park Ranger Frank Wilson suffered an unexpected illness that forced him to request a disability retirement. With Wilson’s medical absence and his replacement’s arrival uncertain, Kretschmann had the National Park Service downgrade Wilson’s ranger position to a full-time park technician so that he could move Robert Wayne Hay into that assignment with the potential to be promoted to ranger in the future. Several months later, Wilson’s vacated position was filled by historian Paul Ghioto and Hay was able to remain as a full-time park technician. The park technician position created some continuity at HOBE during various personnel changes.4

HOBE also benefited from the Volunteers in Parks (VIP) program that originated during Hartzog’s administration. Hartzog envisioned civilian volunteers working side by side with NPS paid staff across all park units. Previously, the National Park Service lacked any formal volunteer program, and individual parks often accepted volunteer labor but did not have any clear guidance about the limits of their duties and potential liabilities that applied if a volunteer was injured on the job. Demand for volunteer opportunities in parks was high. During the 1960s, the number of Americans who could afford retirement grew to its largest number in history. Many retirees want to donate their time to the National Park Service. Hartzog believed that volunteers could help park provide visitor and interpretive services and expand each unit’s outreach capabilities. In 1970, Congress passed Public Law 91-357 that authorized the National Park Service to create the Volunteers in Parks program. HOBE superintendent reports do not mention any VIPs until 1979 when Ric Miller began volunteering at the park. Miller was a black powder weapons expert who had participated in several competitive shooting contests held at HOBE. He used this expertise to perform weapons demonstrations. Perhaps, HOBE’s involvement in the VIP program was slowed by the park’s heavy use of seasonal and temporary workers. HOBE commonly hired individuals to assist with visitor services, interpretive programs, and maintenance. The employment of these individuals varied from a few hours to several months of paid labor. Many locals, especially those seeking additional income or a potential avenue toward full-time federal employment, came to HOBE in search of paid work. During the late 1970s, the park had less money available for seasonal and part-time workers. Rising maintenance costs and the renovation of aging park facilities reduced those opportunities. In addition, many duties that might otherwise have been filled by VIPs were

handled by a broad range of students and faculty from area universities who volunteered their time and expertise. HOBE rangers developed strong partnerships with biology and education professors at both Auburn University and Southern Union State Junior College. U.S. Forest Service staff also helped on several occasions to ensure that HOBE had enough staff for larger events or specialized programs. The VIP program at HOBE expanded during the early 1980s as the National Park Service and all federal agencies experienced budget cuts or freezes during President Ronald Reagan’s administration.⁵

As the 1970s ended, HOBE experienced a change in leadership. James F. Kretschmann, who had served as park superintendent since 1973, was transferred to the Southeast Region Office in Atlanta where he oversaw NPS legislative affairs. Before his departure, Kretschmann hired Margaret Denise Vickers as a seasonal park technician. Vickers was the first woman to be hired at HOBE who was not an administrative assistant. She was also the first African American to be employed at the park outside of the maintenance department. Like other park technicians, Vickers filled in wherever needed which meant helping with the maintenance crew and delivering public programs. For several years, Vickers moved back and forth from HOBE to nearby Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site, established in 1977. Walter T. Bruce, a historian, who had previously helped establish and manage the Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site in Texas, took over as HOBE superintendent. Bruce was a World War II U.S. infantry veteran who in addition to his time in Texas had also been a superintendent at Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine and Fort Frederica National Monument. The combination of Bruce and Ghioto swung HOBE away from its recent focus on natural resources toward a renewed emphasis on military history. Both men believed that HOBE should refocus its efforts on researching all aspects of early 19th-century military history and Creek culture. Bruce sent Ghioto on several archival research trips to Nashville, Tennessee, and Jackson, Mississippi, to gather new materials for the park programs. Bruce placed new emphasis on publishing newspaper and journal articles that promoted the park’s history and established its staff as subject experts.⁶

**1972 Interpretive Prospectus**

Reaching new audiences had become a major concern for HOBE leaders. In 1970, HOBE Superintendent Albert J. Benjamin had distributed a memorandum among his regional office supervisors criticizing current park practices. Extant interpretation focused too much attention on “troop movements” and “territorial boundaries” and “inadequately [examined] the broader social history that so vitally needs to be placed in a relevant perspective.” HOBE’s exhibits no longer reflected what scholars knew about Creek Indian society and the Creek War. Benjamin recommended that “the museum should be redone using a different approach and modern techniques of presentation.” In addition to new exhibits, implementing these new approaches would require the construction of a new assembly room onto the visitor center and the

---

reconstruction of the log barricade that had played a pivotal role in the battle. Benjamin’s call for action led David D. Thompson, Director, Southeast Region, and John W. Bright, Chief, Office of Environmental Planning and Design, ESC, to recommend that HOBE develop a new interpretive prospectus.7

In 1972, HOBE Superintendent Thomas D. Mulhern, Jr. produced a new interpretive prospectus that evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of the park’s existing practices. The document reflected changing attitudes both in the park and across the National Park Service that encouraged interpreters to develop more interactive and diverse programs. The report declared that “interpretation of a park story should never remain static. Facilities and programs that appear excellent at one point in time become antiquated and need constant reevaluation and reappraisal. . . . A new ethic is abroad in the land that views events and peoples and wars in a different way than previous reigning philosophies. One of its aims is to no longer look so closely at individual trees, but to see the entire forest in its more all-encompassing significance.” The need to revise the park’s interpretive programs arose “not . . . from some central office bent on imposing a new look from atop, but from the Park staff itself, which has carefully analyzed the existing program and found certain deficiencies.”8

According to Mulhern, HOBE’s most glaring interpretive problem stemmed from “too much emphasis [placed] on the battle itself, and this almost exclusively presented from the United States’ point of view. There is little, or no, attempt to understand the larger issues involved in this clash of cultures. There is too little emphasis on the Creeks as a people, despite the fact that there are two Creek village sites within the Park boundaries.”9 The 1972 interpretive prospectus urged the National Park Service to allocate funds to support several initiatives that would improve interpretation at HOBE. The park wanted to produce an orientation film. According to Mulhern, “the best way to provide [a conceptual] framework for the visitor is through the medium of a quality sound color film [that illustrates] the larger meanings of the Park story . . . [and provides] a broader philosophical base.” HOBE would also need “an auditorium to show the proposed motion picture.” Mulhern proposed that a 120-seat facility would allow the park to expand its cultural and environmental programs and develop new evening events that might attract new audiences. The new film and auditorium would complement the development of a new museum that would replace the existing narrative-based, military history displays with a “balanced” presentation that devoted greater attention to Creek Indian culture.10

Mulhern’s plan also called for an expansion of the park’s living history programs. Currently, HOBE staff regularly dressed in replica uniforms worn by Tennessee militia and presented programs demonstrating period weapons and camp life. Based on the positive public response to the park’s existing living history program, Mulhern asked the National Park Service to

---

9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
provide additional funding to hire a seasonal park ranger who “would be outfitted and armed as a member of the 39th Infantry Regiment.”

While improving existing living history demonstrations of various American forces who fought at Horseshoe Bend was important, the most significant request made in the 1972 interpretive prospectus was the addition of a new program depicting Creek Indian village life. For the first time in park history, HOBE leadership recommended that the park collaborate with Creek Indians to deliver seasonal living history programs that would demonstrate crafts, foodways, dress, games, and other aspects of American Indian culture. Because of the “National Park Service’s strapped financial status” during the 1970s, HOBE was unable to implement most of the recommendations presented in the 1972 interpretive prospectus. “Exhibit rehabilitation requests,” according to HOBE Chief Interpretive Ranger Paul Ghioto, “dutifully submitted on an annual basis for the past 10 years have received no response from SERO. Apparently, other parks have a greater need.”

Cultural Education and Living History Programs

The 1972 interpretive prospectus reflected changing attitudes at HOBE. Park leaders launched several initiatives to expand the park’s program outreach and diversify its audience. These initiatives led park officials to seek out new partners in the local area. Superintendent Mulhern developed a strong relationship with local Head Start Center directors. In Alabama, the Head Start Centers prepared four-year-old children from low-income households to enter five-year-old kindergarten. During the early 1970s, most public school systems in Alabama had recently racially integrated. As public schools integrated, many white parents removed children from those schools and placed them in newly-created academies and private schools. White participation in programs such as Head Start also declined. Consequently, the percentage of African American children enrolled in the local school system sharply increased. Most of the children enrolled in the Tallapoosa and Chambers County Head Start Centers were black and came from families that lived in poverty. HOBE staff would visit these Head Start Centers often dressed as a Tennessee militia soldier or early Alabama settler and demonstrate some basic facts of early 19th-century American life such as foodways, folklore, and music. When available, HOBE staff would invite area Creek Indians to join these programs and invite children to compare the two cultures that clashed in the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. The Head Start Center programs were important because most of the parents of these children lacked the time and resources to visit Horseshoe Bend. Superintendent Mulhern hoped that these programs helped raise awareness of the diversity of human experiences that had existed in early Alabama history.

Prospectus writers articulated the need for additional Creek Indian interpretation at a moment in the park’s history when those recommendations were already being put into practice. Unable to alter the park’s inadequate exhibits, HOBE staff focused their attention on building a vibrant American Indian living history program. In the early 1970s, HOBE staff worked hard to
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incorporate more Creek Indian perspectives into the park’s programming. Since the late 1960s, the park had hired Creek Indians as seasonal workers to assist with various living history programs. These programs were popular among staff and the public. Superintendent Benjamin requested funds to expand the program, but HOBE did not receive the necessary funds to make those programs part of its standard offerings. By 1970, the number of Creek Indian seasonal workers had swelled to three full-time seasonal laborers. To locate Creek Indians qualified and trained to manage these growing living history programs, HOBE built new relationships with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Ocmulgee National Monument in Macon, Georgia. Ocmulgee National Monument had established a program in cooperation with the Macon Chamber of Commerce, Ocmulgee National Monument Auxiliary Corporation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and National Park Service to relocate Creek Indian families from Oklahoma to central Georgia to expand that region’s American Indian living history programs.

Many Creek Indians living in Oklahoma were facing extreme poverty. The Bureau of Indian Affairs hoped that connecting reservations with NPS park units that interpreted American Indian history might help both sides improve their situation. Local tourism boosters also hoped to attract more visitors from across the region by providing more authentic Indian encounters. Creek families would also be able to sell crafts and operate small businesses as part of their relocation agreement. Several Creek Indians were trained to work as temporary park service employees in positions that had the potential to become full-time NPS jobs. Others received scholarships and vocational training opportunities. In October 1972, Ocmulgee hosted “Creek Week,” a one-week celebration marking the return of Creek Indians to the region. Sponsored programs included a parade, dances, crafts, and a theatrical production. Creek Week was a financial disaster because of poor planning and the lackluster quality of the public programs.14

Though the program embarrassed Ocmulgee National Monument, who many locals blamed for the event’s failure even though the park had little to do with its planning, Creek Week indirectly benefited HOBE. Foremost, in the weeks leading up to the event, a group of Creek Indian travelers from Oklahoma visited HOBE. Park rangers provided the group with a tour and both sides appeared to have enjoyed a friendly, yet somber, visit. At that time, this might have been the largest group of Creek Indians to visit the battlefield since the Creek War. Creek Week also led some Creek Indians who had relocated to central Georgia to contact HOBE to see if there were any temporary positions at the battlefield. Mulhern hired three Creek Indians on a temporary basis to provide American Indian-themed living history programs. National Park Service and Bureau of Indians Affairs officials helped these men find additional work in the community and in nearby cities such as Birmingham and Opelika. The success of these new programs helped Mulhern convince the region office to provide the park with extra funds to hire Samuel E. Harper, a Creek Indian, as a full-time park aide. Harper and HOBE Park Historian Roy F. Beasley delivered more than 111 programs that contrasted early 19th-century Creek Indian and American culture. The program, typically performed on Saturdays, became the park’s most popular living history offering.15

During the 1970s, HOBE made a concerted effort to invite members of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation in Oklahoma to attend and participate in the park’s annual battle anniversary event. Creek Indians found a way to attend all of that decade’s anniversary events. Usually, HOBE invited Creek representatives to speak and sometimes lead visitors in a prayer delivered in Muscogee. The tone of these commemorations had changed substantially since the park opened in 1964. In 1977, park staff joined a small delegation of Creek Indians and Daughters of the War of 1812 for a sunrise memorial ceremony atop Gun Hill. The program avoided long speeches and instead chose to honor all of those who died on March 27, 1814, by observing an extended moment of silence. That afternoon the assembled Creek Indians led the crowd that had gathered in several native songs accompanied by some rhythmic drumming and dancing.\(^\text{16}\)

HOBE staff observed that visitor attendance at the annual battle anniversary event had declined since 1964. The annual program varied during the 1970s. Some anniversary programs varied little from a typical Saturday afternoon of ranger talks and weapons demonstrations. While the anniversary was observed on an annual basis, some superintendent reports fail to mention the program although local newspapers published articles promoting the occasion. Walter Bruce’s 1979 annual report, for example, failed to mention the program, yet the *Tallapoosa Outlook* published an article promoting the event days before.\(^\text{17}\)

The park introduced new elements to the annual program to attract new visitors. To coincide with newly developed nature trails and conservation programs, the park offered several guided tours. Courting a younger audience, HOBE made rounds in local schools in the months prior to the anniversary event promoting a student art contest. Students were asked to paint and sketch an image inspired by the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. According to Faye Johnson, who attended one of the art shows a few years before she began working at the park, many of the paintings depicted proud Creek Indian warriors resisting the American assault upon the barricade. Many students tried to duplicate the visitor center diorama. On at least one occasion, the park asked local fire stations in Alexander City and Dadeville to display emergency vehicles during the event so children could climb around on fire trucks and ambulances. Unable to organize enough reenactors to hold a mock battle, HOBE staff invited members of the Alabama Army National Guard to hold drill during the program. Army officers explained to the crowd how modern drill techniques had much in common with those used by the American forces at Horseshoe Bend. During the late 1970s, Chief Ranger Paul Ghioto used his connections with Alabama National Rifle Association members to organize a series of antique small firearms demonstrations and exhibits. Although superintendents did not always report the program’s attendance numbers in their annual report, the event appeared to draw between 300-500 visitors.


\(^{17}\) “Horseshoe Bend Anniversary, *Tallapoosa Outlook*, 23 March 1979; Superintendent Annual Report, Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, 1979, HOBE.
annually. For many local residents, the annual battle anniversary event was circled on their calendar months prior to the event.  

HOBE also made significant inroads with the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians in North Carolina. Members of their reservation were direct descendants of Cherokee warriors who served under General Andrew Jackson’s command at Horseshoe Bend. In 1970, Superintendent Albert Benjamin asked members of the Eastern Band to create two dugout canoes to display at HOBE. The canoes resembled those used by Cherokee warriors to cross the Tallapoosa River during a critical moment in the battle. Two years later, Eastern Band craftsmen delivered the canoes to HOBE where they were installed as exhibits along the tour road stop that told the story of Whale’s crossing.

As HOBE improved relations with Creek and Cherokee Indians, the park continued to reconnect with various organizations that sought to further memorialize the American soldiers who fought and died at Horseshoe Bend. On June 11, 1972, HOBE hosted one of the more unusual events in the park’s history. In 1839, a group of Alabama militia removed the remains of Colonel Lemuel Montgomery from the Horseshoe Bend battlefield and reinterred them in nearby Dudleyville. Montgomery was the first American soldier killed during the battle and a close friend and protégé of General Andrew Jackson. Since the creation of Horseshoe Bend National Military Park in 1959, park advocates, aligned with groups such as the Daughters of the War of 1812 and the Sons of the American Revolution, had planned to return Montgomery’s body to the park. On June 11, 1972, a crowd of 2,500 visitors watched as a horse drawn carriage returned Montgomery’s remains to their final resting place at the base of Gun Hill. Montgomery was buried with full military honors, including a twenty-one-gun salute and the playing of taps. Alabama Senator John Sparkman, a major contributor to HOBE’s creation, delivered a stirring keynote address that linked Montgomery’s ultimate sacrifice to the actions of hundreds of thousands of other fallen American soldiers. After the ceremony, a granite marker was placed atop the grave. Montgomery remains the only known burial located in HOBE.

Public demand for additional weapons demonstration programs remained strong throughout the 1970s. Park rangers, such as Paul Ghioto and Jerry Hobbs, were active members of the National Rifle Association who became involved in local and state chapters of this growing national organization. Weapons demonstrations were held at the park every weekend and during every school field trip program. Beginning in 1978, HOBE hosted an annual black powder gun shoot that coincided with the park’s late March battle anniversary event. The event was co-sponsored by the Creek Nation Long Rifles Gun Club of Montgomery. Participants paid an entry fee to compete in a variety of precision shooting challenges that tested their use of antique black powder rifles. HOBE held the event in an open field near the Newyaucau Village overlook at Tour Stop 6. Visitors were allowed the watch the competition from a safe distance.
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Between competition rounds, participants would mingle with the crowd and show off their antique firearms. The event drew more than 4,000 visitors over the weekend competition.\textsuperscript{21}

During the 1970s, HOBE staff connected with curators at the U.S. National Infantry Museum at Fort Benning, Georgia. The infantry museum had a large collection of antique firearms and military accouterments used by early 19th-century American armies. The infantry museum loaned HOBE artifacts to be temporarily displayed at the park’s visitor center. These temporary exhibits were popular among HOBE visitors and staff, especially those who had an affinity for antique firearms. Exhibits varied, however. In 1980, the infantry museum sent HOBE a stash of World War II era machine guns, explosive devices, and uniforms. That year visitors might receive a small arms weapons demonstration, featuring an antique smooth bore rifle consistent with what many Battle of Horseshoe Bend soldiers carried, followed by a demonstration firing of a World War II period machine gun. The mixing of historical weapons in the same programs did not seem to bother park visitors or HOBE staff.\textsuperscript{22}

In addition to their partnership with the infantry museum, HOBE continued its long-standing relationship with the Alabama National Guard. Guardsmen had helped HOBE manage numerous public events by providing additional on-site security, emergency medical services, and costumed living history reenactors. In 1978, the guard demonstrated several modern weapons and equipment at the park, including a helicopter flown to the park for the occasion. The guard used these programs at HOBE to recruit civilians into the military. For HOBE, maintaining positive relations with contemporary branches of the U.S. military seemed in line with the park’s mission. In this case, the public relations benefits far outweighed any potential conflicts with the park’s associated historical themes.\textsuperscript{23}

Some new programs strayed from HOBE’s mission. During the early 1970s, HOBE agreed to host an annual historic car show to curry favor with several local organizations that thought the park would make an ideal spot to draw a crowd. Most HOBE superintendents joined area civic groups such as the Rotary Club and Lion’s Club to maintain the park’s presence in the community. Several members of the local Rotary Club who belonged to the Horseshoe Bend Auto Club of New Site, the small community located near the park, asked Mulhern to host the event. Eventually, Mulhern was elected club president and asked to plan upcoming car shows. The club charged participants to enter their cars in the show with the potential to win cash prizes for various awards. Profits from the show would be donated to the New Site Volunteer Fire Department. Prior to 1974, the rural area immediately surrounding HOBE lacked a fire department. In 1973, Park Ranger Ronald Warfield helped locals organize the New Site Volunteer Fire Department. Warfield served as the department’s first assistant chief. He used his connections with the U.S. Forest Service to procure fire equipment and training for the volunteer organization. The antique car show was intended to raise funds for the fire department, which in turn enhanced HOBE’s fire protection. Sixty-one vehicles entered the show and more than 3,500 people attended the October 15th event. The car show was one of the most popular events in the park’s history and forged a lasting relationship with the local New Site Volunteer Fire Department.

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{23} Superintendent Annual Report, Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, 1980, HOBE.
Site Volunteer Fire Department, which benefited from the program’s proceeds. The car shows were held at HOBE until the mid-1980s.\textsuperscript{24}

**Natural Resource Management and Education Programs**

During the 1960s, HOBE staff had largely ignored the park’s natural resources. Although efforts were made to manage the park’s forests, monitor the water quality of the Tallapoosa River, and identify plant and wildlife species, HOBE’s interpretive programs rarely included any discussion of natural resources. The park’s Ethno-Botanical Trail was the sole highlight of HOBE’s natural resource interpretation. None of the visitor center exhibits or wayside exhibits devoted attention to the park’s natural resources. The site of a historic battle, the park focused the bulk of its attention toward its cultural resources. The park’s Master Plan, for example, did not include any mention of the park’s natural resources beyond outlining some management recommendations.\textsuperscript{25}

The environmental movement of the 1960s gradually changed how the National Park Service viewed the conservation of its natural resources. Previously, the park service had been more concerned with maintaining the appearance of natural facades rather than conserving a property’s ecological integrity. At HOBE, for example, park leaders decided to restore the natural appearance of an area of the park that had been used by previous owners as a gravel pit. The decision to replant trees in that area was made to create a natural façade without any consideration of that area’s ecology. Clearing portions of the Tohopeka Village site and various vistas along the Tallapoosa River were also made without any consideration of its potential ecological impact. HOBE attitudes largely reflected those held by NPS directors who believed that park units required modern visitor conveniences to ensure their preservation. While the Mission 66 program brought much-needed facilities upgrades to the park service, environmentalists accused the National Park Service of overdeveloping its resources and encouraging pollution, urbanization, overpopulation, and the loss of natural areas. In 1963, the Special Board to the Secretary of the Interior on Wildlife Management and the National Academy of Sciences published the “Leopold Report.” Named after principal author A. Starker Leopold, a noted conservationist, zoologist, and University of California-Berkeley professor, it recommended the National Park Service improve the identification, study, and conservation of the diverse biological communities found across its vast system. In the future, Leopold advised, the National Park Service should incorporate ecological thinking into its management decisions. Leopold’s report appeared in the vanguard of a wave of congressional legislation enacted between 1964 and 1973 that significantly improved the nation’s environmental public policy. The passage of bills such as the National Wilderness Protection Act (1964), Land and Water Conservation Act (1964), Endangered Species Protection Act (1966), Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (1968), National Trail Systems Act (1968), National Environmental Policy Act (1969), Clean Air Act (1967; amended 1970), Clean Water Act (1970; amended 1972), Environmental Pesticide

\textsuperscript{24.} Superintendent Annual Report, Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, 1980, HOBE; “Antique Car Show,” *Tallapoosa Outlook*, 19 October 1980, ADAH. During battle anniversary programs held in the 2010s, the New Site Volunteer Fire Department provided a concession stand for visitors. The event is their largest annual fundraiser and helps HOBE provide food and drinks for its guests.
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Control Act (1972), and the Endangered Species Act (1972) held federal agencies to a higher standard of conservation policy making and created mechanisms for public comment and government of their actions. Agencies who failed to adjust their policies risked substantial fines.26

In 1964, George Hartzog succeeded Conrad Wirth as director of the National Park Service. Hartzog, a South Carolina native and lawyer who had previously worked at the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and several parks located in the Rocky Mountains before serving as the superintendent of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, brought a new dedication to conservation to the National Park Service. A Washington, D.C. insider, Hartzog counted Department of the Interior Secretary Stewart Udall among his friends. Udall had developed a reputation for being among the nation’s leading conservationists following the 1963 publication of his work The Quiet Crisis. Hartzog shared Udall’s views on conservation and saw the Secretary as an invaluable ally capable of lobbying Congress to improve the National Park Service. Slowly, Hartzog led the National Park Service to create new or revise existing policies that aligned the agency’s management decisions with the new environmental legislation as well as the National Historic Preservation Act (1966).27

Initially, Hartzog hoped to improve NPS conservation policies by categorizing park units into groups based on their natural, historical, or recreational qualities. Hartzog believed that such a method would allow parks with identified natural resource strengths to devote greater attention to those resources and perhaps shed some of their other concerns. Congress disapproved of Hartzog’s plan because it had the potential to neglect natural resources in historic parks and vice versa. In 1970, Congress passed the General Authorities Act that amended the Organic Act of 1916 and required the National Park Service to treat all park units as part of the same system. The National Park Service would be prohibited from selectively applying policies on a park-to-park basis. Eight years later, Congress reaffirmed the “single system” principle in the Redwoods Amendment. HOBE now had to show as much concern for its natural resources as its cultural resources.28

The 1971 arrival of Chief Ranger Jerry Hobbs foretold of changes coming to HOBE. Hobbs was the first HOBE staff member with a natural resources education background. He had previously worked at the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Superintendent Thomas D. Mulhern, Jr. assigned Hobbs two major tasks. First, Hobbs had to develop the park’s first natural resources education programs. Second, Hobbs took the lead in the development of HOBE’s first Natural Resources Management Plan. Many NPS park units that had previously undervalued their natural resources took on similar new initiatives. To assist with these programs, the Southeast Regional Office, now located in Atlanta, hosted numerous natural resource training workshops.

In 1973, Hobbs attended four one-week long natural resource training programs in Atlanta. Workshops offered guidance on the preparation of natural resource management plans and more specialized training in forestry management, fire prevention, environmental study area identification and documentation, and more. During the 1970s, HOBE staff appeared to receive more opportunities to collaborate with park units that specialized in natural resource management. For the first time, HOBE staff were sent to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and Everglades National Park to assess their natural resource management activities. By exposing HOBE staff to more experienced natural resource specialists, the park gleaned ideas for how to better manage their own resources. Superintendent Mulhern, for example, resurfaced and widened HOBE’s fire roads after a visit to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.29

To assist NPS units such as HOBE, Eastern Parks and Monuments Association (ENP&MA), a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit cooperating association founded in 1947 to support the interpretive, educational, and scientific programs and services of the National Park Service, created a grant program to fund new natural resource educational publications. HOBE received funds to develop a new trail map, student field trip guide, and a teacher’s guide titled “Nature and Man.” During the 1970s, HOBE produced numerous environmental-themed brochures and educator packets on topics ranging from animal species to forest management. Many of these materials were distributed far beyond the park and used by teachers as well as state park officials across Alabama. Requests for HOBE materials, especially from teachers, was so frequent that the park had to ask ENP&MA for funds to reprint exhausted materials on several occasions.30

The National Park Service also encouraged park units to reach out to neighboring colleges and universities and federal agencies for assistance. Previously, HOBE had developed relationships with Southern Union State Junior College and Auburn University. In the late 1960s, both schools organized field trips to the park to study the Tallapoosa River. Now that the National Park Service had prioritized the study of natural resources, HOBE invited both schools to conduct more tests of the park’s water, soil, and forests. In 1974, Dr. John Freeman’s Auburn University biology classes produced a “Plant and Animal Resources Basic Inventory” that became part of HOBE’s natural resource management plan. Freeman also coordinated with the U.S. Forest Service to investigate pine beetle infestations in the park on several occasions. His advice helped HOBE maintenance staff determine which trees needed to be cleared. During those consultations, the park selectively removed clusters of invasive species that had overtaken portions of the park. Annually, pine beetle infestations represented the greatest single natural threat to the park and its visitors. As the expanded natural programs opened more trails, HOBE maintenance spent more time inspecting those paths to ensure that beetle infested trees did not fall on unsuspecting hikers. With so few maintenance staff, HOBE regularly asked Freeman and his students to help with these inspections. U.S. Forest Service staff also conducted aerial inspections of HOBE to identify infested trees. HOBE’s good relationship with Tuskegee National Forest and Talladega National Forest rangers produced some sharing of resources, such as aerial surveys, that reduced expenses. Auburn University’s teacher’s college also worked closely with HOBE to incorporate new “NPS environmental concepts into its secondary

education curriculum as a block activity. All education students use the park as an ESA (environmental study area) as part of their teaching skills program.”

The passage of the Environmental Education Act of 1970 had a profound impact on HOBE’s natural resource education programs. As part of that Act, Congress authorized the National Park Service and U.S. Forest Service to manage the National Environmental Education Landmark Program (NEEL) which recognizes areas where the “environmental education programs are of distinctive value in relating man to the environment of America.” HOBE collaborated with Southern Union State Junior College to create the Bald Rock Environmental Study Area in Randolph County, Alabama. Bald Rock is a piedmont granitic outcrop in the middle of a pine forest that contains an unusual collection of rare and threatened species such as pool sprites (amphibian) and the Alabama sandwort (plant). In 1972, Southern Union biology faculty collaborated with HOBE staff to designate Bald Rock as a NEEL site. HOBE Chief Ranger Harry Hobbs (1971–1972) and Ronald Warfield (1973–1975) worked closely with Southern Union faculty to develop a standardized school program for the site. The 1972 dedication ceremony drew more than 3,400 visitors. U.S. Secretary of the Interior Rogers C.B. Morton delivered the event’s keynote address. In Bald Rock’s first year, more than thirty school groups toured the site. That number more than tripled the following year. Most of those students received a program delivered by a HOBE ranger as well as a set of educational activities paid for by an ENP&MA publications grant. Warfield, Southern Union, and Auburn University later developed an environmental education workshop for educators that used the Bald Rock site as an outdoor classroom. The group also solicited the Alabama Department of Education to provide funds to support teacher training at Bald Rock. HOBE rangers continued to play a major role in Bald Rock’s programs until budget cuts in the late 1970s and early 1980s forced the park to reduce its outreach programs.

NPS interpretation strove to raise awareness about environmental degradation and connect people to their local landscapes in meaningful ways that helped them better understand how they shaped their environment and vice versa. In 1968, the National Park Service created the National Environmental Education Development (NEED) to produce education materials for schoolchildren. Park units were asked to develop Environmental Study Areas (ESAs) that provided students with access to outdoor classrooms and supplemental materials. As HOBE developed its natural resources plan, the park identified two ESAs in its boundaries: Man and Nature and Beaver Pond. The ESA program led to the development of HOBE’s relationship with the Talladega Alabama School for the Deaf and Blind. During the 1970s, deaf and blind students visited the park in the fall to receive environmental awareness training. Southern Union State Junior College Professor Mary Shiver’s biology class prepared materials for these programs. Shiver knew American Sign Language and HOBE adapted the program to be as tactile as possible. Park staff usually led the group on a short hike to the Beaver Pond area, located along the park’s southern boundary, where they explored a wetland environment. The program began in 1973 and ended in 1977. Other groups, however, routinely visited HOBE’s ESAs. In 1977, rangers led twenty groups through the Beaver Pond and Man and Nature.

programs. The Man and Nature program focused on the impact that human activities had on the Tallapoosa River. Rangers showed how the river had changed over time because of the construction of hydroelectric dams and the development of new communities that tapped the river for drinking water. The Man and Nature program was shared with Alabama state parks, which adjusted its content so that it could be used in several parks. While the ESA programs were popular, HOBE discontinued them by 1980 as new park leadership shifted resources toward the documentation of cultural themes and halted most of the park’s natural resource programs. By that time, the park staff no longer included a natural resources educator.34

HOBE staff also played central roles in the development of a new youth environmental education program called STEP, or Students Towards Environmental Participation. STEP began in 1971, when Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield staff sent thirty-five students to attend the Fifteenth Conference on Environmental Education sponsored by United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in Atlanta, Georgia. Those students developed a program to encourage their peers to become environmental advocates in their own communities. In 1973, HOBE Chief Ranger Ronald Warfield helped organize and lead sessions at the first Alabama STEP meeting held in Huntsville. After the Huntsville meeting, Warfield helped establish STEP chapters in Huntsville and Auburn. STEP participants met in 1974 at Auburn University where Warfield served as the principal conference organizer. When Warfield transferred from the park in 1975, HOBE’s direct involvement in the STEP program declined.35

As HOBE’s involvement in the STEP program faded, the park increased its involvement in another new environmental education program, the Youth Conservation Corps (YCC). Created in 1971 through a partnership of the Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture, the YCC organized America’s youth to work on federally managed lands performing a variety of tasks ranging from the restoration of ecological systems to the repairing of historic structures. YCC participants had to be between the ages of 15 and 18 years old and were paid the federal minimum wage for their labor. Most YCC programs were held over an eight- to ten-week period during the summer months. This was a non-residential program so most of the participants came from areas adjacent to existing NPS units, national forests, fish hatcheries, or national seashores.36 By the late 1970s, YCC participants were a regular part of the park’s summertime routine. YCC groups were typically supervised by adult volunteers from the region who were involved in various conservation and environmental organizations. Auburn University faculty, for example, supervised many YCC projects and provided transportation for participants to and from the Auburn-Opelika area. Superintendent Kretzschmann’s reports often commented that had it not been for the YCC, the park would have lacked the labor needed to maintain its resources. The National Park Service’s commitment to environmental education created a new
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demand for park trails and trail programs. In 1978, a large YCC group consisting of twenty-four “young people” and five adults spent two months clearing a new trail through an area of the park that had previously been inaccessible for visitors. The new trail, located along the park’s southern boundary, was designed to provide access to several planned environmental studies areas. The group also cleared existing trails of vegetation and rebuilt several bridges and culverts that had hampered visitor access. YCC members also prepared some public brochures identifying various plant and animal species found along park trails. The presence of YCC participants also helped the park monitor the river and wooded areas that were typically not inspected by park staff on a regular basis. During the summer of 1978, Paul Ghioto, Chief Interpretive Ranger, organized a group of YCC volunteers to build a forty-foot-long full-scale model of the barricade across from the parking lot at Tour Stop 1. “Region was so impressed,” reported Ghioto, “after they got through being shook up over our lack of a 106 Statement, they said we could have built it on the original site for all they cared.” Ghioto was so confident that the National Park Service would fund a complete reconstruction that the park submitted a Development/Study Package Proposal for erecting the barricade at its historic location from treeline to treeline, approximately 180 feet.37

YCC summer camps were among HOBE’s most popular summertime programs. Between 1975 and 1979, YCC members and HOBE staff organized a multi-week nonresidential summer camp at the park. The length of the camp varied from two to eight weeks as the YCC experimented with its programs. For a small fee, campers received extensive environmental education training and learned to identify various plant and animal species found in the park. One of the camp highlights was exploring the Beaver Dam environmental studies area in the park where campers could observe beavers building large dams that threatened to flood a nearby fire road. Local newspapers published many complimentary stories about the camp’s activities and the quality of its instructors. HOBE staff taught the campers about fire prevention, emergency medical assistance, and humanity’s impact on local ecosystems. In 1978, nearly 750 children attended HOBE’s YCC summer camps. The camps continued until 1979 when YCC budget cuts forced a four-year hiatus.38

One of the most popular interpretive programs in the National Park Service, especially in western parks, was the campfire program. Inspired by nostalgic stories of President Teddy Roosevelt’s visit to Yellowstone and spiritual evocations of the purifying qualities of fire, the campfire program has been a staple interpretive device at many park for decades. Park rangers would gather park campers and lodge guests around a blazing fire as the setting sun set the scene for an evening of story telling, humor, music, and camraderie. By the 1970s, campfire programs had evolved into environmental programs intended to inspire visitors to make connections between their daily lives and their environment. HOBE lacked a campground or lodge. The park was usually closed before sunset. During the 1970s, when environmental education funding was available, HOBE rangers visited campers on Saturday nights during the summer at the nearby

Wind Creek State Park on Lake Martin to deliver their version of a campfire program. According to state park officials and local newspaper reports, the Wind Creek programs were well-attended and well-organized. The Wind Creek campfire programs ended in the early 1980s due to federal budget cuts that limited HOBE external programs.39

**Facilities Management**

Throughout the 1970s, HOBE faced several challenges created by their existing facilities. Superintendents regularly submitted requests to either upgrade existing facilities or build new facilities that could improve park operations. Improving staff housing, maintenance areas, and the visitor center were the top priorities.40

During HOBE’s development in the early 1960s, the National Park Service had built new houses in the park for its staff. One house was typically occupied by the superintendent. The other house often hosted two or more employees and the occasional seasonal worker. Whenever HOBE staff were temporarily assigned to duties at other parks, temporary rangers had to be brought in to cover their work. Those temporary rangers, who often only remained at the park for several months, relied heavily on park housing. Overall, conditions were crowded, and alternative housing in the area was non-existent or difficult to lease for short periods. The area surrounding the farm remained rural and was filled with many abandoned farm properties. The few houses that existed were occupied by families who had often lived there for generations.

On occasion, park employees who were natives of the region, such as the maintenance staff, provided rooms for HOBE staff on a temporary and case-by-case basis. HOBE Administrative Technician Faye Johnson remembers helping park staff locate temporary housing among some of her closest neighbors and kinfolk. The closest towns were Alexander City and Dadeville. The drive from those towns to the park took about thirty minutes and traveled along some rural sections of road. Most employees wanted to live in or near the park. HOBE’s heavy use of seasonal laborers, especially during the summer, was somewhat hampered by its inability to provide temporary park housing. Several accidents at the park also temporarily reduced staff housing. In the mid 1970s, the superintendent’s residence caught fire and had to be renovated for several months before staff could reoccupy the building. On two occasions, the Tallapoosa River flooded and deposited muddy untreated water into the park’s water filtration system. Staff were without clean drinking water for weeks until the system could be cleared. Between 1963 and 1976, HOBE superintendents frequently reported that the park needed additional staff housing. Unable to receive funds for new construction, park rangers took matters into their own hands. During the late 1970s, Chief Park Ranger Paul Ghioto and his wife placed their privately owned mobile home in the park housing area. At about the same time, HOBE received funds to
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39. Superintendent Annual Report, Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, 1975, HOBE; “Wind Creek Summer Programs,” Tallapoosa Outlook, 8 June 1975, ADAH.
purchase a mobile home that was installed near the existing houses. The trailer remained at the park until 1990 when it was removed to make room for the construction of a third housing unit.41

The need for improved maintenance facilities outweighed the park’s housing shortages. Between 1964 and 1976, HOBE’s principal maintenance facility was the utility wing of the visitor center. The utility wing had a four-bay garage area and large courtyard area for vehicle storage and repairs. Combination visitor center-utility buildings were common throughout Mission 66 program architecture because these designs were believed to improve efficiency and communication.42 By the mid-1970s, HOBE staff developed plans to build a new maintenance facility to be located across Highway 49 opposite the main park entrance. HOBE superintendents Thomas Mulhern and Albert Benjamin pursued funding for new construction because they believed that the National Park Service would be more likely to approve the addition of a maintenance facility than housing or visitor center upgrades. Park leaders had to choose between pursuing approval for a new auditorium to display orientation films and deliver larger programs or seeking funds for a new maintenance center. Kretschmann believed that the National Park Service would be more likely to fund a new maintenance center and decided to put his energies toward that project. HOBE leaders developed a new plan that called for the relocation of all maintenance operations from the visitor center-utility wing to a new maintenance building. Once maintenance operations were transferred, the utility wing would be converted into administrative offices so that current office space in the visitor center could be transformed into an audiovisual/assembly room. The new maintenance building was built in 1976 at a cost of $50,000.43

The new maintenance center opened up additional space in the visitor center for staff offices and interpretive programs. Immediately following the visitor center opening in 1964, HOBE staff realized that the building needed renovations to enhance the visitor experience and to provide enough office space for park personnel. The original visitor center plan had called for the creation of an audiovisual room centrally located in the building where visitors could receive introductory remarks from park staff and watch a slideshow before touring the museum and battlefield. Designers replaced the audiovisual room with a shared office space because other proposals for creating additional office space elsewhere proved to be too expensive. The lack of an audiovisual room frustrated HOBE staff and made the visitor center experience for visitors, especially groups, less comfortable. When visitors entered the visitor center, HOBE staff would greet them and, upon request, provide guests with a 15 to 20 minute overview of the battle. These talks were delivered in the center’s lobby. That area lacked seating for guests. As visitors listened to HOBE staff, they had to stand for extended periods on a hard surface floor. Sometimes guests grew tired of standing and sat on the hard surface floor. Options for guests with physical limitations were nonexistent, often leading elderly or disabled visitors to either

42. Ethan Carr, Mission 66: Modernism and the National Park Dilemma (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007), 149.
decline the introductory talk or leave before the talk finished because of discomfort. The lack of
lobby seating was especially problematic because church groups, often comprised of large
numbers of elderly visitors, were among the park’s most frequent visitors. The space also limited
what HOBE staff could do when school groups visited the park. Without an audiovisual room,
park staff sat all of the students on the floor in the lobby as they delivered their various
children’s educational programs. School groups containing thirty or more children filled the
lobby to capacity and made it difficult for staff to lead demonstrations. On fair weather days the
park staff might have taken the school groups outside to sit under a shady tree to deliver their
programs, but during the first decade or more at the park there was a lack of shade trees in the
immediate vicinity of the visitor center. During visitor center construction, a significant number
of trees along Miller Hill were taken down to provide better vistas from the visitor center and to
protect the new building from potential damage caused by falling trees. Eventually, the park
developed a small outdoor seating area to host group activities, weather permitting. HOBE staff
also made use of the picnic area for group programs.

Between 1964 and 1984, HOBE superintendents made several efforts to add an audiovisual
room to the visitor center. In 1972, HOBE developed an interpretive prospectus to help staff
coordinate park interpretation and to incorporate some of the more recent research on Creek
Indians and the Creek War into the park’s programs. Superintendent Thomas Mulhern, Jr., the
document’s primary author, reported that “about 30,000 people entered the visitor center last
year and 5,000 of these had to either sit or stand on a hard stone floor to hear our interpretive
talk. The physical situation precludes any possibility for the use of visuals. . . . In the absence of
an audiovisual program, the lobby talk has been our main vehicle for the communication of the
park theme.” Mulhern recommended that the National Park Service provide funding for the
construction of a 1,600 square feet auditorium that would be added onto the visitor center off
the existing museum gallery area. The proposed auditorium would seat approximately 120
visitors and have stadium-style seating to afford guests with optimal views of the audiovisual
programs. The addition would cost $65,000. The production of an interpretive motion picture
and installation of a film projector and speakers would cost an additional $37,000. Mulhern’s
plan never received approval and funding for a new auditorium never materialized. HOBE staff
believed that the National Park Service was reluctant to allocate the requested funding because
of the park’s low visibility and comparatively low visitation numbers compared to other parks in
the southeast region. During the late 1960s, park visitation had declined from a high of 59,114 in
1967 to less than 48,000 in 1969.

By the summer of 1980, HOBE had relocated all of its maintenance operations from the visitor
center to the new maintenance facility. Since the park lacked funds to convert the former
maintenance facility into administrative offices, HOBE staff converted a small part of the large
space into a temporary assembly area where visitors could sit and watch a ranger-led slide show
and enjoy other staff led interpretive programs.44

Conclusion

HOBE underwent a number of significant transitions throughout the 1970s. NPS environmental education initiatives brought the first natural resources trained staff to the park. HOBE expanded its natural resources programs and outreach to meet NPS priorities. Those outreach initiatives produced successful partnerships with a wide array of state and federal agencies and area schools and universities. HOBE staff assumed natural resources education leadership roles in Alabama and beyond and had an impact on environmental education programs that extended far beyond the park. The development of ESAs, the STEP program, and NEEL combined to bring a new energy to the park and a more immediate role in the local community as environmental education initiatives spawned statewide. As natural resource programming emerged, the park’s cultural resource programs diversified. The park built a vibrant living history program that involved many Creek Indian interpreters. Through relations with Ocmulgee National Monument and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, HOBE made efforts to hire full-time Creek Indian staff and found creative ways to present a more inclusive history to park visitors.
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CHAPTER SIX
PARK ADMINISTRATION, 1980–1989

Introduction

During the 1980s, Horseshoe Bend National Military Park used its expanded outreach programs to ensure that federal budget cuts did not reduce the park’s activities. Without increased funding from the federal government, HOBE built new and strengthened existing partnerships with a variety of local, state, and federal organizations. Whereas the 1970s had seen an increased interest in environmental education initiatives, the 1980s saw a new emphasis placed on fire management, law enforcement, and public safety. As HOBE staff received more training in these areas, they in turn shared this new knowledge with a number of local and state organizations. By the end of the decade, HOBE had become a major training resource for Alabama. Park staff trained locals in fire suppression, emergency first aid, forest management, law enforcement, river ecology, and more. Park staff sat on numerous state and local advisory councils and typically were chosen to represent NPS interests in Alabama. Beyond new outreach and training initiatives, HOBE also expanded its cultural resource interpretive programs continuing earlier efforts to diversify program content and to reach out to new audiences. Living history programs continued to develop at the park and Creek and Cherokee Indian perspectives were added to the existing interpretation. The park became a vibrant center of activity as park visitation and visibility across Alabama increased. This new energy owed much to the contributions of hundreds of volunteers who helped the park continue its programming during a period of federal budget cuts. Those budget cuts, however, never seemed to impact HOBE’s activities. The park found creative ways to overcome the fiscal uncertainties that faced the National Park Service.

Staffing

During the 1980s, HOBE superintendents led the park through a series of budget crises and staff turnover. In 1981, President Ronald Reagan reduced the federal budget by 5 percent and placed a moratorium on agency funding increases. Senator Pete V. Domencici, a Republican representing New Mexico, referred to Reagan’s policies as “the most dramatic reduction in the ongoing programs in the history of the country.” Federal budget cuts impacted existing environmental, conservation, and historic preservation programs. Park service staff systemwide felt the impact of these budget reductions.

Despite NPS budget cuts, HOBE’s annual park budget increased from $214,900 in 1980 to $247,500 in 1989—a percentage increase of 15 percent. However, those small increases failed to keep up with inflation rates and made little impact within the park. Accounting for the annual average rate of inflation of 7 percent in the United States between 1980 and 1990, the small park funding increases amounted to little more than an 8 percent expansion. Full-time staff salary raises consumed most of the park’s increased appropriations, however, leaving no money for
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the development of new programs or large maintenance projects. Throughout the 1980s, park staff reported that HOBE would need to reduce public services in response to budget cuts. “We want to alert [the SERO director],” reported HOBE Administrative Technician Faye Johnson, “that the funding situation at Horseshoe Bend is, like many small parks, becoming quite critical. This year all of the funding for general supplies and materials for the Interpretive Program will have to come from the donations account. . . . any cutbacks in funding will mean eliminating” park staff. Reduced budgets forced the park to eliminate its seasonal employee positions between 1980 and 1986. Previously, HOBE had depended on those positions to supplement its maintenance and visitor service staff. Without seasonal workers, HOBE recruited more volunteers and college interns to boost the park’s human resources. Nonetheless, the decade-long budget stagnation weighed heavily on the minds of HOBE superintendents who had to either find creative ways to fund new or existing projects or delay that work until new federal funds could be procured.2

The budget was the main concern for the three superintendents who managed HOBE during the 1980s: Walter Bruce (1979–1982), Phillip Brueck (1983–1987), and Marilyn Parris (1987–1990). Bruce, a historian, who had previously managed the creation of the Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site in Texas arrived at HOBE in December of 1979. Bruce was a World War II U.S. infantry veteran who in addition to his time in Texas had also been a superintendent at Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine and Fort Frederica National Monument. In 1982, Bruce retired from the National Park Service. His replacement, Phillip Brueck, had spent his entire life in national parks. His father had been a park ranger at Zion National Park in southern Utah. Prior to coming to HOBE, Brueck had worked in several California national parks as a law enforcement ranger before relocating east of the Mississippi River to serve as the chief of operations at Cape Lookout National Seashore in North Carolina.

Brueck was part of a new generation of NPS superintendents trained as law enforcement officers. The passage of the General Authorities Act of 1976 had created new law enforcement ranger positions in the park service. HOBE was Brueck’s first superintendent post. In 1987, Brueck transferred to Prince William Forest Park in Virginia. Brueck later became Deputy Regional Director for the Northeast Region of the United States and Deputy Superintendent for the Southeast Utah Group, which managed Canyonlands National Park, Natural Bridges National Monument, and Hovenweep National Monument. After retiring from the National Park Service after a 36-year career, Brueck served on the executive council for the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees.1 Marilyn Parris replaced Brueck. She was the first woman to hold the superintendent position at HOBE and among the first females to hold such a position in the National Park Service. The federal government had only recently been forced to halt policies that either directly prohibited women from working as park rangers or placed physical requirements on various park positions that prevented most women from qualifying to serve. During the 1970s, a new generation of female park superintendents laid the foundation for
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women such as Parris to attain NPS leadership posts.² Parris, a native of South Carolina, began her NPS career in 1975 as a seasonal park ranger at Kings Mountain National Military Park. At that time, there were few female rangers in the park service. After completing additional seasonal ranger assignments at Canaveral National Seashore and Biscayne National Park in Florida, Parris earned her first park ranger position in 1978 at Lincoln Home National Historic Site in Illinois. After a brief stint as Chickamauga-Chattanooga National Military Park, Parris transferred to Christiansted National Historic Site and Buck Island Reef National Monument in the U.S. Virgin Islands before coming to HOBE. Parris was a natural resource management expert who helped HOBE implement many of the natural resource management plans that previous superintendents had initiated. Parris left HOBE in 1990 to serve as superintendent of Fort Necessity National Battlefield.³

HOBE’s full-time staff ranged between six and seven employees between 1980 and 1989. Retirements and temporary reassignments often left the park with fewer full-time staff for months. Paul Ghioto, who had been at the park since 1978, remained HOBE’s Chief of Interpretation and Resource Management Ranger until he transferred to Fort Caroline National Memorial in 1984. A trained historian, Ghioto devoted most of his time attending law enforcement training courses and fire suppression workshops. Throughout the 1960s and for much of the 1970s, chief rangers in small NPS units such as HOBE were regularly assigned interpretation and resource management duties. Interpretation tended to receive less attention as many NPS workshops and training sessions focused more attention on various aspects of resource management. For most of HOBE chief rangers, interpretation duties were largely confined to research, writing, developing educator packets, creating and delivering programs, and leading the development or revision of park exhibits and waysides. At that time, the National Park Service lacked the robust interpretive training and certification programs that formed in the late 1990s.⁴

Each year, park units submitted a summary of their interpretation programs to the regional office. These interpretive summaries focused on the message that a park wanted visitors to absorb and rarely commented on the methods used to employ those ideas. Ghioto’s 1982 report, for example, focuses on how HOBE programs emphasized the shared suffering of those who fought at the battle and strove to avoid privileging one group over another. The report mentions the use of living history and weapons demonstration and exhibits and talks but does not delve into explanations of how these are carried out and how the park might assess whether visitors absorbed the intended messages. A ranger’s interpretation agenda often reflected what they had

experienced at previous posts or from their own personal travels. Staff turnover at HOBE largely eroded the park’s institutional memory to the point that staff did not always know what had been done at the park in the past or whether known programs were successful. Rangers relied heavily on NPS networks and advice gleaned from various ranger gatherings and information communicated through the park service’s monthly newsletter. During the 1970s, the National Park Service came to realize that it lacked a best practice guide for interpretation. Interpreters, such as Ghioto, often developed programs based on what they thought worked best because guidance from NPS officials was lacking.\(^5\)

Ghioto’s replacement, Carol Slaughter, had previously worked as the park historian at Fort Donelson National Battlefield. Slaughter was the park’s first female Chief Interpretation and Resource Management Ranger. On two occasions (1987 and 1990), Slaughter served as HOBE’s Acting Superintendent. Slaughter remained at HOBE until 1992. Administrative Technician Faye Johnson remained at HOBE throughout the 1990s. At times, when superintendents and rangers were away for the park for months due to temporary assignments, Johnson served as the park’s de facto acting superintendent. She wrote, for example, the 1982 and 1985 annual superintendent report. Johnson, an Alexander City native, played a critical role in the park’s outreach and public relations programs. She had developed close contacts with many local officials, businesses, law enforcement officers, and civic groups that helped new HOBE staff integrate quicker into the community. Johnson also acted as a sounding board for community members who either had complaints or suggestions for the park. Mark Spier continued his work as a Park Technician with resource management and visitor protection duties until he transferred to Everglades National Park in 1982. While at Everglades, Spier would be promoted to Park Ranger. Both Spier and Denise Vickers, HOBE’s first park technician hires, had managed to be promoted to park ranger fulfilling the purpose of that new park position. Spier was replaced by Robert Martin who came from Natchez Trace Parkway where he worked as a Park Technician with law enforcement duties.

Throughout the 1980s, HOBE devoted more time to enhancing its existing law enforcement operations. Previously, park rangers had devoted a few hours weekly and attended a handful of law enforcement training workshops but the park lacked a full-time law enforcement officer. With the arrival of Superintendent Brueck, a trained law enforcement ranger, and the hiring of Martin, who also had completed significant law enforcement training, HOBE expanded its law enforcement operations to include regular inspections of activities on the Tallapoosa River and monitoring of more isolated parts of the park’s property. HOBE staff also began to regularly monitor motor vehicle traffic on sections of Highway 49 that passed through the park. While at HOBE, Martin was promoted to Park Ranger and then transferred to Mount Rainier National Park in 1984. His replacement, Barbara Griffin, became the first female ranger at HOBE to be responsible for the park’s law enforcement program. HOBE also hired a permanent less than full time park technician during the 1980s who typically staffed the visitor center. Usually, HOBE
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\(^5\) Mackintosh, *Interpretation in the National Park Service*, Chapter Five: Interpretation in Crisis.
would have hired a seasonal interpreter during the summer months to supplement its full time, 12-month staff, but during the early 1980s, funding cuts prevented the park from making those hires.6

During the 1980s, HOBE’s maintenance department consisted of three full-time and one permanent less than full-time (LFT) employees. Brandon Graddock continued his role as Maintenance Foreman with the help of Maintenance Mechanics Billy Thornell and Curtis Morgan and LFT Tractor Operator Millard Patterson. In 1987, Patterson was promoted to a permanent full-time Tractor Operator. Curtis Morgan retired the following year after a 15-year NPS career. Patterson was then promoted to Maintenance Foreman, filling Morgan’s vacated position. The maintenance staff received high praise in the annual superintendent reports. In addition to their regular duties, the staff routinely took on new roles as carpenters, electricians, plumbers, and more to save the park the expense of having to hire outside contractors for these specialized tasks. Like Faye Johnson, most of the maintenance staff were local natives who helped HOBE make critical connections to the local community.7

Because of budget cuts, HOBE’s outreach and community relations efforts became important resources for supplementing the park’s reduced human resources. During the 1980s, the park relied heavily on Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) student workers to augment the park’s reduced staff. Formed in 1971, the YCC is a joint venture of the National Park Service, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Bureau of Land Management that employs teens each summer to aid in the conservation of public lands. In 1982, Congress cut funding for a critical grant program that had previously helped states receive financial support for YCC programs. Despite these funding cuts, the YCC remained a significant part of many NPS units. At HOBE, YCC students helped the park complete projects each summer and staff the visitor center during peak visitation periods. After a four-year hiatus, HOBE and the YCC relaunched their joint summer camp program in 1983. The new camps were organized by New Site High School students and teachers to expand the environmental education programs that the school offered during its regular term. In 1985, four YCC enrollees helped HOBE recruit student volunteers from two local high schools to organize an eight-week day-camp at the park. Camp attendees, under YCC supervision, helped HOBE staff complete seven major projects that included restoring the park’s nature trails, restoring park vistas that had been overgrown by invasive vegetation, creating an inventory of park signage, and inspecting all park foot bridges. Camp attendees also received first-aid and environmental conservation training: valuable instruction that was needed in the local community.8

The YCC had inspired the development of numerous local youth volunteer organizations nationwide. One group, the Young Volunteers in Action (YVA) had formed in the mid-1970s to encourage young people to engage in various community service projects. An YVC chapter organized at the Alexander City State Junior College. They asked Superintendent Brueck how they could help the park. In 1982, the YVA and HOBE signed a cooperative agreement that provided the park with a steady corps of volunteers who received NPS training to staff the visitor center and assist the maintenance crew on special projects. During the summer of 1982, YVA and HOBE staff cleared several hundred yards of brush that had grown along the park’s Tallapoosa River tour stop. YVA crews also cleared some hiking trails and helped maintenance staff grade some of the park’s fire roads. As part of their cooperative agreement, HOBE staff participated in several career day fairs held at Alexander City State Junior College.9

HOBE’s Volunteers in the Parks (VIP) program expanded significantly during the 1980s. Some of the park’s VIPs, such as Hazel Ghioto and Gayle Martin, were spouses of full-time HOBE employees who at times spent more than thirty hours a week staffing the visitor center. HOBE also began attracting volunteers who had recently retired and relocated to the Lake Martin area. During the 1980s, Lake Martin emerged as a popular retirement area. According to Faye Johnson, HOBE became a popular place for local retirees to volunteer. Many of those retired volunteers had specialized skills. Johnson recalled working with a retired accountant who helped her manage the park’s annual budget. At its peak in the mid-1980s, VIPs donated more than 400 hours to the park. During the late 1980s, a group of federal agencies, including the National Park Service and U.S. Forest Service, expanded the VIP program to attract more seniors. The new initiative created the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP). By 1988, more than fifty RSVP members volunteered at HOBE. Their contributions were critical to the park’s visitor services, especially during peak visitation periods such as the annual battlefield anniversary program. The VIP, YCC, YVA, and RSVP programs combined to provide HOBE with a critical labor pool during a period of federal budget cuts.10

HOBE also found new ways to outsource maintenance tasks to reduce costs and personnel. Each summer the park’s maintenance staff had to spend considerable time cutting the forty-five-acre battlefield site. Keeping the grass cut required purchasing quantities of gasoline, maintaining park tractors, and distracted maintenance staff from other more pressing repairs needed throughout the park. In response to a 1983 request from the SERO to seek out new initiatives to reduce park maintenance costs, HOBE Superintendent Philip R. Brueck began leasing 45 acres of park land to a local farmer, Robert Early Cotney, who would “cut and retain hay from the fields” for $301.98 per year. Cotney’s father had been one of the local landowners who once owned land that became HOBE. The leasing agreement saved the park nearly $1,000 a
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year in maintenance costs and helped the park during a period when they could not hire seasonal maintenance staff.  

1980 Interpretive Prospectus

In the 1980s, the National Park Service began to question the quality of its interpretive programs. Leaders questioned what purpose did interpretation serve and which formats might best convey a park’s significance? What do visitors expect to do when they visit a NPS unit? Finding a balance between a visitor’s need to be entertained and a park’s need to establish professional standards and consistent preservation-focused programming continued to challenge NPS interpreters. For more than a decade, the park had been increasing its living history programs, but some NPS leaders accused those programs of pandering to their audience’s need to be entertained. Meanwhile, the National Park Service had developed a number of environmental education programs that usually lacked direct connections with a park unit’s historic themes and programs. Few parks had found effective means to meld the environmental and cultural into a cohesive package that conveyed a park’s ultimate reason for being.

Among NPS leaders, there was a growing belief that park interpretation was getting worse. In the early 1980s, NPS historian Barry Mackintosh was commissioned to prepare a history of interpretation in the National Park Service as part of a larger effort by its leaders to develop plans for improving those programs. Mackintosh’s 1986 report concluded the National Park Service lacked a comprehensive set of best practices and professional standards for its interpretive programs. Mackintosh determined that those within the National Park Service who believed that past interpretive practices had been better than current interpretation had no evidence to support those claims and failed to understand that changes in American communications and entertainment had elevated the quality of presentations that visitors expected to find when they engaged with park rangers beyond what the park service could provide. One problem identified in Mackintosh’s report was that in most parks the tasks of resource management and interpretation were combined and staffed by a single park ranger. Resource management tended to be the top priority because preserving a park’s resources was central to its foundational mission. Consequently, park rangers devoted a lot of time to attending resource management training sessions.

Between 1970 and 1990, for example, HOBE’s Chief Rangers attended more than sixty resource management training workshops either provided by the National Park Service or held in cooperation with other federal agencies. Interpretive skills classes rarely appeared in the park’s superintendent reports although NPS staff likely received some interpretive training during their visitor services workshops. NPS staff participated in many planning meetings during the 1970s to create new policies on fire suppression, property management, law enforcement, weapons, finance, contract management, public relations, and park management but did not participate in any interpretive skills workshops that might have served as incubators for the development of a set of best practices. HOBE Chief Interpretive Ranger Paul Ghioto, for
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example, attended more than one dozen fire prevention workshops compared to only one workshop devoted to cultural resources and none devoted entirely to interpretation. During the mid-1980s, NPS Director Russell Dickenson admitted that the park service had not seriously studied interpretation. NPS newsletters and other publications were, however, filled with stories of successful interpretive programs. HOBE, for example, received attention during the 1970s for its innovative programs for deaf and blind students. The vast majority of these articles presented specific case studies. Few articles deeply explored interpretation from an analytical perspective that might have produced best practice recommendations. At that time, HOBE Chief Interpretive Ranger Paul Ghioto, who was a historian by training, was participating in many natural resource training workshops and learning more about the relationship between humans and their environment. His interpretive programs tried to blend those new perspectives into his existing historical knowledge. A few years earlier, Ghioto had published an article in *In Touch*, a magazine produced by and for NPS interpreters. The article, “Educating Visitors About The Historic Environment,” urged interpreters to “rally your seasonals and give your park’s historic environment a prominent place in your interpretive program.” Ghioto wrote:

> When you give that musket demo or sweat over that campfire cooking wild hickory nuts or whatever, are you giving equal time to the historic environment other than its physical or natural setting? What were the militiamen’s feelings about marching off with Jackson to meet the Creek menace? How did his family feel about it? Did not his Indian adversary and his family share similar feelings the night before the battle? . . . What part did the weather play? It made a mess of black powder. What friction existed among the troops or tribes who came from different locales and backgrounds? . . . How has the modern visitor been affected by the occurrence of the historic event your park commemorates?

Ghioto’s interpretive programs reflected changes occurring among many NPS interpreters. According to Barry Mackintosh, the National Park Service realized that there were not enough good interpreters across its many park units, especially among its cultural resource staff. NPS Director Dickenson wrote that park visitors “are no longer receiving either the quantity or quality of service they have a right to expect from the National Park Service.”

By 1980, Ghioto felt that it was necessary to revisit the 1972 prospectus and offer an update on the park’s perceived interpretive strengths and weaknesses. The park had been asked by the regional office to evaluate any progress HOBE had made to improve its programs based on prior recommendations and planning. Ghioto disagreed with many of the recommendations made in the 1972 prospectus. He defended the park’s military history-themed exhibits as proper and necessary “to reflect the battle because that is what made the park’s acreage so nationally significant and why the battle remains the park’s primary interpretive theme.” Agreeing that park exhibits and programs should try to include more Creek Indian perspectives, Ghioto, nonetheless, argued “that there is a danger that the tables seem to have been completely turned around.” Ghioto seemed uncomfortable with previous HOBE staff whose guided programs questioned the racial motivations of white settlers and Andrew Jackson’s army. Ghioto worried that additional focus on Creek Indian culture might overshadow explanations of the battle and lead to misunderstandings about the park’s principal resources. Horseshoe Bend, Ghioto believed, seemed to be an inappropriate place to interpret the entirety of Creek Indian culture. He even suggested that park visitors preferred discussions of military history to explorations of Creek Indian culture citing the fact that books relating to Creek Indian topics tended to sell less frequently in the park visitor center gift shop than biographies of Andrew Jackson or general histories of the battle. Ghioto thought that interpretations of Creek Indian society had a place at HOBE, but should always be secondary to the military history of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Evidencing HOBE’s continued relationship with Alabama’s Poarch Band of Creek Indians, Ghioto suggested that it would be appropriate to add a small display to the museum describing “what Alabama Creeks are doing in 1980 to preserve their past.”

Ghioto saw the 1972 interpretive prospectus as unrealistic and intended his 1980 revision to provide the park with a more realistic set of suggested improvements. Citing continuing budgetary limitations resulting from a combination of a general stagnation in NPS funding and HOBE’s inability to be seen as a priority in its service region, Ghioto urged park leaders to seek out less expensive alternatives to its 1972 proposals. Foremost, Ghioto dismissed any future possibility that the National Park Service would provide HOBE with new construction funds to build an auditorium addition to the existing visitor center. HOBE would never become a priority for new construction funding because of the large number of new units being added to the National Park Service and because the park did not attract enough visitors to be considered highly visible or in need of additional space to accommodate overflowing crowds. He noted “park staff would be foolish if it thought such construction funds could be had.”

Despite limited funding, Ghioto believed that HOBE had made enormous progress since the 1972 interpretive prospectus. Attracting more student groups was a goal identified in the 1972 prospectus. Alabama fourth grade students studied Alabama history. Many teachers contacted the park requesting classroom materials. In 1978, HOBE staff responded to this demand by developing a traveling slide show program that could be mailed to teachers statewide. Many students in Alabama attended schools that were located too far from HOBE to schedule a field trip. The slide show was intended to introduce the park’s history to a broad audience in the hopes of raising awareness of the site’s history and connection to the state of Alabama and to boost park attendance. The slide show presented a balanced account of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.

Bend through the use of dozens of color slides accompanied by an audio cassette containing a narrated program recorded by Ghioto. Teachers interested in showing the presentation to their students would write the park to receive the slide carousel and audio cassette via mail. The park covered the return postage costs. The slide show was sent to hundreds of teachers between 1978 and 1984. According to Ghioto, the program was so popular that there was a waiting list to use the materials.\(^\text{14}\)

The traveling slide show also contained the first examples of the development of age appropriate educational materials and activities produced by HOBE. In addition to slides and an audio cassette tape, teachers also received a Horseshoe Bend Hidden Word Puzzle filled with terms associated with the battle such as Whale and Prophets, a maze that asked students to help Andrew Jackson march his army from Fort Williams to Horseshoe Bend, a Horseshoe Bend Crossword Puzzle, a slide show quiz game, and a map of Alabama where students were supposed to identify historic sites associated with the Creek War (figures 6.1-6.4). The park also encouraged teachers to share with them any educational activities that they had developed.
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\(^{14}\) Ibid.
Figure 6.2. Horseshoe Bend National Military Park staff developed this hidden word puzzle to introduce fourth grade students to key terms associated with the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.

[National Park Service]

Figure 6.3. Horseshoe Bend National Military Park staff developed this crossword puzzle to introduce fourth grade students to key terms associated with the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.

[National Park Service]
While the 1972 prospectus criticized HOBE visitor center exhibits for telling a one-sided story, Ghioto challenged this assertion and provided several examples of how the park had sought to rectify the situation. Park staff had developed a series of handouts that examined various topics related to Creek Indian history that were available free-of-charge to visitors. Several paperback books that contained accounts of American Indian history were available for purchase in the visitor center gift shop. Temporary exhibits featuring Creek Indian trade items and weapons were installed in the visitor center lobby. New reproduction firearms, ones that might have been used by Creek Indians at the battle, were purchased and incorporated into existing weapons demonstrations. In 1978, members of the Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) assigned to Horseshoe Bend built a forty-foot-long replica of the log barricade across from the Cotton Patch Hill parking area. The model was used to demonstrate the advanced defensive works and military strategy employed by the Creek Indians at Horseshoe Bend.

Ghioto developed a special program that used the reconstructed barricade as an interactive prop that allowed students to experience a small piece of what it would have been like to defend that position. Students were also allowed to climb the barricade to illustrate just how difficult assaulting that structure would have been. Ghioto told visitors that the barricade represented American Indian ingenuity and tactical sophistication. The barricade, he believed, was essential to presenting balanced interpretive programs. Ghioto also reached out to the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians to arrange the purchase of two dugout canoes. The park had purchased canoes from these same craftspeople years earlier but those boats had been ravaged by years of
neglect as they sat along the Tallapoosa River tour stop. HOBE staff used the canoes at the Whale’s crossing tour road stop to demonstrate the scale of the boats used during the battle. The canoe program also emphasized the tactical sophistication and military acumen of American Indians. Ghioto’s telling of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend focused on central roles that American Indians played in its outcome. With Ghioto’s help, YCC members also helped the park create two additional nature trails—the Ecology Trail that extended off of the park’s original Ethno-Botantical Trail and the Battlefield Trail that connected parts of existing trails to a fire road that lead visitors toward the Miller Covered Bridge ruins. Ghioto used those trails to tell a broader story of the battle that included discussion of the local ecology and wildlife as a means of placing Tohopeka in its broader context.¹⁵

Ghioto concluded his 1980 report with a list of several park interpretation priorities. He hoped that funds could be located to renovate the visitor center adminstrative wing so that a permanent AV room could be installed. Without a permanent AV room, Ghioto had to improvise a set of collapsible screens that could be installed and removed quickly wherever it was needed in the visitor center. Since the late 1970s, when the maintenance staff had moved out of the visitor center, HOBE staff had been using the old maintenance area to host large groups and show films. This was a temporary arrangement because HOBE was already developing plans to transform that space into new office space for park staff. As that new space was being developed, Ghioto published an article in the NPS newsletter describing how other parks could use everyday materials to build a collapsible projection screen that could be stored in a small closet. Ghioto also recommended that the park continue to work to redesign the existing museum exhibits. Foremost, Ghioto cited that the existing exhibits contained several factual errors and omitted important details about the Creek War that hampered park interpretation. He also hoped that the National Park Service would allow the park to reconstruct a 100 feet long section of the log barricade on the historic battlefield. And finally, Ghioto called for the erection of a new monument dedicated to the memory of the Upper Creek Indians who died during the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.¹⁶

Ghioto believed that the National Park Service had never fully understood the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. He complained that the park lacked the necessary library of related secondary and primary source materials. If interpretation were to be improved, Ghioto felt that the park had to do a better job of gathering new materials and reaching out to a new generation of American Indian and U.S. military scholars. Ghioto certainly saw himself as a scholar. Perhaps, more than any other HOBE staff member in history, Ghioto wrote extensively for public and academic audiences. In 1981, he published a lengthy series of articles in local newspapers that were eventually shared with newspapers across the state on topics related to the War of 1812 and the Creek War. He was also interested in documenting HOBE’s history at a time when the National Park Service was just beginning to prioritize the documentation of its agency’s history. In 1978, he had published a scholarly article in the Alabama Historical Quarterly titled “The Centennial Celebration of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.” His work is among the first to explore
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the early development of public history in Alabama. The following year, he collaborated with Mark Spier, Park Technician, and Faye Johnson, Administrative Technician, to produce a popular park booklet titled Facts, Legends and Accounts of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. The book can be found in library catalogues across the nation. Ghioto also contributed articles to various NPS serials such as In Touch, NPS Newsletter, and the National Park Courier. He delivered numerous presentations to various historical societies as well as several to professional historical associations such as the Southern Historical Association and the Alabama Historical Association. While at HOBE, Ghioto received external funds from Alabama park supporters to travel to the Tennessee State Archives in Nashville to gather a comprehensive set of records related to the Creek War. He also traveled to the National Archives in Washington, D.C., Georgia Archives in Atlanta, and Mississippi Department of Archives and History in Jackson to gather historic manuscripts, muster rolls, and maps. Ghioto built a research library at HOBE that was likely the largest single collection of materials related to the Creek War in America. Ghioto’s work laid a foundation of knowledge that directly benefitted later park historians.

Ghioto’s research uncovered new information that provided HOBE with a new justification for rehabilitating some of its museum and wayside exhibits. The park now had a better understanding of the movements of Andrew Jackson’s forces on the morning of the battle as well as some additional context about the Creek War’s origins. In 1983, HOBE received $5,000 from the Harpers Ferry Center to revise three museum exhibits. The project was expanded in 1984 to include revisions to two wayside exhibits. According to Ghioto, the revisions corrected many of the most egregious factual errors that had been included in the original signs and added context and empathy for the Creek Indian defenders.

Poarch Band of Creek Indians

Prior to 1984, there were no federally recognized American Indian tribes in Alabama. For decades, HOBE had developed a relationship with the Poarch Band of Creek Indians, a community of Creek Indian descendants living in south Alabama who lacked federal recognition. Poarch Band efforts to gain federal recognition began in the 1950s. At that time, Chief Calvin McGhee played a central role in advocating for the rights of Poarch Band Indians. Although McGhee family members had played major leadership roles throughout the tribe’s history, Calvin was the first to organize the tribe into a government complete with laws and elections that empowered a sole executive officer to represent the Poarch Band. In 1950, McGhee established the Creek Nation East of the Mississippi at Poarch, a tribal government that lobbying the U.S. Department of the Interior to be recognized as an official tribal entity. By unifying Poarch Band Indians into a representative body capable of perpetually lobbying the

BIA for recognition and tribal benefits, McGhee convinced national leaders that the Poarch Band Indians were legitimate descendants of recognized Creek Indians.20

With the help of two Escambia County lawyers and support from the Indian Claims Commission, McGhee filed numerous lawsuits against the federal government seeking compensation for the millions of acres of land that Creek Indians lost in the Treaty of Fort Jackson. The Muskogee Creek Nation objected to Poarch Band efforts to receive federal compensation for lost historic Creek lands and believed that only those Creek descendants who lived on the Oklahoma reservation should have the right to sue the federal government to recover past land cessions. Despite Muskogee Creek Nation objections, the federal government sided with the Poarch Band Indians that Creek Indian descendants, regardless of where they lived, had a right to seek compensation from the federal government. McGhee also led a number of initiatives intended to raise awareness in Alabama and nationwide of the Poarch Band’s existence and educate them about Creek Indian heritage. Likewise, McGhee led a similar effort within his community and among other Creek Indians, especially those who did not live in Oklahoma, to document and teach past cultural practices that had largely been forgotten. McGhee, a savvy promoter who understood that most Americans associated American Indians with the characters portrayed in popular Western-genre motion pictures, purposely adopted the dress and some of the cultural practices of western Plains Indians in the hopes of convincing state and national leaders that the Poarch Band were "real" Indians. Even when many American Indian tribes, especially those living on reservations, disputed the Poarch Band tribe’s legitimacy as descendants of the historic Creek Indians, McGhee and the Poarch Band managed to maintain a highly visible presence in Washington, D.C., that often overshadowed their Muskogee Creek Nation counterparts.21

Following McGhee’s death in 1970, Poarch Band leader Eddie L. Tullis led the successful effort to gain federal recognition. Unlike McGhee, Tullis refused to "play Indian" for national officials and adopted contemporary business attire when negotiating on behalf of the Poarch Band members. Tullis successfully courted the support of Alabama governor George Wallace, who helped the Poarch Band lobby the BIA for recognition and in the development of a Poarch Band reservation in Alabama. On August 11, 1984, the BIA officially recognized the Poarch Band of Creeks Indians as a tribe with all of the same privileges and protections as other federally recognized American Indian tribes. The following year, the U.S. government established the 230-acre Poarch Band reservation in Poarch, eight miles from Atmore. The Poarch Band also received thirty-three acres at Hickory Ground (Otciafofa, in Muskogean) in Wetumpka, Elmore County. Hickory Ground was a well-documented and important Creek Indian burial site placed under Poarch Creek stewardship because they were Alabama’s sole federally recognized tribe.22

The Poarch Band’s successful recognition campaign placed HOBE in a difficult situation. For years, HOBE had been developing improved relations with the Muscogee (Creek) Nation in
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Oklahoma. Many Muscogee Creeks had opposed Poarch Band recognition and were concerned that Alabama had placed Hickory Ground under their control. Most Muscogee Creeks had converted to the Baptist Church during the early twentieth century. Many Creek Baptists opposed gambling and the Poarch Band had made it clear that they would open gaming rooms following their recognition. Muscogee Creeks worried that the Poarch Band might mismanage sacred Creek Indian sites and use their proximity to the Alabama government to gain special favors that the more distant Muscogee Creeks in Oklahoma lacked. If HOBE grew closer to the Poarch Band of Creek Indians, they risked alienating the Muscogee (Creek) Nation. The park had to think carefully about how to proceed especially after the 1990 passage of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), a law that led to greater consultations between federal agencies and federally recognized American Indian tribes.  

### Cultural Interpretive Programs

Throughout the 1980s, HOBE continued to observe the anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. The 1984 170th anniversary program was the first to be held over two days. Paul Ghioto spent several months developing the program. He collaborated with the American Red Cross to plan a 5K and 10K race to be held on the park’s tour road during the first morning of the event. Red Cross staff also accepted blood donations during the weekend programs. Students enrolled at the Lyman Ward Military Academy, located about 20 miles from the park in the town of Camp Hill, volunteered to serve, helping the park direct traffic and set-up an assembly area prior to the program. The academy’s military history course had prepared the students to serve as visitor guides to be stationed in various public areas of the park ready to answer questions and deliver brief descriptions of the battle. Ghioto worked closely with a fourth grade teacher at Dadeville Elementary School to produce a series of student history and art projects that were displayed in the visitor center during the anniversary programs. Many of the students who had submitted projects were on hand that weekend to interact with visitors as they toured the visitor center. U.S. Congressman Bill Nichols, who represented Alabama’s Third Congressional District that included parts of Tallapoosa County, attended the event and delivered a speech that reminded visitors of the heroic sacrifices of those who died at Horseshoe Bend and the enduring value of the NPS mission. Nichols, who had served in Congress since 1966, had been a staunch supporter of the National Park Service and U.S. Forest Service because he believed that both agencies contributed to our nation’s military training and preparedness. Alabama’s chapter of the Daughters of the War of 1812 also attended the event. Several of the women dressed in period-appropriate attire and mingled among the gathered crowd answering questions about life in the early 19th century. Continuing the park’s relationship with the U.S. Army, Ghioto invited the 313th U.S. Army Reserve Band to perform during Saturday’s ceremonies. The Birmingham based reserve band opened Saturday’s festivities with a rousing edition of the “Star Spangled Banner” followed by renditions of John Philip Sousa’s “The Stars and Stripes Forever” and various U.S. military branch theme songs. The unit also provided the park with a color guard that carried the nation’s flag and observed a moment of silence for the fallen. The Saturday ceremony also included speakers representing the Muscogee (Creek) Nation and the Eastern Band of the Cherokee Indians. A small delegation of Creek and Cherokee Indians
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attended the weekend commemorations. In the weeks prior to the event, park staff had made subtle changes to the visitor center “to lend to a more neutral presentation of viewpoints” that many American Indians visitors recognized during the event. The park had displayed a large portrait of General Andrew Jackson in its visitor center lobby since 1964. In the weeks before the 1984 program, HOBE hung an equally sized portrait of Creek Indian leader Menawa beside Jackson’s portrait. A temporary exhibit was also placed in the lobby filled with reproductions of various accounts of the battle that Ghioto had recently located in the Tennessee State Archives. The accounts described the battle’s horrific events and aftermath and presented a part of Jackson’s legacy that few visitors had ever considered. By the mid-1980s, HOBE, as well as most American historians, had begun to portray a more complete depiction of Jackson’s complicated legacy.24

Perhaps, the most noteworthy portion of the 170th anniversary event was the inclusion of a two-day living history encampment. By the mid-1980s, historical reenacting had emerged as a growing hobby for history enthusiasts. In America, battle reenactments had gained popularity during the 1960s Civil War centennial. By the 1980s, battle reenactments were held regularly and groups of reenactors had formed in many areas. While Civil War reenactments were the most popular, other groups devoted themselves to earlier periods of American history such as the American Revolution and War of 1812. In Auburn, Alabama, a group of reenactors formed during the 1980s that focused on depictions of the War of 1812 and Creek War. By the end of the decade, they were holding living history encampments at Fort McHenry National Monument and Horseshoe Bend National Military Park on a regular basis. During the 170th anniversary program, the Auburn reenactors recreated a Creek War American forces encampment that included cooking and weapons demonstrations. The encampment was placed among a strand of pine trees located behind the visitor center. Visitors could walk through the camp, enter the tents, touch many of their materials, and engage in conversation with the reenactors. The reenactors did not try to depict any particular historical figure or stay in character during their interactions with guests. The small group of reenactors performed various military drill exercises and marches and generally informed and entertained the program crowds. After 1984, living history encampments became a standard part of the HOBE’s annual battle anniversary program.25
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24. Superintendent Annual Report, Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, 1984, HOBE; “Horseshoe Bend Anniversary Event,” Tallapoosa Outlook, 26 March 1984. John William Ward’s Andrew Jackson: Symbol for an Age first appeared in the 1950s and was among the first scholarly works to critically analyze “Old Hickory’s” historical legacy and place in American mythology. His work was republished in the 1981 and received much attention as some Americans had drawn comparisons between the popular appeal generated by President Ronald Reagan and Jackson’s populist politicking. The 150th Anniversary of the Trail of Tears (1988) also raised numerous questions about Jackson’s attitudes toward American Indians. During the 1970s, a new generation of American Indians scholars began publishing works that embraced the new methods of ethnohistory as a means of balancing previous depictions and misunderstandings of American Indian culture. Ethnohistory, especially Theda Perdue’s works on Cherokee Indian history, cast Jackson as a perpetrator of genocide who used the politics of race to build his populist political support. John William Ward, Andrew Jackson: Symbol for an Age (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981); Theda Perdue, Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society, 1540-1866 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1987). Historians of American politics and southern society also shed new light on Jackson’s legacy, see: Edward Pessen, Jacksonian America: Society, Personality, and Politics (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985).

In addition to organizing its annual battle anniversary program, HOBE launched a new program in 1984 that eventually became part of its annual offerings. The year 1984 was the 25th anniversary of the creation of Horseshoe Bend National Military Park. HOBE was Alabama’s first national park unit and remained the only park in the system that interpreted the Creek War. The 25th park anniversary event was held on August 12, 1984. A delegation of Muscogee Creek, Poarch Band of Creek Indians, and Cherokee Indians helped the park install a new bronze plaque near the exterior of the visitor center entrance dedicated to the “memory of the Upper Creeks who died in the battle.” Hoping to draw a crowd for the plaque dedication, HOBE decided to hold its annual Horseshoe Bend Antique Car Show the same day. More than 750 visitors attended the park anniversary/car show event. After an eight-year run, the HOBE antique car show ended in 1984 as the park eliminated programs held in the park that had nothing to do with the park’s historic and natural resources.26

After the successful 170th anniversary program, HOBE created a planning committee to organize the upcoming 175th battle anniversary commemorations. After five years of planning, the 1989 175th anniversary event was probably the largest ever held at HOBE with more than 9,000 visitors over a single weekend of programs. According to Superintendent Marilyn Parris, the 175th anniversary program’s success was “largely because of the support, cooperation, and coordination of the park staff with the local communities.”27 The two-day event included military encampments with drill and flintlock demonstrations, art exhibits of work inspired by HOBE’s history, American Indian craft demonstrations, period music performances, a band concert, historic worship service to mark the Easter holiday, and lectures on military history and Creek Indian culture by visiting experts. The large program required substantial external partnerships. Russell Corporation, located in nearby Alexander City, donated equipment and audio technicians to help the park hold its music concert. Thirty-five students from Lyman Ward Academy, a private military school located about twenty miles from the park, assisted park rangers with traffic control. Cadets also provided the concert band and honor color guard for the ceremony. Morrison’s Food Services, a local food distribution warehouse, provided staff to prepare meals for visitors and program participants at a greatly reduced rate. The local newspaper called the event “the most successful festival in the region’s history.”28

HOBE staff tried to improve the visitor’s experience at the park by developing cassette tape guided tours that could be loaned to guests during their visit. The park received funds from Eastern National Park and Monument Association to hire a professional voice actor and recording studio to record two taped programs. The first program was developed to be sent to off-site educators, especially fourth grade Alabama history teachers, who might be unable to visit the park with their class yet wanted students to be introduced the Horseshoe Bend’s history. The park had created a slide show that was packaged with the tape and mailed to teachers who requested park materials. Slide images included snapshots of various locations

and park tour stops including Gun Hill and the Tallapoosa River. The teachers borrowed the tape and materials and returned them within a month of their initial delivery. The program was a success. Park tapes and slides found an eager audience among teachers. Within a few months, the park began raising funds to create additional sets of tapes and slides to meet the rising demand for materials. When the visitor center completed renovations in 1985, park rangers had access to a forty-five seat auditorium equipped with a permanent screen and projector that could play VCR tapes as well as a slide projector. The off-site program was sometimes played for park guests during peak visitation periods using the new auditorium. Eventually, HOBE developed a special Battle of Horseshoe Bend A/V program that replaced on-site performances of the off-site slideshow. The second program was designed for on-site park visitors. HOBE’s staff lacked the resources to deliver guided park tours on a regular basis. Park tours were usually reserved for large groups or special events that had been planned in advance. Park staff delivered interpretive talks at the visitor center regularly, but the visitor center was physically separated from many of the battle’s main sites. Visitors could not observe battle locations and listen to the ranger’s remarks simultaneously. To resolve this problem, HOBE developed a recorded guided park tour that guests could borrow and play during their visit. Cassette tapes could either be played using a guest’s automobile cassette player or by using one of a set of battery operated cassette players provided by the park.29

HOBE also received funds to install wayside signage at the park’s picnic area and boat ramp. HOBE Chief Interpretive Ranger Carol Slaughter argued that many park visitors who used the picnic area annually never entered the visitor center nor drove the tour road. The picnic area lacked any interpretation of the park’s resources and thus failed to invite visitors to further explore the park. Slaughter proposed erecting two panels in this area. The first panel would consist of a bulletin board where park staff could post information about the park and advertise upcoming events and programs. A second panel provided picnickers with a quick overview of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend and included a park map that invited visitors to see the visitor center and tour road exhibits. The usage of the park’s boat ramp had increased steadily throughout the 1980s. The Alabama Power Company was building the Harris Dam, located 35 miles upstream from the park. Construction had reduced boater access to boat ramps located upstream from the dam. The loss of those river access points led to an increased usage of the HOBE boat ramp. Earlier in the decade, HOBE maintenance staff had made significant upgrades to the boat ramp to prevent further erosion of the neighboring riverbank and improve the parking area.

By 1985, the boat ramp had become a major recreation attraction in the area. Most of the boaters never visited the park. Like the picnic area, Slaughter hoped that the installation of new interpretive signage at the boat ramp might raise awareness of HOBE’s resources and encourage boaters to visit the park. In 1985, the park installed a three-sided kiosk at the boat ramp that contained a quick summary of the Battle of Horseshoe in addition to various recreational

regulations maintained by the park. Slaughter worked with Olin Nave of the Harpers Ferry Center to produce the new signs.\(^{30}\)

**Law Enforcement, Natural Resource Management, and Park Maintenance**

Managing and protecting park property has always been one of the major tasks performed by HOBE superintendents. HOBE leaders devoted significant amounts of time toward the supervision of maintenance and construction projects and law enforcement and public safety programs. Throughout the 1980s, HOBE superintendents developed extensive outreach and cooperative partnerships with a variety of local, state, and federal agencies to supplement the park’s limited staff. Together these groups addressed the park’s main threats, which included vandalism and illegal activities on park lands, insufficient emergency medical responders in the area, and increased concerns that wildfires might damage park resources. During the 1980s, the National Park Service developed new programs to support the professionalization of its law enforcement and fire management programs. At HOBE, those developments led to additional staff training and enhancements to the park’s existing public safety and maintenance programs.\(^{31}\)

Monitoring HOBE’s 2,040-acre property was a difficult task for HOBE staff. Despite restrictions, the public could use fire roads and paths to access much of this area. Surrounded by private property that was frequently used by locals for deer hunting, HOBE staff worried that illegal hunting was taking place in the park. The park lacked the staff to routinely patrol these areas. Without these patrols, park staff worried that a wide array of illegal activities could take place on park property without the staff’s knowledge. HOBE needed park law enforcement rangers to curtail potential illegal activities.\(^{32}\)

The amount of law enforcement training received by HOBE staff increased substantially in the 1980s as the National Park Service continued to improve and professionalize its law enforcement programs following the passage of the General Authorities Act of 1976. During the 1980s, park rangers received mandatory training in law enforcement, fire suppression, emergency medical services, firearms, and search and rescue operations. HOBE Superintendent Phillip Brueck was the first superintendent in the park’s history that had extensive NPS law enforcement experience. Brueck’s arrival in 1983 brought a level of expertise to the park that it had previously lacked. He was regularly chosen by the National Park Service to lead law enforcement training workshops across the system. For example, in 1985, he was placed on a team of NPS law enforcement specialists to assess the law enforcement and safety policies at the Great Smoky Mountain National Park. As part of its law enforcement initiatives, the National Park Service also began requiring parks to hold monthly safety meetings. In larger parks than HOBE, these meetings were an opportunity for park rangers and maintenance staff to discuss
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issues than one or the other might not have been aware of without these face to face meetings. At HOBE, park rangers and maintenance staff were in constant communication. Rangers often pitched in to help maintenance staff complete special projects that needed additional labor. HOBE’s monthly safety meetings tended to focus on ways the park could enhance its cooperative relationships with local law enforcement agencies.33

Prior to the early 1970s, park rangers, who received additional law enforcement training, monitored park property for illegal activities. Illegal hunting on NPS property was the most common infraction at HOBE, since the surrounding woods were popular hunting sites for area hunters. Although the park boundaries were marked, and most local hunters knew that hunting on NPS land was prohibited, many ignored the law. Most illegal hunters were never caught because HOBE lacked the personnel needed to constantly patrol park lands. Nonetheless, park rangers occasionally encountered illegal hunters during routine property inspections.34 During one notable incident, Chief Ranger Paul Ghioto heard gunshots while walking the park boundary. As he moved toward the sounds of the shots, he encountered two armed hunters standing near a fatally wounded doe. When the hunters spotted Ghioto, they bolted toward the road. Ghioto gave chase before returning to the visitor center to get help with the search. When they returned to the site of the incident, Ghioto found a rifle that the hunters had discarded during their escape. The hunters avoided capture. The incident reminded Ghioto of the potential dangers that came with monitoring the park’s rural boundaries.35

Monthly reports filed by HOBE park rangers during the 1980s also expressed concerns that unmonitored sections of park property were being used to grow illegal marijuana crops or to sell illegal drugs. Faye Johnson recalled that HOBE Superintendent Phil Brueck once encountered several men moving in the park woods at night. When Brueck flashed a light at the men, they took off. A few minutes later, Brueck heard motorcycles racing along one of the park fire roads. Sometimes during inspections of the park, rangers discovered signs of drug use such as syringes, paper bags (commonly used to inhale paint fumes), or broken glass pipes. HOBE superintendents lacked park staff to adequately monitor these areas. They sought out increased cooperation with local law enforcement officials to reduce these illegal activities.36

The theft of park signs posed the most significant problem for staff law enforcement. During the early 1980s, a band of thieves repeatedly stole metal signs from the park. In one incident, a local Boy Scout troop had recently erected a set of metal signs along the park’s ethno-botanical trail as part of their annual community service project, and they were stolen by local thieves. Shortly after that incident, the same group of thieves stole two of the metal wayside exhibit signs

at Cotton Patch Hill and another at the Newyaucau overlook. In 1985, park staff reported that stolen signs had been a persistent problem at HOBE for more than a decade.37

Despite these periods of stagnant funding, HOBE continued to support area law enforcement and emergency first responders in the local community. In rural Tallapoosa County, Alabama, first responders in emergencies were often volunteer medics and firefighters who carried two-way radios in their cars or monitored police radio transmission from their homes. As members of the local community and park residents, many HOBE rangers and park technicians, such as Brueck, Ghioto, and Martin, joined volunteer first responder units. The local New Site Volunteer Fire Department usually sought out and appointed a HOBE staff member to its leadership team. HOBE used its federal connections to assist the department in the acquisition of equipment and fire and medical training. The park saw the local volunteer fire department as an essential part of HOBE’s visitor safety and resource management activities and thus helped as much as possible to ensure its continued operation. Trained by the National Park Service to administer first aid as part of their park duties, the rangers routinely responded to calls for help outside of the park. In 1985, for example, Ghioto rescued a man trapped in his vehicle following a car crash near the park entrance. During a separate incident, another HOBE ranger administered lifesaving CPR to a motorist who suffered a heart attack while driving through the nearby community of Jackson Gap. HOBE staff trained as emergency responders provided an invaluable service to the local community that had few full-time EMTs, police, or firemen available during emergencies.38

HOBE park rangers collaborated with area U.S. Forest Service personnel to host several first aid certification programs. These programs were especially popular during the late spring months when many area summer camp programs were looking for first aid certificate programs for camp counselors. HOBE also helped many YCC and VIP participants and local educators acquire first aid certification. Park staff also participated in area public safety planning meetings that identified gaps in the area’s emergency response and fire prevention systems.39

Partnerships with the U.S. Forest Service also enhanced HOBE’s fire management programs. During the 1970s, NPS policy evolved from treating fires as unnatural occurrences that needed to be extinguished by personnel as soon as possible to a policy that recognized fire as a critical part of every park unit’s ecosystem. Rather than uniformly extinguishing all fires, the National Park Service developed new policies to manage those fires so that they could perform their vital roles in preserving ecosystems. Several major wildfires had destroyed hundreds of thousands of acres of NPS-managed lands during the late 1970s and 1980s. The 1972 Moccasin Mesa fire at Mesa Verde National Park, the 1977 La Mesa fire at Bandelier National Monument, and the Ouzel Fire in Rocky Mountain National Park had led the National Park Service to reexamine its forest management and fire suppression programs. Those fires created a need for new forest management policies. By the 1980s, many NPS units had supervised controlled burns on their property. Other parks, such as Yellowstone National Park, had decided to allow naturally
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occurring fires, usually caused by lightning, to burn while fighting “fires that threatened human life, property, special natural features and historic and cultural sites.” 40 Park units such as HOBE that lacked a prescribed fire program had a greater potential to experience a devastating wildlife because their inaction had created a densely compacted forest floor that contained abundant fuel capable of turning even the smallest of fires into a major disaster.

Severe droughts in Alabama during the early 1980s, increased concerns that the state’s forest lands could combust at any moment. Prior to the 1980s, HOBE’s main efforts to reduce the potential for forest fires centered on the identification and removal of dead trees in the park. Most of those trees had been infected by pine beetles or some form of blight. The U.S. Forest Service monitored area forests from airplanes and sent reports to HOBE describing locations of dead trees on their property. Maintenance staff usually cut down and removed the trees from the area to prevent the spread of disease. The park also maintained a system of fire roads designed to provide access to remote areas and help prevent small fires from spreading from one area of the park to another. In the early 1980s, HOBE received directives to improve its fire roads. Maintenance staff regraded many of the roads and expanding their width to serve as a better fire barrier. Detailed maps of the park’s fire roads were shared with area fire departments and the U.S. Forest Service. As fire management and planning spread across the National Park Service, HOBE, and the New Site Volunteer Fire Department collaborated to seek out federal and state grants to enhance their existing equipment and training. The New Site Volunteer Fire Department’s inclusion in HOBE’s planning activities helped the volunteer group gain much-needed external funds.

In 1982, HOBE and Alabama Safety Forestry Commission, a state agency tasked with reducing the threat of forest fires, “entered into a cooperative fire agreement which established procedures for each to provide mutual assistance in the suppression of wildfires occurring on park lands and on lands bordering the park.”41 Meanwhile, HOBE rangers and park technicians began attending annual fire suppression and prevention workshops. Forest fighting training videos were circulated across the National Park Service and became a regular part of HOBE’s monthly safety meetings. The park launched a more aggressive fire suppression maintenance program that cleared the woods of downed trees and brush to reduce potential fire fuel sources. In 1983, HOBE, Alabama Safety Forestry Commission, New Site Volunteer Fire Department, and U.S. Forest Service personnel performed the first prescribed burns in the park’s history. Both parties spent months planning the operation. They selected an area of the park located along Highway 49 to carry out their controlled burn. Planners believed that this area posed the greatest risk to park resources because increased automobile traffic had led to greater numbers of discarded cigarette butts found along the road.42

As HOBE evaluated its fire management policies, the construction of a new dam on the Tallapoosa River impacted the park’s natural resources. The Alabama Power Company completed the construction of Harris Dam in 1983. The dam was the fourth to be located on the Tallapoosa River and is located about eighteen miles upstream from HOBE. The dam’s
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hydroelectric production schedule caused some problems at the park. During the drought that impacted the region in the early 1980s, the water flowing through the park was significantly reduced because little was being released from the impounded Lake Wedowee into the Tallapoosa River. When releases happened, HOBE staff and river boaters and sportspeople often had either little or no notice of the changing water flow and levels. Jon boat operators, who used HOBE’s boat ramp, were sometimes swept down river. During heavy rains, the Tallapoosa River was prone to flooding as water released from Harris Dam sometimes overwhelmed the downriver Martin Dam and created rapidly rising water levels in the park. After years without a significant flood, HOBE experienced several floods during the mid–to-late 1980s that damaged the tour road and disrupted visitor services.43

To monitor changing river conditions, HOBE strengthened its existing relationship with Auburn University biology and fishery professors, such as Werner Wieland, who sent students to the park to document the potential impact that Harris Dam had on the Tallapoosa River’s ecology. HOBE provided Auburn University researchers with access to the river on NPS property and supported their work. The research laid the groundwork for subsequent studies that concluded that Harris Dam had a significant impact on the Tallapoosa River’s aquatic species, especially the bronze darter fish. Auburn University and HOBE had worked previously to study many aspects of the park’s natural resources, but during the late 1980s those collaborations increased as the park became an ideal and convenient place to study river ecology. During that decade, more than 20 studies were conducted by Auburn University faculty and students to examine how Alabama Power Company’s practice had impacted the Tallapoosa River.44

**Park Facilities**

In 1984, HOBE Superintendent Phil Brueck set aside enough funding in the park’s annual budget to begin renovations on the visitor center utility wing. By that time, maintenance staff no longer used the visitor center utility wing. The area had been primarily used as a storage building for several years. Brueck saw this as “wasted space” and grew determined to cobble together funds to begin transforming the utility wing into new administration offices. HOBE maintenance staff completed the bulk of the renovations because the park did not have enough funds to hire an outside contractor to do the work. According to HOBE administrative officer Faye Johnson, the project “wasn’t done under contract. . . . We basically did all of the work. . . . [Superintendent Phil Brueck] and the maintenance guys drew up the plans to divide it into offices. . . . Our guys did all of the electrical work but we hired someone to go in afterwards to
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check it all out.” Paul Ghioto described the project to a friend: “Here at Horseshoe Bend we’re busily engaged in the renovation of a former maintenance area on the east wing of the Visitor Center complex into a new office space. The present office space we’ll transform into a 50 seat audiovisual/meeting room. By sometime in early 1985 we should have the work completed. Then we’ll have a capacity to show the visitor all types of A-C programs via VCR, 16-mm film, carousel slides, filmstrips, etc. . . . we’re trying to bring the story of Horseshoe Bend in addition to the park’s natural resources to the visitor in as many ways we can which will be both entertaining and informative.” By November 1984, HOBE maintenance staff had completed renovations and relocated most of the visitor center offices to the new administrative office wing.

During the late 1980s, the U.S. Congress was considering passing new legislation to enhance the existing Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The 1973 Act prohibited discrimination on the basis of disability in programs conducted by federal agencies, in programs receiving federal financial assistance, and in employment practices of federal contractors. Previously, the National Park Service had created employment policies that prohibited many disabled people from becoming park rangers because of their physical limitations. The Rehabilitation Act ended such practices. By the late 1980s, Congress was considering new legislation that would force federally funded programs to improve accessibility for disabled people. For the National Park Service, the new Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) required the park to make its facilities and programs more accessible to the disabled.

In anticipation of this new legislation, the National Park Service launched initiatives in 1988 and 1989 to prepare for new ADA requirements. At HOBE, Superintendent Marrilyn Parris led an initiative to improve the park’s accessibility. HOBE added an additional handicapped parking space in its visitor lot, added new picnic tables that were handicap accessible, installed new handrails on all stairways, constructed new concrete ramps to provide wheelchair access to recreation and visitor center areas, and submitted plans to renovate the visitor center restrooms to provide handicap access. Park staff also investigated strategies to improve handicap access to interpretive shelters and wayside markers along the tour road. Because of the park’s standing relationship with the Talladega School for the Deaf and Blind, the park already had made most of its brochures and educational materials accessible to the deaf and blind. As the park planned its 175th battle anniversary program, park staff developed a plan to enhance handicap access to that program.

In 1989, after years of housing shortages at the park that had forced some staff to live in a mobile home placed among the park’s two permanent staff quarters, HOBE received permission to begin planning for the construction of a third staff quarters. HOBE worked closely with the
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NPS Housing Oversight Committee to investigate potential housing designs that would be best suited to the park’s needs. By 1989, most of the park’s permanent staff lived in neighboring towns and commuted to the park daily. Some superintendents, such as Marilyn Parris, chose to live in park housing while others such as Phillip Brueck lived in town. As federal budgets improved during the late 1980s and HOBE was able to resume hiring seasonal workers, the housing committee determined that the park needed a quarters that could be shared by the park’s temporary staff. Plans for a two-bedroom house were completed so that when funds became available the park could begin construction.48

Conclusion

HOBE managed a broad range of activities throughout the 1980s despite a period of prolonged budget cuts and stagnation. To ensure that federal budget cuts would have as little impact on the park as possible, HOBE developed stronger relationships with a host of external partners whose expertise and human resources not only stabilized the park but opened up new opportunities that may not have otherwise developed. Previous programs, such as the YCC, expanded at the park throughout the 1980s and were supplemented by a new wave of volunteer initiatives that contributed thousands of hours of labor to HOBE. Law enforcement became a greater priority in the park as vandalism, theft, and trespassing increased. During the 1980s, HOBE staff received far more law enforcement training than prior staff had completed. New law enforcement initiatives across the NPS system brought changes to HOBE as well. Meanwhile, the National Park Service’s evolving fire management policies led HOBE to reevaluate how the park managed its wooded areas. After consultation with the U.S. Forest Service and state wildfire task forces, HOBE initiated the park’s first controlled burns to reduce the fuel that had gathered on the park’s forest floor. In addition to new law enforcement training, HOBE staff also participated in a growing number of fire safety, suppression, and management training workshops. In return for the training they had received, HOBE assumed a larger role as public safety educators in Alabama by providing fire training workshops in many local communities. While HOBE’s environmental education programs declined from their 1970s activity levels, the park coordinated with universities and state agencies to study the Tallapoosa River’s ecology as new activities on the river threatened its stability. Overall, the 1980s saw HOBE expand its public safety and environmental study outreach, especially in Alabama.

As HOBE expanded its public safety and environmental study outreach, the park also made significant strides toward improving the quality of its cultural resource interpretation. During the 1980s, the park received funds to revise some of its visitor center and wayside exhibits. The park continued to develop stronger relationships with American Indian tribes. Several Creek and Cherokee Indian delegations visited the park during the 1980s and participated in several park programs. Most notably, the annual battle anniversary program expanded to a two-day program that involved larger numbers of reenactors, American Indian interpreters, community partners, and planned interpretive activities. The 1989 175th battle anniversary program hosted more than 9,000 guests—more than any other program in the park’s history. HOBE also began to commemorate its own history. Across the National Park Service, a renewed effort to document NPS history had taken flight and many parks, such as HOBE, began holding

programs to mark various park anniversaries. The HOBE park anniversary programs eventually became part of the park’s standard annual programs. The event raised local awareness of the role that the National Park Service and HOBE had played in the area. As the 1980s drew to a close, HOBE had emerged as a vibrant center of cultural, environmental, and public safety activities and training.
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Introduction

Horseshoe Bend National Military Park has witnessed numerous changes over the past 25 years. In 1990, Judy Forte became the park’s first African American superintendent and its second female leader. Forte discovered that the park lacked many essential planning documents and initiated plans for their development. After more than twenty five years, the visitor center exhibits were replaced in the mid-1990s. Unfortunately, the updated displays continued to focus much of their attention on General Andrew Jackson’s forces, and exhibit planners failed to consult with any American Indian tribal governments during their development. Meanwhile, HOBE staff developed an improved living history program that collaborated with American Indian reenactors and strove to improve the historical accuracy of the park’s demonstrations. In 1997, HOBE was placed under the administration of Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site. While the loss of an on-site superintendent left many park staff feeling neglected, HOBE benefitted under Tuskegee management receiving new funds to improve programs and facilities.

When HOBE was separated from Tuskegee Institute management in 2001, the park launched new measures to improve its natural resource management including expanded partnerships with local universities and an enhanced fire management program. As the park planned for its 50th anniversary and the 200th anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, park advocates formed the Friends of Horseshoe Bend to help raise funds for special park projects. The bicentennial event on March 27, 2014, was among the best attended programs in the park’s history. On that day, more than 300 members of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation in Oklahoma, including their Chief George Tiger, traveled to the park to participate in the ceremony. Stomp dances and living history demonstrations highlighted commemorations that marked just how far the park had improved its relations with American Indians over the past fifty years.

Judy Forte Administration

In 1990, Phenix City, Alabama, native Judy Forte became HOBE’s first African American superintendent. During the late 1970s, as a college student enrolled at Tuskegee University, Forte had been recruited into the National Park Service by park rangers stationed at Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site (TUIN). She worked at TUIN during her senior year as part of a NPS program to recruit minority college students into the agency. Her first NPS post was at Appomattox Court House National Historical Park in Virginia where she worked as an interpreter. As one of the few African American interpreters at the site where General Robert E. Lee had surrendered the Army of Northern Virginia that directly led to the defeat of the Confederate States of America, Forte confronted many racist attitudes expressed by visitors who believed that she would be better off doing living history demonstrations of slavery rather than telling audiences about the Confederacy’s defeat. When one visitor asked Forte if it would
not be better if she stayed in the slave quarters, she bluntly replied “not anymore.” After spending a few years at Appomattox Court House, Forte transferred to Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in Atlanta where she served as that unit’s district ranger. After ten years at Chattahoochee River, Forte accepted an offer to become the first African American superintendent at HOBE. Forte was immediately welcomed to the park by longtime park advocate Judge Clinton Jackson Coley who went out of his way to introduce her to the local community. Administrative Officer Faye Johnson, who had already worked at the park for more than a decade, helped Forte transition into her new role thanks to her detailed knowledge of the park’s budget, facilities, and community partners.

When Forte began her post in 1990, HOBE had seven full-time staff: Superintendent Judy Forte, Administrative Officer Faye Johnson, Chief Interpretive Ranger Shawn Gillette, Chief Law Enforcement Ranger Dwight Dixon, and three maintenance technicians. Because the park had an experienced staff whose combined park service experience totaled more than a half century, Forte walked into a good situation at HOBE. The park had addressed its law enforcement needs by transferring Dwight Dixon to the park where he served as a full-time Law Enforcement Ranger. Dixon made regular patrols into the park’s isolated areas and used a new park patrol boat to monitor activities on the Tallapoosa River more closely than the park had before. Faye Johnson, native of Alexander City, had worked at the park for more than a decade and at times had served as the park’s de facto acting superintendent during staff turnovers. She helped Forte become acquainted with the park’s budget and could provide her with a lengthy institutional history of the park based on her own extensive experience.

SERO Director Bob Baker and staff met with Forte at HOBE to create a set of short-term park goals. Chief among the park’s short-term goals were

1. to seek an increase in base funding and FTE to allow for adequate staffing;
2. address resource management needs through revision of the Resource Management Plan, updating of the Base Resource Inventory, and the development of Fire Management Plan, and a Collections Management Plan;
3. address the need for additional archeological investigations within the park;
4. actively seek funding for the addition of mobility accessible restroom facilities at the Visitor Center; and
5. address the need for an Exhibit Plan to upgrade/rehabilitate existing museum exhibits.

---

After consulting with previous HOBE superintendents, Forte recognized that the park needed to hire an additional law enforcement officer to conduct patrols to protect park resources. “We needed additional law enforcement,” recalled Forte, “because we were isolated from the city. If anything happened, they were the ones who would need to respond.” Park staff worried about repeated theft of signage, illegal activities such as hunting and drug use as well as “pot hunters” who had been chased off the property. “Current staffing levels,” Forte reported to the SERO, “offer only minimal abilities towards protection.” The Newyaucau Village Site was especially vulnerable because it was “located in a remote area away from the Visitor Center and is heavily overgrown with trees and brush. However, its location has been published, and it is known as a historic Creek Indian site.” Without an additional law enforcement officer, HOBE could not effectively monitor these areas. By the end of Forte’s time at Horseshoe Bend, the park had received approval to hire an additional full-time Law Enforcement Ranger.4

Collections management had been a persistent problem at HOBE since 1964. Park collections needed to be cataloged, museum exhibit display cases failed to adequately protect artifacts, and collections storage space threatened park resources. “Currently the door to our collections room,” reported Forte, “opens to the outside of the building. This allows outside atmospheric conditions to affect the conditions within the storage area. This also poses a security risk, with this door opening to the outside and back of the building.” Funds could not be secured to build a new collection storage area, but Forte managed to acquire enough support to install “state of the art monitoring equipment” in the existing space.5

Forte tried to address what she considered to be the lack of knowledge within the park of its cultural landscapes. The concept of what constituted a cultural landscape and how to best manage those resources was still a relatively new idea within the broader field of historic preservation. The term cultural landscape was first employed by the National Park Service in 1981. The National Park Service defined a cultural landscape “as a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person, or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values.”6 Four years later, the National Park Service published NPS 28: Cultural Resource Management Guideline, a report that provided guidance for creating cultural landscape reports. The report recommended that the creation of a cultural landscape report be included in a park’s planning activities “to avoid or minimize harm to cultural resources, to identify the most appropriate uses for cultural resources, and to determine the ultimate treatment . . . or deliberate neglect or destruction for cultural resources.”7 The report recommended that park units develop a cultural landscape inventory that could be used to produce a cultural landscape report to assist with resource management.

management. The report also urged parks to consult with cultural landscape experts during their cultural landscape management planning. In 1991, the National Park Service was planning to launch a new initiative to develop cultural landscape inventories for all NPS units. During Forte’s time at Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area, she helped that park develop a plan to inventory its cultural landscapes. Following those guidelines, Forte advised the SERO that HOBE needed to compile historical data on the historic battlefield’s flora because it lacked a “clear understanding of the Native American habitat during this time.” Forte believed that a cultural landscape study for HOBE could improve the park’s interpretive planning and resource management practices. If the park could better understand the resource’s historic flora, wrote Forte, “it would greatly add to the Battle of Horseshoe Bend’s interpretation.” Like many NPS units during the early 1990s, HOBE was just starting to think about cultural landscape documentation.8

Forte also sought funding for studies to help the park “fill in gaps . . . about the battle and the Creek Indians.” HOBE was in the process of replacing its 1964 exhibits but needed additional information before it “could balance the battlefield’s physical commemoration of those who fought here.” In her opinion, the park needed to erect a memorial to honor “the Creek Indians who fought so courageously against superior United States forces.” The park also lacked any ethnographic studies of the battlefield that would help them “enter into cooperative agreements and adjust programs and uses to allow continued traditional resources use.” American Indian tribal members had started to visit the park more frequently and sought HOBE’s permission to hold a variety of ceremonies on the property. HOBE needed help ensuring that these ceremonies were appropriate and if they should be incorporated into existing public programming. None of these new studies were funded. Without this information, the Harpers Ferry Center continued developing HOBE’s new exhibits using outdated research that was incapable of providing the kinds of information the park needed to balance its interpretation.9

HOBE’s staff knew that it needed to embrace a more inclusive interpretation of the park’s resources. At that time, a movement had begun across the National Park Service to reevaluate how park units interpreted American Indian resources. During the late 1980s, John E. Cook, Regional Director of the NPS Southwest Region, launched an initiative to improve American Indian interpretation in the National Park Service. He brought together NPS staff representing more than 100 park units whose historic and cultural significance was connected to American Indians. In 1990, this working group published Interpreting Native American Cultures, a guide for the development of best practices across the National Park Service. The report admitted that the NPS relationship with American Indians “had both a positive and negative track record over the years.”10 Cook reminded NPS personnel that “Too often, we have a tendency to think of Indian tribes, as does our society in general, as just another minority or ethnic group, when in fact, they are not. They are landholders with the status of treaty nations that elevates them even beyond statehood. The United States did not make treaties with states.”11 The report sought to
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build improved relations and respect between NPS interpreters and American Indians. The document’s prescribed best practices largely urged park units to do a better job of consulting with American Indian tribal governments before initiating interpretive or resource management planning.

Forte believed that improving American Indian interpretation across the National Park Service would push HOBE interpreters to tell a more diverse story. She wanted the park to move away from celebratory narratives and to rely less on retelling military history. “That was the beginning from my perspective,” Forte remembered. “Particularly at war sites that relied heavily on descriptions of troop movements and on the white man’s victory. Regardless of what park you were at your story was being looked at and trying to get a more balanced and more inclusive perspective on how that story was being told.”

While both the 1964 and 1995 museum exhibits failed to achieve that balance, Forte labored to ensure that the park’s public programs presented different perspectives. American Indian groups had been participating in the park’s anniversary events for years. HOBE developed an annual festival that invited American Indians to the park to demonstrate crafts, foodways, games, and ceremonial practices. The park hired seasonal American Indian interpreters to supplement its existing American military living history program.

The increase in American Indian interpreters in the park coincided with a larger expansion of American Indian reenactors nationwide that took place during the 1990s. By the early 1990s, according to HOBE Interpretive Ranger Ove Jensen, the quality of American Indian-led living history demonstrations had improved significantly. In past decades, the quality of American Indian presentations varied widely and generally relied heavily on “bland depictions of Plains Indian culture.” For example, prior to the early 1990s, during many HOBE events that included American Indians it would be commonplace to see Indian reenactors erecting tipis or adorned with elaborate feather headdresses that would not have been part of Creek or Cherokee Indian society. By the early 1990s, American Indian interpreters at HOBE began presenting more focused programs that displayed specific aspects of Creek Indian society, especially their ceremonial traditions and material culture. Reenactors also started to demonstrate period specific Creek Indian attire. Programs continued to be primarily delivered by reenactors who were not members of federally recognized Creek and Cherokee tribal governments. “Most American Indian reenactors,” Jensen observed, “had only a limited connection or association with any American Indian ancestry.”

The addition of a third park housing unit was one of Forte’s lasting contributions to HOBE. In 1964, HOBE built two houses in the park. A need for additional housing arose almost immediately. For years, HOBE brought in mobile homes to house park staff. At one point,

the park residential zone had two houses and three mobile homes. In 1990, a third house was built, and the mobile homes were removed.16

**Dwight Dixon, Acting Superintendent**

In June 1992, Judy Forte transferred to Martin Luther King Jr. National Historical Park in Atlanta. For nearly a year, Horseshoe Bend was managed by Acting Superintendent Dwight Dixon. Dixon remained in charge until the spring of 1993. During his brief management of the park, several important initiatives progressed. Foremost, the park received approval from the Southeast Regional Office to begin working with the Harpers Ferry Center to renovate the park’s aging visitor center exhibits. Dixon developed an initial draft for the proposed exhibits and met with Harpers Ferry staff on two occasions to coordinate revisions. Planning documents, namely the Resource Management Plan and Statement for Interpretation, that began during Forte’s administration were finalized and implemented at the park. The 1992 *Resource Management Plan* (RMP) incorporated many of the recommendations that had been identified in Forte’s 1991 *Statement for Management*. The RMP recommended that HOBE increase its staff to “properly handle park visitors and resource management concerns / issues.” The plan reported that increasing demands on staff to enforce laws in the park had reduced the amount of time park rangers could devote to other resource management issues such as producing a cultural landscape inventory and assisting external partners with additional ecological studies of the Tallapoosa River. The RMP called for substantial revisions of the park’s existing exhibits and for the replacement of the aging interpretive shelters located along the park tour road. To assist with the development of a more inclusive interpretation of the park’s history, the RMP advised the park to conduct additional archeological work and develop an archeological resource protection plan to ensure that future investigations were properly supervised by park staff. The RMP recommended that HOBE develop a collections management plan to assist with plans to locate a better site for collections storage. The park still lacked a collections inventory, another item included in the RMP’s recommendations. The RMP also included the first recommendations in park history to encourage the growth of hardwood forests in the park to recreate a landscape that more closely resembled the early 19th-century environment.17

Dixon implemented many of RMP’s recommendations. Under his leadership, Dixon worked with Auburn University biologists, who were already conducting extensive research on the Tallapoosa River’s water flow through the park, to update HOBE’s existing flora and fauna inventories. With the help of several students, Dixon was able to make substantial progress on that update. To assist with Auburn University’s research, Dixon worked with the university and the National Park Service to purchase and install a river level monitoring system in the park. The device allowed HOBE and Auburn University to constantly record the river’s water levels and enhanced the latter’s research data. Dixon led the initiative to expand the usage of the NPS

---

Automated National Catalogue System (ANCS) at HOBE to catalog park collections. In 1992, despite reduced staff, HOBE managed to enter more than 250 artifacts into the database.¹⁸

**Jim David Administration**

Superintendent Jim David arrived at HOBE in March of 1993. According to David, park staff morale had been low due to several personnel conflicts among park staff. David immediately set to work getting the staff to “work as a team again.” Fortunately, David, who was a first-time superintendent, had an experienced park staff at his disposal including longtime Administrative Officer Faye Johnson, Chief Law Enforcement Officer Dwight Dixon, and Chief Interpretive Ranger John Reid. Tallapoosa County Judge C.J. Coley welcomed David to the park and helped the new superintendent meet area leaders in Alexander City and Dadeville. The two men formed a quick and productive friendship. With a new visitor center exhibit in production, HOBE appeared ready to move forward with plans that had been in the making for decades, but several problems made David’s task challenging.¹⁹

HOBE promoter Judge Clinton Jackson Coley passed away in December of 1997. Following the park’s creation in 1959, Coley remained a vocal park supporter and valuable resource for new superintendents. He attended most park programs and led countless numbers of guided tours of the park. Few guests at his Alexander City home could leave without first joining him for a battlefield tour or listening to his entertaining rendition of the park’s origins. In a lifetime filled with numerous accomplishments and philanthropic activities, Coley was perhaps proudest of his role in creating HOBE. Coley’s death was a major setback for the park because he was the most active connection between HOBE and area businesses and political leaders. Even in his final years, HOBE superintendents could call on Coley for advice or assistance with navigating potentially problematic situations with local communities.²⁰

According to David, HOBE lacked adequate staff to effectively manage the park’s resources and visitor services. When David started, the park had seven, full-time staff: John Reid, Chief Interpretive Ranger; Faye Johnson, Administrative Officer; Dwight Dixon, Chief Law Enforcement Officer; Terry Cook, Law Enforcement Ranger; and three maintenance technicians. Although the park’s three maintenance technicians could repair anything and excelled at their jobs, HOBE lacked a facilities manager who could direct their work and handle all routine administrative tasks necessary to acquire resources necessary to maintain the park. In addition to his other duties as superintendent, David had to devote too much time to managing maintenance work, time that prevented him from focusing on other duties. During his administration, he lost his Chief Interpretive Ranger and Chief Law Enforcement Officer leaving him without supervisory staff. Because of poor budget conditions NPS-wide, David could not refill these positions with supervisory level (GS-9) rangers and had to hire less expensive (GS-4) personnel.

---

park guides and administrative technicians as replacements. These staff changes meant that David lacked a management team to help him coordinate park programs. Despite juggling all park division leadership positions, David and his staff pushed forward numerous projects and initiatives that benefitted the park.21

When David arrived in the spring of 1993, he was told that the park’s new visitor center exhibits had been through several revisions and were in production at the NPS Harpers Ferry Center. David, who had previously worked at several NPS units that had American Indian interpretive themes, questioned SERO staff as to whether the office or the park had consulted with the Muscogee (Creek) Nation in Oklahoma during the exhibit’s development. Much to his astonishment, no one at the National Park Service had discussed the exhibits with any tribal government representative. With only a few weeks remaining before the final exhibit draft went into production, David contacted the Muscogee (Creek) Nation tribal historic preservation officer Joyce Bear to see if “she would not mind looking over these plans.” Bear recommended a few changes to the exhibit and communicated an interest to HOBE and Harpers Ferry that she would like to be consulted on future exhibit plans.22

The lack of consultation with American Indian tribal governments during the exhibit planning phase contradicted the goals established by HOBE’s 1990 interpretive plan. At that time, the park hoped to build a more inclusive interpretive team to balance HOBE’s complex history. The failure to consult with American Indian consultants likely stemmed from poor timing as funds for the exhibit renovations were secured during the final weeks of Judy Forte’s administration. After her departure, the park’s acting superintendent, who was neither a historian nor interpreter, was tasked with leading the exhibit renovations. It is unclear from the existing park records if Dixon had reached out to American Indians to receive feedback on the exhibit plans. However, according to Jim David, no such consultations ever happened. Dixon, who had to manage the park with two fewer full-time staff than Forte had at her disposal at the time of her transfer, assigned park historian John Reid to manage the project. According to Jim David, Reid disagreed with the park’s interpretive plan that called for incorporating more American Indian culture into future exhibit plans. Reid, an expert in American military history, wanted to refocus the exhibit on Andrew Jackson’s army and the Battle of Horseshoe Bend rather than expand exhibit content to include more discussion of Creek Indian culture.23

Disagreements within the National Park Service about how to best portray military history in the parks were commonplace during the 1990s. Previously, according to NPS Chief Historian Dwight Pitcaithley, “the interpretive programs for the parks focused on the battles themselves and contained nothing on the reasons why they battle occurred.”24 This practice was especially

prevalent at NPS Civil War battlefield units where heritage organizations such as the Sons of
Confederate Veterans and many members of the public at large were opposed to any mention of
slavery as a cause of the war. These groups felt that it was inappropriate to discuss slavery at a
battlefield. The general avoidance of causation among the NPS Civil War parks had an impact
on Horseshoe Bend because any effort to focus more attention on American Indians might
reduce Andrew Jackson’s legacy. In addition, by the 1990s, Creek War scholars had found
evidence that Jackson and his men were motivated by racism and a desire to remove American
Indians from their lands so that they could claim and develop them. By drawing more attention
to the Creek War’s causes, HOBE would have to address what motivated white soldiers to fight
in this conflict. Many heritage groups, such as the National Society United States Daughters of
1812, saw HOBE as a shrine to Jackson and his army’s victory. Among park service historians,
differences of opinion existed over whether battlefield parks should tackle causation. In 1998,
three years after HOBE’s revised exhibit would be finalized, a group of NPS superintendents
who managed Civil War battlefield parks convened in Nashville to initiate plans for the
upcoming Civil War Sesquicentennial. At that meeting, superintendents unanimously decided to
include the causes of the war, especially examinations of slavery’s role, in new exhibits and
brochures. The Nashville meeting changed the course of NPS battlefield interpretation.25

Like their Civil War park unit counterparts, HOBE’s staff debated whether their new exhibits
should focus more attention on causation, which in this case would have involved a deep
discussion of Creek Indian culture and white American motivations. Jim David wanted to see
the exhibit “do a better job of placing the story into its proper context.” David wanted less
attention to be paid to military tactics and weaponry and more attention devoted to explaining
why the Creek Civil War erupted in the years prior to the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Meanwhile,
John Reid, HOBE’s Chief Interpretive Ranger, argued that the exhibit should focus as much as
possible on the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Reid was a well-respected scholar of early American
warfare who had published several scholarly articles and books and was known among
academic circles as an expert on the War of 1812 and early American weapons and military
tactics. Reid was an enthusiastic military reenactor who not only provided public programs at
HOBE, but also toured across the country to participate in reenactments and encampments.
Like many park historians who preceded him, Reid believed that HOBE’s interpretive focus
should concentrate on telling the story of General Andrew Jackson’s victory over Red Stick
Creek Indians. According to David, Reid “saw Horseshoe Bend as a military park.” David
disagreed and the two often engaged in spirited debate about whether HOBE was an American
military memorial or an appropriate site to also shed light on Creek Indian society. David and
Reid continued a debate whose origins were rooted in the park’s early history. Ultimately, in
David’s opinion, the 1995 visitor center exhibit—an exhibit that HOBE staff had wanted for
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decades so that they could tell a more complex story about the battle—“still ended up being fairly Jackson oriented” and presented from an American perspective.26

Under David’s leadership, HOBE managed to continue providing high-quality public programs despite “lots of budget constraints.” Thanks to Reid, the park expanded its living history and weapons demonstrations. Reid managed to encourage several Auburn, Alabama, residents and park enthusiasts to start a War of 1812 reenactor group. The group, one of the first War of 1812 reenactor groups in the southeast, produced period-appropriate uniforms and purchased replica firearms and military accouterments. They also purchased from Breitling Arms of Demopolis, Alabama, a replica six pounder cannon and wooden carriage that could be fired. The men also received black powder training becoming certified experts in handling early American small arms and artillery weapons. This group often demonstrated their cannon and small arms during special summer weekend park programs and portrayed a military encampment during the park’s annual battle anniversary event. During a special one-time “Artillery Through the Ages” event, Reid and David secured on loan cannon representative of those used in the American Revolution, War of 1812, Civil War, and Vietnam. Artillery reenactor groups from across the nation came to the park to demonstrate their weapons. HOBE also organized a one-time nighttime living history program that invited guests to watch a series of vignettes that depicted various scenes from the American military encampment during the Creek War. The program was highly successful but because of changes in park leadership and “lots of budget constraints” the event failed to become an annual program.27

The weapons demonstrations were popular among visitors but David hoped that the park could balance its living history program by inviting American Indians to participate in public events. Members of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation wanted to contribute to the park’s living history program but needed funds to help cover travel costs to and from Oklahoma. Because of budget constraints,” David was unable to convince the Southeast Regional Office to provide special funds to cover these expenses. Without funds to invite American Indian interpreters to HOBE, the park’s living history programs almost exclusively interpreted the American side of the conflict.28

As the park’s living history programs continued to ignore American Indian perspectives, David spent a considerable amount of time working with SERO staff to bring the park into compliance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). NAGPRA requires federal agencies and institutions that receive federal funding to return American Indian cultural items to lineal descendants and culturally affiliated tribes. Cultural items include human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony. The National Park Service had to create an inventory of all American Indian artifacts in its possession that could be used to reconnect objects with its affiliated tribes. Most of HOBE’s

museum collections were housed at the NPS Southeast Archeological Center in Tallahassee, Florida. After cataloguing the park’s museum collections, SEAC determined that HOBE did not possess any human remains or associated funerary items that would have been subject to NAGPRA regulations.  

David made strides to improve public relations with surrounding communities. Like many previous superintendents, David joined and became an active member of the Dadeville Kiwanis Club. The club’s regular monthly meetings provided David with an opportunity to show up in his NPS uniform and to raise local awareness of what was happening in the park. The club provided David with access to many local business owners who could be counted on to urge local officials to support the park.  

David realized that HOBE would have to work hard to continue to be a part of the local community. Located miles away from the nearest towns of Alexander City and Dadeville, HOBE was in a rural area that sometimes isolated it from the surrounding community. Park programs were critical to increasing visitation and raising public awareness but HOBE lacked money to add new annual events. David sought out less expensive options. For several years, HOBE hosted an annual winter holiday Open House event that invited locals to visit the park after hours to enjoy homemade cookies and apple cider before touring the tour loop road specially lit with luminaries. Faye Johnson had fond memories of the popular event. Locals, she said, began asking her weeks before the event when it would start and if she would be baking her delicious cookies that year. Johnson and David’s wife would stay up late the night before the event baking hundreds of homemade cookies. The program lasted for a few years and ended shortly after David left the park. For years after the program ended, local residents would approach Johnson in area stores and on the street asking when the park would restart its winter holiday Open House event.  

During David’s administration, HOBE had several maintenance and law enforcement issues. When the park was built in the early 1960s, the National Park Service constructed a pump house that drew water from the Tallapoosa River and cleaned it so that it could be stored in the park’s water tower and used at HOBE facilities. By the mid-1990s, the park’s internal water system was aging and in need of replacement. The costs were prohibitive and caused HOBE to seek out alternatives. Using a combination of federal, state, and local funds, HOBE, under the supervision of a SERO construction manager, laid several miles of underground water pipes.
along Highway 49 that connected the park to the nearby town of Daviston’s water supply. The project not only provided HOBE with a less expensive water supply but brought water to area residents that had previously been dependent on wells for their drinking water.

One decade earlier, HOBE had renovated the utility wing of its visitor center into an administrative suite of offices. By the mid-1990s, the expanded office facilities were overcrowded and in need of further renovation. David described conditions as “dismal.” The facility posed problems for disabled park staff, such as Faye Johnson, whose wheelchair could not access the staff bathrooms. The visitor center restrooms, located in the lobby, were also inaccessible to visitors and staff with disabilities. David pushed the SERO to allocate funds to erect a new bathroom facility at HOBE.32

During his administration, David submitted several project statements that identified some of the park’s most significant problems. When David arrived at the park, he was surprised to learn that HOBE’s museum collection was stored in a small closet that could only be accessed through an outside door. In a request to fund the construction of a new collections storage space, David reported that “the museum collections are stored in a number of facilities and under a variety of conditions. The care of the collections is not achieved in a timely manner or orderly process and standards are not met.” Currently, the park lacked any consistent communication with the SERO or SEAC to provide any “oversight” of park collections practices. “Space for the growing collection,” according to David, “is becoming a major problem. A larger artifact facility is needed with state of the art monitoring and storage capabilities.” Furthermore, David proposed another project to catalog the backlog of HOBE artifacts at SEAC. “The park’s archeology objects stored at SEAC, 10,256 artifacts are not cataloged, and only their accession documentation is in the ANCS database.” Once cataloged, the collections could be made available for research and educational purposes that would have advanced the park’s interpretive programs. In 1997 and 1998, the SERO allocated $50,000 to provide two full-time employees to catalog HOBE’s collections at SEAC.33

Jim David transferred from HOBE in 1996 when he became the new superintendent at Ocmulgee National Monument in Macon, Georgia. David’s departure began a new phase in HOBE’s history as the park was placed under the administration of the Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site. For the first time in the park’s history, HOBE lacked an on-site superintendent.34

34. Superintendent Annual Report, Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, 1996, HOBE.
Tuskegee Management

From 1997 to 2000, the SERO placed HOBE under the administration of the Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site (TUIN). HOBE, TUIN, the forthcoming Tuskegee Airmen National Historic Site, and the developing Selma to Montgomery National Historic Trail were grouped together to form the Central Alabama National Parks. On one hand, HOBE benefitted from TUIN’s management. During those four years, HOBE received much needed funding to renovate park facilities and improve its interpretive programs. On the other hand, being managed by a park superintendent who is sixty miles away left HOBE staff feeling ignored. TUIN Superintendent Willie Madison spent as little as one day a month at HOBE. Despite his physical absence from the park, Madison successfully acquired special project funds to support numerous HOBE initiatives that had been languishing for years because of a lack of funding. Overall, HOBE gained more than it lost under TUIN management.35

The SERO’s decision to place HOBE under Tuskegee’s management served several purposes. During David’s administration, HOBE had been unable to replace several vacant division leadership positions. Tuskegee had a veteran staff of division leaders in place capable of assisting HOBE to manage its resources. In 1997, the National Park Service was struggling like most federal agencies, following a series of government shutdowns in previous years that had made predicting the federal budget difficult. SERO leaders could not ensure that HOBE would receive the funds it needed to refill its vacant leadership positions. According to Judy Forte, HOBE was “not a difficult park to manage.” HOBE staff believed that, if necessary, the park could manage without a superintendent to oversee daily operations. By eliminating HOBE’s GS-12 Superintendent position, the SERO planned to reallocate those funds to hire new GS-9 supervisory staff member who could handle most of the park’s day-to-day functions. According to Chief Interpretive Ranger Ove Jensen, the decision was an “effort to consolidate management to reduce administrative costs.”36

The SERO also likely consolidated HOBE and Tuskegee to validate increasing the Tuskegee superintendent grade from a GS-12 to a GS-13. By itself, Tuskegee, like HOBE, was a small park with a small staff that was not too difficult to manage. During the late 1990s, however, longtime Tuskegee Superintendent Willie Madison’s responsibilities expanded significantly due to the planning for the new Tuskegee Airmen National Historic Site and the development of the Selma to Montgomery National Historic Trail. Both new NPS units were initially managed by the Tuskegee superintendent. This consolidation allowed the SERO to increase the Tuskegee superintendent position to a GS-13.37

HOBE proved to be a poor fit as part of this consolidated management plan. The two sites in Tuskegee and the Selma to Montgomery Trail shared common interpretive themes associated with the modern American Civil Rights Movement. HOBE, a site that interpreted the Creek

35. Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, Resource Management Plan, 1998, HOBE. This 1998 plan was prepared by TUIN and HOBE Superintendent Willie Madison. The plan included a large appendix that identified more than twenty-five HOBE projects that Madison planned to submit funding requests for during the 1999 fiscal year.
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War, involved a different set of content knowledge and professional connections to manage. For example, the Tuskegee parks did not have to worry too much about American Indian consultations and lacked the contacts among Creek and Cherokee tribes that HOBE needed to improve its interpretation. During the 1990s, according to Judy Forte, Alabama and the National Park Service began to focus more attention on sites associated with the modern American Civil Rights Movement because of the expected increased demand for African American heritage tourism in the lead up to the movement’s 50th anniversary. In November 1999, the U.S. Congress passed the National Park System New Area Study Act of 2000 (S. 1349) as contained in Public Law 106-113, Appendix C, “National Park Service Studies Act of 1999.” The act instructed the Secretary of the Interior “to direct special resource studies to determine the national significance of the sites, and/or areas, listed in Section 5 of this Act to determine the national significance of each site, and/or area, as well as the suitability and feasibility of their inclusion as units of the National Park System.”

Among the areas to be studied were “Civil Rights Sites” on a “multi-state” level. The National Park Service Studies Act of 1999 reflected new studies of historic themes that were already in progress. Two years before the Act, the National Park Service collaborated with the Organization of American Historians (OAH) to launch a new research initiative that would ultimately produce Civil Rights in America: A Framework for Identifying Significant Sites. The 2002 report created a historic context and guidelines for locating Civil Rights Movement sites. The report was part of a growing initiative to identify connections between existing NPS park units and the Civil Rights Movement and identify potential new sites that could be brought into NPS management. TUIN Superintendent Willie Madison was heavily involved in this project. The Tuskegee Airmen and Selma to Montgomery Trail park units were part of the National Park Service’s larger plan to expand its existing Civil Rights Movement affiliated park units in time for various fiftieth anniversary commemorations that would occur between 2004 (Brown v. Board) and 2015 (Selma). Tuskegee leadership had to devote most of their attention to getting the Airmen site on-line and developing the Trail. HOBE was not a priority as “most of the attention went to the other two parks that were under development.” Under Tuskegee management, the superintendent originally planned to come to HOBE at least once a week. In practice, the superintendent’s visits became less frequent and were eventually replaced by weekly visits from Site Manager L.H. Howard, who was stationed at Tuskegee but expected to regularly visit all the park’s subunits. According to HOBE Administrative Technician Vicki Garrett, “we really did not feel like we were getting the attention that we needed.”

In 2000, TUIN and HOBE Superintendent Willie Madison prepared a Resource Management Plan for HOBE. The plan identified several pressing issues. Madison found that HOBE needed to address “natural resource problems” that stemmed from an inadequate “base of knowledge

and information about the park’s natural resources.” According to Madison, “both previous and ongoing efforts to obtain this information have fallen short of present needs.” The bulk of Madison’s proposed HOBE management plan revolved around addressing those natural resource needs. Foremost, the park lacked “a resource inventory and monitoring system” that met NPS standards. Madison complained that “basic information in all categories is virtually non-existent. Ranges, inventories, community impacts, and potential impacts need to be assembled as baseline information and provided to management in a data management system.” Madison found the park’s cultural resource management plans to be equally lacking. “Baseline information is virtually nonexistent or in desperate need of updating. Several resource studies are needed including archeological data on Native American Village Sites . . . . Artifacts housed at the Southeastern Archeological Center need to be catalogued. . . . A cultural landscape report is needed identifying the ethnographic uses of the landscape.”  

In addition to the need for improved management of cultural and natural resources, Madison also declared that “visitor safety and protection is a major concern.” Illegal hunting on HOBE property, according to Madison, had increased. Wild dogs roamed the park. Illegal activities such as drug dealing, and weapons trading had also taken place on park property. Meanwhile, large numbers of metal signs and park tools were stolen annually by thieves. Madison believed that HOBE lacked enough law enforcement staff to monitor the rural park. 

Madison discovered that many of the forest and fire management programs that had been implemented during the 1980s had been abandoned. Prescribed fires had not been conducted in years causing “heavy pine needle litter and duff accumulation [that] could make wildfire uncontrollable. Ladder fuels, such as honeysuckle and other vines would assist a hot ground fire into a crowning fire.” Madison also found several of the park’s fire roads to be in disrepair. 

The Resource Management Plan also identified several issues that directly related to HOBE’s annual budget. According to Willie Madison, “Horseshoe Bend National Military Park receives no natural or cultural resource base funding. Lack of funding, and qualified personnel hampers efforts to complete many projects.” For nearly four years, HOBE lacked any supervisory rangers that could lead the park’s resource management and interpretive services divisions. “There is a need,” wrote Madison, “to employ a natural or cultural resource specialist to address current and ongoing resource problems and assist current staff on resource projects.” The park was also without law enforcement officers and thus the lack of “protection of the park resources, including detection of vandalism, theft of historic resources, and illegal hunting” needed to be resolved.

The plan drew attention to several HOBE infrastructure needs. Despite efforts in the late 1980s to repair the park’s 1965 interpretive shelters, by 2000 the shelters needed “to be replaced with upgraded shelters [because] the current shelters are in poor condition and are in locations which distract from the historical landscape of the battlefield.” Project estimates created by
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Madison in 1998 estimated that HOBE would need $175,000 to complete all of the necessary upgrades. The Mission 66-era visitor center needed renovations to provide enlarged handicap accessible restrooms and improved staff office space. Many of the problems that Madison identified in 2000 would be addressed within the next five years of the park’s history.45

While some HOBE staff felt that the park had been ignored during the Tuskegee management period, others saw the arrangement as beneficial, especially for the park’s interpretive division. Before the Tuskegee management period, according to Ove Jensen, HOBE had always seen itself as a small park and thus had not always advocated hard enough to receive additional NPS resources. During the Tuskegee management period, HOBE began to make a more concerted effort to advocate for additional projects, staffing, and other needs on a more regular basis. According to Jensen, “a lot of the funding that would come into Tuskegee would kind of funnel itself into HOBE.” Tuskegee often asked HOBE interpretive rangers what they needed and usually helped the park find funding. Tuskegee provided HOBE with funds to create a volunteer living history program and purchase a cannon for firing demonstrations. Tuskegee also allocated new funds to expand HOBE’s annual anniversary program. “There was a lot of imagination and creativity going into projects at HOBE at that time,” remembered Jensen. “The ideas would come from HOBE and Tuskegee administration would find a way to support our ideas.”46

Mark Lewis Administration

In 2001, after three years under the administrative management of Tuskegee National Historic Site, SERO restored HOBE’s administrative independence. Mark Lewis was a popular and energetic leader who built productive relationships among his staff, with the SERO, and throughout the local community. He came to HOBE after serving as a site manager of the Davis Bayou area of Gulf Islands National Seashore in Ocean Springs, Mississippi. His prior experience allowed Lewis to adjust to his new superintendent duties quickly as HOBE continued the positive momentum gained under Tuskegee management.47

Lewis benefited from HOBE’s special relationship with NPS Director Frances P. Mainella. The director visited the park regularly for several years during her holiday trips to Alexander City to visit family. During these visits, Mainella often asked Lewis to identify any needs that the park might have. For several years, according to Jensen, Mainella successfully encouraged SERO to provide for HOBE’s needs. Rarely did a small park such as HOBE have as much face-to-face interaction with an NPS director.48

45. Ibid.
HOBE was not the only small park to experience flush times in the early 2000s. Mainella introduced systemwide initiatives designed to do more to promote the National Park Service’s small parks, defined as units with less than 10 full-time staff. Special funding was set aside at the national and regional levels that provided small parks such as HOBE with unique access to support resource management, public programs, staffing increases, and more. Superintendent Lewis created an environment at HOBE where staff were encouraged to develop and share creative ideas that might reshape the park’s future. Lewis listened to his staff’s proposals and transformed their ideas into fundable project proposals that supplemented the park’s baseline budget.49

Lewis funded several new construction projects that resolved some of HOBE’s longtime infrastructure problems. In 2005, HOBE built a restroom building that was attached to the visitor center by a breezeway. For the first time in the park’s history, HOBE had a restroom facility that was accessible for all visitors. The new facility made it easier for HOBE to accommodate large school groups.50

As construction on the restroom building progressed, HOBE replaced its 1966 tour road interpretive shelters with new rustic-style shelters. The older shelters had fallen into a state of disrepair that was unsafe and distracted visitors. The new shelters were built using natural materials, stone and wood, and sited to blend into the landscape. The shelters were replaced along with the 1988 tour road exhibits. The replacement exhibits embraced contemporary NPS best practices. The former exhibits contained a lot of text and any interpretation was told almost exclusively using third person narratives. The new exhibits devoted more space to large illustrations and made every effort to present the story of Horseshoe Bend through firsthand accounts. In addition, for the first time in HOBE’s history, American Indian tribal governments were consulted on the replacement wayside exhibits.51

American Indians also played a central role in the development of HOBE’s 2004 Long Range Interpretive Plan. The project planning team included HOBE staff and other NPS staff representing Harpers Ferry Center, Kings Mountain National Military Park, and the SERO. Several park partners joined the effort including:

- Dr. Richard Allen, Historic Preservation Officer, Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma;
- Joyce Bear, Historic Preservation Officer, Muscogee (Creek) Nation;
- James Bird, Cultural Resources Director, Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians;
- Dr. Kathryn Braund, Ph.D., Professor, Auburn University;
- Becky Burke, Manager, Eastern National Parks and Monuments Association;


• Paul Farmer, Vice-President, Tallapoosa County Historical Commission;
• Jim Parker, Site Manager, Fort Toulouse/Jackson State Historical Park;
• Emily Patterson, Teacher, Dadeville, Alabama Elementary Schools; and
• Tim Thompson, Cultural Advisor, Muscogee (Creek) Nation.

This was the most inclusive planning team ever organized in HOBE’s history. HOBE asked the team to evaluate the park’s current interpretive practices, programs, infrastructure, and public relations and to create goals for future improvements.  

The Long Range Interpretive Plan was HOBE’s first interpretive plan to be adopted following the National Park Service’s 1996 creation of “a Thematic Framework consisting of eight elements linked by the concepts of People, Time and Place.” The eight elements were:

1. Peopling Places
2. Creating Social Institutions and Movements
3. Expressing Cultural Values
4. Shaping the Political Landscape
5. Developing the American Economy
6. Expanding Science and Technology
7. Transforming the Environment
8. Changing Role of the United States in the World Community

The National Park Service developed this thematic framework to help park units rethink their existing themes and make connections with other parks that shared common themes. The themes were also designed to focus park unit interpretation to ensure that park visitors came away with a better understanding of a park’s mission and principal resources. All park unit interpretive programs were supposed to make explicit connections to their identified themes.  

The interpretive plan team identified five themes “that are critical to a visitor’s understanding of the park’s significance.” The themes illustrated both HOBE’s efforts to present a more inclusive history and changes in how cultural heritage organizations, such as the National Park Service, sought to engage public audiences. All future programs at HOBE were supposed to connect to one or more of these themes. Theme number one noted that the Battle of Horseshoe Bend “marked the watershed moment for the Creek Nation. For American citizens, however, it was the beginning of a new era of opportunity and growth in the Old Southwest.” The second theme challenged HOBE’s longstanding military narratives that overtly celebrated the achievements of General Andrew Jackson, “great white men,” and their “mixed blood” Indian allies. The theme recognized that Horseshoe Bend’s combatants “voiced differing views of frontier life.” Their “words and deeds reflect the spectrum of views—Indian separatists, racial hatred, betrayal, cultural cooperation, and Indian removal—and illustrate the unresolved differences that

brought about human suffering, tragedy, and war culminating at Horseshoe Bend.” In the past, many HOBE interpreters had cast the battle as a clash between heroic adversaries. By celebrating the heroism displayed by the vanquished Red Sticks, HOBE’s previous interpretation had failed to draw adequate attention to the stories of human suffering that resulted from the conflict. HOBE’s new thematic approach would devote more attention to the larger issues that had motivated both sides to fight at Horseshoe Bend.54

The 2004 Long Range Interpretive Plan also expanded HOBE’s efforts to use the Tohopeka and Newyaucau village sites to help the public “understand Creek Culture.” HOBE is the sole NPS unit that interprets Creek Indian culture and history. Previously, some HOBE superintendents had been leery of devoting too much attention at the site to Creek Indian culture because they believed that story might be told better elsewhere. By 2004, however, no other historic site had developed in the National Park Service or elsewhere that had a greater potential to interpret Creek Indian society. Interpreting Creek Indian society through the lens of HOBE’s two village sites, however, was problematic. Many of the objects displayed in the visitor center exhibits “relate to an earlier period versus the identified historic period.” Additional historic period artifacts would need to be acquired from SEAC or outside donors before the exhibits could adequately interpret the park’s period of significance. As noted in the interpretive plan, additional funds would be needed to conduct archeological investigations of the village sites to reveal information that would aid park interpretation.

Prior to 2004, only limited archeological surveys had been conducted at either site, the most notable being Charles Fairbanks’ 1961 investigation. In addition, thousands of artifacts that had been gathered at HOBE remained at the NPS SEAC in Tallahassee, Florida. A concerted effort would need to take place so that future HOBE interpretation could incorporate some of these items into their programs. In 2004, HOBE still remained uncertain about the contents of their archeological collection. Before some of these items could be used to help the park improve its depiction of Creek Indian society, research studies would need to be funded to provide critical information about these artifacts. With the aid of future archeological research, HOBE hoped to tell the broader story of Creek Indian “social organization (clan), tribal government, foodways and subsistence, family life, the role of women in Creek culture, and the changes that occurred within Creek society following Anglo-European contact.” The plan recognized that the best strategy for expanding HOBE’s depiction of Creek Indian culture would involve devoting more funding to developing additional living history programs and sponsoring American Indian interpreter travel to the park.55

The fourth interpretive theme recommended that HOBE interpretation reshape its retelling of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend to devote more attention to placing the fight in the context of the “Creek’s tribal civil war” rather than continue to see the battle as a critical moment that influenced the War of 1812’s outcome. In fact, the 2004 interpretive plan made no mention of the War of 1812. Four decades earlier, park promoters and the National Park Service focused a
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great deal of attention on connecting the Battle of Horseshoe Bend to the War of 1812, generally, and the Treaty of Ghent, specifically. At that time, park promoters believed that without a strong association with the War of 1812 HOBE might either fail to achieve national significance or be of little interest to the public. By 2004, thanks to the work of a new generation of scholars of the Creek War, the National Park Service knew a great deal more about the Creek War and were confident of the conflict’s national significance.  

The 2004 interpretive plan also reflected increased efforts across the National Park Service to interpret the historical development of park units. HOBE would have never become a NPS unit without “local commemorative efforts to preserve Horseshoe Bend National Military Park” that “saved the critical natural resources highly depended upon the Creek Indians and sought after by early settlers.” HOBE transformed “lands that once served as a refuge for warring Creeks” into a park that provides “opportunities for resource education, resource preservation, recreational activities, and spiritual renewal for all.”

The 2004 interpretive plan encapsulated many of the plans that Superintendent Mark Lewis had initiated at HOBE. Lewis dramatically expanded the scope and frequency of the park’s public programs. For years, officer training school instructors at Fort Benning, Columbus, Georgia, and Fort Maxwell, Montgomery, Alabama, had worked with HOBE staff to organize “staff rides” to supplement their students’ training. Under Lewis’s leadership, the number of annual staff rides increased. The rise in this group program was in part due to United States military actions in Afghanistan and Iraq. During the early 2000s, there was a great demand for training new military officers. Officer training school instructors found that the conditions that General Andrew Jackson faced during the Creek War, especially operating in enemy territory with a racially diverse army filled with soldiers who shared a common ethnic background with the enemy. Lewis and Chief Interpretive Ranger Ove Jensen, a U.S. Army officer veteran, reached out to officer training school instructors to arrange for more frequent tours.

Lewis also sought to raise public awareness of HOBE by improving relations within the surrounding communities. He reestablished contact with area chambers of commerce and civic clubs. The park began participating in the annual Dadeville Christmas parade. Staff wore period-appropriate costumes depicting Tennessee militia and Red Stick warriors. HOBE built a parade float. Lewis also spent a lot of time visiting local school teachers delivering in-class programs or encouraging school administrators to schedule field trips to HOBE. He collaborated with area teachers to incorporate new curriculum standards into the park’s teacher’s guide and public programs.

Lewis also expanded HOBE’s existing living history and historic weapons programs. Lewis received funds from the SERO to support the travel of Muskogee Creek Indian interpreters. The number of living history volunteers expanded to more than 50 reenactors. Lewis, Jensen,
and Reid continued to work with the War of 1812 reenactor group in Auburn, Alabama. Park staff helped the group acquire funds to improve their historic weapons and weapons training and to travel to various NPS units to perform reenactments.60

Under Lewis’s administration, HOBE’s annual programs also expanded. The March battle anniversary event expanded. The new two-day program included a wider selection of living history encampments, historic weapons demonstrations, guided tours, and other programs designed to reignite local interest in HOBE. Lewis’s efforts worked. Under his supervision, the March anniversary event nearly doubled its attendance numbers and once again became an annual event that local community members eagerly anticipated each year.61

Lewis and Jensen developed new annual programs for the park. The Muster on the Tallapoosa annual program began under Jensen’s supervision. Jensen, an avid military reenactor, wanted to add a new program to the park that would celebrate HOBE’s creation and focus attention on various aspects of the park’s military history. The muster program included both small arms and field artillery weapons demonstrations and soldier encampments. The one-day event remains one of the park’s most popular annual events.62

Lewis and Jensen also improved relations with the Alabama Historical Association, Alabama Historical Commission, and Alabama Department of Archives and History. These established state history organizations helped the park gain access to new and enthusiastic park supporters who added to HOBE’s growing volunteer programs and roster of living history reenactors. At this time, the idea to create a partner organization that could help support HOBE programs fomented among these new park advocates.63

Lewis also wrote HOBE’s first fire management plan. Most of the park’s property was covered with dense second growth pine forests. These forests had created a densely compacted litter layer consisting of decomposing leaves and wood fibers. During dry conditions, this litter layer was highly combustible and capable of being ignited by lightning strikes. Left unmanaged, this litter layer posed a threat to the park’s resources as well as surrounding lands outside of the park. Prescribed burns also had other benefits. The park contains significant numbers of longleaf pine trees, a species that was once common across Alabama but had significantly diminished throughout the twentieth century. Researchers at Auburn University believed that prescribed burns at HOBE would help support the growth of additional longleaf pine trees at the park. Forestry researchers hoped that prescribed burns at HOBE would help shape forest

management policies statewide that would revive Alabama’s longleaf pine tree population. HOBE had organized a few prescribed burns in the 1980s, but those programs were discontinued throughout the 1990s and early 2000s. A fire break was constructed along the entire park boundary in 2004. In 2005, a burn plan was contracted and approved. On April 10, 2006, HOBE implemented their first prescribed burn in nearly two decades.⁶⁴

**Marianne Mills Administration**

In 2005, Mark Lewis transferred to Biscayne National Park in Florida. His departure from Horseshoe Bend was followed by several acting superintendents before Marianne Mills was hired as the park’s new superintendent. Mills, a sixteen-year NPS veteran who specialized in interpretation, brought several fresh ideas to the park and worked to revise park programming and exhibits. Previously, she had been stationed in several western parks including Badlands National Park and Klondike Gold Rush National Historic Park as well as the Minute Man National Historical Park in Massachusetts. She tried to broaden the park’s programs, build new public audiences, and maintain HOBE’s relationship with state and local partners.⁶⁵

When Mills arrived at Horseshoe Bend, she immediately tried to address several interpretive problems found in the park’s exhibits and programs. Mills believed that the park devoted too much attention to military weapons and encampment demonstrations that depicted U.S. Infantry and Tennessee Militia soldiers. The programs, in her mind, privileged the stories of the battle’s white combatants over larger themes associated with Creek Indian culture. Since HOBE was the sole NPS unit that interpreted Creek Indian society and the Creek Civil War, she urged park staff to realign their existing programs to better display the park’s unique story. Mills experienced some resistance among staff who argued that the park’s main mission was to present a military history of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. They felt that historic weapons demonstrations and costumed reenactors were the best method to convey the site’s principal interpretive themes. These tensions produced some slight changes to the park’s existing exhibits. Mills commissioned new temporary exhibits that were exclusively devoted to Creek Indian culture, especially depictions of modern day Muskogee Creek Indian life.⁶⁶

Observers noted that Mills brought an enormous amount of enthusiasm and energy to HOBE. Like her predecessor, Mills devoted a lot of energy to promoting the park in the local community. She attended Chamber of Commerce meetings and invited local business leaders to tour the park. Mills reestablished contacts with local political officials. She participated in many

---

local radio interviews. Mills, a talented writer, penned several lengthy pieces for local newspapers that drew rave reviews. Her work boosted attendance and created an unprecedented level of energy and enthusiasm in the local community.67

As her first superintendent post, Mills wanted to put her stamp on HOBE. One of her top priorities was to attract more local and state attention to the park in the hopes of securing future funding increases for much needed interpretive programs, exhibits, maintenance facilities, collections storage, and public outreach. Many NPS units had developed friends groups that were organized and led by park advocates interested in supporting a park in a manner that park staff could not undertake. For example, friends groups can approach local businesses and governments to raise financial support for new park initiatives. Friends groups can also raise funds to advertise the park to increase visitation. The idea of creating a HOBE friends group had been broached earlier by Mark Lewis but the idea failed to gain momentum because of other more pressing park needs. Mills, however, made establishing a friends group one of her top priorities. She understood that HOBE had once benefited from the organized support of public advocates who were responsible for the park’s early development. Mills hoped that a friends group could generate new public interest and be useful as a private fundraising wing to support park programs and facility development.68

Mills also benefitted from the work of a devoted group of park advocates. Local supporters, including Dr. Kathryn Braund and Harold Banks, established the Friends of Horseshoe Bend. Without assistance from the National Park Service, Braund and Banks completed the necessary IRS paperwork to get the group incorporated. The Friends are an all-volunteer organization comprised of members who pay a small annual membership fee. The organization is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit partner group that helps HOBE staff plan and implement annual park programs such as the March battle anniversary event, the annual symposium, and the August Muster on the Tallapoosa River event. Friends members also advocate on behalf of HOBE staff to local, state, and national leaders on a variety of matters. Recently, Friends members, especially longtime park supporter Harold Banks, played instrumental roles in developing the Harold Banks Canoe Trail, that follows the Tallapoosa River through the park, and crafting a canoe using traditional Creek Indian methods to be displayed at the park visitor center. Several Friends members also maintain communication with the Muscogee (Creek) Nation.69

In addition to encouraging the creation of the Friends of Horseshoe Bend organization, Mills supported Ove Jensen’s idea to establish the park’s annual symposium program. Working in collaboration with Auburn University’s Caroline Marshall Draughon Center for the Arts and Humanities, Mills developed an annual public program that presents recent scholarship on Creek Indian culture and the study of the Creek War. The annual event is held in August and

marks the anniversary of HOBE’s creation. Symposium speakers have included scholars, archivists, representatives of Creek Indian tribal organizations, and NPS staff. Programs are designed to enhance the public’s understanding of HOBE’s interpretive themes.\(^{70}\)

Mills also played an instrumental role in developing HOBE’s Strategic Plan in 2008. The plan identified strategies the park planned to develop to meet several NPS systemwide goals. In addition to stated goals for preserving and monitoring the park’s natural, historic, and archeological resources, HOBE also established some goals for the upcoming NPS Centennial. Foremost among the park’s plans for the centennial was the addition of a new 100-seat auditorium to the visitor center to hold public programs and display the park’s orientation film. Planners also recommended that the NPS support funding for the construction of an outdoor area that could host visitors during various living history programs. HOBE staff believed that the park’s current public facilities were insufficient to meet its expanding interpretive programs. Neither facility was funded in the years that followed but park staff has nonetheless continued to explore these needed projects.\(^{71}\)

**Doyle Sapp Administration**

In 2008, Marianne Mills transferred to the Southeast Region Office in Atlanta where she managed the region’s volunteer programs. Two years passed before the park received a new superintendent. During that period, several acting superintendents managed the park. Among those acting superintendents was Doyle Sapp who eventually became the park’s permanent superintendent. Sapp, a graduate of Georgia Southwestern College, began his NPS career as a volunteer at the Andersonville and Jimmy Carter National Historic Sites before becoming a full-time park ranger at national parks in Virginia, California, Florida, and Washington, D.C. Prior to arriving at HOBE, Sapp had been the Chief Interpretive Ranger at Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in Florida. Under Sapp’s leadership, HOBE worked to improve its planning documents and organized the Battle of Horseshoe Bend’s bicentennial and the park’s 50th anniversary. He also advocated for additional funds to improve the park’s maintenance facilities and to expand its full-time staff.\(^{72}\)

When Sapp arrived at HOBE, he discovered that the park had inadequate maintenance facilities, collections storage, and planning documents. The park’s maintenance facilities had aged and no longer provided the necessary space. Sapp believed that the park’s three-person maintenance staff performed at a high level of efficiency despite the park’s lackluster facilities and equipment. The park’s primary maintenance facility, for example, was in a building that had been a pole barn prior to the park’s creation. The century old building had received some improvements


over the years, but by 2012, its poured concrete floor was cracking, and its electrical system could no longer handle the necessary electrical tools. Sapp successfully lobbied for a new maintenance facility. Planning for that facility was underway by the end of Sapp’s time at HOBE.73

Sapp also collaborated with SERO Chief of Museum Services Mary Troy to assess the state of HOBE’s museum collections. A collections management document had been produced in 2001, but Sapp and Troy believed that it “needed to have been updated several years ago given the growing interest in and responsibility for associated records and other museum collection archives.” Notably, the park’s collection of historical documents relating to the history of the battle and the development and administration of the park had grown and needed to be accessioned and arranged. The park’s museum collections were housed in a storage room in the administrative building located next to the visitor center. The room’s sole entrance was a door that opened to the outside. Consequently, the park had a difficult time maintaining appropriate environmental conditions for its collections. Troy helped the park update its environmental monitoring equipment. She also added artifacts found in the park’s collections area to HOBE’s existing catalog and coordinated efforts to ensure that the park’s collections held at NPS SEAC in Tallahassee, Florida, were also properly recorded. In 2013, HOBE and SERO produced a Scope of Collection Statement for the park. The document helps HOBE manage its current collections, sets acquisitions policies, and connects collections management to the park’s mission and interpretive themes.74

In 2013, under Superintendent Sapp’s leadership, HOBE and the SERO completed a cultural landscape report for the park. A cultural landscape report is the National Park Service’s primary report that documents the history, significance, and treatment of a cultural landscape. A cultural landscape report evaluates the history and integrity of the landscape including any changes to its geographical context, features, materials, and use. When HOBE was established, park Superintendent Clarence Johnson had requested funds to study the park’s landscape to determine which parts were historic and which parts had undergone significant change because of subsequent use. The results of that study, he hoped, would help the park decide how to treat areas of the battlefield that were now overgrown with vegetation or lying in the middle of recently farmed agricultural fields. Johnson’s proposal never developed because the National Park Service did not begin creating cultural landscape reports until the 1990s. By the 1990s, the larger historic preservation movement in America was recognizing the value of assessing a historic resource’s cultural landscape. This was necessitated in part because of the rising number of rural historic districts created that required preservationists to assess which portions of the area had been part of historic farms and associated properties. Cultural landscapes also grew in importance in urban historic preservation districts where discerning how a resource related to its surrounding neighborhood became more important to preservation planning initiatives. In the early 1990s, the National Park Service launched a historic landscape initiative to prepare


74. “Scope of Collection Statement,” 2013, Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, HOBE.
agency guidelines for assessing, documenting, and preserving cultural landscapes. In 1994, Charles A. Birnbaum, a member of the NPS Preservation Assistance Division and the American Society of Landscape Architects, published *Preservation Brief 36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes*, the agency’s first cultural landscapes guidelines. The brief recommended that cultural landscape reports be prepared for all NPS units. Plans for HOBE’s cultural landscape report began under Superintendent Mills’ administration. When Sapp came to HOBE, he wanted to see many of the projects that had begun under his predecessor completed. He felt that many reports and studies had languished and needed to be resolved as soon as possible. During his first year at the park, Sapp prioritized pushing those projects to completion.  

The 2013 *Horseshoe Bend National Military Park Cultural Landscape Report* is a comprehensive inventory and description of HOBE’s cultural resources. The study determined that “the cultural landscape at Horseshoe Bend retains integrity of location, association, feeling, design and setting despite changes to the vegetation, vistas and views, and built environment. The battlefield retains its identity as the place of the battle, but also remains one of the few Creek War sites preserved.” The report recommended that HOBE treat its Mission 66 visitor center and other Mission 66 era associated resources as historic park features that provide a lens into the NPS postwar activities and development. Although the report documented numerous changes that had occurred to the historic battlefield, such as encroachment of secondary forests and slight changes in topography due to soil erosion, the site still retained its sense of place, feeling, and historic integrity. Those findings will help HOBE determine what steps they may take in the future to ensure that the park’s cultural landscapes remain intact.  

The 2014 Battle of Horseshoe Bend bicentennial event was HOBE’s largest public program since its 1989 175th battle anniversary event. Whereas prior commemorations often ignored the Creek Indians who fought at the battle, especially the Upper Creek warriors, the 2014 program recognized that the battle had been a watershed moment in Creek Indian history because the disastrous results of General Andrew Jackson’s victory at Horseshoe Bend forever changed their society. Past programs had often involved Creek Indians in the ceremony and living history programs, but often neglected to include those individuals in the long-range planning process. Planning for the bicentennial program began several years prior to event. Park leaders wanted to make a concerted effort to reconnect the park with members of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation in Oklahoma. From the start, HOBE staff involved Muscogee Creek representatives in the planning process. The event’s tone suggested that the park and the commemoration could help heal the deep scars that the Creek Civil War left on Creek Indian society.  

More than 300 representatives of the Muskogee Creek Nation attended the ceremony. Their presence was the highlight of the event and represented the largest movement of Creek Indians

---

since removal. According to Armon, a Creek Indian who attended the event, “Learning about the battle is one thing, but seeing where we came from has been the most important part of this trip.” Many Creek Indians reflected that the Battle of Horseshoe Bend represented a painful moment in their history. While some Creek Indians had previously visited the park as part of an annual tribal group trip to Ocmulgee National Monument in Macon, Georgia, most Creek Indians avoided Horseshoe Bend because of its traumatic history. The bicentennial event marked a moment of healing for many Creek Indians who for the first time returned to Tohopeka to honor their ancestors.

During the bicentennial program, Muskogee Creek Nation Chief George Tiger addressed the large audience that had gathered near the park visitor center. Tiger’s speech marked the first time that a member of the Muskogee Creek Nation had been included as a keynote speaker during one of the battlefield’s anniversary events. He reminded the crowd that despite numerous adversities the Muskogee Creek people “are still here.” Tiger urged the audience to take notice that despite “some point in time that we were not supposed to be here we are showing them that we are still here.” At the end of the ceremony, the Muskogee Creek Nation presented HOBE Superintendent Doyle Sapp with a ceremonial blanket to display in the park visitor center as a symbol of their memory of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend.

Following the bicentennial ceremony, a group of Muskogee Creek Indians returned to the Tohopeka Village Site to perform a stomp dance in honor of their ancestors and in recognition of a land that, according to Tiger, the “creator” had permanently set aside for the Creek Indians. The Muskogee Creek Indians noted that this was the first time that their people had returned to Tohopeka to perform the stomp dance. That evening, more than 800 luminaries lit up the battlefield marking the devastating loss of life that had occurred 200 years earlier. The bicentennial event maintained a solemn tone that contrasted sharply with the program presented during the centennial and sesquicentennial events. The bicentennial event avoided celebrating General Andrew Jackson’s military conquests and contained no reference to his victory’s “civilizing” influence on the “wilderness,” as previous anniversary events had proclaimed. While several HOBE staff and park volunteer reenactors wore uniforms of U.S. Infantry and Tennessee militia soldiers, the day’s ceremonies focused almost exclusively on acknowledging the survival of Creek Indians in spite of the battle’s devastating outcome.
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The following day, representatives of the Sons of the American Revolution, Daughters of the American Revolution, and the National Society U.S. Daughters of 1812 gathered on Gun Hill near the gravesite of Major Lemuel Montgomery for a small ceremony to honor the American soldiers who fought at Horseshoe Bend. The decreased attention paid to honoring the battle’s victors marked a clear break from previous commemorative ceremonies at Horseshoe Bend. After years of slowly moving toward paying greater attention to Creek Indian culture and history at Horseshoe Bend, the bicentennial ceremony represented a clear indication of where future park interpretive programs and tribal consultations are heading.82

In August 2014, HOBE celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. Although the park was established in 1959 by Congress, the park has traditionally traced its official opening to 1964, the year that the park opened with its commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. The park organized a symposium held at the Alabama Department of Archives and History in Montgomery. The program included a broad range of Creek War experts and was well attended. The program also included two Creek Indian representatives who delivered stirring addresses on what the Battle of Horseshoe Bend meant to the Muscogee (Creek) Indians.

After the bicentennial program, Superintendent Sapp became the Acting Superintendent at the Eisenhower National Historic Site, a position that took him away from HOBE for more than 18 months. When Sapp returned HOBE, he then transferred to Guilford Courthouse National Military Park in North Carolina. During his tenure at HOBE, Sapp “learned the ropes of being a National Park Service superintendent in an environment that was not too stressful and surrounded by experienced park staff.” Sapp had successfully led the park through its bicentennial programming and oversaw the completion of several lingering reports and studies that when finished enhanced HOBE management practices.83

Conclusion

Between 1990 and 2014, HOBE experienced significant changes that ultimately improved the park’s cultural and natural resource management while enhancing existing interpretive programs. Despite being placed under the administration of Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site for four years, HOBE managed to emerge from losing on-site administrative leadership much improved because of the efforts of TUIN Superintendent Willie Madison. Under Madison’s leadership, HOBE received much needed funding to improve park visitor safety and facilities. Those funds eventually paid for new interpretive shelters, ADA compliant restrooms, and maintenance shops. After HOBE’s administration was restored, greater attention was paid to the park’s natural resources. New studies to examine the effects that changes in water flow had on the Tallapoosa River’s physical landscape and aquatic wildlife were coordinated with Auburn University. New fire management programs were implemented as the park resumed controlled burns for the first time since the 1980s. Meanwhile, initiatives to study and inventory the park’s natural resources were launched and helped the park improve its management practices. The park also improved its existing relations with American Indian tribal
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governments and for the first time began to seek comments from those representatives during their interpretive planning. The fruits of those new relationships could be seen during the park’s battle bicentennial program when more than 300 Creek Indians traveled to HOBE to participate in that event.
This page intentionally blank.
AN ACT TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES
APPROVED AUGUST 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535)

BE IT ENACTED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, That there is hereby
created in the Department of the Interior a service to be called the
National Park Service, which shall be under the charge of a director,
who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall receive a salary
of $4,500 per annum. There shall also be appointed by the Secretary
the following assistants and other employees at the salaries designated:
One assistant-director, at $2,500 per annum; one chief clerk at $2,000
per annum; one draftsman, at $1,800 per annum; one messenger, at $600
per annum; and, in addition thereto, such other employees as the Secre-
tary of the Interior shall deem necessary: PROVIDED, That not more than
$8,100 annually shall be expended for salaries of experts, assistants,
and employees within the District of Columbia not herein specifically
enumerated unless previously authorized by law. The service thus estab-
lished shall promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as
national parks, monuments, and reservations hereinafter specified by
such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of the
said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the
scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life 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.
(U.S.C., title 16, sec. 1.)

Section 2. That the director shall, under the direction of the
Secretary of the Interior, have the supervision, management, and
control of the several national parks and national monuments which are
now under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and of the
Hot Springs Reservation in the State of Arkansas, and of such other
national parks and reservations of like character as may be hereafter
created by Congress: PROVIDED, That in the supervision, management, and
control of national monuments contiguous to national forests the Secretary
of Agriculture may cooperate with said National Park Service to such extent
as may be requested by the Secretary of the Interior (U.S.C., title 16,
sec. 2.)

Section 3. That the Secretary of the Interior shall make and publish
such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper for the use
and management of the parks, monuments, and reservations under the juris-
diction of the National Park Service, and any violations of any of the
rules and regulations authorized by this Act shall be punished as provided
for in section fifty of the Act entitled "An Act to codify and amend the
penal laws of the United States," approved March fourth, nineteen hundred
and nine, as amended by section six of the Act of June twenty-fifth,
nineteen hundred and ten (Thirty-sixth United States Statutes at Large,
page eight hundred and fifty-seven). He may also, upon terms and con-
ditions to be fixed by him, sell or dispose of timber in those cases where
in his judgment the cutting of such timber is required in order to control
the attacks of insects or diseases or otherwise conserve the scenery or
the natural or historic objects in any such park, monument, or reservation.
He may also provide in his discretion for the destruction of such animals
and of such plant life as may be detrimental to the use of any of said parks, monuments, or reservations. He may also grant privileges, leases, and permits for the use of land for the accommodation of visitors in the various parks, monuments, or other reservations herein provided for, but for periods not exceeding twenty years; and no natural curiosities, wonders, or objects of interest shall be leased, rented, or granted to anyone on such terms as to interfere with free access to them by the public: PROVIDED, HOWEVER, That the Secretary of the Interior may, under such rules and regulations and on such terms as he may prescribe, grant the privilege to graze live stock within any national park, monument, or reservation herein referred to when in his judgment such use is not detrimental to the primary purpose for which such park, monument, or reservation was created, except that this provision shall not apply to the Yellowstone National Park. (U.S.C., title 16, sec. 3.)

Section 4. That nothing in this Act contained shall affect or modify the provisions of the Act approved February fifteenth, nineteen hundred and one, entitled "An Act relating to rights of way through certain parks, reservations, and other public lands." (U.S.C. title 16, sec. 4.)
AN ACT

To provide for the establishment of the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, in the State of Alabama.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That when not less than five hundred acres of the non-Federal lands hereinafter described (together with improvements thereon) and known as the Horseshoe Bend Battle Ground on the Tallapoosa River, in the State of Alabama, shall have been acquired and transferred free and clear of all encumbrances to the United States without expense to the Federal Government, such area shall be, and are hereby, dedicated and set apart as a unit of the National Park System for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States, under the name of the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make an examination of the Horseshoe Bend Battle Ground with a view to determining the area or areas thereof deemed desirable for inclusion in the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park and which, except for not more than twenty acres of any other lands adjacent to such battleground found by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, lie within the lands particularly described as follows: Sections 13, 14, 15, 22, and 23, all township 23 north, range 23 east, Saint Stephens meridian.

Sec. 3. (a) The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall administer, protect, and develop the park, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 525), as amended.

(b) In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of the park, the Secretary of the Interior shall construct and maintain therein such roads, trails, markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

Sec. 4. This Act shall become effective if and when the requirements of sections 1 and 2 shall have been fully complied with to the satisfaction of the President of the United States, who shall then issue a notice declaring that the requirements herein have been met, and said notice shall be sent to the Secretary of the Interior and shall be published in the Federal Register, and shall be made known to the people of the United States in accordance with the provisions of section 1 hereof.

Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Approved July 25, 1956.
Appendix C

ESTABLISHING THE HORSESHOE BEND NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS the battle of Horseshoe Bend, fought on March 27, 1814, on the Tallapoosa River in Alabama, resulted in a decisive victory for the forces of General Andrew Jackson over a strong body of Creek Indians and broke the power of the Creek Confederacy; and

WHEREAS this significant historic event on the Indian border opened the way for settlement in Alabama and other parts of the old Southwest; and

WHEREAS section 1 of an act approved July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 651), provides that when not less than five hundred acres of non-Federal lands (together with improvements thereon), known as the Horseshoe Bend Battle Ground, shall have been acquired and transferred free and clear of all encumbrances to the United States without expense to the Federal Government, such area shall be dedicated and set apart as the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park; and

WHEREAS section 2 of that act authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to make an examination of the Horseshoe Bend Battle Ground with a view to determining the area or areas thereof deemed desirable for inclusion in the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park; and

WHEREAS the Secretary of the Interior, on June 11, 1957, approved a map showing an area of 2,040 acres on the Horseshoe Bend Battle Ground as being desirable for inclusion in the Horseshoe
Bend National Military Park, and such land was donated to, and
accepted on behalf of, the United States of America on April 24,
1959; and

WHEREAS the requirements of sections 1 and 2 of the act of
July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 651), have been fully complied with:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President
of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested
in me by section 4 of the above-mentioned act of July 25, 1956,
do hereby dedicate and set aside the following-described lands
in Tallapoosa County, Alabama, as the Horseshoe Bend National
Military Park:

Northeast quarter (NE 1/4), northeast quarter of northwest
quarter (NE 1/4 of NW 1/4), northeast quarter of southeast
quarter (NE 1/4 of SE 1/4), fractions A, B, C and E of sec-
tion 15; fractions B, D, and E of section 22; all in township
23 north, range 23 east; also one-half acre known as the
Ferry Landing on the south side of the Tallapoosa River in
said section 15, more particularly described as follows:
Commence at the southwest corner of section 15, township
23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama, thence
south 89 degrees 00 minutes east 1968 feet to a point; thence
north 1 degree 00 minutes west 1267 feet to a point on the
southerly bank of the Tallapoosa River and the point of be-
ginning of the parcel herein intended to be described; thence
south 52 degrees 00 minutes west 147.6 feet to a point; thence
north 38 degrees 00 minutes west 147.6 feet to a point; thence
north 50 degrees 00 minutes west 147.6 feet to a point on the
southerly bank of the river south 38 degrees 00 minutes
east 147.6 feet from the point of beginning, and being situated
in the east half of the southwest quarter of section 15, town-
ship 23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama;
also a parcel of land known as Miller’s Island in the Tallapoosa
River just south of the river bridge more particularly described
as follows: Commencing at the southwest corner of said sec-
tion 15, township 23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County,
Alabama; thence south 89 degrees 00 minutes east 2608 feet
to a point on the west bank of said island, which is the point
of beginning; thence north 5 degrees 00 minutes east 220 feet
to a point; thence north 8 degrees 00 minutes west 510 feet to
a point; thence north 82 degrees 00 minutes east 350 feet to
a point; thence north 55 degrees 30 minutes east 75 feet to
a point; thence north 82 degrees 00 minutes east 115 feet to
a point; thence south 17 degrees 00 minutes east 330 feet
to a point; thence south 8 degrees 00 minutes east 270 feet
to a point; thence south 77 degrees 45 minutes west 270 feet
to a point; thence south 59 degrees 35 minutes west 160 feet to a
point; thence south 36 degrees 06 minutes west 650 feet to a point; thence north 5 degrees 00 minutes east 530 feet to the point of beginning, containing 14.11 acres, more or less, and being situated in sections 15 and 22, township 23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama. Less and except 5.1 acres in said section 15, township 23 north, range 23 east, previously conveyed by Nora E. Miller to Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission, described as follows: Beginning at a point which is 13 chains and 51 links south 75 degrees 30 minutes west of a point on the west line of section 14, township 23 north, range 23 east, which is 69 chains south of the northeast corner of said section 14; thence west 8 chains and 50 links, thence south 6 chains, thence east 8 chains and 50 links thence north 6 chains to the point of beginning.

The above described lands contain 560.66 acres, more or less.

Section 15, township 23 north, range 23 east; west half of northeast quarter and northeast quarter of northeast quarter of section 23, township 23 north, range 23 east; section 5 and section 22, township 23 north, range 23 east, less and except the following described parts of said sections 15 and 22, township 23 north, range 23 east, known as Alabama Power Company lands, described as follows: Northeast quarter (NE¼), northeast quarter of northeast quarter (NE¼) of NE¼, northeast quarter of southeast quarter (SE¼) of NE¼, fractions A, B, C, and D of section 15; fractions A, B, D, and E of section 22; all in township 23 north, range 23 east; also one-half acre known as the Ferry Landing on the south side of the Tallapoosa River in section 15, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the southwest corner of said section 15, township 23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama; thence south 89 degrees 00 minutes east 1968 feet to a point; thence north 1 degree 00 minutes west 1267 feet to a point on the southerly bank of the Tallapoosa River and the point of beginning of the parcel herein intended to be described; thence south 32 degrees 00 minutes west 147.6 feet to a point; thence north 90 degrees 00 minutes west 147.6 feet to a point; thence north 28 degrees 00 minutes east 147.6 feet to a point on the southerly bank of the river south 38 degrees 00 minutes east 147.6 feet to the point of beginning, and being situated in the east half of the southwest quarter of section 15, township 23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama; also a parcel of land known as Miller's Island in the Tallapoosa River just south of the river bridge more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the southwest corner of said section 15, township 23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama; thence south 89 degrees 00 minutes east 2605 feet to a point on the west bank of said island, which is the point of beginning; thence north 5 degrees 00 minutes east 220 feet to a point; thence north 8 degrees 00 minutes west 510 feet to a
point; thence north 82 degrees 00 minutes east 350 feet to a point; thence north 55 degrees 30 minutes east 75 feet to a point; thence north 82 degrees 00 minutes east 115 feet to a point; thence south 17 degrees 00 minutes east 330 feet to a point; thence south 8 degrees 00 minutes east 270 feet to a point; thence south 77 degrees 45 minutes west 270 feet to a point; thence south 59 degrees 35 minutes west 160 feet to a point; thence south 36 degrees 56 minutes west 650 feet to a point; thence north 5 degrees 00 minutes east 530 feet to the point of beginning, containing 14.11 acres, more or less, and being situated in sections 15 and 22, township 23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama. Less and except 5.1 acres in said section 15, township 23 north, range 23 east, previously conveyed by Nora E. Miller to Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission, described as follows: Beginning at a point which is 13 chains and 51 links south 75 degrees 30 minutes west of a point on the west line of section 14, township 23 north, range 23 east, which is 69 chains south of the northwest corner of said section 14; thence west 8 chains and 50 links, thence south 6 chains, thence east 8 chains and 50 links, thence south 6 chains to the point of beginning. Said 5.1-acre exception in said section 15 has heretofore been conveyed to the United States of America by patent from the State of Alabama.

The above-described lands contain 1,474.24 acres, more or less.

Beginning at a point which is 13 chains and 51 links south 75 degrees 30 minutes west of a point on the west line of section 14 which is 69 chains south of the northwest corner of said section 14; thence west 8 chains and 50 links, thence south 6 chains, thence east 8 chains and 50 links, thence north 6 chains to the point of beginning, the said land lying and being in section 15, township 23 north, range 23 east.

The above-described lands contain 5.1 acres, more or less.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.
DONE at the City of Washington this 4th day of August in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fifty-nine, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-fourth.

[Signature]

By the President:

[Signature]

Acting Secretary of State
Enrolled: An Act To provide for the Celebration of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend in 1814 and to provide for the disposition of any property conveyed by the Commission during its existence.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF ALABAMA:

Section 1. Act 500, approved August 5, 1937 relating to the celebration of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend in 1814 is hereby expressly repealed.

Section 2. All property of whatsoever kind and description, both real and personal which was acquired, owned or belonged to the Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission is hereby transferred, assigned and conveyed to the State of Alabama in fee simple.

Section 3. The Governor of the State of Alabama is hereby authorized and empowered to cause a patent to issue under the seal of the State, signed by him and attested by the Secretary of State, conveying to the United States, without consideration, free and clear of all encumbrances whatsoever for the purpose of originating, developing, preserving, improving, protecting and maintaining a National Military Park to be established at Horseshoe Bend in Tallapoosa County that certain five and one-tenth acres of land acquired by the Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission from Mrs. N. V. Kilgore, an unmarried woman by warranty deed dated January 14, 1911 and recorded in Deed Book 81 at page 773 in the office of the Judge of Probate of Tallapoosa County, Alabama.

Section 4. The provisions of this Act are severable. If any part of the Act is declared invalid or unconstitutional, such declaration shall not affect the part which remains.

Section 5. All laws or parts of laws which conflict with this Act are repealed.

Section 6. This Act shall become effective immediately upon its passage and approval by the Governor, or upon its otherwise becoming a law.

Speaker of the House of Representatives

President and President of the Senate

House of Representatives
August 13, 1957

I hereby certify that the within Act originated in and was passed by the House August 2, 1957.

Oakley Melton, Jr.
 Clerk

RECEIVED
AUG 2 1 1957
Passed
Senate

Secretary of S's
Enrolled. An Act, To appropriate out of any funds in the State Treasury to the credit of the general fund, not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $150,000 to the Department of Conservation to be used only for the purchase of lands to be made a part of the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park; and to provide for the lease, sale, swap, exchange, transfer, or otherwise dispose of such lands, including the right to convey same without consideration to the United States of America.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF ALABAMA:

Section 1. That there is hereby appropriated out of any funds in the State Treasury to the credit of the general fund, not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $150,000 to the Department of Conservation.

Section 2. The funds herein appropriated to the Department of Conservation shall be used only for the purchase of lands to be made a part of the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park. The Department of Conservation is hereby authorized, empowered and directed to use said funds, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to acquire title to said lands and to lease, sell, swap, exchange, transfer, or otherwise dispose of such lands for the purpose of preserving and establishing the National Military Park at Horseshoe Bend on the Tallapoosa River in Tallapoosa County, Alabama. The right to convey such lands without consideration to the United States of America for such park purposes is extended to the Department of Conservation.

Section 3. The Comptroller is hereby authorized and directed to draw his warrant on the State Treasurer on funds to the credit of the general fund upon requisition of the Department of Conservation, with the approval of the Governor, for the funds herein authorized to be expended by this Act. However, that the Attorney General shall first certify that such lands are free and unencumbered and that the grants have been in title thereto.

An act shall become effective immediately upon approval by the Governor or upon its avulsion by a law.

Speaker of the House of Representatives

President of the Senate

House of Representatives
August 13, 1937

I hereby certify that the within act originated in and was passed by the House August 2, 1937.

Oakley Melton, Jr.
Clark

Senate 347
8/23/37 Passed

RECEIVED
AUG 23 1937
TIME 10:04 a.m.
Secretary of State
The State of Alabama

TALLAHASSEE COUNTY

Know all men by these presents, That I, the undersigned, am
unmarried person

for and in consideration of

the sum of one dollar, to him

the receipt whereof I do hereby acknowledge, to have been paid, rendered, said, and confirmed to me by the said

The State of Florida and the United States

the following described real estate, lying in the County of Tallahassee, State of Florida, to wit:

First and one tenth (10%) acres of land described as follows: Beginning at a point which is thirteen chains and fifty links south, thirty chains and fifty links east, of a point on the West line of Section fourteen (14) which is sixty chains south of the Northwest corner of Section fourteen (14) thence West

fifty chains, and fifty links; thence South

fifty chains, thence East

fifty chains, thence North

fifty chains to begin hunting frozen, said land to be in Section fourteen (14) Township seven (7) Range six (6).

Said land to be used by the Governor of the United States for the purpose of erecting a monument on the site of the Town of St. John's River to the memory of General and Mrs. W. H. Miller, and his men, the Indians who fought in said battle.

Should the United States, from any reason or any cause fail to build said monument then the above described land shall revert to its owner.

To witness her hand and signature at the expiration of seven years from the date

57
To have and to hold the aforesaid premises to the said 
The Horse Shoe Bend 

Real Estate Commission their successors 

...James and assigns, in their use and behoof, and to the hereby covenant with the said 
The Horse Shoe Bend Real Estate Commission 

...and assigns, that I 

lawfully seized in fee of the aforesaid premises; that they are free from all incumbrances; that I have a good right to sell and convey the same to the said 
The Horse Shoe Bend Real Estate Commission 

...and to hereby agree and covenant to defend the title to said premises to the said 
The Horse Shoe Bend Real Estate Commission there are 

...and assigns, forever, against the lawful claims and demands of all persons.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 

...day of 

...1811 .

...[Seal, marks, and affidavit in the presence of 

...J. S. Pershing...].
The State of Alabama, Tallapoosa County.

I, N. B. Hilder, the Sheriff of Tallapoosa County, in said State, do hereby certify that

whose name I signed to the foregoing concurrence, and who, being known to me, acknowledged before me on this day, that being informed of the contents of the concurrence, acceded to the same voluntarily on the day the same bears date.

Given under my hand, this 18th day of February, 1911.

The State of Alabama, Tallapoosa County.

I, N. B. Hilder, the Sheriff of Tallapoosa County, in said State, do hereby certify that

for said County, in said State, hereby certify that on the

name before me the within named

(formerly known to me to be the wife of the within named

who, being examined separate and apart from the husband, touched her signature to the within

acknowledged that she signed the name of her own free will and

accord, without fear, constraint or threats on the part of her husband.

In witness whereof, I have set my hand, this day of

The State of Alabama, Tallapoosa County.

I, N. B. Hilder, the Sheriff of Tallapoosa County, in said State and County, do hereby certify that

subscribing witness to the foregoing concurrence, known to me, appeared before me this day, and

being sworn, stated that

the grantor voluntarily executed the same in the presence and in the presence of the other

subscribing witness, on the day the same bears date, that he executed the same in the presence

of the grantee and of the other witness, and that such other witness subscribed the same as

a witness in the presence.

Given under my hand, this day of

A. D. 1911.
TO ALL TO WHOM THESE PRESENTS SHALL COME--------------------GREETINGS:

KNOW YE, That the 1957 Regular Session of the Legislature of Alabama in Act No. 348, page 458, approved August 28, 1957, authorized and empowered the Governor of the State of Alabama to cause a patent to issue under the Seal of the State, signed by him and attested by the Secretary of State conveying to the United States without consideration free and clear of all encumbrances for the purpose of originating and developing, preserving, improving, protecting and maintaining a national military park at Horseshoe Bend in Tallapoosa County, Alabama, that certain 5.1 acres of land acquired by Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission from Mrs. N. E. Miller, an unmarried woman, by warranty deed dated January 18, 1911, said land being more particularly described as follows:

Five and one-tenth (5.1) acres of land beginning at a point which is thirteen chains and fifty-one links South 75° 30' West of a point on the West line of Section 14 which is sixty-nine chains South of the Northwest corner of Section 14, thence West eight chains and fifty links, thence South six chains, thence East eight chains and fifty links, thence North six chains to the beginning point, said land lying and being in Section 15, Township 23, Range 23, Tallapoosa County, Alabama.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE STATE OF ALABAMA GRANTS the tract of land above described with all the appurtenances thereto belonging unto the United States of America for use as a national military park.
IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have caused these Letters to be
made Patent, and the Great Seal of the State of Alabama to be
affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Montgomery, this the
22nd day of January, A. D. One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-
Nine, and of the Independence of the United States, this the
One Hundred and Eighty-second year.

ALABAMA GREAT SEAL

/John Patterson/
Governor of Alabama

ATTTEST:

/Betty Frink/
Secretary of State

Recorded Volume 8, Land Patents, Page 168.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The within deed is accepted on behalf of the United States
as of March 10, 1959, under the authority contained in the act of
July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 651), and delegated by section 7 of Secretary's
Order No. 2420, dated June 10, 1951 (16 F. K. 5846), as amended by
Amendment 2, dated January 10, 1952 (17 F. K. 482).

Assistant Director
National Park Service
STATE OF ALABAMA
TALLAPOOSA COUNTY

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, That for the purpose of making
a gift and without expense to the United States of America of the lands
herein conveyed for inclusion in the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park,
Alabama Power Company, a corporation, does grant, bargain, sell and con-
vey unto the said United States of America and its assigns the following
described real estate, situated in Tallapoosa County, Alabama, to wit:

Northeast quarter (NE¼), northeast quarter of north-
est quarter (NE½ of NW¼), northeast quarter of south-
east quarter (NE½ of SE¼), fractions A, B, C, and E of
section 15; fractions B, D, and E of section 22; all
in township 23 north, range 23 east; also one-half
acre known as the Ferry Landing on the south side of
the Tallapoosa River in said section 15, more particularly
described as follows: Commence at the southwest corner
of section 15, township 13 north, range 23 east, Talla-
poosa County, Alabama; thence south 89 degrees 00
minutes east 1968 feet to a point; thence north 1 degree
00 minutes west 1267 feet to a point on the
southerly bank of the Tallapoosa River and that point
of beginning of the parcel herein intended to be de-
scribed; thence south 52 degrees 00 minutes west 147.6
feet to a point; thence north 38 degrees 00 minutes
west 147.6 feet to a point; thence north 52 degrees 00
minutes east 147.6 feet to a point on the southerly bank
of the said river; thence upstream along the southerly
bank of the river south 38 degrees 00 minutes east 147.6
feet to the point of beginning, and being situated in the
east half of the southwest quarter of section 15, township
23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama; also
a parcel of land known as Miller's Island in the Tallapoosa
River just south of the river bridge more particularly de-
scribed as follows: Commencing at the southwest corner of
said section 15, township 23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa
County, Alabama, thence south 89 degrees 00 minutes east
2605 feet to a point on the west bank of said island, which
is the point of beginning; thence north 5 degrees 00 minutes
east 220 feet to a point; thence north 8 degrees 00 minutes
west 510 feet to a point; thence north 82 degrees, 00
minutes east 350 feet to a point; thence north 55 degrees
30 minutes east 75 feet to a point; thence north 82 degrees 00 minutes east 115 feet to a point; thence south 17 degrees 00 minutes east 330 feet to a point; thence south 8 degrees 00 minutes east 270 feet to a point; thence south 77 degrees 45 minutes west 270 feet to a point; thence south 59 degrees 35 minutes west 160 feet to a point, thence south 36 degrees 06 minutes west 650 feet to a point; thence north 5 degrees 00 minutes east 530 feet to the point of beginning, containing 14.11 acres, more or less, and being situated in sections 15 and 22, township 23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama. Less and except 5.1 acres in said section 15, township 23 north, range 23 east, previously conveyed by Nora E. Miller to Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission, described as follows: Beginning at a point which is 13 chains and 31 links south 75 degrees 30 minutes west of a point on the west line of section 14, township 23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama, thence west 8 chains and 50 links, thence south 6 chains, thence east 8 chains and 50 links, thence north 6 chains to the point of beginning.

Together with all the right, title and interest of the grantor, Alabama Power Company, in and to the bed and banks of the Tallapoosa River as said river abuts on or adjoins said lands.

The grantor, Alabama Power Company, hereby expressly accepts and reserves unto itself and its successors and assigns from the lands conveyed above easements on, over and across such lands for existing ways and rights of way of reasonable widths, together with the facilities thereon used in connection with the transmission and distribution of electricity.

The lands above described are conveyed subject to rights of way for public roads and easements on, over and across such lands.

It is the intention of the grantor herein to convey all its right, title and interest in and to the lands owned by it in sections 15 and 22 in township 23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama, except as herein above expressly excepted and reserved unto itself and its successors and assigns.

The total amount of the acreage of the lands herein conveyed is 560.66 acres, more or less.
The lands hereinabove conveyed are a part of the same lands acquired by Alabama Power Company from Benjamin Russell and wife, Roberta McDonald Russell, by warranty deed of August 6, 1924, and from Roy L. Nolen and wife, Mildred J. Nolen, by quitclaim deed of April 24, 1926, which deeds are recorded in the office of the Judge of Probate of Tallapoosa County, Alabama, in Deed Book 41, page 84, and Deed Book 138, page 171, respectively.

The land herein acquired by the grantee is for the National Park Service for inclusion in the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD, To the said the United States of America and its assigns forever.

And the said Alabama Power Company covenants that it has not done or suffered anything whereby the said premises are encumbered in any way whatever, except as aforesaid.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Alabama Power Company has caused this instrument to be executed by Walter Bouldin, its President duly authorized thereto, and attested by Charles P. Jackson, its Secretary, who affixed its corporate seal hereto, being duly authorized thereto, on this 20th day of February, 1959.

ATTEST:

Alabama Power Company

s/Charles P. Jackson
Its Secretary

By s/Walter Bouldin
Its President
STATE OF ALABAMA
JEFFERSON COUNTY

I, Mary J. Cochran, a notary public in and for said county, in said state, hereby certify that Walter Bouldin, whose name as President of Alabama Power Company, a corporation, is signed to the foregoing conveyance, and who is known to me, acknowledged before me on this day that, being informed of the contents of the conveyance, he, as such officer, and with full authority, executed the same voluntarily for and as the act of said corporation.

Given under my hand and official seal this 20th day of February, 1959.

s/Mary J. Cochran
Notary Public
TALLAPOOSA COUNTY

WHEREAS, on March 27, 1814, at Horseshoe Bend on the Tallapoosa River in the State of Alabama, General Andrew Jackson defeated the Creek Indian Nation, which defeat ended the Creek War, and

WHEREAS, the Creek War which the battle of Horseshoe Bend brought to a victorious close involved both the fate of the young United States on its second struggle against England and the westward expansion of the nation from the South, and

WHEREAS, the State of Alabama recognized the great historical significance of this Battle by authorizing with the passage of Act No. 347, Acts of Alabama, Reg. Sess. 1957, Vol. I, page 457, approved August 23, 1957, the acquisition of the site of the Horseshoe Bend Battle and surrounding areas incident thereto for the proposed creation and establishment by the United States of America of a National Military Park at Horseshoe Bend on the Tallapoosa River in Tallapoosa County, Alabama, and

WHEREAS, said Act No. 347, further authorized the Department of Conservation of the State of Alabama upon acquisition of the necessary lands to convey same without consideration to the United States of America for the creation of a National Military Park; and

WHEREAS, the aforesaid lands have been acquired in fee simple by the State of Alabama, Department of Conservation.

NOW, THEREFORE, KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, That the State of Alabama, Department of Conservation, for and in consideration of the 66
premises, the values of which are hereby acknowledged by the State of Alabama, Department of Conservation, has granted, bargained and sold and by these presents does hereby grant, bargain, sell and convey unto the United States of America the following described real estate situated in the County of Tallapoosa, State of Alabama, to-wit:

Section 14, township 23 north, range 23 east; west half of northwest quarter and northeast quarter of northwest quarter of section 23, township 23 north, range 23 east; section 15 and section 22, township 23 north, range 23 east, less and except the following described parts of said sections 15 and 22, township 23 north, range 23 east, known as Alabama Power Company lands, described as follows: Northeast quarter (NE¼), northeast quarter of northeast quarter (NE¼ of NW¼), northeast quarter of southeast quarter (NE¼ of SE¼), fractions A, B, C and E of section 15; fractions B, D, and E of section 22; all in township 23 north, range 23 east; also one-half acre known as the Ferry Landing on the south side of the Tallapoosa River in section 15, more particularly described as follows: Commence at the southwest corner of section 15, township 23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama; thence south 89 degrees 00 minutes east 1968 feet to a point; thence north 1 degree 00 minutes west 1267 feet to a point on the southerly bank on the Tallapoosa River and the point of beginning of the parcel herein intended to be described; thence south 52 degrees 00 minutes west 147.6 feet to a point; thence north 38 degrees 00 minutes west 147.6 feet to a point; thence north 52 degrees 00 minutes east 147.6 feet to a point on the southerly bank of the river south 38 degrees 00 minutes east 147.6 feet to the point of beginning, and being situated in the east half of the southwest quarter of section 15, township 23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama; also a parcel of land known as Miller's Island in the Tallapoosa River just south of the river bridge more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the southwest corner of said section 15, township 23 north, range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama, thence south 89 degrees 00 minutes east 2605 feet to a point on the west bank of said island, which is the point of beginning; thence north 5 degrees 00 minutes east 220 feet to a point; thence north 8 degrees 00 minutes west 510 feet to a point; thence north 82 degrees 00 minutes east 350 feet to a point; thence north 55 degrees 30 minutes east 75 feet to a point; thence north 82 degrees 00 minutes east 115 feet to a point; thence south 17 degrees 00 minutes east 330 feet to a point; thence south 6 degrees 00 minutes east 270 feet.
to a point; thence south 77 degrees 45 minutes west 270 feet
to a point; thence south 59 degrees 35 minutes west 160 feet
to a point; thence south 36 degrees 06 minutes west 650 feet
to a point; thence north 5 degrees 00 minutes east 520 feet
to the point of beginning, containing 14.11 acres, more or less,
and being situated in sections 15 and 22, township 23 north,
range 23 east, Tallapoosa County, Alabama. Less and except
5.1 acres in said section 15, township 23 north, range 23
east previously conveyed by Nora E. Miller to Horseshoe Bend
Battle Park Commission, described as follows: Beginning at a
point which is 13 chains and 51 links south 75 degrees 30
minutes west of a point on the west line of section 14,
township 23 north, range 23 east, which is 69 chains south of
the northwest corner of said section 14; thence west 8 chains
and 50 links, thence south 6 chains, thence east 8 chains and
50 links, thence north 6 chains to the point of beginning,
Said 5.1 acre exception in said section 15 has heretofore been
conveyed to the United States of America by patent from the
State of Alabama.

The lands above described are conveyed subject to rights of way

for public roads and easements on, over and across said lands.

The total amount of the acreage of the lands herein conveyed is
1474.24 acres, more or less, all in Tallapoosa County, Alabama.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD, the aforesaid premises unto the said
United States of America forever for use as a National Military Park.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the State of Alabama, acting by and through
its Director of Conservation and Governor has hereunto caused this
deed to be executed and the seal of the Department of Conservation
and the Great Seal of the State of Alabama to be hereunto affixed
on this the 9th day of February, 1959.

STATE OF ALABAMA
Department of Conservation

s/Claude D. Kelly
Director

Illegible
Notary
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