

CURATED GROUND:
PUBLIC HISTORY, MILITARY MEMORY, AND SHARED AUTHORITY
AT BATTLE SITES IN NORTH AMERICA

A Thesis
Submitted to
the Temple University Graduate Board

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
MASTER OF ARTS

by
Joseph T. Humnicky
Diploma Date May 2020

Thesis Approvals:

Dr. Seth Bruggeman, Thesis Advisor, History
Dr. Hilary Iris Lowe, History

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a synthesis of two separate research projects conducted in the summer of 2018 and the spring of 2020. The first project was conducted in conjunction with the Fort Ticonderoga Association as a means of exploring the memory and legacy of a historic military landmark in written history, interpretation, and public memory. The second project was conducted in conjunction with the National Park Service (NPS) and the American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP) with funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). Instead of focusing on a single site, this second study looked at a collection of federal, state, local, and private battlefields in order to catalog the administrative histories, the boundary expansions, and the preservation priorities that have occurred both at the individual sites as well as collectively over time. The scope of the NEH grant was meant to evaluate the role that the NPS, ABPP, and the Department of the Interior have played in developing and refining preservation standards used by federal and non-federal sites. This thesis integrates the two studies in order to examine the correlation between public memory and battle sites in North America.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	i
ILLUSTRATIONS.....	iii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. BATTLE SITES IN PROFESSIONAL HISTORICAL THOUGHT.....	10
3. CASE STUDIES	
Heritage Tourism in Hallowed Ground.....	21
A Site of National Significance?.....	24
Marcos, Mark, and Marion.....	27
A Big Hole in Battlefield History.....	29
Honor to the Civilian Everywhere.....	31
CONCLUSION.....	34
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	41
APPENDIX	
A. ALEUTIAN ISLANDS WORLD WAR II NATIONAL MONUMENT.....	42
B. BIG HOLE NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD.....	46
C. CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT.....	49
D. FORT TICONDEROGA.....	52
E. HORSESHOE BEND NATIONAL MILITARY PARK.....	57

F. JOURNEY THROUGH HALLOWED GROUND NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.....	60
---	----

ILLUSTRATIONS

1. ALEUTIAN ISLANDS WOLD WAR II NATIONAL MONUMENT, STATE VIEW.....	38
2. ALEUTIAN ISLANDS WOLD WAR II NATIONAL MONUMENT, NATION VIEW.....	38
3. BIG HOLE NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD, STATE VIEW.....	42
4. BIG HOLE NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD, NATION VIEW.....	42
5. CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT, STATE VIEW.....	45
6. CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT, NATION VIEW.....	45
7. FORT TICONDEROGA, STATE VIEW.....	48
8. FORT TICONDEROGA, NATION VIEW.....	48
9. HORSESHOE BEND NATIONAL MILITARY PARK, STATE VIEW.....	52
10. HORSESHOE BEND NATIONAL MILITARY PARK, NATION VIEW.....	52
11. JOURNEY THROUGH HALLOWED GROUND NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA, STATE VIEW.....	55
12. JOURNEY THROUGH HALLOWED GROUND NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA, NATION VIEW.....	55

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 2018, the staff of Fort Ticonderoga invited me to serve as their Edward W. Pell Graduate Research Fellow. Fort Ticonderoga is a non-profit living museum that operates in and around a reconstructed nineteenth-century military structure that overlooks Lake Champlain on the New York-Vermont border. While the location and the region have been home to many armed conflicts between different polities, the current museum focuses primarily on the preservation and interpretation of two British assaults during the French era as well as the assaults that took place during the American Revolution. The mission of the Fort Ticonderoga Association, which manages the fort, is to “preserve, educate and provoke active discussion about the past and its importance to present and future generations,” and a large part of this is to “foster an on-going dialogue surrounding citizens, soldiers, and nations.”¹ Over the course of the several months that I spent at the museum, I designed a new exhibit space that captured the legacy of Fort Ticonderoga as a place and a concept within public memory.²

The fort’s place in long and complex histories creates many opportunities to consider public memory. Long before the fort, the shores of Lake Champlain had served as a middle ground between the original inhabitants of the area.³ To the west of Lake

¹ Hill, Beth, “Our Mission,” Fort Ticonderoga (2020) <https://www.fortticonderoga.org/about/mission/>

² Keagle, Matthew, email to author 5 February 2018, this project “addresses Ticonderoga as a place and concept in our national (and other nations’) narratives from the very late eighteenth century to the present, and how it is repeated, interpreted, and re-imagined throughout that time in ways that show its significance”

³ White, Richard, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016) p.xxvi, defines the concept of a middle ground as “the place in between: in between cultures, peoples, and in between empires and the nonstate world of villages;” Jon Parmenter, “Introduction,” in *The Edge of the Woods: Iroquia, 1534-1701* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 2010) p.xlviii

Champlain were the Kanien'kehá:ka (Mohawk) of the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) Confederacy. In their language, fort's peninsula is known as Tekaniataró:ken, meaning "a forked river" or "the land between two waters."⁴ To the east of Lake Champlain were the Western Abenaki of the Wabanaki Confederacy. In their language, the fort's peninsula is known as tsitó- tegwihlá or "the waterway continues."⁵ While not all their place-names could be considered cognates, the similar etymology and phonetics for Ticonderoga demonstrates one of the common definitions, speech sounds, and linguistics that contributed to place-names that we are still familiar with today. It is due to these cultures that the fort bears the name that it does. Its setting is steeped with the legacy of these nations.

The original structure was built in the 1750s by the French military for the purpose of protecting the strategic portage between Champlain and Lake George. When they named it Fort Carillon, they mimicked the Kanien'kehá:ka and Abenaki by using language that referred to the music of the river that joined the two lakes.⁶ French settlers formed alliances with the Wabanaki while the English/British settlers form alliances with the Haudenosaunee. Even as Euromerican interests began dislocating the natives from

⁴ Delaronde, Karonhí:io and Jordan Engel, "Kanonshionni'onwè:ke tsi ionhwéntsare (Haudenosaunee Country) in Kanien'kéha (Mohawk)," *The Decolonial Atlas*, WordPress, 4 February 2015, <https://decolonialatlas.wordpress.com/2015/02/04/haudenosaunee-country-in-mohawk-2/>;

⁵ Calloway, Colin G., "The Green Mountain Frontier: Conflict, Coexistence, and Migration," in *The Western Abenakis of Vermont, 1600-1800: War, Migration, and the Survival of an Indian People* (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990) p.3-33; Day, Gordon M., "Abenaki Place-Names in the Champlain Valley," *International Journal of American Linguistics*, vol.47, no.2 (Apr. 1981) p.151-153 etymology of Lake Champlain, p.168-9 etymology of Ticonderoga

⁶ Hamilton, Edward P., *Fort Ticonderoga: Key to a Continent* (Ticonderoga, New York: Ticonderoga Press, 1995) p.4s "because of the music of the waterfall in the little river falling down from Lake George"; J.E. and H.W. Kaufmann, *Fortress America: The Forts That Defended America, 1600 to the Present* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Da Capo Press, 2004) p.75-90; René Chartrand, *The Forts of New France in Northeast America, 1600-1763* (Oxford, United Kingdom: Osprey Publishing, 2008)

the region, Champlain and Ticonderoga continued to emphasize the importance of waterways as borders between competing powers.⁷

During the North American theater of the Seven Years' War, the French were driven from the fort after a series of confrontations.⁸ Not only did the British chose to occupy the fort for their own defense network, but it was at this time that they changed the name to the one that it currently bears. While the Treaty of Paris, in theory, secured the region from the French for the British, this location continued to serve as a pivotal military outpost on the frontier of an empire.⁹

Towards the close of the eighteenth century, Britain was forced to confront increased unrest in its North American colonies.¹⁰ When that unrest spilled over into armed rebellion, Ticonderoga once again served as a key location, this time for Revolutionary action. Not only did the fort contribute to the liberation of Boston, it also served as a launching point for the later unsuccessful invasions of Canada. Changing hands throughout the Revolutionary War, the fort was ultimately abandoned and destroyed by the British after their disastrous Saratoga campaign.¹¹

⁷ Cohen, Eliot A., *Conquered into Liberty: Two Centuries of Battles Along the Great Warpath That Made the American Way of War* (New York, New York: Free Press, 2011) p.2-3 uses the native term "Great Warpath" to stress not only the territorial divide but also the military history that took place between Albany, New York and Montreal, Quebec

⁸ Nester, William R., *The Epic Battles for Ticonderoga, 1758* (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 2008)

⁹ Cohen, *Conquered* p.122-7; Anderson, *Crucible of War* p.505-6

¹⁰ Anderson, Fred, *The Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York, New York: Knopf, 2000) p.574-5 American Duties Act of Sugar Act attempted to limit economic viability of French molasses to increase British tax income, p.581 Currency Act limited the agency of colonies to issue paper money for the repayment of debt, p.606-7 Stamp Act which is connected to the "no taxation without representation" argument for revolutionary action, p.648-9 Quartering Act enhanced British military commander's ability to house, feed, and maintain their forces in the colonies which is seen potential for military occupation by a standing army

¹¹ Hamilton, *Fort Ticonderoga* p.111 Benedict Arnold and Ethan Allen's combined forces seize the fort from British forces intending to capture the cannonade there; Cohen, *Conquered* p.157-8 Henry Knox's noble train of artillery moves the forts cannonade to Dorchester Heights, p.149 Richard Montgomery uses the fort to stage his failed invasion of Canada, p.177 Hoartio Gates retreats from

Following the Revolution, New York State took possession of the ruined fort from the military. Shortly after the turn of the century, the state turned stewardship of the ruins over to the joint care of Columbia and Union Colleges.¹² The Pell family purchased the property from the colleges in 1820 to use the grounds as a summer retreat. The Pavilion that they built there served as a precursor to the Great Camps that would occupy the Adirondack region later in the century. The Pell family did not continue to use the property personally nor keep it in one parcel. Throughout the nineteenth century, it served as a hotel as well as a nexus point for stagecoach, steamship, and railroad travel.¹³

In the early twentieth century, Stephen and Sarah Pell initiated the reconstruction of the fort. Inspired by the Colonial Revival movement, Sarah and Stephen intended for the restoration of the barracks buildings to coincide with the three-hundredth anniversary of Samuel de Champlain's exploration into the region.¹⁴ It was in 1931 that they formed the Fort Ticonderoga Association intending to further restore the structures of the fort. The park still functions under its stewardship and has since expanded to focus on the landscape that factored into the several engagements that took place at the fort.¹⁵

Fort Ticonderoga's story thus reaches far beyond its geographic location. Though located in New York, the Fort is also "about" Vermont. Though located in the U.S., it is also about Canada. Though administered by an American heritage organization, the Fort

Canada after Montgomery's failed invasion, p.234-5 the British burn the fort during their retreat following the defeat at Saratoga

¹² Hamilton, *Ticonderoga* p.226

¹³ Brockway, Lucinda A., *A Favorite Place of Resort for Strangers: The King's Garden at Fort Ticonderoga* (Ticonderoga, New York: Fort Ticonderoga, 2001) p.29-30 purchase by William Ferris Pell, p.38, 43-57 Pavillion as a hotel, p.65-6 Stephen and Sarah begin reconstruction

¹⁴ Brockway, *Favorite Place* p.17 Champlain's explorations took place in 1609, p.20 Pell's focus on the 1906 anniversary

¹⁵ Hamilton, *Ticonderoga* p.230 Stephan and Sarah form the Fort Ticonderoga Association

very much belongs to Haudenosaunee, Abenaki, French, and British histories as well. Although the Fort Ticonderoga Association bills its site as “America’s Fort,” it should be asked if this is the most representative way to remember the location and the history that occurred there. When I arrived at Fort Ticonderoga, I discovered that for decades the Fort’s curators had limited explorations of public memory to an exhibit of material culture from the U.S.S. *Ticonderoga* aircraft carrier inherited from a veteran’s association and initially meant for another museum.¹⁶ It led me to ponder the process through which historians decide what gets remembered and what does not. We well know that historians can create or enforce institutional biases, minimizing certain narratives and erasing others.¹⁷ How, I wondered, does this happen specifically at sites of military history? How do we decide, for instance, which battles to emphasize at a given location? How do we decide which battle sites to preserve in the first place? What does this say about the audiences that we are trying to court?

These were the questions I had in mind when I joined the “Honor to the soldier and sailor everywhere” National Parks Service (NPS) and American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP) Grant, funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). The project intended to survey fifty-eight federal and non-federal parks, monuments, and areas that collectively represent over one hundred battle sites in the U.S. The findings of this survey were to be published as a synthetic catalog of the administrative histories, the boundary expansions, and the preservation priorities that

¹⁶ The U.S.S. *Ticonderoga* (CV/CVA/CVS-14) served from World War II through the Vietnam crisis. “Ticonderoga IV (CV-14),” *Dictionary of American Naval Fighting Vessels*, Naval History and Heritage Command, 30 September 2008, <https://www.history.navy.mil/research/histories/ship-histories/danfs/t/ticonderoga-cv-14-iv.html>

¹⁷ Trouillot, Michel-Rolph, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 2015.

have occurred both at the individual sites as well as collectively over time. Analytically, this catalog was meant to evaluate the role that the NPS, ABPP, and the Department of the Interior have played in developing and refining preservation standards used by federal and non-federal sites and by extension their role in public military memory.

Coming into the NEH Grant for the NPS and ABPP, my role in this project had four main components, two dedicated to federal sites and two dedicated to non-federal sites. The first component was to develop a comprehensive bibliography of federal battlefield preservation documentation from 1794-2018. A large part of this element was concerned with cataloging and annotating the policy, founding, and historical documents created by the NPS as well as other government agencies. The planning, interpretation, and preservation of each site was meant to be detailed in the administrative histories that the units or their regional offices produce for them. This component also included applying expertise in order to generate further-reading lists for each individual site as well as for battle sites in general. The historiography of battle sites was meant to inform how academic history has developed in parallel to the public history going on at these sites as well as to provide some discourse about the professional historical interpretation that these sites represent. The bibliography for each site was meant to provide academic studies of the specific engagement(s) that occurred within each unit, the campaigns that they were a part of, and the conflicts that encapsulated their broader contexts.¹⁸

¹⁸ Christian, Terence, "ABPP Grant Doctoral Candidate Research Assistant Tasking Plan" (Temple University, 16 December 2019) p.1

The second component I was asked to address for the federal sites is to write a series of case studies for forty-one NPS units.¹⁹ The NPS currently has four hundred and nineteen sites under their stewardship, at least one hundred of these are battle sites, making this survey a quarter of NPS conservation programming and nearly half of their battlefield interpretation.²⁰ These units contained sites that have been recognized as historical, been preserved, and been interpreted prior to stewardship transferring to federal agencies. For this reason, this part of the research was meant to emphasize how preservation, planning, and interpretation changed after the federal government took on a more direct role in the administration process. These units also represent sites that have been preserved solely under the stewardship of the NPS as well. For this reason, this part of the research was meant to compare the motivations behind NPS founding of sites to those that they inherited.

Since preservation efforts at these sites have not been restricted solely to the NPS, I was tasked with identifying which organizations have or continue to collaborate with each unit. These case studies were intended to match the format and style of those used in the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission (CWSAC) as well as incorporate prioritization information from the ABPP study on Revolutionary War and War of 1812 sites.²¹ Where the general bibliography was meant to inform the research for the rest of

¹⁹ Ibid., p.3 table of case studies lists 11 national battlefields, 4 national battlefield parks, 1 national battlefield site, 9 national military parks, 11 national heritage parks, 1 national park, and 4 national monuments

²⁰ “National Park System,” *NPS*, 31 March 2020, <https://www.nps.gov/aboutus/national-park-system.htm>; “Battles and Wars,” *NPS*, 20 September 2019, <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/battlefields/battles-and-wars.htm>

²¹ Civil War Sites Advisory Commission, *Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields Technical Volume II: Battle Summaries* (National Park Service, 1998); American Battlefield Protection Program, *Report to Congress on the preservation of Revolutionary War and War of 1812 Sites in the United States* (National Park Service, 2017)

the grant, the more site-specific sourcing would be applied here as well as displayed for audience use.²²

The next part of the project moved away from federally controlled sites to look at non-federal sites. This too featured a bibliography charting the policies and planning that have informed each of the sites. Unlike the federal sites, these did not have founding and historical documents nor administrative histories within the NPS databases and required interacting with each site's resources. However, since these sites deal with recognized historical sites, there is still some collaboration with the National Registry. While there may be differentiation in the quality and definiteness of the documentation produced at each site, federal or non-federal, the National Registry provided common foundational documentation.

The last component of my role was to write a series of case studies for the fourteen non-federal units. These are composed of three NPS affiliated areas, three national heritage areas, and twelve non-federal battlefields.²³ Similar to the case studies for the federal units, these case studies were meant to track the growth of preservation boundaries, change over time in preservation and interpretation, and document the collaboration that shape them. Part of this section was meant to determine the influence that federal policies and practices have over non-federal sites. The other purpose for this section was to create a comparative analysis on the success and failure of past and present programming, not only among these fourteen units but also in comparison to the federal units.

²² Ibid., p.1-2

²³ Christian "Tasking Plan" p.3 non-federal units include 5 non-profits, 4 state/county/municipal, 2 private, and 1 tribal

The scholarship surrounding the history of battlefield preservation stressed an origin for memorialization and commemoration associated with the Civil War with a heavy emphasis on veteran and civilian advocacy. I have chosen six units from these case studies as a representative sampling of the larger project. Three of them are directly under the stewardship of the NPS and three are not. I will show that all six sites have been developed through a collaborative effort of federal, state, and local government as well as in conjunction with civilian and tribal organizations. These studies also demonstrate a trend in U.S. battlefield preservation prioritization that initially emphasized the Revolutionary and Civil Wars with increased representation of other conflicts throughout the twentieth century. For that reason, there has been a prolonged effort within historic sites to tell alternative narratives other than traditional focuses on soldiers and leaders in order to complicate the sites with social and cultural context in which each engagement occurred. With a mandate to preserve the nation's historic resources, I will argue that these sites represent the NPS's effort to live up to that mandate and serve the public through more representational interpretation.

CHAPTER 2 BATTLE SITES IN PROFESSIONAL HISTORICAL THOUGHT

Primary and secondary sources for historians of American military history have long rested in the accounts of soldiers. On one hand, soldiers often kept personal accounts either in their journals or in their communications with friends and families. On the other hand, officers were often required to account for the movements of their units and their role in engagements. For these reasons, the written history of battlefields is often as old as the battles themselves— thus predating the advent of modern professional history during the late-nineteenth century—and, at least indirectly, state-sponsored history. If we were to reduce our scope of historical analysis strictly to the British American experience in what would become the U.S., we could consider the earliest battlefields to be those of the Anglo-Powhatan Wars, in which case the earliest written histories of those battle sites would belong to John Smith.²⁴ Since our study was meant to explore the influence that the federal government has had on the preservation of battle sites in the U.S., the historiography being considered was even more narrow. Even so, histories of the American Revolution, for instance, also rely on soldiers' accounts and collaborations between the government and historians for the interpretation of battles.²⁵ Histories concerning the Revolution demonstrate a historiographic trend that focuses a great deal on battles and the individuals who fought there.

²⁴ Smith, John, "The Proceedings of the English Colonie in Virginia," *The Complete Works of captain John Smith*, ed. Philip L Barbour, 3 vol. (Chapel Hill: North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1986) vol.1; "A True Relation of Such occurrences and Accidents of Note, as Hath Happened in Virginia," vol.1; "the Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and Summer Isles," vol.2

²⁵ Massachusetts Provincial Congress, *A Narrative of the Excursion and Ravages of the King's Troops under the Command of General Gage* (New York, New York: New York Times, 1968) reprinted version of the original 1775 publication following the events at Lexington and Concord

Memorialization of battle sites is often associated with the funeral practices for the individuals who fought there. Prior to the popularization of embalming in the nineteenth century, it was almost impossible to transport fallen soldiers back to their friends and families for proper burial.²⁶ Even with the advent of mortuary preservatives, the reality of battle did not always allow for the recovery, identification, or proper burial of fallen soldiers.²⁷ When British Major General Edward Braddock died trying to capture the French Fort Duquesne in what is now Pittsburgh in May of 1755, his remains were laid to rest under the road that they were traveling on.²⁸ The location of his burial, while seemingly bizarre from a modern perspective, demonstrated consideration for commemoration purposes. Since the road was pivotal for frontier travel at the time, burying him beneath it would ensure that the gravesite would not be destroyed. Taking the time to find a way to ensure that his remains were not disturbed demonstrated a level of respect that his men wanted to bestow to his memory and legacy.

The Civil War and, more specifically, the Battle of Gettysburg offer a connection between immediate interpretation and citizens for the expressed purpose of memorializing battle sites. Immediately after the July 1863 battle, the Gettysburg Battlefield Monument Association hired John Bachelder to research, write, and depict the

²⁶ Chiappelli, Jeremiah and Ted, "Drinking Grandma: The Problem of Embalming," *Journal of Environmental Health*, vol.71, no.5 (Dec. 2008) p.24

²⁷ Laderman, Gary, "'Let the Dead Bury the Dead': The Search for Closure," in *The Sacred Remains: American Attitudes Toward Death 1799-1883* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1996) p.103-5 often, the dead were left where they fell, were buried on site, or interned in a collective grave

²⁸ Preston, David L., *Braddock's Defeat: The Battle of the Monongahela and the Road to Revolution* (New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 2015) p.319 discusses how Washington and others lost track of the grave after the fact

site over the course of the 1860s and 1870s.²⁹ Though President Lincoln may not have created the concept of commemoration, it was during the Gettysburg Address that he set aside a portion of the land on which the battle had taken place to serve as a cemetery. It was in this speech that he claimed that, “we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground,” because it already had been by the individuals who had fought upon it.³⁰ Memorials were erected by Civil War veterans for their units and fellow soldiers almost immediately after the engagements in question. In this way, we see that from early on the historical interpretation and memorialization of battle sites has been associated with funeral commemoration and has stressed sharing authority among soldiers doing the burying, historians curating the site, civilian organizations advocating for them, and governments providing legal framework for the preservation.³¹

In terms of battlefield preservation as well, it is appropriate to begin with a discussion of the Civil War. Not only were there active commemoration of sites during the actual war, but modern historical work has noted that the mid-nineteenth century was really when preservation efforts for all battle sites in the U.S. became popular. Thomas Chambers noted that it was during this era that formalized ceremonies and monument

²⁹ Bearss, Edwin C., “The National Park Service and Its History Program: 1864-1986 – An Overview,” *The Public Historian*, vol.9, no.2 (Spring 1987) p.11, Gettysburg Battlefield Monument Association was chartered in 1864 and Batchelder was employed as its historian

³⁰ Lincoln, Abraham, “The Gettysburg Address,” In *Abraham Lincoln, Slavery, and the Civil War: Selected Writings and Speeches*, edited by Michael P. Johnson (Boston, Massachusetts: Bedford, 2001), p.263; David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press, 2001) p.6 notes the importance of the speech to memory

³¹ Frisch, Michael, *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History* (State University of New York Press, 1990) Frisch coined the term “shared Authority” to refer to the symbiotic creation of narrative that takes place between an interviewer and an interviewee; Linda Shopes and Amy Starecheski, “Disrupting Authority: The Radical Roots and Branches of Oral History,” National Council on Public History website, 3 March 2017, <https://ncph.org/history-at-work/disrupting-authority-the-radical-roots-and-branches-of-oral-history/> they use a derivation of Frisch’s term to discuss the “collaborative relationship between communities and historians through the entire public history process, from initial conception to final products,” which in this case would fit the storied development of the sites under consideration

dedications became common. He likened the concerted effort during the Antebellum years to commemorate Revolutionary battles to a means of creating nationalist narratives that both celebrated the approaching centennial and served the utilitarian purpose for growing sectionalism.³² Both secession supporters and their opponents weaponized the founding conflicts as analogs for their political viewpoints, this is why both Union and Confederate forces were able to both claim that they were the inheritors of Revolutionary patriotism. Following the Civil War, a similar political slant was placed upon commemoration efforts, only instead of looking to the Revolution, they looked to the Civil War that had just occurred. For the Union, their victory became the rebirth of the U.S. For the Confederacy, their defeat became the Lost Cause and a failed effort to embody the mission of the Founding Fathers. While the roots of commemorating battle sites came from the soldiers themselves, political actors became the primary authors of interpretation.

Part of the reason that battlefield preservation was not a priority prior to this era was due to the lack of transportation infrastructure that would allow visitors to access secluded sites.³³ While the sites surrounding Boston, New York, and Philadelphia were able to be reached, Chambers noted that more distant Saratoga and Ticonderoga were more equated to the proverbial wilderness. It was due to this limited access that preservation efforts for the Revolutionary War were not able to have the immediacy that

³² Chambers, Thomas A., *Memories of War: Visiting Battlefields and Bonafields in the Early American Republic* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2012) p.xiii-xiv both secession supports and their opponents weaponized the founding conflicts as analogs for their political viewpoints, this is why both Union and Confederate forces were able to both claim that they were the inheritors of Revolutionary patriotism

³³ *Ibid.*, p.4

the Civil War had. Thus, for a majority of Revolutionary battlefields, their commemoration was stalled until the Civil War era.

If we were to consider the first era of battlefield memory to be the funeral efforts of the soldiers themselves, then we might consider the second era to be the advent of tourism and political propaganda. Chambers noted an increase in landscape tourism throughout the 1820s and 1830s seeking the sublime or sacred of the nation's founding.³⁴ However, the tourism during this time was limited to the elite and wealthy, those capable of devoting time to leisurely travel. Also, their travel was associated with visiting sublime landscapes and sacred locations.³⁵ While they ventured to sites from the French and Indian War and the Revolution, they had little interest in recreating the battles themselves, the sites were meant to speak for themselves.

It was in visiting these sites that tourists were able to craft Washington's exploits at Fort Necessity into an origin story for a national hero and the capture of Ticonderoga into a catalyst for revolution.³⁶ It was not until the 1840s that memory was able to collect around the War of 1812. Unlike the Revolution, 1812 did not contain a patriotic origin for the new nation. While there were efforts to commemorate sites, it was not until decades later that its legacy began to coalesce around sentimentality and sacrifice.³⁷ There was perhaps a lessened sense of celebrating great men and more of an acknowledgement of the soldiers who died for a cause. Sacrifice and service are

³⁴ Ibid., p.37

³⁵ Cronon, William, "The Trouble with Wilderness: Or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature," *Environmental History*, vol.1, no.1 (Jan. 1996) p.7-28; James Morton Turner, "From Woodcraft to 'Leave No Trace': Wilderness, Consumerism, and Environmentalism in Twentieth-Century America," *Environmental History*, vol.7, no.3 (Jul. 2002) p.462-484

³⁶ Chambers, *Memories* p.34 Braddock's Road, p.53 Fort Ticonderoga

³⁷ Ibid., p.157. Chambers describes the popular memory of the War of 1812 in the U.S. and Canada in 1845 as "citizens of both nations came to remember martial valor and personal honor, not territory gained, the result of a particular battle, prewar grievances or ideological quarrels"

common threads that connect one U.S. conflict to the next, but always there was a tendency in public memory to invoke a national narrative. For that reason, many U.S. battle sites feature interpretation that stress the memory of individuals, deemed important to the events, and the sacrifice and service performed by all present in order to convey a collective significance towards continued U.S. success and triumph.

While these early eras witnessed the first stirrings of public memory surrounding battle sites, they did little in the way of durable commemoration and nothing in the way of preservation. Commemoration efforts began in fits with efforts in 1783 to build a monument to Washington.³⁸ Between then and the 1820s, there was some effort to commemorate generals but very little in the way of commemorating the battles themselves. By 1860, there were only eight of a proposed sixteen Revolutionary monuments erected and yet beginning in the 1850s battlefields began taking on more national significance.³⁹ With growing sectional divide, nationalist and secessionist interests formed citizen groups desiring to curate and control the narrative of the sites they hoped to use as symbols for their own partisan causes.

From Memory to Preservation

Ronald F. Lee, former chief historian for the National Park Service, places the expansion of these sites from monuments to military parks at the beginning of the

³⁸ Ibid., p.82

³⁹ Ibid., p.94 monuments erected around this time “transformed death from an event associated with gloom to one promising hope in the afterlife, commemorating the dead played a limited role in American culture”; p.163-6 sees Bunker Hill as an example of northern nationalism and the memorialization at Kings Mountain, Guilford Courthouse, and Moore’s Creek between 1855-7 as Southern responses designed to address a lack of preservation; p.173-4 regional differences in battlefields factored into interpretation fueling sectionalism and secession by framing sites as either a part of the founding or the idea of fighting for rights and liberties

1870s.⁴⁰ The first two parks authorized by Congress were the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park and the Antietam National Battlefield Site in 1890. Congress authorized several more Civil War sites in rapid succession throughout the 1890s.⁴¹ During these years, the U.S. War Department had responsibility for managing federal battlefield parks and monuments. The War Department retained its authority over these units, in fact, even after Congress authorized the creation of a National Park Service in 1916. Until the late-1920s, this new conservation agency focused primarily on the “natural and scenic parks in the West and Alaska,” allowing it to focus on a growing interest in sublime wilderness and woodcraft tourism. Authority shifted, however, in 1935 when the National Historic Sites Act designated the NPS official steward of most federal heritage sites, including national battlefields and cemeteries such as at Arlington, Virginia.⁴²

NPS Director Horace Albright fought for this consolidation because he believed that a single agency would be able to increase administrative efficiency and lead to improved interpretation and programming. More than that, NPS stewardship of national battlefields introduced a new mission prerogative to “preserve resources for the use and enjoyment of the people” as well as to “leave the resources unimpaired for future

⁴⁰ Lee, Ronald F., *The Origin and Evolution of the National Military Park Idea* (Washington, D.C.: Office of Park Historic Preservation, 1973) p.5

⁴¹ Bearss, Edwin C., “The National Park Service and Its History Program: 1864-1986 – An Overview,” *The Public Historian*, vol.9, no.2 (Spring 1987) p.12, Shiloh in 1894, Gettysburg in 1895, and Vicksburg in 1899

⁴² *Ibid.*, p.10-11, notes that the Colonial National Monument, now Historical Park, was the first location to hire two professional historians for the sesquicentennial of the surrender at Yorktown. Care of these sites was dispersed among the Department of the Interior, the War Department, and the Department of Agriculture; Barry Mackintosh, “The National Park Service Moves into Historical Interpretation,” *The Public Historian*, vol.9, no.2 (Spring 1987) p.51 agrees that prior to the 1930s there was little to no historical interpretation in the NPS

generations.”⁴³ This has carried with it a paradox in which the NPS has long had to juggle the need to appeal to tourism with the need to conserve and preserve. One benefit to NPS consolidation was that historical narrative would be controlled by a single agency rather than several. For the first time, the NPS could help to author a more complete historical narrative of the sites under its administration.⁴⁴ This shift in historical thought occurred at the same time that the Great Depression was encapsulating the U.S. and President Roosevelt’s New Deal was creating new social programming. Emergency conservation work programs, particularly the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and the Public Works Administration (PWA), were able to employ professional historians and graduate students in larger numbers, drastically altering the mission statement of the agency.⁴⁵ This altered the format of the NPS and park administrations spent the next several decades surveying and evaluating existing federal sites as well as other historic sites in order to identify additions to the system as well as prioritize funding and resources.⁴⁶

While the New Deal policies allowed the NPS to pivot towards historical interpretation, it was the G.I. Bill that helped to fill its ranks in the Postwar Era. With an increased number of former servicemen taking advantage of higher education, the NPS was able to hire veterans as historians. It was during this time that they were able to publish their handbook series, creating illustrated narratives for their sites. As a callback

⁴³ Rogers, Jerry L., “Fulfilling Its Mandate: The National Park Service and Historic Preservation,” *The Public Historian*, vol.9, no.2 (Spring 1987) p.143

⁴⁴ Mackintosh, “The National Park Service Moves into Historical Interpretation,” p.51

⁴⁵ Bearss, “The National Park Service and Its History Program,” p.12-3, the multidiscipline talent pooled by these programs influenced the NPS and its programming for decades after the 1930s

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p.13-4, largely influenced by the Historic Sites Act of 1935, the survey project was stretched throughout the 1950s and 1960s due to the focus on WWII and Cold War interests, not to mention rationing which severely limited employees’ and visitors’ ability to interact with the sites

to early U.S. battle sites, veterans were once again helping to author the commemoration of past battles. It was the hopes of Director Arthur E. Demaray that this level of publication could be turned into a push for each unit to produce its own administrative history. However, this resulted in varying degrees of success and failure.⁴⁷

Despite the increased involvement of historians with the NPS in the Postwar Era, wartime lulls in programming left a backlog of programming. In 1955, Director Conrad L. Wirth initiated an agency-wide plan for postwar recovery called Mission 66 as a way of bolstering the number of historians employed by the NPS in order to prepare for their fiftieth anniversary as well as the centennial of the Civil War.⁴⁸ However, when the decade ended, Director George B. Hartzog, Jr. decided to centralize the service's historical management in Washington, D.C. with each unit focusing on disseminating the information produced.⁴⁹ Faced with complaints from the field, this policy of NPS historical authorship and instruction was rejected in 1979 for the previous model. The model developed during the 1970s saw the Washington office shift to oversight of policy and standards. Mission-oriented research was mostly centralized in the Denver Service Center. The ten regional offices were put in charge of programming and acted as liaisons to the individual parks. While each park was ultimately in charge of implementing interpretation, there was supposed to be a balance between top-down administration and their bottom-up execution.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p.14-5, not all units had historians, in which case the superintendent was meant to author the history, added to the fact that the Washington head office failed to provide guidance allowing each unit to have free range

⁴⁸ Ibid., p.15

⁴⁹ Ibid., p.15-16, Hartzog was advised by historian Robert M. Utley, both agreed that the NPS could function and provide information to visitors if the communication skills of their employees were emphasized, resulting in a lower standard for Civil Service testing

One of the important developments that occurred during this era was the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 by President Lyndon B. Johnson's administration. This created the National Register of Historic Places, which mandated that historic sites be surveyed, evaluated, and registered regardless of federal, state, local, or private ownership. This act also created the Section 106 review process, which required any federally funded undertaking at historic sites to report its effects to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, State Historic Preservation Offices, Tribal Preservation Offices, Indian Tribes, and Native Hawaiian Organizations.⁵⁰ The result was an increased need for regional historians, archaeologists, architects, and curators in order to comply with increased cultural oversight. In terms of creating more professional and representational history in the parks, these changes contributed quite a bit. More than that, it created a certain level of collaboration within each NPS region to inventory and evaluate all cultural properties, even those under the management of state, local, and private organizations.

Using five of the case studies that I have developed, I hope to explore how organizational partnership and collaboration have factored into the development of historic sites. Through a historiographical study, I hope to demonstrate the persistent involvement of soldiers, civilian organizations, and governmental agencies in the recognition, preservation, and interpretation of battle sites. While I would like to stress

⁵⁰ Ibid., p.16-7; National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S. Code 470 et seq.), statute text.; National Register of Historic Places (36 CFR 60), regulation text.; National Park Service, "The Origins of Executive Order 11593: Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment," (Washington, D.C.: Federal Preservation Institute, 2011) Nixon administration mandated a two-year window for registering historic sites; National Park Service, "National Preservation Act, Section 106: A Quick Guide for Preserving Native American Cultural Resources," (American Indian Liaison Office, 2012) p.1-2;

the immediacy of public history following the actual engagements, more organized efforts did not become popular in the U.S. until the mid-nineteenth century. Citizen groups have been largely responsible for beginning the commemoration of U.S. battlefields with the federal government taking a more active role in the twentieth century. This places the professional historical interpretation of these sites and the main push for preservation well within the twentieth and twenty-first centuries under NPS guidance.

I hope to also demonstrate with these studies a prolonged concentration on Revolution and Civil War memory within national memory and the NPS's effort to continue to complicate this. There has been a prolonged effort within historic sites to tell alternative narratives other than the romantic versions of U.S. military action in these two popular wars. Throughout the twentieth century, public history at battle sites has sought to preserve resources from diverse conflicts for the use and enjoyment of the people as well as to leave the landscapes of these battles unimpaired and/or repaired for future generations. I will argue that these sites represent the NPS's effort to live up to that mandate and serve the public through more representational interpretation.

CHAPTER 3 CASE STUDIES

Heritage Tourism Through Hallowed Ground

The first case study that I will discuss concerns the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area, which was established in 2008.⁵¹ As a national heritage area, Journey Through Hallowed Ground is not a park under the direct administration of the NPS, but rather exists as the Journey Through Hallowed Ground Partnership (JTHGP) which is a collaboration among three hundred and fifty organizations. Several NPS units are counted in this partnership, as are elements of state, county, and local governments. Together with non-profits and for-profit interests, they have created a landscape meant to conserve natural, cultural, and historic resources while promoting economic development.⁵²

In 1991, Congress passed the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act to create National Scenic Byways for the purpose of preserving and protecting national roads, promote tourism, and encourage economic development.⁵³ In 1998, Congress used the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century to create similar programming on the state level to work in conjunction with federal transportation networks.⁵⁴ In 2005, Congress extended this programming to tribal organizations by passing the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equality Act: A Legacy of Users.⁵⁵ As a part of this collaboration surrounding transportation networks, preservation, and heritage

⁵¹ Consolidated Natural Resources Act of 2008, Public Law 110-229

⁵² “What is a National Heritage Area?” NPS website, 17 June 2019

<https://www.nps.gov/articles/what-is-a-national-heritage-area.htm>

⁵³ Public Law 102-240, 102d U.S.C. (18 Dec. 1991)

⁵⁴ Public Law 105-178, 105 U.S.C. (9 Jun. 1998)

⁵⁵ Public Law 109-59, 109 U.S.C. (10 Aug 2005)

tourism, the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area was created by the Consolidated Natural Resources Act of 2008, established around the byway that bears the same name.⁵⁶ By its very nature, this area is meant to serve as a collaborative conservation effort that connects federal, state, and tribal interests in historic sites.

Much more expansive than a national park, this area includes large portions of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Maryland, and Virginia and is centered around the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Scenic Byway. The initiative behind this was primarily a response to the failed attempt to establish “Disney’s America” in the 1990s.⁵⁷ Both Disney’s failed attempt as well as the JTHGP placed a prioritization on economic development through the promotion of heritage tourism. In essence, the partnership places a value on the preservation of historical sites in the same way that the Pell family did at Ticonderoga, only it has expanded its campaign over an entire region.

The geographic scope includes historic sites from prior to European contact to modern times, including historic sites from the Revolutionary War, French and Indian War, and War of 1812, as well as the Civil War.⁵⁸ From a heritage tourism perspective, this meant that they could draw from hundreds of years of Native American, colonial, and U.S. history. However, its battlefield attractions are almost completely limited to engagements from the Civil War, there are no battle sites from other conflicts within its boundaries. Stressing a focus on tourism at battle sites, this partnership prominently advertised the Civil War locations in its offerings. Even the name, Journey Through Hallowed Ground, is a direct reference to the speech that Lincoln gave at Gettysburg and

⁵⁶ Public Law 110-229, 110 U.S.C., Title IV, Subtitle A, Sec. 401-11 (8 May 2008)

⁵⁷ “Milestones and Missions” The Journey website, <https://www.hallowedground.org/about/>

⁵⁸ “Itineraries and Ideas” The Journey website, <https://www.hallowedground.org/itineraries-ideas/>

is meant to show how this heritage area represents a chance to see other battlefields that were consecrated through the sacrifices in that war. However, its relatively short history has showed a continued development of multiple narrative itineraries demonstrating a broader desire to move towards inclusive historical interpretation.

The enabling legislation for this area states that its purpose is to “recognize and interpret important events and geographic locations representing key developments in the creation of America, including Native American, Colonial American, European American, and African American heritage.”⁵⁹ By creating a cooperative partnership among government organizations and private interests, Through collaborative lobbying, the partnered organizations can theoretically increase funding for conservation purchasing power.⁶⁰ Together, they are able to pool more funding and support than any individual site can when It comes to increasing boundaries and easing development in historically significant locations. Through this economic partnership, the JTHGP would have an extremely limited role in the interpretation of historic battle sites. With stewardship and administration vested in the individual sites, the JTHGP would not play a direct role in expansion and conservation of its members. However, the promotion of heritage tourism is meant to promote visitation and awareness for battle site initiatives and therefore potentially boost funding and donations that would directly affect expansion, interpretation and conservation.

In order to further the massive learning opportunity that this area represents, the JTHGP established the National History Academy in 2018. Far from being a simplistic

⁵⁹ Ibid., sec.401

⁶⁰ “Corridor Management Plan for the Journey Through Hallowed Ground Corridor,” The Journey Through Hallowed Ground Partnership, October 2008 p.65

heritage tourism campaign, this organization is intended to create summer learning opportunities for high school students to use place-based education to learn about democracy and citizenship while exploring sites from Native American settlement through to the Civil Rights Movement.⁶¹ Designed around history curriculum from Harvard, the program that they put forward stresses critical analysis of primary and secondary source interpretation. Considering the expanded scope that the Academy brings to the Journey's programming, any pitfalls would have to be evaluated from one of the many historic battle sites that they interact with.

This site also offers trends that I would like to highlight in U.S. heritage tourism. First, despite being founded in 2008 and having an expansive list of heritage resources, one of the largest priorities given to this area is still Civil War memory. That is not to say that the JTHG partnership is incapable of promoting other areas of public memory. The Civil War, however, disproportionately figures in the region's tourism landscape. While the area's battlefield offerings are restricted to that particular conflict, the programming offered through the National History Academy and the itineraries that they publish actively encourage tourists to interact with historical sites outside of the area. In that way, the JTHG partnership demonstrates how creating a more representational narrative does not have to be the sole responsibility of a single site but rather a collaborative effort between all historical sites.

A Site of National Significance?

The next case study that I would like to consider is Horseshoe Bend National Military Park. Although associated with the War of 1812, the park made its primary

⁶¹ "National History Academy Program," National History Academy website, 2020
<https://www.historycamp.com/program/>

focus the interpretation of the Creek War. As such, it is one of the few eastern sites dedicated to telling the history of U.S. violence against natives. The preservation of this site is pivotal to U.S. national narratives because the defeat of the Creek resulted in their dislocation from close to twenty-three million acres, resulting in the formation of Alabama, and the extension of chattel slavery.

Following the battle, the Treaty of Fort Jackson not only brought the Creek War to a close, but it also ceded the land on which the site exists to the U.S. government. The property was transferred to the state of Alabama in 1819 when it was admitted to the Union. Until the twentieth century, the land that the site resides on passed to private ownership and was used primarily for agricultural production. Initial efforts to preserve the site began in 1890 with historian Thomas M. Owen seeking to commemorate what he considered to be a significant element to Alabama's eventual founding. Since the cessions won during the Creek War factored heavily into Alabama's statehood, this battle was considered to be a pseudo-founding struggle for the state. Holding on to similar desires, the Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission, formed in 1907, cited the Antiquities Act of 1906 in its bid for federal preservation.⁶² Requests to form a park were denied, however a monument was established by Congress in 1914 due to the sale of private land and advocacy by the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Society of the Daughters of 1812.⁶³ The NPS held that the site was not considered to be nationally significant enough to necessitate a park.⁶⁴

⁶² Braund, Kathryn H. and Keith S. Hébert, *Horseshoe Bend National Military Park Administrative History* (NPS) p.29

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p.33

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p.30-1

The debate over significance centered around the concept of public memory. Advocates for the park were interested in telling the story of Southern expansion.⁶⁵ Initially, they failed to latch onto the Creek War's role in the War of 1812 as well as the presence of Andrew Jackson and his role in the Battle of New Orleans. Subsequent efforts to memorialize the site invoked the future president's name and associated the location with his rise to prominence in public thought. Despite the early resistance, Eisenhower eventually issued Executive Order No. 3308 in 1959 to establish the site as a National Military Park.⁶⁶

Largely absent from popular memory and the appeals for historic recognition were the Creek, Cherokee, and Choctaw tribes that were large part of its history. This began to change in 1964 when park staff began emphasizing the Native American narrative of the site. The NPS noted that the war and following century had largely erased Creek material culture from the region as well as from museums and archives. Initial interpretation of the site lacked the Native perspective in no small part because of a lack of primary and secondary scholarship of the subject.⁶⁷ Therefore, a large part of its mission since the 1970s had focused on trying to correct that gap in history.

Part of this effort is to expand beyond the relevance to the War of 1812 to focus more specifically on the Creek War as well as the eighteenth and nineteenth-century diplomatic relations between the U.S. and Creek nations.⁶⁸ Along with the battle, the site also preserves Newyaucau, an eighteenth-century settlement were Creek leaders and

⁶⁵ Braund and Hébert, *Horseshoe Bend* p.xiii

⁶⁶ Executive Order No. 3308, 16 U.S.C. (11 August 1959)

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p..xvi

⁶⁸ "Horseshoe Bend National Military Park Foundation Document" NPS,

<http://npshistory.com/publications/foundation-documents/hobe-fd-overview.pdf>

George Washington established perpetual boundary treaties. It also served as key node in the supply line during the War of 1812, arguably lending to the U.S. victory at New Orleans.

The narrative of Horseshoe Bend is important when compared to Journey Through Hallowed Ground. Not only is there a pervasive prioritization of the Civil War sites above others, but there is also a severe lack of prioritizing sites more significant to Native Americans. The more recent efforts at Horseshoe recognize that the Creek War, which culminated at Horseshoe Bend, was an important moment in the dislocation of the Creek from three different states. Owen was right when he claimed it as important to the formation of Alabama however the NPS is elaborating on this in order to tell the story of U.S. military history and state formation as one inseparable from the Indian Wars and Removal policies.

Marcos, Mark, and Marion

The next site that I would like to highlight is the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument. Similar to Fort Ticonderoga, the Castillo is a military fort that predates the establishment of the U.S. Located in St. Augustine, Florida and constructed in 1672, this fort is the oldest masonry fort built by Europeans in North America. As an inheritance from the Spanish Empire, this fort plays a pivotal role in the telling the Spanish narrative of U.S. development. Again, similar to Ticonderoga, the location was once native territory and changed hands multiple times. Under Spanish ownership, it was home to two separate sieges by British forces. As an extension of the geopolitical turmoil of the Seven Years' War, it briefly was occupied by the British as Fort St. Mark. Both the fort

and the Florida territory were transferred from Spain to the U.S. in 1821 with the Adams-Onís Treaty, renaming it Fort Marion after the Revolutionary military leader.⁶⁹

As an active military base, the War Department was the first administrator of Fort Marion and received funds from Congress for preservation purposes immediately after transfer of ownership from Spain.⁷⁰ Much like the historiography of battlefields stresses, Fort Marion was a location for early heritage tourism during the nineteenth century. After transferring it from active duty, President Arthur sign appropriation bills in 1884 for the expressed purpose of restoring the fort to its 1821 status.⁷¹ Not only is this an example of early conservatorship by the federal government, but it also demonstrates a collaboration to do so with the state government citing not its importance to national heritage but rather as a “relic of Spanish heritage.”⁷²

Similar to the efforts that went into the early conservation efforts at Horseshoe Bend, the Secretary of War was able to declare the fort a national monument in 1915 by citing the 1906 Antiquities Act.⁷³ In 1942, the fort was restored to its original name, no longer named after the Revolutionary officer. As Castillo de San Marcos again, the NPS hoped to connect the site to the greater St. Augustine area as a means of acknowledging it as the earliest permanent European settlement in North America. Not only does this site go out of the way to acknowledge the multicultural narratives of its past, but it also does not shy away from its more problematic histories. The fort makes sure that its

⁶⁹ Krakow, Jere L., *Administrative History of Castillo de San Marcos National Monument and Fort Matanzas National Monument* (National Park Service, 1986) p.6-7 discusses the imprisonment of Chiricahua Apache after their surrender in 1886

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p.1

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p.8

⁷² *Ibid.*, p.10

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p.14

interpretation includes the role it played in the Second Seminole War as well as a later prison for dislocated natives from the west.

A Big Hole in Battlefield History

Big Hole National Battlefield was created to commemorate the Nez Perce War which took place between June and October of 1877. The hostilities took place between U.S. military forces and members of the Nez Perce tribe who resisted dislocation and reservation which they perceived as a violation of the Treaty of Walla Walla of 1855 which had guaranteed them 7.5 million acres of their ancestral homeland. Similar to the narrative at Horseshoe Bend, this site is steep in U.S. military history and its association with dislocating Native Americans. However, unlike with Horseshoe Bend, Big Hole has a much darker history.

The war consisted of the Nez Perce embarking on a journey north in an attempt to band together with Crow and/or Lakota forces in order to resist reservation. The Battle of the Big Hole commenced at dawn on August 9, 1877 with U.S. forces attacking a still-sleeping encampment of men, women, and children. Despite the surprise, the Nez Perce were able to rally enough fighters to counter the U.S. forces and hold them in a stalemate until their people could retreat. It was an inconclusive engagement that left both sides were numerous dead and more wounded. It should be noted that only a third of the Nez Perce dead were fighters, most of those who were killed were women and children.⁷⁴

Initial memorialization for the Battle of the Big Hole began in 1883 with a monument dedicated to the U.S. soldiers, the Nez Perce were not addressed. Five acres were added to the monument in 1910 to incorporate the Siege Area, but again the Nez

⁷⁴ Catton, Theodore and Ann Hubber, *Commemoration and Preservation: An Administrative History of Big Hole National Battlefield* (Missoula, Montana: Historical Research Associates, Inc.) p.1-9

Perce were not addressed.⁷⁵ An additional 200 acres were added in 1939 to include Colonel Gibbon's approach from Battle Mountain.⁷⁶ In 1963, its designation was changed again to a National Battlefield and Congress began a decade-long process to incorporate the Nez Perce Encampment Area where the fiercest fighting took place.⁷⁷ In 1966, the site was added to the National Register of Historic Places. This acquisition chapter was meant to offer balance to the narrative and finally include the Nez Perce perspective. The Bloody Gulch, where the Nez Perce fled still remains in private ownership.⁷⁸

From its inception to 1933, the monument was under the administration of the War Department and the U.S. Forest Service. Under the War Department, the site took on a typical military history approach to interpretation emphasizing the deeds and actions of heroic figures. When discussed, Chief Joseph was remembered as a military genius who had been able to get his people away despite being ambushed. The Forest Service was less interested in commemoration and instead built a ranger station near the monument in 1912 for the purpose of encouraging year-round camping and recreation.⁷⁹ In both ways, these early stewards had no interest in telling representational history and instead chose to focus on tourism and sensationalized narratives that would appeal to popular memory.

Since becoming a part of the NPS, the battlefield passed among four different regional offices and four different superintendents. From 1927 to 1937 there was a

⁷⁵ Executive Order No.1216, 34 Stat. 225, 23 June 1910

⁷⁶ Proclamation No. 2339, 53 Stat. 2544, 29 June 1939

⁷⁷ 16 U.S. Code § 430uu, Pub. L. 88-24, § 1, May 17, 1963, 77 Stat. 18., Big Hole National Battlefield; re-designation of monument

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p.iv-v

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p.13, p.23

concerted effort to gather oral histories from the survivors of the original battle. It was on the behest of historian Lucullus V. McWhorter that this initiative was made and an early attempt at correcting the misinformation from white survivors. By 1935, the recreation program had ended and the buildings had already begun to be removed for the integrity of the site.⁸⁰ The small plaque to commemorate this narrative was added by historian Merrill J. Mattes in 1937, without permission for the NPS.⁸¹

Further development of the site was hindered over the following decades. The park was not prioritized by the NPS because of its location, it did not have the visitor numbers of other more popular site. Added to that, the Nez Perce site was not in thematic compliance with their focus on the Revolutionary and Civil Wars. Worst of all, its bold telling of historical events countered romanticized collective memory of American Manifest Destiny.⁸² The commemoration of Native Americans within U.S. battle sites has always needed to reconcile with not only national significance but also with national narrative. It is one thing to admit that there is another side to the story than just heroic exploits of the U.S. military, but quite another to tarnish the heroic label by highlighting actions that could be interpreted as atrocities.

Honor to Civilians Everywhere

The last case study that I would like to consider is the Aleutian Islands World War II National Monument. The land that the monument is composed of was first established as the Aleutian Islands Reservation as a preserve in 1913 and as such

⁸⁰ Ibid., p.33-39

⁸¹ Ibid., p.55

⁸² Ibid., p.43

continues to have joint administration with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.⁸³ This primarily limited/managed the hunting and/or harvesting of wildlife within the region. In 1980, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act added 460,000 acres to the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge and subdivided it into 11 refuges.

Initial legislation for the monument went into effect in 1996 creating the Aleutian Islands World War II National Historic Area under the joint administration between the NPS and the Ounalaska Corporation.⁸⁴ The original goal of this unit was to promote the history of the Aleut people and the role that they played in the U.S. war with Japan. More than that, it was always seen as a way for the Unanga people to interpret and educate people about their history and the lasting effects of the war.

In 2008, the monument's three sites were designated a part of the World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument, connecting these Alaskan sites to Pearl Harbor and the internment site at Tule Lake.⁸⁵ These Alaskan sites were associated with Pearl Harbor because together they represent to southernmost and northernmost sites of Japanese attacks on U.S. state soil. The Aleutian sites by themselves represent the only battle sites from World War II to be located in North America. They are also connected to Tule because they too represent a part of government-sponsored internment during WWII. In June of 1942, Japanese forces invaded and occupied the island of Kiska, taking 42 Attuan villagers captive. In response to the occupation, the U.S. military had

⁸³ "Aleutian Islands WWII National Monument," U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service website, 14 January 2020,

https://www.fws.gov/refuge/alaska_maritime/AleutianIslandsWWIIMonument.html

⁸⁴ "The *S.S. Northwestern* Sailing Sheltered Seas: An Illustrated History," *Aleutian Voices*, vol.1, no.1 (2014) p.2

⁸⁵ Alaska Unit, "World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument Foundation Statement," U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and NPS, September 2010, p.1

<http://nps.history.com/publications/foundation-documents/valr-ak-fs-2010.pdf>

nine villages evacuated and destroyed so that they could not fall under Japanese control. The 881 Aleuts who were dislocated were removed to “detention villages” where they had no plumbing, no electricity, and no winter clothes. They were fed poorly and the water they had access to was tainted. They received little to no medical care and as such suffered from severe pneumonia and tuberculosis.

While initially grouped in order to tell a collective history of WWII battle sites on U.S. territory, the monument was separated as a standalone unit in 2019. Within the administration of the Valor in the Pacific Monument, the Aleutian sites were prioritized lower than the sites at Pearl Harbor. Separating from the more popular site gives the Aleutian narrative more of a chance to stand out as its own part of WWII rather than a footnote. Similarly, the separation for Tule keeps the story of Aleutian imprisonment separate from the more familiar Japanese internment. As a service to the public, the NPS has a duty to make sure this relatively unknown moment in history gets its fair shake.

CONCLUSION

When it comes to preserving battle sites, there are a few considerations that limit which ones are capable of being preserved. First, there is a concern for integrity. Given the chronological distance between the event in question and the movement to preserve it, natural and human development may have altered the landscape beyond recognition. This leaves little option beyond noting the coordinates and creating memory through interpretation. Several of the sites that I have highlighted have had that experience. An appropriate example of integrity issues at battle sites can be seen in the cases of Horseshoe Bend and Big Hole. In the case of Horseshoe Bend, the establishment of the park did not occur until almost a century and a half after the battle took place. Prior to 1964, the park placed little to no emphasis on the Native perspective because much of their material culture and history had been degraded. Although Big Hole received some memorialization a mere six years after the battle, the Native perspective at that site received spotty conservation and interpretation for sixty years. With Big Hole, the Native perspective was also hindered in part by the struggle of the site to control all relevant territory. The heaviest fighting took place on land that was not acquired until just shy of a century after it had taken place, portions of land where Natives were involved still lie outside of NPS control. In both cases, this factored into the limited narrative that the sites were capable of curating and reinforced less than representative narratives of their histories.

The other concern, which is probably even more of a limiting factor, is that preservation of battle sites cost money. Prior to the 1960s, expansion of boundaries

within NPS units was performed in no small part by donations from private owners and citizen organizations. The NPS gained financial agency over land acquisitions during the 1970s with the “Buy Back America” campaign, but its budget and spending power was reduced by the Reagan administration which continued throughout the 1990s as well. While the NPS can be limited in purchasing power by current office holders, the reality is that it is also held back by the real estate market.⁸⁶ Intent on furthering its public history and social history mandate, the NPS began acquiring land through easements and partnerships. The perfect example of this is the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area. This unit has been able to gather massive organizational partnering and financial pooling in order to preserve the integrity of historical sites in several states.

As noted in his analysis of the NPS, Jerry Rogers voiced concern that the National Register and other policies that emphasize evaluating cultural resources based on whether or not they are “nationally significant,” can prevent or deter recognition of locally significant resources.⁸⁷ In the case of Horseshoe Bend, the appeals for its recognition as a historic landmark met resistance because its relevance to Creek and Alabama history were not prioritized to the same extent that national relevance was. In a slightly different vein, the Aleutian Islands monument spent eleven years as a unit that stretch from Alaska to Hawaii. Until it was re-designated as its own unit, the importance of the Unangax̂ narrative was not able to be prioritized over the national WWII perspective.

⁸⁶ Frobouck, Jo Ann, “The High Price of Preservation: Why We Must Pick and Choose What America Wants to Enshrine,” *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.) 22 March 1992

⁸⁷ Rogers, “Mandate” p.144-5

The favoring of national interests in historical narratives carries with it the dangers of replicating American exceptionalism. The most apparent issue here is that a focus on the U.S. perspective excludes thousands of years of native history that occurred in the same geographic boundaries. Given the planning material, Journey Through Hallowed Ground is again a good example for this. Instead of restricting its programming to the Civil War sites that have already been established within its boundaries, the partnership has created tourism and educational itineraries that attempt to tell Native American and Euroamerican histories well before the Civil War as well as create a more modern relevance by advocating the regions involvement in Civil Rights throughout the past century. Along with that site, the Castillo de San Marcos also acknowledges the multicultural exchange, agency, and geopolitics in the Atlantic world that contributed to the complexity of the Independence movement. The founding documents for this site establish an ongoing effort for U.S. historical sites to recognize their history beyond the scope of a U.S. chronology.

On the other side of interpretation, limiting the historical narrative of a site in any way can be detrimental to the audience it could attract. In a 2015 article, the *New York Times* argued that the majority of the visitors to NPS sites were white or non-Hispanic.⁸⁸ In this study, it was argued that only 22% of park visitors were minorities despite representing 37% of the population of the U.S. With current census estimate showing the U.S. becoming increasingly non-white, these visitation numbers become more and more problematic.⁸⁹ In a report completed by the NPS and the Organization of American

⁸⁸ Nelson, Glenn, "Why Are Our Parks So White?," *New York Times*, 10 July 2015

⁸⁹ U.S. Census Bureau, "Quick Facts," 1 July 2018,

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045218> estimates are up from 37 to 40% in just 3 years

Historians (OAH) the findings concluded that historical narratives at any NPS site relies on the ability for visitors to get quality information from exhibition and interpreters. Both of these elements of public history rely heavily on each site's ability to have professional historians in the curation process. In short, the report concluded that in order to deliver representational history, the NPS needs more funding in order to maximize the use of the chief historian's office.⁹⁰ Part of this study also recognized the role that historians and new technologies can play in expanding visitor understanding of parks. One of the keys to making interpretation more representational is to listen to the visitor's cues on what is outdated.⁹¹ In this vein, failing to court a more diverse audience directly equates to a lack of collaboration with an entire portion of the population.

Laura Burd Schiavo wrote an article in response to Nelson's publication in which she argued that visitation to historical sites is more likely to occur when "someone's history is acknowledged," going further to say that "he or she is more likely to feel connected, or less likely to feel excluded."⁹² That is not to say that Schiavo's analysis is a complete inditement of current preservation policies and practices, in fact she points out that demographic surveys of visitors can often oversimplify identity and skew representational issues. This is not a total rejection of the claims that park visitation is primarily a white activity, but it also reminds us that visitation data is not complete. She goes on to debate whether or not visitation should be the metric for determining

⁹⁰ Whisnant, Anne Mitchell, Marla R. Miller, Gary B. Nash, and David Thelen, "Imperiled Promise: The State of History in the National Park Service," Organization of American Historians, 2011 p.58

⁹¹ Ibid., p.105

⁹² Schiavo, Laura Burd, "'White People Like Hiking': Some Implications of NPS Narratives of Relevance and Diversity," *The Public Historian*, vol.38, no.4 (Nov. 2016) p.207

successful preservation and interpretation. In fact, she argues that visitation by diverse audiences is secondary to telling diverse stories.

In her analysis she points to research data from the NPS and the Center for American Progress which both catalog federal sites that focus on diverse groups.⁹³ Included on these lists are Horseshoe Bend, the Aleutian Islands, Castillo de San Marcos, and Big Hole.⁹⁴ While she commends these sites for actively pursuing alternative narratives, she critiques the assumption that we as human beings only “seek out history that is ‘ours’.”⁹⁵ I disagree with this, and she does as well based on her suggestion that people feel more comfortable when they are included. The more powerful lesson concerns her claim that the shared culture and heritage of people is not found in or sustained by oversimplified definitions of identity.⁹⁶ The U.S. has never existed as homogenized culture, and she praises the NPS its Urban Agenda for recognizing that.

It is not just the federal system that has to worry about this either. The same year that Nelson published the study about park visitation, census information showed that New York state was only 56% white, with Essex County where Fort Ticonderoga resides as 90% white.⁹⁷ One interpretation of this data is to assume that the fort’s most immediate audience is an overwhelmingly white population. Travel studies have showed, as recently as 2018, that visitors to the Adirondack region are 94% white. This means that anyone coming from outside of the fort’s immediate surroundings is even less

⁹³ Ibid., p.225

⁹⁴ “Places Reflecting America’s Diverse Cultures” NPS website,
<https://www.nps.gov/subjects/travelamericancultures/index.htm>

⁹⁵ Ibid., p.227

⁹⁶ Ibid., p.227

⁹⁷ U.S. Census Bureau, “Quick Facts: New York,” 1 July 2019 <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/NY>
places white and non-Hispanic population at 55.4%

diverse than the local population.⁹⁸ Not only that, but this data shows that the people visiting the region have an average age of 54 years and an average income of over \$100,000, meaning that the fort's potential audience is wealthier, older, white people. As restricted as that potential audience is, this same study showed that only 18% of them spent time at heritage and cultural sites within the fort's county. Now, this isn't to say that the fort is in any way responsible for the demographics of residents and visitors, but it places this battle site in a context that discourages diverse audience. With Fort Ticonderoga in particular, its original visitation in nineteenth century was restricted in many ways to those who had the privilege and wealth to visit the remote site. Given the study just mentioned, visitation at the fort is still restricted along class and racial lines. Offering the same narratives and interpretations is not going to change that. It is generally accepted that in order to get visitors to a public history site, the visitors need to be able to identify with it. Short of building more of a bond with potential visitors, sites can use new technologies and innovation to appeal to audiences outside of their boundaries. If visitors are unwilling to go to the site, the site must find a way to bring quality interpretation to them instead.

It goes without saying that the scope of this case study analysis is extremely limited. The six case studies presented here are formatted for the NEH grant, which appear as such in the appendix. Consider that my overview of each unit is necessarily restricted to roughly five hundred words. The reality is that while this grant intends to assess the success and failure of NPS, ABPP, and the Department of the Interior in

⁹⁸ Regional Office of Sustainable Tourism, "Leisure Travel Study: Essex, Franklin, and Hamilton County Region," May 2019, <https://www.roostadk.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/2018-Leisure-Travel-Study-Regional-FINAL.pdf>

creating and strengthening public history standards, it needs to be done in a much larger format. My experience with these studies shows that each of these units have much more history than can be summarized in three pages. If our intentions are to advise these sites' potential stakeholders, then this format is likely not the most effective way to convey each unit's significance. Consider too that many of these units feature multiple chronologies and narratives that deserve recognition. Then of course there is the problem that this study only engages with sites that are already established. My exploration of battle sites began with questions about what gets remembered. What this study suggests is that answering that question is precisely how projects like "*Honor to the soldier and sailor everywhere*" can elicit a necessity for more extensive battlefield preservation at both federal and non-federal sites. The most successful programming within these studies are arguably cemented in collaborative efforts that join historical sites together in order to create history for the public beyond the boundaries of any individual unit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bearss, Edwin C. "The National Park Service and Its History Program: 1864-1986 – An Overview." *The Public Historian*, vol.9, no.2 (Spring 1987) p.10-18.
- Blackburn, Marc K. *Interpreting American Military History at Museums and Historic Sites*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016.
- Chambers, Thomas A. *Memories of War: Visiting Battlegrounds and Bonefields in the Early American Republic*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Coslett, Daniel E. and Manish Chalana. "National Parks for New Audiences: Diversifying Interpretations for Enhanced Contemporary Relevance." *The Public Historian*, vol.38, no.4 (Nov. 2016) p.101-128.
- Frobouck, Jo Ann. "The High Price of Preservation: Why We Must Pick and Choose What America Wants to Enshrine." *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.) March 22, 1992.
- Lee, Ronald F. *The Origin and Evolution of the National Military Park Idea*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Park Historic Preservation, 1973.
- Linenthal, Edward Tabor. *Sacred Ground: Americans and Their Battlefields*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1991.
- Mackintosh, Barry. "The National Park Service Moves into Historical Interpretation." *The Public Historian*, vol.9, no.2 (Spring 1987) p.50-63.
- Rogers, Jerry L. "Fulfilling Its Mandate: The National Park Service and Historic Preservation." *The Public Historian*, vol.9, no.2 (Spring 1987) p.143-146.
- Schiavo, Laura Burd. "'White People Like Hiking': Some Implications of NPS Narratives of Relevance and Diversity." *The Public Historian*, vol.38, no.4 (Nov. 2016) p.206-235.
- Spence, Mark David. *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX A

Aleutian Islands World War II National Monument

Location: Aleutian Islands, Alaska

Engagement:

Battle of Attu⁹⁹

Invasion of Kiska¹⁰⁰

Unangan Internment¹⁰¹

Campaign: Pacific Theater, Aleutian Campaign

Conflict: World War II

Date(s):

May 11-30, 1943 (Battle)

June 6, 1942-July 28, 1943 (Invasion/occupation)

June 12, 1942-1944 (Internment)

Person(s) of Note:

Maj. Gen. Albert E. Brown (U.S.)

Col. Yasuyo Yamasaki (I.J.A)

Unit(s) of Note:

Japanese Imperial Army

Japanese Imperial Navy

U.S. Army

U.S. Navy

Canadian air support



⁹⁹ Cloe, John Haile, *Attu: The Forgotten Battle* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2017)

¹⁰⁰ Spennemann, Dirk H.R., *The Cultural Landscape of the World War II Battlefield of Kiska, Aleutian Islands* (Albury, New South Wales: Institute for Land, Water, and Society, 2001)

¹⁰¹ Mobley, Charles M., *World War II Aleut Relocation Camps in Southeast Alaska* (Anchorage, Alaska: National Park Service, Alaska Region, 2012); Gary C. Stein, "Cultural Resources of the Aleutian Region, vol. I." Anthropology & Historical Preservation Cooperative Park Studies Unit, October 1977, <http://npshistory.com/publications/aleu/cult-res-v1.pdf>

Result(s):

Japanese victory, subsequent occupation, imprisonment and/or internment of local population by Japanese and U.S. forces (Kiska)

U.S. victory, subsequent liberation (Attu)

Commemoration(s)/Monument(s):**Critical Preservation Sites:**

S.S. Northwestern

Atka Consolidated B-24D Liberator Bomber Crash Site

Kiska Island Occupation Site

Attu Island Battle Site

Description:**Enabling Legislation:**

In 1913, President Taft issued Executive Order 1733 establishing the Aleutian Island chain as a wildlife refuge. This primarily limited/managed the hunting and/or harvesting of wildlife within the region. In 1980, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act added 460,000 acres to the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge and subdivided it into 11 refuges.

In 1996, Congress designated the historical area as a way for the Unanga people to interpret and educate people about their history. The area is managed by the Ounlaashka Corporation with technical assistance provided by the NPS.¹⁰² Not only were they interested in telling the military history of the region, but they also commemorating the 800 natives who spent years either as Japanese prisoners of war or in U.S. internment.

George W. Bush issued Presidential Proclamation 8327 on December 5, 2008 to establish World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monuments throughout Hawaii, Alaska, and California.¹⁰³ In 2019, the Aleutian monument was separated from the Pacific so that

¹⁰²"The *S.S. Northwestern* Sailing Sheltered Seas: An Illustrated History," *Aleutian Voices*, vol.1, no.1 (2014) p.2

¹⁰³Alaska Unit, "World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument Foundation Statement," U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and NPS, September 2010, p.1
<http://npshistory.com/publications/foundation-documents/valr-ak-fs-2010.pdf>

the local story could stand on its own instead of being overshadowed by the more familiar narratives of Pearl Harbor and Japanese-American internment.

Priorities:

From its founding, this monument has maintained several priorities. Its overarching mission statement has remained to “tell the World War II stories and events that occurred in the North Pacific.”¹⁰⁴ One subsequent priority that falls under this purview is to curate the only battle site in World War II to take place in North America. The other, and the one that has been prioritized, is the narrative of the Unanga experience during World War II and the lasting implications.

Burkhart and Linda Cook. *World War II National Historic Landmarks: The Aleutian Campaign*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1993.

Cook, Linda. *World War II in the Aleutians: alternatives for preservation and interpretation of historic resources at Dutch Harbor Naval Operating Base and Fort Mears, U.S. Army, national historic landmark, Unalaska, Alaska*. Anchorage, Alaska: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1991.

Cloe, John Haile. *Attu: The Forgotten Battle*. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2017.

Estlack, Russell W. *The Aleut Internments of World War II: Islanders Removed from Their Homes by Japan and the United States*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Co., 2014.

Garfield, Brian. *The Thousand- Mile War: World War II in Alaska and the Aleutians*. Fairbanks, Alaska: University of Alaska Press, 1995.

Hays, Jr., Otis. *Alaska's Hidden Wars: Secret Campaigns on the North Pacific Rim*. Fairbanks, Alaska: University of Alaska Press, 2004.

Hudson, Ray and Rachel Mason. *Lost Villages of the Eastern Aleutians: Biorka, Kasshefa, Makushin*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2014.

Hutchison, Kevin Don. *World War II in the North Pacific: Chronology and Fact Book*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1994.

MacGarrigle, George L. *Aleutian Islands*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 1992.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p.14

Mobley, Charles M. *World War II Aleut Relocation Camps in Southeast Alaska*. Anchorage, Alaska: National Park Service, Alaska Region, 2012.

National Park Service Alaska Regional Office. *The Battle of Attu: 60 Years Later*. Anchorage, Alaska: U.S. Department of the Interior, 2004.

Perras, Galen Roger. *Stepping Stones to Nowhere: The Aleutian Islands, Alaska, and American Military Strategy, 1867-1945*. Annapolis, Maryland: Naval Institute Press, 2003.

“The S.S. Northwestern Sailing Sheltered Seas: An Illustrated History,”
Aleutian Voices, vol.1, no.1 (2014) p.2

Spennemann, Dirk H.R. *The Cultural Landscape of the World War II Battlefield of Kiska, Aleutian Islands*. Albury, New South Wales: Institute for Land, Water, and Society, 2001.

Big Hole National Battlefield

Location: Beaverhead County, Montana

Engagement: Battle of the Big Hole

Conflict: Nez Perce War

Date(s): August 9-10, 1877

Person(s) of Note:

Col. John Gibbon (U.S.)

Lt. James H. Bradley (U.S.)

Hinmatóowyahtq̓it or Chief Joseph (N.P.)

Allalimya Takanin or Looking Glass (N.P.)

Peopeo Kiskiok Hihih or White Bird (N.P.)

Ollokot (N.P.)

Unit(s) of Note:

Wallowa Nez Perce

7th Infantry Regiment (U.S.)

Bitterroot Valley volunteers (U.S.)

Result(s):

Inconclusive; 30-60 Wallowa women and children were killed

Commemoration(s)/Monument(s):

Critical Preservation Sites:

Critical Terrain Features:

Description:

Enabling Legislation:

The battle site was established as a Military Preserve in 1883 and a monument was dedicated to the U.S. soldiers. In 1910, its



designation was changed to a National Monument adding a 5-acre plot to the monument centered around the Siege Area.¹⁰⁵ In 1933, stewardship was transferred from the War Department and Forest Service to the NPS. In 1939, an additional 200 acres were incorporated to include Gibbon's approach from Battle Mountain.¹⁰⁶ In 1963, its designation was changed again to a National Battlefield.¹⁰⁷ In 1966, the site was added to the National Register of Historic Places. In 1972, the Nez Perce Encampment Area where most of the fighting took place was added to the site. The Bloody Gulch where the Wallowa retreated to remains in private ownership.

Priorities:

From its beginning, this site has stressed a commemoration of military cultures in the Nez Perce War. The first five decades of its existence, there was little effort to conserve the battlefield. During the 1910s, the Forest Service used the site as a camping attraction for tourists. Beginning in the late 1920s, an effort was made to collect oral histories from survivors to complicate the narrative of military leaders. In the 1930s, the recreational camping was removed in order to restore site integrity. A memorial to the Wallowa was finally added in 1937 by a private historian.

Beal, Merrill D. *"I will fight no more forever": Chief Joseph and the Nez Perce War*. Seattle, Washington, University of Washington Press, 1963.

Catton, Theodore and Ann Huber. *Commemoration and Preservation: An Administrative History of Big Hole National Battlefield*. Missoula, Montana: Historical Research Associates, Inc., 1999.

Catton, Theodore. *Nez Perce National Historical Park Administrative History*. Missoula, Montana: Historical Research Associates, Inc., 1996.

Hampton, Bruce. *Children of Grace: The Nez Perce War of 1877*. New York, New York: H. Holt, 1994.

Joseph, Jr., Alvin M. *Nez Perce Contry*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2007.

¹⁰⁵ Executive Order No.1216, 34 Stat. 225, 23 June 1910

¹⁰⁶ Proclamation No. 2339, 53 Stat. 2544, 29 June 1939

¹⁰⁷ 16 U.S. Code § 430uu, Pub. L. 88-24, § 1, May 17, 1963, 77 Stat. 18., Big Hole National Battlefield; redesignation of monument

Sharfstein, Daniel J. *Thunder in the Mountains: Chief Joseph, Oliver Otis Howard, and the Nez Perce War*. New York, New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Inc., 2017.

APPENDIX C

Castillo de San Marcos National Monument

Location: St. Augustine, Florida

Engagement:

First Siege of St. Augustine
Second Siege of St. Augustine

Conflict:

Queen Anne’s War (1702-1713)
War of Jenkin’s Ear (1739-1748)
Seven Years’ War (1756-1763)
Revolutionary War (1775-1783)
Second Seminole War (1835-1842)
Civil War (1861-1865)
Red River War (1874-1875)
Apache Wars (1849-1924)
Spanish-American War (1898)

Date(s):

November 10-December 30, 1702 (First Siege)
June 13-July 20, 1740 (Second Siege)

Person(s) of Note:

First Siege

Governor José de Zúñiga y la Cerda (Sp.)
Governor James Moore (Eng.)
Chief Arratommahaw (Eng.)

Second Siege

Governor Manuel de Montiano (Sp.)
Gen. James Oglethorpe (G.B.)
Chief Ahaya Secoffee (G.B.)
Cap. Vincent Pierce (G.B)



Unit(s) of Note:**First Siege**

Regulars (Sp.)
 Carolina militia (Eng.)
 Yamasee (Eng.)
 Tallapoosa (Eng.)
 Alabama (Eng.)

Second Siege

Regulars (Sp.)
 42nd Regiment of Foot (G.B.)
 Royal Navy (G.B.)
 Georgia militia (G.B.)
 Carolina militia (G.B.)
 Creek (G.B.)
 Chickasaw (G.B.)
 Uchees (G.B.)

Result(s):

Spanish victories

Description:**Enabling Legislation:**

The original construction of the fort was undertaken by Spanish forces beginning in 1672. The Treaty of Paris, ending the Seven Years' War, led to a temporary occupation by British forces in 1763 and renamed it as Fort St. Mark. Spanish administration was restored in 1783 thanks to the Treaty of Paris that ended the Revolutionary War. Both the fort and the Florida territory were transferred from Spain to the U.S. in 1821 with the Adams-Onís Treaty, renaming it Fort Marion after the Revolutionary military leader.¹⁰⁸

Initial conservation was made possible through an 1884 appropriation bill meant to preserve the fort's 1821-appearance.¹⁰⁹ In 1915, the Secretary of War used the 1906 Antiquities Act to declare the site a National Monument.¹¹⁰ Under NPS administration, the fort's original name was restored in order to fulfill the originally cited "Spanish heritage."

¹⁰⁸ Krakow, Jere L., *Administrative History of Castillo de San Marcos National Monument and Fort Matanzas National Monument* (National Park Service, 1986) p.6-7 discusses the imprisonment of Chiricahua Apache after their surrender in 1886

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p.8

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.14

Priorities:

Since this battle site featured engagements that predated the formation of the U.S., its battlefield interpretation has not prioritized U.S. forces. Primary interpretation warfare has focused on the colonial era and connected U.S. history to prolonged imperial competition in the Atlantic world. The primary use of the fort under U.S. military administration has primarily been as a prison for Native Americans who resisted dislocation and reservation in during the Indian Wars and Manifest Dentist Era. For that reason, the site serves less as a battlefield and more as a memorialization to other battlefields in U.S. history.

ABPP Reference No.: FL1001

Preservation Priority: II A

Arana, Luis Rafael. "Conservation and Reutilization of the Castillo de San Marcos and Fort Mantanzas." *The Florida Historical Quarterly*, vol.65, no.1 (Jul. 1986) p.72-91.

Arana, Luis Rafael and Albert Manucy. *The Building of Castillo de San Marcos*. Augustine, Florida: Eastern National Park & Monument Association, 1977.

Krakow, Jere L. *Administrative History of Castillo de San Marcos National Monument and Fort Matanzas National Monument*. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1986.

Lamme, Ary J. *America's Historic Landscapes: Community Power and the Preservation of Four National Historic Sites*. Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 1990.

National Park Service. *Castillo de San Marcos: A Guide to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, Florida*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Publishing Office, 1993.

Palmer, Jason B. "Forgotten Sacrifice: Native American Involvement in the Construction of the Castillo de San Marcos." *The Florida Historical Quarterly*, vol.80, no.4 (Spring 2002) p.437-454.

Searcy, Martha Sondrey. *The Georgia-Florida Contest in the American Revolution, 1776-1778*. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1985.

APPENDIX D

Fort Ticonderoga

Location: Essex County, New York

Engagement:

- Battle of Carillon (July 6-8, 1758)
- Battle of Ticonderoga (July 26-27, 1759)
- Capture of Ticonderoga (May 10, 1775)
- Siege of Ticonderoga (July 2-6, 1777)

Conflict:

- French and Indian War (1754-1763)
- Revolutionary War (1775-1783)



Person(s) of Note:

Battle of Carillon

- Maj. Gen. Louis-Joseph de Montcalm (Fr.)
- Gen. François Gaston de Lévis (Fr.)
- Maj. Gen. James Abercrombie (G.B.)
- Brig. Gen. George Howe (G.B.)

Battle of Ticonderoga

- Gen. François-Charles de Bourlamaque (Fr.)
- Field Marshal Jeffery Amherst (G.B.)

Capture of Ticonderoga

- Colonel Ethan Allen (C.A.)
- Colonel Benedict Arnold (C.A.)
- John Brown (C.A.)
- Captain William Delaplace (G.B.)

Siege of Ticonderoga

- Maj. Gen. Arthur St. Clair (C.A.)
- Maj. Gen. John Burgoyne (G.B.)
- Maj. Gen. William Phillips (G.B.)

Unit(s) of Note:

Battle of Carillon

- Regulars (Fr. and G.B.)
- Militia (Fr. and G.B.)
- Native American allies (Fr. and G.B.)

Battle of Ticonderoga

- Regulars (Fr. and G.B.)
- Provincials (Fr. and G.B.)

Capture of Ticonderoga

- Green Mountain Boys (C.A.)
- Connecticut militia (C.A.)
- Massachusetts militia (C.A.)
- 26th Regiment of Foot (G.B.)

Siege of Ticonderoga

- Regulars (C.A.)
- Regulars (G.B.)
- Loyalists (G.B.)
- Hessians (G.B.)
- Haudenosaunee (G.B.)

Result(s):

French victory (1758)
British victory (1759)
Continental victory (1775)
British victory (1777)

Commemoration(s)/Monument(s):**Critical Preservation****Sites:**

West Barracks
South Barracks
Bastions
Demilunes
Pavilion
King's Garden

Critical Terrain Features:

Mount Defiance
Mount Independence
French village site

Description:**Enabling Legislation:**

Fort Ticonderoga was administered by the U.S. Army through the terms of the Treaty of Paris (1783) until it was turned over to the stewardship of New York State in 1785. The state owned and did little in terms of conservation, turning the ruins over to Columbia and Union Colleges in 1803. Again, the colleges shared ownership of the old fort but did little to conserve it. The property transferred from the colleges to private ownership when William Ferris Pell purchased it in 1820. The Pell family distributed the property between several owners until the Fort Ticonderoga Association was formed in 1931 and began consolidating the parcels. It was declared a National Historic Landmark in 1960 and added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1966.

The fort remained in ruined conditions until 1909 when the Pell hired Alfred Bossom to begin reconstruction of the barracks. In 1912, the bastion and demilunes began to be restored. The King's Garden was restored in 1995. In 2008, the powder magazine was rebuilt as a part of the Mars Education Center and museum space. Restorations to the Pavilion began in 2009.

Between 1900 and 1950, acreage on Mounts Defiance, Independence, and Hope were acquired. In 1910, Mount Independence began to be preserved by the fort and the Pell family. Today, stewardship of the site is split between Vermont and the Association. More recently, an additional 47 acres of the east face of Mount Defiance was purchased by the Association in 2018 in partnership with the Open Space Institute.

Priorities:

The twentieth century restoration of the fort focused on restoring the property to its eighteenth-century appearance. As such, the fort has served as a combination museum/living history site. The military structure alternated its interpretation among French, English, and U.S. military occupation. The Pavillion and Garden are dedicated to the nineteenth and twentieth-century ownership of the Pell family, serving to commemorate their involvement in the Great Camp Era as well as the origins of public history at the site. More recent programming has focused on expanding the living history, including the addition of an eighteenth-century boat shop, the use of a team of oxen, and plans to restore the French village that would have neighbored the defensive structure.

ABPP Reference No.:

Carillon/Ticonderoga Battle Site: NY200
Fort Ticonderoga: NY213
Mount Defiance: ABPP 221
Mount Independence: ABPP NY1033/VT200

Preservation Priority:

Carillon/Ticonderoga Battle Site: II B
Fort Ticonderoga: I B
Mount Defiance: II C
Mount Independence: IIB/I B

Anderson, Fred. *The Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766*. New York, New York: Knopf, 2000.

Brockway, Lucinda A. *A Favorite Place of Resort for Strangers: The King's Garden at Fort Ticonderoga*. Ticonderoga, New York: Fort Ticonderoga, 2001.

- Calloway, Colin G. *The Western Abenakis of Vermont, 1600-1800: War, Migration, and the Survival of an Indian People*. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990.
- Chartrand, Rene. *The Forts of New France in North America, 1600-1763*. New York, New York: Osprey Publishing, 2008.
- Cohen, Eliot A. *Conquered into Liberty: Two Centuries of Battles Along the Great Warpath That Made the American Way of War*. New York, New York: Free Press, 2011.
- Day, Gordon M. "Abenaki Place Names in the Champlain Valley." *International Journal of American Linguistics*, vol.47, no.2 (Apr. 1981) p.143-171.
- Gartlein, Delight. "Transformation at Fort Ticonderoga: Telephone Building Becomes Research Center." *History News*, vol.47, no.3 (May-Jun. 1992) p.16-19.
- Gilchrist, Helen Ives. "The History of Fort Ticonderoga." *The Quarterly Journal of the New York State Historical Association*, vol.3, no.3 (Jul. 1992) p.147-154.
- Hamilton, Edward. *Ticonderoga: Key to a Continent*. Ticonderoga, New York: Ticonderoga Press, 1964.
- Kaufmann, H.W. and J.E. *Fortress America: The Forts that Defended America, 1600 to the Present*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Da Capo, 2004.
- Lounsbury, Floyd G. *Iroquois Place-names in the Champlain Valley*. Albany, New York: University of the State of New York, State Education Department, 1960.
- Nester, William R. *The Epic Battles for Fort Ticonderoga, 1758*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 2008.
- Powell, William S. "Bicentennial Plans Being Laid." *History News*, vol.9, no.6 (April 1954) p.21.
- Terrie, Philip G. *Contested Terrain: A New History of Nature and People in Adirondacks*. Syracuse, New York: The Adirondack Museum, 1997.
- Watrous, Elizabeth. "Fort Ticonderoga Restored." *Proceedings of the New York State Historical Association*, vol.5 (1905) p.128-131.
- Winter, Marietta A. "Ticonderoga in History." *Proceedings of the New York State Historical Association*, vol.11 (1912) p.261-267.

Wiseman, Frederick Matthew. *The Voice of the Dawn: An Autohistory of the Abenaki Nation*. Hanover, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 2001.

APPENDIX E

Horseshoe Bend National Military Park

Location: Tallapoosa County, Alabama

Engagement: Battle of Horseshoe Bend

Campaign: Creek War (1813-1814)

Conflict: War of 1812 (1812-1815)

Date(s): March 27, 1814

Person(s) of Note:

Chief Menawa (Red Sticks)
Gen. Andrew Jackson (U.S.)
Sam Houston (U.S.)
William McIntosh (U.S.)
John Ross (U.S.)

Unit(s) of Note:

39th U.S. Infantry (U.S.)
Lower Creek (U.S.)
Cherokee (U.S.)
Choctaw (U.S.)
Red Stick Creeks

Result(s): U.S. victory over Red Stick Creek

Commemoration(s)/Monument(s):

Critical Preservation Sites:

1917 Gun Hill Congressional Monument
1972 Major Lemuel Montgomery Monument

Critical Terrain Features:

Tohopeka village site
Newyaucau village site



Description:

Enabling Legislation:

Following the battle, the site was used primarily for agricultural production. Initial efforts to preserve the site began in 1890 with historian Thomas M. Owen. The Horseshoe Bend Battle Park Commission, formed in 1907, hoped to cite the Antiquities Act of 1906 in order to establish federal preservation.¹¹¹ Requests to form a park were denied, however a monument was established by Congress in 1914 due to the sale of private land and advocacy by the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Society of the Daughters of 1812.¹¹² NPS held that the site was not considered to be nationally significant enough to necessitate a park.¹¹³ Despite their resistance, Eisenhower issued Executive Order No. 3308 in 1959 to establish the site as a National Military Park.¹¹⁴

Priorities:

Initial inspiration for park formation and site conservation was fueled in large part by the memory of American Southern expansion.¹¹⁵ This changed in 1964 when park staff began emphasizing the Native American narrative of the site. NPS noted that the war and following century had largely erased Creek material culture from the region as well as from museums and archives. Initial interpretation of the site lacked the Native perspective in no small part because of a lack of primary and secondary scholarship of the subject.¹¹⁶ Therefore, a large part of their mission since the 1970s had focused on trying to correct that gap in history. Part of this effort is to expand beyond the relevance to the War of 1812 to focus more specifically on the Creek War as well as the 18th and 19th-century diplomatic relations between the U.S. and Creek nations.¹¹⁷

¹¹¹ Braund, Kathryn H. and Keith S. Hébert, *Horseshoe Bend National Military Park Administrative History* (NPS) p.29

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p.33

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p.30-1

¹¹⁴ Executive Order No. 3308, 16 U.S.C. (11 August 1959)

¹¹⁵ Braund and Hébert, *Horseshoe Bend* p.xiii

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p..xvi

¹¹⁷ "Horseshoe Bend National Military Park Foundation Document" NPS, <http://npshistory.com/publications/foundation-documents/hobe-fd-overview.pdf>

ABPP Reference No.: AL411

Preservation Priority: I A

- Abram, Susan M. "‘To Keep Bright the Bonds of Friendship’: The Making of a Cherokee-American Alliance during the Creek War." *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, vol.71, no.3 (Fall 2012) p.228-257.
- Black, Jason Edward. "Memories of the Alabama Creek War, 1813-1814: U.S. Governmental and Native Identities at the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park." *American Indian Quarterly*, vol.33, no.2 (Spring, 2009) p.200-229.
- Braund, Kathryn E. Holland. *Tohopeka: Rethinking the Creek War and the War of 1812*. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 2012.
- Cummings, Mary-Ellen and Caroline Gebhard. "Treaties and Memorials: Interpreting Horseshoe Bend National Military Park." *The Public Historian*, vol.18, no.4 (Autumn 1996) p.19-36).
- Kanon, Thomas. "‘A Slow, Laborious Slaughter’: The Battle of Horseshoe Bend." *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, vol.58, no.1 (Spring 1999) p.2-15.
- Kanon, Thomas. *Tennesseans at War, 1812-1815: Andrew Jackson, the Creek War, and the Battle of New Orleans*. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 2014.
- Martin, Joel W. *Sacred Revolt: the Muskogees’ Struggle for a New World*. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 1991.
- Martin, Thomas W. *The Story of Horseshoe Bend National Military Park*. New York, New York: The Newcomen Society in North America, 1960.
- McLoughlin, William G. "The Creek War, 1812-1814." In *Cherokee Renascence in the New Republic*, p.186-205. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University, 1986.
- Stagg, J.C.A. *Mr. Madison’s War: Politics, Diplomacy, and Warfare in the Early American Republic, 1783-1830*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Quimby, Robert S. *The United States in the War of 1812: An Operational and Command Study*. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1997.

APPENDIX F

Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area

Locations:

- Pennsylvania
- Maryland
- Virginia
- West Virginia



Civil War			
Engagement	Campaign	Date(s)	Victory
First Manassas	Manassas	Jul. 22, 1861	C.S.A.
Ball's Bluff	McClellan's Operations in Northern Virginia	Oct. 21, 1861	
Cedar Mountain	Northern Virginia	Aug. 9, 1862	
Second Manassas		Aug. 28-30, 1862	
Thoroughfare Gap		Aug. 28, 1862	
Harpers Ferry	Maryland Campaign	Sep. 12-15, 1862	Inconclusive
Antietam		Sep. 16-18, 1862	
Chancellorsville	Chancellorsville	Apr. 30-May 6, 1863	C.S.A.
Brandy Station	Gettysburg	Jun. 9, 1863	Inconclusive
Gettysburg		Jul. 1-3, 1863	U.S.
The Wilderness		Grant's Overland Campaign	May 5-7, 1864
Spotsylvania	May 8-21, 1864		
Monocacy	Early's Raid and Operations against the B&O Railroad	Jul. 9, 1864	C.S.A.

Engagement	Person(s) of Note	Unit(s) of Note	Affiliation
First Manassas	Brig. Gen. Irvin McDowell	Army of Northeastern Virginia	U.S.
	Brig. Gen. P.G.T. Beauregard	Army of the Potomac	C.S.A.
	Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Johnston	Army of the Shenandoah	
Ball's Bluff	Brig. Gen. Charles P. Stone	Army of the Potomac	U.S.
	Col. Edward Baker		C.S.A.
Cedar Mountain	Brig. Gen. Nathan G. Evans	Army of the Potomac	C.S.A.
	Maj. Gen. Nathaniel Banks	Army of Virginia	U.S.
	Maj. Gen. Thomas J. Jackson	Army of Northern Virginia	C.S.A.
Brig. Gen. Jubal A. Early			
Second Manassas	Maj. Gen. John Pope	Army of Virginia	U.S.
	Gen. Robert E. Lee	Army of Northern Virginia	C.S.A.
	Maj. Gen. Thomas J. Jackson		
Thoroughfare Gap	Brig. Gen. James Ricketts	Army of Virginia	U.S.
	Lt. Gen. James Longstreet	Army of Northern Virginia	C.S.A.
Harpers Ferry	Col. Dixon S. Miles	Army of the Potomac	U.S.
	Maj. Gen. Thomas J. Jackson	Army of Northern Virginia	C.S.A.
Antietam	Maj. Gen. George B. McClellan	Army of the Potomac	U.S.
	Gen. Robert E. Lee	Army of Northern Virginia	C.S.A.
Chancellorsville	Maj. Gen. Joseph Hooker	Army of the Potomac	U.S.
	Gen. Robert E. Lee	Army of Northern Virginia	C.S.A.
	Lt. Gen. Thomas J. Jackson		
Brandy Station	Brig. Gen. Alfred Pleasonton	Army of the Potomac	U.S.
	Maj. Gen. J.E.B. Stuart	Army of Northern Virginia	C.S.A.
	Maj. Gen. George G. Meade	Army of the Potomac	U.S.

Gettysburg	Gen. Robert E. Lee	Army of Northern Virginia	C.S.A.
The Wilderness	Lt. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant	Army of the Potomac	U.S.
	Maj. Gen. George G. Meade		
	Gen. Robert E. Lee	Army of Northern Virginia	C.S.A.
Spotsylvania	Lt. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant	Army of the Potomac	U.S.
	Maj. Gen. George G. Meade	Army of Northern Virginia	C.S.A.
Monocacy	Maj. Gen. Lew Wallace	VIII Corps/VI Corps	U.S.
	Lt. Gen. Jubal A. Early	Army of the Valley	C.S.A.

Commemoration(s)/Monument(s):

Antietam National Battlefield	Hunterstown Battlefield
Auburn Battlefield	Kelly's Ford Battlefield
Ball's Bluff Battlefield and National Cemetery	Manassas National Battlefield Park
Brandy Station and Cedar Mountain State Park	Monasukapanough Monacan Village
Buckland Battlefield	Monocacy National Battlefield
Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park	Monticello
Culpeper National Cemetery	Montpelier
Eisenhower National Historical Site	Morton's Ford Battlefield
Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park	Mt. Pony Battlefield National Road
Gettysburg National Military Park	Harpers Ferry National Historical Park
Heart of the Civil War State Heritage Site	Rappahannock Station and Bridge Battlefields
Hessian Barracks	Salem Church Battlefield
Highland	Shenandoah National Park
	South Mountain Battlefield
	Thoroughfare Gap Battlefield
	Trevillain Station Battlefield

Description:

Enabling Legislation:

In 1991, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act was passed creating National Scenic Byways to preserve and protect national roads, promote tourism, and encourage economic development.¹¹⁸ In 1998, the Transportation Equity Act for the Twenty-First Century created similar programming on the state level to work in conjunction with federal transportation networks.¹¹⁹ In 2005, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible,

¹¹⁸ Public Law 102-240, 102d U.S.C. (18 Dec. 1991)

¹¹⁹ Public Law 105-178, 105 U.S.C. (9 Jun. 1998)

Efficient Transportation Equality Act: A Legacy of Users extended programming further to include Native American tribes.¹²⁰ As a part of this collaboration surrounding transportation networks, preservation, and heritage tourism, the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area was created by the Consolidated Natural Resources Act of 2008, established around the byway that bears the same name.¹²¹

Priorities:

The enabling legislation for this area states that its purpose is to “recognize and interpret important events and geographic locations representing key developments in the creation of America, including Native American, Colonial American, European American, and African American heritage.”¹²² By creating a cooperative partnership among government organizations and private interests, they can theoretically increase funding for conservation purchasing power.¹²³ Through this economic partnership, the JTHG would have an extremely limited role in the interpretation of historic battle sites. With stewardship and administration vested in the individual sites, the JTHG would not play a direct role in expansion and conservation of its members. However, the promotion of heritage tourism is meant to promote visitation and awareness for battle site initiatives and therefore potentially boost funding and donations that would directly affect expansion, interpretation and conservation.

Battle Site	CWSAC Reference No.	Preservation Priority
First Manassas	VA005	III.1 A
Ball’s Bluff	VA006	III.2 B
Cedar Mountain	VA022	II.2 B
Second Manassas	VA026	I.2 A
Thoroughfare Gap	VA025	III.3 C
Harpers Ferry	WV010	I.3 B
Antietam	MD003	I.2 A
Chancellorsville	VA012	I.2 A
Brandy Station	VA029	III.3 C
Gettysburg	PA002	I.2 A
The Wilderness	VA048	I.2 A
Spotsylvania	VA048	I.2 A
Monocacy	MD007	I.3 B

¹²⁰ Public Law 109-59, 109 U.S.C. (10 Aug 2005)

¹²¹ Public Law 110-229, 110 U.S.C., Title IV, Subtitle A, Sec. 401-11 (8 May 2008)

¹²² Ibid., sec.401

¹²³ “Corridor Management Plan for the Journey Through Hallowed Ground Corridor,” The Journey Through Hallowed Ground Partnership, October 2008 p.65

