NEXT MEETING: Thursday, February 7, 2019
China Harbor, 2040 Westlake Avenue North, Seattle, Washington
Time: Social hour at 6 p.m.; Dinner served at 6:30 p.m.; Program at 7:45 p.m.
NOTE: MEETING ON THE FIRST THURSDAY (Feb. 7th) INSTEAD OF THE SECOND THURSDAY, WHICH FALLS ON THE 14th, VALENTINE’S DAY!

MENU CHOICES: Mongolian Beef, Chicken, Salmon or Vegetarian
Dinner includes: salad, vegetable delight, General Tso’s chicken, fried rice and fresh fruit.
Cost: $24 for adults; $10 for minors and college students. See below for reservations. Payable at the door. Opting out of dinner? $5 fee for non-members, $1 fee for members.

To make reservations and meal choices, use one of these options (most preferred listed first):
Click on http://www.pscwrt.org/about/dinner-reservations.php
Email Steve Murphy at: steve@adaptech.us
Or lastly, call Steve Murphy at (206) 522-2268
Reservations are MANDATORY and be in by 12 NOON on Tuesday, February 5, 2019.

NOTE: Remember to turn off cell phones before the meeting so there are no distractions for the speaker. Thank you!

RICHARD ROLAND WILL PRESENT AN OVERVIEW OF JOHN BELL HOOD’S DISASTROUS FRANKLIN-NASHVILLE CAMPAIGN OF 1864, and will discuss the resulting disputes and post-war controversies among the union commanders of the campaign, including Generals U. S. Grant and George H. Thomas; Thomas and John M. Schofield; Schofield and David S. Stanley; and Stanley and Jacob D. Cox. Mr. Roland has researched and studied the campaign since attending Vanderbilt University in Nashville in the 1970s. He is a former Naval Aviator and retired attorney living in Northwest Washington.

Important: At the request of the China Harbor staff, please be seated at 6:30 p.m. when dinner will be served. Thank you!

February Birthdays
Several members have birthdays in February and we’d like to acknowledge their special day. They are:

Raqy Cardwell
Patricia Clayton
Dempsey Dybdal

Ken Esemann
Alan Hovland
Gary Martin

Mike Movius
Alexander Welles
NEWS AND PROJECTS

Announcement: The Book Discussion Group will meet on Feb 7, at 5:00 p.m. in the second floor of China Harbor. We will be discussing the book by Andrew Masich, Civil War in the Southwest Borderlands, 1861-1867. The book describes the numerous military engagements of 3 warrior cultures, all related, indirectly to the American Civil War. The book is well researched but complicated and will be good preparation for the author’s discussion of the same book on March 14.

Changes on the PSCWRT Board
Recently, VP-Partnerships Nick K. Adams resigned his position. It has been filled by member Jim Dimond. A big thank-you to Nick for coordinating the Chuck Veit talk at the Kobetich Branch of the Tacoma Public Libraries last month and for faithful service as a board member the last several years.

FEATURED ARTICLES

Gettysburg Address: The Speech Didn’t Become Famous Until Long After Lincoln Was Dead
By Donald Gilliland

Lincoln's speech was a hit on the scene in Gettysburg. His brief delivery was interrupted five times by applause from the crowd, with long applause afterward. But Everett was the headliner, and Everett got most of the attention in the daily press.

As Boritt recounts in his history of the speech, Democratic newspapers tended to downplay Lincoln's speech "which they regarded as the start of the presidential campaign," and even Republican editors made little of it, which suggests most of them "understood the president's remarks at Gettysburg to be routine."

What's more, other news competed for space - both news from the war front and items of more local interest. Boritt notes "The 'Maine Farmer' paid more attention to an eight-foot woman supposedly roaming the woods than what took place in faraway Gettysburg."

Although a few people at the time - notably Oxford historian Goldwin Smith and Elizabeth Granville, Duchess of Argyll during Lincoln's lifetime and Ralph Waldo Emerson and Harriet Beecher Stowe shortly after his death - recognized the speech as truly great, it was not the big deal then that it is today.

In the years after his death, Boritt says, "Lincoln's Gettysburg words were mostly forgotten."
Lincoln believed he would be known for his Emancipation Proclamation, and for years after his death, that was indeed how he was most often depicted in sculpture and painting: as The Emancipator, the man who freed the slaves.

Only with the end of Reconstruction, the re-subjugation of blacks through Jim Crow laws and the rise of the "noble Lost Cause" narrative in the South did the Gettysburg Address rise to prominence in the American imagination.

Boritt documents how in the 1880s "Lincoln the Emancipator" dropped out of fashion and the meaning of Lincoln's words at Gettysburg were "sanitized" and raised to national prominence.

"The 'new birth of freedom' referred henceforth not to a nation that had, 'under God,' ascended through Emancipation in a crucible of war and so was reborn, but rather to a nation that had been threatened by disunion in war but, 'under God,' was saved," writes Boritt. "The Gettysburg speech came to be understood as addressed equally to Federal and Confederate soldiers, and also as a peace message."
Indeed, it was said that a dove of peace flew up as Lincoln began to speak. When asked about this, Robert Todd Lincoln grumbled sarcastically about the confusion between 'the helmet of Mars' and 'a dove's nest.'

Succeeding generations found their own meaning in the Gettysburg Address. Teddy Roosevelt's Progressives focused on its crusade for the common man and equated "Slave Power" with "The Money Power."

Lincoln's words about fighting for a 'new birth of freedom' took on new significance during World War I, and again during World War II, and phrases from the Address were featured on war bonds in both eras. It was no coincidence that Martin Luther King delivered his "Dream" speech from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial.

Lincoln's words took on new and eerie significance as recently as 2002, when the Governor of New York read the full text of the speech during ceremonies commemorating the first anniversary of the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center.

Boritt notes that "Lincoln's words have lived forcefully beyond the culture's flight from the heroes of the past… The deeper message that helped Lincoln's words live, exalted popular government and the equality of people. They were meant to encompass all people, including black people, indeed the people of the world."

Principal sources for this article:
- Martin P. Johnson, "Writing the Gettysburg Address," University of Kansas Press 2013

http://blog.pennlive.com/gettysburg-150/2013/11/seven_things_you_may_not_have.html#incart_river_index

Veterans In Our Back Yard: Genesis of a Marker Project
by Loretta-Marie Dimond

The most challenging vets to find include the ones without markers. Let me take you with me on a journey through a veteran's record.

We'll call this fellow Francis (I've promised some concerned parties to keep his full identity under wraps until we contact next of kin). He was born in New York. He died near Renton, Washington. He had two wives, who interestingly enough were sisters to each other. And despite all of our visits to the Greenwood Memorial Park in Renton, we'd never found him. He'd been in a pile of "when we get around to it" vets. Dig in.

The first record to surface had been a 1910 census schedule in King County. On the far right-hand side of the schedules is a column for "whether a veteran of the Union or Confederate Army or Navy." Diligent enumerators filled this column in. Many times the information is missing. For Francis, we were fortunate. The 1910 census identified him by a bold "UA" for Union Army.

Jim took the search to Ancestry, and he found a matching name in the US Civil War Soldier Records and Profiles database. Name's the same means nothing by itself, so now started the process of proof of identity and proof of service. According to Ancestry, Francis might have been a member of the 24th Iowa
Infantry. The 24th was a veteran unit by the time he would have joined up. Organized at Muscatine and mustered in the day after the battle of Antietam, the “Iowa Temperance Regiment” had survived floods at Helena Arkansas, the siege of Vicksburg (by way of Grand Gulf and Port Gibson), transfer to Banks' command for the disastrous Red River campaign and the battle of Sabine Crossroads, and retreat by way of Maryland all the way to Harper's Ferry. Their replacements were welcomed to the unit in 1864. Joining Sheridan's forces in time for the battle of Winchester, it was a costly time for the recruits, as 74 were killed and wounded. Cedar Creek followed. In January, 1865 it was back to Savannah for occupation duty, with an occasional side trip to Augusta.

To verify not just service, but also character of service (it had to be honorable to qualify him for a marker), we consulted the Adjutant General's report for the state of Iowa. It showed that a veteran of the 24th of this name, born in New York, enlisted at the age of 17 in Clinton County, Iowa. He was wounded severely in the left hip on 19 October 1864 at Cedar Creek, Virginia. He mustered out with his unit on 17 July 1865 at Savannah, Georgia. He survived the war. His service was honorable. Whoever the veteran named Francis was, he was eligible for a government marker.

And there was a Washington death certificate for someone of this name in King County in 1925. With exact dates and known places, we dug deeper.

Was this Francis the same as the Francis on the census, and of the 24th Iowa? Identity still had not been proved. We had a wife, “Jennie,” to work with. Francis and Jennie were enumerated in Linn County, Oregon by the 1900 census. According to the schedules, he was born in January 1847 in New York, she was born in May 1850 in Illinois, they had been married for 32 years, they had three children (only one was living in 1900, and he was no longer at home), and he was a grocer. Jennie used her legal name, however, on the 1910 census. In another Ancestry record, the Illinois County Marriages, we found this same legal name and her maiden surname. Other census years used “Jennie” and provided corroborating information.

Francis was a minister, according to the census. Several church records were found for his denomination. He was stationed in western Nebraska in the 1880s and rode circuit as an ordained deacon. The veteran with the service in the 24th Iowa had joined the GAR in Nebraska. He was a member of Hansen Post 160 at Fairfield in 1883. This was the right place at the right time. The statewide GAR records in Nebraska have been indexed by the state historical society. There was no indication on the index card of a date or place of death, suggesting he moved out of the area.

Our next stop in identity proof was to determine if the veteran of the 24th Iowa had ever claimed a pension. Indeed, he had. The M850 pension payment cards for Francis showed a pension certificate number, a date of death (which matched the death certificate), and a last mailing address (the right town in King County). The pay card showed constant increases in rate from 1908 to 1924, with no breaks or disallowances. There was no widow mentioned, which immediately suggested that Jennie had predeceased him. This turned out to be the case. Jennie's Washington death certificate was dated five years earlier. Everything still matched. And both death certificates said burial occurred at Greenwood Memorial Park.

A quick check of the T288 general index to pensions showed Francis had been in receipt of compensation since 5 September 1877, that no widow ever claimed against his record, and that no consolidated file had been established when the Veterans Administration took over the work of the Bureau of Pensions. The claim was extinct in 1934.

All good matching information. Identity established.
Denise Ottoson (remember our friend Denise?) posted some additional information on this veteran, who was (of course) already on her database. She had found a Seattle obituary. Francis married the second time about a year after the death of his first wife. The marriage certificate can be viewed at the Washington Digital Archives. The list of survivors in the obituary matched other information on census records and the death certificate. Francis was the informant on Jennie's certificate. The known surviving child of Francis and Jennie was the informant on Francis' certificate.

Armed with all of this, we needed just one more piece of data to close the case. We visited Greenwood Memorial Park. We verified that all three individuals, Francis, Jennie, and the second wife, were buried side by side in unmarked graves. And that they are all still there. To review, then:

Proof of service: Adjutant General's report, pension pay card, pension index card, veteran's own statements on federal documents.

Proof of character of service: Adjutant General's report, previous finding of Bureau of Pensions awarding a pension certificate (benefit was not disbursed until honorable service was established).

Proof of identity: matching family members in logical locations; matching dates and places of birth, matching dates of marriage, matching dates and places of death; cemetery records; Washington death certificate corroborating pension information, on official documents. Bureau of Pensions vetting of the veteran's identity from 1877 to 1925 is deemed accurate.

We are actively working toward obtaining a marker for Francis at an early date. However, there are some procedural issues to take care of first. We'll keep you informed of the progress of this and other marker projects.

Recommendations for additional reading on the Speaker’s Topic: Hood’s Tennessee Campaign

By Jeff Rombauer

After the fall of Atlanta in September 1864 to Union forces under the command of Gen. William T. Sherman, the commander of the Confederate Army of Tennessee, Gen. John B. Hood was left in a quandary. What could he do? His army could follow Sherman’s forces, where ever the Union commander decided to go. The Army of Tennessee could attack his supply line and try and force Sherman’s forces back to Chattanooga or Hood could go on the offensive and take his army into Tennessee and Kentucky. With the approval of Jefferson Davis, Hood choose to invade Tennessee. However, Jefferson Davis gave speeches that fall which gave away Hood’s plans, allowing Sherman to send forces back to Tennessee while preparing for the march to the sea. General Hood’s slowness to start his campaign and controversial mistakes, especially at Spring Hill, where Union forces under Schofield and Cox marched past encamped Confederate doomed the campaign. The result was the near destruction of Hood’s army at the battles of Franklin and Nashville in November and December 1864. The following books are recommended for further information on this topic.

CAMPAIGN OVERVIEWS


This early scholarly study of the 1864 campaign is highly critical of Hood and Jefferson Davis. Hay views the campaign as being born of the desperation to which the supporters of the Southern cause had been reduced. He and Davis staked all on a desperate last move and lost. A modern reprint was issued in 1976.

Sword’s account of the 1864 campaign generally concentrates on the Confederate Army of Tennessee. Well written and researched with excellent maps and illustrations, Sword views Hood ultimately, as a tragic failure, a sad, pathetic soldier, whose ambitions totally outstripped his abilities.


A very brief summary of the Tennessee Campaign.


14 essays by prominent historians cover various aspects of Hood’s 1864 campaign. Topics covered include Altoona Pass, Spring Hill, the nature of fighting at Franklin, the role of black troops at the Battle of Nashville.

**SPRING HILL AND FRANKLIN**


A valuable, well written study of Franklin by one who played a pivotal role in the battle on the Union side. Cox covers in detail the controversial points that surround the battle. Also included are the official reports of the major Union officers.


Banks was a member of the 37th Mississippi at the time of the Battle of Franklin. His disjointed account recounts mostly the actions of Mississippians in the battle. Reprinted in 1982.


This rare first person account by a union engineering officer offers “a vivid, insightful account” of the affair at Spring Hill and the Battle of Franklin. Scofield offers personal observations of the fighting around the Carter House and the carnage there. This was reprinted in 1996 by the Save the Franklin Battlefield Committee.


This study by two prominent historians is highly critical of Hood claiming “that he was living in a dream world, torn somewhere between the realities of the cold Nashville hills and the memory of war in Virginia during the more romantic days.”
Exhausting researched, this modern study of the Battle of Franklin offers an unbiased account of the battle. Well-illustrated, but more detailed maps would have been helpful to the reader.

NASHVILLE


A well written study that the author believes broke the back of the Confederacy but his overstatements regarding the consequences of a possible Union defeat are contradicted by his own book.


"The book offers a clear, concise picture of the region as well as an analysis of the different military strategies and political influences that caused the Union and Confederate forces in the west to move as they did during the war's latter stages.” GHQ

THE LAST WORD

“Drill”, Part Four- The Battalion
By Mark R. Terry

The School of the Soldier and the School of the Company culminated in the third building block of infantry drill instruction- The School of the Battalion. This article only skims the surface of battalion drill. So much more detail could be added, but it needs to be kept short.

“Battalion” vs. “Regiment”
While most infantry units during the Civil War were called “regiments”, all the commands in the School of the Battalion start with the preparatory command “Battalion”. Why is that? It is for the sake of flexibility- the manual could be used for any sized unit from battalions (2-9 companies) to regiments (10+ companies) equally. For the purposes of this article, I will use the term battalion instead of regiment.

Companies become Regiments
When the war began, individual companies formed and went to assembly points known as Camps of Instruction. As soon as possible upon arrival they were incorporated into regiments of ten companies. Whatever colorful nickname they had was now replaced by a letter- A to K. Some of you more astute types might say, “wait a minute, there are eleven letters, not ten”. You are correct! The letter “J” was eliminated and replaced by “K” because the letters “I” and “J” looked very similar in the writing styles of that time.

As regiments were accepted into service, they were numbered according to their date of organization, so for example, the First Minnesota was formed on April 29, 1861, with the Second Minnesota not coming in until June 26, 1861.
**Forming the Battalion Line: Guides and markers**

You have seen photographs of infantry regiments in line. They are lined up as straight as if measured off by a straight edge. How did they do that? Guides and markers!

Every time a battalion needed to form a new line, guides and/or markers would be posted. These were simply extra enlisted men tasked with the duty, and company NCO’s. At the direction of a field officer they would line up facing the same direction, with the second marker about the width of a company directly behind the first marker.

In the above diagram, the 2nd Co. is the Color Company and dresses on the markers. Each company successively dresses on the battalion line, using their 2nd Sergeants to the left of the colors and the 1st Sergeants to the right of the colors, who line up exactly with the markers. Then their company dresses to them to continue the line. Once the entire battalion is aligned, the commander commands “Guides, POST” and they return to their positions.

**Figure 1:** A Battalion of ten companies in line of battle.

Here is a complete battalion of ten companies - a regiment - in line of battle. Note the positions of the various field officers, enlisted men and even field musicians (who often substituted as medics during battle). For purposes of evolutions (movements of the battalion), the companies are numbered 1-10 from the right to the left. This is very important. The placement of companies was often done be seniority, with
the two most experienced companies being on the flank-numbers 1 & 10, while the third most experienced was often the Color Company.

To maneuver, the battalion could be broken into columns by company or by divisions (each two companies formed a “division”) depending on a variety of factors. Of course, they would have to conform their own movements to the brigade of which they were a part. And, in order to give battle, they would need to return to this formation, posting markers and guides to reform the line each time.

Here is an excerpt from the report of Brig. General George J. Stannard of the Vermont Brigade at Gettysburg, July 3, 1863:

“At the commencement of the attack [Pickett’s Charge], I called the Sixteenth from the skirmish line, and placed them in close column by division in my immediate rear. As soon as the change of the point of the attack became evident, I ordered a flank attack upon the enemy’s column. Forming in the open meadow in front of our lines, the Thirteenth changed front forward on the first company; the Sixteenth, after deploying, performed the same and formed on the left of the Thirteenth, at right angles to the main line of our army, bringing them in line of battle upon the flank of the charging division of the enemy, and opened a destructive fire at short range, which the enemy sustained but a very few moments before the larger portion of them surrendered and marched in—not as conquerors, but as captives.”

In bold above, Stannard named an evolution from the School of the Battalion. Here is the full series of commands for this maneuver and how it was done:


At the command MARCH, the 1st Company would simply perform a right wheel until it was perpendicular to the line. Markers are posted in this diagram, but might not be used in combat. The captains of Companies 2-10 would go to the center of their companies, each lead a right half wheel, then move up successively, perform a “right turn” and dress right on the company preceding it. Meanwhile, the 1st Company would already be firing into the Confederate line. It could be done at the “double-quick” if required. Here is what it looked like:

As you can see, this is just one maneuver out of many in the manual. And yet, the officers were entrusted with knowing them all, because one never knew when one might be needed. I’ve heard it said that the
The drill manual was like a tool box. The officer in charge needed to know all the tools in his box and which one was best for each and every situation.

I am very grateful for the use of these very clear diagrams and the instruction that goes with them. The PIE Manual as we call it in reenacting does not replace the original manuals but is a great supplement to them.

The Stannard excerpt is from the O.R., 1, 27, 1, pgs. 349-50.

Next month:
As Monty Python used to say “And Now for Something Completely Different”; otherwise known as “Instruction for Skirmishers”.

**DUES & DONATIONS**
The PSCWRT season goes from September to the following May. Dues should be paid in September. Dues are payable either at the meeting or by mail: $25 per individual or for a couple. Also, donations are gratefully accepted. These will help secure speakers for our meetings. Please note that all donations are tax deductible as the PSCWRT is a 501(c)3 organization. Mail to: Stephen Pierce, Treasurer, 8008 190 Street SW, Edmonds WA 98026-6028. Call 425-773-0097 or email: horseless8@hotmail.com

We welcome your article or research submissions for the newsletter, but they may be edited for space. The deadline for the March 2019 Washington Volunteer is Monday, February 25, 2019. Please have it in Mark Terry’s hands via email or snailmail by then. Thank you!

**2018-2019 OFFICERS**
Elected:*  
President: Jeff Rombauer; jeffrombauer@foxinernt.com  
Vice President Successor: Rick Solomon; ricksolo@ricksolo.com  
Past President: Mike Movius; webmaster@pscwrt.org  
Vice President Program: Pat Brady; patsbrady@comcast.net  
Vice President Editor: Mark Terry; markimlor@comcast.net  
Vice President Marketing: Dave Otis; jbhood81@aol.com  
Vice President Membership: Arthur Banner; banneras@comcast.net  
Vice President Partnerships: Jim Dimond; shinodad@gmail.com  
Vice President Reservations: Steve Murphy; steve@adaptech.us  
Vice President Social Media: Mike Movius; webmaster@pscwrt.org  
Treasurer: Stephen Pierce; horseless8@hotmail.com  
Secretary: Doug Galuszka; dhgaluszka@aol.com

*All, except for Past President, an automatic position.